



Does Big Tech Really Have The Power To Unseat Donald Trump?

Dr. Robert Epstein, a Democrat, has been writing that Big Tech will make it impossible for Trump to be re-elected in 2020. He misses the point that Big Tech are Technocrats intending to completely dominate society, everywhere. □ TN Editor

When it comes to election manipulation, left-leaning American technology companies make the Russians look like rank amateurs.

No matter which weak candidate the [Democrats](#) ultimately nominate, and even with [Russia's help](#), President Donald Trump can't win the 2020 election. For that matter, in races nationwide in which the projected winning margins are small—say, under 5 percent or so—[Republicans](#), in general, are likely to lose.

That's because of new forces of influence that the internet has made possible in recent decades and that [Big Tech](#) companies—[Google](#) more

aggressively than any other—have been determined to perfect since Armageddon Day—oh, sorry, Election Day—in 2016.

For the record, I'm neither a conservative nor a Trump supporter. But I love [democracy](#) and America more than I love any particular party or candidate, and [rigorous research](#) that I have been conducting since 2013 shows that Big Tech companies now have unprecedented power to sway elections.

While I cheer the fact that 95 percent of donations from tech companies and their employees go to Democrats, I can't stand by and watch these companies undermine democracy. As long as I'm still breathing, I will do everything I can to stop that from happening—and, for the record, I'm NOT suicidal.

The threat these companies pose is far from trivial. For one thing, they can shift opinions and votes in [numerous ways](#) that people can't detect.

Remember the rumors about that movie theater in New Jersey that got people to buy more Coke and popcorn using subliminal messages embedded into a film? Well, those rumors were a bit exaggerated—those messages actually had a minimal effect—but Google-and-the-Gang are now controlling a wide variety of subliminal methods of persuasion that can, in minutes, shift the voting preferences of 20 percent or more of undecided voters without anyone having the slightest idea they've been manipulated.

Worse still, they can use these techniques without leaving a paper trail for authorities to trace. In [a leak of Google emails](#) to the Wall Street Journal in 2018, one Googler asks his colleagues how the company can use “ephemeral experiences” to change people's views about Trump's travel ban.

Ephemeral experiences are those fleeting ones we have every day when we view online content that's generated on-the-fly and isn't stored anywhere: newsfeeds, search suggestions, search results, and so on. No authority can go back in time to see what search suggestions or search results you were shown, but dozens of randomized, controlled, double-blind [experiments](#) I've conducted show that such content can

dramatically shift opinions and voting preferences. See the problem?

Speaking of content, I'm getting sick of seeing headlines about Russian interference in our elections. Unless the Russians suddenly figure out how to massively hack our voting machines—and shame on us if we're incompetent enough to let that happen—there's no evidence that bad actors such as Russia or the now-defunct Cambridge Analytica can shift more than a few thousand votes here and there. Generally speaking, all they can do is throw some biased content onto the internet. But *content* isn't the problem anymore.

All that matters now is who has the power to decide what content people will see or will not see (censorship), and what order that content is presented in. That power is almost entirely in the hands of the arrogant executives at two U.S. companies. Their algorithms decide which content gets suppressed, the order in which content is shown, and which content goes viral. You can counter a TV ad with another TV ad, but if the tech execs are supporting one candidate or party, *you can't counteract their manipulations*.

Forget the Russians. As I said when I [testified before Congress](#) last summer, if our own tech companies all favor the same presidential candidate this year—and that seems likely—I calculate that they can easily shift *15 million votes* to that candidate without people knowing and without leaving a paper trail.

By the way, the more you know about someone, the easier it is to manipulate him or her. Google and [Facebook](#) have *millions* of pieces of information about every American voter, and they will be targeting their manipulations at the individual level for every single voter in every swing state. No one in the world except Google and Facebook can do that.

In President Eisenhower's famous 1961 farewell address, he warned not only about the rise of a military-industrial complex; he also warned about the rise of a "technological elite" who could someday control our country without us knowing.

That day has come, my friends, and it's too late for any law or regulation

to make a difference—at least in the upcoming election. There’s only one way at this point to get these companies to take their digits off the scale, and that’s to do to them what they do to us and our children every day: *monitor them aggressively*.

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



Flashback: ALEC Behind Push For Mandatory Vaccinations

Government mandated and forced vaccinations are most certainly coming thanks to China’s coronavirus pandemic. It is key to recognize that lobbyists like ALEC have been pushing state legislation for mandated vaccines for years.

It is also key to note that ALEC is a ‘conservative’ Republican-based organization, which demonstrates the political transcendency of Technocrat initiatives. □ TN Editor

Over the last several months, Americans have witnessed an increase in

media propaganda regarding the “dangers” of “anti-vaxxers,” the “proven science of vaccines,” and the “tragedies” that ensue from the failure to vaccinate. That propaganda blitz has resulted in massive hysteria stemming from similar levels of ignorance.

Also resulting from the push by Big Pharma-funded corporate media outlets is the emotional and panicked campaign of pro-vaxxers, vaccine pushers, and adherents to the relatively recent new religion of “scientism” - the religious belief in anything labeled as science or scientific, regardless of whether or not that concept directly contradicts observable reality and experience or even regardless of whether or not it is actually scientific.

The so-called vaccine debate - which is not truly a debate since a debate requires the participation of two opposing sides - is generally nothing more than a shouting and shaming campaign against parents who have come to the conclusion that vaccines are not safe, effective, or neither.

Indeed, it is the unbridled emotion of the pro-vaccine camp that has been provoked and subsequently harnessed into a powerhouse of vitriol and social pressure that is then presented as a public health crisis. The howling of the trendy masses, glued to their televisions, sitcoms, and NPR, is then presented as an organic public outcry in the media, resulting in the conveniently timed response of politicians and lawmakers.

Of course, with the creation of the false debate, there is also the political polarization of the issue - the left must be pitted against the right - in a typical but tried and true method of divide and conquer strategy.

Originally, holding questions regarding the safety or effectiveness of vaccinations was something that bridged political boundaries. Granted, the individuals who held these views were a minority. However, those numbers were growing and could be found in the midst of liberals and conservatives, libertarians and socialists, and even those completely unaligned to any ideology.

Now, however, that is beginning to change. The Big Pharma companies that fund the mainstream media and the political parasites infecting the

federal and state capitols have managed to turn this debate into a partisan issue.

The propaganda campaign has been successful among members of all political denominations, but particularly so among the left. This is because the left is made up of a population that is well-trained to believe anything presented to them under the guise of science in much the same way as the right who are designed to believe anything presented in a religious context.

The result of this massive absorption of indoctrination is that we have the passage of bills mandating that children be vaccinated by force of law in California and even the attempt to force adults to be vaccinated as well.

With mandates coming out of California, North Carolina, and Vermont, clearly there is a nationwide agenda at foot.

But while those on the left continue to attack Koch Industries and ALEC for funding a number of horrific economic policies and divisive domestic campaigns, painting any idea they oppose coming from the Republican camps as a “Koch-funded” program (it often is), the reality is that the leftists are the biggest dupes in the vaccine game.

This is because, while leftists hawk vaccines and pride themselves on their obedience to doctors and “scientists,” they are doing nothing more than falling into line with a massive Koch-funded and ALEC-facilitated propaganda campaign.

American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC)

For those who may not be familiar with the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), the council is considered a “non-profit organization” made up of Conservative state legislators and corporate private sector “partners.” This mixture of government officials and corporate agents then meet regularly, replete with funding from major corporations all across the world to discuss, plan, write, and submit

legislation that is beneficial to the corporations.

In one sense, ALEC is a massive corporate lobbying firm. In another, however, ALEC is much more, since much of the legislation submitted by the attentive congressman is actually written for the Senator or Representative by the agents of the organization. It is an organization that provides funding and direction (marching orders) for Congressmen, particularly those at the state level.

While slimy billionaires like [George Soros act as the guiding force behind much of the American left](#), ALEC and KOCH Industries tend to fill the same void for the right; although, in truth, most of the corporations that make up ALEC are those who also fund Democratic candidates. Presentation, however, in a carefully crafted political theatre like the United States, is paramount.

As Alan Greenblatt [describes the organization in his article for Governing](#),

For decades, the American Legislative Exchange Council has been a force in shaping conservative policies at the state level. Today, its impact is even more pervasive. Its legislative ideas are resonating in practically every area of state government, from education and health to energy, environment and tax policy. The group, which brings together legislators with representatives from corporations, think tanks and foundations to craft model bills, has rung up an impressive score. Roughly 1,000 bills based on ALEC language are introduced in an average year, with about 20 percent getting enacted.

[Brendan Greeley of Bloomberg Business](#) describes ALEC in a similar fashion. He writes,

For three decades, the American Legislative Exchange Council, the meeting's host, has brought together corporations (including Pfizer ([PFE](#)), AT&T ([T](#)), and ExxonMobil ([XOM](#))) and state legislators to write what it calls model bills—pieces of legislation the industries would like to become law. Often this means protecting favored tax treatment or keeping regulations at bay. ALEC has also approved

model bills on social issues, including gun control and voter registration. The bills then get passed around among the 1,800 mostly Republican legislators who are ALEC members. They introduce the model bills about 1,000 times a year in state capitols around the country, the group says. About 200 become law. ALEC pays for the meetings through membership fees (called donations) that corporations pay. The legislators receive travel stipends (called scholarships) to attend the meetings. ALEC is registered with the IRS as a nonprofit that provides a public service, not as a lobbyist that seeks to influence.

This offers two benefits: Corporate members can deduct yearly dues, which run up to \$25,000—more if they want to sponsor meetings; and ALEC doesn't have to disclose the names of legislators and executives who attend. That's important, because if ALEC operated with complete openness it would have difficulty operating at all. ALEC has attracted a wide and wealthy range of supporters in part because it's done its work behind closed doors. Membership lists were secret. The origins of the model bills were secret. Part of ALEC's mission is to present industry-backed legislation as grass-roots work. If this were to become clear to everyone, there'd be no reason for corporations to use it.

While ALEC has pushed a number of bills regarding divisive wedge issues (it has to keep up its conservative veneer), it focuses mostly on economic issues promoting free market, Austrian school, deregulation, free trade, and other policies supported by major banks and corporations.

But ALEC is also a major pusher of laws regarding medical issues - not merely in the context of the American healthcare system, but also in the context of personal choice.

Despite all the rhetoric of ALEC and its puppets in Congress, the position of the organization and its puppets is not necessarily in favor of personal choice. This much has been made clear in the form of mandates and force of law, particularly in the area of vaccination.

This should not be surprising considering ALEC's [many Big Pharma members](#). While the organization is made up of a plethora of major corporations Big Pharma [makes up a sizable portion](#) of its ranks.

Below are a very small few of pharmaceutical companies that are part of ALEC's operations.

- Astellas Pharma Inc.
- Bayer
- Dupont (Dupont Merck Pharmaceuticals)
- Eli Lilly
- Endo Pharmaceuticals
- Express Scripts
- GlaxoSmithKline
- Hoechst- Roussell Pharmaceutical Corporation
- Hoffman La-Roche
- Imperial Chemical Industries Pharmaceuticals
- Johnson & Johnson
- Mylan Pharmaceuticals
- Novo Nordisk
- Pharmacia and UpJohn
- Purdue Pharma
- Pfizer
- Solvay Pharmaceutical
- Takeda Pharmaceutical
- TEVA Pharmaceuticals
- TogetherRX Access ([made up of](#) ABBVIE, GSK, Janssen, Lifescan, Pfizer, Stiefel, Viiv Healthcare, Vistakon Pharmaceuticals)
- The UpJohn Co.

...

Conclusion

The goal of forced vaccination has been in existence for quite some time, going back to a number of elite think tanks decades ago and the halls of pharmaceutical companies. Major pharmaceutical companies, for many obvious (or should be obvious) reasons would also like to mandate

vaccination. Increased profits from the vaccine sales and the treatment of resulting disease, as well as the cover-up of vaccine risks by a population free of a control group are but a few of the reasons such corporations are supporting the vaccine mandates.

After all, as Bertrand Russell stated as far back as 1953,

Diet, injections, and injunctions will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. . . .

But, while the push to mandate vaccines for children and adults is by no means an ALEC-centric conspiracy, this recent push for such laws was indeed formulated in ALEC councils.

For this reason, it is highly ironic that the political left should be the half of the paradigm that takes up the charge for mandatory vaccination laws. After all, it is the left (at the lower levels) who seems to live by the motto "If ALEC supports it, we oppose it." This time, all it took was some clever propaganda, trendy nudging, and social shaming and the left was marching right behind ALEC as militantly as if they were Republicans all along.

The entire vaccine debate can scarcely even be labeled a debate. It is an exercise in social shaming, shouting down opposing views, and religious devotion to television and anyone wearing a lab coat or claiming to be an expert.

With the culprit behind the recent mandatory vaccine/eliminate exemption push now revealed, it is time to begin working toward repealing these laws and making sure that no similar bill is ever politically viable.

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



Uber, Lyft Cause More Congestion And Pollution In Cities

Ride sharing companies were the darling children of Sustainable Development and Smart City policies to 'save the world', but they have done just the opposite: increase pollution and traffic congestion. □ TN Editor

It's a simple fact that ridesharing adds to traffic congestion, but solving the issue is less black and white. Part of the challenge lies in the fact that policymakers have tied their own hands when it comes to regulation.

Uber and Lyft owe their great popularity to customer-friendly features such as short waiting times, low fares and the convenience of hailing a cab and paying by smartphone.

But with these virtues come multiple drawbacks, which state and local officials are struggling to deal with.

Recent studies have found that when Uber and Lyft enter a market, their fleets are [more polluting than autos](#) on average, contribute to [more traffic congestion](#) particularly in the central cities, [undermine public transit systems](#) and [devastate the local taxi industry](#). The ride-hailing firms say that some studies have come to opposite conclusions or that those impacts are outweighed by the advantages they bring to local transportation markets.

Yet government regulators have been hard-pressed to combat these problems, partially because they've tied their own hands.

"We've let them do what they want," Paul Koretz, a Los Angeles councilman who has been concerned about the firms' effect on taxi services, told me.

The issue is especially acute in California, where the Public Utilities Commission took the initiative in 2013 of carving out a separate regulatory regime for the ride-hailing industry, categorized as "transportation network companies."

That forestalled local initiatives to equalize ride-hailing regulations with those of taxis. Cabdrivers are generally subject to more stringent background checks and vehicle inspections than ride-hailing drivers.

But the PUC has had difficulty overseeing the new industry, as commission President Michael Picker, who took office after the PUC's action, later acknowledged, calling ride-hail regulation not "something we can [do effectively](#)."

Let's take a look at the key impacts confronting state and local officials when Uber, Lyft and other such services come into their markets.

Start with congestion. A study by Gregory D. Erhardt and colleagues at the University of Kentucky in conjunction with the city of San Francisco found that [average speed within the city decreased](#) to 22.2 miles per hour in 2016 from 25.6 mph in 2010, and that "vehicle hours of delay" increased by 63% in that period.

Although there were myriad contributors to the change, including

population and employment growth, the researchers blamed it chiefly on the entry of the ride-sharing firms. The worst increase in congestion occurred in the central business district, where Uber, Lyft and other services were prevalent.

Most trips on those services “are adding new cars to the road,” they found. Most ride-hail drivers, moreover, lived outside San Francisco, so their commute into the city was another factor.

A similar trend showed up in New York City, where Uber, Lyft and other app-based services added 50,000 vehicles to the roads, according to [a study by transportation consultant Bruce Schaller](#).

The arrival of ride-hailing services in a city is generally accompanied by a decline in mass transit. [Studies of public transit ridership](#) in major cities published last year by Erhardt’s team concluded that once the services arrive in a market, rail ridership declines by an average of 1.3% and bus ridership by 1.7%.

The effect “builds with each passing year,” the researchers found, to the point where even significant expansion of transit systems isn’t enough to reverse the decline; after eight years, transit systems would have to expand service by 25% just to keep ridership from falling. “Transit agencies are fighting [an uphill battle](#),” they wrote.

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