



## Nationwide Climate Change School Walkouts Led By Rep. Ilhan Omar's Daughter

The Green New Deal is being vigorously supported and promoted by high-visibility Muslims in America, such as Rep. Ilhan Omar (D-MN) and Nasim Thompson, Executive Director of [Justice Democrats](#). TN has long pointed out the attraction of Sustainable Development to the global Islamic community.

The global elite is pledging full support behind the Green New Deal and student protests. This is another clue that GND is Technocracy! □ TN Editor

Rep. Ilhan Omar's (D-MN) daughter is leading a national movement of students seeking to ditch class on Friday to participate in a worldwide climate change protest.



The Club of Rome  
@ClubOfRome

Follow

The Club of Rome deems the students' concerns to be utterly justified and calls on governments to listen to the call for urgent action from young people, scientists and experts across the globe. Full Statement: [bit.ly/2Jb4409](https://bit.ly/2Jb4409) #FridaysForFuture #ClimateStrike



3:37 AM - 14 Mar 2019

The ultra-elitist Club of Rome fully supports the movement. Image: Twitter

Omar's daughter, Isra Hirsi, 16, of Minneapolis, is spearheading the nationwide youth climate strike [protests](#) across the U.S. in nearly 50 states and Washington, DC., along with co-organizers Alexandria Villasenor, 13, of New York, and Haven Coleman, 12, of Denver.

Hirsi, who lists on Twitter [page](#) that she is the head of the Minnesota High School Democrats and several other left-wing youth-based organizations, said in a recent [interview](#) with Grist that she is looking to "change the conversation" on issues such as the Green New Deal by

organizing the strike.

“That’s what we’re trying to do: Change the conversation not only about things like the Green New Deal but so much more. Obviously, one strike isn’t going to change everything, but this isn’t the last strike,” Hirsi said.

Omar is also supporting her daughter’s movement by promising to attend the nationwide protest in Washington, DC, on Friday. The Minnesota Democrat [tweeted](#) Wednesday that she hoped her colleagues would join her at the protest:

 **Justice Democrats** ✓  
@justicedems [Follow](#) ▾

.@IlhanMN's daughter, @israhirsi: "That's what we're trying to do: Change the conversation not only about things like the Green New Deal but so much more. Obviously, one strike isn't going to change everything, but this isn't the last strike."



**Ilhan Omar's 16-year-old daughter is co-leading the Youth Climate Strike**  
Grist's Eric Holthaus sat down with Isra Hirsi, 16, to talk politics, parents, and this week's Youth Climate Strike  
[grist.org](http://grist.org)

8:38 AM - 13 Mar 2019



“We need to listen to the wisdom of our kids!” she added.

The U.S. climate change walkouts are part of a larger worldwide climate change movement called [#FridaysforFuture](#) where tens of thousands of student climate change activists around the world in more than 90 countries are expected to cut class on March 15 to [demand](#) that lawmakers in their respective countries take action on climate change and stop global warming.

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

---



## **Tim Ball: Technocracy Is A Data-Fed Frankenstein**

# Monster

At its root, Technocracy is based on Scientism and Logical Positivism that invalidates all knowledge except scientific knowledge. See [Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#) for a detailed examination of these errors. □ TN Editor

The rise of technocracy is intertwined with data and data collection. These activities are the very heartbeat of our technocratic society. We are now members or rather slaves of the technocrat's dream, a number. Everything and everyone is quantified, a number registered in a technocrats computer in which they are maneuvered and manipulated, usually without their knowledge. Think about a society in which a family who adopt a child end up knowing more about the child than natural parents. For those of you who think that is important, consider that people raised children of their own and those of others throughout history without that information. Being a parent and raising children has nothing to do with numbers and everything to do with humanity and retaining your soul. So much literature is about the struggle people have with that retention. Increase in this type of literature reflects the growing battle and sadly indicates we are losing.

Application of numbers to society began with the introduction of statistics in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. I will use climate as a good example of this development but link it across the wider society.

Many scientists deride the involvement of social scientists in climate studies. They claim it is a math and physics number problem, with no need for ill-informed social scientists. Despite that claim, the application of physics and numbers has not improved the accuracy of forecasts.

Ironically, science brought this on themselves when they used science to defeat religion. More narrowly, they used Darwin's theory of evolution, although Darwin, as an atheist, likely would support the move. By replacing religion, in this case Christianity, they removed God and the reason for people being so remarkably different than all the other species. Academia filled the intellectual vacuum this created with an

entirely new faculty called the Social Sciences. It joined the Humanities and the Natural Sciences but became a single focus faculty with detailed studies of people and their behavior. I call it human navel-gazing.

It was already the largest faculty on most campuses by the 1930s but suffered a justified inferiority complex as a shallow and unnecessary development in learning. For example, somebody said about sociology that they were trying to prove scientifically what your grandmother already knew. The title "Social Sciences" and the word "scientifically" underscores their problem. Scientists say it is not a science and Sociologists tried to make it a science by applying statistics. They were so inept they had to create a book of statistical tests titled *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. (SPSS). All you had to do was plug in the data without any knowledge of what was needed or what the results were telling you.

The big difference that really distinguishes the Social Sciences as unscientific is in the ability to predict. Science is easily and completely defined as the ability to predict. If, your predictions are wrong your science is wrong. In Social Sciences a prediction invalidates itself. For example, if an economist does a study of a community and makes predictions on the findings, the leaders in the community will read it and make adjustments that invalidate the predictions. That cannot happen in science.


In climate, application of statistics began with averages. Climate is the average of the weather in a region or how it changes over time. and explains what it is in a region. That was the first application in society. Suddenly, we saw and heard about averages everywhere. People were identified as above or below average with glory or stigma applied. Bureaucracies and businesses began to group the people for planning purposes. Already, the individual was subsumed as just one component of the average. Consider the information that appeared at the time that there are, on average, 2.6 children per family. I am proud to be the 0.6 child in my family. Emotionally, it is better than being the 'middle' child.

The next development came from a need to make predictions for planning and social engineering as modern postwar societies evolved. It

was the evolution of simple trend analysis, a pattern that still dominates as the recent assumption that house prices and stock markets would continue to trend upward, proves. What's interesting is how this mentality persists despite recent evidence of downturns or upturns. The application of trends to climate data began in the 1970s with the prediction of a coming ice age as temperatures declined from 1940. When the temperature turned to warming in the mid-1980s we were told, again simplistically and incorrectly, it would continue unabated. In addition, they now knew human CO<sub>2</sub> was the cause and since it would continue to increase because of human additions the upward trend was certain to continue. Like all previous trends it did not last as temperatures trended down starting in 2000. Instead of recognizing that this was a normal statistical trend they chose to change the name from global warming to climate change.

The most recent trend in climate change allowed them to accommodate the third variable of statistics, variation. In recent years, weather has become more variable particularly from month to month and year to year. Authorities exploit this pattern to say, incorrectly, it is evidence of their claim of human-caused global warming. No, it isn't. It reflects that there is pattern of climate not seen for 60-years.

One of the objectives is to adjust the data so that it masks evidence or confirms or appear to confirm its political position. A good example is the practice of smoothing the graph. You see this practice in almost all graphs and a climate one illustrates the major problem.



The figure shows two measures of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> for 2000 years between 7 and 9000 years ago. The one on the left is the record from bubbles in the ice. The other is the measure from fossilized tree leaves. They actually measure the size of the holes in the leaf called stomata. These are like your nostrils and their size varies with the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. Even though they are a more precise measure they are made to look better because a 70-year moving average was applied



to the ice core data. It removes all the variability and all the important and unique characteristics of the data.

The application of numbers and statistics to everything quickly reached a peak in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century with a philosophical movement called [logical positivism](#). In simple terms, it implied that everything could and should be quantified and measured. It created a brief intellectual opposition with scientific philosophers like Bertrand Russell and Alfred North Whitehead. The latter produced a quote that summarized their views.

*“There is no more common error than to assume that because prolonged and accurate mathematical calculations have been made, the application of the result to some fact of nature is absolutely certain.”*

Russell’s observation is frighteningly applicable in today’s world.

*“The whole problem with the world is that fools and fanatics are always so certain of themselves, and wiser people so full of doubts.”*

And so, we stand on the verge of having capsules with electronic identity numbers injected under our skins as if, out of sight out of mind, it will make us lose sight of the danger to our freedoms. Of course, there are benefits to the identifiers and to the collection of data. However, this is always the major argument to cover the removal of individual power.

Governments expand their voracious need for data and subjugation of the individual constantly. In Canada the fine for not completing the census is \$500 and 3 months in jail. In the US the fine is \$100 but a form of emotional blackmail was [attached](#).

*“Originally, the census was meant to be a way to count everyone so that the members of the House of Representatives could be allocated properly to the states. Every 10 years there would be a count, and states with more people got more members in the House.”*

The idea was they needed the information for planning and for the

benefit of the people. It was taken a long way from that over the years to the point of almost total control of the people by the technocrats for the benefit of the government. I am not making a comparison about control with any present government, but we must never forget that the ultimate subjugation of people in history was symbolized by a tattooed number on the arm.

---



# Blind Leading Blind: 'US Youth Climate Strike' Promotes Green New Deal

The current generation of youth are completely brainwashed to believe in corrupted science that they have no ability, experience or education to understand; the Green New Deal is attempting to build a tsunami that will sweep the world, not just the U.S. □ TN Editor

***“Adults won’t take climate change seriously. So we, the youth, are forced to strike.”***

We, the youth of America, are fed up with decades of inaction on climate change. On Friday, March 15, young people like us across the United States will [strike from school](#). We strike to bring attention to the millions of our generation who will most suffer the consequences of increased global temperatures, rising seas, and extreme weather. But this isn’t a message only to America. It’s a message from the world, to the world, as students in [dozens of countries](#) on every continent will be striking together for the first time.

For decades, the fossil fuel industry has pumped greenhouse gas emissions into our atmosphere. Thirty years ago, climate scientist James Hansen [warned Congress about climate change](#). Now, according to the [most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report](#) on global temperature rise, we have only 11 years to prevent even worse effects of climate change. And that is why we strike.

We strike to support the [Green New Deal](#). Outrage has swept across the United States over the proposed legislation. Some balk at the cost of transitioning the country to renewable energy, while others recognize its far greater benefit to society as a whole. The Green New Deal is an investment in our future—and the future of generations beyond us—that will provide jobs, critical new infrastructure and most importantly, the drastic reduction in greenhouse gas emissions essential to limit global warming. And that is why we strike.

To many people, the Green New Deal seems like a radical, dangerous idea. That same sentiment was felt in 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed the New Deal—a drastic piece of legislation credited with ending the Great Depression that threatened (and cost) many lives in this country. Robber-barons, ordinary citizens, and many in between were enraged by the policies enacted by the New Deal. But looking back at how it changed the United States, it’s impossible to ignore that the New Deal brought an end to the worst economic disaster in history by creating fundamental programs like Social Security and establishing new regulatory agencies such as the Securities and Exchange

Commission. The Works Progress Administration mobilized workers across the nation to build important infrastructure—including thousands of schools—that has improved Americans' everyday life for generations.

Change is always difficult, but it shouldn't be feared or shied away from. Even for its detractors, Roosevelt's New Deal ended up working out quite well. The United States led the world's economy throughout the many decades since. The changes proposed in the Green New Deal will help ensure our entire species has the opportunity to thrive in the decades (and centuries) to come. As the original New Deal was to the declining US economy, the Green New Deal is to our changing climate. And that is why we strike.

The popular arguments against the Green New Deal include preposterous claims that it will ban airplanes, burgers, and [cow flatulence](#)—claims that are spread even by some of the most powerful leaders in our nation like [Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell](#). Although these outlandish claims are clearly false, they reveal a larger truth apparent in the American, and world, populations: Instead of taking action on the imminent threat of climate change, our leaders play political games. Because adults won't take our future seriously, we, the youth, are forced to. And that is why we strike.

The alarming symptoms of [Climate Denialism](#)—a serious condition affecting both the hallways of government and the general population—mark our current historical crossroads of make-it-or-break-it action on climate change. Although there are many reasons for this affliction—such as difficulty grasping the abstract concept of a globally changed climate, or paralysis in the face of overwhelming environmental catastrophe—the primary mode of Climate Denialism contagion involves lies spouted by politicians, large corporations, and interest groups. People in power, like Senator McConnell and the [Koch brothers](#), have used [money and power](#) to strategically shift the narrative on climate change and spread lies that allow themselves and other fossil fuel industry beneficiaries to keep the fortunes they've built on burning fossil fuels and degrading the environment.

The current US president is a rabid climate change denier himself.



President Trump pulled out of the historic Paris Agreement and repeatedly [tweets about weather](#) phenomena that he claims somehow disprove the existence of climate change—despite the fact that his own administration has [reported](#) the facts of climate change and its [impact on the United States](#).

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

---



## **Weathercasters Now Promote ‘Climate Change’ To Viewers**

Technocrat propaganda has trickled down to the local TV broadcast level where weather reporters are now promoting global warming myths as facts to unsuspecting viewers. The only solution ever offered is Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy. □ TN Editor

When most people tune in to their local TV news station, they’re used to learning whether it’s going to rain tomorrow from the trusted, familiar

voice of their favorite TV meteorologist or weathercaster.

Increasingly, those viewers are also learning about the effects of climate change in their own communities from those same trusted voices.

It was once thought to be a topic to be avoided, but many on TV have become emboldened to talk about this subject as their own understanding has evolved.

Ed Maibach, director of George Mason University's Center for Climate Change Communication, has surveyed TV weathercasters since 2010 on their opinions on climate change, as well as the incorporation of the topic into their broadcasts.

In 2010, the broadcast community was split right down the middle: Fifty percent of those surveyed were convinced that humans were causing climate change, and 50% weren't. Of the half who weren't, most acknowledged that the climate is changing, they just didn't see the human connection.

What Maibach found most disturbing, however, was that a significant amount, roughly 20%, didn't even acknowledge that the climate was changing.

In his most recent survey, conducted in 2017, that number has dropped, and now 95% of broadcasters believe that the climate is changing. Additionally, 85% of those surveyed see humans as the cause.

## **Getting local with global warming**

What changed?

Maibach points to an initiative launched in 2010 by Climate Central, a nonprofit news organization of scientists and journalists who research and reports on climate change, called Climate Matters. As an academic researcher, Maibach partners with Climate Central on the project, tracking the use of the materials and investigating their effectiveness.

The program provided weathercasters with tools they previously lacked: localized climate data tailored to a specific TV market.

Jim Gandy, a local TV meteorologist in the deep red state of South Carolina, launched the pilot Climate Matters project, and Maibach gauged the success of the program by surveying viewers from Gandy's and competitors' stations.

"We found that the more viewers watched Jim's station, the more likely their views on climate change evolved," Maibach said.

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

---



## Scientists: Turn CO2 Back Into Coal And Bury It

Science is being weaponized against planet earth, its eco-system and inhabitants. If CO2 is removed from the atmosphere, it would sterilize earth into a barren desert devoid of all life. □ TN Editor

Researchers have used liquid metals to turn carbon dioxide back into

solid coal, in a world-first breakthrough that could transform our approach to carbon capture and storage.

The research team led by RMIT University in Melbourne, Australia, have developed a new technique that can efficiently convert CO<sub>2</sub> from a gas into solid particles of carbon.

Published in the journal *Nature Communications*, the research offers an alternative pathway for safely and permanently removing the greenhouse gas from our atmosphere.

Current technologies for carbon capture and storage focus on compressing CO<sub>2</sub> into a liquid form, transporting it to a suitable site and injecting it underground.

But implementation has been hampered by engineering challenges, issues around economic viability and environmental concerns about possible leaks from the storage sites.

“While we can’t literally turn back time, turning carbon dioxide back into coal and burying it back in the ground is a bit like rewinding the emissions clock,” Daeneke, an Australian Research Council DECRA Fellow, said.

“To date, CO<sub>2</sub> has only been converted into a solid at extremely high temperatures, making it industrially unviable.

“By using liquid metals as a catalyst, we’ve shown it’s possible to turn the gas back into carbon at room temperature, in a process that’s efficient and scalable.

“While more research needs to be done, it’s a crucial first step to delivering solid storage of carbon.”

## **How the carbon conversion works**

Lead author, Dr Dorna Esrafilzadeh, a Vice-Chancellor’s Research Fellow in RMIT’s School of Engineering, developed the electrochemical



technique to capture and convert atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> to storable solid carbon.

To convert CO<sub>2</sub>, the researchers designed a liquid metal catalyst with specific surface properties that made it extremely efficient at conducting electricity while chemically activating the surface.

The carbon dioxide is dissolved in a beaker filled with an electrolyte liquid and a small amount of the liquid metal, which is then charged with an electrical current.

The CO<sub>2</sub> slowly converts into solid flakes of carbon, which are naturally detached from the liquid metal surface, allowing the continuous production of carbonaceous solid.

Esfafilzadeh said the carbon produced could also be used as an electrode.

“A side benefit of the process is that the carbon can hold electrical charge, becoming a supercapacitor, so it could potentially be used as a component in future vehicles.”

“The process also produces synthetic fuel as a by-product, which could also have industrial applications.”

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

---



## **Slouching Toward Green New Deal, Some Republicans Flip-Flop On Climate Change**

Rep. John Shimkus (R-IL) used to forcefully fight against climate change fanatics. Now he says, “It’s just not worth the fight anymore.” Such surrender is spreading among Republican and conservative ranks. □ TN Editor

Representative John Shimkus once issued a forceful rejection of climate science at a congressional hearing, invoking the Bible and declaring that “Earth will end only when God declares it’s time to be over.”

Last month, in a turnabout, the Illinois Republican signed onto a letter with the top Republican of the House Energy and Commerce Committee that said “prudent steps should be taken to address current and future climate risks.”

“It’s just not worth the fight anymore,” Shimkus said in an interview when asked about his changing stance on climate change. “Let’s just see what we can do to address it and not hurt the economy.”

Shimkus is among a number of Republicans who — after years of sowing doubt about climate change or ignoring it altogether — are scrambling to confront the science they once rejected. They are planning hearings on the issue, pledging to invest in technologies to mitigate its impact and openly talking about the need for taking action.

The shift in posture follows the public’s growing anxiety after catastrophic hurricanes, flooding and wildfires linked to global warming. Fully 74 percent of registered voters think global warming is happening and 67 percent said they are worried it, according to polling conducted by Yale Program on Climate Change Communication. Among conservative Republicans, just 42 percent think global warming is happening but that is up five percentage points since a poll taken in 2017.

Moreover, Democrats have seized the issue with populist fever — even proposing a sweeping plan to phase out climate-warming gas emissions through a “Green New Deal.”

“Members are openly using the term climate change,” Republican Senator Lisa Murkowski, from oil-rich Alaska, said of her GOP colleagues. “You are not seeing this kind of dismissive attitude but more open conversations about some of the challenges, some of the technologies we can look to, some of the solutions.”

To be sure, the party hasn’t gone completely green. It hasn’t passed any major proposals to combat climate change and generally supports Trump administration policies to roll back environmental regulation.

“It’s a baby step forward,” said Tiernan Sittenfeld, a senior vice president with the League of Conservation Voters. “It remains to be seen whether they are sincere or whether they are just starting to engage in deceitful rhetoric.”

Murkowski, who chairs the Senate Energy and Natural Resources

Committee and has long acknowledged climate change, has scheduled the panel's first hearing on the topic in years, focused on electricity generation. Additional GOP controlled-committees plan to follow with a focus on greenhouse gas emissions, Murkowski said. "It is very much a multicommittee effort," she said.

In addition to Murkowski, other Republicans have been meeting in small groups to come up with a strategy on the issue: Senators John Cornyn of Texas, Cory Gardner of Colorado, Susan Collins of Maine, Bill Cassidy of Louisiana, Thom Tillis of North Carolina, Rob Portman of Ohio, Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, and former 2012 presidential nominee Mitt Romney, now a senator representing Utah.

"There is a growing consensus on our side that man-made emissions are contributing to global warming, that the 'green deal' is absurd, and we should be able to find a more appropriate solution to the problem," Graham said in an interview, adding he had recently been discussing the issue with Romney, who has called climate change a critical issue.

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





# Flushing The Future: U.S. Toilet Paper Use Is Wiping Out Canadian Forests?

Grasping at straws to condemn the United States, two global NGOs make the absurd claim that American toilet paper use is destroying Canadian forests. Does this imply that Canadians and Mexicans don't use toilet paper? □ TN Editor

The voracious use of toilet paper in the United States — with the average American using almost three rolls each week and major manufacturers spurning alternative fibres — is destroying Canada's forests and causing widespread environmental damage, two international environmental groups say.

A report on tissue paper use gave failing grades to the leading toilet paper, tissue and paper towel brands for using only virgin fibre pulp, mostly from Canada's old boreal forests.

"Forests are too vital to flush away," says [the report, called The Issue With Tissue](#), released Wednesday by Natural Resources Defense Council and Stand.earth, international nonprofit environmental organizations that cooperated on the study.

The report hammered the three biggest tissue producers in the U.S. — Procter & Gamble, Georgia-Pacific, and Kimberly-Clark — over their big, recognizable brands such as Charmin, Cottonelle, Brawny, Bounty, Kleenex, Angel Soft, Quilted Northern and Viva.

"None of their flagship at-home brands contain recycled materials or alternative fibres, and each company misses other key commitments necessary to ensure their products do not come at the expense of the boreal forest," according to the report.

The report also unrolls the incredible toilet paper use by consumers in the U.S., noting that just 150 years ago Americans used corncobs to clean up, but have since been drummed by marketing campaigns to

demand the softest tissue they can get, which comes from Canada's softwood.

The U.S. consumes more toilet paper than any other country, almost three rolls per person each week. The U.S. is followed by Germany and Britain in annual toilet paper consumption. They far out-pace the other nations. Canada isn't in the top 10.

It's created an industry absorbing \$31 billion in revenue every year in the U.S, the report says.

Compounding the environmental concerns is that all of those trees turned into pulp and made into tissue are then flushed down the toilet without recycling diversion.

The report calls that a "tree-to-toilet pipeline."

Rampant use of virgin pulp tissue is threatening the way of life for Canada's Indigenous Peoples, causing large environmental damage, endangering wildlife and contributing to climate change, the report says: "Tissue products made from virgin fibre pulp, which comes from trees, are a clear threat to our climate."

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

---



## **Beware Green Technocrats: Unelected, Unaccountable, Unremitting**

This writer pleads that the answer to global warming cannot and must not be Technocracy, but the fact is that Technocracy (aka Sustainable Development and Green New Deal) is the only solution offered by the global elite. □ TN Editor

The UK Committee on Climate Change has nothing but contempt for the public.

Ask people what the UK's biggest housing problems are, and most will tell you, rightly, that there aren't enough homes, and that prices and rents are far too high. But UK policymakers are preoccupied by something else and have been for a long time: that our homes contribute to, and are at risk from, [global warming](#).

So it was that a non-departmental public body, the Committee on Climate Change (CCC), announced last week that 'UK homes are not fit for the future', and that tough new building standards and enforcement will be necessary. Most shocking of all, the CCC said 'no new homes

should be connected to the gas grid', and that gas central heating and plumbing should therefore be phased out.

Saving the planet, and homes, from the ravages of climate change is a good idea. But the CCC's claims are questionable. As I reported [here](#) during last Summer's heatwave, the CCC, like many climate alarmists, has a tendency to exaggerate risk and lose historical perspective. In truth, homes are actually better protected from the slightly warmer, slightly wetter and slightly windier weather that scientists predict might be our future than they were even a generation ago.

The CCC argues that UK emissions-reduction targets cannot be met 'without near complete decarbonisation of the housing stock'. Gas boilers should therefore be banned in new (and then older) homes, because 'energy use in homes accounts for about 14 per cent of UK greenhouse gas emissions'. In their place will be more energy-efficient systems, such as ground- and air-source heat pumps, and greater levels of insulation.

The problem with this is that if economic alternatives to gas-fired central heating and hot water existed, there would be no need for standards and their enforcement. But they don't exist. Zero-carbon homes are the stuff of *Grand Designs* - a nice idea, but more a fashion accessory for the wealthy than a design principle that will improve lives.

Lower-cost experiments with low-carbon construction have resulted in complaints of homes becoming too hot in the summer; having poor ventilation and, therefore, damp and mould; and of requiring their inhabitants to sacrifice comfort. Most notably, and most tragically, the incautious application of energy-efficiency standards as dictated by remote technocrats - rather than consumers, according to their own needs - [contributed](#) to the Grenfell disaster.

---





## Ocasio-Cortez: People Maybe Shouldn't Reproduce Due To Climate Change

Ocasio-Cortez is spouting from the Agenda 21/Sustainable Development playbook, aka Technocracy. The UN calls for population reduction and floats propaganda encouraging couples to forego having children to make it easier for "mother earth." AOC is simply showing the uber-radical face of Technocracy. □ TN Editor

Democratic socialist Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) suggested on Sunday night that people should consider not having children due to climate change because there is a "scientific consensus" that life will be hard for kids.

"Our planet is going to hit disaster if we don't turn this ship around and so it's basically like, there's a scientific consensus that the lives of children are going to be very difficult," Ocasio-Cortez said while chopping up food in her kitchen during an Instagram live video. "And it does lead, I think, young people to have a legitimate question, you know, 'Is it okay to still have children?'"

Ocasio-Cortez then took a shot at Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) over an [incident that happened](#) in Feinstein's office on Friday when a far-left fringe group tried to pressure Feinstein into supporting the Green New Deal.

"You know what's interesting about this group?" Feinstein told the group on Friday, in response to the group storming into her office. "I've been doing this for 30 years. I know what I'm doing."

"You come in here, and you say it has to be my way or the highway. I don't respond to that," Feinstein continued. "I've gotten elected, I just ran. I was elected by almost a million-vote plurality. And I know what I'm doing. So you know, maybe people should listen a little bit."

Ocasio-Cortez said Feinstein's response was "like not good enough" because the legislation that the Democrats support is "frankly going to kill us."

"This idea that 'I've been working on this for x-amount of years,' um, it's like not good enough," Ocasio-Cortez said. "Like, we need a universal sense of urgency, and people are like trying to introduce watered-down proposals that are frankly going to kill us. A lack of urgency is going to kill us."

"The issue has gotten worse," Ocasio-Cortez continued. "So I don't think that working on an issue for 30 years alone is what qualifies as, as what someone qualified to solve an issue."

"That said, there are a lot of people that have been doing this work for decades that have proposed ambitious solutions for years and have not been listened to," Ocasio-Cortez [added](#). "So it's not just, 'I've been doing this for 30 years,' so we need to listen to them because frankly people have been failing at the same things for 30 or 40 years. What we need to do is say, 'What solutions have not been tried yet? And what ambitious scale have we not shot at yet.' And let's do it."

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



# Climate Change ‘Heat Records’ Are A Huge Data Manipulation

Global media continues its hysterical coverage of ‘catastrophic’ global warming predictions. The only solution ever offered is Sustainable Development, which is specifically designed to replace Capitalism and Free Enterprise. □ TN Editor

The idea that climate change is producing heat records across the Earth is among the most egregious manipulations of data in the absurd global warming debate.

Americans receive a daily barrage from the fake news media and climate “experts” reporting that each and every day, week, month or year is the hottest on record due to global warming. On Feb. 7, several major newspapers carried stories of the declaration by NASA and NOAA that the past five years have been the warmest on record.

Sadly, these supposed experts use mathematical equations that do not jibe with reality over the past 140 years.

The same climate experts warn that record heat is just the tip of the iceberg. We are constantly told that global warming is the root cause behind any and all weather events that are extreme, destructive, unusual or uncomfortable.

Many of these fear mongers also say we should stop burning fossil fuels that are causing this mayhem.

Is the Earth truly experiencing the hottest weather on record?

Absolutely not.

Actual weather records over the past 100 years show no correlation between rising carbon dioxide levels and local temperatures.

However, climate change alarmists always find somewhere on Earth where temperatures are higher than ever. The focus is always on isolated temperatures that have reached all-time highs while the same reports ignore all-time record lows. These zealots would like you to believe that due to fossil fuel emissions, summers are now longer and hotter while winters are shorter and milder.

Yet, the actual temperature records tell a very different story. Did the Earth experience its highest temperature ever this year? The answer is no.

The highest temperature ever reported was 136 degrees Fahrenheit in Libya in 1922. The record high temperature for the United States was 134 degrees Fahrenheit in Death Valley, California, in 1913. Fossil fuel emissions in 1913 and 1922 were negligible compared to today.

The coldest temperature ever reported was 129 degrees below zero Fahrenheit in Vostok, Antarctica, in 1983, when Carbon dioxide emissions were five times higher than in 1913. The coldest temperature in the lower 48 states of minus 64 degrees Fahrenheit was recorded in 1996 in Embarrass, Minnesota. Did the media and climate scientists warn that this low temperature indicated that we are headed for another Ice Age?

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

