



Leftist Caught on Camera Screaming 'Slash Republicans Throats' at Arizona State University

Police at Arizona State University said they are investigating a video of a youth who screamed about slashing Republicans' throats, reportedly directing his threat to the leader of the Students-for-Trump group at ASU. It is unknown if he is a student.

Warning: vulgar language

- Police at ASU are investigating after a video began circulating on social media showing a man screaming, "slash Republican throats."
- The video was shared by Students for Trump at ASU.

Police at Arizona State University said Wednesday that they are investigating after a video began circulating on social media showing an individual "making threats" against Republicans.

"We are aware of a video circulating on social media where an individual appears to be making threats. We are working with the University to address the matter," ASU Police tweeted. The identity of the individual or whether he is a student was

unclear.

“Slash his throat. Every fucking Republican” Tweet This
The announcement by campus law enforcement seemed to reference a video shared by Students for Trump at ASU in which a “crazy leftist” screams “slash Republican throats.”

“Slash his throat. Every fucking Republican. Suck my fucking balls. Slash Republican throats. Slash fascist throats,” he screams

Read full article here...



Weather Warning: Earth Could Be Hit by MINI ICE-AGE as Sun ‘Hibernates’

Sunspot activity on the surface of the Sun follows a well-known 11-year cycle, with activity rising and falling that creates the so-called solar maximum and then solar minimum. The Sun entered a solar minimum two years ago, and one expert is warning that the sun also will enter a period of “hibernation” this year, in what is known as a Grand Solar Minimum. Professor Valentina Zharkova says agriculture could become less productive, affecting food harvests, especially in the middle latitudes. She says the Sun’s hibernation period could last for 33 years, which will lead to wetter and colder

summers. A Grand Solar Maximum occurs roughly every 400 years, and the last one, known as the Maunder Minimum, lasted from 1650 to 1710, a period of greater cold on Earth. -GEG

Sunspot activity on the surface of the Sun follows a well-known but little understood 11 year cycle. Activity rises and falls creating the so-called solar maximum and then solar minimum. During a solar maximum, the Sun is more powerful and is littered with sunspots.

Conversely when the Sun enters a solar minimum – which it did about two years ago – energy from our host star begins to lessen.

However, one expert has warned that the Sun will enter a period of “hibernation” this year, in what is known as a Grand Solar Minimum (GSM).

Prof Valentina Zharkova, from the department of mathematics, physics and electrical engineering at Northumbria University, warned this could cause global temperatures to drop by one degree Celsius.

While that sounds like an insignificant drop, it could have major ramifications for the planet, including a slow down in agricultural production.

The expert added the Sun’s hibernation period could last for three decades, which will lead to wetter and colder summers.

Prof Zharkova told The Sun: “The Sun is approaching a hibernation period.

“Less sunspots will be formed on the solar surface and thus less energy and radiation will be emitted towards the planets and the Earth.”

“The reduction in temperature will result in cold weathers on Earth, wet and cold summers, cold and wet winters.”

“We will possibly get big frosts as is happening now in Canada

where they see [temperatures] of -50C.

Read full article here...



‘New Way Forward Act’ Is Designed to Open US Borders to All Immigrants, Including Criminals

The New Way Forward Act is legislation designed to make a new country out of the US using immigration as the means. The laws says: “convictions should not lead to deportations, meaning that criminals could settle in the US with no danger of being sent back. The bill says criminalizing illegal entry into the US is “white supremacist”. Illegal aliens would become a protected class while Americans would be required to sustain them financially. Aliens who already have been deported for crimes would be brought back into the country at taxpayer expense. Forty-four House Democrats are sponsoring this bill. [This will make the hair stand up on the back of your neck. If you are in a rush, start at the 4:25 mark.] -GEG

At this moment there is a bill pending in Congress called the New Way Forward Act. It’s received almost no publicity, which is unfortunate as well as revealing.

The legislation is sponsored by 44 House Democrats, including Reps. Ilhan Omar of Minnesota and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez of New York. At roughly 4,400 words, it's almost exactly as long as the U.S. Constitution.

Like the Constitution, this legislation is designed to create a whole new country. The bill would entirely remake our immigration system, with the explicit purpose of ensuring that criminals are able to move here, and settle here permanently, with impunity.

TUCKER CARLSON: TRUMP'S ACQUITTAL WAS AS PREDICTABLE AS 'TITANIC' – MAYBE NOW WE CAN HAVE OUR COUNTRY BACK

You may think we're exaggerating for effect. We're not – not even a little.

The New Way Forward act is the most radical single piece of legislation we've seen proposed in this country. It makes the Green New Deal look like the status quo.

A document produced by Democrats to promote the bill says: "Convictions ... should not lead to deportation."

Keep in mind, we're not talking about convictions for double parking. The bill targets felony convictions – serious crimes that send you to prison for years. A press release from Rep., Jesus Garcia, D-Ill., is explicit about this.

Garcia brags that the bill will break the "prison to deportation pipeline." How does the bill do that? Under current U.S. law, legal U.S. immigrants can be deported if they commit an "aggravated felony" or a "crime of moral turpitude" – that is, a vile, depraved act, like molesting a child. Under the New Way Forward Act, "crimes of moral turpitude" are eliminated entirely as a justification for deportation. And the category of "aggravated felony" gets circumscribed too.

What does that mean?

Consider this: Under current law, immigrants who commit serious crimes – such as robbery, fraud, or child sexual abuse – must be deported, regardless of the sentence they receive. Other crimes – less severe ones like racketeering – require deportation as long as the perpetrator receives at least a one-year sentence.

But if this bill passes the House and Senate and is signed into law by the president, there will no longer be any crimes that automatically require deportation. None.

And one crime – falsifying a passport – will be made immune from deportation, no matter what. Because apparently 9/11 never happened, and we no longer care about fake government documents.

If you just renewed your driver's license to comply with the Real ID Act, you must feel like an idiot. Under the proposed legislation, the minimum prison sentence for crimes that still require deportation would rise from one year to five.

We checked the Bureau of Justice Statistics. According to federal data, crimes like car theft, fraud, and weapons offenses all carry average prison sentences of fewer than five years. And that's just looking at averages. There are people who commit rape, child abuse and even manslaughter and receive sentences of fewer than five years. Lots of them.

If the New Way Forward Act becomes law, immigrants who commit those crimes and receive those sentences would remain in the country. They'll all be eligible for citizenship one day, too.

But even that is understating the law's effect. Even a five-year prison sentence won't necessarily be enough to secure deportation. The bill would grant sweeping new powers to immigration judges, allowing them to nullify a deportation order.

The only requirement is that “the immigration judge finds such an exercise of discretion appropriate in pursuit of humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest.” In other words, anti-American immigration judges – and many of them are exactly that – would have a blank check to open the borders. No vote required.

Sound shocking to you? We’re just getting started. Current U.S. law makes drug addiction grounds for deportation, because why wouldn’t it? This bill would eliminate that statute.

Current law also states that those who have committed drug crimes abroad, or any “crimes involving moral turpitude,” are ineligible to immigrate here. The New Way Forward Act abolishes that statute.

A Mexican drug cartel leader could be released from prison, then freely come to America immediately. And if he wants, he could come here illegally, and it wouldn’t be a crime – because, and you were waiting for this, the bill also decriminalizes illegal entry into America, even by those previously deported.

According to a document promoting the bill, criminalizing illegal entry into America is “white supremacist.”

By this point, you’re beginning to wonder if we’re making this up. We’re not. In fact, we’re barely halfway through the bill.

The legislation doesn’t just make it harder to deport legal immigrants who commit crimes. It doesn’t just make it easier for criminals to legally move here. The bill would also effectively abolish all existing enforcement against illegal immigration.

To detain illegal immigrants, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) would have to prove in court that the illegal immigrants are dangerous or a flight risk. But of

course, ICE wouldn't be allowed to use a detainee's prior criminal behavior as proof he or she is dangerous. That's banned.

ICE would have to overcome even more hurdles if the detainee claims to be gay or transgender, under 21, or can't speak English and an interpreter isn't immediately available.

In other words, it would be much harder to arrest an illegal alien than it is to arrest you. They're the protected class here. You're just some loser who's paying for it all.

But believe it or not, we saved the nuttiest part for last. What could be more destructive than changing U.S. law, specifically to allow rapists, child molesters, and drug dealers to stay in America? How about this: Using taxpayer money to bring deported criminals back into America.

That's right. This bill would not only abolish your right to control who lives in your own country, but it invents a new right in return: the "right to come home."

The bill orders the government to create a "pathway for those previously deported to apply to return to their homes and families in the United States," as long as they would have been eligible to stay under the new law.

The Department of Homeland Security must spend taxpayer dollars transporting convicted criminal illegal aliens into the United States. Who will be eligible for these free flights? Tens of thousands of people kicked out of this country for all kinds of crimes. Sexual abuse. Robbery. Assault. Drug trafficking, weapons trafficking, human trafficking.

From 2002 to 2018, 480,000 people were deported for illegal entry or reentry into America. And under this bill, you'd have to buy them all a plane ticket to come back. The tickets alone would cost about a billion dollars, and that's before

Democrats make you start paying for these criminals' free health care, too. Which they plan to.

Read full article here...

Read legislation here:

<https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/5383/text>



Mysterious Bank Jeffrey Epstein Created in the Virgin Islands Received \$15.5 Million After His Death

The New York Times reported that Jeffrey Epstein opened a mysterious bank in 2014 in the Virgin Islands that appeared to be stagnant for years until Epstein died and it suddenly received \$15.5 million dollars from his estate. It is unclear if the bank had any clients or actually conducted any business. The millions disappeared by then end of 2019. A judge who is overseeing Epstein's remaining assets of \$653 million has requested the estate to provide a full accounting of the missing money.

A mysterious bank Jeffrey Epstein opened in the Virgin Islands in 2014 – which has been seemingly stagnant for years – suddenly received millions of dollars from his estate after his death, the New York Times reported Tuesday.

The fallen billionaire and accused sex trafficker applied to open one of the territories' first international banking operations, Southern Country International, so he could chase the "dynamic discipline of international banking," according to an application for the institution, obtained by the outlet.

The application, where Epstein describes himself as one of the investment world's "pioneers," was ultimately approved in 2014 and allowed him to do business with offshore clients only, the outlet said.

While the bank renewed its license five times since then, it's unclear if it had any clients or actually conducted any business, until it received a windfall of cash from Epstein's estate after he died, the outlet reported.

The bank had \$693,157 in assets when Epstein died back in August and then, four months later in December, the estate transferred \$15.5 million to the bank in two separate checks. Southern Country then sent back \$2.6 million, leaving the total deposit at \$12.9 million, the outlet said, citing records filed by the estate last week.

By the end of the year, the millions were gone and the total assets at the bank were just below half a million dollars, the outlet said.

Read full article here...



Iowa Caucus: Buttigieg Wins Iowa, But Bernie Tops Popular Vote. Critics Predict He Will Be Cheated Again

Former South Bend Mayor Pete Buttigieg won Monday's Iowa caucus with 26.9% of the state delegates, followed by Senators Bernie Sanders with 25.1%, Elizabeth Warren in third with 18.3%, and Joe Biden placing fourth with 15.6%.

Democrats used a new voting app from Shadow, Inc, that malfunctioned and prevented many caucus site leaders from uploading their results. Buttigieg was a financial contributor to Shadow, the maker of the app. Bernie Sanders, who was cheated out of the nomination last year, reportedly sent five lawyers to meet with party officials after he sent field workers to polling locations to gather an independent count. - GEG

Tucker Carlson interviewed Jimmy Dore, a liberal, who said the Democratic party is against candidates who represent workers and that Bernie Sanders will be cheated with the help of the media that pushed the story that Buttigieg won. He further explained that both parties follow the same agenda as they are beholden to their donors

Update (02/05 01:30 p.m.): Buttigieg maintained a slim lead in

Iowa after the second round of results from Monday night's caucus were released, according to *The Hill*.

The results, which accounted for roughly 71 percent of the precincts that voted, showed the former South Bend, Ind., mayor with 26.8 percent of the delegate share. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) nipped at his heels with 25.2 percent.

Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) and former Vice President Joe Biden rounded out the top four with 18.4 percent and 15.4 percent, respectively.

The Iowa Democratic Party earlier Tuesday released results for 62 percent of precincts, showing Buttigieg and Sanders in the lead. With the substantial number of precincts left to count and the margin so slim, the race remains too close to call.

* * *

Former South Bend Mayor Pete Buttigieg won Monday's Iowa caucus with 26.9% of the state delegates, followed by Sens. Bernie Sanders in second (25.1%) and Elizabeth Warren in third (18.3%) according to Iowa Democratic Party (IDP) Chair Troy Price, after 62% of statewide precincts were finally counted.

Read full article here...



Liberal White Women pay \$2,500 to Attend Dinners Where They Know They Will be Told They Are Racists

The Guardian reported that some liberal white women are paying \$2,500 to be lectured on how racist they are. This is done by attending meetings called 'Race to Dinner', organized by Regina Jackson, who is black, and Saira Rao, who identifies as Indian American. So far fifteen dinners have been held in major cities across the US. -GEG

Liberal white women are allegedly paying \$2,500 tithes to get lectured on how racist they are, at least if this story from the Guardian is to be believed.

From The Guardian, "Why liberal white women pay a lot of money to learn over dinner how they're racist":

Freshly made pasta is drying on the wooden bannisters lining the hall of a beautiful home in Denver, Colorado. Fox-hunting photos decorate the walls in a room full of books. A fire is burning. And downstairs, a group of liberal white women have gathered around a long wooden table to admit how racist they are.

"Recently, I have been driving around, seeing a black person, and having an assumption that they are up to no good," says Alison Gubser. "Immediately after I am like, that's no good! This is a human, just doing their thing. Why do I think that?"

This is Race to Dinner. A white woman volunteers to host a dinner in her home for seven other white women – often strangers, perhaps acquaintances. (Each dinner costs \$2,500, which can be covered by a generous host or divided among

guests.) A frank discussion is led by co-founders Regina Jackson, who is black, and Saira Rao, who identifies as Indian American. They started Race to Dinner to challenge liberal white women to accept their racism, however subconscious. "If you did this in a conference room, they'd leave," Rao says. "But wealthy white women have been taught never to leave the dinner table."

[...] It seems unlikely anyone would voluntarily go to a dinner party in which they'd be asked, one by one, "What was a racist thing you did recently?" by two women of color, before appetizers are served. But **Jackson and Rao have hardly been able to take a break since they started these dinners in the spring of 2019. So far, 15 dinners have been held in big cities across the US.**

I want to see the receipts.

I understand polls show liberal white women are the only racial group on the planet who view their own in-group negatively but dropping \$2,500 on a dinner just to wallow in ethnomasochism seems like a bit much.

I reached out to one of the women named in the story but she didn't immediately respond.

*The women who sign up for these dinners are not who most would see as racist. They are well-read and well-meaning. They are mostly Democrats. Some have adopted black children, many have partners who are people of color, some have been doing work towards inclusivity and diversity for decades. But they acknowledge they also have unchecked biases. **They are there because they "know [they] are part of the problem, and want to be part of the solution," as host Jess Campbell-Swanson says before dinner starts.***

Campbell-Swanson comes across as an overly keen college student applying for a prestigious internship. She can go on

for days about her work as a political consultant, but when it comes to talking about racism, she chokes.

“I want to hire people of color. Not because I want to be ... a white savior. I have explored my need for validation ... I’m working through that ... Yeah. Um ... I’m struggling,” she stutters, before finally giving up.

Across from Campbell-Swanson, **Morgan Richards admits she recently did nothing when someone patronizingly commended her for adopting her two black children, as though she had saved them. “What I went through to be a mother, I didn’t care if they were black,” she says, opening a window for Rao to challenge her: “So, you admit it is stooping low to adopt a black child?” And Richards accepts that the undertone of her statement is racist.**

[...] In the conversation that followed the dinner, **Campbell-Swanson, who couldn’t get her racist thoughts out, committed to writing a journal, jotting down daily decisions or thoughts that could be considered racist, and think about how to approach them differently.**

Read full article here...



Coronavirus Following a Familiar Pattern, Blaming Deaths on the Virus, But Is a Virus Really the Culprit?

Investigative journalist Jon Rappoport cites an interview with an AIDS researcher who revealed that Luc Montagnier and Robert Gallo, purportedly the co-discoverers of HIV, failed to publish proof of an isolated virus. This casts doubt on whether the virus even exists. He says the Chinese Coronavirus is following a similar pattern where deaths are blamed on a virus that may not have been properly isolated, identified, or proven to be causing illness. Rappoport calls for an open, published debate among researchers—including independent researchers who have no profit motive such as making a fortune from selling treatments for a virus that does not exist. -GEG

In my research on so-called epidemics and viruses over the last 30 years, I've examined a point very few people want to think about.

Does the virus being promoted actually exist?

It might seem absurd to ask that. "Well, of course it exists. Why else would experts be saying it's causing disease and death? Why else are they developing a vaccine?"

I don't buy that reply at face value. Never have, never will.

Let me illustrate with a short tale. —Word goes out to an elite intelligence agency that a stranger on a train is a spy, and he is dangerous. He must be captured. The Agency sends a few people to board the train.

Who is the spy? What does he look like? Unknown. The agents move from car to car looking at passengers. From "past

experience" in profiling suspects, they decide their target is probably a man in sleeping car 100. They knock on his door. He opens it. They place him under arrest.

The next thing the Agency knows, a week later, the ops director says, "Boys, he was the one, we have our man. He was planning to blow up bridges. Great work."

Evidence of guilt? Proof? Was the initial story about a spy on a train even true? Answers unknown. But who cares? The job is done.

With a purported new epidemic disease, how do researchers find the man on the train? What method do they use to isolate a unique virus that is present in the bodies of people who are sick?

Various experts will offer various answers. In a moment, I'll present an interview with a researcher who proposes a method. To sum up this method in simplistic terms: you remove a tissue sample from a person suspected of carrying a virus. Taking a tiny piece of that sample, you place it into a sugar solution and spin it in a centrifuge at high speed. The solution settles out, according to layers of density and weight. You presumably know, from past experience, which layer will contain particles of virus (if they are there). From that layer, you remove a small sample. You look at it under an electron microscope. You photograph what you see. If you've found a virus, you should be able to observe many copies of it in the photo. From analyzing these copies, you should be able to tell what kind of virus you've found. This is a very rough description of the process.

To announce to the world that you've found a virus that's causing a rapidly spreading and dangerous epidemic, you should be sure of your work. *You should have performed the above process on MANY, MANY supposed human carriers of the virus, and you should have obtained the same result in the*

overwhelming percentage of cases. And independent researchers should be able to replicate your work.

In the Chinese epidemic, and in other past epidemics, I've seen no evidence that this process of isolation was employed on many, many patients with the same result—much less the independent confirmation.

Therefore, the whole inquiry and research are in doubt. Simply announcing to the world that “the virus has been found” means nothing.

All right. Here are excerpts from an interview. It gets somewhat technical. It was conducted by a brilliant independent journalist, Christine Johnson. The interviewee is Dr. Eleni Papadopulos, “a biophysicist and leader of a group of HIV/AIDS scientists from Perth in Western Australia. Over the past decade and more she and her colleagues have published many scientific papers questioning the HIV/AIDS hypothesis...”

CJ: Does HIV cause AIDS?

EP: There is no proof that HIV causes AIDS.

CJ: Why not?

EP: For many reasons, but most importantly, because there is no proof that HIV exists.

[...]

CJ: Didn't Luc Montagnier and Robert Gallo [purportedly the co-discoverers of HIV] isolate HIV back in the early eighties?

EP: No. In the papers published in *Science* by those two research groups, there is no proof of the isolation of a retrovirus from AIDS patients. [HIV is said to be a retrovirus.]

CJ: They say they did isolate a virus.

EP: Our interpretation of the data differs. To prove the existence of a virus you need to do three things. First, culture cells and find a particle you think might be a virus. Obviously, at the very least, that particle should look like a virus. Second, you have to devise a method to get that particle on its own so you can take it to pieces and analyze precisely what makes it up. Then you need to prove the particle can make faithful copies of itself. In other words, that it can replicate.

CJ: Can't you just look down a microscope and say there's a virus in the cultures?

EP: No, you can't. Not all particles that look like viruses are viruses.

[...]

CJ: My understanding is that high-speed centrifugation is used to produce samples consisting exclusively of objects having the same density, a so-called "density-purified sample." Electron microscopy is used to see if these density-purified samples consist of objects which all have the same appearance – in which case the sample is an isolate – and if this appearance matches that of a retrovirus, in terms of size, shape, and so forth. If all this is true, then you are three steps into the procedure for obtaining a retroviral isolate. (1) You have an isolate, and the isolate consists of objects with the same (2) density and (3) appearance of a retrovirus. Then you have to examine this isolate further, to see if the objects in it contain reverse transcriptase [an enzyme] and will replicate when placed in new cultures. Only then can you rightfully declare that you have obtained a retroviral isolate.

EP: Exactly. It was discovered that retroviral particles have a physical property which enables them to be separated from other material in cell cultures. That property is their

buoyancy, or density, and this was utilized to purify the particles by a process called density gradient centrifugation.

The technology is complicated, but the concept is extremely simple. You prepare a test tube containing a solution of sucrose, ordinary table sugar, made so the solution is light at the top but gradually becomes heavier, or more dense, towards the bottom. Meanwhile, you grow whatever cells you think may contain your retrovirus. If you're right, retroviral particles will be released from the cells and pass into the culture fluids. When you think everything is ready, you decant a specimen of culture fluids and gently place a drop on top of the sugar solution. Then you spin the test tube at extremely high speeds. This generates tremendous forces, and particles present in that drop of fluid are forced through the sugar solution until they reach a point where their buoyancy prevents them from penetrating any further. In other words, they drift down the density gradient until they reach a spot where their own density is the same as that region of the sugar solution. When they get there they stop, all together. To use virological jargon, that's where they band. Retroviruses band at a characteristic point. In sucrose solutions they band at a point where the density is 1.16 gm/ml.

That band can then be selectively extracted and photographed with an electron microscope. The picture is called an electron micrograph, or EM. The electron microscope enables particles the size of retroviruses to be seen, and to be characterized by their appearance.

CJ: So, examination with the electron microscope tells you what fish you've caught?

EP: Not only that. It's the only way to know if you've caught a fish. Or anything at all.

CJ: Did Montagnier and Gallo do this?

EP: This is one of the many problems. Montagnier and Gallo did use density gradient banding, but for some unknown reason they did not publish any Ems [electron microscope photos] of the material at 1.16 gm/ml...this is quite puzzling because in 1973 the Pasteur Institute hosted a meeting attended by scientists, some of whom are now amongst the leading HIV experts. At that meeting the method of retroviral isolation was thoroughly discussed, and photographing the 1.16 band of the density gradient was considered absolutely essential.

CJ: But Montagnier and Gallo did publish photographs of virus particles.

EP: No. Montagnier and Gallo published electron micrographs [EMs] of culture fluids that had not been centrifuged, or even separated from the culture cells, for that matter. These EMs contained, in addition to many other things, including the culture cells and other things that clearly are not retroviruses, a few particles which Montagnier and Gallo claimed are retroviruses, and which all belonged to the same retroviral species, now called HIV. But photographs of unpurified particles don't prove that those particles are viruses. The existence of HIV was not established by Montagnier and Gallo – or anyone since – using the method presented at the 1973 meeting.

Read full article here...