



Reporter Shows Why the British Government's Plan to Ban All Gas and Diesel Cars by 2035 Is Doomed to Failure

The UK government plans to ban all gasoline, diesel, and hybrid cars by 2035 in an attempt to meet a near-zero carbon target allegedly to combat global warming. This reporter says switching to electric cars is doomed because massive amounts of new infrastructure will be required to support the new vehicles. The country will need at least 25-million roadside charging points. There also would be the need to generate enough electricity for all the new cars that will be needed. The National Grid will need another 20 gigawatts of generating capacity, which is double the amount now generated by all the UK's nuclear power stations. It is estimated that, by 2025, computer servers storing digital data from billions of devices (the Internet of Things) will be using 20% of all the world's electricity. Obtaining sufficient lithium, cobalt, and rare-earth metals for batteries is another problem. A report from the Swedish-government says the energy consumption required to make just one of the batteries for this 'data farm' releases as much CO2 as eight years' of driving a petroleum vehicle. - GEG

The government's eco-edict that all new cars be electric in 15 years is doomed to backfire – because

old bangers can be greener, says JOHN NAISH

For those readers left scratching their heads over the Government's ban on sales of all new petrol, diesel and hybrid cars from 2035, here's what I – a former Fleet Street motoring editor – will be doing to help save the planet.

Our family car, a VW Golf, has at least a decade left in its petrol engine. Good care and servicing should stretch that to 2033. Then I'll buy the very latest-technology petrol or diesel car, just before the pre-ban sales scramble causes prices to spiral.

Why? Because I'm convinced it is the greenest thing to do all round.

Debacle

The government's attempt to meet its near-zero carbon target by bringing forward by five years its ban on petrol, diesel and hybrid cars is well-intentioned. Yet it is doomed to backfire as badly as a Model T Ford.

We all know well from the great diesel debacle what happens when politicians grab the steering wheel on eco policy.

Back in 2001, the then Chancellor Gordon Brown slashed road tax and fuel duty on diesel cars because some boffin in a white coat had told him they emit 15 per cent less CO₂ greenhouse-gas carbon dioxide than petrol cars.

Sales rocketed as eco-minded drivers rushed to buy.

But then some other boffins discovered diesels spewed out vastly more damaging nitrogen oxide and nitrogen dioxide than petrol cars.

What's more, their exhausts send asthma and heart disease rates soaring.

So punishing new taxes got slapped on diesels. Costs spiralled

and re-sale prices plummeted. Those well-meaning motorists got taken to the cleaners.

Now we are experiencing the great electric car push – and that is set to be still more of a shocker, both for people and the planet. At a local level, we require massive amounts of new infrastructure to be built to support electric cars.

We will need at least 25 million new roadside charging points – the equivalent of installing 4,000 new ones a day, starting yesterday – with roads and pavements having to be ripped up in the process which will, of course, create plumes of emissions.

And where on earth will the electricity needed come from?

More than a third of Britons commute by car. Imagine, in 2035 and beyond, each of those motorists arriving home at night and hurriedly plugging in their vehicles at around the same time.

Malcolm McCulloch, head of Oxford University's Energy and Power group, has warned that the National Grid will need another 20 gigawatts of generating capacity – double the amount currently generated by all the UK's nuclear power stations – to cope.

The Engineer magazine says that charging an electric car at home with a medium-speed charger is like 'leaving the electric shower on all night. If just a few people in a street decided to do that, it'd blow the local distribution fuse.'

Indeed, the whole system may fail.

Read full article here...



Jussie Smollett Indicted By Special Prosecutor in Alleged Hate Hoax

Chicago: Special Prosecutor Dan Webb had indicted Jussie Smollett on six new counts of disorderly conduct and filing false police reports. This is related to the actor's claim that he was a victim of a racist and homophobic attack by two white Trump supporters on January 29, 2019. Police say that two Nigerian brothers admitted that Smollett paid them \$3,500 to stage the attack. The State's Attorney's Office announced on March 8, 2019, that Smollett had been indicted by a grand jury on 16 felony counts of disorderly conduct. However, prosecutors dropped all charges two weeks later. The city of Chicago has since sued Smollett for the cost of overtime that the police department incurred while investigating the hoax. The actor counter-sued for malicious prosecution. Smollett is due to appear in court on Webb's charges on February 24. -GEG

Chicago, IL – Former “Empire” actor Jussie Smollett was indicted by a special prosecutor on Tuesday afternoon.

WFLD reported that Special Prosecutor Dan Webb had indicted Smollett on charges related to the alleged racist and homophobic attack that the actor reported to police on Jan. 29, 2019.

The indictment happened just one month after a Cook County judge ordered Google to turn over copious amount of information from the accounts Smollett and his manager and

five months after the special prosecutor began his investigation.

Smollett told police on Jan. 29 that he had been attacked by two white supporters of President Donald Trump on his way home from a Subway restaurant.

He claimed the men called him homophobic and anti-black slurs and told him "This is MAGA country" as they beat him up and put a noose around his neck. He also said they threw a chemical on him.

Chicago Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson explained at a press conference the day of Smollett's arrest that that police considered the actor a victim up until Ola and Abel Osundairo returned from Nigeria to Chicago and were taken into police custody, and then the investigation "spun in a totally different direction."

"We gave him the benefit of the doubt up until that 47th hour. But when we discovered the actual motive, quite frankly, it pissed everybody off," he explained.

He said the brothers told police that Smollett paid them \$3,500 to stage the attack, with another \$500 after they returned from a planned trip to Nigeria.

"We have the check that he used to pay them," Superintendent Johnson said.

The Cook County State's Attorney's Office announced on March 8 that Smollett had been indicted by a grand jury on 16 felony counts of disorderly conduct.

But then on March 26, the State's Attorney's Office unceremoniously announced all charges against the "Empire" actor had been dropped.

The city of Chicago has since sued Smollett for the cost of the overtime the police department incurred while

investigating the hoax and the actor has counter-sued for malicious prosecution.

But despite that legal wrangling over dollars and cents, Smollett is not yet in the clear on the criminal charges he initially faced.

Cook County Judge Michael Toomin in June of 2019 appointed a special counsel to investigate what actually happened after information about Smollett hiding evidence and the involvement of Michelle Obama's former chief of staff, Tina Tchen, in the case.

Toomin said that Foxx was right to recuse herself from Smollett's trial after she asked Commissioner Johnson to turn over the case to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) after talking to Tchen, but that she did not have the authority to appoint her second-in-command to the prosecution in her stead, the Chicago Tribune reported.

Read full article here...



Top Brass at DOJ Reverses Prosecutors' Sentencing

Recommendations for Roger Stone

Roger Stone, former adviser to President Trump, was found guilty in November 2019 on seven counts related to attempts to obtain emails that would be harmful to Hillary Clinton's 2016 bid for the White House. Four career DOJ prosecutors, including Obama holdovers from former Special Counsel Robert Mueller's team, recommended that Stone be sentenced to seven to nine years in prison. However, senior officers at the Department of Justice reduced that recommendation, which caused all four prosecutors to resign in protest. When Trump tweeted that the original sentencing recommendation was "very horrible and unfair", Democrats responded by accusing the president of wielding undue influence over the DOJ in this case. -GEG

Four career Department of Justice (DOJ) prosecutors abruptly withdrew from their posts on Tuesday in an apparent dramatic protest just hours after senior leaders at the DOJ said they would take the extraordinary step of effectively overruling the prosecutors' judgment by seeking a lesser sentence for President Trump's former adviser Roger Stone.

Fox News reported earlier Tuesday that top brass at the DOJ were "shocked" that prosecutors handling the case had recommended Monday night that Judge Amy Berman Jackson sentence the 67-year-old Stone to between 87 and 108 months in prison. The prosecutors asserted in the Monday filing that Stone's conduct post-indictment – including violating the judge's social media gag orders – merited a sentence much longer than the 15 to 21 months that the defense said was actually advisable under the federal sentencing guidelines.

In a new, amended filing Tuesday afternoon, the DOJ told Jackson that the government "respectfully submits that a sentence of incarceration far less than 87 to 108 months'

imprisonment would be reasonable under the circumstances,” but that the government “ultimately defers to the Court as to the specific sentence to be imposed.”

FLASHBACK: FORMER FBI DIRECTOR MCCABE ADMITS LYING TO INVESTIGATORS, STILL NO CHARGES

The government said in the amended filing that while it was “technically” possible to argue that Stone deserved the severe federal sentencing enhancement for threatening physical harm to a witness, such a move would violate the spirit of the federal guidelines.

It would place Stone in a category of the guidelines that “typically applies in cases involving violent offenses, such as armed robbery, not obstruction cases,” the government argued, noting that Stone’s “advanced age, health, personal circumstances, and lack of criminal history” also counseled against the harsh penalty.

Specifically, prosecutors said that although Stone had allegedly threatened witness Randy Credico’s therapy dog, Bianca – saying he was “going to take that dog away from you” – it was important to recognize that Credico, a New York radio host, has acknowledged that he “never in any way felt that Stone himself posed a direct physical threat to me or my dog.”

“If the Court were not to apply the eight-level enhancement for threatening a witness with physical injury, it would result in the defendant receiving an advisory Guidelines range of 37 to 46 months, which as explained below is more in line with the typical sentences imposed in obstruction cases,” the government wrote.

READ THE DOJ’S NEW FILING ; READ THE ORIGINAL FILING REQUESTING A LONGER SENTENCE

A senior DOJ official confirmed to Fox News that senior leadership officials there made the call to reverse the

initial sentencing recommendation, saying the filing on Monday evening was not only extreme, but also substantially inconsistent with how the prosecutors had briefed DOJ leadership they would proceed on the case. The “general communication” between the U.S. Attorney’s Office and the main DOJ had led senior officials to expect a more moderate sentence, the official told Fox News.

In response to the new push for a lighter sentence, all the prosecutors on the Stone case, including several holdovers from former Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s team, quit. Assistant U.S. Attorney in the U.S. Attorney’s Office for Washington, D.C., Jonathan Kravis, resigned as an assistant U.S. attorney in a filing with Jackson. Another prosecutor, Aaron Zelinsky, also filed a notice with the court that he was leaving his position as a special prosecutor with the U.S. attorney’s office in Washington, although he would remain as an assistant U.S. attorney in Baltimore.

[Read full article here..](#)