

How To Prove That A California Politician Is Lying To You

By Conrad Brown

Aside from the standard retort: "*when their mouth is moving*"; it is unfair to assume that every politician has based their lives on political corruption.

Here is how to determine, with absolute certainty, if your public official is a lying scumbag that is just saying some "*feel good*" crap in order to trick you into letting them get away with their stock market scams.

You ask then to **prove to you** that they, and their family members, are not receiving the following quid-pro-quo: Billions of dollars of Google, Twitter, Facebook, Tesla, Netflix and Sony Pictures stock and stock warrants which is never reported to the FEC; Billions of dollars of Google, Twitter, Facebook, Tesla, Netflix and Sony Pictures search engine rigging and shadow-banning which is never reported to the FEC; Free rent; Male and female prostitutes; Cars; Dinners; Party Financing; Sports Event Tickets; Political campaign printing and mailing services "Donations"; Secret PAC Financing; Jobs in Corporations in Silicon Valley For The Family Members of Those Who Take Bribes And Those Who Take Bribes; "Consulting" contracts from McKinsey as fronted pay-off gigs; Overpriced "Speaking Engagements" which are really just pay-offs conduited for donors; Private jet rides and use of Government fuel depots (ie: Google handed out NASA jet fuel to staff); Real Estate; Fake mortgages; The use of Cayman, Boca Des Tores, Swiss and related money-laundering accounts;

Bribes to Stanford officials to admit their kids to college; The use of HSBC, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs and Deutsche Bank money laundering accounts and covert stock accounts; Free spam and bulk mailing services owned by Silicon Valley corporations; Use of high tech law firms such as Perkins Coie, Wilson Sonsini, MoFo, Covington & Burling, etc. to conduit bribes to officials; and other means now documented by us, The FBI, the FTC, The SEC, The FEC and journalists.

Then you ask the FBI, GAO, SEC, FEC, FTC and Congress (who work for you, the taxpayer) to prove it to you.

Then you ask the community service forensics groups like Cause Of Action, Judicial Watch, Sunlight Foundation, ICIJ, Ralph Nader, and all of the other public forensics groups to prove it to you.

Then **you** buy some books on "***How To Be A Private Investigator***" and prove it to yourself.

Then you can see if they are lying or not.

For example; the politicians and families of Jerry Brown, Kamala Harris, Nancy Pelosi, Barbara Boxer, etc. own the companies that offer the "*solutions*" to green energy "**problems**" that they promote. In other words: These politicians control and exploit the profits to the thing they are screaming about! They positioned themselves to make exclusive profits on issues that they made into big deals!

Tilak Doshi reveals that widespread view that fossil fuels are "dirty" and renewables such as wind and solar energy and electric vehicles are "clean" has become a fixture of mainstream media and policy assumptions across the political spectrum in

developed countries. Indeed the ultimate question we are led to believe is how quickly can enlightened Western governments, led by an alleged scientific consensus, “decarbonize” with clean energy in a race to save the world from impending climate catastrophe. The ‘net zero by 2050’ mantra, calling for carbon emissions to be completely mitigated within three decades, is now the clarion call by governments and intergovernmental agencies around the developed world, ranging from [several EU member states](#) and the [UK](#), to the [International Energy Agency](#) and the [International Monetary Fund](#).

Let’s start with Elon Musk’s Tesla. In an astonishing achievement for a company that has now posted four consecutive quarters of profits, Tesla is now [the world’s most valuable automotive company](#). Demand for EVs is set to soar, as government policies subsidize the purchase of EVs to replace the internal combustion engine of gasoline and diesel-driven cars and as owning a “clean” and “green” car becomes a moral testament to many a virtue-signaling customer.

Yet, if one looks under the hood of “clean energy” battery-driven EVs, the dirt found would surprise most. The most important component in the EV is the lithium-ion rechargeable battery which relies on critical mineral commodities such as cobalt, graphite, lithium, and manganese. Tracing the source of these minerals, in what is called “full-cycle economics”, it becomes apparent that EVs create a trail of dirt from the mining and processing of minerals upstream.

A recent [United Nations report](#) warns that the raw materials used in electric car batteries are highly concentrated in a small number of countries where environmental and labour

regulations are weak or non-existent. Thus, battery production for EVs is driving a boom in small-scale or “artisanal” cobalt production in the Democratic Republic of Congo which supplies two thirds of global output of the mineral. These artisanal mines, which account for up to a quarter of the country’s production, [have been found](#) to be dangerous and employ child labour.

Mindful of what the image of children scrabbling for hand-dug minerals in Africa can do to high tech’s clean and green image, most tech and auto companies using cobalt and other toxic heavy metals avoid direct sourcing from mines. Tesla Inc. [TSLA -0.8% struck a deal last month](#) with Swiss-based Glencore Plc to buy as much as 6,000 tons of cobalt annually from the latter’s Congolese mines. While Tesla has said it aims to remove reputational risks associated with sourcing minerals from countries such as the DRC where corruption is rampant, Glencore assures buyers that no hand-dug cobalt is treated at its mechanized mines.

There are [7.2 million battery EVs](#) or about 1% of the total vehicle fleet today. To get an idea of the scale of mining for raw materials involved in replacing the world’s gasoline and diesel-fueled cars with EVs, we can take the example of the UK as provided by [Michael Kelly](#), the Emeritus Prince Philip Professor of Technology at the University of Cambridge. According to Professor Kelly, if we replace all of the UK vehicle fleet with EVs, assuming they use the most resource-frugal next-generation batteries, we would need the following materials: about twice the annual global production of cobalt; three quarters of the world’s production lithium carbonate; nearly the entire world production of neodymium; and more than half the world’s production of copper in 2018.

And this is just for the UK. Professor Kelly estimates that if we want the whole world to be transported by electric vehicles, the vast increases in the supply of the raw materials listed above would go far beyond known reserves. The environmental and social impact of vastly-expanded mining for these materials — some of which are highly toxic when mined, transported and processed – in countries afflicted by corruption and poor human rights records can only be imagined. The clean and green image of EVs stands in stark contrast to the realities of manufacturing batteries.

Proponents of EVs might counter by saying that despite these evident environmental and social problems associated with mining in many third world countries, the case remains that EVs help reduce carbon dioxide emissions associated with the internal combustion engines run on gasoline and diesel fuels. According to the reigning climate change narrative, it is after all carbon dioxide emissions that are threatening environmental catastrophe on a global scale. For the sake of saving the world, the climate crusaders of the richer nations might be willing to ignore the local pollution and human rights violations involved in mining for minerals and rare earths in Africa, China, Latin America and elsewhere.

While one might question the inherent inequity in imposing such a trade-off, the supposed advantages of EVs in emitting lower carbon emissions are overstated according to a [peer-reviewed life-cycle study comparing conventional and electric vehicles](#). To begin with, about half the lifetime carbon-dioxide emissions from an electric car come from the energy used to produce the car, especially in the mining and processing of raw materials needed for the battery. This compares unfavorably with the

manufacture of a gasoline-powered car which accounts for 17% of the car's lifetime carbon-dioxide emissions. When a new EV appears in the show-room, it has already caused 30,000 pounds of carbon-dioxide emission. The equivalent amount for manufacturing a conventional car is 14,000 pounds.

Once on the road, the carbon dioxide emissions of EVs depends on the power-generation fuel used to recharge its battery. If it comes mostly from coal-fired power plants, it will lead to about 15 ounces of carbon-dioxide for every mile it is driven—three ounces more than a similar gasoline-powered car. Even without reference to the source of electricity used for battery charging, if an EV is driven 50,000 miles over its lifetime, the huge initial emissions from its manufacture means the EV will actually have put more carbon-dioxide in the atmosphere than a similar-size gasoline-powered car driven the same number of miles. Even if the EV is driven for 90,000 miles and the battery is charged by cleaner natural-gas fueled power stations, it will cause just 24% less carbon-dioxide emission than a gasoline-powered car. As the skeptical environmentalist [Bjorn Lomborg](#) puts it, "This is a far cry from 'zero emissions'".

As most ordinary people mindful of keeping within modest budgets choose affordable gasoline or diesel-powered cars, experts and policy advisors the world over have felt compelled to tilt the playing field in favor of EVs. EV subsidies are regressive: given their high upfront cost, EVs are only affordable for high-income households. It is egregious that EV subsidies are funded by the average tax-payer so that the rich can buy their EVs at subsidized prices.

The determination not to know or to look away when the facts assail our beliefs is an enduring frailty of human nature. The [tendency towards group think and confirmation bias](#), and the will to affirm the “scientific consensus” and marginalize sceptics, are rife in considerations by the so-called experts committed to advocating their favorite cause. In the case of EVs, the dirty secrets of “clean energy” should seem apparent to all but, alas, there are none so blind as those who will not see.

So these politicians are lying and covering up safety defects and corruption in order to protect their business partner Elon Musk. Musk puts money in their pockets.

It is even worse than that!

 [Capital Corruption](#)

Brianne Burr, says that politicians break the very same laws they create. Federal officials recently found three California senators to be corrupt.

While no state or country is completely immune from corruption, some are worse than others. The state of California, for example, has seen significant government corruption in recent times. This corruption can drastically affect the lives of its leaders, but more importantly, citizens are impacted directly.

Three state senators in California have been found to be corrupt by federal officials. These state senators were suspended from attending sessions of the California State senate. And while their

corrupt voices are banned, the people they represent have no voice at all.

Sadly, this is only true of those who are caught. Former mayors and current city officials have been arrested for political corruption, and still the problem remains. There are governmental structures in place that enable and indeed, encourage corruption in our public officials. And because of it, far more engage in corruption without getting caught and punished.

How Much California Corruption Should We Tolerate?

In an article published in City Watch LA, Clinton Galloway asks us, "How much should we tolerate?" He indicates that if the same ratio of corruption were to exist in the city of Los Angeles, roughly 50K would be felons and 100K would be federally indicted for major crimes.

"While we will not tolerate anarchy in the streets, we will tolerate it in our legislative bodies," he says.

Galloway's poignant question alludes to a greater problem than corruption in our government. Yes, there is structure in place that fosters corruption and fails to dissuade it. But the people allow these things to happen. We do not do much to call corruption, generally speaking, but simply voice our distrust our government.

One final question posed by Galloway asks us, what does law even mean if we do not have integrity to uphold it? We see politicians creating laws and breaking them. We see politicians make oaths to uphold the law, and yet they behave as though they are above the law.

And what of those public officials who strive to honestly and judiciously govern? Each day, their numbers seem to diminish as corruption spreads to more of our governmental bodies. The FBI must overtly arrest each of these crooks and do it sooner than later!