



Outer Space Cult Popular Among Tech's Biggest Billionaires

The Transhuman movement, based on the religion of Scientism, largely believes that mankind must escape planet earth in order for mankind to survive. Many Technocrats are also Transhumans. Any other explanation of these people is inadequate. □ TN Editor

The explosion could be felt 30 miles away. At 9.07am on 1 September, a SpaceX rocket containing 75,000 gallons of liquid oxygen and rocket-grade kerosene ignited into a fireball that could be seen from orbit, billowing black smoke into the gray sky around its Cape Canaveral launch pad.

On board was a \$200m, 12,000lb communications satellite - part of Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg's Internet.org project to deliver broadband access to sub-Saharan Africa.

Zuckerberg wrote, with a note of bitterness, on his Facebook page that he was "deeply disappointed to hear that SpaceX's launch failure destroyed our satellite". SpaceX founder Elon Musk told CNN it was the

“most difficult and complex failure” the 14-year-old company had ever experienced.

It was also the second dramatic explosion in nine months for SpaceX, following a “rapid unscheduled disassembly” of a booster rocket as it attempted to land after a successful mission to the International Space Station.

Later that day, Nasa’s official Twitter account responded: “Today’s @SpaceXincident - while not a Nasa launch - reminds us that spaceflight is challenging.”

Yet despite those challenges, a small band of billionaire technocrats have spent the past few years investing hundreds of millions of dollars into space ventures. Forget gilded mansions and super yachts; among the tech elite, space exploration is the ultimate status symbol.

Musk, who founded SpaceX in 2002, is arguably the most visible billionaire in the new space race. The apparent inspiration for Robert Downey Jr’s Tony Stark character in Iron Man, Musk has become a god-like figure for engineers, making his fortune at PayPal and then as CEO of luxury electric car firm Tesla and clean energy company Solar City. Yet it is his galactic ambitions, insiders say, that really motivate him. “His passion is settling Mars,” says one.

SpaceX has completed 32 successful launches since 2006, delivered cargo to the International Space Station and secured more than \$10bn in contracts with Nasa and other clients. Musk has much grander ambitions, though, saying he plans to create a “plan B” for humanity in case Earth ultimately fails. He once famously joked that he hoped to die on Mars - just not on impact.

Musk has outlined an ambitious timeline for colonizing the red planet, which he said could begin as soon as 2022. Speaking to the International Astronautical Congress in Mexico in September, Musk described a 400-foot-tall rocket that would ferry 100 colonists at a time to Mars over a period of decades.

Read full story here...



Republican Success Opens Door To Constitutional Convention

A Constitutional Convention (ConCon) would be the end of America, but few realize it. The first calls for ConCon were made in the 1970s by Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski; need I say more? □ TN Editor
The November election put Republicans in full control of a record number of state legislatures around the country, a level of power that gives the party an unprecedented opportunity: change the U.S. Constitution.

Republicans already control Congress, the White House and more

governors' offices than they have in nearly a century. But it's the state legislatures that hold perhaps the greatest promise for lasting change.

The GOP now holds numerical majorities in 33 legislatures, one shy of the two-thirds required to initiate a convention on constitutional amendments. There is no credible talk of using that power for amendments on hot-button social issues, such as banning abortion or gay marriage. But conservatives have a list of bread-and-butter governing issues they would like to see enshrined in the Constitution.

One, to require a balanced federal budget, is already approaching the level of support that would trigger a convention. Beyond that, a major state-level push is planned during 2017 for a constitutional convention that could also consider amendments to impose term limits on members of Congress and rein in various federal powers.

President-elect Donald Trump has pledged support for an amendment on congressional term limits.

"The possibility of constitutional change is in the air," said law professor Jeffrey Rosen, president and CEO of the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia, a nonprofit museum that is hosting academic debates and symposiums about the efforts to amend the Constitution.

The U.S. Constitution has been amended 27 times since it was ratified in 1788, and its Article V spells out two ways to propose amendments. By a two-thirds vote of each chamber, the U.S. House and Senate can refer an amendment to the states. Or two-thirds of the state legislatures can request that Congress call a convention of the states.


Both scenarios require three-fourths of the states - or 38 - to ratify an amendment before it takes effect.

If the supporters of a balanced budget amendment succeed, it would be the first time in the nation's history that states initiated the process. That scenario has become more likely as a result of the November election.

It takes 34 states to trigger a convention for constitutional amendments,

meaning a unified Republican push would need the help of only a few Democrats in a single state to reach the mark.

Read full story here...



Is The Global Warming Hustle Finally Falling Apart?

The global warming fraud needs to be killed once and for all, but don't think that will deter the UN and the global elite from rushing ahead with Sustainable Development. The march to global Technocracy will proceed at full speed unless we stop it as well. □ TN Editor

With the election of Donald Trump, climate change and global warming have come back into the spotlight. In a different way.

“The science is settled” isn't good enough now.

Neither is the Globalist plan to cut energy production in every country in the world, in order to “rescue us from frying.”

LA Times: “Donald Trump will be about the only head of state who does not believe in climate science or the responsibility of his government to

act,” said Michael Brune, executive director of the Sierra Club...”

But all along, there have been dissenters from the manmade warming mantra; they just haven’t been allowed inside government portals.

Freeman Dyson, physicist and mathematician, professor emeritus at Princeton’s Institute for Advanced Study, Fellow of the Royal Society, winner of the Lorentz Medal, the Max Planck Medal, the Fermi Award: “What has happened in the past 10 years is that the discrepancies [in climate change models] between what’s observed and what’s predicted have become much stronger. It’s clear now the models are wrong, but it wasn’t so clear 10 years ago... I’m 100 per cent Democrat myself, and I like Obama. But he took the wrong side on this [climate change] issue, and the Republicans took the right side...” (The Register, October 11, 2015)

Dr. Ivar Giaever, Nobel-prize winner in Physics (1973), reported by Climate Depot, July 8, 2015: “Global warming is a non-problem...I say this to Obama: Excuse me, Mr. President, but you’re wrong. Dead wrong.”

Green Guru James Lovelock, who once predicted imminent destruction of the planet via global warming: “The computer models just weren’t reliable. In fact, I’m not sure the whole thing isn’t crazy, this climate change.” (The Guardian, September 30, 2016)

And these are but a tiny fraction of the statements made by dissident scientists who reject manmade global warming.

The science is only settled in government circles where leaders have climbed on board the Globalist plan to undermine economies all over the world by grossly lowering energy production, as a way to “reduce warming.”

One of the major warming hustlers is, of course, Al Gore.

Consider facts laid out in an uncritical Washington Post story (October 10, 2012, “Al Gore has thrived as a green-tech investor”):

In 2001, Al was worth less than \$2 million. By 2012, it was estimated

he'd locked up a nice neat \$100 million.

How did he do it? Well, he invested in 14 green companies, who inhaled — via loans, grants and tax relief — somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2.5 billion from the Federal government to go greener.

Therefore, Gore's investments paid off, because the Federal government was providing massive cash backup to those companies. It's nice to have Federal friends in high places.

For example, Gore's investment firm at one point held 4.2 million shares of an outfit called Iberdrola Renovables, which was building 20 wind farms across the United States.

Iberdrola was blessed with \$1.5 billion from the Federal government for the work which, by its own admission, saved its corporate financial bacon. Every little bit helps.

Then there was a company called Johnson Controls. It made batteries, including those for electric cars. Gore's investment company, Generation Investment Management (GIM), doubled its holdings in Johnson Controls in 2008, when shares cost as little \$9 a share. GIM sold when shares cost \$21 to \$26 — before the market for electric-car batteries fell on its head.

For a while, the going was good. To make it go good, Johnson Controls had been bolstered by \$299 million dropped at its doorstep by the administration of President Barack Obama.

On the side, Gore had been giving speeches on the end of life as we know it on planet Earth, for as much as \$175,000 a pop. (It isn't really on the side. Gore was constantly on the move from conference to conference, spewing jet fumes in his wake.) Those lecture fees can add up.

So Gore, as of 2012, had \$100 million.

The man has worked every angle to parlay fear of global-warming catastrophes into a humdinger of a personal fortune. And he didn't achieve his new status in the free market. The Federal government has been helping out with major, major bucks.

This wasn't an entrepreneur relying exclusively on his own smarts and hard work. Far from it.

—How many scientists and other PhDs have been just saying no to the theory of manmade global warming?

A letter to The Wall Street Journal signed by 16 scientists just said no. Among the luminaries: William Happer, professor of physics at Princeton University; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences at Massachusetts Institute of Technology; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology.

And then there was the Global Warming Petition Project, or the Oregon Petition, that just said no. According to Petitionproject.org, the petition has the signatures of “31,487 American scientists,” of which 9,029 stated they had Ph.D.s.

Global warming is one of the Rockefeller Globalists' chief issues. Manipulating it entails convincing populations that a massive intervention is necessary to stave off the imminent collapse of all life on Earth. Therefore, sovereign nations must be eradicated. Political power and decision-making must flow from above, from “those who are wiser.”

Al Gore is one of their front men.

He jets here and he jets there, carrying their messages. He's their delivery kid.

And for his work, he is paid \$100 million — a drop in the bucket.

A final note about the “science” of global warming—

A hypothesis is a provisional statement that remains to be confirmed through experiments.

Confirmation means making a correct prediction. Not just any prediction, but a useful one.

Take this hypothesis: The Earth has become warmer by X degrees over the past 1000 years.

Putting all the chatter aside, have scientists deployed this hypothesis to make accurate, specific, and useful predictions about warming?

So far, the answer is no.

That eliminates, for the time being, the acceptance of the warming hypothesis. Many predictions have been made, many alarm bells have been rung, many dire warnings have been issued, many threats have been launched...but no correct and useful predictions.

However, scientists will say their (rejected) hypothesis is also a statement of fact. That is, it is a summary of a warming trend derived from thousands of measurements of temperatures, now and in the past, on land, sea, and air.

Scientists will also claim their investigation reveals humans have directly and significantly contributed to a recent warming trend.

At this point, we are leaving the method of hypothesizing and predicting, and moving to a debate about the accuracy of all those temperature measurements and the causes of any actual climate changes.

Among scientists, there is a great deal of disagreement about the accuracy of the measurements. Any fair examination of studies and their critics will reveal that.

In this regard, the science is not settled. Far from it.

So: useless as a hypothesis, the assertion of manmade warming, as fact, is wide open to debate. To say the least.

Yet...based on this non-proof, Globalists want all national governments on the planet to commit to lowering energy production by a significant and destructive percentage in the next 15 years—"to save us from a horrible fate."

Their real agenda is clear: "The only solution to climate change is a global energy-management network. We (the Globalist leaders) are in the best position to manage such a system. We will allocate mandated energy-use levels throughout planet Earth, region by region, nation by

nation, and eventually, citizen by citizen.”

Yes, citizen by citizen.

This is the long-term goal. This is the Globalists' Holy Grail.

Slavery imposed through energy.

Read full story here...