



Up To 90% Of COVID-Positive Americans Were Possibly Not Even Contagious

Further evidence that the COVID “Great Panic of 2020” will go down in history as a giant fizzle. However, those Technocrats who orchestrated the false narrative in the first place have already achieved their purpose in creating a new and permanent global system of biosecurity. □ TN Editor

Then what were the lockdowns for?

The vast majority of the [nearly 6 million coronavirus diagnoses](#) in the United States likely were not contagious, [according to the New York Times](#).

Despite continued widespread COVID-19 panic, which includes many virus-related restrictions, up to 90% of individuals who have tested positive for COVID-19 potentially carried such “insignificant” amounts of the virus that they were not contagious, the Times reported.

What are the details?

The most widely used diagnostic test for COVID-19 is called the PCR test, which, [according to the FDA](#), tests for the virus' genetic material.

The problem with the test is that it only reports the presence of the genetic material being searched. It does not report the amount of genetic material, meaning individuals with such insignificant levels of COVID-19 genetic material will still test positive even if they aren't really sick.

From the Times:

The PCR test amplifies genetic matter from the virus in cycles; the fewer cycles required, the greater the amount of virus, or viral load, in the sample. The greater the viral load, the more likely the patient is to be contagious. This number of amplification cycles needed to find the virus, called the cycle threshold, is never included in the results sent to doctors and coronavirus patients, although it could tell them how infectious the patients are. In three sets of testing data that include cycle thresholds, compiled by officials in Massachusetts, New York and Nevada, up to 90 percent of people testing positive carried barely any virus, a review by The Times found.

Dr. Michael Mina, an epidemiologist at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, said testing thresholds are currently too sensitive. The problem, he told the Times, is akin to finding an individual hair in a room long after the person who was responsible for dropping the strand of hair had left.

he solution is to drop the cycle threshold used to determine whether an individual is infected.

Currently, the standard is 37 or 40 cycles, the Times reported. But Dr. Mina told the newspaper that it should be fewer than 30. Then, only individuals with 100 to 1,000 times the genetic material above the current standard would return a positive COVID-19 test result, Dr. Mina said.

[Read full story here...](#)



Global Technocracy And The 'Great Reset' Is Coming Like A Bullet Train

This important book review by Steven Guinness (UK) reveals the same old language of 'interdependence', collaboration and cooperation that was heard from the Trilateral Commission in 1973. The then-and-now goal is Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy, and will result in the biggest resource grab in the history of the world. □ TN Editor

A few weeks after the World Economic Forum launched their '*Great Reset*' initiative, it was followed up with the release of a new book titled, '*Covid-19: The Great Reset*', authored by the executive chairman of the WEF, Klaus Schwab, and Senior Director of the Global Risk Network at the institution, Thierry Malleret.

Having read the book I wanted to share with you some initial thoughts on the potential significance of the publication.

[As touched upon in my last article](#), there are 5 planks to the Great Reset – economic, societal, geopolitical, environmental and technological – all of which the book covers in detail. But I want to focus largely on the conclusion, as it is here where the author’s motivations and rationale for championing a Great Reset, in the wake of Covid-19, become clearer.

Schwab and Malleret characterise the future direction of the world as **‘The Post Pandemic Era’**, a phrase that is repeated ad nauseam throughout. Rather than define it to a particular outcome, the authors opt instead to ask whether this new era will be marked by more or less cooperation between nations. Will countries turn inward resulting in the growth of nationalism and protectionism, or will they sacrifice their own interests for greater interdependence?

No firm prediction is made either way, but we do manage to gain a degree of insight into the authors’ way of thinking when they discuss what they call **‘the direction of the trend.’** They write that concerns over the environment (primarily through the prism of climate change) and the advancement of technology (integral to the Fourth Industrial Revolution) were pervasive long before Covid-19 entered the picture. With the economic and health implications of the lockdowns now ingrained within society, Schwab and Malleret contend that long established worries amongst citizens **‘have been laid bare for all to see’** and **‘amplified’** because of the pandemic. In other words, if minds were not concentrated on the problems and threats the world faced before Covid-19, then they certainly are now.

And whilst the direction of these trends on the environment and technology may not have changed, with the onset of Covid-19 it **‘got a lot faster.’** It is why Schwab and Malleret believe that these two issues in particular **‘will force their way onto the political agenda’** due to increasing public pressure. A movement such as Extinction Rebellion is one example. Another is the rapid growth of the Fintech community which is leading people to question what constitutes money **‘in the digital age.’**

As for where they see things going in the future, the suggestion is that current trends are pointing towards a world that will be **'less open and less cooperative than before the pandemic.'**

Effectively, the WEF have presented the world with two potential outcomes. The first is that the Great Reset can be achieved relatively peacefully with nations acquiescing to the objectives being pushed by global planners. The second outcome, they warn, would be far more disruptive and damaging. It would come about through countries failing to address the **'deep rooted ills of economies and societies'**, which could see a reset being **'imposed by violent shocks like conflicts and even revolutions.'**

And, apparently, we do not have much time to decide our fate. What we have now, according to the authors, is **'a rare and narrow window of opportunity to reflect, re-imagine and reset our world'**. If a **'proper reset'** is to be realised, it can only occur through an increased level of collaboration and cooperation between nations. As Schwab and Malleret see it, the alternative is a world entrenched in perpetual crisis which would eventually lead to the disintegration of the post World War Two **'rules based global order'** and a global power vacuum.

There is, therefore, a very real risk of the world becoming **'more divided, nationalistic and prone to conflicts than it is today.'**

One thing the authors do write on from a position of clarity is that never can the world return to normal. Or more to the point, be allowed to return to normal. Their view is that before Covid-19 took hold, a **'broken sense of normalcy prevailed'**. The situation now is that the virus **'marks a fundamental inflection point in our global trajectory.'** In a very short space of time it **'magnified the fault lines that beset our economies and societies'**.

If it was not already obvious, then the authors confirm over the last few pages of the book that the United Nations' Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development programme is intertwined with the Great Reset. This is evident when studying the WEF's Strategic Intelligence unit. Sustainable Development and the Great Reset go hand in hand.

For Agenda 2030 to be implemented successfully, Schwab and Malleret offer an alternative to the possibility of countries failing to come together. As you might expect, it revolves around collaboration and cooperation. In their eyes no progress can otherwise be made. Covid-19 offers the opportunity to **'embed greater societal equality and sustainability into the recovery'**. And, crucially, this would **'accelerate rather than delay progress towards 2030 Sustainable Development Goals'**.

But it does not end simply with the full implementation of Agenda 2030. Schwab and Malleret want to go further. Their aim is that the open exposure of weaknesses within existing global infrastructure **'may compel us to act faster by replacing failed institutions, processes and rules with new ones that are better suited to current and future needs.'** To convey the importance of this statement, the authors state that this alone is **'the essence of the Great Reset'**. What they appear to be seeking is global transformation where systems and the age of the algorithm take precedent over political institutions. We are already beginning to see moves by major global institutions like the [Trilateral Commission](#), the [World Trade Organisation](#) and the [European Union](#) to *'reform'* and *'rejuvenate'* both their work and membership. Covid-19 has undoubtedly straightened the hand of global planners and their quest for reformation.

As 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' was published, it was accompanied by an article written by Schwab and Malleret. Called, ['COVID-19's legacy: This is how to get the Great Reset right'](#), they stated plainly that not only will a lot of things change forever, **'the worst of the pandemic is yet to come'**:

We will be dealing with its fallout for years, and many things will change forever. It has wrought (and will continue to do so) economic disruption of monumental proportions.

Indeed, no industry or business will be able to avoid the impact of the changes ahead. Either they adapt to fit in with the Great Reset agenda (assuming they have the resources to do so), or they will not survive.

According to Schwab and Malleret, '**millions of companies risk disappearing**', whilst only '**a few**' e.g. corporate monoliths, will be strong enough to withstand the disruption. It is your smaller companies and independent run businesses that are faced with ruin, opening the door to a new era of mergers and acquisitions that will further erode consumer choice and competition.

Schwab and Malleret tell us that the worst of the pandemic is yet to come, and from an economic standpoint I would not doubt them. But let's look at the health aspect for a moment. Global media coverage of Covid-19 has characterised it as a deadly virus that kills with impunity, and without the antidote of a vaccine could devour communities whole.

Perhaps surprisingly, the authors offer up a little fact based logic. They admit that Covid-19 is '**one of the least deadly pandemics in the last 2000 years**', and barring something unforeseen '**the consequences of the virus will be mild compared to previous pandemics.**' At the time the book was published, 0.006% of the global population were reported to have died from Covid-19. But even this low figure is not altogether accurate.

In the UK for instance the way the death rate has been calculated has meant that people who have been diagnosed with the virus and then succumbed to an accident within 28 days of being tested will have their [cause of death marked as Covid-19](#).

To quote Professor Yoon Loke, from the University of East Anglia, and Professor Carl Heneghan, from Oxford University:

Anyone who has tested COVID positive but subsequently died at a later date of any cause will be included on the PHE COVID death figures.

Schwab and Malleret could not be clearer when they write that Covid-19 '**does not constitute an existential threat or a shock that will leave its imprint on the world's population for decades**'. As it stands the Spanish Flu and HIV/AIDS have a larger mortality rate.

It was not an uncontrollable spread of Covid-19 that caused governments around the world to shut down their national economies, but the data modelling of unaccountable technocrats like Neil Ferguson of Imperial College London that predicted hundreds of thousands of people were at immediate risk of dying without the imposition of social restrictions, which we now know to be a combination of social distancing and lockdown measures.

When Schwab and Malleret talk about Covid-19 leaving its imprint on the world, the truth of the matter is that it is the measures imposed in the name of Covid-19 that have caused widespread economic destruction, not the virus itself. That distinction is one that mainstream outlets in particular refuse to engage with.

In summary, if we are to take the authors at their word, then they see a rise in nationalism and protectionism off the back of Covid-19 as a detriment to the quest for a Great Reset. The much coveted Sustainable Development Goals could even be at risk should nations turn inward. IMF Managing Director has said the world [has a choice between the Great Reset or the Great Reversal](#) (the Great Reversal being '**more poverty, more fragmentation, and less trade**') I would argue that there is another way of looking at it.

In the book Schwab and Malleret describe how in an interdependent world - which is precisely the kind of world that global planners have been championing since at least the end of World War Two - '**risks conflate with each other, amplifying their reciprocal effects and magnifying their consequences**'. When nations are interdependent, '**the systemic connectivity between risks, issues, challenges determines the future.**' It is the old cliché of dominoes falling. Once one falters it sets off a chain reaction, which was evidenced back in 2008 when Lehman Brothers collapsed.

The scale of change that globalists are calling for through the vehicle of a Great Reset, which by definition is global in nature, will in my view require the implosion of the current world order to lay the foundations for a new world order. The old must make way for the new. And the one method for how that could be achieved is through increased kickback

against interdependence. Sustained crises offer many opportunities for global planners. The potential for a contested U.S. election, an upcoming no deal Brexit and warnings of '[vaccine nationalism](#)' are three eventualities that if brought to bear could be exploited and used to advance the cause for a Great Reset. I would say that the further the world appears from collaboration and cooperation, the more people are going to call for those very same things if they become increasingly desperate.

The authors say that there is only a narrow window of opportunity for the Great Reset. Let's keep in mind though that so far it is only global institutions like the WEF that are promoting the initiative, not national administrations. When it starts to permeate politics is when you know the agenda is advancing. But what exactly will the economic and societal conditions be when the Great Reset becomes part of the global conversation? Has what we have seen up to now been enough to compel people to call for change on a global scale? Has there yet been enough degradation and material change to living standards for citizens to implore global institutions to take action? I would argue not.

Already '*solutions*' like Universal Basic Income have been touted. But as yet there is not a widespread clamouring for change. But that time is coming. Whether it be in the name of Agenda 2030 (aka Sustainable Development), The Green New Deal or The Great Reset, it would amount to largely the same outcome - the subjugation once and for all of national sovereignty where the nation state is subordinate to global governance.

[Read full story here...](#)



Technocrats Freak Out Over CDC's 6% COVID Death Figure

Well, first Technocrats and leftist media blame Qanon. Q is crazy, right? Then they point to Trump for retweeting that same number: if Trump said it, it must be false, right? After Twitter deleted everyone else's tweets about it, the media figured it had to be fake news, right?

Within hours, every major publication was blasting anyone and everyone who dared to "misinterpret" the CDC's latest finding. You have to leave the interpreting part to the experts, they say, to the epidemiologists and to the scientists. Mere citizens are simply too ignorant and uneducated to understand lofty mathematical concepts like 6% or complicated medical terms like comorbidity.

Fools, all.

The CDC's website clearly and [definitively states](#):

For 6% of the deaths, COVID-19 was the only cause mentioned. For deaths with conditions or causes in addition to COVID-19, on

average, there were 2.6 additional conditions or causes per death.

What is unclear about this?

It is a really pathetic pandemic where only 6% of deaths are due exclusively to COVID-19. Stack that up against the Black Plague, TB or Ebola.

The freak-outs want you to instead focus on the 94% who died with a plethora of comorbidity conditions. Some of the most common ones mentioned in the study are:

Influenza, pneumonia, hypertensive diseases, heart disease, cardiac arrest, heart failure, diabetes, alzheimers, renal failure and on and on.

Patients with these other conditions also just happened to test positive for COVID-19, and that's all it took to be recorded as a COVID death. What's more, the average patient had an average of 2.6 of these other factors when they died.

Even a motorcycle crash victim who died on the scene tested positive for COVID. His death was recorded as COVID until some locals pointed out the sheer stupidity of such a categorization and it was ultimately rescinded.

OK, Look. Dying WITH COVID is not the same as dying FROM COVID. Only 6% died FROM COVID exclusively. The other 94% died WITH COVID.

Did anybody make an assessment of how many of the 94% would have died anyway, even if they did not have COVID? Nope. Not a one, so we'll never know for sure. But even a baseball bat could figure out that there has been a significant number who *were* headed for their earthly exit no matter what else they contracted along the way.

But, why would Technocrats freak out so bad over this viral CDC announcement (pun intended)? Because it puts their entire narrative in jeopardy.

No more panic over a pandemic would mean no more face masks, no more social distancing, no more lockdowns, no need for vaccines, no more funding, no more “Karens”, no more social engineering. It means Anthony Fauci would be released into permanent retirement, sans a fortune in lost profits from his Big Pharma investments. Worst of all, it would mean that they were WRONG, and to a Technocrat, being wrong is a cardinal sin.

Note to Technocrats, their minions and all their political and media stooges: Get lost and don't come back!



Technocratic-Fascism: Like Moths Drawn To The Flame

When the “system” knows you better than you know yourself, you cannot escape its control. Whoever has the data makes the rules, and those rules can encase you, console you, manipulate you, shape you until you are doing everything someone else wants you to do. This is the “Science of Social Engineering” as predicted by Technocracy back in the 1930s. □
TN Editor

The enduring beauty of fascism is that it requires so little from us... so little independent thought; just our basic belief and adherence to a limited set of popularly-shared directives and narratives that once fully accepted, relieve us of the need to address stubborn questions or to fret over subtle differences of opinion and feeling.

Propaganda reassures us that we are complete, that we know all there is to know, that we are rational, pragmatic and pure, that the science has been settled and that we are a part of something special.

Such a surrender to reductionist narratives cuts across all classes and income brackets. Neither the most educated nor the least uneducated retain any special advantage in the face of powerful consensus-shaping propaganda.

PROPAGANDA is, of course, the life-blood of fascist control. Maintaining the economic, governmental and scientific frameworks of a technocratic-fascist “operating system” is unthinkable without propaganda and disinformation. When truth is seen as a liability to power, it must always be disallowed, and all instances of it effectively penalized.

Radio and television and their constant enabler, popular “science” – operate today as their own religions, reliant for their success upon the devotion of the masses. As McLuhan told us, the experience of electronic media is always more powerful than the specific messaging it contains.

The currency that we use to pay for the electronic spectacle is our attention, and in such hyper-mediated times as these, the charges mount up exponentially, until we find ourselves saddled with soul-crushing denial and disconnection.

Three defining historical moments (among many) have defined the confluence of fascism, propaganda and technology.

1. The fundamental principles of propaganda were first defined 100 years ago by Edward Bernays, often referred to as the father of public relations.
2. Joseph Goebbels served as Reich Minister of Propaganda of Nazi Germany from 1933 to 1945. The stunning successful lessons of

his Nazi propaganda programs were not lost on the world's political and economic leaders in the post-war era, and in the time since then.

3. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was founded in 1947, for the expressed purpose of conducting secret intelligence operations that could serve political aims at the same time they generated huge and untraceable profits. The extent of the CIA's illegal enterprises necessitated the creation and maintenance of a permanent ministry of disinformation, managed by our own taxpayer-funded "Shadow Government" and "Deep State."

In retrospect then, it is clear that these propaganda campaigns have proven SO successful, that even today, few of us ever realize how ongoing, vast and wide-spread they are.

Propaganda's efficacy is so indisputable, that it is commonly the case that those who are the most certain that they are NOT among the propagandized, are in fact its most overt victims.

Corporate media focuses on those stories they are paid to propagate, i.e., those which support the financial and ideological agendas of their owners, who themselves are all, without exception, central parts of the larger global ruling oligarchy.

A key part of the propagandist's handbook is to simply leave unexplored stories that they are NOT given approval to manage and control; stories which, we might assume, do not generate sufficient advantage for the owners. Such calculated sins of omission are essential to keeping the mass of believers unperturbed by the vagaries of complexity in the delivery of their daily dogmas.

If an individual were to insist upon learning more about any of these less-discussed stories, they would soon arrive at the realization that while an abundance of relevant facts can easily be found, and often hidden in plain sight, the truth is that most people simply do not WANT to know, think or talk about any such truths that differ from those accepted by their peers, for whom cognitive dissonance causes such literal pain and disorientation, as to keep them docile and compliant to

the dictates of the media.

[Read full story here...](#)



The Green, Green Road To Energy Blackouts

Of course, California vehemently denies that their alternative energy policies and/or installations have anything to do with rolling blackouts or brownouts this summer. However, anybody with half a brain can immediately connect the dots surrounding California's failing energy policy. The only obvious remedy is to reverse course while there is still a viable state to do so. □ TN Editor

California leads the way to electricity blackouts, closely followed by South Australia. They both created this problem by taxing, banning, delaying or demolishing reliable coal, nuclear, gas or hydro generators while subsidising and promoting unreliable electricity from the sickly green twins - solar and wind. All supposed to solve a global warming crisis that exists only in academic computer models.

Energy policy should be driven by proven reliability, efficiency and cost, not by green politics.

Wind and solar will always be prone to blackouts for three reasons.

Firstly they are intermittent, producing zero power when winds drops or sunlight fails.

Secondly, green energy is dilute so the collection area must be huge. Both solar panels and wind turbines are old technologies and now close to collecting the maximum energy from a given land area of wind and sun, so limited technology gains are possible. Wind turbines generate nothing from gentle breezes and must shut down in gales. To collect more energy the green twins must collect from greater areas using a widespread scatter of panels and towers connected by a fragile network of roads and transmission lines. This expensive, extensive but flimsy system is far more susceptible to damage from cyclones, hail, snow, lightning, bushfire, flood and sabotage than a big, well-built, centrally-located, well-maintained traditional power station with strong walls, a roof and lightning protection. Green energy also requires far more investment in transmission lines and inter-connectors that consumers must pay for, and the energy transmission losses are greater.

Thirdly, green energy is like a virus in a distribution network.

When the sun shines, solar energy floods the network, causing energy prices to plummet. Coal and gas plants are forced to operate at a cash loss or shut down. Erratic winds make this problem worse as they are less predictable and changes can be quicker. But when all green energy fails suddenly, like in an evening peak demand period after a still cold sunset, coal cannot ramp up quickly unless it has been kept on standby with boilers hot, waiting for an opportunity to generate some positive cash flow. Gas and hydro can fire up swiftly but who wants to own/build/maintain an expensive fair-dinkum power station that operates intermittently?

Currently hydro, or stop-start gas turbines on standby, or coal generators fired up but not generating are keeping Australian lights on during green energy blackouts. But no one will build new reliable

generators to operate part-time. Soon we will have day-time where there is heaps of electricity producing no profit for any generator, and night-time when electricity prices will soar and blackouts will threaten.

Authorities have their solution - rationing. They will use a blackout crisis to grab the power to dictate rolling blackouts of whole suburbs, areas or factories or selective consumer blackouts using smart meters.

Naturally Green "engineers" also have a solution - "More Big Batteries"

There are many contestants in the battery growth "industry" including pumped hydro, lithium batteries, compressed air, big flywheels, hydrogen storage, capacitors and molten salt. They all need to be able to cope with a few days without wind-solar, which makes them huge and expensive. And all are net consumers of energy as they go through the charge/discharge cycle.

Half-tonne Li/Co/Pb batteries are huge consumers of energy - energy for exploring/mining/refining metals and for concrete, battery manufacture, transport and construction; energy to charge them and absorb the inevitable losses in the charge/discharge cycle; energy to build battery warehouses and finally energy to recycle/bury worn-out batteries (which wear out far quicker than coal, gas, hydro or nuclear power stations).

Few people consider the extra generating capacity needed to maintain charged batteries. Solar energy at best delivers power for about 8 hours per day when there is no cloud, smoke or dust in the air. So a solar array needs batteries with a capacity of twice name-plate capacity just to cover the hours of darkness, every day. These batteries then need extra generating capacity to charge them during daylight hours.

But a solar system also needs to be able to cope with up to 7 days of cloudy weather. This needs 7 times more batteries plus the generating capacity to charge them.

The Big Battery in South Australia has a capacity of 150 MW and cost \$160m. East Coast demand these days is about 22,500 MW which would require 150 SA batteries and adding a 10% factor of safety = 165 batteries. The cost could be $165 \times \$160\text{m} = \26.4bn .

No matter whether the battery is stored hydrogen or pumped hydro, the cost to stabilise 100% green energy would be prohibitively expensive. Before we leap over this green cliff, those who claim otherwise must be obliged to demonstrate a working pilot plant without coal, gas or diesel.

Wind power suffers the same problems but is far less predictable. Wind droughts are a common feature. At times wind turbines drain electricity from the grid.

To maintain grid stability, the generators must charge batteries which can then supply a steady stream of electricity to the grid. This requires many more transmission lines and battery connections.

At this point the maths/costs of zero-emissions with 100% solar/wind become preposterous. And the ecological disruption becomes enormous.

When Danish windmills stand silent, they import hydro power from Scandinavia. When German solar panels are covered in snow, they import nuclear electricity from France. And California can draw power from Canada.

But Australia is an island. When the grid fails, Tasmanian hydro or New Zealand geo-thermal are the closest reliable-energy neighbours.

The looming Covid Depression has no room for more green energy silliness. We cannot afford to mollycoddle an aging failing technology. A hard dangerous new world is coming. To survive we will need cheap reliable energy - coal, gas, nuclear or hydro.

[Read full story here...](#)



California's Renewable Energy Policy Backfires Amidst Wildfires And Energy Shortages

Control over energy has been a goal of Technocracy since the 1930s, but first that requires the destruction of fossil fuel (which is incredibly abundant, cheap and reliable) and nuclear power (also cheap and reliable). California has led the way in renewables (which are highly controllable) and is now suffering the consequences. □ TN Editor

Amid a heatwave in the West, the largest U.S. solar state, California, is grappling with power issues and with keeping its electricity grid stable as demand exceeds supply. And in a looming renewable future, those power disruptions just might be a sign of things to come.

California energy consumers were [warned of rolling outages](#) as there is insufficient energy to meet the high demand during the heatwave, the

California Independent System Operator (ISO) said over the weekend.

The warning to Californians about the outages and strained grid should serve as a warning for policymakers and system operators across the United States and elsewhere: a rush to boost renewable energy power generation should be coupled with - and even preceded by - more careful planning on how to ensure the reliability and stability of the power grid.

California's Struggles With Power Reliability

In the case of California, where solar power supplies [more than 20 percent](#) of electricity as per the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA), the rolling outages this week were the worst such outages since the [2000-2001 energy crisis](#) in the state.

Some blame the current power crisis on California's aggressive renewable energy rollout and retirement of natural gas-powered plants. Others say that there is a way for the state to reconcile renewables with reliability, although this would not come in the near term and certainly not soon enough to help with the current power supply issues.

It would seem that California has put the renewable cart before the proverbial horse.

The blame game and the debate about how exactly to cope with reliability in a heavily renewable power grid highlight the fact that meeting clean energy goals and reducing emissions should be made only after careful planning on how to ensure reliable power supply to customers and how to prepare the grid for an increased share of solar and wind power.

Earlier this week, California Governor Gavin Newsom [sent a letter](#) to California Independent System Operator (CAISO), the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and the California Energy Commission (CEC), demanding "an investigation into the service disruptions that occurred over the weekend and the energy agencies' failure to predict and mitigate them."

At the same time, Governor Newsom signed an emergency proclamation designed to free up energy capacity and reduce the need for temporary energy service disruptions.

“These blackouts, which occurred without prior warning or enough time for preparation, are unacceptable and unbecoming of the nation’s largest and most innovative state,” Governor Newsom wrote in the letter.

Are Renewables To Blame For Outages?

In a [joint response](#) to the letter, CAISO, CPUC, and CEC said that California’s clean energy plans were not to blame for the rotating outage, although they needed to do more to integrate renewables into the grid.

“Collectively, our organizations want to be clear about one factor that did not cause the rotating outage: California’s commitment to clean energy. Renewable energy did not cause the rotating outages,” they said.

“Our organizations understand the impacts wind and solar have on the grid. We have already taken many steps to integrate these resources, but we clearly need to do more. Clean energy and reliable energy are not contradictory goals.”

The current situation, however, would suggest that that is indeed the case at present.

CAISO President Stephen Berberich said at a meeting on Monday, as carried by [Greentech Media](#), “The situation we are in could have been avoided.”

The grid operator has been warning regulators for years about the insufficient availability of power supply during the so-called net peak in the evenings when solar power generation is no longer available.

CAISO has warned that “there is inadequate power available during the net peak, the hours when the solar [generation] has left the system,” Berberich said.

“California, in many ways, is the canary in the coal mine,” Todd Snitchler, CEO at nationwide trade group Electric Power Supply Association, [told](#) *The Wall Street Journal*.

“Many of the natural-gas units that some in California would like to see go away have been exactly what’s needed to keep the system operating,” Snitchler [told the Journal](#).

[Read full story here...](#)



Technocracy Is Already Driving Tens Of Millions Into Extreme Poverty

The global rise of extreme poverty was entirely predictable as Technocrats shut down the entire global economy in response to

COVID-19. In the end, it will be hundreds of millions forced to live in abject squalor.

In America, the homeless population is exploding as people are displaced from homes and apartments. This too was fully predictable. This underscores the sheer lack of concern for any other lives except those “saved” from COVID-19. □ TN Editor

As a domestic worker, Amsale Hailemariam knew from the inside out the luxury villas that had grown up around her simple shelter of raw metal and plastic sheeting. And in them, she saw how her country, Ethiopia, had transformed.

The single mother told herself, “Oh God, a day will come when my life will be changed, too.” The key lay in her daughter, just months from a career in public health, who studied how to battle the illnesses of want and hunger.

Then a virus mentioned in none of her textbooks arrived, and dreams faded for families, and entire countries, like theirs. Decades of progress in one of modern history’s greatest achievements, the fight against extreme poverty, are in danger of slipping away because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The world could see its first increase in extreme poverty in 22 years, further sharpening social inequities.

“We are living in a state where we are above the dead and below the living,” Amsale said, near tears. “This is not life.”

With the virus and its restrictions, up to 100 million more people globally could fall into the bitter existence of living on just \$1.90 a day, according to the World Bank. That’s “well below any reasonable conception of a life with dignity,” the United Nations special rapporteur on extreme poverty wrote this year. And it comes on top of the 736 million people already there, half of them in just five countries: Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, Congo and Bangladesh.

India is struggling with one of the world’s largest virus caseloads and the effects of a lockdown so abrupt and punishing that Prime Minister Narendra Modi asked the poor to forgive him. Nigeria, Africa’s most populous nation, has surpassed India with the most people in extreme

poverty — roughly half its citizens. And Congo remains one of the world's most crisis-ridden countries, with outbreaks of Ebola and measles smoldering.

Even China, Indonesia and South Africa are expected to have more than 1 million people each fall into extreme poverty, the World Bank says.

"It's a huge, huge setback for the entire world," Gayle Smith, president of the ONE Campaign to end extreme poverty, told The Associated Press. Smith, a former administrator for the U.S. Agency for International Development, called the global response to the crisis "stunningly meager."

Most of the millions newly at risk are in sub-Saharan Africa, a region that against countless odds had some of the world's fastest growing economies in recent years. The World Bank shared with the AP the earliest data out of Ethiopia as it takes a global measure of the pandemic's direct effects over several months, showing that the pain is already widespread. Similar efforts are under way in more than 100 countries.

Back in 1991, when Ethiopia began its transformation, the country was exhausted by war. A new leader, Meles Zenawi, was shaking off years of Marxist dictatorship and terrifying drought whose images of withered children left the world aghast. The former rebel had a vision that became his legacy, one of bringing millions of countrymen out of grinding poverty.

Amsale was newly arrived in the capital, Addis Ababa, from what is now neighboring Eritrea, her baby daughter in her arms. For her the child, Bethlehem Jafar, became a tiny symbol of the city's rise.

Bethlehem benefited from the welfare of the state and the charity of those who saw in her a better future. Her mother scraped by through manual labor, vowing her girl would never do the same.

Fellow Ethiopians were moving up in the world, as the government looked to emulate China's astonishing lifting of more than 800 million people from poverty. Some embraced new manufacturing jobs. Others

left subsistence farms for the growing sectors of hospitality, services and aviation that catered to the changing times, hoping to join Africa's expanding middle class.

[Read full story here...](#)

New Mayor's Order: Masks 8

IT'S SIMPLE: WHEN YOU LEAVE HOME, YOU MUST WEAR A MASK.

Common allowable exceptions:

- You are under the age of 3
- You are actively eating or drinking
- You are vigorously exercising outdoors and not close to anyone else
- You are in an enclosed office and alone

Wear a mask. Save lives. Stop the spread.

CORONAVIRUS.DC.GOV July 22, 2020 DC HEALTH GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MURIEL BOWSER, MAYOR

DC Mayor: \$1,000 Fine For Not Wearing Mask Outside Home

The Great Panic of 2020 is rising to new heights as police in Washington, DC are instructed to issue \$1, 000 citations to anyone caught not wearing a mask in public. This only demonstrates that the police state currently has the upper hand in America. □ TN Editor

Mayor [Muriel Bowser](#) (D) issued an executive order Wednesday requiring residents to wear masks outside of the home as the city battles rising coronavirus cases.

“Basically what it says is, if you leave home, you should wear a mask,” Bowser said at a press conference. “This means, if you’re waiting for a bus, you must have on a mask. If you are ordering food at a restaurant,

you must have on a mask. If you're sitting in a cubicle in an open office, you must have on a mask."

[The order](#), which allows for fines of up \$1,000 per violation, won't be enforced on children under the age of 3 and people who are actively eating or drinking.

The mayor also said she will extend the District's state of emergency.

The nation's capital has been experiencing a spike in cases as it moves toward reopening its economy. D.C., Maryland and Virginia [all reported](#) their highest COVID-19 case counts since early June on Wednesday.

On Wednesday, the District reported 102 new coronavirus cases — the most added in a single day since June 4, bringing its total cases to 11,529.

D.C. Health Director LaQuandra Nesbitt said that two-thirds of new coronavirus cases in July involve people under the age of 40 and that many patients likely got the virus while traveling.

Baltimore Mayor [Bernard Young](#) (D) on Wednesday ordered restaurants to suspend indoor dining by the end of the week and announced expanded requirements for face coverings.

[Read full story here...](#)



Democrats Try To Sneak 'Green New Deal' Through Tax Code

Technocrats are fixed on realizing the Green New Deal, aka Technocracy, by hook or by crook. The GND is regressive and will result in economic destruction rather than nirvana, and many Republicans are on board with “deep transformation” spoken of by the United Nations. □
TN Editor

In recent weeks, House Democrats have begun to signal how they would govern if given unified control of the federal government. While they will take what they can get from COVID-19 relief bills and conventional extender-type legislation, they have also begun to introduce “shoot for the moon” measures that reveal their unified government ambitions. One area in which this has been crystal clear has been the “Green New Deal,” a series of proposals to bring a radical environmental agenda to all areas of our lives.

The most straightforward way to conduct a major reform campaign in modern government is through the tax code, and that's true for both parties. Want to promote school choice? Create a tax credit voucher. Ditto for helping people pay for health insurance premiums, or save for retirement, or afford child care, or invest in new business equipment.

The reason is simple: the Senate. Unlike the House of Representatives, which has a Rules Committee dominated by the speaker and allows for virtually anything to pass with a bare majority vote, the Senate has always had slower, super-majoritarian roadblocks to hasty lawmaking. Most notably, a determined Senate minority may try to block a motion to proceed or a cloture motion, which in practice requires 60 votes out of 100 senators to overcome. This may be a moot point in a Senate overseen by current [Minority Leader Chuck Schumer](#), who has expressed a willingness to explore invoking the "nuclear option" on the legislative calendar, allowing bills to pass with a simple majority vote. In order for this to occur, a resolved and ample Senate Democrat majority would have to do so, which may or may not materialize in 2021 no matter how well their party does this fall.

Advocates of the "Green New Deal" know this, and they want to use the tax code to put in place most of their domestic policy goals for a simple reason — there is a workaround to the Senate's hoary super-majority impediments called "budget reconciliation." Under these rules, which have been used by both parties to advance everything from Obamacare to the Trump tax cuts, a simple Senate majority is all that's required to pass entitlement spending and tax legislation, provided the deficit is not increased outside the budget window. Democrats are sure to include enough tax increases to more than offset "Green New Deal" junk tax credits, so reconciliation is an attractive option. Why make 60-vote law when you can accomplish the same goal with a 51-vote tax bill?

That strategy emerged not once, but twice, in the past couple of weeks. The first is a catch-all "Green New Deal" plan called the "[Moving Forward Act](#)," a kind of "Contract with America" for radical environmentalists. The second was a more conventional [highway funding reauthorization](#) pork-barrel bill, but it contained a raft of green tax credits and other tax code atrocities.

By way of example, each of these bills contains an extension of the supposedly-phasing out investment tax credit, which provides tax breaks for the purchase of green energy equipment such as solar panels and geothermal converters. They also want to expand the investment tax credit to include energy storage devices. The bills would extend this expanded tax credit to 2025.

The investment tax credit began in 2005 as a “temporary” market support to then-emerging green energy providers. It was supposed to wind down by 2015 but was extended all the way to 2021. Last December, Congress decided to keep this phaseout schedule in place, except for certain aspects of windmill energy. By advocating a further extension to 2025, congressional Democrats have made it clear they never want the credit to go away.

It’s not as if these “Green New Deal” companies are startup firms struggling to claw out market share. [Renewable energy](#) is now nearly one-fifth of all electricity produced in the country. These companies are great investments, with or without a consumer tax credit to spur demand for their products — that’s why [private equity firms](#) are getting in on the act.

[Read full story here...](#)



House Passes \$1.5T Infrastructure Bill Packed With Green New Deal's Wish-List

When the Great Panic of 2020 started, TN said to watch for stimulus money to be spent on Green New Deal programs to snap the world into Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy. Thus far, global stimulus spending exceeds \$25 trillion. □ TN Editor

On Wednesday, the House of Representatives passed a massive \$1.5 trillion infrastructure bill packed with Democrats' climate wish-list items. Democrats [passed the bill 233-188](#) on a mostly party-line vote. Much of the funding tied to actual transportation measures — \$500 billion — is tied to green measures requiring states to set targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and preparing for mitigation as if an unspecified climate catastrophe were on the immediate horizon.

President Donald Trump slammed the bill, [H.R. 2](#), as “full of wasteful ‘Green New Deal’ initiatives.”

“Naturally this nonsense is not going anywhere in the Senate,” Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) insisted.

“Predictably, this is what follows the federal government’s decision to forcibly shut down large sections of the economy and then spend massive, unprecedented amounts of money for compensation. The concept of fiscal responsibility no longer exists in Washington, D.C., even to a small degree,” [James Taylor](#), president of the Heartland Institute, said in a statement on the bill.

“This partisan Democratic wish list of leftist priorities treats the American economy as if it runs on Monopoly money. Not only is this bill partisan and divisive, but it would dramatically and needlessly accelerate the financial ruin of this country,” Taylor added.

[Myron Ebell](#), director of the Center for Energy and Environment at the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) compared H.R. 2 to a “Green ATM” for the “climate industrial complex.”

“Included in H. R. 2’s hundreds of billions of dollars of wasteful spending is what amounts to a Green ATM, which would use taxpayer dollars to provide full funding for every aspect of the climate industrial complex. The Green ATM would provide more handouts for wind and solar energy, which have already received handouts for decades; for purchasing electric vehicles, whose buyers are at the top end of the income scale; and on and on,” Ebell said. “The Green ATM even has grants for university environmental justice programs. None of this spending will do anything to speed up economic recovery.”

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s (D-Calif.) decision to stuff an infrastructure bill full of Green New Deal climate wish-list items should not surprise Americans, given her recent attempts to take advantage of the coronavirus crisis. Her coronavirus stimulus bills were chock-full of [her own far-left agenda items](#) on vote-by-mail, LGBT financial literacy, collective bargaining for unions, a \$15/hour minimum wage, and — of

course — mandates for airlines to report the *exact amount* of carbon emissions on every flight beforehand.

Presumptive Democratic nominee [Joe Biden hailed the coronavirus crisis](#) as a “wake up call” for climate change and an “opportunity” for institutional change.

[Read full story here...](#)