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Introduction / Abstract

The influence of geopolitical and global economic conditions on the fabric of domestic societies and on individual psychology is most frequently underestimated by civilian commentators, especially regarding Western “free and democratic” societies. The military, on the other hand, do not underestimate the importance of broad trade and economic factors on the very fabric of a society and on the psychology of its citizens, at least in targeted developing countries.

This article has two main goals.

The first is to demonstrate the large extent to which the global financial system determines national and regional reality in people’s lives and security, including in the USA itself and in the Western world in general, with an emphasis on the two main post-World-War-II transformations, which were initiated in 1971, following the cancellation of the Bretton Woods agreement, and in 1991, following the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

---


2 So-called sanctions (and trade blockades) and currency devaluation are weapons of mass destruction, often applied prior to economic restructuring or military obliteration, just as “winning hearts and minds” is a weapon of economic occupation. And see: “Leaked Wikileaks Doc Reveals US Military Use of IMF, World Bank as "Unconventional" Weapons — This “U.S. coup manual,” recently highlighted by WikiLeaks, serves as a reminder that the so-called “independence” of such financial institutions as The World Bank and IMF is an illusion and that they are among the many “financial weapons” regularly used by the U.S. government to bend countries to its will.” By Whitney Webb, MintPress News, 7 February 2019, https://www.mintpressnews.com/leaked-wikileaks-doc-reveals-how-us-military-uses-of-imf-world-bank-as-unconventional-weapons/254708/.
The second is to describe the on-going tectonic shift that followed the 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union in broader terms than is usually envisioned, and how this driven and coordinated shift was chronologically accompanied by: a dramatic acceleration of trade and finance “globalization”, and an unprecedented campaign of social engineering of the Western upper-middle-classes, aimed at facilitating USA and world-elite opportunistic exploitation of the new global circumstances, in turn leading to the present Gilets jaunes, Brexit, Trump… backlash. (In a sense, “the Russians did it.”)

For an “executive summary” with description of the supporting socio-economic data, see the Conclusion section.
PART-I: ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION

Bretton Woods

The deciding architects of the post-Second-World-War (post-WWII) Bretton Woods system of global finance wanted stable conditions for the growth and reconstruction of the USA-led “free world”, to avoid wars and destabilizing economic maneuvering between capitalist Western states, and to facilitate military and strategic integration under USA supremacy, while allowing “fair” exploitation of the “developing world” and Western allies, under USA control.

The resulting Bretton Woods system had three operational components [1][2]:

1. “[T]he American dollar functioned as a virtual world currency, conferring great advantages on the US vis-à-vis the other capitalist powers. These advantages were limited, at least in theory, by the provision that the US dollar could be redeemed in gold at the rate of $35 per ounce.”[2]

2. There were mechanisms to ensure balance of trade accounts, including the control of currency exchange rates. No signatory nation could accumulate an excessive deficit or surplus.
3. Capital mobility (flight) was limited, in order to preserve some national economic sovereignty: “Keynes had made clear that if free capital movements were allowed then it would not be possible to establish the kind of regulated capitalism at which the new agreement was aimed. ‘Freedom of capital movements,’ he insisted, ‘is an essential part of the old laissez-faire system and assumes that it is right to have an equalisation of interest rates in all parts of the world. ... In my view the whole management of the domestic economy depends upon being free to have the appropriate rate of interest without reference to the rates prevailing elsewhere in the world. Capital control is a corollary to this.’”[2]

Obviously, unilateral sanctions against signatories (against members of the “free world” and its protectorates) were not possible.

A foreseen flaw with Bretton Woods was the “asymmetric adjustment problem”: [1]

“In particular, Keynes (1942–3) held strongly the view that the major problem of all international monetary systems had been that they forced asymmetric balance-of-payments adjustment on deficit versus surplus countries: the former were forced to adjust, as they generally lacked adequate external financing or adequate reserves to manage crises, whereas surplus countries did not face similar pressures. Keynes’ obsession with this issue was, of course, related to the fact that this asymmetry generates a global contractionary bias during crises. [...] The asymmetric adjustment problem, therefore, continued to be a feature of the system designed at Bretton Woods as well as of the non-system that succeeded it.”

In the absence of abuse, or in the presence of corrective measures, this built-in problem did not threaten the viability of the system.

The Bretton Woods period, from 1945 to 1971, saw unprecedented distributed economic growth, development of a strong Western middle-class, cultural, technological and scientific development, colonial liberation of Africa, and the creation of effective global negotiating bodies such as the United Nations, including several war-prevention protocols and conventions.

**USA annuls Bretton Woods**

The system worked too well. The USA experienced a growing deterioration of its preeminence as the main trade-surplus nation, and projected a difficulty in honouring the gold redeeming arrangement if confidence in the USA dollar were to falter. If the rules were maintained, the “asymmetric adjustment problem” could become a problem for the USA itself, which would be obliged to either reduce its large military expenditures or devastate its middle-class.

The first rule, written or unwritten, is that the boss can change the rules. “On August 15, 1971, without prior warning to the leaders of the other major capitalist powers, US president Nixon announced in a Sunday evening televised address to the nation that the US was [unilaterally] removing the gold backing from the dollar.”[2]

Nick Beams put it this way:[2]

“—In 1971 an administration grouping under the leadership of Paul Volcker (later to become chairman of the US Federal Reserve Board) concluded that financing for US
deficits has ‘permitted the United States to carry out heavy overseas military expenditure and to undertake other foreign commitments’ and that an important goal was to ‘free ... foreign policy from constraints imposed by weaknesses in the financial system.’ [...] Moreover, there was considerable support for the view within US ruling circles that if the system of controls on capital movements were scrapped, the US would be able to maintain its hegemonic position because of its weight within the world economy. Other nations would want to hold dollars because of the role it played in the international monetary system.—"

Unlocking the dollar from gold freed the USA to print as much money as it wanted, and to disregard any trade deficit (or "debt") that it might accumulate, as long as the dollar kept its place as the de facto world currency. The mechanisms were brilliantly explained by Michael Hudson in his 1972 book “Super Imperialism: The Economic Strategy of American Empire”.

OPEC caught on quickly. The so-called oil crisis of the 1970s followed on the heels of the demise of Bretton Woods. Basically, the major oil-producing countries increased the US-dollar price of oil to maintain a constant gold-based value of oil when the dollar was decoupled from gold, thus protecting their true buying power despite oil-contracts in US dollars.[3]

Excluding gold itself, oil became the first global commodity to acquire a constant and significant value, as long as OPEC could control its price. No other essential legal commodity (labour, agriculture...) achieved this feat. Given oil’s central importance in the real economy, in industrial and domestic operations,3 demand for the US dollar would be high and the US dollar would preserve its preeminence, as long as oil contracts were forced to be in US dollars.

This is why there is coercive military presence in the Middle East, and why Israel has become tied to the hip of the USA. It explains the destructive wars against Iraq and Libya, both oil-producing countries that sought freedom from the US dollar.

Another major global commodity that tends to be valued in “gold” prices is opioid drugs. The USA has an “existential” interest to ensure that opioid drugs are traded in USA dollars. This explains the USA occupation of Afghanistan (“In 2015 Afghanistan produced about 66% of the world’s opium.”[4]), and the zeal with which the USA enforces drug patents and big-pharma monopoly. It explains the USA’s “war on drugs” in Latin America.

From a world-currency-based empire perspective, the USA war in Afghanistan is not an "error", nor is it a "failure": “After 16 years and $1tn spent, there is no end to the fighting – but western intervention has resulted in Afghanistan becoming the world’s first true narco-state.”[5]

Similarly, the “green revolution” of USA-patented GMO crops is an extortion racket for global agriculture, in which the seeds and tailored pesticides and herbicides are bought in US dollars.

The ultimate over-priced item in the present non-system is USA military hardware sold, like any mafia sells “protection”, to all “allies” under the USA umbrella. To buy Russian military technology is a fatal or near-fatal transgression, as Saudi Arabia recently discovered with a contract for S-400 missiles, which almost caused a regime change.[6]

---

3 Fossil fuels, today, comprise 87 % of all energy used in the world. Low tech (e.g., wood burning) and high tech (e.g., wind, nuclear) have proven to be either impractical in most settings or prohibitively expensive to manufacture, operate, and decommission (all activities requiring fossil fuel use).
Therefore, since the collapse of Bretton Woods, the USA has been forced to vigilantly project its military power to every continent, on aircraft carriers and through covert means, in order to impose the global currency that it prints. It is not uncommon for the USA to ship freight containers full of actual printed dollars to establish “democracy” in overthrown states such as Iraq.

The USA cannot be in every village and board room. Without the dollar, it is not the master of the world. This explains almost everything, as we will see further, below.

The most dramatic graph of the global economic significance of the Bretton Woods system and its demise is this one, showing the USA trade imbalance (as percentage of US-GDP) from 1895 to 2015:

![U.S. Merchandise Trade Balance (1895-2015)](image)

The imbalance goes from positive and stable to negative, at 1971, and grows to a large permanent and negative value until this day. We also note a large increase in the negative slope at the 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union, which is the main subject of this article.

**Societal impact associated with the collapse of Bretton Woods**

USA power did not want its world dominance to be interfered with by economic constraints designed to provide global stability. It did not want to be limited in its military expenditures and it wanted to print the currency that would be imposed globally.
The USA exploited the 1970s “oil crisis” in institutionalized (media and academic expert) propaganda to justify putting a halt to middle-class development that had led to “The Crisis of Democracy”[7] and that had threatened its Vietnam and perpetual-war project.

It also criminalized and jailed the radical “ghetto” element of society in order to toxify the fertile ground that had produced Robert F. Williams, Malcolm X, the Black Panthers, and others. Urban ghettos would never again be allowed to independently be politicized.

These implementations are discernible in the following two graphs of macro-economic parameters. The first shows inflation-corrected hourly worker wages and USA productivity per hour worked, from 1948 to 2013:

The halting of worker wages is evident, and detaches from the increasing productivity per hour worked, following the USA’s cancellation of the Bretton Woods agreement (1971).

The second graph shows USA incarceration rates:
Starting at the sudden dismantling of the Bretton Woods system (1971), the incarceration rate for men increased five-fold, to a staggering near 1% of the male population. The devastation to communities plateaus at approximately the year 1998. The USA has the highest population incarceration rate in the world.[8]

These post-Bretton-Woods changes were accompanied by USA-managed finance globalization, which supports the US dollar as a global currency by increasing interlocked global trade and debt relations, and by enlisting the global elite:[1]

“The shift towards liberalizing capital flows started with the United States in 1974 but then spread to the rest of the developed world in the second half of the 1970s and through the 1980s, and was essentially completed by these countries in the early 1990s. […] This worldwide trend was reinforced by the multiplication and expansion of offshore financial centres. In any case, IMF rules continue to allow countries to regulate capital flows. The attempt by the managing director of the IMF, with US support (and pressure), to change the Articles of Agreement in 1997 to impose the obligation of capital account convertibility on Fund members was defeated. Major constraints on capital account regulation came with free trade agreements, notably those with the United States.”

Post-Bretton-Woods globalization was not “free trade”, nor was it “balanced development”. It was anchored in USA control of the de facto global currency, and it was predatory. It eventually had palpable consequences in Western societies, beyond stagnation of real wages and out-of-sight incarcerations, such as the apparent homelessness in USA and Canadian cities, which accelerated as an emergent phenomenon in the 1980s,[9] associated with a predictable major Western recession—the 1982 crash, from Third World debt defaults on predatory loans from USA banks (see Michael Hudson’s analyses). For an overview of the magnitude and duration of the global effects of the early-1980s recession, see the Wikipedia article “Early 1980s recession” (accessed on 28 February 2019).
The said post-Bretton-Woods predatory globalization gave rise to what could be termed “globalization migration”. Although, to our knowledge, it has previously not been linked as such, a macro-economic or social-geography signature of the USA cancellation of the Bretton Woods system is the dramatic increase in legal immigration to the USA, starting in approximately 1971:[10]

Thus, we see a post-WWII USA that first consolidated its strength by building up the “free world” to oppose the communist blocks, using elements of state-of-the-art macro-economic theory (Bretton Woods), then, in 1971, abandoned cooperation to preserve its top-predator status, suppressed dissent at home, and pursued covert and military enforcement and spread of world-currency-enabled exploitation by any means, except to the extent that it was limited by Cold War opposition.

This is the USA-centered context of the next global event that changed the world: the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union.
The 1991 fall of the Soviet Union

Following Russia’s long, costly and transformative war in Afghanistan, against CIA-armed jihadist resisters, the Soviet Union dissolved on December 26, 1991, by declared recognition of independence of the former Soviet republics. The fall of the Soviet Union was a major world event, comparable in importance to the world wars that preceded it. This graph gives a world-communist perspective of the event:

Globalization response to the fall of the Soviet Union

It is not generally recognized that the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union spurred accelerated “globalization” that restructured Western domestic societies to a degree comparable to the magnitude of changes occurring in a war period. But this fact is evident from many global parameters.

The circumstances that should have led to an increase in distributed global wealth from integrated military and economic cooperation with former Cold War foes, a la Bretton Woods, instead led to a USA rampage for unrestricted exploitation of and dominance over formerly protected regions.

The USA could not invent wars fast enough, to enforce its will and its currency: a renewed war on drugs, the Gulf War, wars to “prevent genocide”, NATO expansion, the war on terror, wars to bring “democracy” and “human rights”, war to “protect transportation routes”, and so on.

An aggressive financial “globalization” ensued. Investment revenues went through the ceiling and elite salaries became stratospheric, at the same time that targeted influential professional orders (teaching and civil service) were gutted of professional independence, and the support structures of the working class were decimated, including their jobs. In contrast, lawyers and doctors were elevated to the highest corporate-service levels.
Acceleration of *de facto* globalization is seen in a graph of world exports plus imports as percentage of GDP (gross domestic product):[12]

Here, we see a first rise following dissolution of the Bretton Woods system, a plateau up to the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union, followed by the current accelerated globalization (large positive slope).

The post-1991 acceleration of globalization is also recorded in the “KOF Globalization Index”: [13]

Here, “de facto globalization measures actual international flows and activities, de jure globalization measures policies and conditions that, in principle, enable, facilitate and foster flows and activities”. [13]
The Bank for International Settlements (BIS) describes the said post-1991 acceleration of globalization in the following terms:[14]

“—External financial assets and liabilities have soared, from around 36% of GDP in 1960 to around 400% ($293 trillion) in 2015. The rapid expansion in financial openness from the mid-1990s has been concentrated in advanced economies. Relative to GDP, the external positions of advanced economies and emerging market economies (EMEs) were roughly equal up until the early 1990s. Since then, the cross-border financial assets and liabilities of advanced economies have surged, from roughly 135% to over 570% of GDP.—”

The post-Soviet-Union globalization, the post-1991 accelerated globalization, the new globalization, is a globalization era characterized by a large negative net international investment position (NIIP) of the USA, in which the USA became the largest debtor nation:[15]

See Wikipedia for a background definition of NIIP, and references therein.[16] The post-Soviet-Union globalization (1991-), like the post-Bretton-Woods globalization (1971-) is highlighted by a large onset of USA immigration. In the following graph, we note large step-wise increases in the decadal changes in number of USA immigrants, occurring at the decadal markers 1970 and 1990:
The decadal change in USA immigration population is virtually zero until the 1970-1980 decade in which it jumps to almost 5 million per decade, is virtually constant up to 1990, and then jumps to over 10 million per decade in 1990-2000.

Here, the “percent immigrants” (red line) is the value at each end of decade. The yearly data counts all immigrants (persons not born in the USA), both legal and illegal. The values for 2010-2020 are linearly extrapolated from the data up to 2017. Source of the data: MPI.[10]

The post-1991 accelerated globalization is also seen in China’s economic development. China was in-effect integrated into capitalist globalization at the 1991 turning point, as show in a graph of its GDP:[17]
There are many records of the investor-benefits and elite-managerial bonanza that ensued. A conservative indicator of investment profits is seen in the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS) fund value evolution from 1988 to 2018:[18]

Here, a positive mean slope of 10 billion per year is sustained after 1991. “As of June 30, 2014, CalPERS managed the largest public pension fund in the United States, with $300.3 billion in assets” (Wikipedia).

The inflation-adjusted Dow Jones stock market index shows a more dramatic post-1991 rise of globalization, in one of its main effects:[19-a]
The initial lag, immediately following 1991, may be due to the lag-time for the USA military apparatus to position itself and to be perceived as “assertive” regarding globalization, in the post-Soviet-Union era. Regarding the 1995 Taiwan Strait crisis, BBC News put it this way: “The US’ pivotal role was most clearly shown in 1996, when China conducted provocative missile tests to try and influence Taiwan’s first direct presidential election. In response, US President Bill Clinton ordered the biggest display of US military power in Asia since the Vietnam War, sending ships to the Taiwan Strait, and a clear message to Beijing.”[19-b]

However, the said initial lag, may be largely due to the time between initialing of the draft (October 1992) and establishment (January 1, 1994) of the massive North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). It appears that the first task of the USA, following the fall of the Soviet Union was to strong-arm Mexico and Canada into the vast socio-economic integration that was NAFTA. The impact of NAFTA on Canadian society has been transformative.[20]

**Effect of post-Soviet-Union globalization on social-class structure**

The corresponding geographic class restructuring that has occurred since the post-1991 accelerated globalization has been described using the growth-by-income-percentile-distribution known as the “elephant graph”.[21][22] The social geography of the changes in Western states has been studied in detail by Christophe Guilluy.[23] The (“elephant”) graph of percent real income growth since 1988 (to 2008, or present, say) by percentile of global income (as a density distribution) shows a frozen poverty segment, rise of a middle-class in developing economies
(China), decline of the Western middle-class (“deplorables”), and disproportionate income growth of the managerial and elite classes (“bobos”) as:[24]

The elephant graph can also be constructed for years from 1980 to 2016 and using a logarithmic scale for the higher income group percentiles, which looks like this:[25]

These “elephant graphs” reflect two other main features that characterize the new post-1991 globalization, beyond the coarse aspects of reported global trade and financial mobility. These are two sides of a campaign of class restructuring that created the present Western-class divide.
between the “bobos” and the “deplorables”,[26] referred to as the “anywheres” and the “somewheres” by British journalist David Goodhart: rocketing elite salaries, and dismantling of the independent-professional and working-class support systems in Western nations.

The takeoff of “rocketing elite salaries” is well documented, such as in the ratio of CEO to worker incomes, which closely matches or correlates to global investment returns (see Dow Jones Index, above):[27]

Likewise, clear early-1990s rises in the incomes of top percentile income groups is detected in data up to the year 2000 for Canada and the USA, but was not linked by those authors to accelerating globalization.[28]

**Emergent features in the new (post-Soviet-Union) globalization**

Novel features in the new globalization included more aggressive predation of allied-country economies through new massive trade agreements, and through increased investment mega-mergers across national boundaries.

In North America, there was NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. It was wholesale dismantling of the trade and social-policy sovereignties of Canada and Mexico; a corporate and investor agreement in the hands of the dominant USA partner.
In Canada, the NAFTA trade agreement worked to dismantle social-program sovereignty, in at least two ways.

First, those domestic business “leaders” and interests that benefit from globalization relentlessly apply political pressure for the dismantling:[20]

“—Since the beginning of the free-trade era, Canada’s own business elite has argued that Canadian social programs would have to conform to the generally inferior U.S. levels in order to maintain competitiveness. As early as 1980, Laurent Thibault, who later became president of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, told a Senate committee: “It is a simple fact that, as we ask our industries to compete toe to toe with American industry ... we in Canada are obviously forced to create the same conditions in Canada that exist in the U.S., whether it is the unemployment insurance scheme, Workmens’ (sic) Compensation, the cost of government, the level of taxation, whatever.”

Indeed in April of 1989, just four months after the implementation of the CUFTA, the Conservative government brought down what became known as its “free-trade budget”. It included cuts to Unemployment Insurance, Old Age Security and federal transfers to provinces for health care and education. This pattern of spending cuts continued throughout the mandate of the Conservative government. It was accelerated after the Liberals were elected in 1993 and especially pronounced in the watershed budget of 1995 which included C$29 billion in spending cuts over three years.— ” (at p. 53)

Second, the very principle of foreign investment works its magic:[20]

“—The broader social impact of NAFTA is captured by Ken Traynor of the Canadian Environment Law Association who comments, “The old issue of who gets what even when overall ‘economic efficiency’ may have been enhanced is worth examining. Consider moving brassière manufacture from Cambridge, Ontario to Juárez on the Mexican border. $8 per hour wages paid to women in Cambridge to produce brassieres sold for $20...gets spent in the immediate vicinity of their homes, gets taxed and the firm generates local municipal taxes too. With NAFTA and a shift of production to the maquilas, only $2 of the $64 per day wages saved goes to the women in Mexico and almost none of the municipal and other taxes are paid in Mexico. The $62 per day per worker gets reallocated to Exxon for fuel to ship things around, to road transport companies, to brokers, and to the company itself and the spending circle of these guys is very different than that of the women displaced. And where the money circulates does matter,” Traynor concludes, “especially to the women in this example.”— ” (at p. 55)

The said magic was well understood by all the great classic economic theorists of the industrial era but has been turned on its head in the false logic of post-Bretton-Woods finance globalization, and with a vengeance in post-Soviet-Union globalization.[29]

Indeed, the said vengeance is also seen in the other important emergent feature in the new globalization of the post-Soviet-Union era, which is the following.

The USA predation is no longer solely based on the wealth-extraction conveyer belt of printing the imposed world currency. In addition, the large USA banks (Wall Street) have bought the Democratic Party outright and (in addition to their muscle in the USA system) have thereby acquired free reign to create money for themselves by scamming, and fixing and gaming the system, while being bailed out when the most daring mega-hustles fail, such as in 2008.[29]
The said emergent feature is well illustrated by this graph of percentage of total banking assets belonging to the ten largest (USA) banks:[30]

![Chart showing percentage of total banking assets belonging to the ten largest banks.](image)

This phenomenal concentration of capital ownership is accompanied by a large incidence of USA bankruptcies, under all judicial structures:[31]

![Bankruptcy Case Loads, 1899-2016](image)

More concretely, the said emergent feature of the new globalization corresponds to an unprecedented wave of global mega-mergers, the so-called “fifth wave of mergers (1993-2000)”, in the economic history of mergers and acquisitions.[32] USA mergers lawyer Martin Lipton described the fifth wave this way:[33]

“—**Fifth Period – 1993 to 2000.** This was the era of the mega-deal. It ended with the bursting of the Millennium Bubble and the great scandals, like Enron, which gave rise to the revolution in corporate governance that is continuing today. During the fifth wave companies of unprecedented size and global sweep were created on the assumption
that size matters, a belief bolstered by market leaders’ premium stock-market valuations. High stock prices simultaneously emboldened companies and pressured them to do deals to maintain heady trading multiples. A global view of competition, in which companies often find that they must be big to compete, and a relatively restrained antitrust environment led to once-unthinkable combinations, such as the mergers of Citibank and Travelers, Chrysler and Daimler Benz, Exxon and Mobil, Boeing and McDonnell Douglas, AOL and Time Warner, and Vodafone and Mannesmann. From a modest $342 billion of deals in 1992, the worldwide volume of mergers marched steadily upward to $3.3 trillion worldwide in 2000. Nine of the ten largest deals in history all took place in the three-year period 1998-2000, with the tenth in 2006.—"

This graph of volume of mergers per year (in trillions of dollars) is worth a thousand words:[34]

The onset of the fifth wave is ascribed to “deregulation and globalization”,[32] however, we have not found any analysts or commentators who have linked the fifth wave of mergers (the new globalization) to the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union. It seems to us that the fall of the Soviet Union would have generated a zeal for USA-led deregulated mergers because the sudden absence of a global superpower-backed competing block would make capitalist satellite jurisdictions (Canada, Europe…) particularly vulnerable.

Indeed, the damage caused to Mexico by the new globalization (NAFTA and predatory investment) is strikingly reflected in the post-1991 surge of illegal USA immigration:[35]
Here, the number of undocumented immigrants shoots up in the mid-1990s, from values in the range 1-3 million to a plateau value of approximately 11 million, starting in the mid-2000s.

**Post-Soviet-Union era down-scaling of the social safety net and human consequences of the increased globalization**

The said “dismantling of the independent-professional and working-class support systems in Western nations” is difficult to illustrate by a single graph of some global economic parameter, because the changes were fragmented through several layers and regions of governance and different territorial jurisdictions (nation, state or province, municipality, public board). The changes were varied and occurred in institutions, regulations, statutes, governance structures, and management culture.

In Canada, the changes were experienced as though, in the vicinity of 1994 (NAFTA came into force on January 1, 1994), word was sent down from the governing elites, to every elected political leader, and to all influential board members of all the major public corporations, that everything needed to be overhauled because there was too much democracy for what was to come.
Regarding social transformation:[36]

“—Up until 1995, provinces and territories received funding for their social programs through the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP), a policy introduced in 1966 that enshrined national standards for welfare policies and guaranteed matching federal funds for every dollar spent by provinces on social welfare programs, based on a core concept of ‘need.’

In 1995, as part of a debt reduction strategy, the federal government changed its formula to a block funding model, called the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST), which combined funding for health, education, and social welfare into one block transfer to each province and at the same time reduced national standards and the amount of funding that each province would receive.

[…] The overall number of people receiving social assistance fell from just over 3 million in 1993 to 1.75 million in 2003 (…) in spite of a growing population.—” (at pp. 37-38)

One end result, shown graphically, is in the number of social rental housing units completed per year:

![Social housing units built, by year, Canada 1972–2010](source: calculated by the first author from CMHC Canadian Housing Observer, various years).

The number of lone-mothers with children rose from approximately 410,000 in 1990 to 530,000 in 1994. The post-NAFTA value of 550,000 lone-mothers is one-and-one-third the value at 1990, while the slope of increase in lone-fathers with children changed from 1,500 per year in 1976-1990 to 4,700 per year in 1990-2008.[37]
Therefore, the aggressive globalization wave that followed the 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union may have put unprecedented strain on families with children. A strain on families is corroborated by the fact that, in Canada, the volumes of family-law and child-protection litigation in the courts increased dramatically (three-fold) from a relatively low quasi-plateau value in the 1980s, through a large climb in the 1990s, to a higher quasi-plateau value in the 2000s and 2010s. This is seen both in claims and applications received and in judgements rendered.[38]

In addition to the area of family law, court-judgement databases for Canada show 1990s threefold increases in numbers of judgements per year in several broad areas of law: criminal, bankruptcy, health, contract, and defamation.

A large increase (threefold, from 1993 to the early-2000s) also occurred in the USA, in terms of the legal needs of low-income households, as reported on the basis of several (nine) extensive surveys:[39]

"—With one exception, all [nine] of the recent state studies found a level of [legal] need substantially higher than the level found in the 1994 ABA study. The ABA study found an annual average of 1.1 needs per low-income household, while the recent state studies range up to more than three legal needs per house-hold per year, as shown in Table 3. The ABA study thus represents the lowest figure available for estimating the number of legal needs experienced by low-income Americans.

Footnote: The studies found that most problems were experienced in the areas of housing (such as evictions, foreclosure, and unsafe housing conditions), consumer (such as debt collection, bankruptcy, and consumer scams), and family (such as divorce,
domestic violence, child custody and support), as well as employment, government benefits, health care, and regional and community problems. Although the distribution of problem types varied somewhat from state to state, the same basic types of problems appeared in all nine states.

Footnote: One recent state study found that the legal needs of low-income people in the state had actually increased over the preceding decade. The 2003 Massachusetts study documented a higher level of legal needs than had been found in a 1993 state study using a similar methodology. The study concluded that these differences were not attributable to methodology, but rather indicated an increase in needs since 1993. —"

In our view, the 1990s increase in both need and litigation, occurring in several Western nations, is the fundamental cause of the widespread so-called “crisis in access to justice”, although professional associations and legal commentators are silent on the increase, and have ascribed the “crisis” essentially to the high costs of lawyers.[40][41][42]

The full array of globalization-induced consequences to individuals and families in Western societies is expected to have included: job scarcity, job insecurity, lost prospects of job promotions, lower earnings, diminished State safety net, increased housing costs, increased travel costs, and so on.

These factors appear to have also translated into measurable impacts on individual health, including suicide, opioid overdose, and asthma, as follows.

Suicide attempt rates and mortality from suicide are established to be highly correlated with low economic status in Western societies; for example, in Quebec society (Canadian province).[43] The age-standardized rates of suicide-attempt hospitalizations (per 100,000 population) by gender, in Quebec, show large significant increases in going from 1990-1993 to 1994-1997, of more than 30 %, for both genders:[43]

![Graph showing suicide attempt rates](image)

A 1990-1993 to 1994-1997 increase also occurs in the mortality rate from suicide, and large economic-status differences in suicide rates are seen for all age groups and both genders.[43]
The same type of trend occurs in the USA regarding suicide, such as with rates of hospital emergency department (ED) visits:[44]

“—With regard to temporal trends, rates for attempted suicide and self-inflicted injury increased significantly over the 16-year period from 1993 to 2008 (P for trend <0.001). The average annual number of ED visits for suicide attempt and self-inflicted injury more than doubled from 244,000 between 1993–1996 to 538,000 between 2005–2008 (Figure 2), a ratio of 2.21 (95%CI; 2.02–2.40). […]

This increase in self-harm visit rates per 1,000 US population was seen in all major demographic groups. Comparing 1993–1996 to 2005–2008, rates nearly doubled for both males (0.84 to 1.62) and females (1.04 to 1.96). Similar increases were noted for patients aged 15–19 (2.57 to 4.53), 30–49 (1.29 to 2.49), and those over 50 (0.11 to 0.90). Likewise, increases were observed for whites (0.94 to 1.82) and blacks (1.14 to 2.10).—”

This confirmed a similar earlier study, which was for the period 1992-2001.[45]

Opioid overdose population statistics show the same picture:[46]

“—In a nationally representative database of U.S. ED [emergency department] visits, we found that the ED visit rate for opioid overdose quadrupled from 1993 to 2010. […]

Between 1993 and 2010, the national ED visit rate for opioid overdose increased from 7 to 27 per 100,000 population (307% increase; Ptrend = 0.03) and from 19 to 63 per 100,000 ED visits (235% increase; Ptrend < 0.001—"

Asthma epidemiology is likewise informative. “Asthma is one of the most common chronic conditions affecting both children and adults.”[47] We are said to be in the midst of a global asthma epidemic. In addition to genetic and environmental and other causal factors, there is a link to socio-economic stress: “Children whose caregivers report high levels of stress and who have difficulties parenting are at greatest risk for asthma.”[47]

An authoritative review has:[48]

“—The prevalence and incidence of asthma are very high in the Western world. […] According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the prevalence of asthma among U.S. children increased from 3.6% in 1980 to 5.8% in 2003. Asthma is the third leading cause of hospitalization among persons under 18 years of age in the United States, exceeded only by pneumonia and injuries.—”

In the early-1990s, the number of ambulatory visits for asthma per 1,000 children 0–17 years of age in the USA rose from a 1980s plateau value of approximately 30 to values of approximately 60, extending into the 2000s (Fig. 3 in [49], and see Fig. 3 in [50]). At the same time, in the vicinity of 1993, the number of attributed asthma deaths in the USA, per 100,000 population, had a 17 % step-wise increase from approximately 48 to approximately 56 (Fig. 4, in [51]).

Coming back to NAFTA in Canada, in another example, the grants to university students were cut dramatically in Canada’s largest province of Ontario, at the same time that the province’s GDP grew equally dramatically:[52]
Such social cuts that followed the dissolution of the Soviet Union were not simply a consequence of adjusting to a more competitive trading partner. They seemed to be ideological, without a valid economic justification in terms of domestic strength, stability, and equity. For example, in the USA, President Bill Clinton (January 1993 to 2001) oversaw a massive cut in welfare, which produced the only federal budget surplus of the USA since the end of Bretton Woods, during a period of fairly constant defence spending:
For comparison, USA defence spending in the periods of globalization looks like this:
Removing professional independence by restructuring institutions

It was not just welfare that was cut in Canada. Large cuts and imposed structural changes were implemented in public education, in the research-university system, and in the federal civil service. The restructuring significantly reduced profession independence and academic freedom in these sectors.

Premier Mike Harris in Ontario (1995-2002) applied his so-called “common sense revolution”, whereby he reduced primary school and high-school to holding and obedience-training farms by attacking the preparation and professional-development allocations of teachers. Teachers were reduced to overworked baby-sitters “delivering” a more centralized and directed curriculum. Grade-13 was eliminated altogether, without effective recovery at the university level. Student tolerance to Power Point presentations and sterile content increased. Undergraduate education in Ontario has never recovered.

The universities themselves were restructured, using draconian and arbitrary cuts. The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) reported:[53]

“—Ontario Finance Minister Ernie Eves announced a 1 per cent cut to university funding - the full amount promised in the Tory Common Sense Revolution for the life of the government - as part of his November 29, 199 economic statement.—”

In response, for example, the University of Ottawa named an out-of-faculty hatchet-man dean of science who threatened to eliminate entire departments in order to get cooperation for increased centralization and resource reduction. Independent departments historically managed by committees of professors and students became centrally managed, and lost control over
their operating budgets. New staff was *de facto* named by the university administration, following centralizing strategic “mission statements”, rather than selected by the department. And so on. The net effect was that professors were further constrained to “their” research areas, and curricula were more centralized and regulated. Professors lost management of the academic units. Both professional independence and academic freedom were significantly reduced in the new organizational structure.

At the same time, the university research federal funding model was overhauled away from principle-investigator-directed independent research and towards industry-partnered research, and formalized mega-research alliances. University offices of industrial and contract cooperation mushroomed, at the same time that curricula became bland textbook-supported content delivered in a standardized way. Fewer and fewer tenured faculty were hired; and, in practice, a shrinking fraction of the research professors could tailor their research to supplement teaching, digress from the curricular track, or find the time to prepare classes from multiple and current sources. In any case, the students, coming out of the new high-schools, wanted only to be rewarded for obedience.

On the larger scale of the entire country, the new globalization that followed the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union, and the 1994 establishment of NAFTA, is seen in large cuts, from 1993 to 2000, to both the federal program expenses and the Canadian federal public workforce:[54]
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The cuts in the federal government workforce were not uniform. Rather they targeted sector managers who had institutional memory and influence on policy, the so-called Assistant Deputy Ministers (ADMs) (“the most senior public servants appointed under the Public Service Employment Act”).[55] The ADMs are the largest contingency of high-level managers who attend Executive Committee meetings of the government ministries. They are the most influential government employees below the Deputy Minister and Associate Deputy Minister.

Most analysts present the social-services cuts as necessary to reduce the government deficit,[56][57] but otherwise outside of the historic global context. However, the actual cuts were preceded by a structural overhaul of the public service, intended to align and redesign the
government machinery in the new era of NAFTA. Prime Minister Mulroney had given Canada NAFTA, and then he resigned and gave the job of cutting and transforming government in order to implement NAFTA to Kim Campbell. She dramatically and irreversibly initiated the transformation in the four months of her only term in office as Prime Minister (July-October 1993), thereby preparing the government apparatus for the actual cuts to social services that would be made by the Liberal government.

Analyst Evert Lindquist describes the Campbell-implemented transformation in the following terms:[58]

“— […] a bolt out of the blue which reduced the number of ministers and departments from 32 to 23, and affecting tens and tens of thousands of federal public servants. It was a comprehensive, fundamental re-design of the structure of the Canadian government, affecting not only the size and operation of Cabinet, but also the size and portfolios of a host of departments and portfolios. Planned in secret out with the Machinery of Government group in the Privy Council Office, the restructuring initiative had the general endorsement of Prime Ministers Brian Mulroney and Kim Campbell […]

But the June 1993 restructuring, which was followed by the significant targets set out early on in the 1994-95 Program Review process, led to significant upheavals for public servants at all levels – gone was the long-held assumption that the Canadian Public Service could provide jobs and careers for life, since even high-performing individuals found themselves dismissed from their positions, in temporary assignments, or waiting for whatever positions would open up in the new departments (Lindquist and Paquet 2000). This break from long-held understandings was reinforced over the next decade with public servants increasingly receiving less protection from the media and more blame from governments and their ministers (Savoie 2003).

It is also important to understand that the two-step sequence was not an accident: the designers of the June 1993 restructuring knew that when a new government was elected in late 1993, it would have to deal decisively with Canada’s growing deficit and debt situation and that difficult policy and program decisions would need to be made to deal with short-term needs, such as building confidence in financial markets, and longer-term rethinking of policies and programs in almost every sector. Restructuring the government at the level of cabinet and ministerial portfolios was seen as the means for repositioning the cabinet and its public service to make and implement these impending decisions.—”

In our words, constrained by NAFTA, you can cut social services rather than increase corporate and resource-extraction taxes, and reduce democratic participation in or control of society, but you need compliance to get it through: independent-minded civil servants who have an institutional culture of serving the public, and who have some sway, need to be brought in line. It’s the “difficult” ADMs that were let go.

To be clear, the historically unprecedented 1993-2000 cuts in “federal program expenses” (social-support programs) were particularly harsh and contrary to Canadian social-program design sovereignty, in that equivalent services or programs could not easily be recovered later, due to the Chapter-11 “investor rights” clauses of NAFTA. That is, foreign corporations would have to be compensated for future lost profits argued to arise from any recovery of sovereignty, with additional great legal expense in the litigation itself (and potential for public exposure).[20][59]
Post-Soviet-Union globalization deregulation of the agricultural and public-health industries

Following intense industry lobbying of USA scientists and politicians in the 1980s, government institutional culture of industry-compliance, and deregulation, accelerated in the early 1990s, setting the scene for global-market invasion of genetically modified crops (GM crops).[60] This USA phenomenon was followed in Western nations, after the regulatory principle of "substantial equivalence" was introduced by the UN Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1993, and endorsed by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and World Health Organization (WHO) in 1996.[61] Much resistance was offered by principled government scientists, but these efforts were overwhelmed.[62] Commercial sale of GM food started in 1994.

With such effective industry pressure to deregulate, and given the accelerated post-Soviet-Union (post-1991) globalization, new markets were created that transformed the agriculture, food, and public-health realms. This occurred with GM crops, pesticide use, and vaccines. All three had surges clearly starting in the early 1990s.

Regarding vaccines, the USA National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act (NCVIA) was enacted in 1986 and its National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (NVICP) became operational in 1988. The program shielded the vaccine industry from liability litigation. It is a national limited-liability public litigation-insurance program, with its own claims tribunal. Since 1988, it has received over 20 thousand claims, and paid out approximately 4 billion US dollars to over 6 thousand determined victims of vaccine injury. The corresponding average risk of determined injury is approximately 1 in 1 million vaccine doses.[63]

Roundup is a glyphosate-based herbicide introduced by Monsanto in 1976. Nonetheless, the increased use of glyphosate did not start until 1993, but prior to the 1996 introduction of GM crops. Glyphosate is used in massive quantities, especially now in combination with GM crops, which are modified to be glyphosate-resistant, and which are imposed globally by the USA development-fund loan managers. The heavy use of the herbicide has caused glyphosate-resistant "super weeds" to emerge, so that even more glyphosate is used than would otherwise be needed. Glyphosate use shows a typical signature of post-Soviet-Union globalization, by its chronology and decadal monotonic increase (here "a.i." stands for "active ingredient"): [64]
See also [65].

The number of seasonal influenza vaccine doses distributed in the USA is another example, showing the typical signature of post-Soviet-Union globalization:[66]

The influenza vaccine is overwhelmingly the most distributed vaccine in the USA, and has an average (1988-2018) NVICP-filed-injury rate of 3.3 per million doses.[63]

The number of vaccine doses delivered to less-than-24-month-old infants, per infant in the USA, also shows the typical signature of post-Soviet-Union globalization. It rose threefold, in the years from pre-1990s to 2005 (black curve):[67]

Spectrum of post-Soviet-Union globalization upsurges of chronic diseases

The USA databases of the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and of the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program of the National Cancer Institute, show that there is a spectrum of chronic diseases, and some cancers, which have death rates and
incidence rates with typical temporal-trend signatures of post-Soviet-Union globalization. This spectrum of diseases has significant and sustained occurrence-rate increases, clearly starting in the early 1990s. The spectrum includes (and see the case of asthma, described above in relation to family stress):

- death from intestinal infections
- incidence of thyroid cancer
- death from Parkinson’s disease
- prevalence of diabetes
- autism in children of different age groups
- phobia, anxiety disorder, panic disorder

One highly-cited research group has ascribed the cause to glyphosate toxicity, on the basis of documented correlation and plausible bio-molecular mechanisms.[68][69][70] Here are two examples of their graphical comparisons, for intestinal infection, and thyroid cancer:

![Graph 1](image1.png)

*Figure 2. Deaths due to intestinal infections ICD A04, A09; 008, 009 with glyphosate applications to wheat ($r=0.9834$, $p<0.001$). Sources: USDA/ANR; CDC. (Figure courtesy of Nancy Swanson).*

![Graph 2](image2.png)

*Figure 3. Thyroid cancer incidence rate plotted against glyphosate applied to U.S. corn & soy crops ($r=0.988$, $p<0.001$) along with %GE corn & soy crops ($r=0.9377$, $p<0.01$). Sources: USDA/ANR; SEER. (Figure courtesy of Nancy Swanson).*
Summary of the new globalization in the post-Soviet-Union world

The fall of the Soviet Union was immediately followed by an accelerated globalization in which the USA dominated its “allies” for investment supremacy, became more predatory, and allowed its financial class more latitude to defraud than ever before since WWII.

European nations anticipated the threat and signed the Maastricht Treaty on February 7, 1992, which formed the European Union and led to a unified currency for protection of Europe itself.

Major features of the new globalization were unprecedented mergers in the finance, agri-food, pharmaceutical and information-technology sectors, aggressive investor-centered “free-trade” pacts, rise of the global elite and its entourage, loss of socio-economic security for the Western middle-class, concurrent negative public-health impact (suicide, emergency-department visits, asthma), increased leniency in food and drug regulation, concurrent upsurge of disease and chronic ailments (death from intestinal infections; incidence of thyroid cancer; death from Parkinson’s disease; prevalence of diabetes; autism in children of different age groups; phobia, anxiety disorder, panic disorder), integration of China into the capitalist finance sphere, accelerated and unprecedented USA negative trade balance, alignment of the top-layer service professionals and intellectuals into the paradigm and application of the new globalism, and an increase in USA global military presence and unilateral war campaigns (first NATO, then post-9/11).

The post-9/11 war campaigns protected the US dollar from abandonment, showcased USA military strength and aggressiveness, destroyed nations seeking sovereignty from USA dominance, secured the opium trade, increased control over oil, frustrated Eurasian integration, created CIA-managed terrorist proxies from the devastation of war, and created a strong demand for USA military hardware.

Throughout all of this, it is important to keep in mind that the USA privilege of being the printer of the global currency is and remains the mechanistic backbone of the global empire, ever since the 1971 end of the Bretton Woods system. The US dollar retains its status via international demand for the US dollar, which, in turn, comes from USA control of the main commodities that have the greatest global demand and the highest prices in US dollars. These dollar-boosting “commodities” include: oil and gas, opium, financial debts of nations (serviced in US dollars), US-dollar currency choice to secure savings and investments, and USA military hardware. Recently, the USA is proposing exorbitant rent extraction (in US dollars) for its globally distributed military bases.[71]

Oil and gas are tricky, because Russia, Venezuela, China… have oil, gas, coal… and because the USA domestic energy sector (shale) is developing, causing a glut, lower energy prices, and less demand for the US dollar. Whereas a high price of oil helps USA shale, it also helps global opponents Venezuela, Iran and Russia. One “solution” is military or financial (“sanctions”-based) destruction of all energy-producing centers that the USA does not control, which may be present USA strategy?

In all of this, the Western middle and professional classes must consent (by agreement or inaction), be wilfully blind to what is actually going on, and keep “hope” in their politicians and the future. The next sections describe the vast social engineering campaigns that were created following the fall of the Soviet Union. It is not generally appreciated that these campaigns were
massively organized and implemented immediately following the fall of the Soviet Union. The said campaigns installed a primacy of select social concerns, thus masking the actual cultural and social-class restructuring, for those influential classes that can afford the illusion. Selected, siloed and constructed social concerns were: gender equity, anti-racism, and global environmentalism.

PART-II: SOCIAL-CONSTRUCT GLOBALIZATION

Mass-cooperation induced by organized religion

« [P]our qui est seul, sans dieu et sans maître, le poids des jours est terrible. Il faut donc se choisir un maître, Dieu n’étant plus à la mode. »4 —Albert Camus, La Chute, 1956

A successful empire-sanctioned and supported religion is a powerful vehicle to direct individual impetus and self-image, thereby stabilizing the empire against both rebellion and worker lethargy.

Nationalism itself is such a religion, but it can fall out of favour in an ethos of international globalization for the greater good. The Roman Empire had Roman Catholicism, which later infused European colonial powers. “The Gods” that surveil citizens for moral rectitude have often found their homes in states and empires.[72]

Such policy considerations were saliently brought forth in the early 1970s, as the instabilities from the post-Bretton-Woods globalization were first becoming palpable. The Trilateral Commission think tank was founded by David Rockefeller in 1973, and its most influential report is “The Crisis of Democracy”, published in 1975.[7] The report is silent on the Bretton Woods dissolution catastrophe and the emergent globalization, yet it expresses newfound concern for managing democratic societies. The report's authors explain the need for “gods” this way (at pages 159-160):

“—What is in short supply in democratic societies today is thus not consensus on the rules of the game but a sense of purpose as to what one should achieve by playing the game. In the past, people have found their purposes in religion, in nationalism, and in ideology. But neither church, nor state, nor class now commands people's loyalties. […] But now all three gods have failed. We have witnessed the dissipation of religion, the withering away of nationalism, the decline— if not the end— of class-based ideology.

In a nondemocratic political system, the top leadership can select a single purpose or closely related set of goals and, in some measure, induce or coerce political and social forces to shape their behavior in terms of the priorities dictated by these goals. […] In a democracy, however, purpose cannot be imposed from on high by fiat; nor does it spring to life from the verbiage of party platforms, state of the union messages, or speeches from the throne. It must, instead, be the product of the collective perception by the significant groups in society of a major challenge to their well-being and the perception by them that this challenge threatens them all about equally. […] Now, however, these purposes have lost their salience and even come under challenge; the imperatives of

4 Translation from the French: “[F]or anyone who is alone, without god and without a master, the weight of days is dreadful. Hence one must choose a master, God being out of style.”
national security are no longer obvious, the desirability of economic growth is no longer unquestioned.—"

The question arises: what can serve as an overarching religion (or collection of religions) that will support and stabilize increased USA global economic predation in the unipolar context following the fall of the Soviet Union, in a globalized world built on “universal human rights” since the end of WWII, in which multicultural immigration is a labour-supply reality?

The devices and illusions of “human rights” and “democracy” worked well for decades but it is difficult to maintain these constructs in a world in which globalization is more aggressive, more extensive, and visibly more violently enforced. Furthermore, the Cold War is no longer much of a unifying threat for Western populations.

After being subjected to the September 11, 2001 attacks, initiating the war against Afghanistan, and opening Guantanamo Bay, on May 6, 2002, the USA withdrew its signature from the 1998 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which established four core international crimes: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression.

The empire seeks to turn our attention away from actual crimes with actual victims — whether the weapons are depleted uranium or economic sanctions or debt devastation or capital flight — and instead asks us to look up to the sky for the threat (CO2) that could end the human species, no less, unless we are sufficiently good, active, and cooperative.

This, in our opinion, is the process of how the global-warming “religion” was born. Like any proper religion of an empire, it must be taxable, exploitable by a large layered array of power players, and useful in motivating massive restructuring campaigns. The alleged danger must be gigantic, involving humanity and the planet itself, in order to focus attention, and for personal investment in the religion to be rewarding.

The following section presents data showing that the current global warming ethos was artificially created following the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union, and later exploited by global financiers in the mid-2000s to create carbon trading and a carbon economy.

If there is any doubt of the potential for the global warming paradigm to in-effect be a State “religion”, even justifying war, the words of Noam Chomsky, spoken in 1994 to 1996 and 1999, merit being noted:[73]

“—For example, suppose it was discovered tomorrow that the greenhouse effect has been way underestimated, and that the catastrophic effects are actually going to set in 10 years from now, and not 100 years from now or something. Well, given the state of the popular movements we have today, we’d probably have a fascist takeover—with everybody agreeing to it, because that would be the only method for survival that anyone could think of. I’d even agree to it, because there just are no other alternatives around right now.—”

Following the global-warming section, further sections will present similar data regarding gender equity and anti-racism, as state ideologies. If the reader finds it difficult to consider that ideology related to gender and anti-racism can be a surrogate State religion, then we invite them to note how Russia has in recent years expressly motivated developing policy, ratifying national statutes, and lobbying the United Nations, to enshrine “family values” and gender-role
preservation, as questions of sovereignty, national security, and societal stability. It is interesting that, among others, Western gender-studies academics are pointing this out regarding Russia.[74]

**Emergence, capture, promotion and institutionalization of global warming**

We are not the first to propose that global warming is a religion. It seems the first was Alexander Cockburn, in 2007,[75] although he was preceded by Michael Crichton regarding environmentalism, in 2003.[76] A Google search for “global warming religion” presently gives over ten thousand relevant results. One recent example is this one.[77]

In a 2017 encyclopedia article, Mike Hulme writes:[78]

> “—The growing political resonance of climate change was partly explained by the dissolution of the Soviet Union between 1989 and 1991. Fears of Cold War destruction were displaced by those associated with climate change, prompting the observation at the time from cultural theorist Andrew Ross that, “apocalyptic fears about widespread droughts and melting ice caps have displaced the nuclear threat as the dominant feared meteorological disaster” (Ross 1991, 8).—”

This is correct, as can be seen in United Nations frameworks, and as the graphs below illustrate.

The international legal structure to monitor and control CO2 emissions was created immediately following the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union:[79]

> “—The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is an international environmental treaty adopted on 9 May 1992 and opened for signature at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro from 3 to 14 June 1992. It then entered into force on 21 March 1994, after a sufficient number of countries had ratified it. The UNFCCC objective is to ”stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system”.—”

The Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro was an integral part of the United Nations (UN) (USA) response to the Soviet Union. The official UN “Introduction” text presenting a series of post-1991 world conferences, including the Earth Summit, has:[80]

> “—All were convened with the strong support of the UN General Assembly, currently the voice of 185 Member States, and the recognition that the end of the cold war presented the opportunity — indeed, the necessity — to revitalize international cooperation on development issues. All addressed problems of a global magnitude which Member States recognized had grown beyond their individual capacities to solve and which needed a concerted international effort. All of them reflect the work of Member States and a growing number of other actors in the field of international development, particularly non-governmental organizations (NGOs). All of them actively sought out media attention, capturing the imaginations of millions of people around the world and greatly enhancing awareness and understanding of the issues in the public at large. —” (emphasis added)
At the same time, the pre-existing (1988) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was assigned to assessing the science related to climate change specifically for use by the UNFCCC.

The formalized institutional backing at the highest levels, the involvement of sectors of civil society (NGOs), and the media coverage, instantly gave the global warming narrative a large boost, both in the amount of scientific activity and in the cultural and media realms (see graphs below).

The said boost was artificial, in that the planet did not suddenly experience an onslaught of sustained climate and weather catastrophes in December 1991. There was no global change of atmospheric or climatic regime in 1991. There was no sudden increase in atmospheric concentration of CO2 in 1991.

On the latter point, high-quality instrumental measurements of CO2 have been available since the 1950s:

Likewise, climatologists did not, in 1991, suddenly start using climate models to simulate the effects of increasing CO2, or suddenly develop more sophisticated global circulation models. On the contrary, radiative and heat-transfer atmospheric physics and global circulation models of the planet were essentially as advanced as they are today as early as the 1960s, and were being used to make essentially the same CO2-effect predictions as today.⁵

In 1967 leading theoretical climatologists Manabe and Wetherald calculated a 2 degree C increase in mean global near-surface temperature from a doubling of CO2 atmospheric concentration.[81] No one batted an eye. The media was silent.

Such calculations of surface-temperature sensitivity to CO2 and other factors quickly became a mature field of science, which was reviewed by Ramanathan and Coakley in 1978. Then, as now: “The principal weakness of the current models is their inability to simulate the feedback

⁵ And these model calculations suffered from the same shortcomings as they do today: unknown cloud response, unknown atmospheric water-vapour response, unknown “dirty snow” albedo response, unknown surface-humidity emissivity response, etc. See Rancourt for definitions of the basic concepts, in the radiation-balance context: “Radiation physics constraints on global warming: CO2 increase has little effect”, by Denis Rancourt, archive.org, 4 June 2011. https://archive.org/details/RadiationPhysicsConstraintsOnGlobalWarmingCo2IncreaseHasLittleEffect
mechanism between surface temperature and cloud cover." The questions and the state of knowledge were essentially the same as today: "The review also summarizes radiative-convective model results for the sensitivity of surface temperature to perturbations in (1) the concentrations of the major and minor optically active trace constituents, (2) aerosols, and (3) cloud amount."[82]

Coupling of the ocean and atmosphere systems was included in global circulation models in 1969.[83] By 1980, detailed simulations of spatially-resolved earth surface warming were being produced. For example, Manabe and Stouffer reported winter warming in the range 6 to 18 degrees C for the Arctic Ocean and its surroundings, from quadrupling CO2 concentration (their figure 16).[84] No one got excited about a coming end of the world, whatsoever, not even when relative newcomers James Hansen and colleagues at the NASA Institute for Space Studies concluded in more alarmist terms in their 1981 paper in the influential journal Science:[85]

"—The global warming projected for the next century is of almost unprecedented magnitude. On the basis of our model calculations, we estimate it to be ~ 2.5°C for a scenario with slow energy growth and a mixture of nonfossil and fossil fuels. This would exceed the temperature during the altithermal (6000 years ago) and the previous (Eemian) interglacial period 125,000 years ago (53), and would approach the warmth of the Mesozoic, the age of dinosaurs.—"

Likewise, climate and environmental scientists did not flock to research the coming CO2-induced possible end of the world. This flocking of direction in scientific research did not occur until the UN’s post-Soviet-Union new-found UNFCCC concern to “stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system”, and until the media hype surrounding the Earth Summit. The onset of the said flocking is seen in our Google Scholar search results:

![Google Scholar search results](image)

This chart shows the number of scholarly articles with the exact phrase “climate change” (orange), “global warming” (red), or “ice-age” (bleu), each divided by the number of articles with “climate”, expressed in percentages, in decadal bands from 1960 to present. 100 % corresponds to approximately one million articles per decade.
In 2000-2010, 68% of the scientific articles with “climate” had “global warming”; which is a surprisingly high number that would never occur from spontaneous organization of scientific truth-seeking without political influence, in our opinion.

Such a high degree of polarization of scientific research, we suggest, was produced by two mechanisms: alignment of scientific public funding-agency goals with the goals of the UNFCCC, and the media and societal-status appeal of the topic. Many of the scientists, in turn, and their professional associations, were also public-policy and media-commentator contributors, which is a positive feedback for the cultural acceptance of the topic.

A separate case study of science-society feedback amplification can be made of the “nuclear winter” scientific saga of the 1980s. In the nuclear-winter saga, apocalyptic-fear interest was generated in the popular culture, during the Cold War era, using the same global circulation models developed since the 1960s to simulate the climate consequences of a large nuclear war. In 1983, Turco et al. published the prediction of their “nuclear winter” in the influential scientific journal Science, which led to a decadal flurry of scientific work.[86]

At the time, prediction of global cooling following a nuclear war seemed more worthy of increased attention than prediction of slow onset of permanent cooling from industrial activity. The difference with the continuing “global warming” episode is that “nuclear winter” did not have the backing of the UN or the USA finance and globalization interests. Nonetheless, the said feedback was qualitatively the same, and produced an instant onset of significant scientific activity, which died down at the onset of the “global warming” frenzy and never reached stratospheric proportions (pun unintended):

This chart shows the number of scholarly articles with the exact phrase “nuclear winter” (blue), or “global cooling” (red), each divided by the number of articles with “climate”, expressed in percentages, in decadal bands from 1960 to present. The topic “global cooling” is shown for comparison. 1% corresponds to approximately ten thousand articles per decade.

Sociologist Brian Martin has analyzed the degree of politicization of the science of nuclear winter predictions.[87] In 1990, Turco et al. reviewed the field of nuclear-winter predictions, and somewhat toned down their original prediction.[88] but there remained a “scientific consensus” that a large nuclear war would cause 10 degree C cooling.[89]
The rapid onset of scientific research into “global warming”, starting at the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union (above chart of Google-Scholar data), is also seen, at approximately the same year, as a broader societal phenomenon in the data of all published books, whether fiction or non-fiction; as is seen in our phrase-occurrence search of the Google Books “1960 to 2008, American English” corpus, using Ngram Viewer:

This graph shows the percentage of books (per year) in which the phrases “global warming”, “climate change”, “cap and trade”, “Framework Convention on Climate Change”, “IPCC”, or “carbon tax” occur. Some of the percentages are multiplied, as indicated, for ease in visualization. A smoothing range of one year was applied.

Next, we add the phrases “nuclear winter”, “cold war”, “global cooling”, and “ice age” for comparison (and remove some phrases for clarity):
We see that “ice age” and “nuclear winter” were of more concern or interest than “global warming” and “climate change” up until the end of the 1980s. In the mid-2000s, “global warming” became of more concern or interest than “cold war”.

By 2008, “global warming” was of ten times more concern or interest than “nuclear winter” at its peak during the Cold War. That is phenomenal when one considers the imagery associated with a global nuclear war, the memory of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the strength of the civil societal movements to reduce the risk of nuclear war, and the history of media attention for arms-reduction negotiations and protocols.

Societal concern or interest for “global warming” can also be measured by phrase-frequency data for the scripts (or generated captions) of all movies and TV shows. For this, we apply Bookworm, developed at the Cultural Observatory by Benjamin Schmidt and his collaborators. Here is the result for “global warming” and “climate change”, 1960 to 2015:

---

6 See the application here: http://movies.benschmidt.org/
This is for all 84 thousand texts of movies and TV shows. We applied a smoothing of one year. At its peak, “global warming” was present in a remarkable 2% of scripts of all movies and TV shows (on a per-year basis). For comparison, the word “homeless” has its maximum value of 5% after 2007. “Cold war” has a maximum value of 1.25% in the same year-range of 1960 to 2015 (in the vicinity of 2001). “Nuclear winter” never rises beyond 0.2% (in the vicinity of 1980).

In summary, all the reviewed data shows that “global warming” suddenly became “a thing”, both in the general culture and in the science community, when the UNFCCC and Earth Summit said it was a thing. Both the UNFCCC and Earth Summit were organized immediately following the fall of the Soviet Union.

This sudden “turning on” of “awareness” regarding an impending end of the human species from increasing atmospheric CO2 occurred at this late time even though virtually all the relevant science and its predictions (with the same limitations as today) had already been done and communicated by the end of the 1960s, by some of the same leading theoretical climatologists at the same theoretical climatology laboratories, such as Syukuro Manabe and Richard Wetherald. Other media-worthy catastrophe predictions from theoretical climatology, such as “nuclear winter” and emergence of the next ice-age, never attained the heights of “global warming” because they were not supported by the UN and USA globalization interests; even though the risk of nuclear engagement is objectively higher in periods of global instability such as during the 1990s fall of the Soviet Union.

Carbon-trade rush of the mid-2000s

In addition to showing an early-1990s onset of preoccupation with “global warming”, the data from academic publishing (Google Scholar), all published books (Ngram), and movies and TV (Bookworm) also show a new large increase in “global warming” concern or interest in the mid-2000s (see graphs above).

The said mid-2000s increases are synchronous with the mainstream media becoming virtually monochromatic in its acceptance of global warming as a real and vital issue for humanity. Study of major daily newspapers across the world shows a large and discontinuous increase in media coverage of global warming or climate change occurring between the years 2005 and 2006. The
abrupt step-wise increase is typically four-fold in the magnitude of a newspaper’s percent coverage for climate change (from 0.29 % in the years 2001-2005 to 1.26 % in the years 2006-2009, on average, on a per-year basis), and occurs simultaneously in all 27 countries studied, on all the continents: see Figure 1 and Table 3 of the article by Schmidt et al.[90]

This is the figure for the Australian data, from the Schmidt et al. paper:

For these breaks in news-media coverage to be so large, so sudden and to occur simultaneously in all countries is not a phenomenon that is easy to explain, at least not in terms of the usual models of independent media outlets making newsworthiness decisions on the basis of authentic a priori readership interest.

There were no world climatic calamities in 2005-2006. Yet another IPCC report would not do it, as such reports never had. Former USA Vice-President (Democrat) Al Gore did put out his “An Inconvenient Truth” documentary film in 2006, but we see that as part of the media burst, not as a causal factor.

In looking for an actual cause of the media-coverage transition, one should have an eye to information about connections to global finance markets, such as the fact that “Generation Investment Management LLP (Generation IM) is a sustainable investment management firm, founded in 2004. It was co-founded by former US Vice President Al Gore and Goldman Sachs' Asset Management head David Blood.”[91]

Regarding finance, the frequency of the phrase “cap and trade” shoots up after 2005 in our Ngram results from mining words in Google Books, shown in one of the graphs above. A sudden 2005-2006 increase in the frequency of the phrase “cap and trade” is also seen in our search of the Google Scholar database of academic articles, both in the texts of articles and in the titles of articles:
This chart shows the number of scholarly articles with the exact phrase “cap and trade”, in the
texts of articles (blue), or in the titles of articles (red), each divided by the number of articles with
“climate”, expressed in percentages, in half-decadal bands from 1980 to present. The “titles”
data is multiplied by 30 for ease of visualization. The data for 2015-2019 was obtained by
extrapolating the data for 2015-2018; that is, by multiplying the number for 2015-2018 by 1.25.
1 % corresponds to approximately five thousand articles per half-decade.

“Cap and trade” becomes a prominent topic in both all books and academic articles at the same
time (2005-2006) that there is the dramatic and unprecedented increase in news media
coverage for “climate change” or “global warming”, world-wide.

The late renowned historian of science and technology David F. Noble was acutely aware of the
media explosion of the mid-2000s in Canada and the USA. In an important paper published on
a blog in 2007, Noble wrote:[92]

“— […] This potential for profit-making from climate change gained the avid attention of
investment bankers, some of whom were central participants in the PCA through their
connections with the boards of the Pew Center and Environmental Defense. Goldman
Sachs became the leader of the pack; with its ownership of power plants through
Cogentrix and clients like BP and Shell, the Wall Street firm was most attuned to the
opportunities. In 2004 the company began to explore the “market-making” possibilities
and the following year established its Center for Environmental Markets, with the
announcement that “Goldman Sachs will aggressively seek market-making and
investment opportunities in environmental markets;” The firm indicated that the Center
would engage in research to develop public policy options for establishing markets
around climate change, including the design and promotion of regulatory solutions for
reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The firm also indicated that Goldman Sachs would
“take the lead in identifying investment opportunities in renewable energy;” that year the
investment banking firm acquired Horizon Wind Energy, invested in photovoltaics with
Sun Edison, arranged financing for Northeast Biofuels, and purchased a stake in logen
Corporation, which pioneered the conversion of straw, corn stalks, and switchgrass into
ethanol. The company also dedicated itself “to act as a market maker in emissions
trading” of CO2 (and SO2) as well as in such areas as “weather derivatives,” “renewable
energy credits,” and other “climate-related commodities.” “We believe,” Goldman Sachs
proclaimed, “that the management of risks and opportunities arising from climate change
and its regulation will be particularly significant and will garner increasing attention from capital market participants.”

Among those capital market participants was former U.S. Vice President Al Gore. […] By the beginning of 2007 the corporate campaign had significantly scaled up its activity, with the creation of several new organizations. […] Also joining USCAP was the Natural Resources Defense Council, the World Resources Institute, and the investment banking firm Lehman Brothers whose managing director Theodore Roosevelt IV chaired the board of the Pew Center and was soon also to chair Lehman’s new Global Center on Climate Change. As Newsweek now noted (March 12, 2007). “Wall Street is experiencing a climate change,” with the recognition that “the way to get the green is to go green.” —

Therefore, we interpret the mid-2000s transition in “climate change” concern — seen to have occurred in a spectrum of academic and popular media and in national law-making initiatives (see [90]) — to have been caused by global financiers, based in the USA and connected to the Democratic Party. We postulate that these elite finance leaders have considerable sway, directly and indirectly, in the editorial policies of the major news media, especially the main trend-setting media in the USA and USA-allied or influenced economies. The scientists followed the funding and popularity trend.

In conclusion, whereas globalization following the demise of Bretton Woods and accelerated globalization following the fall of the Soviet Union were driven by USA hegemonic ambition itself, the said ambition seems recently to have aligned with beyond-Federal-Reserve USA investment banking opportunism, at least under the Democrats, with devastating consequences for local developing-world communities.[93] Furthermore, a new global “commodity” (carbon) traded in US dollars, under USA control of the global financial institutions, is one more commodity (with oil, opium, military hardware, and debt) to secure the US dollar as the world currency.

Emergence of gender-equity and anti-racism as state doctrines in the post-Soviet-Union era

Global warming is a powerful state-religion that has siloed concern and individual emotional investment away from the violence of globalization and class exploitation, including actual environmental destruction in the immediate environments of many communities, towards a diffuse danger for which everyone, and therefore no one, is responsible. It serves to appease the consciences of the professional-class collaborators, and of middle-class individuals who are vulnerable to privilege-guilt.

The first sign of a religious revolution against global warming as a dominant state ideology is the Gilets jaunes (Yellow Vests) movement that was sparked in France in 2018, which is fundamentally a class revolt (deplorables vs bobos-and-elites) that mirrors the Brexit vote and the Trump electoral phenomenon. Even former Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper, who oversaw the rise of the class conflict in Canada, has noticed and is now offering a non-solution of better managed conservatism, without addressing class-power-inequity, globalization or the USA problem.[94]
Two other state-religions are worthy of study, which arose following the fall of the Soviet Union, have attained extraordinary extremes, and which are experiencing backlash from the deplorables. The said two other state-religions are gender-equity and anti-racism, as siloed, limitless, and de facto class-blind doctrines.

The post-Soviet-Union rise of gender-equity and anti-racism as state doctrines followed a similar path as the rise of global warming: United Nations world-conference creation, academic-sector embrace, national statutory and institutional changes, broad media promotion, and cultural assimilation vectored by opinion leaders.

**World Conference on Human Rights, 1993**

In the case of gender-equity and anti-racism, the seminal UN world conference was the World Conference on Human Rights, held in Vienna, 14-25 June 1993. It was part of the flurry of UN-sponsored world conferences that were organized immediately after the fall of the Soviet Union, in “recognition that the end of the cold war presented the opportunity — indeed, the necessity — to revitalize international cooperation on development issues. [...] All of them actively sought out media attention, capturing the imaginations of millions of people around the world [...].”[80]

The 1993 conference was the second-ever UN world conference on human rights. The first had been held in 1968. The main outcome of the conference was the “Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action” (VDPA), which was adopted by consensus by the 171 states present, including the USA. “As of today, all countries, except for Somalia and the United States of America, have ratified the Convention.”[95] As recently as June 2017, a world general debate and progress report on the VDPA was hosted by the UN.[96]

The VDPA is a surprising document. On the one hand it rightly reaffirms the importance of universal human rights, and gives explicit assurances for the actual human rights of women, children, disabled persons, displaced persons, migrant workers, minorities, extremely poor persons, and victims of mass and war crimes, while on the other hand it represents significant departures from prior code regarding universal human rights.[97]

The said departures from prior code on human rights support globalization and support the implementation of frameworks leading to dubious state doctrines. We outline five such said departures prominent in the VDPA.

First, Chapter I, Section 31 of the VDPA reads:[97]

“—31. The World Conference on Human Rights calls upon States to refrain from any unilateral measure not in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations that creates obstacles to trade relations among States and impedes the full realization of the human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights instruments, in particular the rights of everyone to a standard of living adequate for their health and well-being, including food and medical care, housing and the necessary social services. The World Conference on Human Rights affirms that food should not be used as a tool for political pressure.—”

This can be interpreted to condemn the use of unilateral so-called “sanctions” or trade blockades as political or military weapons but it does not use the words “sanction” or “blockade”, nor is it clear that the purpose of the section is to prevent trade blockades by those states
powerful enough to apply such blockades. On the other hand, Section 31 has a distinct pro-“free trade” spin, where “any unilateral measure … that creates obstacles to trade relations among States”, such as national protective measures implemented by democratic states, is presumed to “[impede] the full realization of human rights … in particular the rights of everyone to a standard of living adequate for their health and well-being …”.

This is apparently the first time that a broadly accepted UN declaration and program of action links the attainment of basic “standard of living” to an absence of “any … obstacles to trade relations”, while not proposing any measures whatsoever to actually produce or allow development where development is needed. In this way, the VDPA anchors trade globalization in the attainment of alleviation of world poverty, at a fundamental conceptual level. To oppose “free trade” is to oppose human rights. The influence of the USA in the final text is palpable.

Second, Chapter I, Section 38 of the VDPA reads, in part:[97]

“—38. The World Conference on Human Rights recognizes the important role of non-governmental organizations in the promotion of all human rights and in humanitarian activities at national, regional and international levels. […] Non-governmental organizations should be free to carry out their human rights activities, without interference, within the framework of national law and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.—”

This was the first time that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were assigned global reach and international rights in a broadly accepted UN declaration. This is remarkable because NGOs are non-government agencies, are not directly accountable to democratic state structures, and are easily influenced by large so-called philanthropists tied to powerful states.

Examples of said philanthropists, known to massively fund NGOs and associated think tanks, are the past and present “charity empires” of John D. Rockefeller, George Soros, Bill Gates …, which typically now purport to advance UN goals of health, democracy, and development (good governance, access to pharmaceuticals, access to technology). For example, there was no lack of funding for free economic advice to Russia after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Nowadays, few would deny that NGOs can be powerful vectors for interference, destabilization, undue legitimization, war propaganda and regime change, and that they are often tainted by geopolitical ambitions. This vector is statutorily supported by the VDPA, which instead, as a UN endeavor, should have guarded State sovereignty and international responsibility.

Third, Chapter II, Section 20 of the VDPA reads:[97]

“—20. The World Conference on Human Rights urges all Governments to take immediate measures and to develop strong policies to prevent and combat all forms and manifestations of racism, xenophobia or related intolerance, where necessary by enactment of appropriate legislation, including penal measures, and by the establishment of national institutions to combat such phenomena.—” (emphasis added)

This is a stunning development. Nothing like this is present in prior major UN declarations or covenants. The text urges States to enact criminal statutory provisions against “phobia”, “intolerance”, and “all forms” of racism. The said urging is antithetical to longstanding international law that forbids criminalization of defamation, and that provides stringent conditions against state violations of individual opinion, belief and expression.[98]
Section 20 does not discriminate between racism of expression and racist actions against victims, nor does it discriminate between intolerance of attitude and actual denial of rights against victims. It encourages States to criminalize offending expression itself, thereby creating a chill against the very communication that is needed to resolve actual racial tensions in communities.

The VDPA’s subchapter II.B.1 is entitled “Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance”, yet the subchapter and the entire VDPA are silent on the knowledge that racial tensions are spurred by economic pressures and aggression organized and manipulated by powerful players. Thus Section 20, in the context of the VDPA, displaces the problem from the causes to the symptoms, and seeks to irradiate the symptoms without addressing the causes, in a way that impedes people from potentially resolving conflicts by authentic expression of sentiment and emotion.

Section 20 is the seed for State penal enforcement of political correctness. It is an instrument for acceptance of “hate speech” laws, which are pathological laws that violently silence authentic individual expression, thereby pouring oil on any fire of racial tension.

Fourth, Chapter II, Section 39 of the VDPA reads, in part:

“—39. The World Conference on Human Rights urges the eradication of all forms of discrimination against women, both hidden and overt. The United Nations should encourage the goal of universal ratification by all States of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women by the year 2000. […]—”
(emphasis added)

This is in the VDPA’s subchapter II.B.3 entitled “The equal status and human rights of women”. The VDPA was the first time that the UN expressly enshrined women’s right as a species of human rights. It put much emphasis on woman’s rights, throughout.

The rights reviewed in the VDPA had some gender imbalance in their coverage. For example, the VDPA contains the phrase “girl-child” five times, but has no mention of the “boy-child” as soldiers, slave, or sex object. The document breaks from the practice of avoiding a gender-hierarchy of rights, and invites broad policy initiatives and State “education” as a corrective measure.

Finally, Chapter II, Sections 81 and 82 of the VDPA read, in part:

“—81. […] […] The World Conference on Human Rights recommends that States develop specific programmes and strategies for ensuring the widest human rights education and the dissemination of public information, taking particular account of the human rights needs of women.

82. Governments, with the assistance of intergovernmental organizations, national institutions and non-governmental organizations, should promote an increased awareness of human rights and mutual tolerance. […] The proclamation of a United Nations decade for human rights education in order to promote, encourage and focus these educational activities should be considered. —"
This is in the VDPA’s subchapter II.D entitled “Human rights education”. Thus, the conference directs States to implement specific educational programs for human rights. In our view, since the States are the main purveyors and enablers of violations of human rights, this provision is disingenuous and was enacted for an ulterior motive. Western nations responded by creating more “social justice” education programs.

The new plans and intentions globally initiated in the VDPA have been vigorously and continuously pursued, with little result on the ground, one might add, and no method to quantify actual progress. One need only examine the most recent mass atrocities committed in the West’s proxy war to destroy Syria, under the false pretext of attacking the very jihadist mercenaries that were funded and logistically and militarily supported by the West, Israel and their regional allies.[99][100][101] Another example is the ongoing genocidal attack in Yemen, using a hard blockade and continuous military bombing. Similarly, girl-child and women’s basic human rights are difficult to find in Saudi Arabia or on Canadian indigenous reserves that have toxic water, almost three decades after VDPA.

Nonetheless, reality has not deterred purported good intentions. In a recent example, UN Women was created in 2010 and “is the United Nations entity dedicated to gender equality and the empowerment of women.”[102] In its own words, listing its “major partners”:[103]

“—UN Women is thankful to all our business and philanthropic partners for their support of gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Some of our partners are Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Elizabeth Arden, Ford Foundation, Open Society Foundation, Procter & Gamble, PROYA Cosmetics Co. Ltd, Rockefeller Foundation, The Coca-Cola Company, Unilever, and Zonta International Foundation.—”

There is no lack of interest for gender equity, from the elite supporters of both globalization and trade in US dollars. What more proof does one need that the lives of women are improving thanks to the good will of USA global investors and merchants? There is also no lack of service collaborators to dress the illusion that such devices as UN Women advance human rights in the world.

**Words that wound**

The academic sector in the West embraced the new directions of the VDPA. Concomitantly with the World Conference on Human Rights, law academics wrote and published the highly (overly) influential 1993 book entitled: “*Words that Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, and the First Amendment*.”[104] This spawned the large new area of academic study known as “critical race theory”, or at least was its legal-argument front.

*Words that Wound* was incisively criticized by Henry Louis Gates Jr.,[105] but this did not slow the enthusiasm for its radical new proposals that demolished the adage “sticks and stone may break my bones but names will never hurt me”. The authors of *Wounds that Wound* have largely won, as more and more statutes and codes of behaviour enforce political correctness, and as many Western nations consider “denial” of State-approved versions of history to be penal offences that are systematically prosecuted.
It’s not just the questioning of the number of Jews who were murdered during the Nazi holocaust. Several influential pundits have in all seriousness called for jailing “climate deniers”, as criminals against humanity.[106][107] To argue against State doctrine is to commit the new crime of “hate speech”. A “hate crime” use to be a crime motivated by hate, as might be ascertained by the charged person’s words. Now, the words themselves are the crime that routinely puts into motion the state’s penal apparatus.[98][108]

**University gender studies and critical race theory**

The early 1990s saw the emergence of Third Wave Feminism, in which academic (institutionalized) feminism repositioned itself in the new “critical race theory” context of the post-Soviet-Union world. College departments of “women’s studies” largely became departments of “gender studies”,[109] and everyone became aware of “intersectionality” (“the complex, cumulative way in which the effects of multiple forms of discrimination - such as racism, sexism, and classism - combine, overlap, or intersect especially in the experiences of marginalized individuals or groups”, *Merriam-Webster*).

More and more study programs became imbued with “critical race theory”, and there were more and more social justice and gender studies programs. The social sciences and history and geography and English departments could not get away with being “old fashioned”. Everyone needed to check their privilege. The burden of students (deemed oppressed) to fight their own oppression became an unjust burden that the State needs to assume.[110]

Book phrase-mining statistics show these trends in the academic culture, just as they illustrate author-perception of the new post-Soviet-Union globalization. First, the following graph shows indicators of globalization and related societal concerns.

This graph shows phrase-occurrence frequencies for the Google Books “1960 to 2008, American English” corpus, using Ngram Viewer. The graph shows the percentage of books (per year) in which the phrases “domestic violence”, “prison population”, “rape”, “free trade”, “homeless”, “new world order”, and “NAFTA” occur. Some of the percentages are multiplied, as indicated, for ease in visualization. A smoothing range of one year was applied.
Here we see that “new world order” and “NAFTA” show sharp changes chronologically related to the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union. The phrase “free trade” has a large increase in slope at 1990, and its maximum in frequency of use occurs just following the fall of the Soviet Union, but it is otherwise a generally prevalent term throughout the entire period 1960 to 2008. The phrase “homeless” starts its rise from a steady background value in the 1980s, when the real phenomenon of urban homelessness became prevalent in the Western world (see above).[9] The phrase “domestic violence” starts to have a significant frequency in the early 1980s, has a large positive slope from 1986 to 1992, and has a sharp rise to a high-plateau value, which is synchronous with the increase of “NAFTA”.

The terms “prison population” and “rape” appear as signatures of aggressive globalization. They both have a step-wise increase following the USA’s 1971 unilateral cancellation of the Bretton Woods system, and they both have and additional step-wise increase following the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union. The same occurs with the phrase “sexual assault” (not shown). This suggests the idea that societal concern or attention for sexual crimes and criminality increases with increasing negative effects from predatory investment globalization (see Part-I, above, for said negative effects).

Similarly, phrase-frequencies of some of the broad topics relevant to the VDPA can be examined for changes in time. These phrase-frequencies show gradual and extended variations whereas other topics show sharp transitions chronologically associated with VDPA and the fall of the Soviet Union, as follows.

For example, this graph shows the percentage of books (per year) in which the phrases “racism”, “feminism”, and “women’s studies” occur:

Two of the percentages are multiplied, as indicated, for ease in visualization. A smoothing range of three years was applied.

Here, “feminism” and “women’s studies” increase after 1970, and again in the 1980s, but no change in behaviour or signature can be assigned to the 1991 changes in geopolitics.

However, new topics more specifically related to or spawned on the global scale in-part by the VDPA show a sharp and systematic post-Soviet-Union rise in their phrase-frequencies:
This graph shows phrase-occurrence frequencies for the Google Books “1960 to 2008, American English” corpus, using Ngram Viewer. The graph shows the percentage of books (per year) in which the phrases “globalization”, “critical race theory”, “intersectionality”, “gender studies”, “political correctness”, and “hate speech” occur. Some of the percentages are multiplied, as indicated, for ease in visualization. A smoothing range of one year was applied. The range in years is 1970 to 2008, since the frequencies are virtually zero in the range 1960 to 1970.

Here, the near-1990 onset for all these phrases is striking, and coincides with the onset of the phrase “globalization”. Basically, these terms or topics (critical race theory, intersectionality, gender studies, political correctness, and hate speech) became “a thing” in published books, starting at the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union, and the USA-led West’s global response to the said fall.

The post-Soviet-Union onsets of societal concern or cultural emergences seen in published books are also detected in the phrase-frequency data for the scripts (or generated captions) of all movies and TV shows. For this, we again apply Bookworm (see above).

For example, “feminism” has a first rise following the 1971 collapse of Bretton Woods, and a second rise following the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union, whereas “prison population”, “hate speech” and “political correctness” first emerge immediately at or following 1991:

Here, a smoothing of 2 years was applied, for clarity in visualization. The y-axis is percent of texts or scripts in the entire data set, on a per-year basis.
Clearly, in the movies and TV, “political correctness” (like “hate speech”) became “a thing” immediately following the fall of the Soviet Union and the organization of the VDPA, accompanied by a new rise of “feminism”. Interestingly, “mental health” has a dramatic rise at approximately 1991, to a plateau of almost 1 % of all texts or scripts (not shown).

Analogous results arise in the academic-journal literature, as follows.

First, we examine the phrase-occurrence frequencies in the Google Scholar database, by decade, for the common phrases “women’s studies” and “crime rate”. We report the number of articles with the target phrase anywhere in the text, as a percentage of the number of articles in the same decade with the word “sex” in the title of the article.

The use of articles with the word “sex” in the title is simply a convenient normalization, which assumes that the fraction of articles with “sex” in the title is a constant fraction of the total number of academic articles in the decade, throughout the full time period in the graph. We multiplied the percentages for “crime rate” by 1.5, in order to facilitate visualization. 50 % on the y-axis corresponds to approximately 20,000 articles per decade:

We note two features in the history of these target phrases. First, “women’s studies” starts in the 1970s, following the USA cancellation of the Bretton Woods system, when women’s studies programs were installed in universities, and experiences its next largest fractional increase (doubling) in the 1980s.

Second, “crime rate” phrase-frequency in academic journals — like “feminism” frequency in movie and TV scripts (above), and “prison population” and “rape” frequencies in published books (above) — is a signature of aggressive globalization. “Crime rate” has a step-wise increase following the USA’s 1971 unilateral cancellation of the Bretton Woods system, and an additional step-wise increase following the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union.

We interpret these “signatures of aggressive globalization” as follows. The globalization causes heightened levels of domestic economic pressure and social tension, thus increasing authors’ attention and concern for criminality, and sexual crime in particular, and attention and concern (in movies and TV) for the “feminism” response.
Second, we examine the phrase-occurrence frequencies in the Google Scholar database, by decade, for the common phrases “racism” and “feminism”. The same normalization, definitions, and method are used as above. 500 % on the y-axis corresponds to approximately 200,000 academic articles per decade:

Like with “feminism” frequency in movie and TV scripts, “feminism” frequency in academic (Google Scholar) articles appears as a signature of aggressive globalization, turning on in step-wise fashion first at 1971-1980 (Bretton Woods cancellation), then at 1991-2000 (Soviet Union dissolution). Both steps correspond to approximately five-fold increases.

“Racism” occurs frequently throughout the Google Scholar database, but more so than with the books or movies and TV databases, “racism” in academic articles shows a sudden and sustained increase in the post-Soviet-Union and post-VDPA era. We see this as evidence that academics, as a service class, took their cue from and coalesced around the VDPA proposals. Actual racism regarding egregious violations of human rights did not, in the West, suddenly become a more urgent problem in 1991-2000.

By comparison, the massive post-9/11 (post-2001 World Trade Center attack) USA-led regime-change economic sanctions and civilian-infrastructure bombing war campaigns (Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Syria, Yemen) did not produce a comparable increase in “racism” concern among academics, nor did the extensive creation and use of drone bases under Obama. The post-9/11 war campaigns also did not lead to a flurry of UN world conferences, as did the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union. Not even a single UN wold conference has been convened to address present-era war campaigns. Instead, the UN is working feverishly to globalize and “share the burden” of refugee migration.

One does not have to be cynical to see the UN as the USA’s Uncle Tom, regarding propagandist ideological policy issues. The reality is hidden in plain sight, in virtually everything that the UN does; notably in the Earth Summit and the VDPA and all their offspring.
Third, we examine the phrase-occurrence frequencies in the Google Scholar database, by decade, for the phrases “critical race theory”, “gender studies”, “political correctness”, and “hate speech”, which we associate with the VDPA proposals. The same normalization, definitions, and method are used as above. The percent for “gender studies” is multiplied by 0.5 for improved comparative visualization. 50 % on the y-axis corresponds to approximately 20,000 academic articles per decade:

Clearly, all four topics enter the academic-journal corpus in 1991-2000. Three of the topics increase steadily with a large rate of growth (15 % of the “sex in title” reference per decade), whereas “political correctness” turns on abruptly and stays at a high level (approximately 40 % of the “sex in title” reference).

The four target phrases are not themselves present in the text of the VDPA, but they are the academic embodiment of the new direction expressed in VDPA. We see the four topics as related to the principle of freedom of expression, which itself is an internationally recognized human right.

The societal context of the developing gender studies[109] is one where it becomes disallowed by the State for an individual to “misgender” another individual, and where it can become statutory “family violence” for a parent to make “any attempt to persuade” their own child not to undergo gender-change medical treatment.[111]

For example, the Ontario Human Rights Code, in Canada, has:[112]

“— The law recognizes that everyone has the right to self-identify their gender and that “misgendering” is a form of discrimination. […] Refusing to refer to a trans person by their chosen name and a personal pronoun that matches their gender identity, or purposely misgendering, will likely be discrimination when it takes place in a social area covered by the Code, including employment, housing and services like education. The law is otherwise unsettled as to whether someone can insist on any one gender-neutral pronoun in particular.—”
We view the measurable degradation of the right of freedom of expression, in general, beyond the confines of the said four topics, in the USA as a strong indicator of the degradation of democracy and social fairness in the USA, arising from the effects of globalization.[113]

**Women in Congress and Parliament**

But propaganda and the maintenance of a mental environment and doctrine are not solely about media and academics. There is also a need to institutionally support the illusion of democracy. If the new equity doctrine can be meshed with an improved appearance of democracy, then the two fabrications support each other.

“The Year of the Woman was a popular label attached to 1992 after the election of a number of female Senators in the United States.”[114]

In the 103rd Congress of the USA, between 3 January 1993 and 3 January 1995, the maximum number of women members of Congress jumped from the prior Congress value of 32 to the then unprecedented value of 54.[115] The sharpness of the increase is seen graphically:

![Figure 1. Number of Women by Congress: 1917-2017](image)

The suddenness of the 1993 increase is seen most dramatically in the division between Democrat and Republican numbers for the House of Representatives:
Whereas the Republican and Democrat percentages followed each other and were both conservative numbers up until 1993, the Democrat numbers abruptly rose starting at 1993, the year of the UN VDPA promotion of gender equity in all spheres as a global ideal.

We interpret the difference in percentages of female House representatives between the two parties as arising in part because the Democrats are tied to global finance interests, which use the UN to shape acceptance of their practices, whereas the Republicans are tied to USA-based big industry (energy, military). Domestic energy has again become huge in the USA.[116] This division was spectacularly illustrated, on the USA domestic scene, in the 2016 election of Trump. In the words of Michael Hudson:[117]

“—A new term was introduced to the English language: Identity Politics. Its aim is for voters to think of themselves as separatist minorities – women, LGBTQ, Blacks and Hispanics. The Democrats thought they could beat Trump by organizing Women for Wall Street (and a New Cold War), LGBTQ for Wall Street (and a New Cold War), and Blacks and Hispanics for Wall Street (and a New Cold War). Each identity cohort was headed by a billionaire or hedge fund donor.—”

These days, there is no lack of absurdity in having taken identity politics and the divisive equity maneuver (“equity” for a specific gender or race) to its logical end point: “Congress just Lynched another Black Woman in the Name of Anti-Racism.”
In short, prior to the present and recent Trump et al. backlash, the VDPA organized and heralded the birth of identity politics, newly minted to suit globalization in the post-Soviet-Union era. Such an important emergent phenomenon as “identity politics” needs to be bound by academics. Here is the phrase-frequency graph from Google Scholar, for the phrases “identity politics” and “Wall Street”, using the same method as described above:

“Wall Street” became of increased interest to academics in the new post-Soviet-Union era of globalization, starting in the 1990s, like never previously. Wall Street (private USA investment interests) was more involved in the new globalist expansion, compared to the post-Bretton-Wood era that was more purely about currency predation and classic national-debt extortion. “Wall Street” meshes with “identity politics”. The former is the new scammers. The latter is the new cover.

Increased woman as democratic figureheads, rather than solely men as democratic figureheads, was not limited to the USA. Here is a graph showing the large increase in percentage of female Members of Parliament in the UK, which occurred at 1993.
It would seem that voters in both the USA and the UK, an ocean apart, suddenly and spontaneously decided to elect female representatives, in synchronicity, in 1993?

**African-Americans in Congress**

The number of African-Americans in the USA House of Representatives appears to be a signature or indicator of aggressive globalization. It has a first rise immediately following the cancellation of Bretton woods (1971) to a plateau value of approximately 20, followed by a second rise immediately following the fall of the Soviet Union (1991) to a new plateau value of approximately 45:[118]

![Figure 1. Number of African Americans in Each Congress, 1870 to Present](image)

We interpret this to mean that at times when the USA empire is emboldened to make a new thrust of predatory globalization and is confident that it is not threatened on the geopolitical stage in doing so, then it has shored up its number of African-American representatives to
bolster the appearance of democracy and social fairness. Furthermore, the second rise is aligned with the proposals of the VDPA.

These geopolitical trends invite us to consider whether the most recent new composition of Congress, “reflecting America’s diversity”, and including Muslim members, and a Palestinian member,[119] is related to the increased dispossession of Palestinians in the Middle East, covering up the vicious on-going wars against Syria and Yemen, and the continued attack against Iran by economic blockade, while explicitly threatening major wars in Iran and Venezuela. There will need to be increased Asian-American members of Congress if the USA increases its military moves against China.

Recent examples of State ideological excesses

With State ideologies, ideological enthusiasts are rewarded with promotions, praise, and positive media attention, which can lead to palpable excesses. Here are a few recent examples, which largely speak for themselves.

The respected Palestinian human-rights advocacy and Jewish media group Mondoweiss recently published two articles in which the authors position Israel’s militarized occupation — a longstanding human-rights regional hotspot that is characterized by a large apartheid gap in economic prospects, extreme State violence, a 10-year life expectancy gap, and a water consumption of Palestinians in the West Bank at 70 % of the WHO minimum, while being five times more for Jewish settlers[120] — in the context of the “climate crisis”.[121][122]

On February 4, 2019, David Klein writes to introduce his article:[121]

“—The urgency of the global climate crisis makes it imperative for any social justice movement to come to grips with, and confront it in some way. There can be no social justice, after all, on a dead planet.—”

On March 12, 2019, Zena Agha entitles their article “Palestinians will suffer the impacts of climate change more severely than Israelis due to the occupation”, and introduces it as:[122]

“—Climate change is among the greatest threats currently facing human life. Its effects are global, wide-ranging, and unequally distributed. Despite Palestinians and Israelis inhabiting the same physical terrain, Palestinians under occupation will suffer the effects of climate change more severely.—”

One wonders what the other “greatest threats currently facing human life” might be, if we were to put them on a scale of quantum of lost person-years per 1000 deaths, say?

Some professional academics also have had their say regarding climate change and the Israeli occupation.[123]

Regarding anti-racism ideology, in a March 11, 2019, article in the prestigious Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS), the authors explain the “Significance” of their work about “pollution inequity” as:[124]

“—Some may find it intuitive that, on average, black and Hispanic minorities bear a disproportionate burden from the air pollution caused mainly by non-Hispanic whites, but
this effect has not previously been directly established, let alone quantified. Our "pollution inequity" metric is generalizable to other pollution types and provides a simple and intuitive way of expressing a disparity between the pollution that people cause and the pollution to which they are exposed. Our results are timely, given public debate on issues relating to race, equity, and the regulation of pollution.—

This was dutifully reported as highly newsworthy in the influential *Washington Post*, with the headline: "Whites are mainly to blame for air pollution, but blacks and Hispanics bear the burden, says a new study".[125]

Regarding the UN’s continued role in promoting global warming and legalizing censorship, the three opening keynote speeches of the month-long UN Human Rights Council’s 40th session in Geneva, pronounced on February 25, 2019, are worthy of study. As reported by the UN itself and echoed in the international media, the salient features of the three keynote speeches were as follows.[126]

The President of the UN General Assembly, María Fernanda Espinosa, raised those concerns that will not be acted upon, including "wars", and:[126]

—Ms. Espinosa expressed concern about the widening gap between the planet’s haves and have-nots.

"Perhaps one of the most sensitive challenges for the human rights agenda is inequality," she said. "The concentration of wealth has increased to such an extent that, in 2018, 26 individuals had more money than the 3,800 million [3.8 billion] poorest people on the planet.”—

“Michelle Bachelet, High Commissioner for Human Rights, highlighted the dangers of ignoring climate change:[126]

— “How can any State’s interests be advanced by policies that damage the well-being of all humans?” she said. “This is true of climate change; you may know the saying, ‘If you think economic interests are more important than environment, try counting your money while holding your breath.’”

Ms. Bachelet also hailed the young climate activists inspired by Swedish teenager Greta Thunberg.

The 16-year-old who had grabbed the attention of the world’s media, recently travelled to the Davos World Economic Forum (WEF) in Switzerland where she called for the world’s decision makers to take swifter action to limit carbon dioxide emissions and reduce global temperature rise to 2°C above pre-industrial levels.

"In recent weeks I have watched children marching for sound climate change policies and other measures," the High Commissioner said. “As a parent, a grandparent and quite simply as a human being, they inspire in me a fierce determination to continue our struggle to uphold their rights.”—

The UN Secretary-General’s segment announces a global plan of action against “hate speech”, and reads as follows:[126]
—Hate speech ‘spreads like wildfire’

In addition to improving women’s rights, the UN Secretary-General expressed alarm about the “shrinking civil space in every region of the globe”; and a rise in harassment, attacks and inflammatory rhetoric.

“Hate speech is a menace to democratic values, social stability and peace,” Mr. Guterres said. “It spreads like wildfire through social media, the internet and conspiracy theories. It is abetted by public discourses that stigmatizes women, minorities, migrants and refugees and any so-called ‘other’. Indeed, hate is moving into the mainstream, in liberal democracies and authoritarian States alike.”

To tackle this, the UN chief announced the creation of a fast-track strategy to scale up the organization’s response to hate speech and present a global plan of action, headed by his Special Adviser for the Prevention of Genocide, Adama Dieng.

This kind of initiative was necessary in light of the political capital earned at the expense of migrants and refugees, who some leaders had blamed for a rise in crime and terrorism, the Secretary-General insisted.

“We must re-establish the integrity of the international refugee protection regime and continue to work for common values and international cooperation to reassert rights and help protect people from ruthless traffickers, smugglers and other predators,” he said.—

Thus, the censorship desires of the “liberal democracies” will soon have explicit support in new UN policy. “Cyber bullying” cannot be allowed to make election results “unpredictable”. It seems: “Goodness must prevail.”

CONCLUSION

Take-home points are as follows:

• The Bretton Woods period (1945 to 1971) had regulated trade balances, regulated currency exchange, and a US dollar limited by being tied to gold. It was designed to develop the USA-led capitalist-block nations, against the communist bloc. It produced social-class-shared development and exhilarating social, cultural, engineering, and scientific advances. It worked too well. Japan, Western Europe and participating nations developed too much. The USA ended the Bretton Woods agreement in 1971 and started the first modern era of predatory globalization, with a second wave following the 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union.

• “Globalization” is a euphemism for Western USA-led economic predation of countries in the so-called developing world, of the global under-classes as resources themselves, and of the Western USA-allied nations to the extent tolerable. From the USA perspective, the world is its plantation.

• The main administrative instrument for sustained global USA economic pillaging is the monetary instrument of the unbounded and USA-controlled US dollar as global currency. The said monetary instrument is essentially a conveyor belt for the continuous transfer of actual wealth and resources from the world to the USA system.
Arguably, the main global concern of the USA, in addition to the classic geopolitical landmass-resource and trade-route considerations, is to enforce and ensure, in tandem, the US dollar as the global currency.

Enforcing the US dollar’s status as the global currency includes covert and overt regime-change coups and wars — against administrations vying for currency sovereignty (sovereignty) — and economic and trade blockades, whereas “ensuring” the US dollar’s status involves controlling major “commodities” to be purchased in US dollars, thus securing demand for the US dollar.

The US-dollar-ensuring “commodities” to be controlled include: energy, opioid drugs, national debts of debtor nations (excluding the USA), monetary savings of the world elite (legally or illegally acquired), and USA military hardware and military bases (“protection”) imposed on allied nations at exorbitant prices; and extend into the always developing globalized markets of pharmaceuticals (vaccines, etc.), GMO patented crops, and proprietary high technology (5G, etc.).

Basically, the modus operandi of the USA Empire has been: any localized world mineral or essential resource of global importance will be controlled, through whatever means (military occupation, destruction of capacity, blockade, puppet regime…).

Globalization is progressive and has occurred in bursts that define globalization eras. The first era was the post-Bretton-Woods era (1971-1991), starting when the US dollar was decoupled from gold.

End results of the post-Bretton-Woods era were: the systematic relative loss of middleclass economic status, and palpable social misery in the West, such as the emergence of urban homelessness in the 1980s, associated with a predictable major Western recession (1982 crash, from Third World debt defaults that were written down via Brady bonds[29]).

The second globalization era started immediately after the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union. It was a period of extended and accelerated globalization. The close targets were traditional USA-allied markets: Canada and Mexico (NAFTA), and Europe (mega-mergers). Europe somewhat resisted by forming the European economic union. Investment returns went into the stratosphere, as did CEO salaries. The USA industrial working class was decimated. China was brought into the capitalist orbit. The “deplorables versus bobos-and-elites” divide was created, as a major socio-geographic consequence in the West.

Measured human consequences synchronous with the post-1991 acceleration of globalization, mainly affecting the lower-income classes, in the West, include: loss of welfare safety net, increase of number of single-parent families, threefold increase in rate of confrontational litigation in the courts, between parents and between individuals and with the state (“crisis in access to justice”), increased low-income household basic-need incidence (housing, health, safety, work, finance), increased rates of both suicide and suicide attempt, increased rate of opioid overdose (preceding the opioid epidemic of the 2010s), and increased rates of chronic asthma emergencies, and asthma prevalence, in both children and adults.

Increased leniency in food and drug regulation, and a dramatic increase in the global use of the herbicide glyphosate starting in 1993 in the USA, were concurrent with post-1991 upsurges of diseases and chronic ailments: death from intestinal infections; incidence of thyroid cancer; death from Parkinson’s disease; prevalence of diabetes; autism in children of different age groups; and phobia, anxiety disorder, panic disorder.

The mid-2000s saw Wall Street and the major USA Banks take a more leading role in globalization, one that is eclipsing the traditional global economic instruments that are the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. The USA’s so-called subprime
mortgage crisis, the 2008 crash, the mega-bailouts… are symptoms. The monkeys are demanding and being allowed more run of the zoo, in which all of the play is in US dollars.

- The large acceleration and expansion of globalization occurring immediately after the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union is not generally recognized as having been a USA response to the said fall, but it should be recognized as such. There was a large acceleration of globalization, both structural and in terms of extension and volume, and there can be little doubt that it was a response to the newly apparent geopolitical and ideological fracture.

- At the same time, in express response to the end of the Cold War, the UN undertook an unprecedented flurry of highly mediatized world conferences. Most notably, the UN advanced new paradigms of global concern that can be categorized as “climate change”, “gender-equity”, and “anti-racism”; and put in place declarations and plans to institutionalize and legalize these new paradigms of global concern.

- The said new paradigms of global concern are siloed and sanitized concerns, in-effect devoid of social-class, development-disparity, exploitation-structure and nation-sovereignty practical dimensions. They became global and state “religions” to pacify, hypnotize, and align populations for continued globalization, including the first steps towards a global carbon economy (with carbon traded in US dollars).

- The government, scientific, academic, education, NGO, and media sectors embraced and promoted the new paradigms of global concern. All globally-controlled corporations greened and equified. There could never be enough climate change prevention, gender equity, or racial social justice; and all problems and risks were due to deficits in climate change prevention, gender equity, and racial social justice.

- A social-justice education industry developed, based on newly-minted “critical race theory”, which transformed old-fashioned political analysis of exploitative power relations into awareness of “intersectionality”, and old-fashioned political analysis of social coalition formation into recognition of white privilege and the unjust burden of being brown.

- The UN had explicitly called for criminalization (“penal measures”) of “all forms and manifestations of racism, xenophobia or related intolerance”, and this elite-instigated desire was made reality with codes of conduct, vast internet censorship, hate-speech prosecutions, exploding defamation litigation threats, and arrays of sanctions against unapproved political views.

- The only effective resistance against globalization in the West has become the recent electoral and demonstrative revolts related to the Brexit vote, the Trump electoral victory, and the Gilets jaunes movement, all newly understood as the class conflict between the deplorables and the bobos-and-elites, between the sedentary rural inhabitants (the “somewheres”) and the globalist urbanites (the “anywheres”).

- Thus, it is no accident that the deplorables express their particular multi-faceted array of complaints from needed economic revitalization of the rural nation, to rejection of carbon taxation, to repudiation of the gender-equity and anti-racism programs, including censorship and political correctness.

Denis Rancourt is a Researcher at the Ontario Civil Liberties Association since 2015. He is a former Full Professor of Physics at the University of Ottawa, Canada.
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