



Democrats Try To Sneak 'Green New Deal' Through Tax Code

Technocrats are fixed on realizing the Green New Deal, aka Technocracy, by hook or by crook. The GND is regressive and will result in economic destruction rather than nirvana, and many Republicans are on board with “deep transformation” spoken of by the United Nations. □
TN Editor

In recent weeks, House Democrats have begun to signal how they would govern if given unified control of the federal government. While they will take what they can get from COVID-19 relief bills and conventional extender-type legislation, they have also begun to introduce “shoot for the moon” measures that reveal their unified government ambitions. One area in which this has been crystal clear has been the “Green New Deal,” a series of proposals to bring a radical environmental agenda to all areas of our lives.

The most straightforward way to conduct a major reform campaign in modern government is through the tax code, and that's true for both parties. Want to promote school choice? Create a tax credit voucher. Ditto for helping people pay for health insurance premiums, or save for retirement, or afford child care, or invest in new business equipment.

The reason is simple: the Senate. Unlike the House of Representatives, which has a Rules Committee dominated by the speaker and allows for virtually anything to pass with a bare majority vote, the Senate has always had slower, super-majoritarian roadblocks to hasty lawmaking. Most notably, a determined Senate minority may try to block a motion to proceed or a cloture motion, which in practice requires 60 votes out of 100 senators to overcome. This may be a moot point in a Senate overseen by current Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, who has expressed a willingness to explore invoking the "nuclear option" on the legislative calendar, allowing bills to pass with a simple majority vote. In order for this to occur, a resolved and ample Senate Democrat majority would have to do so, which may or may not materialize in 2021 no matter how well their party does this fall.

Advocates of the "Green New Deal" know this, and they want to use the tax code to put in place most of their domestic policy goals for a simple reason — there is a workaround to the Senate's hoary super-majority impediments called "budget reconciliation." Under these rules, which have been used by both parties to advance everything from Obamacare to the Trump tax cuts, a simple Senate majority is all that's required to pass entitlement spending and tax legislation, provided the deficit is not increased outside the budget window. Democrats are sure to include enough tax increases to more than offset "Green New Deal" junk tax credits, so reconciliation is an attractive option. Why make 60-vote law when you can accomplish the same goal with a 51-vote tax bill?

That strategy emerged not once, but twice, in the past couple of weeks. The first is a catch-all "Green New Deal" plan called the "Moving Forward Act," a kind of "Contract with America" for radical environmentalists. The second was a more conventional highway funding reauthorization pork-barrel bill, but it contained a raft of green tax credits and other tax code atrocities.

By way of example, each of these bills contains an extension of the supposedly-phasing out investment tax credit, which provides tax breaks for the purchase of green energy equipment such as solar panels and geothermal converters. They also want to expand the investment tax credit to include energy storage devices. The bills would extend this expanded tax credit to 2025.

The investment tax credit began in 2005 as a “temporary” market support to then-emerging green energy providers. It was supposed to wind down by 2015 but was extended all the way to 2021. Last December, Congress decided to keep this phaseout schedule in place, except for certain aspects of windmill energy. By advocating a further extension to 2025, congressional Democrats have made it clear they never want the credit to go away.

It’s not as if these “Green New Deal” companies are startup firms struggling to claw out market share. Renewable energy is now nearly one-fifth of all electricity produced in the country. These companies are great investments, with or without a consumer tax credit to spur demand for their products — that’s why private equity firms are getting in on the act.

Read full story here...



'Green Economic Growth', Decoupling Is A Myth

Using Orwellian "double-speak", green growth means economic contraction. Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy and the Great Reset will go down in history as the greatest plundering of global assets ever conducted.

This article is pro-green but points out that *"the idea that we can do both [be "green" and grow at the same time is a persistent mythology, an article of faith]no less, that needs to be discarded."* -TN Editor

There are 'no realistic scenarios' to make the economic growth demanded by capitalism compatible with a safe climate, researchers who advised the United Nations found.

As societies get richer, they consume more resources. That also means they generate more pollution, driving climate change and destroying natural ecosystems.

We need to somehow break this link between material wealth and environmental catastrophe. That's why financial institutions and governments have been focused on the idea of "decoupling" GDP growth from resource use.

The idea of "decoupling" is driven by the recognition that to stay within the ~safe limit of 1.5 degrees Celsius, we have to dramatically reduce our material consumption of Earth's resources.

The assumption is that it is possible to continue growing the global economy while reducing our actual resource use and material footprint, perhaps by shifting to renewable energy.

This notion has been most recently articulated in the book *More From Less: The Surprising Story of How We Learned to Prosper Using Fewer Resources and What Happens Next*, by Andrew McAfee, principal research scientist at the MIT Sloan School of Management. Financial

and other data, McAfee argued, shows we can actually easily reduce our material footprint while continuing to grow our economies in a win-win scenario.

But new scientific analysis by a group of systems scientists and economists who have advised the United Nations seems to pull the rug out from under this entire enterprise. The new research indicates that the conventional approach is based on selective readings of statistical data.

McAfee argues, for instance, that as we are increasing wealth, the productivity motor of capitalism is driving us to greater heights of efficiency due to better technologies. This means we are able to make stuff faster and smaller using less materials and in some cases less energy. And that in turn implies we are causing less pollution. The problem is that this story, according to the new research, ignores how greater efficiency in certain regions or sectors is not slowing down the overall consumption machine. Within the wider system these efficiencies are enabling us to consume even greater quantities of resources overall.

That's why decades of data on material flows confirm that there are "no realistic scenarios" for such decoupling of economic growth from resource use. Combing through 179 of the best studies of this issue from 1990 to 2019 further reveals "no evidence" that any meaningful decoupling has ever taken place.

"The goal of decoupling rests partly on faith," conclude the team from the BIOS Research Institute in Finland, an independent multidisciplinary scientific organisation studying the effects of environmental and resource factors on economy, politics, and culture.

The BIOS team previously advised the UN Global Sustainable Development Report on the risk that endless economic growth under capitalism would be undermined due to intensifying "biophysical" limits. A combination of diminishing returns from energy extraction and increasing costs of environmental crises are already undermining growth, and require us to rewrite the global economic operating system, the scientists concluded in a powerful background report to the UN.

In two new, peer-reviewed research papers published in June, their analysis goes further. Capitalism's drive for maximising profits means that the economy is structured around continued economic growth: if it doesn't grow, it collapses. This means that huge technological efficiencies tend to empower capitalism to grow faster and bigger.

Read full story here...



Is Parler The Uncensored Replacement For Twitter?

The Social justice crowd and other leftists are doing their best to disrupt the new social media platform, Parler, that is drawing away millions of conservatives from the highly-censored Twitter. Parler is the first alternative social media to gain serious traction against Twitter.

Technocracy News has also joined Parler as **@PatrickWood** and you can find our posted articles there for review and discussion. □ TN Editor

I have never been a fan of social media platforms, primarily because I realize most of them are operated by leftists and globalists with an

antagonistic agenda. The idea of spending all the time and resources needed to build a following on these websites only to then have that work used against you as leverage to silence your viewpoints is not appealing. The more effort you put into sites like Twitter, the more dependent you become on it to get your message out, and the more dependent you become the more power the people at these companies hold over you.

Just ask any of the numerous conservative personalities that have been banned from Twitter over the past couple of years because of their political positions. Or ask the people who were banned from YouTube, Twitch, Facebook, etc. as part of a massive purge of accounts this past month, the vast majority of them considered conservative or moderates. Of course, these companies usually don't admit outright that they are biased against conservative and moderate viewpoints; instead, they accuse accounts of spreading "hate speech", violating community guidelines or violating "copyright rules".

The claim by Twitter that they have no political bias is typical leftist misdirection. Banning people for copyright or for "hate speech" is not necessarily politically motivated, right? However, as analysts have shown in the past, conservatives are somehow FOUR TIMES more likely to be accused of "neutral" policy violations than leftists on Twitter. As for hate speech, everything conservative is now considered a form of hate speech. Everything moderate is considered hate speech. Everything that does not conform to the social justice religion is considered hate speech. And if it's not considered hate speech today, it will be considered hate speech tomorrow.

It's interesting that SJWs on social media can froth at the mouth with anti-white rabies whenever they please and consequences rarely befall them, yet conservatives can relate nothing more than facts and figures and are summarily booted for "racism".

No bias? Yeah, right...

YouTube banned thousands of accounts over the past two weeks because of "supremacist ideas and conspiracy theories", calling the people

behind them “harmful users”.

Twitch organized a “Safety Advisory Council” made up primarily of social justice leftists (including a power hungry lunatic that thinks he’s a female deer) to “inform and guide decisions” specifically on protecting the safety of “marginalized” users.

Look, I understand the concepts behind Alinsky Tactics and the reality that leftists as a rule deny everything they are doing no matter how obvious it is. They’ll even claim their own groups (like Antifa) don’t exist whenever they get caught in a compromising position. But there comes a point when the gaslighting just isn’t going to work anymore. We all know that social media platforms HATE anyone that opposes the social justice narrative; the only reason they haven’t kicked all conservatives off their platforms yet is because there is something else they hate even more - the prospect that conservatives and moderates might retaliate en masse by organizing on their own competing platforms.

Enter Parler...

I have been arguing for years that alternative analysts and anyone not on the political left should be building their own social media. If you are dependent on controlled systems, then you can be controlled. It’s really that simple. Whenever someone puts in the work to establish an alternative system, it behooves us to support it and at least give it a chance.

There have been some attempts to make this happen, but in every case the attacks from the mainstream media and leftists have been relentless. What I want to explore here is why? Why do the lefties care so much if we leave them to their little bubble world and start our own thing?

Parler in particular has been under endless attack the past few weeks from SJWs attempting to troll and disrupt the site, as well as disjointed criticism from the MSM. Perhaps part of the reason is that Parler has been gaining momentum; with 500,000 new people joining in a matter of days. We have to consider the possibility that Parler wasn’t a threat to the social justice cult, they would not be attacking it so consistently.

The main criticism of Parler by the left goes a little something like this:

“Parler claims it’s a free speech site but it censors people just like Twitter, so why leave Twitter at all?”

I love this argument because it really showcases the dishonest sophistry of leftists. First, leftists do not care about free speech and haven’t cared for at least a decade. They only care about controlling the narrative. How often do you see leftists attacking Twitter or YouTube for censorship of conservatives? They won’t do that, because they like it and they know the odds are slim that those platforms will ever come after them.

Second, when Parler says it’s a “free speech platform” I think it’s obvious that they are referring to political speech specifically. Leftists OPENLY ADMIT to trolling Parler in order to disrupt and sabotage its progress, including posting pornography and other childish tactics in order to force Parler to ban them so that they can then say “Look! Parler lied about free speech...”

The left defends censorship by companies like Twitter, Facebook and Google because they are “private corporations” and websites are private property (imagine that, commies defending private property rights). I actually agree with that basic premise, but there are some problems with their arguments. Parler is indeed a private company and is perfectly within its rights to ban trolls that are attempting to disrupt discussion and drive people off the platform. But, there is a big difference between sites like Parler and the major media platforms.

Most major tech conglomerates, like Google and Facebook, receive billions of dollars in state and federal government subsidies and taxpayer dollars. As far as I can tell from my research Parler does not. Twitter even received an extensive tax break for eight years worth over \$70 million for being based in San Francisco as part of a program called “the Twitter tax break”. In return for giving welfare and special treatment to silicone valley, Californians in SF now enjoy a historic bubble in real estate and rental prices, along with a spike in poverty and homelessness as well endless traffic. Many of the people that work at

these companies can't even afford to live in the same city as them.

Major social media platforms that accept government funds are receiving an unfair advantage over other competing companies and should therefore be held accountable as public services, not private businesses. If a corporation like Google wants to give up taxpayer cash and pay full price for all that bandwidth it uses, then sure, they should be allowed to censor whoever they want. But until then, these companies are subject to oversight, just as any corporate monopoly would be.

The fact that Parler is encouraging political free speech is what matters here. And so far the only leftists being kicked off the site are those that deliberately go there to try to burn it down. Is it perfect? No, nothing is. But Twitter and others have a proven prejudice against conservative voices and even liberal voices that go against the accepted script. Why stay on Twitter when there are other options that are more free?

I suspect SJWs despise Parler because it represents a focal point for conservative organization, and they think they own the organizational wheelhouse.

Leftists, being collectivist in nature, are only adept at one thing - mobilizing bodies through lies and manipulation. This is where they have a distinct advantage over conservatives. The issue is that leftists are easy to mobilize because they have a drone mentality. They tend to follow their gatekeepers blindly. Conservatives tend to be more independent and often question the motives behind any given movement, and this causes internal disagreements on mobilization. Our liberty mindedness is our strength as well as our weakness, and the political left knows it.

By congregating on a platform that is not relentlessly hostile to us, we are given a free hand to discuss options and organize without being attacked by an engineered mob in the process.

When I see the vitriol from leftists over Parler, I am also reminded once again that communists don't see people as "allies", they see people as property. They want to get rid of conservatives from their platforms but also don't want conservatives to leave and build their own platforms. I

often think of the Chinese invasion of Tibet when pondering this mentality. The CCP's strategy was one of ethnic cleansing; building railways to Tibet to import Chinese people and run out the indigenous Tibetans. But, when Tibetans sought to leave the country on foot to go to Nepal, the Chinese government set up snipers in the mountains to kill them as they tried to escape.

This is the communist philosophy - You are not allowed to walk away. You are not allowed to stay as you are. Your only choice is to be reeducated. Your only option is to conform.

One criticism that I've seen on the conservative side is that by moving to Parler we are "walling ourselves off" from public discourse and will not have any sway going into election time. This is an idiotic notion.

There is no rule that says you can't use BOTH Parler and Twitter to spread your message. If you really think elections still matter, then by all means jump on as many platforms as you can. Just understand that the purge on sites like Twitter and YouTube is going to get much worse as 2020 comes to a close. Count on it.

Beyond that, if you believe that the lines are not already deeply drawn on the political divide in the US then you are kidding yourself. Most people have made up their minds as to which side they are on. The only ambiguity is perhaps that many people don't yet realize how bad the situation could get. Staying on leftist platforms to "fight the good fight" is, in my view, a waste of time. Now is the time to build community so that we are ready for the political and social storm that is ready to make landfall, I have no interest in trying to win raving leftists to my side.

I'm promoting Parler in this article because it's the first major attempt I've seen to grow a conservative friendly social media outlet. They don't pay me, I don't know the people that run the company, and I don't have any stake in Parler's success or failure. I have joined the site, and anyone who wants to follow me there can do so by searching @altmarket. My hope is that the site will become an internet safe haven for conservatives during these troubled times. I feel it can be used as a tool for us to join forces and prepare. Conservative ideals and

principles of limited government, civil liberties, free markets and individualism must endure for the sake of future generations. We have to begin building our citadels, and Parler could be a good place to start.

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