



Strong Cities Network - aka Global Police Force - Could Sink American Republic

Attorney General Loretta Lynch's [speech to the United Nations](#) on September 29, 2015, will go down in history as the tipping point of total globalist control over the streets and cities of the United States, and the end to a Republic form of government.

This stands in stark contrast to the oath of office that was administered to Lynch prior to being installed as America's "top cop."

*'I, Loretta Elizabeth Lynch, do solemnly swear that **I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.**' [Emphasis added]*

Yet, in Lynch's speech she states, "... connecting those localities to one another - as the Strong Cities Network is doing - is not only a powerful way to lift up our communities worldwide. It also sends a message about who we are and what we aspire to be - as an alliance of nations and as a global community."

This begs the question, who is the [Strong Cities Network](#)? A quick look at their website reveals,

"The Strong Cities Network is the first global network of cities and other sub-national entities working together to build social cohesion and resilience to prevent violent extremism in all its forms.

"The Strong Cities Network provides a global platform to support local authorities to systematically share lessons learned, pool resources and build a community that can mobilize local action on a global scale."

First, it should be noted that Strong Cities Network is NOT a government body at all, but rather a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) with no connection to any government, or even the United Nations! They simply state that an International Steering Committee of officials from 25 cities around the world will "determine the strategic direction and thematic priorities of the Strong Cities Network."

Second, the Strong Cities Network About page clearly states "**The Strong Cities Network is run by the Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD)**, a London-based 'think-and-do' tank with a long-standing track record of working to prevent violent extremism across all forms." That is to say, the Strong Cities Network is a front group for the **Institute of Strategic Dialogue**.

Who is the [Institute for Strategic Dialogue](#)? It is yet another NGO think-tank run by a fourteen-member Board of Trustees *all of whom* are directly connected to the global oligarchy. One member, Field Marshal The Lord Guthrie, is a member of the Trilateral Commission and a former Director of the global financial empire, N M Rothschild & Sons Limited. No less than ten other board members also have direct ties to

the global financial world. The Board also contains two Baronesses and three Lords of the British monarchy.

One of ISD's ideological positions should be of great concern to all Americans. A section of their web site details an initiative to fight against "[Far-Right Extremism and Intolerance](#)", which states,

*"The blurred relationship between **violence from the extreme right and broader trends of Islamophobia and anti-immigration sentiment poses several challenges for policy makers seeking to address the increasing risk of violent right-wing extremism...**In 2012, ISD launched a new programme of work to enhance understanding of **the threat from the far right**, and help policy makers to **develop effective responses to these violent and non-violent movements.**" [Emphasis added]*

In America, such "far-right" groups are already defined by the FBI and Department of Homeland Security as Tea Party groups, Oath Keepers, Constitutionals, defenders of the 2nd Amendment and all who oppose Islam, the United Nations, Sustainable development, Agenda 21, Common Core Education Standards, etc.

What has Attorney General Loretta Lynch just done to America?

She has sold us out to a high-level and self-interested group of global oligarchs, none of whom have any experience in fighting "violent extremism" in a general sense. In fact, the only "violent extremism" they fear is that which is directed at themselves or their protected interests.

This makes total mockery of Lynch's oath of office. Instead of supporting and defending the Constitution, she is stripping the American Republic of its Constitutional protections.

Indeed, her co-opting of American cities into the hands of unelected and unaccountable global elitists is grounds for nothing less than immediate impeachment.

In the meantime, watch your own city like a hawk and deny the Strong Cities Network from gaining a foothold.



Scientists: Genetically Modified Humans Can Fight Climate Change

It was just a matter of time before Eugenics met Climate Change. Even if it sounds like science fiction and absurd speculation, the discussion is taking place now in scientific circles.

In fact, this is the ultimate application of science to the human condition. For instance, designer babies might be genetically engineered to be smaller as adults: This would proportionally reduce their carbon footprint.

Or genes might be inserted to improve night vision. That would allow nighttime lighting requirements to be reduced, thus saving boatloads of energy and reducing carbon.

Other ideas are increased body hair could keep you warm in the winter

to save on heating oil and less intelligence so you wouldn't be so tempted to be greedy and over-consume earth's resources. Well of course: Everyone knows that simple-minded people don't have strong materialistic aspirations.

Somebody might even get the idea to combine all these traits at once to suggest the ideal human design to fight climate change: short, hairy, simple-minded with cat-like eyes to see better at night than in the daytime. Can you imagine a world full of Ewoks?

<https://soundcloud.com/meanwhileinthefuture/the-carbon-gene>

This stuff is so disturbing that even the United Nations – the global home of climate-change religion – is [warning against it](#). Apparently, people at the U.N. are tracking this discussion and are alarmed. In a recent press release, the U.N. stated,

5 October 2015 - Warning that rapid advances in genetics make “designer babies” an increasing possibility, a United Nations panel today called for a moratorium on “editing” the human genome, pending wider public debate lest changes in DNA be transmitted to future generations or foster eugenics.

While acknowledging the therapeutic value of genetic interventions, the panel stressed that the process raises serious concerns, especially if the editing of the human genome should be applied to the germline, thereby introducing hereditary modifications.

“Gene therapy could be a watershed in the history of medicine and genome editing is unquestionably one of the most promising undertakings of science for the sake of all humankind,” the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization ([UNESCO](#)) said in [a news release](#) on a report by its International Bioethics Committee (IBC).

But the IBC added: “Interventions on the human genome should be admitted only for preventive, diagnostic or therapeutic reasons and without enacting modifications for descendants.” The alternative would “jeopardize the inherent and therefore equal dignity of all

human beings and renew eugenics,” it said.

This is not the first time that a UN body has raised such concerns. In 2010, UN chief Ban Ki-moon said that “as we develop technologies that enable us to make life-or-death decisions, we need a shared, value-based approach to what are fundamentally moral questions.”

In 2004, former Secretary-General Kofi Annan questioned whether such processes might promote a world dominated by eugenics like that imagined by Aldous Huxley in the novel Brave New World.

“The greatest fear is that we may be trying to ‘play God,’ with unforeseeable consequences, in the end precipitating our own destruction,” Mr. Annan warned then, asking whether the dangers outweigh the benefits and where the line should be drawn between what is feasible and what is desirable or ethical.

In today’s report IBC, comprising scientists, philosophers, lawyers and government ministers, noted that recent advances have opened the door to genetic screening and testing for inherited diseases, gene therapy, the use of embryonic stem cells in medical research and the possibility of cloning and genetic “editing” for both medical and non-medical ends.

It noted that scientists and bioethicists are calling for a wider public debate about the power of science to modify genetically human embryos in the laboratory, so as to control inherited traits, such as appearance and intelligence.

A new genome “editing” technique called CRISPR-Cas9 makes it possible for scientists to insert, remove and correct DNA simply and efficiently, IBC added. It holds out the prospect of treating or even curing certain illnesses, such as sickle cell diseases, cystic fibrosis and some cancers. But germline editing can also make changes to DNA, such as determining a baby’s eye colour, easier for scientists working with human embryos, eggs and sperm.

The report also cautions against the hidden danger of do-it-yourself genetic testing, saying that consumers who tested their own DNA

using so-called Direct-to-Consumer (DTC) kits bought online, needed professional genetic and medical counselling to understand and act on the results. It called for clear regulations and information for consumers about such tests.

UNESCO member States adopted the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights in 2005 to deal with ethical issues raised by rapid changes in medicine, life sciences and technology. It states lists the human genome as part of the heritage of humanity, outlining rules that need to be observed to respect human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms.

However, methinks the lady doth protest too much. The U.N.'s dream of Sustainable Development is precisely a Brave New World. As Aldous Huxley penned that book in 1932, he was looking straight in to the face of the Technocracy movement that was sweeping both the U.S. and Germany.

Even though Huxley well-understood Scientific Dictatorship when he saw it, I expect that even he would agree that sometimes truth is stranger than fiction.

Other resources:

[Human Engineering and Climate Change - Matthew Liao](#)

[How Engineering the Human Body Could Combat Climate Change](#)

[Is "Human Engineering and Climate Change" Paper a Case of Academic Trolling?](#)

[Bioengineer Humans to Tackle Climate Change, say Philosophers](#)

[The Genesis Engine](#)

Comparing Protections Across Trade Agreements	NAFTA	Jordan, Singapore, Chile, Australia, Morocco, CAFTA-DR, Bahrain, Oman	Peru, Colombia, Korea, Panama	Trans-Pacific Partnership
<i>Environment provisions in the core of the agreement</i>	✘	✔	✔	✔
<i>Parties shall effectively enforce their own environmental laws</i>	✔	✔	✔	✔
<i>Parties shall not waive or derogate from environmental laws to encourage trade/investment</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Parties shall implement obligations under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Commitments on control of marine pollution</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Commitments on control of ozone depleting substances</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Commitments on fisheries management</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Commitments on natural protected areas</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Commitments on illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Prohibitions on harmful fish subsidies</i>	✘	✘	✘	✔
<i>Commitments on combatting illegal take/trade in wildlife, plants and fish (incl. in violation of other countries' laws)</i>	✘	✘	✘	✔
<i>Normal/commercial trade sanctions apply to all provisions in the event of a violation</i>	✘	✘	✔	✔
<i>Stand-alone cooperation provisions in the core of the agreement</i>	✘	✘	✘	✔

Trans-Pacific Partnership: Enforcement for UN 2030 Agenda

Negotiations have been completed on the controversial Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP), establishing comprehensive regulations across 12 Pacific Rim nations, an area representing 40 percent of the global economy.

Since President Obama achieved Fast Track Authority from Congress earlier this year, the next step toward enactment is submission of the TPP document for a straight up-or-down vote with no amendments or other changes permitted. In the meantime, the actual TPP text will be made public for a period of 60 days.

Public and Congressional debate promises to be the most contentious in modern times, far surpassing the choleric that preceded the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) under President Bill Clinton in 1994.

However, one aspect of TPP that is already being ignored is its tight synchronization with the United Nations' recent enactment of its 2030 Agenda to implement Sustainable Development on a global scale. This will be further enhanced by the upcoming completion of the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) that is still under negotiation.

The current U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) and lead TPP architect is Michael Froman. The USTR is a member of the President's Cabinet and as such, is Obama's first and last authority on matters of international trade. On the USTR's official blog, Tradewinds, Froman states,

*“Trade agreements are a vital tool for combatting these global [environmental] threats. Two decades ago, **environmental provisions** under NAFTA were relegated to a side agreement, with only a single enforceable obligation to ‘effectively enforce your own environmental laws.’ In contrast, **our most recent trade agreements contain extensive, enforceable environmental commitments**. These commitments are subject to the same dispute settlement procedures as other commercial obligations, including recourse to trade sanctions in the event of a violation.”* [Emphasis added]

The business of enforceable environmental commitments is further reiterated on the blog: “Enforceable commitments to protect the environment, coupled with targeted technical assistance and capacity building, can result in important environmental progress on the ground.”

My point is this: The United Nations conned the world into thinking that Agenda 21 and now its 2030 Agenda are somehow voluntary for implementation. In fact, Agenda 21 critics have been consistently lambasted with the rebuttal that nothing has ever been forced down anyone's throat on a local, regional or national level - it's just a voluntary program.

Hogwash. Such critics just haven't been following the bouncing ball. Whatever may be couched as voluntary by the U.N. is fully enforceable by Trade Agreements.

While NAFTA and CAFTA (Central American Free Trade Agreement) were relatively light on environmentalism, the TPP majors in it. In fact, it is the most comprehensive statement on environmental regulations, enforcement and penalties in the history of all U.S. agreements and treaties.

We should not be surprised at this. On May 6, 2009 President Obama stated at the Proclamation of World Trade Week, “The United States and our trading partners stand to gain when trade is open, transparent, rules-based, and fair, showing respect for labor and environmental standards.” [Emphasis added]

Indeed. The debate will now rage over whether the TPP is open, transparent and fair, but let’s not forget that it also intends to become a major enforcement tool for the United Nations implementation of its 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development throughout the world.

And No, it is not voluntary. Whoever would dare to focus on the U.N.’s velvet hammer of volunteerism will soon get clobbered by the iron anvil of global trade regulations and their harsh system of enforcement. Ignore that at your own risk.

###

Patrick Wood is an author and lecturer on elite globalization policies since the late 1970s. He is co-author with the late Antony C. Sutton of *Trilaterals Over Washington*, Volumes I and II. His latest book, [Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#), focuses on the role of science and technology in the quest for global domination, and the elite who are perpetrating it. It is also available on Amazon.com.

Please attribute this article to Patrick Wood at www.Technocracy.News



The United Nations' Green Economy Isn't Sustainable Or Green!

The United Nations intends to replace Capitalism and Free Enterprise with its Green Economy, or Sustainable Development. However, its concepts of development and economy are deeply flawed and reminiscent of fringe ideas from the Great Depression era. (For a full discussion of Technocracy in the 1930s, see [*Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation.*](#))

Sustainable Development, as most recently promoted by the UN's 2030 Agenda Conference in New York at the end of September 2015, blatantly promises to end poverty everywhere, provide work with dignity and life-long education for all.

Leaders from virtually every nation on Earth jumped on the bandwagon and made politically binding commitments to rapidly implement Sustainable Development in their home countries. Of course, the United Nations will be there to help them every step of the way.

The catch is: Who will specify and enforce the envisioned “sustainable production and consumption” practices that are only mentioned in passing as a requirement for Sustainable Development and Green Economy?

In fact, we should demand answers from these would-be social engineers and technocrats as to exactly who will be making all of these decisions for us, and on what criteria.

And in any case, why are these technocrats masquerading as economists?

The United Nations Division for Sustainable Development (UNDESA) published in 2002 *A Guidebook to the Green Economy: Exploring Green Economy Principles*. On page 5, the following “principles of a green economy” are listed:

1. “It delivers sustainable development
2. “It delivers equity - The Justice Principle
3. “It creates genuine prosperity and wellbeing for all - The Dignity Principle
4. “It improves the natural world - The Earth Integrity, Planetary Boundaries and Precautionary Principle
5. “It is inclusive and participatory in decision making - The Inclusion Principle
6. “It is accountable - The Governance Principle
7. “It builds economic, social and environmental resilience - The Resilience Principle
8. “It delivers sustainable consumption and production - The Efficiency Principle
9. “It invests for the future - The Intergenerational Principle.”

Although the *Guidebook* contains several similar lists that attempt to define Green Economy, this one will suffice for this discussion.

In particular, what are these “Principles” that are only mentioned but not defined? The *Guidebook* provides further explanation. For instance, the Earth Integrity Principle (item 4 above) reveals,

“The Earth, her natural communities and ecosystems, possess the inalienable right to exist, flourish and evolve, and to continue the vital cycles, structures, functions and processes that sustain all beings. Every human has the duty to protect her.”

It is plain that this is not an economic proposition at all, but rather a religious one: Earth is a female entity that has “inalienable rights to exist” and demands to be served and protected. Really?

The Dignity Principle (item 3 above) states that it “upholds that every human being, now and in the future, has the right to livelihood. Poverty eradication and redistribution of wealth should be the main priority of governance and measured in those terms.”

It was no slip-of-the-pen that equates poverty eradication with redistribution of wealth. Forced redistribution of wealth resulted in the death of countless millions of people in the last 100 years who were forced to live in failed societies that imposed socialism, communism and Marxism.

There is no dignity in wealth redistribution.

Furthermore, this is not a matter of economic theory that might define an alternative theory to Capitalism and Free Enterprise. It simply states that one group will be chiseled out of their economic prosperity with the spoils going to another group that neither deserve nor has earned it. In America, this is called “stealing.”

On the UN Environmental Programme web site, it states,

“A green economy implies the decoupling of resource use and environmental impacts from economic growth... These investments, both public and private, provide the mechanism for the reconfiguration of businesses, infrastructure and institutions, and for the adoption of sustainable consumption and production processes.”

No economist I have ever known or studied would ever suggest that it is possible to decouple resource use from economic growth. Resources and all economic activities are inseparable. However, UNEP has no problem

with this because it seeks to “reconfigure” infrastructure and institutions (i.e., government, regulations, etc.) for “the adoption of sustainable consumption and production processes.”

Oops. There they go again. Who will determine production and consumption?

In this writer’s strong opinion, proponents of Sustainable Development and Green Economy need to answer some pointed questions. And, they need to stop pretending to be economists, because they are not!

Indeed, they are Utopian ideologues who think they know better than you on just about everything.

###

Patrick Wood is an author and lecturer on elite globalization policies since the late 1970s. He is co-author with the late Antony C. Sutton of *Trilaterals Over Washington, Volumes I and II*. His latest book, [Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#), focuses on the role of science and technology in the quest for global domination, and the elite who are perpetrating it.

Please attribute this article to Patrick Wood at www.Technocracy.News



Warning: Pope Francis, Utopia & The 2030 Agenda

For the first time in the history of America, a Catholic Pope will address a joint session of the U.S. Congress on September 24, 2015.

With approximately one-third of Congress being Catholic, including Speaker Boehner and former Speaker Nancy Pelosi, this promises to be a defining moment of the 114th Congress.

But, why is the Pope really here and what is his real mission?

First, he is here to address the opening session of the UN Summit for the Adoption of Post-2015 Development Agenda (2030 Agenda) that starts the next morning. This is arguably the most important meeting of the United Nations since the so-called Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 that produced the Agenda 21 document and the doctrine of Sustainable Development itself.

Second, the Pope will enshrine his major Encyclical on climate-change titled *Laudato Si'*, *On Care For Our Common Home*, which is a forceful appeal for rapid implementation of all policies contained in 2030 Agenda, namely, Sustainable Development.

The 2030 Agenda promises the end of poverty and hunger, good education and jobs for every person, decent shelter and a life of personal dignity. These are lofty goals, but are they for real? Or do they sound like a bait-and-switch scheme that contains a potentially dangerous payload?

Background

The 2030 Agenda document proposes 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets to their achievement. The framers claim that there was wide public consultation achieved to build consensus between all stakeholders, public and private organizations and citizens. Nonsense.

The actual creation of the 2030 Agenda is easily traced directly back to an earlier UN project called the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda that met in July 2012 and concluded on May 30, 2013. There were only 27 elite members of this group, each handpicked from around the world and summarily appointed by the UN Director-General Ban Ki-moon.

The U.S. was represented by John Podesta, founder of the Center for American Progress and member of the elitist Trilateral Commission, who subsequently went to work for President Obama as a Senior Policy Consultant on Climate Change.

The committee of 27 "Eminent persons" delivered their concluding document to be ratified by another UN group, the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development that met this summer from June 26 through July 8.

It is this very document that is to be presented for a global vote at the general plenary session of the UN on September 25. And, this is an all or nothing vote: Further changes will not be suggested or allowed.

Scope of Transformation

2030 Agenda builds upon Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development that was first created at the Earth Summit held in Rio De Janeiro in 1992. It not only extends the original goals, but it also gives them a definitive timeline - 2030 - to be fully implemented.

In simplest terms, Sustainable Development is a replacement economic system for

Capitalism and Free Enterprise. It is a system based on resource allocation and usage rather than on supply and demand and free economic market forces.

Christiana Figueres, Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change referred to this last March when she stated,

“This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the industrial revolution.” [Emphasis added]

She amplified by adding, “This is probably the most difficult task we have ever given ourselves, which is to intentionally transform the economic development model, for the first time in human history”

Dangerously Absurd

In short, twenty-seven appointed and narrow-minded UN loyalists have created deeply transformative policies and timelines to literally overturn the world’s current economic system for a completely untried and untested one, and yet it boldly promises to “end poverty and hunger, in all their forms and dimensions,” ensure that “all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives,” and that an era of global peace will result.

This is dangerously absurd. Any honest economist would instantly balk at such Pollyannaish promises of Utopia, and the American public should do so as well. The fact is that these wild promises of prosperity for all

are merely the candy coating to deceive the world into going along with its own economic destruction. Yes, the stakes are really that high.

And now you have an idea of why Pope Francis – the most visible religious figure in the world – has been called in to deliver the keynote address on September 25th and why he will smooth-talk Congress the day before to minimize any possible resistance to the plans of these globalist hucksters.

P.S. President Obama has already marginalized Congress, pledging his unequivocal support and signature on the 2030 Agenda document.



The Untimely Demise of Capitalism

Christiana Figueres, Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change recently revealed the UN's true purpose in the implementation of Sustainable Development on a global scale:

"This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting

ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time to **change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the industrial revolution.** [Emphasis added]

She amplified by adding, “This is probably the most difficult task we have ever given ourselves, which is to intentionally transform the economic development model, for the first time in human history.”

Two questions immediately come to mind. First, does the UN actually have the wherewithal to displace Capitalism and second, what does it mean for us if they do so?

The first question will assuredly be answered on September 25th at the upcoming UN Summit for the Adoption of Post-2015 Development Agenda. This is the most important general meeting of the UN since the 1992 Earth Summit held in Rio De Janiero where Sustainable Development and the Agenda for the 21st Century (Agenda 21) were both given birth in the first place.

The purpose of the current meeting is to herd all nations on earth, including the United States, into signing a politically binding document called the “2030 Agenda” which lists 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets by which to achieve them by 2030.

The answer to the second question is now in view: What goals and targets do they have in mind?

For sugar coating, 2030 Agenda goals include promises of Utopia such as “end poverty and hunger, in all their forms and dimensions “, ensure that “all human beings can enjoy prosperous and fulfilling lives”, and to provide “life-long learning opportunities” for all.

However, the devil’s teeth are found in the fine print. Paragraph 28 of the 2030 Agenda states:

“We commit to making fundamental changes in the way that our societies produce and consume goods and services. Governments, international organizations, the business sector and other non-state actors and individuals must contribute to changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns... to move towards more

sustainable patterns of consumption and production.”

Production? Consumption? These are the very cornerstones of Capitalism and Free Enterprise upon which all principles of supply and demand are predicated. Whereas a free market currently determines what is made and what is consumed, the 2030 Agenda intends to overthrow this in favor of a resource-based economic system where “experts” will simply set production and consumption quotas according to their own formulas and computer algorithms.

And what experts, you ask? They will be the unelected, unaccountable and otherwise untouchable social engineers who claim to know better than you what your life should look like. You will be forced to consume less and sacrifice more. Your ability to engage in commerce, to make profits and to create inheritance will be at their whim, not yours. Goods and services will be priced according to resources used instead of supply and demand.

Figueres is absolutely right that replacing free markets will be “the first time in human history”. Although current practices of Sustainable Development around the world have caused many more economic dislocations than successes, the UN simply responds that we need more of it before Utopia is realized.

As a resource-based economic system, the only historical precedent for Sustainable Development is a well-defined economic model called Technocracy, created during the 1930s when the Great Depression was raging. Back then, prominent scientists, engineers and technicians supposed that Capitalism was dead and it was therefore up to them to run all of society as a social engineering project.

Fortunately, the Technocrats failed to gain traction and the movement faded into obscurity. But now it’s back with a vengeance, under the clever guise of Sustainable Development.


Early Technocracy did not go unnoticed, however. Aldous Huxley nailed it in his classic work, *Brave New World*, which was penned in 1932 at the peak of the Technocracy movement in the U.S. Indeed, the end result of Technocracy was seen to be scientific dictatorship where every detail of life is micromanaged by an unseen hand, driven by uncontestable

policies and regulations.

If the upcoming 2030 Agenda meeting is successful in conning world leaders into signing on to it, the euphemism “Brave New World” will be taken to a whole new level as it becomes reality.

R.I.P. Capitalism and Free Enterprise.

This is not the future that America wants, but it is the future that we are about to get.



Data Dominance: Technocracy's Final Hurdle

Within the last week, stunning revelations prove conclusively that: a) an extensive and comprehensive, multi-faceted database already exists on

all Americans and b) The specific purpose of the data is to control and micro-manage the entire population.

In [*Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*](#) I demonstrated that a comprehensive data monitoring system on the entire societal system is the holy grail of Technocracy, without which absolute control would not be possible.

On July 18, 2015, Paul Sperry wrote in the NY Post, [Obama collecting personal data for a secret race database](#). It is important to note that the mere existence of data by itself does not imply intent. Intention and purpose are only revealed by humans when they seek to find answers to questions posed for whatever reason. In this case, Obama is sifting an existing database to find specific answers relating to race and diversity issues.

The same database could just as easily calculate everyone's carbon footprint, reveal political preferences and involvements, list supporters of Sustainable Development and Global Governance, and much more. Basically, once the data is collected, the sky is the limit as to the kind of questions that can be asked of it.

The scope of data mining revealed includes information on healthcare, housing, home loans, credit cards, employment and education. Other sources (i.e., Ed Snowden's revelations on NSA spying) reveal massive data collections of all emails, phone calls, text and chat messages, social media activity, vehicle license plate readers, facial recognition and energy consumption (via Smart Grid/Smart Meters).

Background

Technocracy was originally proposed and documented in 1934 as a replacement economic system for Capitalism and Free Enterprise, to be based on energy currency instead of monetary currency and supply and demand economic principles. Many observers then and now have concluded that if fully implemented, Technocracy would result in a totalitarian form of scientific dictatorship.

The fifth of the seven key requirements for implementing Technocracy

was plainly recorded in the [Technocracy Study Course](#) in 1934: ***“Provide specific registration of the consumption of each individual, plus a record and description of the individual.”***

Control over what? *The Technocrat* magazine (1938) gave a succinct summary of Technocracy’s purpose and scope: *“Technocracy is the science of social engineering, **the scientific operation of the entire social mechanism** to produce and distribute goods and services to the entire population...”*

The economic nature of Technocracy is revealed throughout their own documents, as well as it is today. For instance, the NYPost article notes Obama’s purpose as “racial and *economic* justice.”

Free Enterprise calls for the distribution of goods and services based on supply and demand depending on consumer preferences; Technocracy ignores the consumer and makes arbitrary decisions on which goods and services will be created, what they will cost, and to whom they will be distributed. To the technocrat, societal engineering is the ultimate expression of micro-management down to the very last minutiae of existence.

Purpose and Intention

Obama seeks to use the master database of personal information to answer questions about “racial and economic justice.” Sperry concludes,

“Obama is presiding over the largest consolidation of personal data in US history. He is creating a diversity police state where government race cops and civil-rights lawyers will micromanage demographic outcomes in virtually every aspect of society.”

Such are the unmistakable markers of Technocracy-in-process.

But the intentional use of data to manipulate society and the people in it is only *just beginning*.

Micromanaging Travel: A Smart Meter For Your Car

On 7/12/2015, Leo Hohmann wrote in WND, "[Feds want to track your every move on road](#)", which detailed Oregon's new "Vehicle Miles Traveled" tax, or VMT. VMT is predicated on placing a discrete GPS tracking device in every vehicle that will report wirelessly your exact travel route during the reporting period. You would then be sent a tax bill for your "share" of the road.

A University of Iowa study revealed the Devil in the details of how individual taxation will take place. A customized tax rate will be applied to each vehicle based on its owner's "carbon footprint". How would they know what your carbon footprint is? Well, your master profile has all the information needed for the calculation:

- How many and what type of vehicles do you own?
- Do you ride to work on a bicycle or mass transit?
- How much electricity and gas do you use in your home?
- How large is your home?
- Where do you live? In the country? Suburb? Urban dweller?
- How efficient are your appliances?
- How many children do you have?
- How many plane flights do you take?
- How much waste/garbage does your household produce?

The VMT is comparable to a "smart meter" for you car, and is being rolled out by Federal mandate, in similar fashion to the kickstart of Smart Grid in 2009. Twenty-nine states are already proposing legislation to follow in Oregon's footsteps, and the Department of Transportation is already working within all fifty states to accelerate acceptance.

Hohmann concludes, *"If this sounds like a line straight from the United Nations' sustainability agenda, that's because it is."*

Conclusion and Endgame

So here we have two concrete examples of how data from multiple

sources is being combined to force policy issues regulating all of society.

Data is being collected at an unprecedented rate in all of world history. Virtually every piece of digital information in existence is being stored in Federal systems, such as the massive NSA facility in Utah that has capacity to hold 100 percent of all data on the planet. The full societal impact of current data stored has not yet been felt because data analysis technology has not kept pace with storage technology. In fact, current computer technology is completely and permanently inadequate to analyze such volumes of data in a timely fashion.

This is rapidly changing, however, and the recent advent of [quantum computing technology](#) should become fully operational within a 2019-2021 timeframe - that's just 4 to 6 years away from now! Quantum computers operate at the molecular level and can potentially speed up data operations by several orders of magnitude. One writer states that even first generation quantum computers make the fastest desktop computer seem like an abacus by comparison.

Although universities and large computer companies are working non-stop on developing quantum computers, the NSA and DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency) are leading the charge, fully expecting to receive the first benefits on behalf of the emerging Technocracy.

Technocracy's final hurdle is data domination. When completed, Technocracy will assert itself over every facet of existence in America. There will be no turning back. Resistance will be punished. Freedom and Liberty will permanently sink back into the dark ages of history.

Will Americans recognize the threat and respond? This writer certainly hopes so, but thus far the response has been minimal.

Special Note

The *only* book in print today that addresses historic and modern Technocracy is ***Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global***

Transformation. It is highly recommended to purchase and read this book immediately, and then to distribute copies to everyone you know.



Encyclical: Pope Francis Speaks Technocracy

Pope Francis recently released his promised Encyclical Letter on Climate Change titled, [*Laudato Si' of the Holy Father Francis On Care For Our Common Home*](#), which specifically seeks to influence the outcome of the United Nations Climate Change Conference to be held from November 30 through December 11 in Paris.

The exact purpose of the Summit is to “achieve, for the first time in over 20 years of UN negotiations, a **binding and universal agreement on climate**, from all the nations of the world.(1)” [Emphasis added] In fact, this is the most important convention ever held by the U.N., intending to cement Sustainable Development and Agenda 21 policies into place all

over the world.

Pope Francis' contribution to the global consensus is only 98 pages long, but it is a pithy call for Sustainable Development and global governance to enforce it. He sees the United Nations as the clear choice to promote both.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change has set up a [special news site](#) to track ongoing developments. The following statement appears on the home page:

These new front pages and focus sections capture news of climate change and stories about the groundswell of climate action by governments, companies, cities, the UN and civil society around the globe.

The Pope's analysis of the current status quo, as most damaging to the ecology, is that technocracy is mostly to blame. He writes in Paragraph 194, for instance,

*It (talk of sustainable growth) absorbs the language and values of ecology into the categories of finance and **technocracy**, and the social and environmental responsibility of businesses often gets reduced to a series of marketing and image-enhancing measures.*

In the next paragraph, he proposes the orthodox U.N. position of the "green economy":

The principle of the maximization of profits, frequently isolated from other considerations, reflects a misunderstanding of the very concept of the economy. As long as production is increased, little concern is given to whether it is at the cost of future resources or the health of the environment; as long as the clearing of a forest increases production, no one calculates the losses entailed in the desertification of the land, the harm done to biodiversity or the increased pollution. In a word, businesses profit by calculating and paying only a fraction of the costs involved. Yet only when "the economic and social costs of using up shared environmental resources are recognized with transparency and fully borne by those

who incur them, not by other peoples or future generations”, can those actions be considered ethical.

In earlier paragraphs, the Pope opines about “a **technocracy** which sees no intrinsic value in lesser beings coexists with the other extreme, which sees no special value in human beings.” He further stated, “Politics must not be subject to the economy, nor should the economy be subject to the dictates of an efficiency-driven paradigm of **technocracy**.”

Are you confused by his positioning of the word **technocracy** yet? Well, you should be!

While the Pope rails against the “efficiencies” and cold-heartedness of **technocracy**, he recommends running straight into the arms of **Technocracy**, which is the very heart of Climate-Change, Sustainable Development and Agenda 21. (For a full discussion of Technocracy and its relationship to these topics, please refer to [Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#) by this writer)

This is most clearly seen in this statement from Paragraph 111: “Liberation from the **dominant technocratic paradigm** does in fact happen sometimes, for example, when cooperatives of small producers adopt less polluting means of production, and opt for a non-consumerist model of life, recreation and community.”

Pope Francis’ chief science advisor, who is largely responsible for the crafting of this Encyclical, is Hans Schellnhuber, who is a pantheist (a form of atheism). [Schellnhuber believes in Gaia, or Mother Earth](#), as being a living, self-aware and self-regulating organism to which man is responsible. This is a polar opposite position of the traditional Catholic belief that God gave the earth to man for his sustenance and enjoyment.

If it was indeed Schellnhuber who introduced the concepts of *technocracy* and *technocratic paradigm* into the Encyclical, then he has done the Pope a great disservice, painting him to be ignorant of history and ignorant of the current nature of Sustainable Development. On the other hand, Schellnhuber has identified himself as a *master of dis-information* against this author who is trying to expose the historical and modern tyranny associated with Technocracy.

Whatever Schellnhuber's intent, it is interesting to note that he did indeed write about technocracy at the same time when the only recently published book on technocracy and Technocracy is this author's work, [*Technocracy Rising*](#).


Endnotes:

1. ["Issues and reasons behind the French offer to host the 21st Conference of the Parties on Climate Change 2015"](#). Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 22 May 2013. Retrieved 31 January 2014.



Energy Currency: Your Money Won't Help You

One of the main tenets of Technocracy is the abolition of private property. This has always been the case, even from the 1930s when Technocracy was first conceived as a coherent



economic system run by scientists and engineers. The early Technocrats wanted to scrap money altogether and substitute “Energy Certificates” instead.

The Technocracy Study Course (1934, Scott & Hubbert) clearly delineated the requirement:

*“Under a technological administration of abundance there is only one efficient method—that employing a system of Energy Certificates. By this system all books and records pertaining to consumption are kept by the Distribution Sequence of the social mechanism. The income is granted to the public in the form of Energy Certificates. These certificates are merely pieces of paper containing certain printed matter. **They are issued individually to every adult of the entire population.**” (p. 288) [Emphasis added]*

At the end of the allocation period, all Energy Certificates would expire and the citizen would receive a new allocation for the next period. Thus, there was no provision for saving wealth from period to period. Since the ownership of private property had already eradicated, there was no way to accumulate anything. They expected you to just live hand-to-mouth at their sole discretion.

Your children would fare no better. Since you could not accumulate wealth, you would have nothing to leave as inheritance.

R.I.P Capitalism and Free Enterprise.

Crazy or Not, Here We Come

This snaps the mind of most people. It’s too fantastical and radical. It couldn’t happen here.

Oh really? Then process this: The [International Social Transformation Conference](#) held in 2012 in Croatia that specifically focused on “**Energy Currency: Energy as the Fundamental Measure of Price, Cost and Value.**”

Insignificant, you say? The press release stated that “The event featured about 80 prominent economists, scientists and scholars from around the world,” including the World Academy of Art & Sciences. At the end of the conference, the participants pledged to use their resources to petition the European Union and the United Nations to adopt an Energy Currency.

The United Nations, with its Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development initiatives, is well ahead of the curve on Technocracy. On February 3, 2015, Christiana Figueres stated in a press conference,

*“This is the **first time in the history of mankind** that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time **to change the economic development model** that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the industrial revolution...That will not happen overnight and it will not happen at a single conference on climate change. It is a process, because of the depth of the transformation.”*[Emphasis added]

Figueres is the Executive Secretary of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, and is the undisputed global driver for implementing climate-change policies and Sustainable Development.

This is the first time that the United Nations has plainly stated that their goal is to destroy Capitalism and Free Enterprise. What will replace it? The economic machinery of Technocracy with Energy Currency as the lubricant for the gears.

If you have trouble reasoning this through, you are not alone, but if you get nothing else out of this, make it this: The scientific dictatorship of Technocracy will destroy 100% of your wealth and remove all means of recovering it in the future.

America Can and Must Reject Technocracy

Technocracy may conquer the rest of the world, but it is not a foregone conclusion that America must succumb - but that is up to Americans like you and I. If we do nothing, we will lose everything. If we do something (to reject Technocracy), we may lose everything in the short run but at least we will have the means to regain our losses in the future.

The fact that citizens will not let go of their hard-earned money to fight Technocracy only tells me that they still don't believe what is clearly stated above. This is really sad, and I hope it changes soon. The fact of the matter is, your money can only help you now, while you still have some left. It will certainly not help you in the future if Technocracy wins and takes it all away.

The same goes for your time and activism. Your activism is worth something today, but there will be no protesting if Technocracy reigns.

Conclusion

This is my country as much as it is yours. We are under attack by an heretofore unknown and unseen enemy that cannot be destroyed unless all corners of our nation come together to fight.

What? Do you think the Tea Party alone can destroy Technocracy? Or the John Birch Society? Or Republicans? Or Libertarians? or Democrats? No, we need all Americans in this fight, and we need lay down arms against each other for the sake of winning the greater war that threatens us all.

The book, *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*, is the lightning rod that can energize our generation to take action. It is the only book in publication that identifies the threat as well as the enemy. If you have read this article to the end and understood the implications but have not yet read *Technocracy Rising*, do it now. Failure to learn and alleviate ignorance will be not be viable excuses for where we are headed.



Trilateral Ashton Carter to Head Defense Department

Nobody questions the importance and power vested in the Secretary of Defense, which controls the most potent and advanced military forces in the world. The largely unexplained resignation of Chuck Hagel from this position on November 24, 2014, left many observers scratching their head. Insiders first claimed that Hagel was fired over disagreements with Obama, but then Hagel forcefully refuted those charges by December 4. "This was a mutual decision based on the discussions that we had," he said, "I don't think there's ever one overriding or defining decision in situations like this, unless there's some obvious issue, and there wasn't, between either one of us."

What forced Hagel to resign? Was it the failure to contain ISIS in Syria and Iraq? Was it his inability to restructure America's declining military forces while continuing to honor existing commitments? Perhaps it was perceived that Hagel's overall leadership was headed in the wrong direction.

I suggest that the answer to Hagel's departure is instead found in his chosen replacement rather than in his own conduct. Obama's announced candidate is **Ashton Baldwin Carter**, a member of the Trilateral Commission and Technocrat extraordinaire. If confirmed by the Senate, Carter will join his fellow Trilateral Commission member and longtime friend, **Susan Rice**, who currently serves as Obama's National Security Adviser.

Is this just a coincidence that yet another member of the Trilateral Commission finds his way into a top-level position in Obama's Administration? Hardly.

I just performed a new detailed analysis on the current Trilateral Commission membership list, which consists of roughly 375 individuals from North America, Europe and Asia. Although the Commission's website states that the U.S. member "quota" is 97, I counted 107 members. In examining the 107 U.S. members, at least 14 are in their late 80's and simply too old to hold public office. Another 16 are high-powered corporate executives who have not been open to any public office. Furthermore, there are 11 members directly affiliated with media companies, who do not hold public office. I also found another 15 members involved in academia or foundations who have never held public office.

This leaves 51 North American members who *might be* chosen for public service. However, these are roughly split between Democrat and Republican, leaving a pool of possible appointees of around 25 for either party.

Trilateral Commission members currently serving Obama include **Susan Rice** (National Security Adviser), **Lael Brainard** (Under Secretary for International Affairs, Department of the Treasury), **Sylvia Burwell** (Director, Office of Management and Budget), **Michael Froman** (U.S. Trade Representative). Others who have recently served Obama include **Thomas Donilon** (National Security Adviser), **Adm. Dennis Blair** (Director of National Intelligence), **Austan Goolsbee** (former Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers), **Michael Chertoff** (Secretary of Homeland Security), **John Hamre** (Obama's Transition Team), **Steven**

Koonin (Undersecretary for Science, Energy Department), **Judith McHale** (Undersecretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs), **Celia Rouse** (Obama's Council of Economic Advisers), **Anne-Marie Slaughter** (Director of Policy Planning), **James Steinberg** (Deputy Secretary of State), **Ellen Trauscher** (Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Affairs), **Melanne Vermeer** (Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues), **Philip Zelikow** (Intelligence Advisory Board), **C. Fred Bergsten** (Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations), **Stephen Bosworth** (U.S. Special Representative for North Korea Policy), **Kurt M. Campbell** (Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs), **Diana Farrell** (Deputy Director of the National Economic Council, Presidential Task Force on the Auto Industry) and **Michèle Flournoy** (Under Secretary of Defense for Policy). This list is *not* exhaustive.

Add **Ashton Carter**'s name as Secretary of Defense to the above 22 persons, and you have just reviewed almost 92 percent of the available (Democrat) U.S. membership that Obama might have appointed.

Another key Trilateral Commission operative is **John Podesta**, who currently serves as policy adviser to the President on climate change policy, and is actively creating Executive Orders for the President to sign. Podesta founded the Center for American Progress in 2003, an ultra left-wing Washington think-tank that was originally funded by George Soros. Until recently, Podesta was listed as a member of the Trilateral Commission, but the most recent list omits his name.

In 1979, I interviewed a then-prominent member of the Trilateral Commission who suggested that the reason for President **Jimmy Carter**'s (also a Trilateral) appointment of their members to top Administration posts was merely because they were the best qualified for the selected positions. However, that was just as statistically ludicrous then as it is now.

The Trilateral Commission and its members are executing a coup right under our noses and nobody says a word.

Furthermore, I have carefully documented in my upcoming book,

[Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#), that the Commission's so-called "New International Economic Order" is being specifically expressed as a Technocracy - that is, a replacement economic system to Capitalism run by scientists and engineers.

Ashton Carter is a perfect fit for Technocracy. As a Rhodes Scholar, he earned a doctorate in theoretical physics from Oxford University and then became a postdoctoral fellow at Rockefeller University and MIT.

According to the [New York Times](#),

*"In Ash you have a poster child for the guy who discovers that science and technology are the major drivers for some of the most important events in international affairs, and sometimes are the sources of the solutions," said **Graham Allison** [Note: Allison was also a Trilateral Commission member], who recruited Mr. Carter in the early 1980s to come to the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard's Kennedy School. "Here was a guy with a physics background who was fascinated by ballistic missile defense."*

Unfortunately, a very smooth confirmation process is expected when Carter appears before the Senate.