



Greta: You Are Being Used As A Pawn For Technocracy

Sixteen year old climate activist Greta Thunberg has become a poster child for the Green New Deal but it has nothing to do with democracy, but rather Technocracy that is behind her elite handlers.

On April 23, 2019, Quillette reported that

“Greta is eleven years old and has gone two months without eating. Her heart rate and blood pressure show clear signs of starvation. She has stopped speaking to anyone but her parents and younger sister, Beata.

“After years of depression, eating disorders, and anxiety attacks, she finally receives a medical diagnosis: Asperger’s syndrome, high-functioning autism, and OCD. She also suffers from selective mutism—which explains why she sometimes can’t speak to anyone outside her closest family. When she wants to tell a climate researcher that she plans a school strike on behalf of the environment, she speaks through her father.”

So, Greta suffers from Asperger's Syndrome, Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder, eating disorders, anxiety attacks and severe depression. Is this really the new face of climate emergency or is she being shamelessly used by Technocrat handlers?

The following story gets it exactly correct: **“their goal is technocracy not democracy.”** □ TN Editor

Behind the schoolgirl climate warrior lies a shadowy cabal of lobbyists, investors and energy companies seeking to profit from a green bonanza

Whatever Greta or her parents know or think, her eco-mob increases the likelihood of legislation and investment that will make colossal profits for people like Global Challenge, We Don't Have Time and Sustainable Energy Angels. For Sweden's energy titans, saving the planet means government contracts to print the green stuff. **Green energy lobbyists use populist scare tactics and a children's crusade to bypass elected representatives, but their goal is technocracy not democracy, profit not redistribution. Greta, a child of woke capitalism, is being used to ease the transition to green corporatism.**

Greta Thunberg is just an ordinary 16-year-old Swedish schoolgirl whose fiery visions have convinced the parliaments of Britain and Ireland to declare a “climate emergency”. Greta's parents, actor Svante Thunberg and opera singer Malena Ernman, are just an ordinary pair of parent-managers who want to save the planet. Query their motives, and you risk being accused of “climate denial”, or of bullying a vulnerable child with Asperger's. But the Greta phenomenon has also involved green lobbyists, PR hustlers, eco-academics, and a think-tank founded by a wealthy ex-minister in Sweden's Social Democratic government with links to the country's energy companies. These companies are preparing for the biggest bonanza of government contracts in history: the greening of the Western economies. Greta, whether she and her parents know it or not, is the face of their political strategy.

The family's story is that Greta launched a one-girl “school strike” at the

Swedish parliament on the morning of August 20, 2018. Ingmar Rentzhog, founder of the social media platform We Have No Time, happened to be passing. Inspired, Rentzhog posted Greta's photograph on his personal Facebook page. By late afternoon, the newspaper *Dagens Nyheter* had Greta's story and face on its website. The rest is viral.

But this isn't the full story. In emails, media entrepreneur Rentzhog told me that he "met Greta for the first time" at the parliament, and that he "did not know Greta or Greta's parents" before then. Yet in the same emails, Rentzhog admitted to meeting Greta's mother Malena Ernman "3-4 months before everything started"—in early May 2018, when he and Malena had shared a stage at a conference called the Climate Parliament. Nor did Rentzhog stumble on Greta's protest by accident. He now admits to having been informed "the week before" by "a mailing list from a climate activist" named Bo Thorén, leader of the Fossil Free Dalsland group.

Independent journalist Rebecca Weidmo Uvell has obtained an earlier email from Bo Thorén's search for fresh green faces. In February 2018, Thorén invited a group of environmental activists, academics and politicians to plan "how we can involve and get help from young people to increase the pace of the transition to a sustainable society". In May, after Greta won second prize in an environmental op-ed writing competition run by the newspaper *Svenska Dagbladet*, Thorén approached all the competition winners with a plan for a "school strike", modelled on the student walk-outs after the shootings at Parkland, Florida. "But no one was interested," Greta's mother claims, "so Greta decided to do it for herself."

Fortunately, Greta's decision coincided with the publication of *Scenes from the Heart*, Svante and Malena's memoir of how saving the planet had saved their family. Unfortunately, Malena omitted to tell her publisher that Ingmar Rentzhog had commandeered Greta's stunt.

"We had a problem," says Malena's editor, Jonas Axelsson. "Journalists asked if it was promotion for the book. It wasn't at all. It was a nightmare."

It was, however, a dream for Ingmar Rentzhog. When Rentzhog combined Thorén's plan and Malena Ernman's musical fame with Greta's uncanny charisma and We Have No Time's mailing list, he turned Greta into a viral celebrity.


"I have not invented Greta," Rentzhog insists, "but I helped to spread her action to an international audience."

Trained by Al Gore's Climate Reality Project, Rentzhog set up We Don't Have Time in late 2017 to "hold leaders and companies accountable for climate change" by leveraging "the power of social media". Rentzhog and his CEO David Olsson have backgrounds in finance, not environmental activism, Rentzhog as the founder of Laika, an investment relations company, and Olsson with Svenska Bostadsfonden, one of Sweden's biggest real estate funds, whose board Rentzhog joined in June 2017. We Don't Have Time's investors included Gustav Stenbeck, whose family control Kinnevik, one of Sweden's largest investment corporations.

In May 2018, Rentzhog and Olsson of We Don't Have Time became chairman and board member of a think-tank called Global Utmaning (Global Challenge). Its founder, Kristina Persson, is an heir to an industrial fortune. She is a career trade unionist and a Social Democrat politician going back to the party's golden age under Olof Palme. She is also an ex-deputy governor of Sweden's central bank and a New Ager who has discussed her reincarnations and communication with the dead. Between 2014 and 2016, Persson served as "Minister for the Future" in the Social Democratic government of Stefan Lofven.

Petter Skogar, president of Sweden's biggest employer's association, is on Global Challenge's ten-person board. So is Johan Lindholm, chairman of the Union of Construction Workers and member of the Social Democrats' executive board. So is Anders Wijkman, president of the Club of Rome, chair of the Environmental Objectives Council, and a recipient in February 2018 of Bo Thorén's call for youth mobilisation. So is Catherina Nystedt Ringborg, former CEO of Swedish Water, advisor at the International Energy Agency, and former vice-president at Swedish-Swiss energy giant ABB.

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



China Is Leading The Quantum Computing Revolution

Quantum technology is important because it could potentially lead to total domination over Internet security, censorship and control. Chinese Technocrats are intent on leading this disruption. □ TN Editor

More than a decade ago, Chinese physicist Pan Jian-Wei returned home from Europe to help oversee research into some of the most important technology of the 21st century.

At a conference in Shanghai this summer, Pan and his team offered a rare peek at the work he described as a “revolution.”

They spoke of the hacking-resistant communications networks they are building across China, the sensors they are designing to see through

smog and around corners, and the prototype computers that may someday smash the computational power of any existing machine.

All the gear is based on quantum technology - an emerging field that could transform information processing and confer big economic and national-security advantages to countries that dominate it. To the dismay of some scientists and officials in the United States, China's formidable investment is helping it catch up with Western research in the field and, in a few areas, pull ahead.

Beijing is pouring billions into research and development and is offering Chinese scientists big perks to return home from Western labs. China's drive has sparked calls for more R&D funding in the United States, and helped trigger concerns in the Trump administration that some types of scientific collaboration with China may be aiding the People's Liberation Army and hurting U.S. interests.

"The United States must be prepared for a future in which its traditional technological predominance faces new, perhaps unprecedented challenges," the Center for a New American Security wrote in a recent report about China's quantum ambitions.

Quantum technology seeks to harness the distinct properties of atoms, photons and electrons to build more powerful tools for processing information.

Last year, China had nearly twice as many patent filings as the United States for quantum technology overall, a category that includes communications and cryptology devices, according to market research firm Patinformatics. The United States, though, leads the world in patents relating to the most prized segment of the field - quantum computers - thanks to heavy investment by IBM, Google, Microsoft and others.

Helping oversee China's program is Pan, whom Chinese media call the "father of quantum." From his labs at the University of Science and Technology of China (USTC), in Shanghai and Hefei, the 49-year-old leads a team of 130 researchers. In 2017, the journal Nature named him one of "ten people who mattered this year," saying he had "lit a fire

under the country's efforts in quantum technology.”

Pan occasionally gives lab tours to President Xi Jinping, who takes a keen interest in his work, according to Chinese media. Pan is also overseeing plans for a new national lab for quantum research in Anhui province, which he said had drawn about \$400 million in government funding.

At the Shanghai event, Pan illustrated his slide presentation with science-nerd jokes about Einstein and “Star Trek.” In a nod to Schrödinger’s cat - a 1930s thought experiment that helped define a quantum concept called superposition - Pan used images of a cartoon feline standing upright and lying flat on its back.

“As we all know, in our everyday life, a cat can only either be in an alive or dead state,” Pan said, but “a cat in the quantum world can be in a coherent superposition of alive and dead states.”

He was making the point that quantum particles, also known as quantum bits, differ fundamentally from the bits in today’s technology. Existing computers and communications networks store, process and transmit information by breaking it down into long streams of bits, which are typically electrical or optical pulses representing a zero or one.

Quantum bits, or qubits, which are often atoms, electrons or photons, can exist as zeros and ones at the same time, or in any position between, a flexibility that allows them to process information in new ways. Some physicists compare them to a spinning coin that is simultaneously in a heads and tails state.

In his talk, Pan detailed how China is harnessing qubits to safeguard its communications from hacking - one of the fields in which China appears to have a lead over the West.

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

“This idea of equating climate deniers with scientific experts is a dangerous practice which frames the threat to our planet, our existence as an ongoing debate,” Klein Salamon added. “I don’t think sacrificing the future of our planet in exchange for a look of ‘objectivity’ is an even exchange. It’s one the coming generation will judge us on, if we don’t move with the urgency necessary to fight back against global warming and win.”

In other words, climate alarmists aren’t just calling for radical changes to America to stave off some hypothetical climate disaster — they’re also calling for opposing voices to be silenced. “Science” can only have one voice, and that voice must be Chicken Little.

The Climate Mobilization seized on a [Newsweek article](#) about a study from [Nature Communications](#). The study’s authors claimed that the U.S. news media gives “climate change deniers too much prominence by placing people with little understanding of the complexities involved in the same league as top scientists.”

“It’s time to stop giving these people visibility, which can be easily spun into false authority,” University of California Merced Professor Alex Petersen said in a statement. Petersen and his team traced the digital footprints of voices for and against climate alarmism across 100,000 media articles. They found that about half of mainstream outlets seek out “climate denying” experts.

Many outlets will present both sides of the issue, including one scientist echoing the climate alarmist mantra and another expert who disagrees — and who therefore must not be a real scientist, the article suggested.

“It’s not just false balance; the numbers show that the media are ‘balancing’ experts—who represent the overwhelming majority of reputable scientists—with the views of a relative handful of non-experts,” Professor LeRoy Westerling, the study’s author, said in a statement. “Most of the contrarians are not scientists, and the ones who are have very thin credentials. They are not in the same league with top scientists. They aren’t even in the league of the average career climate scientist.”

Yet the *Nature Communications* study notes that 224 of the 386 “climate change contrarians” quoted by the media have at least one publication in peer-reviewed scientific journals. The study did not mention how many of the “climate change scientists” quoted by the media had published articles, but the authors selected 224 of their papers and showed how their papers were more heavily cited.

If the professional world of climate science is dominated by the ideology of climate alarmism, it would make sense that climate alarmists are more heavily cited than climate skeptics. In January 2017, Judith Curry, former chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at Georgia Tech, resigned, [calling out](#) the alarmist ideology that increasingly dominates her field.

“I no longer know what to say to students and postdocs regarding how to navigate the CRAZINESS in the field of climate science,” Curry wrote. “Research and other professional activities are professionally rewarded only if they are channeled in certain directions approved by a politicized academic establishment — funding, ease of getting your papers published, getting hired in prestigious positions, appointments to prestigious committees and boards, professional recognition, etc.”

“How young scientists are to navigate all this is beyond me, and it often becomes a battle of scientific integrity versus career suicide (I have worked through these issues with a number of skeptical young scientists),” Curry wondered.

In other words, climate science is becoming an ideological echo chamber that rewards alarmism and silences dissenting voices, even when the dissenters are good scientists like Curry.

The study also parroted the blatantly false claim that there is a scientific consensus on the issue — citing the Cook study from 2013. The Cook study [notoriously misrepresented](#) the scientific literature to claim a 97 percent consensus, and activists continue to cite it as if it were gospel truth.

The study analyzed all published peer-reviewed academic research papers from 1991 to 2011 that use the terms “global warming” or

“global climate change.” Of the nearly 12,000 papers analyzed, the study discounted 7,930 — 66.4 percent — because they allegedly did not state a position. Then the study added up the papers it claimed endorsed man-made climate change and the papers it claimed opposed man-made climate change, and found that 97 percent of the papers *that stated a position* favored global warming.

But here’s the kicker: many scientists whose papers were included in the study complained that the papers were misinterpreted as supporting man-made global warming when they did not.

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