


Deutsche Bank: Green New Deal Requires ‘Certain Degree Of Eco-Dictatorship’

What we must do to



The Great Reset, aka Green New Deal and Technocracy, requires the complete transformation of all elements of society, from legal frameworks to trade to population control. The global Deutsche Bank has revealed that it will take a “certain degree of eco-dictatorship” to get there. Scientific dictatorship is the key outcome of Technocracy is a civilizational trap of no return. □ TN Editor

An analysis published by *Deutsche Bank* sharply criticises the “dishonest debate” with which the EU is selling its “Green Deal” to the people of Europe. The massive risks of the project for prosperity, the economic system and democracy itself should not be concealed, but should be addressed openly.

Eric Heymann, a senior economist at *Deutsche Bank Research*, warns that Europe’s Green Deal and its goal of climate neutrality by 2050 threatens a European mega-crisis, leading to “noticeable loss of welfare and jobs”. And he warns: It won’t work without “a certain degree of eco-dictatorship”.

The analyst describes it as dubious that the Green Deal is being touted across the board as “a new growth strategy” which would allow the EU to become a “fair and prosperous society.” While this may look good on paper, Heymann writes, in order to achieve carbon neutral by 2050, Europe’s economy and its entire political and legal systems will have to be changed fundamentally.

For the time being, the revolutionary consequences of the EU’s climate agenda for everyday life are “still relatively abstract” and for most households “still acceptable.” Soon, however, the path towards climate neutrality will require drastic interventions in the choice of means of transport, the size of housing, the means of heating, the possession of electronic consumer goods, as well as restrictions in the consumption of meat and tropical fruits.

And he warns these restrictions and infringements will inevitably trigger “massive political resistance.”

Some parties will find arguments against strict climate protection policies if the latter lead to a significant increase in energy prices or to restrictions of personal freedom or ownership rights. And let us not fool ourselves: these parties will find voter support. At the EU level, there will be major conflicts about distribution, which may contribute to (further) divisions within the bloc. Are we ready to deal with this polarisation?

Below are excerpts of Eric Heymann’s (Deutsche Bank Research) analysis.

A certain degree of eco-dictatorship will be necessary

The impact of the current climate policy on people’s everyday lives is still quite abstract and acceptable for many households. Climate policy comes in the form of higher taxes and fees on energy, which make heating and mobility more expensive. Some countries have set minimum energy efficiency standards for buildings or similar rules in other areas. However, climate policy does not determine our lives. We take key

consumption decisions, for example whether we travel at all, how much we travel and which means of transport we use, whether we live in a large house or a small apartment and how we heat our homes, how many electronic devices we have and how intensely we use them or how much meat and exotic fruit we eat. These decisions tend to be made on the basis of our income, not on climate considerations.

If we really want to achieve climate neutrality, we need to change our behaviour in all these areas of life. This is simply because there are no adequate cost-effective technologies yet to allow us to maintain our living standards in a carbon-neutral way. That means that carbon prices will have to rise considerably in order to nudge people to change their behaviour. Another (or perhaps supplementary) option is to tighten regulatory law considerably. I know that “ecodictatorship” is a nasty word. But we may have to ask ourselves the question whether and to what extent we may be willing to accept some kind of eco-dictatorship (in the form of regulatory law) in order to move towards climate neutrality. Here is an example: What should we do if property owners do not want to turn their houses into zero-emission buildings; if they do not have the financial means to do so; if doing so is not possible for technical reasons or if the related investments do not pay off?

Read full Deutsche Bank report [here](#).

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

**Twitter Purges 70,000
Accounts Since Friday**



Twitter, like Facebook, Apple, Google and Amazon, thinks it can hide behind its own terms of service while destroying the basic human right to free speech of millions of Americans. Meanwhile, congress and states do nothing to correct them. This is the end result of Technocracy. □ TN Editor

In a Monday night blog post, Twitter lays out all the latest details of a historic purge that started with the suspension of president Trump and has escalated into the ban of tens of thousands of conservative voices, or as Twitter puts it, “steps taken to protect the conversation on our service from attempts to incite violence, organize attacks, and share deliberately misleading information about the election outcome.” Odd how none of those considerations emerged during the summer when US cities were literally burning as a result of countless violent protests and frequent riots, but we digress.

In any case, In twitter’s own delightfully ironic words, “It’s important to be transparent about all of this work as the US Presidential Inauguration on January 20, 2021, approaches.” Which is a probably a good idea in the aftermath of the biggest censorship purge in twitter history, one which sent Twitter stock tumbling. So this is what how twitter justifies “the purge”:

We’ve been clear that we will take strong enforcement action on behavior that has the potential to lead to offline harm. Given the violent events in Washington, DC, and increased risk of harm, we

began permanently suspending thousands of accounts that were primarily dedicated to sharing QAnon content on Friday afternoon.

And with tens of thousands of accounts suspended (most of them permanently), banned, or merely disappeared, it will hardly be a surprise that according to Twitter, **“more than 70,000 accounts have been suspended”**. What is the justification? *“These accounts were engaged in sharing harmful QAnon-associated content at scale and were primarily dedicated to the propagation of this conspiracy theory across the service.”*

More in the full blog post below. Meanwhile, as BofA warned today and as traders clearly agreed, Twitter now faces the risk of wholesale “churn”, i.e., exodus, by the conservative community in response to this unprecedented crackdown, which could see tens of millions of MAUs gone:

More engagement risk for Twitter than Facebook

Donald Trump had 88mn followers on Twitter, the 6th most followed account, and on Facebook he had over 33mn followers. President Trump’s follower count represents 47% of Twitter’s daily active users (DAUs) (though clearly not all followers are DAUs), with his account averaging 34 Tweets per day in 2020 (up from 21 in 2019). Additionally we see churn from the conservative community within Twitter as a modest 1Q DAU threat, however SensorTower suggests DAUs on Parlor (a conservative focused alternative) is roughly 130k (0.37% of Twitter’s US DAUs) as of January 8th. Our call is that after some deactivation newsflow near-term, strong political activists will stay on Twitter for other content.

Content risk and Section 230 back in focus

In June, The DoJ had a proposal to rollback some Section 230 protections, which specifies that Internet companies are generally not liable for user posted content. While a Democratic administration may be less focused on significant reform of Section 230, recent events may make content legislation more likely. While we think social platforms may welcome content guidelines, risks of

a rollback of Section 230 include: 1) potential civil liability arising from victims of Online content, and; 2) expense risk from need to increase content review capabilities. Facebook CEO, Mark Zuckerberg, has been vocal in embracing an update to Section 230, while Twitter CEO, Jack Dorsey, noted “Eroding the foundation of Section 230 could collapse how we communicate on the Internet, leaving only a small number of giant and well-funded technology companies”.

And now we wait to find out just how extensive the conservative user “churn” has been.

Meanwhile, here is Twitter’s full statement on the *Friday night purge*:

An update following the riots in Washington, DC

Following the horrific events in Washington, DC, last week, here are some of the steps we’ve taken to protect the conversation on our service from attempts to incite violence, organize attacks, and share deliberately misleading information about the election outcome. It’s important to be transparent about all of this work as the US Presidential Inauguration on January 20, 2021, approaches.

Updated our coordinated harmful activity policy

We’ve been clear that we will take strong enforcement action on behavior that has the potential to lead to offline harm. Given the violent events in Washington, DC, and increased risk of harm, we began permanently suspending thousands of accounts that were primarily dedicated to sharing QAnon content on Friday afternoon.

Many of the individuals impacted by this updated enforcement action held multiple accounts, driving up the total number of accounts impacted. Since Friday, more than 70,000 accounts have been suspended as a result of our efforts, with many instances of a single individual operating numerous accounts. These accounts were engaged in sharing harmful QAnon-associated content at scale and were primarily dedicated to the propagation of this conspiracy theory across the service.

Our updated enforcement on QAnon content on Twitter, along with routine spam challenges, has resulted in changes in follower count for some people's Twitter accounts. In some cases, these actions may have resulted in follower count changes in the thousands.

As stipulated in this policy that we announced ahead of the 2020 US election, accounts that have Tweeted or Retweeted associated content will continue to be subject to limited visibility across search, replies, and on timelines and are prohibited from being recommended to others by Twitter. It's important that these types of accounts — that are not predominantly engaged in sharing this material — can see different perspectives in the open public conversation that Twitter uniquely provides.

Our teams are discussing ways we can empower research into QAnon and coordinated harmful activity on Twitter.

Escalated enforcement measures for our civic integrity policy

During the past several weeks, misleading and false information surrounding the 2020 US presidential election has been the basis for incitement to violence around the country. We took action on these claims in line with our Civic Integrity policy

Now that the results of the election have been officially certified by Congress, we updated our Civic Integrity policy on Friday to aggressively increase our enforcement action on these claims. The updated policy provides details about how we enforce against violations of this policy, including repeated sharing of Tweets that receive warning labels. Ultimately, repeated violations of this policy can result in permanent suspension.

Deployed tech to surface potentially harmful Tweets for urgent human review

Our teams are continuing to aggressively deploy technology to surface potentially harmful Tweets for human review in an effort to take action as quickly as possible on violative content. Using this combination of technology and human review helps our teams work

at scale during this critical time. We continue to update these tools as terminology and behaviors evolve on Twitter.

Limited engagement on labeled Tweets

On Tuesday, we limited engagement by no longer allowing any Tweets labeled for violations of our civic integrity policy to be replied to, Liked or Retweeted. People on Twitter are still able to Quote Tweet to share this content with additional context or their own perspective.

Blocked violative keywords from Search and Trends

We want Trends to promote healthy conversations on Twitter. This means, at times, we may prevent certain content from trending. There are rules for Trends, and if we identify Trends that violate these rules, we'll take enforcement action.

Since last week, we've prohibited certain terms from surfacing in Trends and Search suggestions based on the following Twitter Rules:

- *Coordinated harmful activity*
- *Civic integrity*
- *Hateful conduct*
- *Glorification of violence*
- *Violent threats*
- *Sensitive media*

We will also continue to prioritize reviewing and adding context to Trends. Our goal is to help people see what's happening while ensuring that potentially confusing trends are presented with context.

Fought spam and challenged potentially inauthentic accounts

It is against the Twitter Rules to engage in spamming behavior, including bulk, aggressive, or deceptive activity. That's why we routinely deploy anti-spam challenges to accounts to fight this behavior and protect the public conversation. During these challenges, account

owners must verify their authenticity through a variety of measures, such as reCAPTCHA or providing a functional email address.

As always, while accounts are undergoing these challenges, they're temporarily removed from follower counts. This, along with our updated enforcement around coordinated harmful activity, means some people may notice drops or fluctuations in their follower count.

Ahead of the inauguration, we'll continue to monitor the situation, keep open lines of communication with law enforcement, and keep the public informed of additional enforcement actions.

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

Recognizing the coordinated attacks on the First Amendment



By Patrick M. Wood

America's foundational rights are set out in the First Amendment. Without the freedoms expressed in that amendment, there is nothing to

protect us from totalitarianism, aka Technocracy. Yet we are currently in the midst of a very sustained attack on the right, and the attack is coming via methods too many fail to recognize.

The First Amendment in the Bill of Rights contains five separate statements that when taken together underscore the necessity of communication required to maintain a Constitutional Republic:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof (1); or abridging the freedom of speech (2), or of the press (3); or the right of the people peaceably to assemble (4), and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances (5).

Much has been already said about instances of “summary judgment” censorship by various Big Tech media players like Facebook, Twitter, and Google, but few have considered the more ominous asymmetric warfare being waged against the First Amendment in its entirety.

While America has almost 330 million citizens and well over half still have great respect for the Constitution, those who would destroy the First Amendment have launched an all-out stealthy, coordinated, and intentional high-tech attack against each element noted above.

In every revolution over the past 150 years, the first wave of attacks always focused on taking over communications networks: Radio and TV stations, newspapers, and public forums.

Thanks to the “Great Panic of 2020” driven by an invisible virus, this is exactly what has just happened in the U.S. Instead of being driven by thugs with guns and tanks, however, it was accomplished with high technology, pseudo-science, and misrepresented statistics.

The policies resulting from COVID-19’s fear and propaganda are the common thread in the communication takeover:

- **The free exercise of religion** is impossible when you can’t go to church or freely worship. Many churches are permanently closed because giving and attendance have dried up. For those

remaining open, mandates are dictating how services will be conducted: masks, social distancing, no singing of worship songs, no hugging or touching, etc.

- **Free speech** is in tatters as people are forced to wear face diapers. You are not understandable and you cannot understand others.
- **Freedom of the press** is virtually non-existent thanks to massive censorship by a juggernaut of Big Media and Big Tech companies who effortlessly suppress any person or narrative with whom they disagree.
- **Peaceable assembly** is completely on hold thanks to social distancing, limits on attendees, and face mask requirements.
- **Petitioning the government** for a redress of grievances is impossible when many government offices are closed and others simply don't listen or respond.

A second aspect of all revolutionary takeovers is the destruction of civilizational knowledge. Historical documentation of book burnings is legendary from the 1918 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia to Nazi Germany in the 1930s and China under Mao Zedong in the 1940s. Books and historical papers represent historical touchstones that would keep citizens from accepting their new reality.

While we normally think of freedom of the press as related to the present, it stretches far back in history. Thus, it's not enough to censor current literature and journalism, but also that of the past.

Access to public and university libraries — where physical books are located - has been almost completely shut down during 2020. During that time, electronic "book burning" has begun in earnest as certain authors and topics are being rapidly expunged from electronic media.

The implication of these attacks is very alarming. If they are indeed the first wave of a revolutionary coup d'état, then we must immediately prepare for the main invasion.

The greatest question, however, is who are we really fighting? Marxists? Communists? Socialists? Fascists?

I suggest that it is none of these because all of the above attacks are related to scientists and Big Tech who appear to be working closely together to bring this about. More likely, these people are Technocrats. They are not interested in collectivism but rather total domination and outright Scientific Dictatorship.

Nevertheless, they are well underway to flipping the world into the World Economic Forum's vision of The Great Reset, which is rife with elements of Technocracy and Transhumanism. Along the way, Capitalism and Free Enterprise must die and the will of the American people must be forced into submission.

The First Amendment and our ability to communicate freely may be the first major casualties of this revolution but it is not yet a *fait accompli*.

America must not go down without a fight. The rapidly expanding national membership of Citizens for Free Speech is mounting its own counter-initiative to preserve and defend the First Amendment to rebuild its functionality from the bottom up. It could be too little, too late, but we encourage all Americans to join us to take a stand.

Indeed, if America is ultimately silenced by its Technocrat invaders, then all else will be lost.