



Busted: Club Of Rome Reveals Gushing Support For Green New Deal


The venerable global elite group, [The Club of Rome](#), has tipped its hand by gushing over the Sunrise Movement and the Green New Deal.

Founded in 1968, the Club of Rome was the original elite group who created crisis-mode global cooling and then global warming. They produced the infamous treatise called "The Limits to Growth" that was positioned as "A Report for The Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind." Limits to Growth proposed a resource-based economic system in the likeness of Technocracy, and called for economic equilibrium between population and available resources.

When the Trilateral Commission was co-founded in 1973 by David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski to establish a "New International Economic Order", Club of Rome members intermingled with the Bilderberg group and members of the Commission.

The totality of the Green New Deal spectacle in America is precisely in line with the global elite’s plan to force Sustainable Development upon the entire world. In the Club’s statement below, they state “We know the facts. We have the solutions. **We just need the political will.**” The purpose of Green New Deal movement is specifically to develop the “political will” to implement their “solutions”.

The recent tweet that spilled the beans on Club of Rome’s support is pictured below.

 **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 #FridaysForFuture #ClimateStrike



3:37 AM - 14 Mar 2019

The organization sponsoring these youth protests is the [Sunrise](#)

Movement. Their website states,

We're building an army of young people to make climate change an urgent priority across America, end the corrupting influence of fossil fuel executives on our politics, and elect leaders who stand up for the health and wellbeing of all people.

*We are **ordinary young people** who are scared about what the climate crisis means for the people and places we love. We are gathering in classrooms, living rooms, and worship halls across the country. Everyone has a role to play. Public opinion is already with us - if we unite by the millions we can turn this into political power and reclaim our democracy.*

These students may think that they are “ordinary young people” but they are completely unaware that they are being shamefully manipulated and orchestrated by the global elite to drive the world into Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy.

In The Club of Rome's 1991 book, [The First Global Revolution](#), they stated:

*“In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, **we came up with** the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill. In their totality and their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which must be confronted by everyone together.”*

Thus, The Club itself takes credit for coming up with the global warming mantra in order to drive global adoption of Sustainable Development. In other words, global warming was an intentional, premeditated fraud.

The full statement released by the Club of Rome in support of the above Twitter posting is reproduced below:



**STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF GLOBAL
STUDENT CLIMATE PROTESTS**
Winterthur, Switzerland, 14th March 2019

People always tell me that they are so hopeful that young people are going to save the world. But they are not. There is simply not enough time to wait for us to grow up and become the ones in charge" Greta Thunberg

This week, hundreds of thousands of students in multiple cities across the globe will once again follow in the brave footsteps of Greta Thunberg by staging climate demonstrations. Their call to world leaders is simple yet true: "it is time for less talk and more action on the climate".

We deem the students' concerns to be utterly justified and irrefutable and will continue to play our role in ensuring ambitious climate action. These courageous young leaders point to challenges for the planet and humanity which have long been recognized by the scientists, economists, business leaders and experts within the Club of Rome.*

It has been 50 years since the "The Limits to Growth", which alerted the world to the acute environmental and demographic challenges ahead. Decades of exponential growth in both population and consumption are now colliding with the limits of the Earth's biosphere. We concur with the Extinction Rebellion and the student protesters that we cannot turn a blind eye to the dual tipping points of species extinction and climate change. Emergency action is more necessary than ever and cannot be put off any longer. We no longer have the luxury of time!

We know the facts. We have the solutions. We just need the political

will. Global action is lagging and is often woefully inadequate, stymied by political meandering. This is why we are calling on governments across the world to listen to the call for urgent action from young people, scientists and experts and translate these calls into concrete Climate Emergency Plans with clear targets and time lines. To avoid the worst outcomes, global carbon emissions must be cut by half by 2030 and to zero by 2050. For the wealthier nations, this increases to around 80% by 2030, with full de-carbonisation less than a decade later. This is an unprecedented task, requiring a reduction rate of at least 7% annually; no country has to date achieved more than 1.5%.

The only possible response is emergency action that will transform human social, economic and financial systems. Yet we also believe that the existential threat from climate change, if heeded now, offers the possibility for a societal renaissance of unprecedented proportions. This is the vision we seek to promote - a vision of the future, which ensures well-being for the many and harmony between humanity and the planetary boundaries that protect us. A vision which speaks to the calls from young people marching on the streets in towns and cities across the world.

Engaged citizens of all ages demanding action by their politicians on climate change is of paramount importance, to hold us all accountable for delivering on our climate goals and ensuring that we seize this opportunity to sustainably transform our economies.

Let us find the vision, the leadership and the creativity to collaborate in developing constructive solutions for a decent future for present and succeeding generations. We have the capabilities: we must now find the will and listen to the enlightened youth who have taken time away from their studies to march on the streets to be heard.

ANDREW YANG

2020 PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE



5 Reasons Universal Basic Income Will Never Work

Universal Basic Income (UBI) is an economic impossibility being sold to ignorant masses as snake oil designed to pacify resistance against the onslaught of automation displacing workers. The sooner people see through this, the better. □ TN Editor

Tech entrepreneur Andrew Yang is a dark horse contender for the Democratic nomination in 2020 and one of his proposals is getting a lot of attention. His idea is to pay everyone in the United States \$1000 per month. It sounds great, right? I mean, who wouldn't want an extra \$1000 per month? I would also add that, perhaps surprisingly, there have been people on the Right like Thomas Paine, Charles Murray, and Milton Friedman who have favored the idea.

Of course, there do tend to be differences between the liberal and conservative versions of universal basic income. The conservative version tends to pay for the whole thing by liquidating most of the other welfare programs. In other words, let's cut the government agency middlemen out and just give people a certain amount of money. Given the incredible amount of money that the government wastes, it's

certainly theoretically possible that it could SAVE US MONEY if we were willing [to cut deep enough](#),

The UBI is to be financed by getting rid of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, Supplemental Security Income, housing subsidies, welfare for single women, and every other kind of welfare and social-services program, as well as agricultural subsidies and corporate welfare. As of 2014, the annual cost of a UBI would have been about \$200 billion cheaper than the current system. By 2020, it would be nearly a trillion dollars cheaper.

That being said, it would be politically impossible to cut many of those programs and layering it on top of the existing welfare state would defeat the potential purpose of it from the conservative perspective. On the other hand, there's practically no price tag imaginable that gives liberals pause. That brings us to the first issue with Andrew Yang's proposal.

1. We can't afford it

The federal government took in \$3.4 trillion in taxes last year and ran a \$985 billion deficit on top of that, which is in addition to the nearly \$22 trillion debt. Now consider that Andrew Yang's proposal would probably cost more than \$2.8 trillion. Yes, a value-added tax (VAT) along with cutting social programs would pay for some of that, but all? Highly unlikely. In fact, by some estimates, Yang's proposal is coming up [\\$1.2 trillion PER YEAR short of paying for the whole thing](#). It's sort of like someone who can't pay for a mansion on his current income who decides that the solution to that problem is adding a second mansion.

2. It creates a massive new VAT

Andrew Yang is proposing to pay for UBI with a gargantuan new 10 percent VAT to go along with some mostly undefined cuts in welfare programs. In case you are unfamiliar with a VAT, it's a very popular tax around the world because it taxes products at every stage of development while passing the costs on to consumers. It's a LITTLE like the gas tax in that respect. You curse the gas companies because gas is so high, but you don't realize that you are paying much more in taxes

than the corporation is receiving in profit. If we end up with a 10 percent VAT that we pay ON TOP OF all the other taxes we have, the safest bet you could ever make would be that the VAT is going to skyrocket in coming years because there is no better way on earth for the government to soak the middle class without people realizing who's really taking the money out of their wallets.

Additionally, depending on how the VAT is structured, it has the potential to wipe out a lot of the benefits of a UBI. If you get \$1000 more per month, but the prices of everything you buy go up significantly because of the VAT, you're just taking money out of one pocket and putting it in the other.

3. There are few meaningful tests of this proposal

Because this idea has such an enormous price tag, it hasn't been tested very much in the real world. Probably the most applicable experiment was the one the [Canadian government did in Manitoba](#) back in the mid-seventies and it had mixed results. Does giving money to people in African nations like Kenya or Namibia translate to America? [Does giving 100 people in Stockton, California, \\$500 per month](#) tell us anything of use at all? We're talking about an extraordinarily expensive, radical transformation of how our society works and given the extremely limited amount of data we have to work with, we'd be flying blind through a canyon while trying to do it.

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



GMO Cooking Oil Quietly Arrives In Restaurants

Flipping logic upside-down, the Technocrats at Calyxt state: “At Calyxt, we believe it is unethical NOT to use our technologies to address these issues head-on.” In reality, GMO is not equivalent to traditional plant husbandry. □ TN Editor

Somewhere in the Midwest, a restaurant is frying foods with oil made from gene-edited soybeans. That’s according to the company making the oil, which says it’s the first commercial use of a gene-edited food in the U.S.

Calyxt said it can’t reveal its first customer for competitive reasons, but CEO Jim Blome said the oil is “in use and being eaten.”

The Minnesota-based company is hoping the announcement will encourage the food industry’s interest in the oil, which it says has no trans fats and a longer shelf life than other soybean oils. Whether demand builds remains to be seen, but the oil’s transition into the food supply signals gene editing’s potential to alter foods without the

controversy of conventional GMOs, or genetically modified organisms.

Among the [other gene-edited crops](#) being explored: Mushrooms that don't brown, wheat with more fiber, better-producing tomatoes, herbicide-tolerant canola and rice that doesn't absorb soil pollution as it grows.

Unlike conventional GMOs, which are made by injecting DNA from other organisms, gene editing lets scientists alter traits by snipping out or adding specific genes in a lab. Startups including Calyxt say their crops do not qualify as GMOs because what they're doing could theoretically be achieved with traditional crossbreeding.

So far, U.S. regulators have agreed and said several gene-edited crops in development do not require special oversight. It's partly why companies see big potential for gene-edited crops.

"They've been spurred on by the regulatory decisions by this administration," said Greg Jaffe of the Center for Science in the Public Interest, a health watchdog group.

But given the many ways gene editing can be used, Jaydee Hanson of the Center for Food Safety said regulators should consider the potential implications of each new crop. He cited the example of produce gene-edited to not brown.

"You've designed it to sit around longer. Are there problems with that?" he said.

Already, [most corn and soy](#) grown in the U.S. are herbicide-tolerant GMOs. Just last week, regulators cleared a hurdle for [salmon](#) genetically modified to grow faster. The fish is the first genetically modified animal approved for human consumption in the U.S.

Though regulators say GMOs are safe, health and environmental worries have persisted, and companies will soon have to [disclose](#) when products have "bioengineered" ingredients.

Calyxt says its oil does not qualify as a GMO. The oil is made from

soybeans with two inactivated genes to produce more heart-healthy fats and no trans fats. The company says the oil also has a longer shelf life, which could reduce costs for food makers or result in longer-lasting products.

Soybean oils took a hit when regulators moved to ban oils with trans fats. Other trans fat-free soybean oils have become available in the years since, but the industry has found it difficult to win back food makers that already switched to different oils, said John Motter, former chair of the United Soybean Board.

Calyxt said the first customer is a company in the Midwest with multiple restaurant and foodservice locations, such as building cafeterias. It said the customer is using it in dressings and sauces and for frying, but didn't specify if the oil's benefits are being communicated to diners.

Calyxt is working on other gene-edited crops that it says are faster to develop than conventional GMOs, which require regulatory studies. But Tom Adams, CEO of biotech company Pairwise, said oversight of gene-edited foods could become stricter if public attitude changes.

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