



Technocrats Freak Out Over CDC's 6% COVID Death Figure

Well, first Technocrats and leftist media blame Qanon. Q is crazy, right? Then they point to Trump for retweeting that same number: if Trump said it, it must be false, right? After Twitter deleted everyone else's tweets about it, the media figured it had to be fake news, right?

Within hours, every major publication was blasting anyone and everyone who dared to "misinterpret" the CDC's latest finding. You have to leave the interpreting part to the experts, they say, to the epidemiologists and to the scientists. Mere citizens are simply too ignorant and uneducated to understand lofty mathematical concepts like 6% or complicated medical terms like comorbidity.

Fools, all.

The CDC's website clearly and definitively states:

For 6% of the deaths, COVID-19 was the only cause mentioned. For deaths with conditions or causes in addition to COVID-19, on

average, there were 2.6 additional conditions or causes per death.

What is unclear about this?

It is a really pathetic pandemic where only 6% of deaths are due exclusively to COVID-19. Stack that up against the Black Plague, TB or Ebola.

The freak-outs want you to instead focus on the 94% who died with a plethora of comorbidity conditions. Some of the most common ones mentioned in the study are:

Influenza, pneumonia, hypertensive diseases, heart disease, cardiac arrest, heart failure, diabetes, alzheimers, renal failure and on and on.

Patients with these other conditions also just happened to test positive for COVID-19, and that's all it took to be recorded as a COVID death. What's more, the average patient had an average of 2.6 of these other factors when they died.

Even a motorcycle crash victim who died on the scene tested positive for COVID. His death was recorded as COVID until some locals pointed out the sheer stupidity of such a categorization and it was ultimately rescinded.

OK, Look. Dying WITH COVID is not the same as dying FROM COVID. Only 6% died FROM COVID exclusively. The other 94% died WITH COVID.

Did anybody make an assessment of how many of the 94% would have died anyway, even if they did not have COVID? Nope. Not a one, so we'll never know for sure. But even a baseball bat could figure out that there has been a significant number who *were* headed for their earthly exit no matter what else they contracted along the way.

But, why would Technocrats freak out so bad over this viral CDC announcement (pun intended)? Because it puts their entire narrative in jeopardy.

No more panic over a pandemic would mean no more face masks, no more social distancing, no more lockdowns, no need for vaccines, no more funding, no more “Karens”, no more social engineering. It means Anthony Fauci would be released into permanent retirement, sans a fortune in lost profits from his Big Pharma investments. Worst of all, it would mean that they were WRONG, and to a Technocrat, being wrong is a cardinal sin.

Note to Technocrats, their minions and all their political and media stooges: Get lost and don't come back!



Technocratic-Fascism: Like Moths Drawn To The Flame

When the “system” knows you better than you know yourself, you cannot escape its control. Whoever has the data makes the rules, and those rules can encase you, console you, manipulate you, shape you until you are doing everything someone else wants you to do. This is the “Science of Social Engineering” as predicted by Technocracy back in the 1930s. □
TN Editor

The enduring beauty of fascism is that it requires so little from us... so little independent thought; just our basic belief and adherence to a limited set of popularly-shared directives and narratives that once fully accepted, relieve us of the need to address stubborn questions or to fret over subtle differences of opinion and feeling.

Propaganda reassures us that we are complete, that we know all there is to know, that we are rational, pragmatic and pure, that the science has been settled and that we are a part of something special.

Such a surrender to reductionist narratives cuts across all classes and income brackets. Neither the most educated nor the least uneducated retain any special advantage in the face of powerful consensus-shaping propaganda.

PROPAGANDA is, of course, the life-blood of fascist control. Maintaining the economic, governmental and scientific frameworks of a technocratic-fascist “operating system” is unthinkable without propaganda and disinformation. When truth is seen as a liability to power, it must always be disallowed, and all instances of it effectively penalized.

Radio and television and their constant enabler, popular “science” – operate today as their own religions, reliant for their success upon the devotion of the masses. As McLuhan told us, the experience of electronic media is always more powerful than the specific messaging it contains.

The currency that we use to pay for the electronic spectacle is our attention, and in such hyper-mediated times as these, the charges mount up exponentially, until we find ourselves saddled with soul-crushing denial and disconnection.

Three defining historical moments (among many) have defined the confluence of fascism, propaganda and technology.

1. The fundamental principles of propaganda were first defined 100 years ago by Edward Bernays, often referred to as the father of public relations.
2. Joseph Goebbels served as Reich Minister of Propaganda of Nazi Germany from 1933 to 1945. The stunning successful lessons of

his Nazi propaganda programs were not lost on the world's political and economic leaders in the post-war era, and in the time since then.

3. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was founded in 1947, for the expressed purpose of conducting secret intelligence operations that could serve political aims at the same time they generated huge and untraceable profits. The extent of the CIA's illegal enterprises necessitated the creation and maintenance of a permanent ministry of disinformation, managed by our own taxpayer-funded "Shadow Government" and "Deep State."

In retrospect then, it is clear that these propaganda campaigns have proven SO successful, that even today, few of us ever realize how ongoing, vast and wide-spread they are.

Propaganda's efficacy is so indisputable, that it is commonly the case that those who are the most certain that they are NOT among the propagandized, are in fact its most overt victims.

Corporate media focuses on those stories they are paid to propagate, i.e., those which support the financial and ideological agendas of their owners, who themselves are all, without exception, central parts of the larger global ruling oligarchy.

A key part of the propagandist's handbook is to simply leave unexplored stories that they are NOT given approval to manage and control; stories which, we might assume, do not generate sufficient advantage for the owners. Such calculated sins of omission are essential to keeping the mass of believers unperturbed by the vagaries of complexity in the delivery of their daily dogmas.

If an individual were to insist upon learning more about any of these less-discussed stories, they would soon arrive at the realization that while an abundance of relevant facts can easily be found, and often hidden in plain sight, the truth is that most people simply do not WANT to know, think or talk about any such truths that differ from those accepted by their peers, for whom cognitive dissonance causes such literal pain and disorientation, as to keep them docile and compliant to

the dictates of the media.

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



The Green, Green Road To Energy Blackouts

Of course, California vehemently denies that their alternative energy policies and/or installations have anything to do with rolling blackouts or brownouts this summer. However, anybody with half a brain can immediately connect the dots surrounding California's failing energy policy. The only obvious remedy is to reverse course while there is still a viable state to do so. □ TN Editor

California leads the way to electricity blackouts, closely followed by South Australia. They both created this problem by taxing, banning, delaying or demolishing reliable coal, nuclear, gas or hydro generators while subsidising and promoting unreliable electricity from the sickly green twins - solar and wind. All supposed to solve a global warming crisis that exists only in academic computer models.

Energy policy should be driven by proven reliability, efficiency and cost, not by green politics.

Wind and solar will always be prone to blackouts for three reasons.

Firstly they are intermittent, producing zero power when winds drops or sunlight fails.

Secondly, green energy is dilute so the collection area must be huge. Both solar panels and wind turbines are old technologies and now close to collecting the maximum energy from a given land area of wind and sun, so limited technology gains are possible. Wind turbines generate nothing from gentle breezes and must shut down in gales. To collect more energy the green twins must collect from greater areas using a widespread scatter of panels and towers connected by a fragile network of roads and transmission lines. This expensive, extensive but flimsy system is far more susceptible to damage from cyclones, hail, snow, lightning, bushfire, flood and sabotage than a big, well-built, centrally-located, well-maintained traditional power station with strong walls, a roof and lightning protection. Green energy also requires far more investment in transmission lines and inter-connectors that consumers must pay for, and the energy transmission losses are greater.

Thirdly, green energy is like a virus in a distribution network.

When the sun shines, solar energy floods the network, causing energy prices to plummet. Coal and gas plants are forced to operate at a cash loss or shut down. Erratic winds make this problem worse as they are less predictable and changes can be quicker. But when all green energy fails suddenly, like in an evening peak demand period after a still cold sunset, coal cannot ramp up quickly unless it has been kept on standby with boilers hot, waiting for an opportunity to generate some positive cash flow. Gas and hydro can fire up swiftly but who wants to own/build/maintain an expensive fair-dinkum power station that operates intermittently?

Currently hydro, or stop-start gas turbines on standby, or coal generators fired up but not generating are keeping Australian lights on during green energy blackouts. But no one will build new reliable

generators to operate part-time. Soon we will have day-time where there is heaps of electricity producing no profit for any generator, and night-time when electricity prices will soar and blackouts will threaten.

Authorities have their solution - rationing. They will use a blackout crisis to grab the power to dictate rolling blackouts of whole suburbs, areas or factories or selective consumer blackouts using smart meters.

Naturally Green "engineers" also have a solution - "More Big Batteries"

There are many contestants in the battery growth "industry" including pumped hydro, lithium batteries, compressed air, big flywheels, hydrogen storage, capacitors and molten salt. They all need to be able to cope with a few days without wind-solar, which makes them huge and expensive. And all are net consumers of energy as they go through the charge/discharge cycle.

Half-tonne Li/Co/Pb batteries are huge consumers of energy - energy for exploring/mining/refining metals and for concrete, battery manufacture, transport and construction; energy to charge them and absorb the inevitable losses in the charge/discharge cycle; energy to build battery warehouses and finally energy to recycle/bury worn-out batteries (which wear out far quicker than coal, gas, hydro or nuclear power stations).

Few people consider the extra generating capacity needed to maintain charged batteries. Solar energy at best delivers power for about 8 hours per day when there is no cloud, smoke or dust in the air. So a solar array needs batteries with a capacity of twice name-plate capacity just to cover the hours of darkness, every day. These batteries then need extra generating capacity to charge them during daylight hours.

But a solar system also needs to be able to cope with up to 7 days of cloudy weather. This needs 7 times more batteries plus the generating capacity to charge them.

The Big Battery in South Australia has a capacity of 150 MW and cost \$160m. East Coast demand these days is about 22,500 MW which would require 150 SA batteries and adding a 10% factor of safety = 165 batteries. The cost could be $165 \times \$160\text{m} = \26.4bn .

No matter whether the battery is stored hydrogen or pumped hydro, the cost to stabilise 100% green energy would be prohibitively expensive. Before we leap over this green cliff, those who claim otherwise must be obliged to demonstrate a working pilot plant without coal, gas or diesel.

Wind power suffers the same problems but is far less predictable. Wind droughts are a common feature. At times wind turbines drain electricity from the grid.

To maintain grid stability, the generators must charge batteries which can then supply a steady stream of electricity to the grid. This requires many more transmission lines and battery connections.

At this point the maths/costs of zero-emissions with 100% solar/wind become preposterous. And the ecological disruption becomes enormous.

When Danish windmills stand silent, they import hydro power from Scandinavia. When German solar panels are covered in snow, they import nuclear electricity from France. And California can draw power from Canada.

But Australia is an island. When the grid fails, Tasmanian hydro or New Zealand geo-thermal are the closest reliable-energy neighbours.

The looming Covid Depression has no room for more green energy silliness. We cannot afford to mollycoddle an aging failing technology. A hard dangerous new world is coming. To survive we will need cheap reliable energy - coal, gas, nuclear or hydro.

Read full story here...



China's Dystopian AI Development Incorporates Population Control

Anyone who thinks that AI learns by itself and is ethically neutral has bought the Technocrat lie. AI is just a computer algorithm programmed by humans to do what humans want it to do. Biases cannot be excluded. China's AI seeks to reduce global population and is being exported to other countries.

As a Technocracy, China is bent on perfecting the "science of social engineering" so that all of society can be monitored and controlled to suit Technocrat goals. One big goal is to reduce global population in order to consume less resources. □ TN Editor

Since its conception, people have worried that an artificial intelligence would turn against humanity and threaten our lives. While this may be a result to be feared several years in the future, right now the more pressing danger is AI used to oppress millions of people and facilitate

the threat of a controlling regime.

Homebound in the pandemic quarantine, my daughter and I have been rewatching *Person of Interest* on Netflix.

In essence, the former network series is about a man who created a nearly omniscient artificial intelligence that watches everyone through networks of cameras, computers and smartphones. Each week, our team of heroes, assembled by the AI creator, tries to help a person whom the AI has identified as a likely soon-to-be murder victim. Because this AI was invented by the show's protagonist, it demonstrates empathy and values human life.

However, into the third season, a second AI is operated on behalf of the government, and this AI does not value human life. It works under orders from and for the benefit of a shadowy corporation, which begins to organize people's lives for its own purposes, including killing people who won't fit into its program. It is frightening.

This show is a good television and I recommend it to anyone who regularly reads this blog and thus interested in how technology can affect our lives. *Person of Interest* may also introduce you to what is now happening in this world's most populous country.

I have written much recently on video surveillance and facial recognition in the U.S., but American police are limited by Constitutional requirements and there can easily be rules applied to new technologies that will limit the government's abilities to use them indiscriminately. The U.S. also boasts protections for rights of individuals to assemble and protest, a government that can regularly be changed, and a court system that generally protects those rights. An independent press shines light on government behavior deemed abusive of these rights.

So think about a country without any of those checks and balances, with no individual rights guaranteed under law, no free press, no independently operative court system, and a single party dictatorship holding all power. Now think about what would happen if you give that country unlimited electronic and physical surveillance from hundreds of millions of cameras to drones to capturing all phone, text and internet

traffic including searches and social media. Then give this society ever-increasing sophistication in artificial intelligence to manage the information flow and assign meaning to all the acts it captures, even aggregate the full view of a person's behavior into a score that determines all important aspects of a person's life. Receive a good score from the government, and you are awarded that apartment you desire or permission to have a baby. A bad score means roadblocks in your life. This is what China is rapidly becoming.

China is not only instituting a surveillance society, including a social scoring system for every resident, but it is investing heavily in the artificial intelligence needed to manage it all and make evaluations of what cameras, biometric readers and internet filters capture. According to U.S. military estimates, China will be spending \$70 billion in government funds on AI development in 2020 compared to \$17 billion in 2017. U.S. non-defense spending on AI this year will be about one billion dollars.

Not only is China building government laboratories to develop the next several generations of AI, but the government's close coordination with companies like Huawei and Alibaba provide the surveillance state with top private commercial research as well. All powered by the supermassive amounts of data produced in the world's largest surveillance state, because huge data sets are the building blocks of effective AI. China, as *The Economist* recently observed, is the Saudi Arabia of data.

The other recommendation I will make in this column is to read Ross Anderson's article in *The Atlantic* called *The Panopticon is Already Here*, which explains how surveillance, AI, social scoring, a one-party state, and political oppression are combining in China to both create the first all-knowing social system and to export it to other countries. Anderson reports on how the entire system is being tested right now in the "open air prison" of Xinjiang province, where Muslim Uighurs are monitored every minute of their lives.

Anderson writes of Chinese President, Party leader and effective dictator, Xi Jinping, "With AI, Xi can build history's most oppressive

authoritarian apparatus, without the manpower Mao needed to keep information about dissent flowing to a single, centralized node. In China's most prominent AI start-ups—SenseTime, CloudWalk, Megvii, Hikvision, iFlytek, Meiya Pico—Xi has found willing commercial partners. And in Xinjiang's Muslim minority, he has found his test population.”

More than a million Uighurs have been imprisoned which is more political prisoners than any instance since the Nazi concentration camps. John Oliver discussed life in these prisons and re-education camps on his show this week. But the Uighurs still living in Xinjiang Province are subject to checkpoints, constant video and other surveillance and the introduction of Han Chinese “big brothers and sisters” to monitor forced assimilation into the communist culture. According to Anderson, “At these checks, police extract all the data they can from Uighurs’ bodies. They measure height and take a blood sample. They record voices and swab DNA.”

And this surveillance and political compliance testing ground can be easily exported to the rest of the country. Anderson notes, “Once Xi perfects this system in Xinjiang, no technological limitations will prevent him from extending AI surveillance across China. He could also export it beyond the country's borders, entrenching the power of a whole generation of autocrats.”

The investment in AI drives the entire process. The *Atlantic* article states, “Much of the footage collected by China's cameras is parsed by algorithms for security threats of one kind or another. In the near future, every person who enters a public space could be identified, instantly, by AI matching them to an ocean of personal data, including their every text communication, and their body's one-of-a-kind protein-construction schema. In time, algorithms will be able to string together data points from a broad range of sources—travel records, friends and associates, reading habits, purchases—to predict political resistance before it happens. China's government could soon achieve an unprecedented political stranglehold on more than 1 billion people.”

So new surveillance tools like robot bird surveillance drones, good

enough to fool other birds into flying with them, are already being introduced in China to feed more data about people's behavior into state-run AI. As stated by C/NET, "China also employs facial recognition, artificial intelligence, smart glasses and other technologies to monitor its 1.4 billion citizens with the aim of one day giving each of them a personal score based on how they behave."

Imagine a credit score that instead of simply measuring financial behavior and ability, measures all aspects of your life and interactions with society. And then imagine that your score can determine what kind of apartment you are allowed to have - or if the government will allow you to live in an apartment at all. The same is true for your job, education opportunities, reproduction and other core aspects of your life. This is the Chinese social score. As pointed out in Wired UK, while some of the current system is voluntary, there are incentives for participating and penalties for not participating.

Finally, and maybe most frightening, China is using its economic clout and private industry to export population control technology to dictators around the world. Anderson observes, "China is already developing powerful new surveillance tools, and exporting them to dozens of the world's actual and would-be autocracies. Over the next few years, those technologies will be refined and integrated into all-encompassing surveillance systems that dictators can plug and play."

Read full story here...



Lawyers Reveal Strategy On How To Demonize ‘COVID Deniers’

Anyone questioning the coronavirus pandemic should be aware of the strategies being passed around to discredit, ridicule and even shame such thinking. Hint: facts don't matter. Fortunately, one can use the same techniques and strategies to turn the table in the other direction. □
TN Editor

Anyone who's braved a Thanksgiving conversation with an uncle or commented on a Facebook post or really is just alive in the year 2020 knows that convincing a skeptic to change their mind is nearly impossible. A hostage negotiator may say that empathy and not logic is often the best weapon against COVID-deniers, but should you want to engage in a debate about the reality of the virus that's led to over 150,000 American deaths, it's best to come armed with cross-examination skills.

Since lawyers aim to convince a jury rather than the witness themselves, this isn't a perfect parallel, but plenty of the same techniques apply. Two law professors, Lara Bazelon (USF) and Spencer Pahlke (Berkeley Law), humored our questions about how to use their decades of legal acumen to disarm someone distrustful of science, or worse, a troll posting memes showing Bill Gates as a "plandemic" puppet master (who also spreads cancer through 5G cell phone towers, obviously).

Like any lawyer taking on a difficult case, the first thing to do before interacting with a COVID denier is prep work. You can expect a spread offense of many divergent theories not covered in mainstream media, so Google "what sources do coronavirus deniers rely on most commonly." Politely ask for evidence, and be ready to discredit unreliable outlets or so-called experts by stressing their underlying motivations, which in the case of viral Youtube personalities, is likely financial. With regards to hydroxychloroquine advocate Stella Immanuel, one might calmly inquire if they're aware of her statements about demon sex.

The key phrase there is "calmly ask" (close second, "demon sex").

"I think for some of these folks, they really enjoy making other people angry, and sort of red-faced, and almost incoherent in the enormity of what they're trying to explain and the stupidity of what they're confronted with," says Bazelon. "I wouldn't give them that."

Pahlke suggests establishing agreement on a few basic facts that may deflate faulty arguments, like comparisons to flu deaths. For instance, establishing a universal reference point, like the fact that the 3,000 deaths from the September 11 terrorist attacks is something of a big deal. Or even playing to partisan slants, bringing up the cost of lives from controversial issues like inner city gun violence.

"If you're concerned that they were going to disagree that 150,000 deaths isn't enough, there are ways to get them into a difficult position where they're agreeing that something less than that is in itself a tragedy," says Pahlke.

A personal hypothetical is another strong approach. Present a scenario where one of their specific family members contracts COVID-19 and has

to be hospitalized. What happens when as their mother's medical contact, they're forced to sign off on treatment decisions? Will they follow the doctor's advice or insist that it's not serious and demand another treatment? A concrete situation like that will resonate much more than sweeping data-driven statements or testimonials about others.

Another strategy is to ask a question and give the denier a few options that are all bad (hopefully no judge is present to yell "leading the witness!"). One could present a list of Democrat and Republican politicians who have all spoken out against the virus, then ask the denier if they trust any of them. Or go even further and ask an open-ended question.

"I generally don't like to ask open-ended questions," says Bazelon. "But with crazy people I sometimes do, because whichever answer I get is going to be good." In the case of the coronavirus, Bazelon suspects answers would fall into two categories: total ignorance or defiance of conventionally accepted knowledge (neither a good look).

You can push somebody out on the limb and make them look even more silly, because the position they're taking has so little support so that nobody else, your jury, would want to follow them out on that limb," says Pahlke. "You get to persuasion not by virtue of directly persuading your witness, but by isolating them in this world that's not real. And pointing out how unreal this world they're living in is, so others wouldn't tread there."

Read full story here...



Nomophobia: No Mobile Phone Phobia Hits Students

Almost ninety percent of college students freak out if they are separated from their smart phones. Psychologists have standardized and profiled the condition as “nomophobia”, or No Mobile Phone Phobia”. Adults and younger children are just as addicted to smart phones as students, however. □ TN Editor

Introduction

Previously, active phone use at bedtime has been implicated in disrupted sleep and related complaints. To improve sleep, a recommendation following such findings is limiting phone use before and during bedtime. However, for those with the characteristic of “nomophobia”, fear of being out of mobile phone contact, this recommendation could exacerbate anxiety at and around bedtime and disrupt, rather than improve, sleep. In 2012, an estimated 77% of 18-24-year-olds could be identified as nomophobic. Because of the prevalence of nomophobia and its possible interaction with sleep, we explored the existence of

nomophobia in a college-age population and its relationship to sleep, sleepiness, and sleep hygiene behaviors.

Methods

327 university students (age: $M=19.7$ years, $SD=3.78$) recruited from introductory psychology courses and campus newsletters were given extra credit or a chance to win \$25 gift cards for participation. Participants completed demographic information, the Nomophobia Questionnaire (NMP-Q), the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS), the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, questions regarding associated features of inadequate sleep hygiene, and the Sleep Hygiene Index. Additional sleep hygiene questions assessed frequency of active and passive technology use during sleep time.

Results

89.4% of the participants had moderate or severe nomophobia. Greater nomophobia was significantly related to greater daytime sleepiness (ESS) ($r(293)=.150$, $p<.05$), associated features of poor sleep (daytime sleepiness: $r(297)=.097$, $p<.05$, and avolition: $r(297)=.100$, $p<.05$), more maladaptive sleep hygiene behaviors including active technology use during sleep time ($r(298)=.249$, $p<.05$), long daytime naps, inconsistent wake and bed times, using bed for non-sleep purposes, uncomfortable bed, and bedtime cognitive rumination (r 's=0.097 to 0.182).

Conclusion

Most participants experienced moderate to severe nomophobia with greater nomophobia associated with greater sleepiness, avolition, and poorer sleep hygiene. Nomophobia is likely to be an important consideration when treating sleep disorders and/or making any sleep hygiene recommendations.

Read full story here...