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**Profiling: The New Department of Pre-Crime**

The case of Esteban Santiago, the 26-year-old shooter in the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport massacre, gets stranger by the minute. Everything I am about to tell you is hindsight. It still may not be 20/20, but you should be getting the message now after 8 years of this type of attack in America. What has become clear is that the Dept of Justice has been directed at the highest and most powerful levels to stand down, when it comes to profiling Jihadists. What you are about to hear, may be worse than that. It may be the crafting of a Jihadist by our own government. Let’s review the facts, and then we will discuss it.

Esteban flew from Alaska without checking any bags, other than the hard gun case he collected in baggage claim and opened to kill five people while wounding six others. Now, I have wanted to take my gun with me on a trip, but I would have unloaded it, carried no ammo, and put it into my luggage with my other things. You know. Like I might shave and brush my teeth and change underwear before I decide to shoot someone.

He had a history that would have made him ineligible to own a gun on nearly every State. He was already being prosecuted for attacking his girlfriend and attempting to strangle her. He even broke the terms of his release on that charge by entering her home again. But he was allowed to keep his gun.

How many of you have been interviewed by the FBI? No one, right? Well, the FBI interviewed him in November after his employer in Alaska expressed concerns about things he was saying at work. He was doing his Jihadist ranting at work. I am engineering support for a plant with perhaps 95% non-white employees. They work hard and they do an excellent job. I am sure many of them are Muslim. They never, and I mean never talk about religion of politics at work. Esteban did. He reportedly told the FBI during that interview he was being forced by the CIA to fight for ISIS. While being evaluated, the FBI took his gun. But they released him and gave it back after a psychiatric investigation that called for no followup and no medication. We cannot verify whether anyone at the FBI even called the good folks down at Wars-R-Us, CIA, and asked them if they even knew Esteban.

He registered on MySpace under the name “Aashiq Hammad” and recorded Islamic religious music on the site three years before he ever deployed to Iraq. Yes. He was accepted for enlistment, and he served in Iraq for the Army Reserves and the Alaska National Guard but was discharged for “unsatisfactory performance.” This means he did not follow orders. He was insubordinate, or he was unfit for service. It could also mean he resisted the training they were putting his through. He looked Jihadi. He spoke Jihadi. He would have made a great agent, if they could just make him. By the way, being *made* means you kill your first victim in the name of the gang leader.

In 2007 he was posting on an explosives and weapons forum about mass-downloading Islamic terrorist propaganda videos. He also downloaded three songs – one of them titled “La ilaha illAllah,” which is Arabic for “There is no God but Allah” – the first half of the Muslim declaration of faith, the Shahadah. “Like a month ago, it was like he lost his mind,” Maria Luisa Ruiz of New Jersey told the Bergen Record newspaper. “He said he saw things.”

He lived within walking distance of Alaska’s only mosque. I am sure they welcomed him with open and warm arms. Was the FBI watching? No. Was the CIA watching? You bet your ass.

Investigators say he was planning the attack for some time – selling his possessions, including his car, and posting comments that, authorities say, indicate an extended period of preparation.

His family was pleading for help – warning of his instability, and friends in Alaska have told investigators that his behavior had grown erratic. His brother blames the FBI for letting him slip through their fingers. It means they were ordered not to profile him. Hands off.

As a result of these Department of Justice orders, once again, Santiago AKA Asshiq Hammad, was able to kill five and injure 6 in a shooting attack at the Florida airport Friday after all those “warning shots.”

Santiago emptied three magazines from his pistol, and then police ordered him to sit down, which he did. Police never fired a shot.

He was born in New Jersey, he lived in Alaska. The facts show he took Delta flight 1088 from Anchorage to Minneapolis-St. Paul Thursday night. He landed Friday morning, and then took Delta flight No. 2182 from Minneapolis-St. Paul to Fort Lauderdale.

He had checked his gun, picked it up at baggage claim, then went into the bathroom and loaded it. He came out and started shooting in Terminal 2.

Florida Gov. Rick Scott held a Friday press conference and said he’d been in contact with President-elect Donald Trump and Vice President-elect Mike Pence, keeping both of them updated on the incident. He said he had not been in contact with President Obama. He knew better. Obama would immediately have applied assets to “fix” the situation. The question on everyone’s mind is this.

Why did he plan those flights? He could have gone anywhere in the world. He could have gone to LA much easier and cheaper than Florida. He could have gone to New York, or Tulsa. Why did he pick those flights? Who was on that flight with him that the CIA might want to have killed? Why those victims? Or was there just one victim, and the rest were just cover shots, smeared across the crime scene with the appearance of his insanity?

The reason I bring up this event first, tonight, is because this is the final full week of Obama’s reign of blood and terror. Oh, things are going to change. You can take that to the bank. Jeff Sessions is the exact opposite of Miss Step-and-Fetch, along with the slimiest lawyer in the country, Jeh Johnson. They are openly and provocatively targeting white, home-grown terrorists who love the Constitution or fly an American flag. They have directed the entire law enforcement community to leave the porch light off and the door ajar for Jihadists like Asshiq Hammad to slip in and kill Americans when they are unarmed and think they’re safe.

Are you ready for the change? Really? We know what they look like. We know what they sounds like. We know where they go to get their religious training. The signs are always the same, days, weeks, and even years ahead of these attacks. You can say what you want about America’s penal system, but statistics show that 95% of crime is done by the same people over and over again. We separate them from society, to keep society safe. Our laws allow them to be freed after they serve their time, but 90% of the time they commit more terrible crimes as soon as they can. We know what they look like. We know what they sound like. We know where they go to get their training. Get ready for the office of pre-crime to open for business. Get ready for profiling. Oh, and I bet there are some changes down at Wars-R-Us as well.

**Assange Receives Award for Peace**

Mr. Julian Assange was given the Sydney Peace Medal at a ceremony at the Frontline Club in central London today.

The Sydney Peace Foundation said that it was making the award to recognise Mr in recognition of the need “for greater transparency and accountability of governments”.

Professor Stuart Rees, director of the foundation, said: “By challenging centuries old practices of government secrecy and by championing people’s right to know, WikiLeaks and Julian Assange have created the potential for a new order in journalism and in the free flow of information.”

Speaking at the event, Mr Assange referred to whistleblowers as "heroes" and said it appeared the website had played a "significant role" in the recent Arab uprisings in north Africa by releasing US diplomatic cables in December that were later translated into Arabic and French.

He said WikiLeaks was part of England's historic "free speech traditions, these go back in the UK to the time of the English Civil War of the 1640s". He said: “The real value of this award, and the Sydney Peace Foundation is that it makes explicit the link between peace and justice.

**The Truth Behind the Employment Stats**

Barack Obama's presidency began with a record number of Americans not in the labor force, and it's ending the same way.

The final jobs report of the Obama presidency, released Friday, shows that the number of Americans not in the labor force has increased by 14,573,000 (18.09 percent) since January 2009, when Obama took office, continuing a long-term trend that began well before Obama was sworn in.

In December, according to the Labor Department’s Bureau of Labor Statistics, a record 95,102,000 Americans were not in the labor force, 47,000 more than in November; and the labor force participation rate was 62.7 percent, a tenth of a point higher than in November.

The participation rate dropped to a 38-year low of 62.4 percent on Obama's watch, in September 2015. It was only 3-tenths of a point higher than that last month.

People over age 16 who are no longer working or even looking for work, for whatever reason (retirement, school, personal preference, or gave up), are counted as not participating in the labor force.

When President Obama took office in January 2009, 80,529,000 Americans were not in the labor force, the highest number on record. That number rose steadily during his two terms, reaching a record 95,055,000 in November 2016, then setting another record (95,102,000) in December.

BLS said the December unemployment rate increased a tenth of a point to 4.7 percent, well below the Obama-era high of 10 percent. Last month, a record 152,111,000 Americans were counted as employed, up 63,000 from November; and the number of unemployed stood at 7,529,000, an increase of 120,000 from the prior month.

But people who stop looking for a job are no longer counted as unemployed.

In an interview with a Chicago reporter yesterday, Obama said he has done "an enormous amount" to create greater economic opportunity for Americans.

"I took an economy that was about to go into a Great Depression, and we've now had a little over six years of straight economic job growth, an unemployment rate that's down below 5 percent, and incomes that have gone up and poverty that has gone down."

Obama also conceded that "there are still folks out there who struggle and communities that are still depressed." He called it an "ongoing battle."

"We have to continue to work to make sure that kids are getting the best education they can, that jobs are being located so that people in need can access them, and that's going to be something that I suspect we'll all be working on, and folks will still be working on after I'm gone."

During Obama’s two terms in office, the number of employed Americans reached its lowest point – 138,013,000 – in December 2009. Eight years later, in December 2017, 14,098,000 Americans have been added to the employment rolls.

The government collects payroll taxes from Americans who work, and some of that money is spent on government programs that support people who do not work. So the more who work, the better for the economy.

In December, the nation’s civilian noninstitutionalized population, consisting of all people age 16 or older who were not in the military or an institution, reached 254,742,000.  Of those, 152,111,000 participated in the labor force by either holding a job or actively seeking one.

The 152,111,000 who participated in the labor force equaled 67.3 percent of the 254,742,000 civilian noninstitutionalized population.

According to BLS, total nonfarm payroll employment rose by a lackluster 156,000 in December. Over the past 3 months, job gains have averaged 165,000 per month.

Among the major worker groups, the unemployment rates for adult men (4.4 percent), adult women (4.3 percent), teenagers (14.7 percent), Whites (4.3 percent), Blacks (7.8 percent), Asians (2.6 percent), and Hispanics (5.9 percent) showed little change in December.

The number of long-term unemployed (those jobless for 27 weeks or more) was essentially unchanged at 1.8 million in December and accounted for 24.2 percent of the unemployed. In 2016, the number of long-term unemployed declined by 263,000

**Another Brick in the Wall**

House Republicans and Donald Trump's team are coalescing around a multi-billion dollar plan to make good on the president-elect's campaign vows to build a wall between the United States and Mexico, according to top Republican lawmakers and aides.

Republican leaders, in tandem with Trump’s transition staff, are considering using a 2006 law signed by former President George W. Bush that authorized the construction of 700 miles-plus of “physical barrier” on the southern border. The law was never fully implemented and did not include a sunset provision, allowing Trump to pick up where Bush left off — with the help of new money from Congress.

Yet the plan could potentially provoke a showdown with Democrats over government funding. Republicans are considering whether to tuck the border wall funding into a must-pass spending bill that must be enacted by the end of April. GOP lawmakers and aides believe they could win a public relations war over the matter by daring Democrats — particularly vulnerable red-state senators up for reelection next year — to shutter the government over one of Trump’s most popular campaign pledges.

Bolstering their cause is a long list of Senate Democrats who voted for the border measure a decade ago, including Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) — making it harder for Democrats to say no now, Republicans believe.

“There’s already in existing law the authorization for hundreds of miles of build out on the southern border … so, one important step in the right direction will be funding the existing law and beginning the building out of hundreds of miles of wall, or fence, on the southern border,” said House Republican Policy Committee Chairman Luke Messer (Ind.).

The Indiana Republican added: “If tied to the rest of government funding, it’s much harder for the Democrats to stop, and by the way, I think it’s much harder for Democrats to vote against it if what you’re doing is authorizing funding for an existing law.”

The plan appeared to be an implicit acknowledgment by Republicans and the incoming administration that Mexico will not pay for the border wall. But in a tweet Friday morning, Trump denied that, saying he still plans to force Mexico to pick up the tab on the back end.

ADVERTISING
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"The dishonest media does not report that any money spent on building the Great Wall (for sake of speed), will be paid back by Mexico later!" he tweeted just after 6 a.m.

The tentative plan would likely be just a piece of a broader, multiyear border security strategy, which Capitol Hill Republicans are still hashing out. They’re already framing the spring cash infusion — which could total hundreds of millions, or perhaps billions, of dollars — as a “down payment” on Trump’s “build-the-wall” platform. That pledge vaulted the New Yorker from afterthought to front-runner in last year’s crowded GOP presidential primary.

Multiple Republican sources said the House will also likely pass a border-security package sometime later in the spring or summer. The plan could meld new provisions to older bills passed by the House and the Homeland Security Committee in 2014 and 2015, respectively.

The cost of a border wall is potentially enormous, with estimates ranging from a few billion dollars to $14 billion. And that’s just for constructing the wall or fence; it does not include a range of other expenses, from maintenance to border patrol agents to purchasing private property from Texas landowners.

Still, House Republicans feel they need to give Trump the tools he needs to carry out his wall promise as quickly as possible. The proposal under discussion could offer a way to produce legislation within his first 100 days in office.

“I think the sooner Republicans can get it done the better because [Trump] made such an issue out of it,” said Rep. Peter King (R-N.Y.), the former chairman of the Homeland Security Committee who offered the 2006 bill currently under consideration.

The 2006 Secure Fence Act, included as part of a broader immigration reform package, originally called for 850 miles of double fencing along the nearly 2,000-mile southern border. Lawmakers amended the law in 2008 to reduce the length to a minimum of 700 miles, a change that also gave the secretary of Homeland Security discretion over what kind of “physical barrier” to construct.

Ultimately, only 36 miles of double-layer fencing was erected. U.S. Customs and Border Protection built roughly 350 miles of single-layer pedestrian fences, most which stand about 18 feet, and 300 miles of low-level vehicle barriers that any person could easily walk through, according to sources following the matter.

Facing heavy complains from the Mexican government and immigrant groups, the Bush and Obama administrations pushed for a "virtual fence" on much of the border area using towers and surveillance sensors to provide security. They argued that it was a much more cost-effective approach for the physically challenging terrain. More than $3 billion was spent on the project over time. Homeland Security froze the "virtual fence" project in 2010.

Because the 2006 law included a floor on fencing miles, not a ceiling, and since it also allows the Department of Homeland Security to determine what kinds of structures to build, Capitol Hill Republicans believe Trump already has all the authority he needs to start construction of a wall.

All they have to do is fund it.

One of their biggest challenges in doing so will be Senate Democrats. To clear the upper chamber's 60-vote legislative threshold, Republicans will need eight Democrats to back the measure.

GOP insiders plan to pressure Democrats who voted for the original law to get in line with their plan. Schumer and Democratic Sens. Dianne Feinstein of California, Debbie Stabenow of Michigan, Ron Wyden of Oregon and Tom Carper of Delaware all voted for the legislation a decade ago. So, too, did then-Sens. Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton.

But the dynamics on immigration and border security have shifted dramatically since then. Democrats nowadays want comprehensive immigration reform to accompany any fortifications of the border. That sweeping approach would include a pathway to citizenship, which is extremely unlikely to happen under Trump.

It’s one of the reasons Republicans may slip the funding into must-pass spending legislation. The government is currently operating on a stopgap “continuing resolution,” which expires at the end of April, so they'll have to fund the government for the rest of the year by then.

Other wall funding vehicles being considered include the 2018 appropriations bill for Homeland Security and a standalone legislative package. There are legislative hurdles to both those approaches as well.

Republicans could also run into roadblocks within their own party. For one, the price tag could be a major issue with the far right. A new, yet-to-be-released Government Accountability Office study estimates the cost of a single layer fence at $6.5 million per mile, or $10.4 million per mile for a double-layer fence.

Insiders say Customs and Border Protection, at the request of the incoming Trump administration, has identified about 400 miles on the U.S.-Mexico border where structures could be erected or need to be fortified. Should Trump line that with double-layer fencing, for example, the cost would be about $4.2 billion.

Conservatives are bound to demand any such cost be offset, another potential hurdle. Republicans could also face an uphill battle with Republicans from border towns, whose constituents would likely grumble at construction projects running through their backyards. There are also eminent domain wrinkles to iron out, as the government will have to purchase land from Texans to construct the project.

**Federal Concerns over Asteroids**

Earth could be at higher risk of being hit by a comet than widely thought, according to astronomers who have suggested keeping a closer eye on distant objects.

Most studies of potential hazards involved objects in the asteroid belt roughly between Mars and Jupiter, the researchers said. But they noted that the discovery in the last two decades of hundreds of giant comets dubbed “centaurs” requires expanding the list of potential hazards.

**The Global Telescope Network**

The number of discovered near-Earth asteroids (NEAs) now tops 15,000, with an average of 30 new discoveries added each week. This milestone marks a 50 percent increase in the number of known NEAs since 2013, when discoveries reached 10,000 in August of that year.

Surveys funded by NASA's [Near Earth Object (NEO) Observations Program](http://neo.jpl.nasa.gov/) (NEOs include both asteroids and comets) account for more than 95 percent of discoveries so far.

The 15,000th near-Earth asteroid is designated 2016 TB57. It was discovered on Oct. 13 by observers at the Mount Lemmon Survey, an element of the NASA-funded [Catalina Sky Survey](http://www.lpl.arizona.edu/css/) in Tucson, Arizona. 2016 TB57 is a rather small asteroid -- about 50 to 115 feet (16 to 36 meters) in size -- that will come closest to Earth on Oct. 31 at just beyond five times the distance of the moon. It will safely pass Earth.

A near-Earth asteroid is defined as one whose orbit periodically brings it within approximately 1.3 times Earth's average distance to the sun -- that is within 121 million miles (195 million kilometers) -- of the sun (Earth's average distance to the sun is about 93 million miles, or 150 million kilometers). This distance also then brings the asteroid within roughly 30 million miles (50 million kilometers) of Earth's orbit. Observers have already discovered more than 90 percent of the estimated population of the large NEOs -- those larger than 0.6 miles (one kilometer).

"The rising rate of discovery is due to dedicated NEO surveys and upgraded telescopes coming online in recent years," said NASA's NEO Observations Program Manager Kelly Fast.  "But while we're making great progress, we still have a long way to go." It is estimated by astronomers that only about 27 percent of the NEAs that are 460 feet (140 meters) and larger have been found to date.  Congress directed NASA to find over 90 percent of objects this size and larger by the end of 2020.

Currently, two NASA-funded NEO surveys -- the Catalina Sky Survey and the [Panoramic Survey Telescope & Rapid Response System (Pan-STARRS)](http://pan-starrs.ifa.hawaii.edu/public/) in Hawaii -- account for about 90 percent of [new NEO discoveries](http://neo.jpl.nasa.gov/stats/). Both projects upgraded their telescopes in 2015, improving their discovery rates.

A recent upgrade to one of the Catalina Sky Survey's telescopes resulted in a tripling of its average monthly NEO discovery rate. When the Pan-STARRS system increased the observing time it devoted to NEO searching to 90 percent, it increased its rate of discovery by a factor of three. Pan-STARRS also will add a second telescope to the hunt this fall. As more capable telescopes are deployed, the overall NEO survey effort will be able to find more objects as small as and smaller than 140 meters (460 feet).

The NEO Observations Program is a primary element of NASA's [Planetary Defense Coordination Office,](https://www.nasa.gov/planetarydefense) which is responsible for finding, tracking and characterizing potentially hazardous NEOs, issuing warnings about possible impacts, and coordinating U.S. government planning for response to an actual impact threat.

"While no known NEO currently poses a risk of impact with Earth over the next 100 years," says NASA Planetary Defense Officer Lindley Johnson, "we've found mostly the larger asteroids, and we have a lot more of the smaller but still potentially hazardous ones to find."

**The Great Star Incursion**

Researchers have known for a while that [a star called Gliese 710](http://www.solstation.com/stars2/gl710.htm) is headed straight for our solar system, but they've now worked out precisely when it should arrive.

The star is currently hurtling through space at about 32,000 mph, and is around 64 lightyears away. (One lightyear is around 5,878,000,000,000 miles.)

Gliese 710 is about half the size of our sun, and it is set to reach Earth in 1.35 million years, according to a paper published in the journal Astronomy & Astrophysics in November.

And when it arrives, the star could end up a mere 77 light-days away from Earth — one light-day being the equivalent of how far light travels in one day, which is about 26 billion kilometers, the researchers [worked out.](http://www.aanda.org/articles/aa/abs/2016/11/aa29835-16/aa29835-16.html)

As far as we know, Gliese 710 isn't set to collide directly with Earth, but it wil be passing through the Oort Cloud, a shell of trillions of icy objects at the furthest reaches of our solar system.

So although 77 light-days sounds like a relatively safe distance, the speeding star could burst through the cloud and shoot these icy objects and comets all around our solar system. Any one of these is pretty likely to collide with Earth.

The Oort Cloud around our solar system. [Jedimaster / Wikimedia Commons](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3AF_oort_cloud.jpg)

"Gliese 710 will trigger an observable cometary shower with a mean density of approximately ten comets per year, lasting for three to 4 million years," wrote the authors.

The team, who hails from Adam Mickiewicz University in Poland, used measurements from the European Space Agency's Gaia space observatory.

This new observatory is constructing the largest and most precise 3D space catalog ever made, totalling approximately 1 billion astronomical objects, which means the data are ten times more accurate than previous predictions.

There's still an error rate of around 50% though, which means Gliese 710 could actually scrape past at a mere 40 light-days away.

Some scientists [speculate that a similar event](http://www.americanscientist.org/issues/pub/perturbing-the-oort-cloud) of a star passing through the Oort cloud triggered the asteroid that wiped out the dinosaurs around 65 million years ago.

However, the Gliese 710 event could make the dinosaur extinction look relatively minor. At its closest distance, it will be the brightest and fastest observable object in the sky, and as the authors say in the paper, it will be the "strongest disrupting encounter in the future and history of the solar system."

But it's also not the only galactic body to worry about. [There are as many as 14 other stars](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.3648) that could come within a 3 light-year distance to us any time over the next few million years.

**Currency Update: The Bitcoin**

The cryptocurrency bitcoin could triple in value this year thanks to US President-elect Donald Trump’s “spending binge,” according to a report from Saxo Bank which said the value of bitcoin could hit over $2,100.

Read more

[Bitcoin set for best week since June on strong Chinese demand](https://www.rt.com/business/364562-bitcoin-biggest-weekly-rise/)

The bank’s annual report “Outrageous Predictions for 2017” was published in December. It stated the expected increase in fiscal spending by Trump’s administration would cause “US growth and inflation to skyrocket, forcing the Federal Reserve to accelerate its hikes and the US dollar to hit the moon.”

The dollar would be an attractive currency for foreign investors. That will create a “domino effect in emerging markets and China, in particular, leading people globally to look for alternative forms of currencies and payment systems not tied to central banks,” said chief economist at Saxo Bank Steen Jakobsen.

He added that bitcoin as the largest cryptocurrency would benefit from that chaos. “We could see bitcoin easily triple over the next year going from the current level to $2,100,” Jakobsen said.

Bitcoin was trading at around $900 in the first week of January, up from $400 at the start of 2016.

The digital currency’s price would rise partly due to Chinese investors seeking higher returns. China accounts for about 90 percent of all bitcoin trading on exchanges. The country has strict capital controls, which makes it difficult for the Chinese to convert the yuan into foreign currency, and limits the amount of cash investors can move abroad.

Some analysts echo Saxo Bank’s prediction, saying the price of bitcoin will continue to rise as more devaluations are expected from the Chinese government.

The slower appreciation of the US dollar against the Chinese yuan in comparison to bitcoin against the greenback shows that Saxo Bank’s $2,000 forecast is not unrealistic, they add.

Danish Saxo Bank’s annual roundup of ‘outrageous predictions’ is a collection of speculations that, according to the bank, represent more of a fringe outlook than anything official

**NATO: The Marketing Plan for War**

Hundreds of American tanks, trucks and other military equipment have arrived at the German port of Bremerhaven to be transferred to Eastern Europe as part of NATO’s buildup near Russia’s borders.

**Trends**[Russia-NATO relations](https://www.rt.com/trends/russia-nato-relations/)

The Resolve cargo ship arrived on Wednesday, while two more vessels – Freedom and Endurance – are expected in Germany on Sunday, Deutsche Welle reported. The unloading of the ships began on Friday, with the heavy equipment to be transported to Poland via rail and road.

While the Lithuanian Defense Ministry said it could not share the details about the US Special Operations Forces in the country, including their numbers and activities, Galdikaite confirmed the presence of US troops on Lithuanian soil.

“US Special Operations Forces presence in Lithuania is one of the deterrents” against Russia, and is another sign of the “long-term close cooperation with the US forces,” Galdikaite [said](http://lietuvosdiena.lrytas.lt/aktualijos/patvirtino-del-rusijos-gresmes-lietuvoje-dislokuoti-jav-spec-operaciju-pajegu-kariai.htm?utm_source=lrExtraLinks&utm_campaign=Copy&utm_medium=Copy).

The spokeswoman added that the US troops arrived to train local forces following an invitation from Vilnius. Galdikaite added that the US contingent is to remain as the long as the security situation in the region requires it.

The US Embassy in Vilnius also refused to comment on the specifics of US special forces deployment.

“The United States and the Lithuanian armed forces maintain close cooperation, in the presence of conventional land forces, National Guard units and special operations forces. We cannot comment on specific details of the deployment” Embassy’s spokesperson confirmed to local news.

Meanwhile, former Special Forces commander, Darius Jauniškis [told](http://www.respublika.lt/lt/naujienos/lietuva/lietuvos_politika/vsd_mokymus_rengs_ir_seimo_nariu_padejejams/) lawmakers in Parliament on Tuesday, that “the deployment [US Special Forces] is a tough response to Russia.”

At a meeting with US senators visiting Vilnius last week, Lithuania's President, Dalia Grybauskaite, said the US was a key player in the region.

**NATO: A Defensive Force (yeah right)**

Washington has expressed discomfort over Russia’s deployment of Iskander missiles and air defenses in Kaliningrad, saying that NATO is a “defensive alliance”and is not threatening Moscow. Meanwhile, more tanks and troops are being deployed to the Baltics.

 “NATO is a defensive alliance, it’s always been a defensive alliance, it will remain a defensive alliance,” State Department spokesman John Kirby told reporters on Tuesday. “There is no reason why Russia should view NATO in any way, shape or form as a threat.”

On Sunday, NATO kicked off “Iron Sword 2016” exercises in Lithuania, the largest such maneuvers to date, involving 4,000 troops from across the alliance. The exercises in 2015 and 2014 involved 2,500 and 2,000 troops, respectively.

“There is no reason for anybody in Russia to feel threatened by NATO’s military activities or preparations.” Kirby continued. “In terms of recent months and years, there would have been no reason for NATO to advance and commit additional capabilities on the European continent – including American capabilities – had it not been for Russia’s move in Ukraine.”

This is in line with NATO’s official position that military activities in eastern Europe were a defensive response to alleged Russian “aggression” in Ukraine. NATO said Russia was responsible for “annexing” Crimea from Ukraine. The region voted to join the Russian Federation in March 2014, following the coup that overthrew Ukraine’s elected government.

<

Moscow responded to the recent NATO build-up by announcing it would deploy S-400 air defense systems and “Iskander” missile launchers to Kaliningrad Oblast, a Russian exclave containing almost one million inhabitants sandwiched between Poland and Lithuania.

“Russia is doing all that is necessary to protect itself amid NATO's expansion toward its borders,” Dmitry Peskov, spokesman for President Vladimir Putin, [told](https://www.rt.com/news/367820-russia-rockets-nato-buildup/) reporters at the Kremlin on Tuesday. “The alliance is a truly aggressive bloc, so Russia does what it has to do. It has every sovereign right to take necessary measures throughout the territory of the Russian Federation.”

NATO’s military drill on Russia’s border comes amid preparations to permanently station 4,000 alliance troops in Poland, Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, a decision made at the NATO summit in Warsaw in July.

A quarter of the force would be composed of US troops currently based in Germany, who would relocate to Poland. A 1,000-strong German-led force equipped with tanks would be deployed in Lithuania in February for the first time since WWII. The remaining 2,000 British and Canadian troops would be stationed in Estonia and Latvia.

NATO has accused Russia of “aggressive military posturing” over reports that missiles would be deployed in Kaliningrad, while on Monday Kirby called for Moscow to “refrain from words or deeds that are inconsistent with the goal of promoting security and stability.”

Established in April 1949 – six years before the Warsaw Treaty Organization – NATO ensured a permanent US presence in western Europe during the Cold War. After the dissolution of both the WTO and the Soviet Union, NATO expanded both its boundaries and its mission. On March 12, 1999, the alliance admitted the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary. Twelve days later, NATO attacked Yugoslavia. After a 78-day bombing campaign, alliance troops were allowed occupy the Serbian province of Kosovo as “peacekeepers.”

Bulgaria, Romania and the Baltic states joined the alliance in March 2004, putting NATO on the shores of the Black Sea and on the western border of the Russian Federation. In March 2011, NATO launched an intervention in Libya, aiding the rebels that overthrew the government of Colonel Muammar Gaddafi.

 “Given the changing geopolitical environment, the active role that the United States plays in Europe and the region continues to provide the most reliable security guarantees for the Baltic states and for the whole trans-Atlantic community,” the President's Office said.

Following the Ukrainian coup, the US deployed about 150 troops in each of the three Baltic countries and Poland in April 2014 to fend off the perceived threats from Russia.

The US special forces arrived to Lithuania amid ongoing NATO preparations for the stationing of 4,000 alliance troops in Poland, Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, a decision made at the NATO summit in Warsaw.

A quarter of the force would be composed of US troops currently based in Germany, who would relocate to Poland. A 1,000-strong German-led force equipped with tanks would be deployed in Lithuania in February. The remaining 2,000 British and Canadian troops would be stationed in Estonia and Latvia.

In an earlier response, Moscow criticized NATO for its expansion toward Russian borders and denounced it as “a truly aggressive bloc,” adding that it has “every sovereign right to take necessary measures throughout the territory of the Russian Federation.”

The US plans to deliverer a total of 87 Abrams M1A1 tanks, 20 Paladin artillery vehicles and 136 Bradley fighting vehicles to Eastern Europe, according to Reuters.  Four thousand American troops will reportedly be spread across Poland, the Baltic States, Bulgaria and Romania where they’ll remain on rotation basis.

Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania will host troops from Germany, Canada and the UK, with each nation sending up to 1,000 servicemen.

NATO calls it military buildup near Russia’s borders a defensive measure, claiming it is justified after Moscow’s reunion with Crimea in 2014 and its alleged involvement in the Ukrainian crisis. Russia views the military bloc’s actions aggressive and said the massive military is undermining the security balance on the European continent.

In November 2016, the Pentagon shipped more than 600 containers of ammunition for Army and Air Force units in Europe, according military.com, marking the largest single shipment of US ammunition in more than two decades, the website [reported](http://www.military.com/daily-news/2017/01/06/us-tanks-heavy-equipment-flow-europe-next-week.html).

Moscow has responded by stationing its most modern weaponry and armaments on its western borders, including the enclave region of Kaliningrad, and staging large-scale military drills on its own territory.

Washington opted to speed up the deployment of its troops to Eastern Europe after Donald Trump’s win in the presidential election.

Trump, who is to be inaugurated on January 20, has been calling for improved relations with Russia and has voiced skepticism towards NATO, saying European powers would have to contribute a bigger part of the budget if they wanted to continue relying on US protection.

**Manufacturing down. Federal Jobs up.**

Jobs in manufacturing in the United States increased by 17,000 in December—the first post-election month—climbing from 12,258,000 in November to 12,275,000 in December, according to data released today by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Even so, over all of 2016, manufacturing jobs declined by 45,000--dropping from 12,320,000 in December 2015 to 12,275,000 in December 2016.

At the same time, jobs in federal, state and local government increased not only from November to December, but over the course of the entire year.

From November to December, government jobs climbed from from 22,211,000 to 22,223,000, an increase of 12,000.

From December 2015 to December 2016, government jobs climbed from 22,040,000 to 22,223,000--an increase of 183,000.

Last December, government jobs in the United States outnumbered manufacturing jobs by 9,720,000. This December, government jobs outnumbered manufacturing jobs by 9,948,000.



The BLS has published seasonally-adjusted month-by-month employment data for both government and manufacturing going back to January 1939. According to this data, manufacturing employees in the United States of America outnumbered government employees every month for more than half a century. Then, in August 1989, government employees slipped ahead of manufacturing employees for the first time—taking a slim lead of 17,989,000 to 17,964,000.

Since then, government has pulled dramatically ahead of manufacturing as an employer in the United States.

The 22,223,000 who now work for federal, state or local government in this country, according to the BLS, is more than ever worked in manufacturing.

Manufacturing employment peaked in June 1979 at 19,553,000. Since then, manufacturing employment has declined by 7,278,000—or 37.2 percent—to its current level of 12,275,000.

**The Great Solar Eclipse of 2017**

On Aug. 21, the moon will completely blot out the sun for observers in 12 states, from Oregon to South Carolina, in the first [total solar eclipse](http://www.space.com/15584-solar-eclipses.html) visible from the United States mainland since 1979. The rest of North America, and parts of South America, Africa and Europe, will be treated to a partial eclipse.

Enthusiasm has long been high for the Aug. 21 event, and the excitement will only build in the weeks and months ahead. [[Total Solar Eclipse 2017: When, Where & How to See It (Safely)](http://www.space.com/33797-total-solar-eclipse-2017-guide.html)]

It's "going to be the most observed, most filmed and photographed, most studied and documented, and, probably, the most appreciated of all eclipses in human history," Lika Guhathakurta, lead scientist for the Living With a Star program at NASA Headquarters in Washington, D.C., said last month at the annual fall meeting of the American Geophysical Union (AGU) in San Francisco.

## A special solar eclipse

By a cosmic coincidence, [the sun](http://www.space.com/58-the-sun-formation-facts-and-characteristics.html) is about 400 times wider than the moon but lies 400 times farther from Earth than the rocky satellite does. That means the two objects appear to be the same size in the sky. When they line up just right, the moon blocks the sun's disk entirely, and Earthlings see a total solar eclipse. [[Total Solar Eclipse 2017: Path, Viewing Maps and Photo Guide](http://www.space.com/35080-total-solar-eclipse-2017-path-maps.html)]

This happens somewhere on Earth just once every 18 months or so, though partial solar eclipses — in which the moon takes a bite out of the solar disk — are more common. On average, two to five solar eclipses of some type occur every year. (Solar eclipses are rare because the moon's orbit is inclined by about 5 degrees relative to that of Earth. If the two bodies orbited in exactly the same plane, Earth-based observers would see a solar eclipse every month, during [the moon's "new" phase](http://www.space.com/62-earths-moon-phases-monthly-lunar-cycles-infographic.html).)

Total solar eclipses are special, and not just because they happen infrequently, Guhathakurta said. "A total solar eclipse, I would say, is widely regarded as probably one of the most breathtaking, amazing phenomena that you can observe from this planet Earth with your own eyes," she said. "With unaided eyes, you can actually see the outer atmosphere of the sun." The Aug. 21 event will also bring a strange and brief false night to the landscapes on the "path of totality."

"All of a sudden, you know, you see a 360-degree sunset all around you," Guhathakurta said. "Stars appear. The temperature drops. You can actually hear chirping of grasshoppers. So, animals actually naturally go back to their nocturnal behavior." [[Solar Eclipses: An Observer's Guide (Infographic)](http://www.space.com/15613-solar-eclipses-observing-guide-infographic.html)]

Many people will be able to experience this on Aug. 21 if they so choose: About 220 million folks live within one day's drive of the totality path, according to Space.com skywatching columnist Joe Rao. That 70-mile-wide (113 kilometers) path extends from the coast of Oregon through Idaho, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina.

Totality will be fleeting everywhere along the path; the area around Carbondale, Illinois, gets the most protracted view, at 2 minutes and 40 seconds, NASA officials said.

It's been 99 years since a total solar eclipse was so accessible to Americans from coast to coast, eclipse expert Jay Pasachoff, an astronomer at Williams College in Massachusetts, [told Space.com last year](http://www.space.com/33797-total-solar-eclipse-2017-guide.html). In addition, the Aug. 21 event will be the first-ever solar eclipse whose path of totality hits no country other than the United States. (The last one to meet this geographical standard occurred before the nation gained its independence in 1776.)

## Scientists eager, too

Skywatchers aren't the only people excited about the eclipse. Scientists are pumped, too, because the celestial show will give them a rare opportunity to study the sun's outer atmosphere, known as [the corona](http://www.space.com/17160-sun-atmosphere.html).

Temperatures in the faint, wispy corona — which the sun's overwhelming glare usually hides — top 1.8 million degrees Fahrenheit (1 million degrees Celsius). That's far hotter than the sun's surface, which is a pedestrian (by comparison) 11,000 degrees F (6,000 degrees C).

Getting a good look at the corona could shed light on just why it's so sizzling, Pasachoff and other researchers have said.

"This eclipse, because it's going over this [American] landmass, allows us to use all our ground-based equipment, balloons [and] new camera technology to really gather data and kind of understand the sun-Earth connection, but also study the corona in great detail," Guhathakurta said.

## Be safe!

You can safely view the total solar eclipse without eye protection, but **only during totality**. And, as stated above, totality will be brief everywhere. So be very careful: Make absolutely sure the eclipse is in its total phase before raising your naked eye to the sky.

At all other times — to view the unblocked sun, or the solar eclipse in its [partial phase](http://www.space.com/30532-partial-solar-eclipse-2015-photos-by-skywatchers.html) — you'll need to use protection, such as special eclipse glasses or No. 14 welder's glass (or solar filters, if you're using a telescope.) Otherwise, serious and permanent eye damage can result.

**Flat Earth Debunked**

From the most powerful telescope orbiting Mars comes a new view of Earth and its moon, showing continent-size detail on the planet and the relative size of the moon.

The view is available online at:

<http://www.jpl.nasa.gov/spaceimages/details.php?id=PIA21260>

The image combines two separate exposures taken on Nov. 20, 2016, by the High Resolution Imaging Science Experiment (HiRISE) camera on NASA's Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter. The images were taken to calibrate HiRISE data, since the reflectance of the moon's Earth-facing side is well known. For presentation, the exposures were processed separately to optimize detail visible on both Earth and the moon. The moon is much darker than Earth and would barely be visible if shown at the same brightness scale as Earth.

The combined view retains the correct positions and sizes of the two bodies relative to each other. The distance between Earth and the moon is about 30 times the diameter of Earth. Earth and the moon appear closer than they actually are in this image because the observation was planned for a time at which the moon was almost directly behind Earth, from Mars' point of view, to see the Earth-facing side of the moon.

In the image, the reddish feature near the middle of the face of Earth is Australia. When the component images were taken, Mars was about 127 million miles (205 million kilometers) from Earth.

With HiRISE and five other instruments, the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter has been investigating Mars since 2006.

The University of Arizona, Tucson, operates HiRISE, which was built by Ball Aerospace & Technologies Corp. of Boulder, Colorado. NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, a division of Caltech in Pasadena, California, manages the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter Project for NASA's Science Mission Directorate, Washington. Lockheed Martin Space Systems, Denver, built the orbiter and collaborates with JPL to operate it.

**Radical Coup Advertised by NYT**

A group of radical leftists that includes activists, entertainers, artists, professors, writers, and at least one known terrorist has launched what amounts to a sort of soft coup attempt in America with the release of a full page New York Times ad and accompanying website that lays out a concrete plan to prevent Donald Trump from ever taking office.

The website, refusefascism.org, makes it clear from the start that this is not about simply protesting Trump’s inauguration but rather about actually preventing him from being inaugurated to the office he rightfully won.

**In other words, this is a direct attempt to steal the election from both Trump and the American people.**

The homepage for the groups website starts out by shouting “Bring DC to a halt!” and “Millions in the street say no!” before laying out what they are actually calling for.

“Going into the Inauguration, flood the streets of Washington, DC with millions of people, determined to stay on the streets to stop the Trump-Pence regime before it starts,” [the website reads](https://refusefascism.org/).

“This starts January 14, the weekend of Martin Luther King Jr.’s birthday, and DOES NOT STOP till this regime is prevented from ruling. This is the kind of political crisis needed at this moment in history. It has happened before, and it can happen again,” it continues.

A quote on the sites sidebar fantasizes about what it would be like to stop the elected President of the United States from ever taking office.

“Imagine if people, in the tens of millions, filled the streets, powerfully declaring that this regime is illegitimate and demanding that it not be allowed to rule! The whole political landscape would be dramatically transformed, every faction within the established power structure would be forced to respond—and all this could well lead to a situation in which this fascist regime is actually prevented from ruling. This is not some idle dream but something which could be made a reality if all those who hate what is represented by this fascist regime translate their outrage into firm determination and massive mobilization to create the conditions which make this possible.”

Its one thing to call for massive protests that would then somehow lead to Trump being unable to take office. Having a plan for how that would actually happen is another thing altogether and this group seems to have that covered as well.

 Startlingly, the plan not only includes massive protests, it also aims to cause so much of a problem that the “ruling elite” would then be forced to intervene against Trump. That’s right, this hard left and communist run sneak coup attempt is planning for the establishment to join them.

On the [FAQ section](https://refusefascism.org/faqs-on-stopping-trump-pence/) of their website they describe, in great detail, how they plan to stop Donald Trump from ever becoming president.

“By the intersection of two things: first, massive protest and resistance from tens of millions of ordinary people, daring and determined to actually prevent this fascist regime from taking over and implementing its program, beginning more or less immediately and growing to a crescendo in the next few weeks, and through that creating “a crisis of rule”; and second, coupled with this, attempts by different factions in the established power structure which have real differences with Trump-Pence to solve the crisis by preventing them from taking the reins of power.

These protests could be something with the character of the protests against police murder over the past few years, or the Occupy protests before that—but larger by several orders of magnitude and even more determined. Such protests would have to have the effect of figuratively “stopping society in its tracks” and would raise real questions as to whether people very broadly would recognize the legitimacy of such a regime to even rule in basic ways and enforce its edicts.

The “not normal” character of Trump-Pence—the radical changes they embody in how people are to be ruled in this country (in short, the fascist ethos and measures they campaigned on) and in regard to U.S. international policy—have not only created tremendous anguish and anger among many millions of ordinary people, but among ruling factions which have up to now nevertheless chosen to go along with this. But should there be a political eruption “from below,” their concerns over Trump would combine with immediate questions as to whether their basic stability and perhaps even the entire system would be endangered by continuing to stick with Trump-Pence.

As that dynamic developed, scandals that up to now have been covered up could erupt, or be treated in a different way so as to raise fundamental constitutional issues, and ways would be found to prevent the coming to power of Trump-Pence.”

The group also has a planned full-scale propaganda effort that includes paying the mainstream media to run ads to promote their goal of stealing the election as well as a highly coordinated social media campaign aimed at the same.

Eventually they envision bringing Washington D.C. to a complete halt in the week leading up to the inauguration as well as new “Trump scandals” to magically erupt in the mainstream media.

Early this week, the call for this campaign will hit with tremendous impact via ads in major news outlets, in print and online, co-ordinated with massive and burgeoning social media efforts. Spokespeople will be made available to media in a concerted effort to get the word out and to involve as diverse a group of initiators and other possible spokespeople as possible in doing that. And with this, plans will be announced to “bring DC to a halt” in the week before the scheduled inauguration. Shortly after that we envision the growth of demonstrations and other forms of protest—including especially non-violent direct action disrupting business as usual, occupying public spaces, assemblies and meetings in institutions and workplaces, strikes, etc.—in cities across the country. As people see that there are many who feel like they do and, more than that, are determined and acting to do something about what would almost certainly be a horrific regime, they will themselves become inspired and compelled to join in these. This would have to quickly spread and find ways to overcome resistance and obstacles; but once people are aroused and acting on their highest aspirations, tremendous creativity and resources can become unlocked and things can spread like wildfire. While this is far from assured, historical experience shows that there is a reasonable chance that in the face of extreme provocation from the ruling powers, people can act in extraordinary ways.

As this develops, we envision public spaces being occupied in major cities and millions travelling to DC to protest the inauguration in the days leading up to it (and the millions in the DC and Baltimore areas who DID oppose Trump-Pence making resources and shelter available). This is a highly mobile and highly interknit society in which there is still relative freedom of movement and outlets for expression\*; if such a thing could happen in a highly repressive and non-interlinked society like Egypt, it could certainly happen here.

As all this emerges and then comes to a head, we would expect that even further scandals around Trump would surface from various sources, that different sections of the population with different concerns would get drawn into this, and that the social will to stop Trump-Pence from ruling would emerge and the political/legal means to accomplish that would be found.

On first glance this may seem like more of the same – the endless petty attacks on Trump and his incoming presidency that have all so far failed. Sadly this **does not** seem to be the case here, especially when you consider who is actually behind this de facto coup attempt.

While more mainstream leftists such as Debra Messing and “Rosie” O’Donnell are leading the media charge for the group, its actual key members are much more important,with the list reading like a who’s who of the radical communist left.

Calling themselves “initiators” the group includes former Weather Underground terrorist Bill Ayers and founding member of the American communist party Carl Dix.

Others listed on the website as responsible for the plan [include](https://refusefascism.org/about-contact/initiators/):

* Herb Boyd, activist, author, journalist and teacher
* Isabel Cardenas, Salvadoran-American activist, Los Angeles
* Niles Eldredge, evolutionary biologist
Charles Gaines, visual artist
* Henry Giroux
* Chase Iron Eyes
* Everett Iron Eyes Sr., Water Administrator, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe
* Robin D. G. Kelley, Gary B. Nash Professor of American History at UCLA\*
* Fran Luck, Executive Producer of Joy of Resistance, Multicultural Feminist Radio at WBAI
* PZ Myers, evolutionary developmental biologist
* Arturo O’Farrill, composer and musician
* Milton Saier, PhD, Professor of Molecular Biology, UCSD\*
* Yusef Salaam, one of the Central Park Five
* Ted Sirota, jazz musician
* Sunsara Taylor, writer, Revolution Newspaper
* Cornel West, writer, professor
* Michael A. Wood Jr.
* Rev. Frank Wulf, United Methodist minister
* Andy Zee, spokesperson, Revolution Books
* David Zeiger, filmmaker

For their part, the seemingly compliant mainstream media, which would have had a field day if a group of patriots like those in the standoff at the Bundy Ranch ever did something so coordinated and direct as this, has largely ignored this stunning call for election theft. When they have covered it, they have directly misconstrued what the ad in the Times was actually about.

For example, a [Variety headline](http://variety.com/2017/biz/news/rosie-odonnell-debra-messing-donald-trump-fascism-1201952809/) on this actual plan to stop the elected president from taking office called it, “an anti-Trump Fascist warning”. Add this to the fact that the media looks to be taking money from this group for their ads and you have at the very least tacit support from the establishment press.

The next three weeks are lining up to possibly be on a scale not seen in this country for decades and now we have known radical leftist provocateurs initiating a plan to steal the election.

By the way, one of the signatories, and they are not so different, is the <http://afgj.org/about/our-principles> See if this sounds good to you:

 We believe in the right of people to self-determination and self-defense. We do not criticize the strategies and tactics of authentic organizations of the oppressed. Our parent organization, the Nicaragua Network, was founded to support an armed revolution. We respect pacifism as a strategy, and we respect individuals who practice it as a way of life. We do not support imposing that personal belief on others, especially the marginalized and oppressed. Our work adheres to the Solidarity Model which says that our role is to amplify the articulated priorities of our oppressed partners rather than to tell them what we think is best for them.

 We are anti-capitalist without rigidly adhering to any one utopian alternative economic model. We support social contracts and economic systems that maximize the development of human potential and well-being.  We believe that there are many ways for communities to develop such contracts and systems, including some not yet thought of.

 We believe in the right of people to shelter, sufficient food, medical care, education, employment, leisure, and self-organization for the common good. We oppose structures that distribute wealth in ways that deny anyone those basic rights.

 We are anti-imperialist and oppose US militarism. We oppose all US wars and use of US military force abroad. History has shown that US wars are unjust, exploitative, and profit-driven. We reject the concept of “humanitarian” intervention by the US because we believe its underlying motives are strategic and economic rather than humanitarian.”

 We support participatory democracy as opposed to Western-style liberal democracy which was explicitly designed to limit democracy and insure control of government by the propertied class.

 We support national sovereignty and oppose all efforts by the US government to subvert other sovereign States through manipulation of their elections, social movements, forced debt, unequal trade treaties and predatory business practices, or military threat.

 We believe in the continued survival of humankind. We oppose threats to that survival from destruction of the environment, unrestrained Western consumerism, and unsustainable exploitation of resources in the natural world.

 We support a multi-polar political world and oppose the myth of US exceptionalism and its ambition toward unchallengeable military power, the quest for which is bankrupting the country.

 We support group rights as equal to or superior to the rights of individuals articulated by 18th Century European men.

 We respect and support diversity in every form that does not infringe on the group and individual rights of others

**The Rise of Fascism in America**

In 1932 governor of New York, Franklin D. Roosevelt, was elected President of the United States. When Roosevelt came into office he began work on a wide range of economic policies that would take several years to sign into law. These policies would become collectively known as "[The New Deal](http://newdeal.feri.org/index.htm)".

When Roosevelt began work on his economic reforms after his election, he did so with a large team of economists, businessmen, policy makers, and bankers; people from all different perspectives and backgrounds. By the time the Great Depression hit America and FDR had come into office, Benito Mussolini was at the height of his success and many Americans viewed Mussolini's programs as a proven and successful way to deal with the problems of economic depression.

Like the fascists in Europe, Americans were generally opposed to both Communism and "high finance," that is to say the extremely powerful capitalists who had come to dominate the American economy, and who many felt had far too much control over American life.

Since the time of Mussolini's rise to power men like US Ambassador to Italy Henry Fletcher, Secretary of State Frank Kellogg, Charles Lindbergh, State Department head Norman Davis, and many others all agreed that his regime represented "solid opposition to communists, socialists, and anarchists."

Eleanor Roosevelt wrote that FDR's appointed American Ambassador to Italy, Breckenridge Long, had been "rhapsodizing about the achievements of Mussolini's new 'corporate state'" saying:

"Italy today is the most interesting experiment in government to come above the horizon since the formulation of the Constitution 150 years ago. [Mussolini] is one of the most remarkable persons . . . And they are doing a unique work in an original manner, so I am enjoying it all."

In 1931 Major General Smedley Butler publicly relayed a story about Mussolini, apparently told to him by Cornelius Vanderbilt Jr., in which Mr. Vanderbilt was riding with Mussolini and Mussolini hit a child with his car but kept on going and refused to stop. Butler's public telling of the story caused international outrage and Butler was then arrested,  court-martialed by Secretary of War Stimson and told to apologize to Mussolini. Butler refused, deciding instead to retire. Nevertheless this illustrates the degree to which Mussolini and fascism were respected in America at the time.

In 1934 the American State Department proclaimed that the 99% victory of the Fascist Party in Italian elections "demonstrate incontestably the popularity of the Fascist regime."

The State Department, as late as 1937, praised Italian Fascism stating that it "brought order out of chaos, discipline out of license, and solvency out of bankruptcy."  The State Department continued to embrace fascism because of its anti-Communist position. Italy and Germany were being "made safe" by the fascists for American investment, and this is  what was important in economic terms, especially during the Great Depression in America.

The New Deal policy makers took many cues from Mussolini's public works programs, and the way in which he organized labor and corporations in order to promote employment. These are all of the same basic types of programs that were implemented with the New Deal.

New Deal legislation saw the creation of a wide range of federal agencies and programs, which are listed below:

[Works Projects Administration](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARwpa.htm) (WPA)

[Civilian Conservation Corps](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARccc.htm) (CCC)

[National Youth Administration](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARnya.htm) (NYA)

[Farm Security Administration](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARfsa.htm) (FSA)

[National Recovery Administration](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARnra.htm) (NRA)

[Public Works Administration](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARpwa.htm) (PWA)

[Federal Emergency Relief Administration](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARfera.htm)

[Agricultural Adjustment Act](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARagriculture.htm)

[National Housing Act](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARhousing.htm)

[Federal Securities Act](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARsecurities.htm)

[Social Security Act](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARsocial.htm)

[National Labor Relations Act](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USARnlra.htm)

The net effect of all of this was to increase the role of the State in the economy for the purpose of creating stability, providing security for average citizens and businessmen alike, and to give the government a hand in directing the development of the national economy.

Mussolini, "instituted a program of public works hitherto unrivalled in modern Europe. Bridges, canals and roads were built, hospitals and schools, railway stations and orphanages, swamps were drained and land reclaimed, forest were planted and universities were endowed." Along those same lines FDR promoted many public works projects, such as the Rural Electrification project and the building of many dams through the Tennessee Valley Authority, including the Hoover Dam. As with all of these projects, they were not done by the government, they were done by private companies with funding from the government. This is one crucial difference between fascist economies and socialist economies. In a fascist economy public taxation is used to funnel money to private corporations through the government, whereas in a socialist economy like that of the Soviet Union there is no taxation and industry itself is run by the government for profit.

A company called Six Companies is who won the bid for the Hoover Dam and the project was very successful for them. All of the public works programs brought corporations and the State closer together and allowed companies to build projects that they would have otherwise not been able to get the funding for. This also helped to provide much needed jobs for large numbers of unemployed Americans.

Also like the fascists of Europe, FDR held rallies and parades to promote his economic agenda, and encouraged citizens to show their support. In 1933 a public relations campaign was launched by the NRA to bolster popular support the organization and its initiatives. Business were encouraged to hang banners with the NRA logo and motto in their windows showing that they were complaint with NRA regulations.

Much is made about the eventual backing of the New Deal by the Communist Party of America in 1935, however the Communist Party backing only came as part of the "Popular Front" movement, which was when American Communists decided to support New Deal legislation in an effort to prepare American industry for conflict with the European fascists.

Despite the Popular Front backing of the New Deal though, Marxists continued to criticize the plan as essentially American fascism.  Whether or not their charges were correct or not is actually beside the point, the point is that the New Deal does not represent left-wing socialist ideology, as is often thought, and despite the apparent support for the New Deal by left-wing political groups, much of that support actually came more in the form of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend" type support, Roosevelt and his New Deal being the enemy of European fascism. These views were reflected in many American Communist publications, such as this October 1941 publication of [The Communist](http://www.rationalrevolution.net/special/library/the_communist.htm).

The New Deal was seen by the radical American left as the best hope to mobilize America in preparations for a fight against European fascism, which was always something that far left political groups were more concerned about than the average citizen. During the early and mid 1930s the average American citizen was not overly concerned with the goings on in Europe, and in fact many supported the Fascist regimes there because of their anti-Communist and pro-order policies, but the far American left was acutely aware of the magnitude of the problems in Europe and was opposed to the Fascist regimes from the start, because of course the Fascists were anti-leftist regimes.

This is why, even during the mid 1930s, members of the American far left were already thinking about war with the Fascist powers of Europe and indeed they were participating in that war early by volunteering to fight against the fascists in the Spanish Civil War, the precursor to WWII, and this is why the New Deal was seen by the American far left in a different light than that of the American mainstream. To them it was about more than just domestic policy, they recognized it as the mobilization of industry to prepare for war, and as such backed the New Deal on those terms. The American Communist Party opposed the FDR administration's lack of support for anti-lynching legislation and what was seen as a weak stance on issues of racial and gender justice.

In 1965 Libertarian author Murray Rothbard observed:

Thus, in 1934, the British Leninist theoretician R. Palme Dutt published a brief but scathing analysis of the New Deal as "social fascism" - as the reality of fascism cloaked with a thin veneer of populist demagogy. No Conservative opponent has ever delivered a more vigorous or trenchant denunciation of the New Deal. The Roosevelt policy, wrote Dutt, was to "move to a form of dictatorship of a war-type"; the essential policies were to impose a State monopoly capitalism through the NRA (National Industrial Recovery Act), to subsidize business, banking, and agriculture through inflation and the partial expropriation of the mass of the people through lower real-wage rates and to the regulation and exploitation of labor by means of government-fixed wages and compulsory arbitration. When the New Deal, wrote Dutt, is stripped of its "social-reformist 'progressive' camouflage," "the reality of the new Fascist type of system of concentrated State capitalism and industrial servitude remains," including an implicit "advance to war." Dutt effectively concluded with a quote from an editor of the highly respected Current History Magazine:

'The new America [the editor had written in mid-1933] will not be capitalist in the old sense, nor will it be socialist. If at the moment the trend is towards fascism, it will be an American fascism, embodying the experience, the traditions, and the hopes of a great middle-class nation.'

In a 1934 interview of Joseph Stalin by H.G. Wells, [Joseph Stalin and H. G. Wells, Marxism VS. Liberalism: An Interview](http://www.rationalrevolution.net/special/library/cc835_44.htm), published in 1937, Stalin explained that what was taking place in America under FDR was not in any way the same thing that was taking place in the U.S.S.R. Stalin stated:

"The United States is pursuing a different aim from that which we are pursuing in the U.S.S.R. The aim which the Americans are pursuing arose out of the economic troubles, out of the economic crisis. The Americans want to rid themselves of the crisis on the basis of private capitalist activity without changing the economic basis. They are trying to reduce to a minimum the ruin, the losses caused by the existing economic system. Here, however, as you know, in place of the old destroyed economic basis an entirely different, a new economic basis has been created. Even if the Americans you mention partly achieve their aim, i.e., reduce these losses to a minimum, they will not destroy the roots of the anarchy which is inherent in the existing capitalist system. They are preserving the economic system which must inevitably lead, and cannot but lead, to anarchy in production. Thus, at best, it will be a matter, not of the reorganization of society, not of abolishing the old social system which gives rise to anarchy and crises, but of restricting certain of its bad features, restricting certain of its excesses. Subjectively, perhaps, these Americans think they are reorganizing society; objectively, however, they are preserving the present basis of society."

It must be noted that while the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) gave official support to the New Deal and President Roosevelt in 1935, it retracted that support and began opposing FDR in 1939 when the [**Molotov-Ribbentrop pact**](http://www.historyplace.com/worldwar2/timeline/pact.htm), also known as the Soviet-Nazi pact or Stalin-Hitler pact, was signed between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. The Soviets signed this pact in an effort to prevent what they felt would be an imminent invasion by the Germans had they not signed it, and Germany promoted the offer in an attempt to annex Poland without causing war. Nonetheless, Britain and France did declare war on Germany when the Germans invaded Poland. During the time between the signing of this pact and the invasion of the Soviet Union by Germany, the CPUSA, at the direction of Moscow, called for non-involvement on the part of the United States in the European War and waged a campaign against FDR. The effect of the CPUSA's campaign was minor on the general public, but it did cause many members of the CPUSA to break ranks with the party and the party lost considerable credibility.

Neither Winston Churchill nor FDR were in favor of Communism, but they began more and more to view Germany and Italy as greater rising threats to the capitalist interests of their countries than was the Soviet Union. Churchill was very outspoken in his contempt for the Bolsheviks, but he, along with FDR, began trying to court Russia in what amounted to a containment strategy of Germany. This was a program that FDR himself felt very strongly about, but he faced a nation of citizens who were either extremely pacifistic, anti-war, or were sympathizers of the European fascists.

This is not to say that everyone during this time understood what was going on, the intentions of the various players in the situation, or the actual implications of the policies being implemented. FDR, while popularly supported overall, still received strong criticism from the "right" and "far left." The New Deal was representative of the types measures that were observed to work for the Fascists in Italy in pushing back Communist political advances, and in addition it was simply a pragmatic way to deal with the real problems of laissez-faire capitalism. The New Deal embodied measures of collectivism and centralization, but not with the same goals of socialist measures. The New Deal made no attempt to fundamentally change the American economic system, only to stabilize it and strengthen the capitalist system.  The New Deal was implemented with all of the best intentions in mind.

In 1933 US Ambassador to Germany, William E. Dodd issued a speech titled [Dilemma in the United States](http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/psf/box32/t299b01.html) in Berlin at an American Club Dinner about the situation in America. Dodd was also a professor of history.

Parts of this speech read:

"The Federal Constitution is a balanced instrument of most limited powers, and all executive functions are subject to legislative and judicial approval.  Only in time of war may a President take any decisive action. Lincoln violated the Constitution to save the Union, and Wilson sometimes transcended his powers for the obvious common good, though actual violations of the fundamental law were not a part of his practice.  Might men interpret the events of March 1933 as warlike?

In the chaotic situation, with banks closing their doors everywhere, President Roosevelt acted as if he were in a state of war.  He declared a bank holiday and hastened the assembling of congress.  Excitement was everywhere as great as in 1917.  Senators and Representatives recognized urge of the hour; but they also felt the pull of the American Legion and the pressure of local demands.  It was a situation which legislators are apt to convert into an impasse, witness the panicky times of Andrew Jackson and Grover Cleveland when all Presidential action was defeated. But Roosevelt had converted his long struggle for recovering his health into a ten-year study of history and economics. He had learned how men behaved in past crises.

He held conferences with the greater committees of both houses of Congress; he consulted experts on subjects on which expert opinion was needful; he coaxed semi-hostile newspaper folk to delay their opposition; and he postponed appointments to ten thousand offices in which mere politicians were interested.  It was a human picture, a Jefferson urging Southerners to abolish slavery, lest they themselves be abolished; a Wilson urging war to end war.  And Roosevelt was successful. A banking war was enacted which gave the Federal Government powers which must paralyze all state systems. A control over the issue of securities was enacted which would probably have prevented the depression if applied in 1921-1929.  The farmers of the West were told in legal form how much wheat they might plant, and cotton growers were ordered to plow up ten million acres of the 1933 crop.  If railroads were to operate, their managers must submit to orders from the White House. The whole economic life of the country was taken in hand upon mandates voted by both houses of Congress. There had never been anything like it before, but some way to recovery must be sought, else even greater catastrophe than that of 1929 might come. It was not revolution as men are prone to say.  It was a popular expansion of governmental powers beyond all constitutional grants; and nearly all men everywhere hope the President may succeed.  If he is able to put half the unemployed back to work; if the new banking law and corporation control yield half the desired results, the cause of democracy and personal liberty may survive the onslaughts of our times."

This is a fairly accurate account of what happened and the perception of the conditions under which it did happen. It was a change, a significant change, of that there is no doubt, and it was a change of the economically fascist type, but that is not meant in a negative way per-se. It was a change that brought the economy under a new level of control by the federal government, and it was done for much the same reasons that it was done in Italy and Germany, in order to save the economy from collapse or vulnerability. Unlike Italy and Germany however, the "threat of communism" was essentially nonexistent in America, whereas in Italy and Germany communists held significant political power, which was part of the reason why regimes there were much more extreme.

FDR himself would have in no way considered any of his policies "fascist," nor would he ever have compared himself to the fascists of Europe, of that there is little doubt. FDR despised dictatorship and he despised the actions of the Nazis especially, yet the fact remains that fundamentally they were all walking along many of the same lines. Their objectives and ideologies were very different but they were all faced with the same issues and all arrived at similar solutions. The problems inherent in laissez-faire capitalism and the opposition to Marxist ideology resulted in the middle ground development of economic fascism in all three places, and there was a measure, especially early on, of admiration and imitation of the Italian system by contributors to the New Deal.

As was the case in Germany and Italy, people began to look more and more to the State, and to Roosevelt himself, as their savior. The State was playing a much larger role in people's lives under Roosevelt than at any other time in American history.

In addition to his economic agenda, FDR shared some other traits of fascist leaders of the day as well, such as his "cult of personality." FDR was, and perhaps still is, one of the best loved presidents of all time. He was an excellent speaker and motivator and unlike any president before or since he made a connection to the people. FDR held frequent radio addresses to the public, his "[Fireside Chats](http://www.mhric.org/fdr/fdr.html)", which took on the air of a personal conversation.

Much like the Italians and Germans did with  Mussolini and Hitler, the American public identified strongly with FDR as "their leader," however FDR's approach and message was much different than that of the European fascists. FDR did not preach hate or conquest, or try to fill people's heads with messages of superiority. It has to be remembered too though that in fact the majority of the message of the fascists of Europe was not one of hate, they too spoke primarily about unity and building a stronger nation.

Though much is made about the fact that FDR served an amazing four terms in office, what is often overlooked is that FDR was ready to retire after his second term, in fact he nearly declined the 1940 Democratic Party nomination. It was at first said that FDR would not run for office again, but at the Democratic National Convention he received a standing ovation and chants of "We want Roosevelt, We want Roosevelt," and indeed he did finally accept by saying "If nominated and elected, I could not in these times refuse to take the inaugural oath, even if I knew I would be dead in thirty days." (a reference to his poor health)

His four terms were served at public request because he was very popular; he inspired people, and the same can be said of the European fascists; they all had developed a "cult of personality."  They were inspiring people, as a member of the SS said of Hitler:

"As far as Hitler is concerned, we regarded him as a true man. He was only a corporal when he earned the Iron Cross First Class in World War I. In those days that was quite an achievement. When he spoke at meetings or rallies he managed to captivate his audience. He was able to get us in a mood where we believed everything he said and we left fired with enthusiasms. Everyone I met respected and trusted Hitler and I myself shared these feelings and opinions." - Standartenoberjunker Jan Munk - SS

The Term "Liberal" Redefined

The term "liberal" in America has been redefined from its classical meaning. Liberalism, in the classical sense of the word is a laissez-faire approach to economics and social issues. Liberalism in the true sense of the word means "hands off," "let people do what they will".

In America the term "liberal" has become synonymous with "big government."  This is because FDR proclaimed himself to be a champion of liberalism. Thus what happened during FDR's 12-year term in office is that he single handedly changed the American perception of what "liberal" meant.

Below are a few quotes from FDR that demonstrate how FDR really created the modern image of what it means to be "a liberal" by proclaiming himself to be a liberal and proclaiming that his actions were of a liberal nature.

"A radical is a man with both feet firmly planted-in the air. A conservative is a man with two perfectly good legs who, however, has never learned to walk forward. A reactionary is a somnambulist walking backwards. A liberal is a man who uses his legs and his hands at the behest of his head." - date unknown

"Throughout the world, change is the order of the day.... In most nations social justice, no longer a distant ideal, has become a definite goal. We seek it through tested liberal traditions.

We find our population suffering from old inequalities.... In spite of our efforts... we have not weeded out the overprivileged and we have not effectively lifted up the underprivileged. .

We have, however, a clear mandate from the people, that Americans must forswear... the acquisition of wealth which, through excessive profits, creates undue private power over private affairs and, to our misfortune, over public affairs as well...." - 1935 Inaugural Address

Speaking about very wealthy American capitalists:

"The "privileged princes of these new economic dynasties, thirsting for power, reached out for control over Government itself. They created a new despotism and wrapped it in the robes of legal sanction...." They erected a "new industrial dictatorship" which controlled the "hours men and women worked, the wages they received, the conditions of their labor...."

"For too many of us the political equality we once had won was meaningless in the face of economic inequality. A small group had concentrated into their own hands an almost complete control over other people's property, other people's money, other people's labor-other people's lives. For too many of us life was no longer free; liberty no longer real...."

"Against economic tyranny such as this, the American citizen could appeal only to the organized power of Government. The collapse of 1929 showed up the despotism for what it was. The election of 1932 was the people's mandate to end it. Under that mandate it is being ended ..." - 1936

**FDR's 1944 "Economic Bill of Rights":**

"It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people-whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth-is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights-among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As our nation has grown in size and stature, however-as our industrial economy expanded-these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necessitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all-regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens."

There is some merit to the way in which FDR used the word liberalism as well though. When FDR used the word liberalism or when he described his policies as "liberal", what he meant was that private power was becoming anti-liberal. In other words, private power was becoming controlling. Wealthy capitalists had consolidated so much power in America that by government taking a "hands off" approach all it was doing was allowing these private institutions and individuals to dictate the country's economic conditions and thereby allowing these private entities to become controlling forces in people's lives.

So, in that respect FDR saw his policies of taking some of that power away from the private institutions as "liberal" in the sense that is was restoring liberty to the common man.

FDR's policies dramatically increased the scope and power of the federal government and thus became associated with "big government" and "tax and spend," when in fact neither the idea of "big government" or "tax and send" are "liberal ideas." They are in fact fundamentally fascist qualities, which were implemented for the purpose of solving real problems that existed in the American economy. What has to be remembered is that aside from all the bad things which we now associate with fascism, the fascists did develop some successful policies and they were popularly supported at the time

While FDR was busy bringing American capitalism under the control of the State, many American capitalists began looking to blatantly Fascist Italy and Germany, who were engaged in a large amount of spending, as favorable regions to expand their capitalist empires. In addition, many of America's wealthy elite were primarily concerned with Communism and viewed the Fascist regimes as a bulwark against the spread of Communism.

Some of these people were simply businessmen doing business, but others were more involved.

[William E. Dodd](http://www.rationalrevolution.net/special/library/ambassador_dodd.htm), the US Ambassador to Germany, gave important insight into German and American economic alliances. He wrote of the situation in general that:

"A clique of U.S. industrialists is hell-bent to bring a fascist state to supplant our democratic government and is working closely with the fascist regime in Germany and Italy. I have had plenty of opportunity in my post in Berlin to witness how close some of our American ruling families are to the Nazi regime. "

"Certain American industrialists had a great deal to do with bringing fascist regimes into being in both Germany and Italy. They extended aid to help Fascism occupy the seat of power, and they are helping to keep it there."
- William E. Dodd, U.S. Ambassador to Germany, 1937

Some of the primary and more famous American companies and individuals that were involved with the Fascist regimes of Europe are: William Randolph Hearst, Joseph Kennedy (JFK's father), Charles Lindbergh, John Rockefeller, Andrew Mellon (head of Alcoa, banker, and Secretary of Treasury), DuPont, General Motors, Standard Oil (now Exxon), Ford, ITT, Allen Dulles (later head of the CIA), Prescott Bush, National City Bank, Coca-Cola, and General Electric.

It should be noted that businessmen from many countries, including England and Australia, also worked with the Fascist regimes of Europe prior to WWII. The Fascist governments were involved in a high level of construction, production, and international business. All in all, American corporate investments in Germany grew by almost 50% between 1929 and 1940, while declining in the rest of continental Europe.

I.G. Farben, a German company, was the largest chemical manufacturing enterprise in the world during the early part of the 20th century. As such, the company had many holdings in a variety of countries, including America. The American holdings of I.G. Farben included Bayer Co., General Aniline Works, BASF, Agfa Ansco, and Winthrop Chemical Company.

I.G. Farben was critical in the development of the German economy and war machine leading up to WWII. During this time I.G. Farben's international holdings along with its international business contracts with companies like Standard Oil, DuPont, Alcoa, and Dow Chemical were crucial in supplying the Nazi regime with the materials needed for war, as well as financial support.

Ford and GM supplied European Fascists with trucks and equipment, as well as investing money in I.G. Farben plants. Standard Oil supplied the fascists with fuel. US Steel and Alcoa supplied them with critically needed metals. American banks gave them billion's of dollars worth of loans. American banks and businesses continued to support the Fascist regimes of Europe legally up until the day Germany declared war on America and the activities were stopped under the Trading with the Enemy Act. Despite this, some companies and individuals still maintained a business relationship with the Third Reich.

The following is excerpted from a [report](http://www.corpwatch.org/campaigns/PCD.jsp?articleid=4368) printed by the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary in 1974:

The activities of General Motors, Ford and Chrysler prior to and during World War II...are instructive. At that time, these three firms dominated motor vehicle production in both the United States and Germany. Due to its mass production capabilities, automobile manufacturing is one of the most crucial industries with respect to national defense. As a result, these firms retained the economic and political power to affect the shape of governmental relations both within and between these nations in a manner which maximized corporate global profits. In short, they were private governments unaccountable to the citizens of any country yet possessing tremendous influence over the course of war and peace in the world. The substantial contribution of these firms to the American war effort in terms of tanks, aircraft components, and other military equipment is widely acknowledged. Less well known are the simultaneous contributions of their foreign subsidiaries to the Axis Powers. In sum, they maximized profits by supplying both sides with the materiel needed to conduct the war.

During the 1920's and 1930's, the Big Three automakers undertook an extensive program of multinational expansion...By the mid-1930's, these three American companies owned automotive subsidiaries throughout Europe and the Far East; many of their largest facilities were located in the politically sensitive nations of Germany, Poland, Rumania, Austria, Hungary, Latvia, and Japan...Due to their concentrated economic power over motor vehicle production in both Allied and Axis territories, the Big Three inevitably became major factors in the preparations and progress of the war. In Germany, for example, General Motors and Ford became an integral part of the Nazi war efforts. GM's plants in Germany built thousands of bomber and jet fighter propulsion systems for the Luftwaffe at the same time that its American plants produced aircraft engines for the U.S. Army Air Corps....

Ford was also active in Nazi Germany's prewar preparations. In 1938, for instance, it opened a truck assembly plant in Berlin whose "real purpose," according to U.S. Army Intelligence, was producing "troop transport-type" vehicles for the Wehrmacht. That year Ford's chief executive received the Nazi German Eagle (first class)....

The outbreak of war in September 1939 resulted inevitably in the full conversion by GM and Ford of their Axis plants to the production of military aircraft and trucks.... On the ground, GM and Ford subsidiaries built nearly 90 percent of the armored "mule" 3-ton half-trucks and more than 70 percent of the Reich's medium and heavy-duty trucks. These vehicles, according to American intelligence reports, served as "the backbone of the German Army transportation system."...

After the cessation of hostilities, GM and Ford demanded reparations from the U.S. Government for wartime damages sustained by their Axis facilities as a result of Allied bombing... Ford received a little less than $1 million, primarily as a result of damages sustained by its military truck complex at Cologne...

Due to their multinational dominance of motor vehicle production, GM and Ford became principal suppliers for the forces of fascism as well as for the forces of democracy. It may, of course, be argued that participating in both sides of an international conflict, like the common corporate practice of investing in both political parties before an election, is an appropriate corporate activity. Had the Nazis won, General Motors and Ford would have appeared impeccably Nazi; as Hitler lost, these companies were able to re-emerge impeccably American. In either case, the viability of these corporations and the interests of their respective stockholders would have been preserved.

In 1940 Graeme K. Howard, of General Motors, published America and the New World Order, in which he advised that America give full cooperation to the Nazi regime. In his book he blames FDR for causing the war in Europe and goes on to say that the fascists should be supported as the better alternative to the spread of Communism.

mbassador Dodd also relayed important information about major American publicist William Randolph Hearst's relationship with the European fascists and how Heart's publications were influencing American readers.

By the late 1930s a significant coalition of wealthy American businessmen had formed opposition to FDR. Many believed that he was getting too cozy with the Soviet Union and perceived his New Deal as communist style legislation, which in fact it was not.

FDR did want to form peaceful relations with the Soviet Union however, as he did with all nations. FDR's vision of the future was one of peace among all nations, who would work together cooperatively. FDR saw the fascists in Europe, especially Germany, as a threat to that climate. Both Roosevelt and Churchill, while opposed to Communism, also preferred opening relations with the Soviets in order to contain the fascists.

So, while FDR was pursuing peace with the Soviet Union and a domestic program of serious economic reform, powerful American businessmen interpreted his actions as "Red" and formed coalitions against him and began working hard on all fronts, political, economic, foreign and domestic, to oppose FDR and his policies.

Corporations and the Military-Industrial Complex

Throughout Roosevelt's administration the majority of businessmen felt themselves at odds with the president. Though the New Deal did provide government money to corporations for government funded works projects, those bids went to the lowest bidders and were relatively few in number compared to the larger number of businessmen who felt that the New Deal policies had a negative impact on their businesses because of things such as the government endorsement of unions in the 1935 National Labor Relations Act. However, once serious preparation for the war effort began a new alliance between government and business formed. Those who were able to secure government contracts benefited greatly, while others faced a difficult struggle.

Prior to World War II military contracts were made through sealed bids, but with the war the system changed to negotiated bids, which involved a more personal and subjective system for awarding bids, i.e. the start of the "good ole boy" system.

Secretary of War Henry Stimson stated: "If you are going to try to go to war, or to prepare for war, in a capitalistic country, you have got to let business make money out of the process or business won't work."

As proof of how influential and wide ranging the effects of the war effort were for corporations, even Coke-a-Cola became part of the "military-industrial complex."

During the first world war materials were rationed, and sugar was one of those materials. The rationing of sugar significantly hurt Coca-Cola's profits. During the depression of the 1930s Coke's major competitor, Pepsi, was able to increase market share by adopting more economical bottling practices, giving them a cheaper product.

Understanding the implications of sugar rationing Ben Oehlert, a Washington lobbyist for Coca-Cola, promoted the need to secure a government contract during war time. By getting war time contracts Coca-Cola would able to avoid the rationing penalties that were placed on other food makers. In order to get contracts it was said that Coca-Cola could play an important role in the operation of the military, by providing an energizing drink during pauses in action.

In 1942 sugar rationing went into effect and Coca-Cola was awarded an exclusive contract to supply soft-drinks for the US military. Coca-Cola was then able to completely dominate all competition because not only did they have a huge contract, but they also had un-rationed access to sugar. Pepsi nearly went bankrupt during WWII, while Coke flourished.

Sixty-four Coca-Cola bottling plants were built in Allied territory on military bases, and the bottling plants were moved forward with the progression of the military advances. Ironically, at the same time, Coca-Cola's bottling plants in Nazi Germany were continuing production as well, under the Fanta brand name, which was changed so as to disassociate America with the drink. Coca-Cola, like so many other companies, was making money off both sides of the war.

Coca-Cola played up its patriotic image through the war, both in domestic advertisements, and also on military bases.

Stonewall Jackson taught us what the pause that refreshes really means.... On the march he gave his men rations of sugar and at intervals required them to lie down for a short rest. Thus he marched troops farther and faster than any other general in the field. Since his day all marching troops have been given a short rest period out of every hour.

Stonewall Jackson was a Confederate General and Southern hero for his opposition to the Union. Coca-Cola of course is an Atlanta based company, but nevertheless, it is an additional point of interest that Coke used a Confederate General as part of their "patriotic" advertising campaigns, associating Coke with a military "tradition" of giving soldiers rests for "sugar breaks." The basis of Coke's military contract with the military was regimented and regular consumption of Coke by soldiers as part of the moral and energy boosting program.

A domestic Coke ad read:

And no matter what anybody is doing to help (this doesn't go for fighting men) nobody is doing his full share if he's not buying U. S. War Bonds and War Stamps regularly. Are you buying them? Are you buying your share in Victory and in the good American way of Life?

Of course, Coca-Cola was paid by the US Government out of money raised by selling War Bonds. The promotion of buying War Bonds was in effect a means of Coke promoting its own financial security. The more money that the government raised for the war effort, the more money they could afford to spend on Coca-Cola contracts.

After the war was over, the sugar rations stayed in place until 1947, continuing to give Coke a major lead over competitors due to its insider status, and Coke has remained very close to the White House ever since.

Another commodity industry that became heavily involved in the war effort was the tobacco industry.

Coca-Cola though is of course not what people think about when they think of the "military-industrial-complex."

The majority of the World War II production contracts went to large corporations, such as General Motors, Ford, and Dupont, many of the same companies that had been involved military production in World War I. The rate of profit for these companies in World War II was much less than during World War I, where rates of profit reached over 1,000%, but they were still well above peace time profits, especially by Depression era standards. Furthermore there was little or no risk once contracts were established. General Motors was the leading contractor of World War II, receiving about 8% of the total value awarded, despite the fact that government officials knew that GM and other companies had been supplying the fascists with materials as well.

Government contracts were awarded in a fairly concentrated manner. Two thirds of the Research & Development contracts went to 68 companies.  During the war the US government became the largest investor in American private business to the tune of $17 billion 1941 dollars. Again, this can hardly be criticized, this was a war for national life and death, and one of the most important events in all of human history. Nevertheless, the business relations between certain private corporations, indeed specific individuals in those corporations, and the US government became very strong during this time and huge profits were made at little risk for companies and businessmen, while American citizens bought War Bonds and paid taxes to fund it and soldiers went abroad to fight and die.

It was at this time the aircraft industry became the number one industry in the nation, having previously not been a major industry at all. To this day the aviation industry has one of the strongest relationships with the federal government of any private industry.

While there was a dramatic increase in corporate-government relations during the war, and while the companies involved did make handsome profits with little risk, it also has to be remembered that there was significant attention paid to the regulation of profits as well. In World War I companies made huge profits from the war effort and there was an enormous backlash against the government and industry for this, thus during the Second World War close attention was paid to limiting excessive profits.

Even President Dwight D. Eisenhower spoke about the significance of the Military-Industrial complex when he left office in 1961, [Military-Industrial Complex Speech, Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1961](http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/indust.html):

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence -- economic, political, even spiritual -- is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded.

**The Transition is Complete 2008**

As an economic system, fascism is socialism with a capitalistic veneer.  In its day (the 1920's and 1930's), fascism was seen as the happy medium between boom-and-bust-prone capitalism, with its alleged class conflict, wasteful competition, and profit-oriented egoism, and Marxism, with its violent socially divisive prosecution of the bourgeoisie.

Where socialism abolished all market relations outright, fascism left the appearance of market relations while planning all economic activities.  Where socialism abolished money and prices; fascism controlled the monetary system and set all prices and wages *politically*.  [Emphasis added.]

Under fascism, the state, through official agencies, controlled all aspects of manufacturing, commerce, finance, and agriculture.  Licensing was ubiquitous; no economic activity could be undertaken without government permission.  Levels of consumption were dictated by the state, and "excess" incomes had to be surrendered as taxes or "loans".

To maintain high employment and minimize popular discontent, fascist governments also undertook massive public-works programs financed by steep taxes, borrowing and *fiat money creation.*

Barack Hussein Obama’s fascism is a different kind of fascism, it looks different from [Adolf] Hitler’s Brownshirts,” the activist explained. “This is a…three-piece suit fascism where they have a folded New York Times under their arm but it’s ultimately the same story.”

The wedding of corporations and government is Mussolini’s definition of fascism and that’s what we have in this country. The insurance companies have sent their executives and financiers into the Dept of Health and Human Services to dump 25 million sick people off their accounting, and replace them with 20 million healthy young people. Then, they quadrupled their premiums and increased the deductibles to the point that it is not insurance at all. Then, they forced America through fines and taxes to buy this insurance.

The US Dept of Treasury passed regulations outlawing banks from doing business with any business startups. Not surprisingly, within 8 years, there are less startup businesses in America than since records have been kept. That means ever. There is no shortage of entrepreneurs or people with the willingness to work hard to make a new business prosper. There is only the law, stopping them from being formed.

The IRS is used as a protection force to stop enemies of the President and to help his friends. Trillions of grants and other forms of stimulus have been transferred to Democrat supporters and withheld from anyone who is not a Democrat supporter.

The same goes for healthcare, internet management, highway repair, oil exploration, education, and the list goes on and on. Americans are tired of this, and they have chosen to rebel in a Constitutional way; they voted. Now, we will see how the Fascists will fight in the coming years. Once thing is for sure. They will never give up.

A legacy of the FDR years is the nearly 170,000 pages of federal regulations that exist today and intrude into all aspects of the day-to-day life of every American.  However, Barack Obama has not only added to the regulatory burden, but also taken actions which are geared to further establishing a fascist economy.

ObamaCare is not about health care, per se; rather, it is intended to dictate to business and the individual what insurance they must buy, what health care they are allowed to access, and ultimately what behavior is acceptable -- all at the whim of a centralized bureaucracy.  The Dodd-Frank Bill firmly establishes the concept of "too big to fail" for certain financial institutions, thereby subjecting them to the absolute control of the state while allowing, and in many cases forcing, others to cease doing business, as well as instituting lending and operating policies determined by government regulators.

The Obama regime has thrown out the rule of law when it comes to the rights of private investors by their actions against the bondholders of Chrysler and General Motors, as well as forcefully taking over and operating both companies and others as quasi-private entities.  They have chosen which businesses will succeed or fail by the taxpayer financing of companies such a Solyndra among a score of others, others of which have failed.  The Obama appointees to the National Labor Relations Board are now dictating to companies where they can locate and are attempting to force their workers into unions without secret ballots.

The mantra of public-works spending is alive and well and constantly being used to justify massive government spending.  The demonization of the rich has taken on a new role in the Obama era, as the rich are now being singled out as responsible for all the problems created by the Obama policies and are a potential target for retaliation.  The current proposal to raise taxes on the wealthy and the so-called "Buffett Tax" are solely an attempt to rally the people into a unified anger over the need to punish a perceived foe -- in order to shift the spotlight off the failure of the current government.

A key characteristic of the reality of fascist thinking is rampant cronyism and corruption.  Certain capitalists, wishing to ingratiate themselves with the state, are willing to fund the election of those in power in exchange for favorable government contracts and avoidance of regulatory wrath.  Recently, much of Wall Street, Hollywood, the unions, major companies such as General Electric, and the super-wealthy such as Warren Buffett are willing to sleep with those in power and be used as props in any propaganda campaign initiated by the Obama regime.

The Obama administration has, through the Justice Department and other agencies, behaved exactly as many quasi-fascist regimes in the past -- almost all of whom have been governed by groups of friends and associates who appoint each other to government positions and use governmental power and authority to protect themselves and their friends from accountability.

The term "fascism" has been redefined by the horrendous acts of Mussolini and Hitler, actions spurred by their megalomania and nationalism.  However, the economic philosophy that is fascism is alive and well and being pursued in the United States by those whose desire it is to control the people of the country and reinforce their domestic power base, not to conquer the world.  Yet the pursuit of the same tenets that motivated Franklin Roosevelt has prolonged and exacerbated the current economic disaster facing the United States.

However, as with FDR, chances are that it will not succeed in America, with its history of individualism and entrepreneurship -- but only if the current citizenry recognizes what is the Obama end-game.  It is time to call what is being pursued by Barack Obama what it is: fascism.

**The Peso Crisis: The Anti-Trump Blame Game**

The Trump-Mexico hysterical sideshow has a new episode.  They are now talking about Mr. Trump and the Mexican peso.  Some people are seeing a connection between better Trump polls and a decline in the value of the peso.

It was first brought to my attention at [Fausta's Blog](http://faustasblog.com/2016/09/mexico-th-trumppeso-index/).  Now [Eric Martin at Bloomberg](http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2016-09-12/want-to-know-how-trump-s-doing-just-look-at-the-mexican-peso) is also writing about it:

Polls? Who needs ’em.

If you want to know how Donald Trump is doing, all you need to do is check the Mexican peso.

Over the past four months, Mexico’s currency has repeatedly declined when Trump’s election outlook improves and rallied when his odds of winning slump.

The peso tumbled to a 2 1/2-month low Monday after his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, canceled a two-day trip to California because she’s suffering from pneumonia.

The presidential campaign has kept Juan Carlos Alderete busy. The 32-year-old head of currency strategy for Grupo Financiero Banorte SAB in Mexico City said phone calls from clients such as pension and mutual funds jumped 50 percent in July, when Trump improved his showing in predictive models like FiveThirtyEight during the Republican and Democratic conventions.

Alderete has become a U.S. political junkie, closely following the daily movements and speeches of the two candidates -- particularly the one who pledges to end or overhaul Nafta and make Mexico pay for a $10 billion border wall.

For the record, no one was more anti-NAFTA than then-senator Obama in 2008, and it had zero impact on the Mexico peso.  Remember when they sent Obama campaign representatives to visit with the Canadian government to [calm them down](http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2008/03/03/obama-camp-downplays-conversation-with-canada/comment-page-10/)?

Let me add a couple of thoughts about the Mexican peso.

First, devaluations are chaotic, and we see the consequences up here.  I was living in Mexico City in 1982 working for a U.S. bank when the peso went from 27 to 72 in one morning.  It was panic like I've never seen before.  We had Mexican clients on the phone wondering how they were going to pay their dollar-denominated loans.  We had U.S. citizens on the other line wondering about their "mex-dólares," or their investments in Mexico.  The merchants were changing their prices to reflect the new peso vs. dollars.  Even the fellow who came in the office to shine our shoes was aware of the devaluation and wondering how it'd impact his business.  It was chaos the likes of which I've never seen before.

Things were so crazy that year that Paul McCartney wrote a song about the world's currencies: "[The Pound Is Sinking](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XK9doTm8CH8)."  From the collapse of the Argentine peso to the devaluation in Mexico of August 1982, a pop song by the former Beatle was one way of dealing with it.

The peso was also devalued in 1994, and I would argue that it set off much of the illegal immigration we saw subsequently.  My point is that peso volatility does not help anyone, specifically a future President Trump dealing with the chaos it always brings.

Second, I don't think the current peso unease has anything to do with Trump.  Back in February 2016, or around the time of New Hampshire's primaries, there were already signs of a weak peso.  I specifically [saved this article](http://fusion.net/story/267321/mexicans-are-angry-about-the-rising-dollar/) and forward it to some friends in Mexico:

The Mexican peso’s exchange rate to the U.S. dollar, which has normally traded at 12:1, recently jumped to 19:1, putting a serious pinch on Mexicans’ wallets. For Mexicans, the widening exchange rate means it has suddenly become nearly twice as expensive to travel to the U.S. or buy U.S. goods.

As a result, currency exchange rates and inflation have strangely become the talk of the town — and not just among economists, but all Mexicans. Young people especially are slamming the government for trying to downplay the effects of depreciating currency on their daily lives.

Is the Mexican peso a poll about the U.S. election?  I don't think so.  It is a statement on concerns about the Mexican economy, such as low oil prices.  It is also about exports and having a peso that helps Mexican exporters.  That was the [consensus of an economic summary](http://www.oecd.org/eco/outlook/mexico-economic-forecast-summary.htm) I read a few months ago.

Trump causing a weakening of the Mexico peso?  I don't think so, and I pray that it is not so.  Mexico has been floating its peso since the late 1990s, and it's been good for both sides.  Again, I saw a Mexican peso devaluation firsthand, and it was not fun, even if I went out that weekend and bought some nice business suits suddenly cheaper in dollars!

By the way, rumors of widespread food rioting in Mexico is false. There are a couple of government sites that are doing their best to make you believe this, but it ain’t so. Looting has largely subsided in Mexico following a 20 percent hike in gasoline prices, but protests are continuing.

The Interior Department reported that more than 1,500 people have been detained for looting or disturbances nationwide since protests began early in the week. That is not national rioting over food. The YouTubes that they trying to foist on you are from 2007 through 2009 during the Obama crash, not the Trump election period.

It is unclear how many have been charged. Hundreds of stores were looted, mainly on Wednesday and Thursday. Police protection of stores has been stepped up since.

The federal police reported continued protests, and some highway blockages, yesterday. Really not more to see than what went on in Ferguson, Baltimore, or Charlotte, without the racial content. Black Lives Matter really doesn’t have a foothold in Mexico. So, they do the next best thing. They make it up.

**The Great California Drought is Over**

A large storm will affect the west coast of the United States with drenching rain, ice, flooding and high country snow this weekend into next week.

"There is the potential for excessive rain, combined with melting snow to trigger the worst flooding in northern California since 1997 and perhaps 1986," according to Senior Vice President of AccuWeather Enterprise Solutions Mike Smith.

The next storm will roll ashore early this weekend, and it will not be in a hurry to leave.

"The storm this weekend will be the latest in a series of major storms to affect the West Coast this winter," according to AccuWeather Senior Meteorologist Brett Anderson. "The storms are piping a river of moisture into the region from the Pacific Ocean and will go a long way toward drought relief but at a price."

**Storm to unleash flooding, mudslides**

Unlike the storm along the West Coast at midweek, which concentrated over northern California and southern Oregon, the impacts from the storm this weekend will be significant, far-reaching and long-lasting.

At the very least, the storm this weekend will cause disruptions to travel due to wet conditions on the highways and low cloud ceilings and gusty winds at area airports over much of the Interstate 5 corridor.

Initially, rain, ice and mountain snow will affect areas from northern California to Oregon. However, rounds of rain and mountain snow will spread northward through Washington and inland over Nevada, Idaho and Utah as the weekend progresses. Cities that can expect multiple days of wet weather from the storm include San Francisco, Sacramento and Fresno, California.

Enough rain will fall to cause urban flooding, as well as raise the risk of mudslides. The risk of mudslides will not be limited to recent wildfire areas.

A heavy amount of rain will fall and a tremendous amount of water will be released into area streams and rivers.

From Saturday to early Tuesday, there is the potential for a general 4 to 8 inches of rainfall. However, rainfall of 8 to 16 inches can occur along the west- and southwest-facing lower slopes of the Sierra Nevada and the northern California Coast Ranges.

Snow levels will be significantly higher during the bulk of the storm this weekend, when compared to recent storms, according to AccuWeather Storm Warning Meteorologist Alexandria Davis.

Snow levels may rise to near 9,000 feet in the Seirra Nevada.

"As a result, some of the snow can rapidly melt at intermediate elevations and lead to the potential for flash and stream flooding," Davis said.

In the worst-case scenario, a significant threat to lives and property can result. Some of the snow on the mountainsides could liquefy and lead to major small stream and river flooding over the Central Valley of California.

As one storm finally leaves the coast, yet another potent storm will roll in from the Pacific Ocean a few hours later during the middle of next week. The midweek storm could bring another 3 to 6 inches of rain on the foothills and lower elevations along the mountainsides.

Yet another storm may slam into the Pacific coast later next Friday or Saturday.

"Despite flood control improvements in recent years, it is likely that current flood protection measures will not be able to capture all of the runoff from the storms through next week in northern California," Smith said.

Once reservoirs are filled from the train of storms, the water will spill downstream where major river flooding can occur.

The siege of storms has the potential to wipe out or greatly erase the long-term drought conditions in the region.

Some rain will also expand southward into parts of Southern California, including the Los Angeles and San Diego areas, by Monday afternoon. However, unlike that of areas farther north, rainfall will be of rather short duration in most cases.

Rain will cause existing snow on the ground to turn to slush, in cities such as Spokane, Washington; Medford, Oregon; Boise, Idaho; and Salt Lake City. Where piles of snow are blocking storm drains, minor urban flooding can result.

**Ice to encase some communities; Snow to pile up in high country**

Ice will be a concern at the onset of the storm from Portland, Oregon, to Eugene, Oregon. Along this swath of I-5, there is the potential for a heavy accumulation of ice that can lead to widespread downed trees and power outages during the first part of the weekend.

The varying temperatures and dry versus wet snow can also elevate the avalanche risk in the high country. Snow levels will fall to pass levels of the Cascades and Sierra Nevada on Monday. By the storm at midweek, snow levels will be significantly lower, when compared to this weekend.

The highest elevations of the Cascades and Sierra Nevada will pick up several more feet of snow from the storm into Tuesday. This will be on top of the [3-6 feet of snow that fell](http://www.accuweather.com/en/weather-news/weekly-wrap-up-deadly-storms-pummel-west-coast-southeast-2016-global-disaster-losses-were-highest-in-4-years/70000475) in some areas through Wednesday, Jan. 4.

The storm at midweek can unload another few feet of snow.

**Winds to raise surf, may cut power**

While wind-induced waves along the coast will not be extreme, minor coastal erosion is possible and seas will become dangerous for small craft.

When enhanced by terrain effects, winds can become strong enough to down trees and power lines. The saturated ground will allow trees to topple that would normally withstand strong winds.

**The Average Temperature is 11 in America**

Temperatures will plunge to dangerously low and damaging levels this weekend into early next week in the wake of the snowstorm over the southern United States.

Those without power in the wake of the winter storm could face additional hardship due to the severe cold. The extremely low temperatures will increase the risk of frozen pipes.

Any lingering wet or slushy areas left behind by the storm will turn icy on untreated surfaces. The cold air will rival levels from January of 2014 and 2015 in the region. Record lows for the date will be challenged in many areas.

"The lowest temperatures will occur when there is fresh snow cover, little to no wind and the sky remains clear," according to AccuWeather Chief Meteorologist Elliot Abrams.

Temperatures will dip into the single digits in much of central and northern North Carolina and southern and western Virginia during Saturday night and Sunday night.

**The Great Sun of 2022: Seen this Before**

At the beginning of the 3rd century civil war raged in Britain as the Roman emperor Septimius Severus sought to quell unrest in the north. But unknown to the fighting cohorts and Caledonian tribes, high above their heads two stars were coming together in a huge cataclysmic explosion.

Now 1800 years later the light from that collision will finally arrive on Earth creating a new star in the night sky - dubbed the ‘Boom Star - in an incredibly rare event which is usually only spotted through telescopes. Before their meeting the two stars were too dim to be seen by the naked eye, but in 2022, the newly formed Red Nova will burn so brightly in the constellation Cygnus that everyone will be able to see it.

“For the first time in history, parents will be able to point to a dark spot in the sky and say, ‘Watch, kids, there’s a star hiding in there, but soon it’s going to light up,” said Dr Matt Walhout, dean for research and scholarship at [Calvin College, Michigan](https://calvin.edu/), where the prediction was made.



The star will appear in the constellation Cygnus, also know as the Northern Cross. For around six months the Boom Star will be one of the brightest in the sky before gradually dimming, returning to its normal brightness after around two to three years. It is the first time scientists have ever predicted the birth of a new star and astronomers in Britain said it would be a fascinating and important event which is likely to trigger a race to be the first to record the phenomenon.

Dr Robert Massey, of the [Royal Astronomical Society](https://www.ras.org.uk/), said: “What we’re talking about you might literally call the birth of a new star which should be very visible.

“The good news for people in the UK is that it is in the constellation Cygnus which is always above the horizon and is very high in the sky in the summer, so everyone will be able to see it.

“Nobody has ever managed to predict the birth of a star before so this is really unprecedented and I think there will be a race among amateur astronomers, and members of the public to spot it first.”



The new star, known as the Boom Star, sits just off the right hand wing of Cygnus

The forecast was made officially at a press conference on Friday, all the more poignant because it coincided with the epiphany, which commemorates the visit of the Three Wise Men, who followed the star to Bethlehem to witness the birth of Jesus.

The binary star system, named KIC9832227, is 1,800 light years away and is made from two suns which spin around each other every 11 hours.

In 2013 Professor Larry Molnar and his team at Calvin College noticed that the orbital speed was decreasing. And doing so faster and faster.

It matched the data from another binary star which exploded in 2008 without warning and was picked up by astronomers. When experts went back over data from previous years they discovered that the crash could have been predicted because of the increasing orbital speeds.



The star will be as bright or brighter than the other stars in Cygnus

“Observations of KIC9832227 show its orbital period has been getting faster since 1999 in the same distinctive way.  We arrive at our predicted date by assuming the same process is happening here," said Prof Molnar, who is professor in astronomy.

“The star is around 1800 light years.  Hence if we are right about the upcoming outburst, it actually occurred 1795 years ago, and the light from the outburst has been travelling toward us ever since.

“Explosions of this size occur about once a decade in our Galaxy.  This case is unusual in how close the star is and hence how bright we will see it shine and unique in that it is the first time anyone has predicted an explosion in advance.

“It’s a one-in-a-million chance that you can predict an explosion. It’s never been done before.”

Not only will be the event be an amazing spectacle for stargazers, it will also give scientists an unprecedented opportunity to observe the process as it unfolds.  Astronomers do not understand the details of why stars merge or even how the explosions work.

“If Larry’s prediction is correct, his project will demonstrate for the first time that astronomers can catch certain binary stars in the act of dying, and that they can track the last few years of a stellar death spiral up to the point of final, dramatic explosion,” added Dr Walhout