



Party Hardy: How Amazon 'Sells' Ring Cameras To Police Departments

Jeff Bezos is the richest Technocrat in the world, and he is absolutely intent on creating the ultimate surveillance state by partnering civilians with police departments. Sales tactics include free booze, food and Ring cameras.

What drives Bezos to create a snitch culture? It is in perfect harmony with Technocracy, which requires total surveillance, constant monitoring and ubiquitous command-and-control. If left unchecked, Bezos would turn the whole world into an experience like an Amazon warehouse. □

TN Editor

Amazon's surveillance company has seeped into hundreds of American communities by throwing parties for police and giving them free devices.

Ring likes to throw bangers for police.

Here's what you'll find at a Ring party: Open bar. Free food. Live music. A "special recognition ceremony." Free Ring doorbells. A live viewing of *Shark Tank*, the show that launched what would become Ring and to which company founder Jamie Siminoff eventually returned as a shark. And, most importantly, an appearance from retired basketball player Shaquille O'Neal.

You could find all this at a private party that Ring hosted for police at the 2018 International Association of Chiefs of Police conference in Orlando. Ring threw a similar party on IACP weekend this year, this time in Chicago, including appearances by both Shaq and Siminoff, according to an event invitation obtained by Motherboard using a freedom of information request. The invitation notes that firearms are strictly prohibited.

Ring—a company that has hosted at least one company party where employees wore "FUCK CRIME" shirts and racist costumes of Native and indigenous Americans, according to new images reviewed by Motherboard—wants to brand itself a friend of police, the antidote to fear of crime, and a proponent of law and order.

Events like these seem to have a positive effect. Emails after the 2018 Ring party show, for example, that senior police leadership were enticed by the idea of free stuff.

"The Deputy and the Chief signed up to go to the party with Shaq," a Haverhill, MA police officer told a Ring representative in an email. "But I guess the lines were really long and so the Deputy got an email for a free Ring Doorbell, only the Chief did not get his, was wondering if you know of why only one did and not the other?"

"Regarding the free doorbell, to get the email you had to have RSVPd for the event," the Ring representative said. "What does the chief want. I'll send it."

Ring's efforts to woo police aren't limited to lavish parties. The company offers police officers \$50 off Ring products if their department partners with Ring; those from departments that don't partner with Ring [can get discounts, too](#).

If Ring can sell an inviting brand image, police are more likely to trust the company. That trust is a crucial foundation for its partnerships with police, which have quietly proliferated since 2016, usually without public input.

[Ring has over 600 partnerships with law enforcement agencies](#) around the country, and this number is increasing daily. The company has spent the past three years systematically making sure police everywhere know and recognize Ring, quietly building a nationwide surveillance network through police partnerships, and embedding itself into the functions of law enforcement. This network of police partnerships isn't only unusual because of its size and scope. Behind the scenes, Ring is experimenting with emerging technologies, as well as pursuing a partnership with at least one other private surveillance company.

The number of Ring partnerships with police grows almost daily, and, to date, there has been limited public debate about whether these partnerships should exist in the first place. Unless lawmakers curb or regulate the expansion of these partnerships, what we are seeing now is just a minuscule version of this company's full potential.

The Surveillance State Gets an Update

Motherboard has examined tens of thousands of pages of documents obtained via public-records requests from more than 90 cities that have partnered with Ring. They describe the typical relationship as a simple transaction: police get a portal where they can request footage from Ring's network of private surveillance cameras, and the company gets the promotional muscle of the police.

In order to entice police departments into partnering with the company, Ring often tells the police the number of Ring camera owners and Neighbors app users in their jurisdiction. Sometimes, [the company provides "active camera" maps](#) showing where camera owners live.

Ring also offers police access to the Law Enforcement Neighborhood Portal, an interactive map that allows police to request camera footage directly from camera owners. (Until July, their [approximate location was](#)


[shown](#).) These owners can choose to share some, all, or none of their footage with police; police do not need a warrant in order to request camera footage from residents. The portal also includes a case management tool, in which videos associated with an investigation are sorted into groups based on case number.

If someone refuses to provide footage to police, all police need to do is reach out to Ring. According to a memo obtained from the police department of Pomona, CA, when camera owners are “uncooperative or unavailable,” officers are instructed to contact Ring and request that the captured video be preserved.

In exchange for all of this, police have to promote Ring. Some partnerships, [like those in Lakeland, FL and Anne Arundel County, MD](#), explicitly require police to “encourage adoption” of Ring cameras and Ring’s free app, Neighbors. (Ring has told police that the more people download Neighbors, the more the Law Enforcement Neighborhoods Portal “grows in value.”)

These cities receive up to 40 “seed cameras,” free Ring devices they can raffle off or give away to city residents. When police share a download link to Neighbors, they can receive even more free cameras. (Ring representatives have encouraged police to post on social media often in order to “drive downloads to your unique link,” and receive free Ring cameras as a “reward.”)

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



Scientists Cite ‘Unintended Mutations’ In Chinese GMO Baby

In 2018, He Jiankui created a storm of protest when he used CRISPR technology to produce HIV resistance twins. Now it appears that he not only failed, but created unwanted mutations. Other geneticists are calling him a fraud, an idiot, or both. □ TN Editor

The gene editing performed on Chinese twins to immunise them against HIV may have failed and created unintended mutations, scientists have said after the original research was made public for the first time.

Excerpts from the manuscript were [released by the MIT Technology Review](#) to show how Chinese biophysicist He Jiankui ignored ethical and scientific norms in creating the twins Lula and Nana, whose birth in late 2018 [sent shockwaves through the scientific world](#).

He made expansive claims of a medical breakthrough that could “control the HIV epidemic”, but it was not clear whether it had even been

successful in its intended purpose - immunising the babies against the virus - because the team did not in fact reproduce the gene mutation that confers this resistance.

A small percentage of people are born with immunity because of a mutation in a gene called CCR5 and it was this gene that He had claimed to have targeted using a powerful editing tool known as Crispr which has revolutionised the field since 2012.

Fyodor Urnov, a genome-editing scientist at the University of California, Berkeley told the MIT Technology Review: “The claim they have reproduced the prevalent CCR5 variant is a blatant misrepresentation of the actual data and can only be described by one term: a deliberate falsehood.

“The study shows that the research team instead failed to reproduce the prevalent CCR5 variant.”

While the team targeted the right gene, they did not replicate the “Delta 32” variation required, instead creating novel edits whose effects are not clear.

Moreover, [Crispr remains an imperfect tool](#) because it can lead to unwanted or “off-target” edits, making its use in humans hugely controversial. Here, the researchers claimed to have searched for such effects in the early-stage embryos and found just one - however it would be impossible to carry out a comprehensive search without inspecting each of the embryo’s cells, and thus destroying it.

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



Professor: UN Might Use Military To Enforce Climate Agenda

Speaking of the 2011 Greece crisis, this professor says, “There were decisions that were made for them and then they just had to have a more or less technocratic government and get it through.” Now, the United Nations is in the same predicament with nations not adopting its bogus climate change agenda. This gives expression to Al Gore’s statement ‘deniers deserve to be punished.’ □ TN Editor

Action to address climate change has been left so late that any political response will likely become an international security issue — and could threaten democracy.

That’s the view of Ole Wæver, a prominent international relations professor at the University of Copenhagen, who also says climate inaction could lead to armed conflict.

“At some point this whole climate debate is going to tip over,” he [tells](#)

[RN's Late Night Live.](#)

“The current way we talk about climate is one side and the other side. One side is those who want to do something, and the other is the deniers who say we shouldn't do anything.”

He believes that quite soon, another battle will replace it. Then, politicians that do ‘something’ will be challenged by critics demanding that policies actually add up to realistic solutions.

When decision-makers — after delaying for so long — suddenly try to find a shortcut to realistic action, climate change is likely to “be securitised”.

Professor Wæver, who first coined the term “securitisation”, says more abrupt change could potentially threaten democracy.

“The United Nations Security Council could, in principle, tomorrow decide that climate change is a threat to international peace and security,” he says.

“And then it's within their competencies to decide ‘and you are doing this, you are doing this, you are doing this, this is how we deal with it’.”

A risk of armed conflict?

Professor Wæver says despite “overwhelmingly good arguments” as to why action should be taken on climate change, not enough has been done.

And he says that could eventually lead to a greater risk of armed conflict, particularly in unstable political climates.

“Imagine these kinds of fires that we are seeing happening [in Australia] in a part of Africa or South-East Asia where you have groups that are already in a tense relationship, with different ethnic groups, different religious orientations,” he says.

“And then you get events like this and suddenly they are not out of each other's way, they'll be crossing paths, and then you get military conflicts

by the push.”

He isn't the first expert to warn of the security risks of climate change.

Chris Barrie, former Defence Force chief and honorary professor at the ANU's Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, [wrote](#) in October that “climate change is a threat multiplier”.

“It exacerbates the drivers of conflict by deepening existing fragilities within societies, straining weak institutions, reshaping power balances and undermining post-conflict recovery and peacebuilding,” he wrote.

And current Defence chief Angus Campbell has [warned](#) that increased incidences of climate change-related natural disasters could stretch the capability of the ADF.

Letting ‘the dark forces’ loose

Professor Wæver argues that delayed action will lead to more drastic measures.

“The longer we wait, the more abrupt the change has to be,” he says.

“So a transformation of our economy and our energy systems that might have been less painful if we had started 20 years ago, 30 years ago.

“If we have to do that in a very short time, it becomes extremely painful.”

He says classifying climate change as a security issue could justify more extreme policy responses.

“That's what happens when something becomes a security issue, it gets the urgency, the intensity, the priority, which is helpful sometimes, but it also lets the dark forces loose in the sense that it can justify problematic means,” he says.

This urgency, he says, could lead to more abrupt action at an international level.

“If there was something that was decided internationally by some more

centralised procedure and every country was told 'this is your emission target, it's not negotiable, we can actually take military measures if you don't fulfil it', then you would basically have to get that down the throat of your population, whether they like it or not," he says.

"A bit like what we saw in southern Europe with countries like Greece and the debt crisis and so on.

"There were decisions that were made for them and then they just had to have a more or less technocratic government and get it through."

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