



Swarms Of AI Drones To Patrol Europe's Borders

Threat analysis and decisions will be made autonomously, notifying border patrol agents; however, this is a slippery slope that could all too easily be inducted into broad law enforcement practices. □ TN Editor

Imagine you're hiking through the woods near a border. Suddenly, you hear a mechanical buzzing, like a gigantic bee. Two quadcopters have spotted you and swoop in for a closer look. Antennae on both drones and on a nearby autonomous ground vehicle pick up the radio frequencies coming from the cell phone in your pocket. They send the signals to a central server, which triangulates your exact location and feeds it back to the drones. The robots close in.

Cameras and other sensors on the machines recognize you as human and try to ascertain your intentions. Are you a threat? Are you illegally crossing a border? Do you have a gun? Are you engaging in acts of terrorism or organized crime? The machines send video feeds to their human operator, a border guard in an office miles away, who checks the videos and decides that you are not a risk. The border guard pushes a button, and the robots disengage and continue on their patrol.

This is not science fiction. The European Union is financing a project to develop drones piloted by artificial intelligence and designed to autonomously patrol Europe's borders. The drones will operate in swarms, coordinating and corroborating information among fleets of quadcopters, small fixed-wing airplanes, ground vehicles, submarines, and boats. Developers of the project, known as Roborder, say the robots will be able to identify humans and independently decide whether they represent a threat. If they determine that you may have committed a crime, they will notify border police.

President Donald Trump has used the specter of criminals crossing the southern border to stir nationalist political sentiment and energize his base. In Europe, two years after the height of the migration crisis that brought more than a million people to the continent, mostly from the Middle East and Africa, immigration remains a hot-button issue, even as the number of new arrivals has dropped. Political parties across the European Union are winning elections on [anti-immigrant platforms](#) and enacting increasingly restrictive [border policies](#). Tech ethicists and privacy advocates worry that Roborder and projects like it outsource too much law enforcement work to nonhuman actors and could easily be weaponized against people in border areas.

"The development of these systems is a dark step into morally dangerous territory," said Noel Sharkey, emeritus professor of robotics and artificial intelligence at Sheffield University in the U.K. and one of the founders of the International Committee for Robot Arms Control, a nonprofit that advocates against the military use of robotics. Sharkey lists examples of weaponized drones currently on the market: flying robots equipped with Tasers, pepper spray, rubber bullets, and other weapons. He warns of the implications of combining that technology with AI-based decision-making and using it in politically-charged border zones. "It's only a matter of time before a drone will be able to take action to stop people," Sharkey told The Intercept.

Roborder's developers also may be violating the terms of their funding, according to documents about the project obtained via European Union transparency regulations. The initiative is mostly financed by an €8 million EU research and innovation grant designed for projects that are

exclusively nonmilitary, but Roborder's developers acknowledge that parts of their proposed system involve military technology or could easily be converted for military use.

Much of the development of Roborder is classified, but The Intercept obtained internal reports related to ethical considerations and concerns about the program. That documentation was improperly redacted and inadvertently released in full.

In one of the reports, Roborder's developers sought to address ethical criteria that are tied to their EU funding. Developers considered whether their work could be modified or enhanced to harm humans and what could happen if the technology or knowledge developed in the project "ended up in the wrong hands." These ethical issues are raised, wrote the developers, when "research makes use of classified information, materials or techniques; dangerous or restricted materials[;] and if specific results of the research could present a danger to participants or to society as a whole."

Roborder's developers argued that these ethical concerns did not apply to their work, stating that their only goal was to develop and test the new technology, and that it would not be sold or transferred outside of the European Union during the life cycle of the project. But in interviews with The Intercept, project developers acknowledged that their technology could be repurposed and sold, even outside of Europe, after the European project cycle has finished, which is expected to happen next year.

Beyond the Roborder project, the ethics reports filed with the European Commission suggest a larger question: When it comes to new technology with the potential to be used against vulnerable people in places with few human rights protections, who decides what we should and should not develop?

Roborder won its funding grant in 2017 and has set out to develop a marketable prototype — "a swarm of robotics to support border monitoring" — by mid-2020. Its developers hope to build and equip a collection of air, sea, and land drones that can be combined and sent out

on border patrol missions, scanning for “threats” autonomously based on information provided by human operators, said Stefanos Vrochidis, Roborder’s project manager.

The drones will employ optical, infrared, and thermal cameras; radar; and radio frequency sensors to determine threats along the border. Cell phone frequencies will be used to triangulate the location of people suspected of criminal activity, and cameras will identify humans, guns, vehicles, and other objects. “The main objective is to have as many sensors in the field as possible to assist patrol personnel,” said Kostas Ioannidis, Roborder’s technical manager.

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



WEF Claims World Population Supports Globalism

The World Economic Forum, running scared from rising populism and nationalism around the world, sponsored their own survey that have

them what they wanted to hear: that the world really does favor globalism, immigration and even global warming. □ TN Editor

Maybe populist political movements don't have as much support as often presumed.

The global public favours cooperation between nations, thinks immigration is a good thing and believes climate scientists, according to a poll of 10,000 people in every region of the world.

The poll was commissioned by the World Economic Forum (WEF) and will be discussed at panels at this year's meeting in Davos, Switzerland.

People in South-east Asia and Africa were the strongest believers in countries working together, with 88 per cent saying it's extremely or very important.

The least enthusiastic region was Western Europe, where 61 per cent held that view. In North America, the figure was 70 per cent. Worldwide, it was 76 per cent.

A global majority of 57 per cent said immigrants were "mostly good" for their new country, but only 40 per cent of Eastern Europeans thought so. Despite the continuing stand-off in the United States over building a wall along the Mexican border, 66 per cent of North Americans had a positive view of migrants.

One theme where there's less optimism is social mobility, with only 20 per cent of Western Europeans and 34 per cent of Americans saying it is common to be born poor and become rich.

Across the world, 54 per cent have trust in climate scientists. But in North America, only 17 per cent do.

Meanwhile, WEF founder Klaus Schwab said the annual meeting remains relevant even though US President Donald Trump and other major world leaders have announced they would not attend it this year.

Mr Trump called off his attendance earlier this month because of the government shutdown, and as it extended last Thursday, also cancelled the planned trip of a US delegation, which included Treasury Secretary

Steven Mnuchin, Secretary of State Michael Pompeo and Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross.

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



UN Pushes To Criminalize Opposition To Mass Migration

The UN pushes the mantra that Sustainable Development is only possible in a multi-cultural society, which guarantees the elimination of the nation-state. However, immigration is only pushed toward First World countries, like Europe and the United States. □ TN Editor

Dutch politician and European Parliament member Marcel de Graaff has issued a dire warning about the [United Nations'](#) frightening vision to criminalize opposition to mass migration. The baby blue wanna-be tyrannical organization is even calling for policing of the media on the issue. You probably haven't heard much about de Graaff's remarks. That's because the globalist big box media [we have](#) today is already in the camp of the pro-migration authoritarians.

Levers Of Power

In a press conference, de Graaff raised the alarm over an international conference in Marrakech, Morocco on Dec. 11 and 12 where the U.N. Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration is to be signed. Though the pact is said to be non-binding, it is meant to establish the groundwork for an Orwellian campaign to cement mass migration as a human right legally above any and all criticism.

“One basic element of this new agreement is the extension of the definition of hate speech,” de Graaff [says](#). “The agreement wants to criminalize migration speech. Criticism of migration will become a criminal offense. Media outlets that give room to criticism of migration can be shut down.”

That last sentence is no exaggeration. The U.N. Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner posted onto its website the text of an ominous Nov. 20 [speech](#) given by Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights Andrew Gilmour. The title of the speech alone shows the union is not even trying to hide its agenda: “Words Matter: Role and Responsibility of the media in shaping public perceptions about migrants and refugees and promoting inclusive societies.”

Gilmour begins his speech with a sweeping declaration highlighting just how unrestrained the UN sees itself in its machinations for power.

“Hate crimes against migrants are an especially unpleasant manifestation of what I see as an almost global backlash against human rights,” he bluntly asserts. In one sentence Gilmour wedds the mass migration of peoples into sovereign nations with the entire concept of human rights itself. From there it is easy to justify a stern authoritarian approach to crushing “racism” and “xenophobia.” And Gilmour lets it be known that command of the media is to be a key part of the global compact’s effort to do just that:

“In its Objective 17, the Global Compact commits States and other stakeholders to promote quality reporting by media outlets of migration-related issues and terminology, to investing in ethical

reporting standards and advertising, and to stopping allocation of public funding or material support to media outlets that systematically promote intolerance, xenophobia, racism and other forms of discrimination against migrants. These are crucial points we all need to build on.”

Goodbye, free press. Gilmour explains how his office will help states “to distinguish free speech from hate speech” that, of course, has no right to exist. He points out that media reporting that is not sufficiently pro-migration cannot be tolerated. “It is clear to us all that many media outlets are deliberately failing to promote the concept of common humanity,” Gilmour says, again defining mass migration as a basic human right. “Words obviously do matter: dehumanising racist rhetoric frequently leads to hatred, tensions, violence and conflict. It requires a greater effort from the international community to confront those in the media who seek to stir up hatred.”

Death Of Nations

This is the appeal to tyranny that de Graaff is warning about. It will utterly destroy the nations that give in to it. “This agreement is a coup d’etat of pro-migration liberal globalists, which will greatly benefit multinationals,” de Graaff says. “Countries who import the third world, will become the third world. And it is absolutely clear that in third world countries multinationals dictate the rules.”

The good news is that sane-minded nations are refusing to sign this trans-national suicide pact. Led by President Trump’s defiant dismissal of the U.N.’s right to impose its will in any way on the people of the United States, which he [eloquently](#) reaffirmed during his September address before that den of vipers, [more](#) and [more](#) nations are rejecting this power grab.

By openly endorsing the invasion of the West by Third World hordes and calling for the reining in of a free and objective press, the United Nations has declared itself an enemy of the American people. It is far past time to remove this hostile entity from its comfortable quarters on

our soil. The U.S. must pull out of the United Nations and they must clear out of our country.

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



UN Continues To Push Countries To Open Up Borders For Unrestricted Migration

UN migration champion Peter Sutherland is dead, but the UN continues to lever open borders to let the migration invasion continue. This is not surprising considering the overwhelming influence held at the UN by Islamic nations who are supplying the 'migrants' to Europe and elsewhere. Ultimately, the UN wants to achieve a borderless world with no migration restrictions. □ TN Editor

Governments that crack down on migrants are only harming themselves,

UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres warned Thursday ahead of UN talks on a global response to migration boycotted by the United States.

Guterres presented a report to the General Assembly on ways to address the plight of the 258 million international migrants, some of whom are trapped in legal limbo.

“Authorities that erect major obstacles to migration - or place severe restrictions on migrants’ work opportunities - inflict needless economic self-harm,” Guterres said.

“They impose barriers to having their labor needs met in an orderly, legal fashion.”

“Worse still, they unintentionally encourage illegal migration,” he said.

President Donald Trump’s administration is threatening to deport thousands of immigrants who came to the United States illegally as children and were allowed to stay under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which Trump has since scrapped.

UN member-states will next month open negotiations on a global compact for migration that would encourage governments to offer more legal venues for migrants, but the United States will not be at the table.

US Ambassador Nikki Haley cited concerns over sovereignty, saying “our decisions on immigration policies must always be made by Americans and Americans alone”, even though the document is non-binding.

Calls for stronger cooperation to address migration followed the 2015 refugee and migrant crisis in Europe, when countries were overwhelmed by the flow from Syria and Libya.

The total number of international migrants has grown by 49 percent since 2000 and now represents 3.4 percent of the world’s population, according to the United Nations.

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



Migration Invasion: Germany Is 'Losing Control Of The Streets'

Trilateral Commissioner Peter Sutherland, head of migration policy at the UN, has boasted that multiculturalism is the only path to Sustainable Development. He has heavily lobbied European nations since 2006 to open wide their borders to migration from the south, which has since destabilized many European nations. □ TN Editor

German Chancellor Angela Merkel is facing catastrophe over her failed migrant policy, according to a new report.

During the first six months of 2016, migrants committed 142,500 crimes, according to the Federal Criminal Police Office.

And Germany has been hit by a spate of horrendous violent crime including rapes, sexual and physical assaults, stabbings, home invasions, robberies, burglaries and drug trafficking.

Adding to the country's woes is the fact that thousands of people have gone missing after travelling there on invitation from Angela Merkel.

Germany took in more than 1.1million migrants in the past year and parts of the country are crippled with a lack of infrastructure.

“During the first six months of 2016, migrants committed 142,500 crimes, according to the Federal Criminal Police Office. This is equivalent to 780 crimes committed by migrants every day, an increase of nearly 40 per cent over 2015. The data includes only those crimes in which a suspect has been caught.

“Thousands of migrants who entered the country as ‘asylum seekers’ or ‘refugees’ have gone missing. They are, presumably, economic migrants who entered Germany on false pretences.

“Many are thought to be engaging in robbery and criminal violence.”

According to Freddi Lohse of the German Police Union in Hamburg, many migrant offenders view the leniency of the German justice system as a green light to continue delinquent behaviour, says the report.

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



The Dark Agenda Behind Globalism And Open Borders

The anti-globalization movement is gaining intellectual support and credibility. This article correctly points out, "There is no modicum of evidence to support the notion that globalization, interdependency and centralization actually work." □ TN Editor

When people unfamiliar with the liberty movement stumble onto the undeniable fact of the "conspiracy" of globalism they tend to look for easy answers to understand what it is and why it exists. Most people today have been conditioned to perceive events from a misinterpreted standpoint of "Occam's Razor" — they wrongly assume that the simplest explanation is probably the right one.

In fact, this is not what Occam's Razor states. Instead, to summarize, it states that the simplest explanation GIVEN THE EVIDENCE at hand is probably the right explanation.

It has been well known and documented for decades that the push for globalism is a deliberate and focused effort on the part of a select "elite;" international financiers, central bankers, political leaders and

the numerous members of exclusive think tanks. They often openly admit their goals for total globalization in their own publications, perhaps believing that the uneducated commoners would never read them anyway. Carroll Quigley, mentor to Bill Clinton and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, is often quoted with open admissions to the general scheme:

“The powers of financial capitalism had (a) far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent meetings and conferences. The apex of the systems was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland; a private bank owned and controlled by the world’s central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank... sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury loans, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence cooperative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world.” - *Carroll Quigley, Tragedy And Hope*

The people behind the effort to enforce globalism are tied together by a particular ideology, perhaps even a cult-like religion, in which they envision a world order as described in Plato’s Republic. They believe that they are “chosen” either by fate, destiny or genetics to rule as philosopher kings over the rest of us. They believe that they are the wisest and most capable that humanity has to offer, and that through evolutionary means, they can create chaos and order out of thin air and mold society at will.

This mentality is evident in the systems that they build and exploit. For example, central banking in general is nothing more than a mechanism for driving nations into debt, currency devaluation, and ultimately, enslavement through widespread economic extortion. The end game for central banks is, I believe, the triggering of historic financial crisis,

which can then be used by the elites as leverage to promote complete global centralization as the only viable solution.

This process of destabilizing economies and societies is not directed by the heads of the various central banks. Instead, it is directed by even more central global institutions like the International Monetary Fund and the Bank for International Settlements, as outlined in revealing mainstream articles like [Ruling The World Of Money](#) published by Harpers Magazine.

We also find through the words of globalists that the campaign for a “new world order” is not meant to be voluntary.

“... When the struggle seems to be drifting definitely towards a world social democracy, there may still be very great delays and disappointments before it becomes an efficient and beneficent world system. Countless people ... will hate the new world order ... and will die protesting against it. When we attempt to evaluate its promise, we have to bear in mind the distress of a generation or so of malcontents, many of them quite gallant and graceful-looking people.” - *HG Welles, Fabian Socialist and author of The New World Order*

“In short, the ‘house of world order’ will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It will look like a great ‘booming, buzzing confusion,’ to use William James’ famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.” -*Richard Gardner, member of the Trilateral Commission, published in the April, 1974 issue of Foreign Affairs*

“The New World Order cannot happen without U.S. participation, as we are the single most significant component. Yes, there will be a New World Order, and it will force the United States to change its perceptions.” - *Henry Kissinger, World Action Council, April 19, 1994*

I could quote globalists all day long, but I think you get the general idea.

While some people see globalism as a “natural offshoot” of free markets or the inevitable outcome of economic progress, the reality is that the simplest explanation (given the evidence at hand) is that globalism is an outright war waged against the ideal of sovereign peoples and nations. It is a guerrilla war, or fourth generation warfare, waged by a small group of elites against the rest of us.

A significant element of this war concerns the nature of borders. Borders of nations, states and even towns and villages, are not just lines on a map or invisible barriers in the dirt. This is what the elites and the mainstream media would like us to believe. Instead, borders when applied correctly represent principles; or at least, that is supposed to be their function.

Human beings are natural community builders; we are constantly seeking out others of like-mind and like-purpose because we understand subconsciously that groups of individuals working together can (often but not always) accomplish more. That said, human beings also have a natural tendency to value individual freedom and the right to voluntary association. We do not like to be forced to associate with people or groups that do not hold similar values.

Cultures erect borders because, frankly, people have the right to vet those who wish to join and participate in their endeavors. People also have a right to discriminate against anyone who does not share their core values; or, in other words, we have the right to refuse association with other groups and ideologies that are destructive to our own.

Interestingly, globalists and their mouthpieces will argue that by refusing to associate with those who might undermine our values, it is WE who are violating THEIR rights. See how that works?

Globalists exploit the word “isolationism” to shame sovereignty champions in the eyes of the public, but there is no shame in isolation when such principles as freedom of speech and expression or the right to self defense are on the line. There is also nothing wrong with isolating a prosperous economic model from unsuccessful economic models. Forcing a decentralized free market economy to adopt feudal

administration through central banking and government will eventually destroy that model. Forcing a free market economy into fiscal interdependence with socialist economies will also most likely undermine that culture. Just as importing millions of people with differing values to feed on a nation after it has had socialism thrust upon it is a recipe for collapse.

The point is, some values and social structures are mutually exclusive; no matter how hard you try, certain cultures can never be homogenized with other cultures. You can only eliminate one culture to make room for the other in a border-less world. This is what globalists seek to achieve. It is the greater purpose behind open border policies and globalization - to annihilate ideological competition so that humanity thinks it has no other option but the elitist religion. The ultimate end game of globalists is not to control governments (governments are nothing more than a tool). Rather, their end game is to obtain total psychological influence and eventually consent from the masses.

Variety and choice have to be removed from our environment in order for globalism to work, which is a nice way to say that many people will have to die and many principles will have to be erased from the public consciousness. The elites assert that their concept of a single world culture is the pinnacle principle of mankind, and that there is no longer any need for borders because no other principle is superior to theirs. As long as borders as a concept continue to exist there is always the chance of separate and different ideals rising to compete with the globalist philosophy. This is unacceptable to the elites.

This has led not so subtle propaganda meme that cultures that value sovereignty over globalism are somehow seething cauldrons of potential evil. Today, with the rising tide of anti-globalist movements, the argument in the mainstream is that “populists” (conservatives) are of a lower and uneducated class and are a dangerous element set to topple the “peace and prosperity” afforded by globalist hands. In other words, we are treated like children scrawling with our finger paints across a finely crafted Mona Lisa. Once again, Carroll Quigley promotes (or predicts) this propaganda decades in advance when he discusses the need for “working within the system” for change instead of fighting

against it:

“For example, I’ve talked about the lower middle class as the backbone of fascism in the future. I think this may happen. The party members of the Nazi Party in Germany were consistently lower middle class. I think that the right-wing movements in this country are pretty generally in this group.”

- Carroll Quigley, from Dissent: Do We Need It?

The problem is that these people refuse to confront the fruits of globalization that can be observed so far. Globalists have had free reign over most of the world’s governments for at least a century, if not longer. As a consequence of their influences, we have had two World Wars, the Great Depression, the Great Recession which is still ongoing, too many regional conflicts and genocides to count and the systematic oppression of free agent entrepreneurs, inventors and ideas to the point that we are now suffering from social and financial stagnation.

The globalists have long been in power, yet, the existence of borders is blamed for the storm of crises we have endured for the past hundred years? Liberty champions are called “deplorable” populists and fascists while globalists dodge blame like slimy slithering eels?

This is the best card the globalists have up their sleeve, and it is the reason why I continue to argue that they plan to allow conservative movements to gain a measure of political power in the next year, only to pull the plug on international fiscal life support and blame us for the resulting tragedy.

There is no modicum of evidence to support the notion that globalization, interdependency and centralization actually work. One need only examine the economic and immigration nightmare present in the EU to understand this. So, the globalists will now argue that the world is actually not centralized ENOUGH. That’s right; they will claim we need more globalization, not less, to solve the world’s ailments.

In the meantime, principles of sovereignty have to be historically demonized — the concept of separate cultures built on separate beliefs has to be psychologically equated with evil by future generations.

Otherwise, the globalists will never be able to successfully establish a global system without borders.

Imagine, for a moment, an era not far away in which the principle of sovereignty is considered so abhorrent, so racist, so violent and poisonous that any individual would be shamed or even punished by the collective for entertaining the notion. Imagine a world in which sovereignty and conservatism are held up to the next generation as the new “original sins;” dangerous ideas that almost brought about the extinction of man.

This mental prison is where globalists want to take us. We can break free, but this would require a complete reversal of the way in which we participate in society. Meaning, we need a rebellion of voluntary associations. A push for decentralization instead of globalization. Thousands upon thousands of voluntary groups focusing on localization, self reliance and true production. We must act to build a system that is based on redundancy instead of fragile interdependency. We need to go back to an age of many borders, not less borders, until every individual is himself free to participate in whatever social group or endeavor he believes is best for him, as well as free to defend against people that seek to sabotage him; a voluntary tribal society devoid of forced associations.

Of course, this effort would require unimaginable sacrifice and a fight that would probably last a generation. To suggest otherwise would be a lie. I can't possibly convince anyone that a potential future based on a hypothetical model is worth that sacrifice. I have no idea whether it is or is not. I can only point out that the globalist dominated world we live in today is clearly doomed. We can argue about what comes next after we have removed our heads from the guillotine.

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



Hillary Clinton Lines Up With U.N. To Go All-In For Unlimited Migration

Patrick Wood was interviewed for this article, which was subsequently linked on DrudgeReport. Little by little, the world is hearing our message on Technocracy! Thank you to all who have supported Technocracy Rising and Technocracy.News in the past and to those who will in the future. □ TN Editor

The United Nations has cooked up a "[New Urban Agenda](#)" coming soon to a city near you.

It was unveiled this week in Quito, Ecuador, at the so-called Habitat III conference.

And part of the plan, enthusiastically embraced by Hillary Clinton, calls for unlimited migration across open borders. Migrants displaced by war, failing economies or other hardships will be seen as having "rights" in nations other than their own. Cities are seen as the key battlegrounds and the U.N. conference in Quito had a lot to say about how your city

will be expected to embrace migrants of all types, from all regions of the world.

By now most Americans who follow world events are familiar with the U.N.'s plan for global governance as envisioned by its "2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development," approved by some 190 world leaders including President Obama and Pope Francis in September 2015.

This agenda includes 17 goals aimed at ending hunger, wiping out poverty and stamping out global income inequality by "[transforming our world](#)" through sweeping changes ostensibly aimed at freeing cross-border "labor mobility," among other things.

Hillary Clinton, anointed by Obama as his successor, said in a speech to Wall Street bankers she envisions the U.S. as part of a single "hemispheric common market with free trade and open borders," according to WikiLeaks data dumps.

In another bombshell revealed by WikiLeaks, Mrs. Clinton told Goldman Sachs bankers that Americans who want to limit immigration are "[fundamentally un-American](#)." She has also called for a 550-percent increase in the resettlement of Syrian refugees in America - that's 550 percent more than Obama's vastly increased level of more than 12,000 resettled in one year.

In short, Hillary's agenda for cities sounds an awful lot like the U.N.'s agenda for cities as laid out in the [New Urban Agenda document](#) approved this week by world leaders in Quito.

"She's totally in line with the U.N. agenda, on board with everything they do," says economist Patrick Wood, author of "[Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#)."

Clinton earlier this year announced her \$135 billion "[breaking every barrier](#)" program to transform America's cities.

In this plan, she makes 37 pledges promising everything from removal of blight to construction of affordable housing in areas that are currently out of the price range of refugees, immigrants, the chronically

unemployed and under-employed. She intends to build on the “successes” of her husband and the Obama administration in using public-private partnerships to transform cities. Obama’s contribution in this area included his Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule, which forces grant-receiving cities to infuse their low-crime suburban areas, deemed “too white,” with subsidized housing marketed to low-income renters.

This fits right in with the U.N.’s 2030 Agenda.

“She’s making a pre-announcement here that she’s going to follow the U.N. agenda,” Wood said. “She’s signaling to her fellow globalists that she’s 100 percent on board with their agenda.”

The problem that keeps globalists like Obama and Clinton up at night is how to implement the sweeping changes laid out in the U.N. 2030 Agenda last September at the global sustainability summit in New York.

That’s where Habitat III comes into play. It’s called the U.N. Conference on Housing and Sustainable Development or “Habitat III” for short. Its focus is on the world’s cities.

Largest U.N. conference ever

Habitat III was attended by a staggering 50,000 people including more than 200 mayors and another 140 city delegations.

The sole purpose of this conference is to approve a 24-page document called the New Urban Agenda.

“The only purpose of the conference is to rubber stamp this document and elevate it and lift it up to the world,” said Wood. “And right now it looks like they are. Everybody. All the nations.”

In this document lies the globalists’ plans for cities. All cities. Big, small, even tiny cities. Every American who lives in a city will at some point see the fruits of the plan the U.N. has in store for the world, says Wood, an expert on global governance and the technocracy movement.

The Habitat conference convenes only once every 20 years but when it

does, it leaves a trail of anti-capitalist, anti-liberty “global standards” in its wake, says Wood. These are the standards by which the U.N. wants each and every city in the world to be operated. They come packaged as “non-binding” and Congress never approves them.

Yet, somehow, the global standards coming out of the major U.N. conferences always seem to filter down to even the smallest American hamlet. How? Through federal grants. Any city that accepts federal grants will at some point be required to implement the practices that the U.N. has declared “sustainable.”

‘Inclusive’ by design, coercive by default

The buzzword in the New Urban Agenda is “inclusive” or “inclusivity.” This concept has a long history with global elites and technocrats.

The definition of “technocracy” as used by the original technocrats back 1938 was “the science of social engineering, the scientific operation of the entire social mechanism, to produce and distribute goods and services to the entire population.” That’s according to The Technocrat magazine.

“They use the word ‘entire’ twice in that definition so I’m really not surprised we see it showing up in these conferences today,” Wood said. “Their intent is to create a net that will catch 100 percent of the people.”

The word “inclusive” or “inclusivity” appear in the New Urban Agenda document no fewer than 36 times.

“There is no exclusion,” Wood says. “If you read the [document](#), you’ll find for instance under item 6a, ‘transformative commitments,’ the statement starts out ‘leave no one behind.’”

That same phrase, leave no one behind, is in the U.N.’s 2030 Agenda.

“In fact just about everywhere you go now at the U.N. you’ll find this concept,” Wood said. “It’s a little disturbing.”

Wood says the U.N. is resurrecting an old concept that fizzled in the early days of the technocracy movement. Its time hadn’t arrived yet,

back in the 1930s, but now things are different. The world is run by big data and the world is eager to embrace a set of globalized, one-world standards for everything, whether it be Common Core education standards, globalized police standards that Attorney General Loretta Lynch announced at the U.N. last fall in the form of the Strong Cities Network, or global standards for healthcare, ala Obamacare. You name it, the United Nations wants to standardize it.

The next big hurdle in the race to standardize the world is the issue of immigration.

Point 42 on page 7 of the [New Urban Agenda](#) talks about cities providing opportunities for dialogue, “paying particular attention to the potential contributions” of women and children, the elderly and disabled, “refugees and internally displaced persons and migrants, regardless of migration status, and without discrimination based on race, religion, ethnicity, or socio-economic status.”

Everyone is welcome

Wood notes that, in America, that would mean exactly what John Podesta, Clinton’s campaign manager, has already said — that anyone with a driver’s license should be allowed to vote.

“This is the way I read it,” he said. “It doesn’t matter if they’re legal or illegal, wanted or unwanted, jihadists or non-jihadists, sick or healthy. If they show up in your country, they must participate in the affairs of that country immediately, whatever country they find themselves in.”

The preamble to the New Urban Agenda says cities are the “key to tackling global challenges.”

“So these people are viewing cities as the key ingredient right now to implementing sustainable development, and they say this battle for sustainability will be won or lost in the cities.”

And the U.N. document goes on to state that this agenda is “the first step for operationalizing sustainable development in an integrated and coordinated way at the global, national, subnational, and local levels.”

In essence, it's a roadmap to global governance where American cities will no longer get their direction from elected officials representing them on the city council, or even the state legislature, but the United Nations itself. The local councils will likely not even know that the rules they are following in order to qualify for federal grants are tied to United Nations' standards for sustainability.

Cities committing to 'a paradigm shift'

The document talks about cities committing to "a paradigm shift" in the way they "plan, develop and manage urban development."

"It's top to bottom," Wood said. "They're saying it's going to be a top-down implementation. But for all the gains that sustainable development have made since 1992, there's been a complaint that it hasn't gone fast enough or far enough, and that it's not inclusive enough, that some pockets have been left out. So, what they're saying here is that this New Urban Agenda document is really, in their minds, the first step for operationalizing it. First step to making sustainable development completely operational. That's huge."

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



Open Borders Policy is Pushed By Democrats, Republicans And Technocrats

Trilateral Commission policy for erasing the borders of the world is seen to be thriving in all political parties. It is also backed by other unsavory characters like George Soros. The global elite believe that the UN's Sustainable Development cannot be completely implemented without first establishing a multicultural society. □ TN Editor

A member of the Hillary Clinton campaign praised former President George W. Bush on immigration, according to leaked emails from campaign chairman John Podesta's account.

As the [campaign tried to figure out](#) whether to let former President Bill Clinton speak on immigration, his chief of staff Tina Flournoy took a minute to praise Bush.

"43 is soooooo good on it," Flournoy wrote in a March 2015, email.

“Really good. At least he has been when I’ve seen him talk about it with 42.”

The rest of the email chain is devoted to whether to risk Clinton talking about immigration and having a potential interview with Jorge Ramos, a journalist and anchor at Fusion’s America.

“This would be our third interview with Jorge Romas - none of which have been particularly great. And as a general matter, trying to manage the number of joint 43 events - we have lots of requests for same,” Flournoy pointed out.

Podesta quickly gave his approval, saying that preparation would be needed beforehand.

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



Soros On EU: ‘Self-Serving,

Beggar-Thy-Neighbor Migration Policies'

This story is written by George Soros himself. He is a walking Hegelian dialectic. While he calls for a unified EU, he pushes for policies that will fracture and destroy it. Technocrats are pushing for a global economic reset that will make way for Technocracy. □ TN Editor

The refugee crisis in Europe was already pushing the European Union toward disintegration when, on June 23, it helped drive the British to vote to Brexit the EU. The refugee crisis and the Brexit calamity that it spawned have reinforced xenophobic, nationalist movements that will seek to win a series of upcoming votes- including national elections in France, the Netherlands, and Germany in 2017, a referendum in Hungary on the EU refugee policy on October 2, and a rerun of the Austrian presidential election on the same day.

Rather than uniting to resist this threat, EU member states have become increasingly unwilling to cooperate with one another. They pursue self-serving, beggar-thy-neighbor migration policies - such as building border fences - that further fragment the Union, seriously damage member states, and subvert global human-rights standards.

The current piecemeal response to the refugee crisis, culminating in the agreement reached earlier this year between the EU and Turkey to stem the flow of refugees from the Eastern Mediterranean, suffers from four fundamental flaws. First, it is not truly European; the agreement with Turkey was negotiated and imposed on Europe by German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Second, it is severely underfunded. Third, it has transformed Greece into a de facto holding pen with inadequate facilities.

Most important, the response is not voluntary. The EU is trying to impose quotas that many member states strenuously oppose, forcing refugees to take up residence in countries where they are not welcome and do not want to go, and returning to Turkey others who reached Europe by irregular means.

This is unfortunate, because the EU cannot survive without a comprehensive asylum and migration policy. The current crisis is not a one-off event; it augurs a period of higher migration pressures for the foreseeable future, due to a variety of causes. These include demographic shortfalls in Europe and a population explosion in Africa; seemingly eternal political and military conflicts in the broader region; and climate change.

The agreement with Turkey was problematic from its inception. The very premise of the deal - that asylum-seekers can legally be returned to Turkey - is fundamentally flawed. Turkey is not a “safe third country” for most Syrian asylum-seekers, especially since the failed coup in July.

What would a comprehensive approach look like? Whatever its final form, it would be built on seven pillars.

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



George Soros Speaks: 'Globalization' Will 'Increase Migration Pressures'

The hacktivist group DCLeaks penetrated Soros' Open Society Foundation reveals that Soros intends to influence global migration policies, including erasing national boundaries. Soros is not a member of the elitist Trilateral Commission, but his policies and actions are right in line with it. □ TN Editor

[George Soros's](#) Open Society Foundations is anticipating an increase in "migration pressures in the coming decades" due in part to "globalization," according to a leaked memo outlining a proposed strategy for successfully influencing immigration policy.

The memo, which was published by "hacktivist" group DCLeaks, contains a proposed strategy for OSF's International Migration Initiative, which aims to influence global immigration policy. The proposed strategy previews the organization's work from 2016 to 2019.

"IMI's work on migration is set against a volatile backdrop. More people than ever before are crossing borders in search of safety and a better life, while in nearly every region xenophobia, populism, and hostility towards migrants are on the rise," notes the memo.

"In some contexts, governments manage migration through guest worker programs that restrict migrants' rights by tying them to short-term jobs, satisfying business demand for cheap labor while also appeasing anti-migrant sentiment. Elsewhere, governments pursue policies of deterrence and enforcement designed to keep migrants out. IMI's work responds to both trends."

"The fierce opposition to immigration reforms in the US and Europe, rising numbers of deaths in the Mediterranean, and record numbers of unaccompanied children point to a breakdown in the governance and public acceptance of migration," the memo continues. "This will be

amplified as demographic forces, globalization, climate change, and conflicts increase migration pressures in the coming decades.

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