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**Little Peter Buttcrack**

The father of Democratic presidential hopeful Pete Buttigieg was a Marxist professor who spoke fondly of the Communist Manifesto and dedicated a significant portion of his academic career to the work of Italian Communist Party founder Antonio Gramsci, an associate of Vladimir Lenin.

Joseph Buttigieg, who died in January at the age of 71, immigrated to the U.S. in the 1970s from Malta and in 1980 joined the University of Notre Dame faculty, where he taught modern European literature and literary theory. He supported an updated version of Marxism that jettisoned some of Marx and Engel's more doctrinaire theories, though he was undoubtedly Marxist.

He was an adviser to Rethinking Marxism, an academic journal that published articles “that seek to discuss, elaborate, and/or extend Marxian theory,” and a member of the editorial collective of Boundary 2, a journal of postmodern theory, literature, and culture. He spoke at many Rethinking Marxism conferences and other gatherings of prominent Marxists.

In [a 2000 paper](http://www.bgu.ac.il/~ngordon/Marx%20Article.pdf) for Rethinking Marxism critical of the approach of Human Rights Watch, Buttigieg, along with two other authors, refers to "the Marxist project to which we subscribe."

In 1998, he wrote in [an article](https://www.chronicle.com/article/Marking-the-Anniversary-of/21511) for the Chronicle of Higher Education about an event in New York City celebrating the 150th anniversary of the Manifesto. He also participated in the event.

"If The Communist Manifesto was meant to liberate the proletariat, the Manifesto itself in recent years needed liberating from Marxism's narrow post-Cold War orthodoxies and exclusive cadres. It has been freed," he wrote.

"After a musical interlude, seven people read different portions of the Manifesto. Listening to it read, one could not help but be struck by the poignancy of its prose," he wrote. The readers "had implicitly warned even us faithful to guard against conferring upon it the status of Scripture, a repository of doctrinal verities."

“Equity, environmental consciousness, and racial justice are surely some of the ingredients of a healthy Marxism. Indeed, Marxism's greatest appeal — undiminished by the collapse of Communist edifices — is the imbalances produced by other sociopolitical governing structures,” Buttigieg wrote.

Paul Kengor, a professor at Grove City College and an expert in communism and progressivism, said Buttigieg was among a group of leftist professors who focused on injecting Marxism into the wider culture.

"They’re part of a wider international community of Marxist theorists and academicians with a particular devotion to the writings of the late Italian Marxist theorist Antonio Gramsci, who died over 80 years ago. Gramsci was all about applying Marxist theory to culture and cultural institutions — what is often referred to as a 'long march through the institutions,' such as film, media, and especially education," Kengor told the *Washington Examiner*.

Pete Buttigieg, an only child, shared a close relationship with his father. In his memoir *Shortest Way Home,* Pete called his dad a “man of the left, no easy thing on a campus like Notre Dame’s in the 1980s.”

He wrote that while he did not understand his parents’ political discussions as a young child, “the more I heard these aging professors talk, the more I wanted to learn how to decrypt their sentences, and to grasp the political backstory of the grave concerns that commanded their attention and aroused such fist-pounding dinner debate.”

Pete wrote that his dad was supportive when he came out as gay. He and his husband bought a house in South Bend around the corner from his parents, which gave the couple “a good support network despite our work and travel schedules” when they decided to get a dog.

The elder Buttigieg was best known as one of the world’s leading scholars of Gramsci.

Gramsci thought cultural change was critical to dismantling capitalism. Nevertheless, although critical of certain aspects of Bolshevism, Gramsci endorsed Vladimir Lenin’s “maximalist” politics and identified within the Leninist faction of the Italian communists. He went to Moscow in 1922 as the official representative of the Italian Communist Party and returned home to lead the resistance against Italy’s Prime Minister Benito Mussolini, on the orders of Lenin, while his new wife and children stayed in the USSR.

Those efforts landed Gramsci in an Italian prison, where he lived much of his brief life, which ended in 1937 at the age of 46. Yet his time behind bars was also some of his most prolific, leading to a collection of essays called the *Prison* *Notebooks.*Buttigieg completed the authoritative English translation of Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks*, and his articles on Gramsci have been translated into five languages.

Buttigieg was a founding member and president of the International Gramsci Society, an organization that [aims](http://www.internationalgramscisociety.org/about_igs/index.html) to “facilitate communication and the exchange of information among the very large number of individuals from all over the world who are interested in Antonio Gramsci's life and work and in the presence of his thought in contemporary culture.”

In 2013, Buttigieg spoke at a $500,000 outdoor New York City [art installation](https://www.artsjournal.com/culturegrrl/2013/07/thomas-hirschhorns-lively-gramsci-monument-brings-intellectual-gobbledygook-to-the-masses-with-video.html) honoring Gramsci.

Buttigieg died just days after Mayor Pete announced his 2020 presidential exploratory committee.

Lis Smith, communications adviser for Buttigieg’s presidential exploratory committee, declined to comment on how his father influenced his political beliefs or on Pete Buttigieg's thoughts on Marxist thinkers such as Gramsci.

Pete Buttigieg said in an MSNBC [interview](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/03/20/2020-candidate-pete-buttigieg-heres-the-biggest-problem-with-capitalism-right-now.html) on March 20 that he considers himself a capitalist but that the system needs changes.

“The biggest problem with capitalism right now is the way it's become intertwined with power and is eroding our democracy,” Buttigieg said, noting the influence of big businesses in government.

A self-described progressive, Buttigieg has called to abolish the Electoral College system, supports a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, and thinks that climate change is a national security threat.

In another MSNBC interview in February, Buttigieg said that socialism “is a word in American politics that has basically lost all meaning” and “has been used as a kill switch to stop an idea from being talked about.”

After his son won his mayoral election in 2011, Joseph Buttigieg told the Notre Dame [student newspaper](https://ndsmcobserver.com/2011/11/professor-reflects-on-sons-mayoral-victory/) that he never expected him to run for office.

“I know Peter has been interested in politics for a long time,” Buttigieg said. “At home we always discussed government affairs, but never in that way … I’m very pleased because he’s doing something he genuinely likes."

**The New Curricula**

The New York Times’ 1619 Project — a curriculum that makes the fantastical claim that a primary cause of the Revolutionary War was the colonists’ desire to protect slavery — has been adopted in 3,500 classrooms across all 50 states.

For this reason, some of the nation’s [most renowned historians](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/20/magazine/we-respond-to-the-historians-who-critiqued-the-1619-project.html) have called for The Times to correct this and other factual errors.

The Pulitzer Center, which is partnering with The Times to promote [The 1619 Project](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/12/20/magazine/1619-intro.html), recounted in its [2019 annual report](https://pulitzercenter.shorthandstories.com/2019-annual-report/index.html), “Good journalism, innovative educational resources, and deep community engagement are absolutely essential to bridging the divisions that threaten to rip our democracy apart. It is this belief that has driven the Pulitzer Center for the last 14 years.”

Nikole Hannah-Jones, The Times’ lead writer on the project, argued in her [introductory essay](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/14/magazine/black-history-american-democracy.html) to it, “The United States is a nation founded on both an ideal and a lie. Our Declaration of Independence, approved on July 4, 1776, proclaims that ‘all men are created equal’ and ‘endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.’

“But the white men who drafted those words did not believe them to be true for the hundreds of thousands of black people in their midst.”

Hannah-Jones went on to contend “that the year 1619 is as important to the American story as 1776.”

That was the year, she explained, that British colonists in Jamestown purchased 20 to 30 enslaved Africans.

“Conveniently left out of our founding mythology is the fact that one of the primary reasons the colonists decided to declare their independence from Britain was because they wanted to protect the institution of slavery,” Hannah-Jones wrote.

The reporter is honest enough to admit that slavery in America predated the nation’s founding by over 150 years.
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However, she alleges by 1776, Britain “had grown deeply conflicted over its role in the barbaric institution.”

There were calls to abolish slavery, which “would have upended the economy of the colonies, in both the North and the South,” Hannah-Jones wrote.

Slavery was abolished in Great Britain in [1833](https://www.britannica.com/topic/Slavery-Abolition-Act) — over a half-century after the founding of the United States.

Advertisement - story continues below

Also working completely against Hannah-Jones’ narrative is the fact that almost all the states north of the Mason-Dixon Line had voted to abolish slavery by the end of the Revolutionary War in 1783.

By 1804, [all the Northern states](https://www.history.com/news/deeper-roots-of-northern-slavery-unearthed) had passed legislation ending slavery.

The preposterous notion that protecting slavery was one of the “primary” reasons the American Colonies declared independence is not supported by the documentary evidence from the period, either, as my research for my book “[We Hold These Truths](https://www.amazon.com/THESE-TRUTHS-Randall-Norman-DeSoto/dp/1604772689/ref%3Dtmm_pap_swatch_0?_encoding=UTF8&qid=&sr=)” made clear.

Any middle school history student should be taught that the Stamp Act in 1765, followed by the Declaratory Act in 1766, were what began rallying colonists against Mother England.

In [the Declaratory Act](http://www.ouramericanrevolution.org/index.cfm/page/view/p0062), Parliament claimed the legislative body held “full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies and people of America … in all cases whatsoever.”

The rallying cry in the Colonies became, “No taxation without representation.”

Thomas Jefferson, a slave owner, made the case against King George III and Parliament in his 1774 essay “[A Summary View of the Rights of British America](https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/jeffsumm.asp),” pointing to Britain’s tax and trade policies toward the Colonies, the decision to suspend the New York legislature and the imposition of martial law in Massachusetts as unjust acts that must be opposed.

Thomas Paine, in his widely read political pamphlet “[Common Sense](https://www.gutenberg.org/files/147/147-h/147-h.htm),” published in January 1776, did not list a fear that Great Britain would end slavery in the Colonies as a reason for declaring independence.

Over [500,000 copies](https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/thomas-paine-publishes-common-sense) of the pamphlet were published just three months after its release at a time when the entire population of the 13 Colonies was only 4 million at most.

Paine was an abolitionist who wrote the preamble to Pennsylvania’s abolition act in 1780 (during the heart of the Revolutionary War), which freed 6,000 slaves in the state, according to [History.com](https://www.history.com/topics/american-revolution/thomas-paine).

The[Declaration of Independence](http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1776-1785/the-final-text-of-the-declaration-of-independence-july-4-1776.php) itself, which lists dozens of grievances the Colonies had against the king and Parliament, makes just a passing reference to slavery by pointing to England’s efforts to “excite domestic insurrections.”

Jefferson’s [original draft](https://www.monticello.org/thomas-jefferson/jefferson-s-three-greatest-achievements/the-declaration/transcript-of-the-rough-of-the-declaration/) submitted to the Continental Congress included a condemnation of the king’s support for the African slave trade, writing it was a violation of the “most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither.”

This language was struck from the Declaration’s final text out of deference to South Carolina and Georgia, which wanted to continue the African slave trade, according to the Claremont Institute’s [Founding.com](http://founding.com/he-has-excited-domestic-insurrections-amongst-us-and-has-endeavoured-to-bring-on-the-inhabitants-of-our-frontiers-the-merciless-indian-savages-whose-known-rule-of-warfare-is-an-undistinguished-des/).

“The British had encouraged slave and Indian revolts against the colonists,” the institute reported. “For example, in 1775, [British Governor] Lord Dunmore of Virginia, swore to members of the Virginia House of Burgesses that if ‘any Injury or insult were offered to himself’ he would ‘declare Freedom to the Slaves, and reduce the City of Williamsburg to Ashes.'”

So the issue for the British rulers in America wasn’t really a desire to free to slaves, but to wreak havoc in the rebellious Colonies.

Some of the nation’s top historians sent a [letter](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/20/magazine/we-respond-to-the-historians-who-critiqued-the-1619-project.html) to The New York Times in December taking The 1619 Project to task for claiming that protecting slavery was a primary cause of the Revolution.

Among the signers of the letter were Princeton University American history professor emeritus James McPherson, Brown University history professor emeritus Gordon Wood and Princeton University history professor Sean Wilentz.

McPherson is the Pulitzer Prize-winning author of “Battle Cry Freedom: The Civil War Era,” while Wood won the Pulitzer Prize for his work “The Radicalism of the American Revolution.”

Wilentz was a Pulitzer finalist for his book, “The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln.”

So by Pulitzer’s estimation, these historians know what they are talking about when it comes to American history.

In their letter to The Times, the academics applauded The 1619 Project’s desire “to address the enduring centrality of slavery and racism to our history.”

“Nevertheless, we are dismayed at some of the factual errors in the project and the closed process behind it,” they wrote.

“On the American Revolution, pivotal to any account of our history, the project asserts that the founders declared the colonies’ independence of Britain ‘in order to ensure slavery would continue.’ This is not true. If supportable, the allegation would be astounding — yet every statement offered by the project to validate it is false.”

The historians went on to list their concern that this and other unsupported claims were “offered as an authoritative account that bears the imprimatur and credibility of The New York Times.”

Woods told [RealClearInvestigations](https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2020/01/31/disputed_ny_times_1619_project_is_already_shaping_kids_minds_on_race_bias_122192.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) the only way The 1619 Project should be used in the classroom is “as a way of showing how history can be distorted and perverted.”

The New York Times Magazine’s editor in chief, Jake Silverstein, issued a [response](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/20/magazine/we-respond-to-the-historians-who-critiqued-the-1619-project.html) last month disputing the charge that The 1619 Project contains “significant factual errors and is driven by ideology rather than historical understanding.”

“The project was intended to address the marginalization of African-American history in the telling of our national story and examine the legacy of slavery in contemporary American life,” Silverstein wrote.

In a December [radio interview](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IF36IQH3BRw), Hannah-Jones said, “When my editor asks me, like, what’s your ultimate goal for the project, my ultimate goal is that there’ll be a reparations bill passed.”

“If you read the whole project, I don’t think you can come away from it without understanding the project is an argument for reparations,” she told the [Chicago Tribune](https://www.chicagotribune.com/lifestyles/ct-life-nikole-hannah-jones-1619-project-20191009-20191010-m3rym2hxyncj7ihcn67q2gekdq-story.html) in October.

It sure sounds like The 1619 Project is [ideologically driven](https://www.westernjournal.com/ap-ap-norc-poll-americans-oppose-reparations-slavery/).

[The Atlantic](https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/12/historians-clash-1619-project/604093/) reported in December that Hannah-Jones has not “budged from her conviction that slavery helped fuel the Revolution.”

“I do still back up that claim,” she told The Atlantic’s Adam Serwer, but she conceded her essay phrased it too strongly to make readers think slavery was universally supported in the Colonies.

“I think someone reading that would assume that this was the case: All 13 Colonies and most people involved. And I accept that criticism, for sure,” Hannah-Jones said, while promising to better contextualize the claim when The 1619 Project is published in textbook form by [Random House](https://www.colorlines.com/articles/1619-project-become-multi-book-series).

That promise does not sound too reassuring when the entire proposition is bunk.

Further proof against Hannah-Jones’s claim is in the Constitution itself, which rather than protect slavery put it on a path to extinction, [Abraham Lincoln](https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/weekly-standard/lincoln-said-it-best-the-founding-fathers-opposed-slavery) and abolitionists like [Frederick Douglass](https://www.aaihs.org/frederick-douglass-and-the-united-states-constitution/) argued.

The Constitution specifically authorized the federal government to [ban the importation of slaves in 1808](https://www.heritage.org/constitution/#!/articles/1/essays/60/slave-trade) (approximately 20 years from the date the document was ratified).

Congress did so in 1808, and President Thomas Jefferson signed the bill into law.

An additional compromise that the Founders reached was counting [three-fifths of the state’s slave population](https://www.theusconstitution.org/news/understanding-the-three-fifths-compromise/) when calculating the overall population for determining how many representatives a state would have in Congress.

The Southern states wanted to count their entire slave populations for representation purposes, but the Northern states did not allow it.

The impact was to lessen the number of votes slaveholding interests held in the House of Representatives.

Both of these constitutional provisions were a recognition that[slavery was a present evil](https://www.westernjournal.com/ted-cruz-thoroughly-debunks-buttigiegs-lie-founding-fathers-slavery/) but not something many of the Founders wanted to see continue in perpetuity.

Finally, one other triumph in the fight against slavery during the founding period took place right across the street from the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

The Continental Congress passed the [Northwest Ordinance](https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/northwest.html), which established the laws governing the territorial land encompassing the future states of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin. The ordinance outlawed the introduction of slavery in the territory.

All of these facts from the founding era demonstrate that slavery was not a primary reason the Colonies declared their independence from Great Britain, and our nation’s students should not be taught that it was.

Not satisfied to push their liberal ideological perspective in reporting current events, The Times has moved on to propagate false narratives about America’s founding.

What motivated the founding generation to pledge their lives, fortunes and sacred honor was not to protect slavery but to secure their God-given right to liberty.

**328 Days**

NASA Astronaut Christina Koch has returned to Earth after spending a record 328 days in space, breaking the record for the longest time a woman has spent in space.

Koch and two of her colleagues [returned](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/02/06/nasa-astronaut-christina-koch/) to Earth at 4:12 a.m. EST on Thursday after the spacecraft carrying them home landed on a remote, frozen patch of desert in Kazakhstan, 7,000 miles away from Houston where NASA is headquartered and where most of the NASA astronauts like Koch live.

Koch [spent](https://www.wwltv.com/article/news/astronaut-christina-koch-returns-to-earth-after-record-breaking-stint-in-space/67-adb3355c-d2c4-45bd-8fb7-e70b9470876e) a total of 328 days in space, followed 5,248 orbits around Earth, performed six spacewalks, and spent 42 hours and 15 minutes working outside the International Space Station.

Koch’s lengthy stay in space broke a record set in 2017 by NASA astronaut Peggy Whitson, who spent 288 days on a single mission in space. She [broke](https://www.breitbart.com/science/2019/12/30/nasa-astronaut-breaks-woman-longest-time-space/) Whitson’s record on December 29. Koch’s mission is also the second-longest spaceflight ever taken by an American astronaut.

Scott Kelly holds the record for the longest spaceflight taken by an American astronaut.

Koch’s achievement comes as NASA is celebrating 20 continuous years of being present on the International Space Station, which 240 miles above Earth.

Koch, a North Carolina scientist who joined the astronaut corps in 2013, participated in a number of scientific experiments while onboard the space station. Some of those experiments had to do with mustard greens, bio-printing, combustion, and kidney diseases.

**The Mini Nuke**

**The Pentagon confirmed this week that it has, for the first time, already armed some of its submarines with long-range nuclear missiles which have a lower destructive power compared with existing warheads.** That means that this unit has already gone through its design and validation phases without actually having exploded a weapon. These so-called “mini-nukes” represent – despite the diminutive-sounding name – an increased risk of nuclear war. I have several thoughts about this skud-running of the current non-proliferation treaty guidelines.

First, this lower-yield weapon is nevertheless an instrument of immense mass destruction, equivalent to approximately a third of the power of the bomb the US dropped on Hiroshima in August 1945 which killed tens of thousands of people. **Even though these little beggars are believed to have an explosive yield of just five kilotons, or about 1 per cent of the existing W76-1 weapon, it is not like exploding 5 thousand tons of TNT. That is just a measurement of the actual energy released by the fusion reaction.** The folks down at Wars-R-Us are trying to say that because this is a mini-nuke, it makes nuclear war winnable, by containing the collateral damage. Really?

Second, the energy this weapon releases is extremely short wavelength, and blasts millions of volts of electricity into the atmosphere with no where to go. That means it is looking for a way to ground, which by the way is the Earth. That pathway is primarily power lines that act like huge antennae. This voltage energizes all the powerlines hanging from poles all over the cities hundreds of miles in every direction. It instantly travels to substation transformers and arcs through the insulating oil, destroying those transformers. Remember, that oil, and the clearances between the plates, is designed for 100 thousand volts stepped down to 14 thousand volts. It is not designed to insulate 2 million volts with very high amperage values. The power supply goes out and stays out until that transformer can be checked out and replaced if necessary. It takes about a year to replace the big transformers, provided the factory that manufactures them is not affected by the grid that just got fried.

If the public utility has enough warning and can disconnect the transformer from the power lines before the blast, then the voltage goes the other way, through homes and businesses and jumps to ground past the on-off switches and digital relays. It fries everything in its path. Remember, just because you flip the breaker, does not disconnect the ground. The energy also courses through the ground circuits before it passes down that grounding rod outside your house. Unplugging the equipment is the only way to protect it.

Third, t**he newly deployed W76-2 warhead is fitted to the same Trident missile system as the larger, more devastating W76-1 warhead. These Trident weapons are deigned to fit into the tubes of a submarine. The launching tube is charged with compressed gas, like air or nitrogen. The gyros in the missile are spun to keep it pointed vertical after it is pushed out of the tube of the submarine, still under water, so fast that it breaks the surface and travels upwards about a hundred feet. A split second after it breaks the surface, the fins pop out and the rocket propellant is ignited. The North Koreans have practiced this many times, and can do it without fail. The only difference between their subs, the plans for which they stole from South Korea, and US subs, is that they can only launch one missile at a time. They have to reload and recharge the tube between shots. The Nork sub is very quiet. Two or three subs coordinating can actually fire more missiles in less time than a US sub. By the way, the whole reason, I believe, that a mini-nuke has been announced is directly because we know that the Norks have perfected a 250 kiloton mini-nuke.**

**What one needs to keep in mind is that someone watching this on a screen from a satellite wondering how to retaliate does not know it is the smaller nuke until it actually blows up. They may actually retaliate with 1 megaton weapons, just because they don’t know what has been launched at them**

Pentagon official John Rood stated his pure insanity by saying, “***...the new device would make Americans safer because it would deter the danger of nuclear war happening.”***

As though out of some Dr. Strangelove sequel, he also reportedly cited the weapon as a deterrent against alleged Russian aggression. Russia is not the Soviet Union. Russia is a gas station posing as a country. Have they been meddling with us? Yes. You would be too if a country was conducting a $2 billion proxy war against you for the last 15 years. Yeah, it’s true. At the head of all the Ukraine corruption is a murderous Oligarch who has made corrupt US politicians tons like the Bidens, Bushes, McCains, and Kerrys and the Obamas tons of money. They have been laundering your tax dollars for years, and making themselves rich. Had Hillary been elected, we would never have known a thing about it, until it was too late. That is another story for another day.

I believe these weapons may **actually increase the risk of an eventual nuclear war.**It lowers the horror bar to the point that in a moment of panic or anger, Wars-R-Us could convince a president to launch one of these in an act of war. Forget the fact that they already convinced a half-dozen presidents to launch more than 2,500 of them just to see what would happen.

**I am positive Russia is not happy about this announcement. They are being made out to be the aggressor. Really?**

Last year, Wars-R-Us convinced President Trump to walk away from the Cold War Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty, governing the use of short-range, or tactical, nuclear missiles. So far, Washington has shown every indication that it has no intention to extend the New START accord with Russia governing long-range strategic weapons, which is due to expire next year. It wasn’t hard to do, considering the recent demonstrations by the NORKs. They are being sanctioned into oblivion right now. They have the weapon. They need money. Iran has hundreds of billions that Kerry and Obama gave them. If Obama can fly a couple billion around in cash in the middle of the night, don’t you think the Iranians could do the same thing? Have you ever thought that maybe one of those planes landed in North Korea to drop of a pallet or two? How traceable is cash?

**The deployment of low-yield nuclear weapons has already destabilized the global strategic balance.  The US announcing they also have just such a weapon may be a deterrent, but it also may ratchet up the possibility of nuclear battle.**
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**It is tempting to speculate that the US is merely reacting to Russia’s development of hypersonic non-nuclear weapons which are said to be able to evade any anti-missile defense system.** Moscow maintains that its arsenal is predicated on a doctrine of self-defense and not a first-strike objective. In any case, it seems that the US having realized that it has lost out to Russia in development of hypersonic non-nuclear weapons has taken the tack of expanding its nuclear options. Anti-nuke people claim this move overturns decades of declared non-proliferation commitments. Actually, the shuffling of these weapons has been going on for a decade or more. The Global Syndicate would only use one in an act of desperation. Like if Trump won a major political victory, or if their Democrat party were to fail to field an effective candidate to run against him.

**It should also be noted that this week the Kremlin disclosed that an urgent call issued by Russian President Vladimir Putin for the five permanent members of the UN Security Council to convene a summit in order to address international peace has so far been ignored by Washington.**

Last month, at a Holocaust memorial in Israel, Putin repeated a proposal for the UN founding powers – the US, Britain, France, Russia and China – to consolidate efforts for strengthening global security, non-proliferation and arms controls. This week, the Kremlin said this call has not received any response from the US (or the UK) to participate in such a forum.

Furthermore, next month sees one of the biggest-ever NATO war maneuvers in Europe, including a massive trans-Atlantic deployment of US forces. Russia’s Ministry of Defense has deprecated the huge mobilization as being akin to a rehearsal for an invasion of Russia.

President Donald Trump has previously stated his abhorrence of nuclear war and has called for negotiation of a new comprehensive arms control treaty between the US, Russia and China. Maybe he is trying to restrain Wars-R-Us. But the Global Syndicate is patient. They can wait 5 years. Maybe.

We know there is a conflict. Why? Because all empirical evidence shows that American rhetoric is completely and contemptibly detached from the reality of its threatening practices. It means that President Trump does not control Wars-R-Us. Just like I wrote in *Charm of Favor*, there is war for the world inside the walls of the Pentagon. That is precisely why President Trump formed the Space Force. He wants the high ground.

**Going Viral**

A shocking report published yesterday by the Epoch Times [revealed](https://www.epochtimes.com/b5/20/2/5/n11845444.htm) that crematoriums in China are struggling to keep up with the hundreds of bodies they are receiving, suggesting Beijing is not telling the world the truth. Really? One thing people need to know about China culture. Bad news is always, by design, suppressed. You are not even allowed to have a scowl on your face, let along spread news that is not officially sanctioned. Why would the world be surprised to find out China is not being truthful with the extent of the Coronavirus outbreak.

The flu does not break out this this, anyway. It usually breaks out like Austin, Seattle, Chicago, Miami all in the same flu season. They announce it on TV and the radio like it’s part of the weather or linked to some holiday period. They sell billions in cold and flu remedies just to make sure we can get back to work quicker. The Coronavirus escaped. Plain a simple. One source of the flu a few block away from China’s bioweapons lab in Wuhan? That’s a no-brainer. Outbreak my ass. It was a designer weapon that escaped. Has anyone thought this might be worker retaliation against China’s government for the whole social scoring program? Maybe some virus designer got a bad score and got pissed about it. I would.

The Epoch Times, a Chinese-American anti-communist newspaper, sent journalists to speak with the heads of several funeral homes and crematoriums in Hubei province – whose capital, Wuhan, is the epicenter of the current novel coronavirus outbreak. The newspaper found that adding up the total number of people cremated per day in several funeral homes yielded a significantly larger number than the official number of deaths tallied since the outbreak began in December.

The Chinese Communist Party alerted the world to the discovery of a new type of coronavirus on January 20, over a month after locals became aware of a disease spreading and 20 days after local officials shut down a wild meat market in Wuhan where the virus is believed to have originated.

According to the Epoch Times, the crematoria were handling “4-5 times the usual cremation volume” per day. Only a very few of those cremated were officially confirmed as coronavirus cases.

“I received 127 corpses yesterday [February 3], and burned 116. Among them, 8 were confirmed [coronavirus cases] on the death certificate and 48 were suspected,” a funeral home director in Hubei using the pseudonym “You Hu” told the newspaper. “I am about to collapse, we are under great pressure now.”

The newspaper offered insight into a larger funeral home in Hankou, a Wuhan neighborhood, which it estimated had the capacity to burn 576 people per day. “You Hu” told the Epoch Times that the backlog of people waiting to be cremated was not due to lack of space in the burners, but lack of sufficient transportation and collapsing staff numbers, as few were sleeping or taking breaks. Due to transportation and staff limits, the Epoch Times estimated that the Hankou crematorium was burning 225 corpses a day.

With this math, the newspaper concludes that Hubei province incinerated 341 bodies on February 3; China officials only  reported 65 deaths nationwide due to coronavirus that day.

Hubei province has eight municipal funeral homes that can keep up with the normal rate of death in that city. Similarly judging from their capacity for bodies and the amount of time the furnaces are running, the article adds another 135 corpses a day to the tally from five of these. The other three, it concludes, burned 476 people a day. While less confident in these numbers since the journalists were unable to speak to their managers, these numbers reveal a rough estimate of nearly 1,000 people incinerated per day.

Sure, we can’t say that all these people died after becoming infected with the coronavirus. Reports say of the 127 remains “You Hu” received on February 3 (116 were cremated that day), eight were confirmed coronavirus patients and 48 were suspected carriers. The newspaper also identified another funeral home that took in 22 sets of remains and three were confirmed coronavirus cases.

Even taking all this into account, these numbers, the report argues, do not align with the Communist Party policies issued on handling coronavirus remains.

“As per from the current policy of the Communist Party of China … the funeral home must give priority to the burning of novel coronavirus patients’ bodies; other bodies may not be burned on the same day due to funeral culture, rituals, and other reasons,” the article notes. “Based on this, it can be inferred that the 116 dead [at “You Hu”‘s crematorium] basically all died of novel coronavirus pneumonia, or at least suspected of having died of it.”

What’s more, a local ordinance in at least one Hubei county, Yangxin, required crematoria to immediately handle coronavirus victims and prioritize them over other deaths.

The Epoch Times report is not the first one to accuse the Chinese regime of secretly cremating large numbers of individuals suspected of carrying the novel coronavirus – or refusing to take patients in hospitals and confirm their disease. Last week, the Hong Kong-based website Initium Media [published](https://www.breitbart.com/national-security/2020/01/31/china-accused-secretly-cremating-coronavirus-victims-conceal-fatalities/) a report contending that the Communist Party is artificially suppressing the death toll from the coronavirus outbreak by incinerating people suspected of having died of it before their deaths can be properly documented.

The implication that China is also not properly documenting cause of death on people’s birth certificates is also not new. Shortly after China revealed the outbreak to the world on January 20, Radio Free Asia (RFA) highlighted the strange death of Xu Dapeng, the founder of the oldest environmentalist group in the country. Xu and his wife lived in Wuhan and both died of pneumonia in January. Neither they nor anyone who was exposed to them were tested for the novel coronavirus, and their cause of death was simply declared “[pneumonia](https://www.breitbart.com/asia/2020/01/23/report-china-ignores-signs-of-wuhan-virus-in-environmentalists-pneumonia-death/).”

At press time Friday, the Chinese government and the World Health Organization (WHO) have [confirmed](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3049614/coronavirus-chinese-data-shows-80-cent-cases-are-deemed-mild-who) 31,527 cases of novel coronavirus. Of those, 638 people have died, all but two within China. The government also claimed another 1,568 people have fully recovered from the infection.

The WHO claimed on Friday that 82 percent of cases have been deemed “mild.”

We think the number is closer to 300,000 infected, and more than 30 thousand dead. This virus could not have been designed any better. It has a long incubation period, during which time the infected person is contagious. It produces a thick histamine reaction that allows pneumonia to develop. The pneumococci toxins go straight to the kidneys and liver for removal from the body, killing those organs so quickly, that full flu symptoms don’t even have time to develop. It is perfect for spreading. It is perfect for killing the old, the weak, and debilitating the healthy. Cause of death? Pneumonia. Perfect.

**Voyager II**

IN AN INCREDIBLE FEAT of remote engineering, NASA has fixed one of the most intrepid explorers in human history. Voyager 2, currently some [11.5 billion miles](https://www.inverse.com/article/51610-voyager-2-has-left-the-building) from Earth, is back online and resuming its mission to collect scientific data on the solar system and the interstellar space beyond. On Wednesday, February 5 at 10:00 p.m. Eastern, [NASA's Voyager Twitter](https://twitter.com/nasavoyager?lang=en) account gave out the good news: Voyager 2 is not only stable, but is back at its critical science mission.

"My twin is back to taking science data, and the team at @NASAJPL is evaluating the health of the instruments after their brief shutoff," the account tweeted.

Voyager 2 is sister craft to Voyager 1. Both have been traveling through the solar system — and now beyond it — for the last four decades. Together, they have [transformed our understanding](https://www.inverse.com/article/61801-nasa-voyager-2-first-findings) of our stellar neighborhood and are already revealing unprecedented information about the [interstellar space](https://www.inverse.com/article/60656-voyager-2-interstellar-space-solar-system) beyond the Sun's sphere of influence.

"Mission operators report that Voyager 2 continues to be stable and that communications between the Earth and the spacecraft are good."

"The spacecraft has resumed taking science data, and the science teams are now evaluating the health of the instruments," the agency said.

The fix is no mean feat: It takes 17 hours one-way to [communicate with Voyager 2](https://voyager.jpl.nasa.gov/) from Earth, which is the furthest away manmade object in space. That means a single information relay takes 34 hours.

The spacecraft had run into trouble on January 28, when NASA revealed that it had unexpectedly — and for unknown reasons — shut down. The world held its breath. As Inverse reported at the time, [Voyager 2](https://www.inverse.com/article/60656-voyager-2-interstellar-space-solar-system)went black right before it was scheduled for a maneuver in which the spacecraft rotates 360 degrees in order to calibrate one of its instruments onboard.

But the spacecraft didn't make the move. As a result, two of its systems — both of which consume a lot of power — were running at the same time, according to [a statement by NASA.](https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/news.php?feature=7587)

The likeliest problem was that the spacecraft was using up too much of its available power supply, which triggered protection software. The software automatically turns off Voyager 2’s science instruments when there is a power overload to save on power. It only has a finite supply, after all.

As of writing, NASA hasn't confirmed or denied whether that is what actually happened. Only time will tell whether the agency ever gets an answer to what went wrong. But for now, we can all rest assured that Voyager 2's mission is far from over yet. If all goes well, it should have another five years of life left, meaning five more years of data collection from an area of space we humans have no other way of studying.

**The Capitalism Evolution**

The current economic system converts value into a system of exchange we call money. That is not a bad thing, because it makes it easy for you to work, get paid, and buy stuff on Amazon. It would be fine, except that the industry that manages the movement of this value, the actual system of exchange, has made itself wealthy in the process. They print money from nothing and claim it has the same value as the money you earned by doing what you do. They call their money wealth.

They distribute this wealth in a very focused manner that prevents a vast majority of humans from being adequately rewarded by the technologically advanced civilization they have helped design and build. I want to draw attention to this system’s impending obsolescence. The banker class that creates money from ones and zeroes hinders economic growth, and is not sustainable going forward.

​

My comments are my thoughts, and I utilized an article by "The Syntellect Hypothesis: Five Paradigms of the Mind's Evolution" by Alex M. Vikoulov, available now on amazon and Barnes and Noble. I found it most stimulating.

​​The current economic operating system may work with “alternating success” for some time, because various level heads may be able to constrain the Fed and the other banks and treasuries to behaving themselves. But, if we get another Obama or Biden in office, all bets are off. They will very quickly seek to make themselves wealthy at the expense of everyone and everything else.

That being said, capitalism is a system based upon service to one another, whereas socialism is based upon service to government. Capitalism, due to the inherent temptations presented by the system of exchange we call money, may have run its course. It must eventually evolve and be gradually replaced with an IT-based shared economy as long as everyone in the system adds value to the economy. There still will be no tolerance for freeloaders, who lay around as part time poets and full-time drug addicts. There are quite a few, rather frightening labels that will corrupt my story, so I will stick with the more benign, broad term ‘Post-capitalism’ here to refer to any subsequent economic model.

​I am not trying to sell any particular model. I’m only saying that we are quickly outgrowing the classic form of capitalism. I believe economic evolution is akin to any other natural process of unfolding patterns, so it would apply to economic development as well. If the human being is ready to evolve, then the system is ready to evolve with him. Economic evolution doesn’t end with capitalism. Rather, it begins with capitalism. In fact, it cannot even sprout without capitalism, because the system is based upon service to one another, and not service to the government, or perhaps better stated *the crown*.

By the year 2040 or so, geo-post-capitalism will likely combine market economy, some socialist elements and even AI-engineered central planning amid decentralized backdrop of its global components. Evolutionary utilitarianism – ensuring the greater good for the greatest number – seems like an obvious eventuality. The key here is to realize that money as a form of exchange will survive, in some cyber-textual manner, but the system of exchange will be absorbed into both sides of the equation. That is to say, your work and what you want to buy with it will be brought so close together, that the bankers and the money printers who make themselves wealthy like Monopoly cheaters, will disappear. There will be no space or function for them in this new economic structure.

​Overall, we have been on the right track, nonetheless. Many aspects of life on Earth are getting dramatically better. Extreme poverty has fallen by half since 1990, and life expectancy is increasing by leaps and bounds in developing countries. A recent poll showed that 90% of Americans are happy with their lives. That is something never seen before. And what is so amazing, is that this joy is spreading around the world. Billions of people are rebelling against their socialist governments and against the ultimate climate-change-oligarchy that is crushing the poor all over the world. Propaganda is no longer accepted as news by most people on the planet. In short, things are not going well for the Global Syndicate. Their ability to buy and sell countries with cash printed by them, is no longer a viable form of domination.

As long as the costs of communications and computation continue to drop due to exponential advances in technology, communication networks become global and ubiquitous, and as the networks proliferate, they gradually replace matter with mind, i.e. networked intelligence. Truth is much harder to suppress now, thanks to programs like America Free Radio. Access is becoming more important than ownership. It would be more economically optimal in some situations to rent than to own, in other situations to share and generate passive income. Agility is more important than owning real estate to many people. Going to where the earning is best also serves the greater good. It is going to be the key to the evolution I am talking about.

If the premise of the current sharing economy is that you can turn your car into a cab or your house into a hotel, the premise of the next phase of the IT-based shared economy is that you can turn anything into a productive asset. All you have to do is set your price and other criteria, and AI will take care of the rest. The blockchain “smart contracts” could make a lot of things sharable. The key thing to remember is that it is the OWNERS of those things that are sharing, not the government.

Electronic “gig economy” can distribute creative and enjoyable mini-tasks, and “digital twins” can earn you additional income. I am already seeing that Webinars are a better economic model than flying to conferences and speaking to a live audience. People just won’t spend $1,200 to go to a conference when they can hear their favorite, or discover new live speakers from home for less than $50. I get paid, rather than having to buy plane tickets and hotels, and they get to hear me. Live speaking venues are evaporating faster than drive-in theaters.

Our AI future is almost unimaginable: AI will destroy the banking empire and create tens times as many jobs, invent new industries, accelerate innovation to a new level and fundamentally change the way business is done across the board. Amazon may be bad for malls, but it has expanded the manufacturing economy 200% on less than 20 years. People buy more, more often, and that means people have to make more, which crates jobs. Millions of people have their own Amazon stores, and they work from home and spend their profits in their own local markets for food, entertainment, cars, and homes.

Silicon Valley has an outsized influence on the world’s economy, stock markets and culture. This small stretch of land from San Jose to San Francisco is home to three of the world’s five most valuable companies. Tech giants such as Apple, Facebook, Google, Intel and Oracle all claim Silicon Valley as their birthplace and home. San Francisco Bay Area has the 19th-largest economy in the world, ranking above Switzerland and Saudi Arabia. And California is now the 5th largest economy, surpassing the U.K. in 2018. The top four tech giants have more money than all but four countries on the planet.

Across the Pacific Ocean, China seems to put more emphasis on developing robotics – empathic machines – to integrate robots, and consequently, AGIs into the fabric of society, while the focus of the U.S. has favored the human element over the robot. China might be closer to the realization of the Global Brain, epitomized in the Internet of Things, Internet of NanoThings, Quantum Internet and Virtual Metaverse than most countries. This is a grave cause for concern, as their power is owned by the State. The State has become all powerful and all knowing.

Nation-states evolved to regulate human beings – the main intellectual and physical resource in the past few centuries. They are the entities that cause wars and scarcity of thought and thus of wealth. Blockchains, and similar systems that could be called “virtual states” are evolving to regulate information technology. What needs to happen in order for this evolution to happen is to make sure the State does not own the blockchain. The value, which is you, must connect to the value. In other words, the State must be taken out of the equation as a regulating body. It must be removed as a perpetrator of war. It must be disarmed and dissolved, while the ability to become valuable to the world is unlocked by the new structure.

Not only the world around us is rapidly shifting to a truly digital economy, but one that will become economically borderless. The nationalism that is setting us free right now is exactly the force that will bring about this new economy. The old, oppressive, global forces of men and money is being dismantled, while the innate rights to speak, move, and work are unleashed for everyone. Just like medieval city walls later were either demolished or reduced to historic curiosity, over time, nation-states will, too, gradually play less of role in our lives. The Global Syndicate of Brussels that extracted wealth from every country it absorbed will go away. The system of economy will surpass the decentralization of nationalism complete the evolution to empowering every single human to reach their fullest potential. Of course the key word here is reach. Humans must reach. Sitting on the porch or wandering aimlessly around the neighborhood looking for a drink or sex or a free meal will no longer be part of the human society.

​The greatest fear of a tech world is the dystopian world of Aldous Huxley. That is exactly what happens when all power is centralized. Yes, technology would allow a single power to rule the world. Even Jesus would not make everyone happy and fulfilled. The entire idea behind the economy I proposed is a benign and powerful system that is completely decentralized. Everyone has the ability to reach as far as they can imagine. There is no central power that claims all ownership. It is a completely non-profit, self-less system that does not make its managers and politicians wealthy and superior to all of us. There is no woman in white ripping up a President’s speech. There is no oligarchy, because there is no scarcity anymore. It is not the difference between us that make us valuable. It is the potential we each have that makes us valuable. Whether are born on one side of a border the other will make no difference any longer, because the system of exchange or the real property is no longer the value in the equation. You are.

Over the long term, technology trends will inexorably trump any geopolitics in significance. Entrepreneurs, researchers and socialites are much better adept and motivated to cooperate on a global scale than politicians. In the meantime, technology will fundamentally change how governments work, and the changes will likely come much sooner than many think. As long as AI does not deem humans its enemy, I would much rather have a robot as a Congressman than a man or woman. A robot doesn’t need sex, sleep, drugs, booze, a Maserati, or five houses and a pension. It will represent each of us; all of us. It can take all of our phone calls, answer all our emails, and address all of our needs right down to the new sewer line permits for a new neighborhood. Nationalism will evolve into nano-nations that create self-sustaining human habitats, rather than megacities that pollute and empower politicians to rule and reign while making themselves powerful and rich. The central government will become irrelevant, with respect to the economy.

Economies have think they have created a zero sum game for humanity. They think that in order for one nation to prosper, other nations must lose. I maintain that is not the case. Once we evolve into this type of economy, we can settle other planets, expand our energy base, and reach further in the stars than every before.

 Now, let me ask you this question. What if with the new wave of technologies, such as nanotechnology which would enable us to reprogram matter at a molecular level, we can overcome scarcity once and for all?

Design would then become the most important part from start to end product which can be freely shared or have a premium in the marketplace. At any rate, this will dismantle the current social, economic, and political system, because it will become irrelevant; every institution, every value system, every aspect of our lives have been governed by scarcity: the problem of distributing a finite amount of “stuff.” There will be no need for any of the today’s social institutions. In other words, when nanotech and ultra-realistic VR are commonplace, the system built on scarcity will crumble and that would herald the forthcoming "economic singularity."

**Money Into Gold**

President Donald Trump has formally nominated Judy Shelton, a liberty-minded advocate of sound money, to one of the open spots on the Federal Reserve Board. It is possible she is being considered as Fed chief, sources say. The news sparked celebrations among free market-oriented economists and patriots, who spoke of adding some intellectual diversity to the board. But her nomination has also stoked concerns among establishment figures from the media to Congress. Trump has repeatedly [expressed support for an honest monetary system](https://www.thenewamerican.com/economy/economics/item/24019-blasting-false-economy-trump-takes-on-the-federal-reserve), but this may be his most significant move aimed at actually bringing about some degree of monetary reform. Now the battle heads to the U.S. Senate.

Known as a fierce critic of the Fed and its quasi-“central planning” schemes, Shelton has argued for a gold-backed currency as well as for more competition with private currencies. Perhaps even more unusual, the longtime Republican even questioned whether a central bank is needed, and has called for an end to federal deposit insurance. She has also exposed the fact that the Federal Reserve System has “rigged” the economy “in favor of Wall Street and the wealthiest 1 percent.” In an essay last year, Shelton, who served as an economic advisor to the president’s 2016 campaign, explained how important a sound monetary system is to Trump’s overall agenda for restoring the nation. “We make America great again by making America’s money great again,” Shelton wrote.

Echoing Trump’s 2016 campaign comments about the Fed's dangerous manipulation of interest rates, Shelton gave an explosive interview to the Financial Times that revealed an in-depth understanding of the threat. “How can a dozen, slightly less than a dozen, people meeting eight times a year, decide what the cost of capital should be versus some kind of organically, market supply determined rate?” she asked. “The Fed is not omniscient. They don’t know what the right rate should be. How could anyone? If the success of capitalism depends on someone being smart enough to know what the rate should be on everything ... we’re doomed. We might as well resurrect Gosplan.” Gosplan was the committee that centrally planned the failed Soviet economy.

Shelton also appears to understand the Fed’s role in causing regular economic crises, and the manipulation of official inflation and GDP figures. In a Wall Street Journal piece headlined “The Case for Monetary Regime Change,” Shelton directly blamed the Fed for the “devastating 2008 global meltdown” that sparked economic turmoil worldwide. In particular, she pointed the finger at the Fed’s “influence over the creation of money and credit.” To deal with perpetual inflation caused by the Fed's never-ending expansion of the monetary supply, meanwhile, Shelton has called for “linking the supply of money and credit to gold.” That would severely limit the Fed’s ability to quietly steal the savings of everyone holding U.S. dollars.

On interest rates, her views have been described as “more complicated.” During the near-zero interest rates implemented under Obama, Shelton was highly critical. Writing in the defunct neocon journal known as the Weekly Standard in 2013, Shelton slammed the ultralow interest rates supposedly designed to “stimulate” the economy back to prosperity. “The Federal Reserve is not your friend,” Shelton argued. “Loose monetary policy is bad for you and for your economic prospects.” Shelton has also repeatedly slammed so-called “Quantitative Easing,” which is basically a term designed to conceal the fact that the central bank is creating debt-backed currency out of thin air and then using it to buy U.S. Treasury bonds that taxpayers will have to repay with taxes.

However, more recently, she has expressed criticism of the Fed’s moves to keep raising rates, saying the central bank is basically subsidizing mega-banks while holding back economic growth. Shelton has also criticized the Fed paying interest to banks for sitting on “excess reserves.” President Trump, meanwhile, has been pushing for rate cuts that he believes would “stimulate” the economy — something that could help boost his reelection prospects. Fed boss Jerome Powell, though, whom Trump put in place early on in his term, has been less than cooperative, leading to widespread speculation that the president may seek to put Shelton in Powell’s current job.

At this point, banking lobbyists, Democrats, and potentially even some so-called Republicans In Name Only (RINOs) in the U.S. Senate are scrambling to figure out how they may be able to derail the nomination. Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) blasted Shelton as “radical,” while former Obama Treasury bigwig Larry Summers slammed Trump’s nominee as “dangerous.” Lobbyists for the banking cartel that literally owns the Fed are also busy expressing their concerns.

For Republicans, though, undermining Shelton may be tough to do without infuriating their constituents, with GOP voters overwhelmingly supportive of President Trump. “There are a lot of questions about her,” Senator Richard Shelby of Alabama, who serves on the Senate Banking Committee that must approve candidates for the Fed board, told the anti-Trump Washington Post. “I have a few, but I’m not the only one.... I have an interest in having solid, mainstream people on the Fed.” Some other Republicans on the Banking Committee have already publicly expressed their support for Shelton's nomination.

However, for Trump-supporting conservatives, there are also some red flags surrounding Shelton. For instance, Shelton has in the past been an advocate of “open borders” with Mexico. She also chaired the National Endowment for Democracy, a key Deep State-controlled institution that has been involved in all sorts of lawless intrigue. And she helped bankroll Senator Lamar Alexander, a globalist who helped further federalize education while lying about it toward the end of Obama’s term. In 2012, she supported Republican candidate Mitt Romney financially in the presidential election.

Writing for the Ludwig von Mises Institute, a pro-sound money think-tank associated with the Austrian school of economics, Institute Vice President Joseph Salerno[sounded positive](https://mises.org/wire/fed-nominee-judy-shelton-wants-sound-money%E2%80%94and-lots-it) about the nomination, but with some reservations. The good news, he said, was that Shelton supports the gold standard and has not been indoctrinated into believing the modern economics establishment’s “prevailing orthodoxy.” She also has a lot of experience working for prominent free market think tanks, including the Hoover Institute and the Atlas Network.

“The bad news is that she leans heavily toward supply-side economics, which is deeply flawed on monetary policy,” argued Salerno, professor emeritus of economics at Pace University and editor of the Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics. “Like most supply-siders, the position she advocates may be summed up in the motto, ‘I favor sound money — and plenty of it.’”

On the gold standard, Salerno pointed out that Shelton appears to favor a return to some version of the failed Bretton Woods system that collapsed in the late 1960s and was formally ended by President Nixon in 1971, rather than the genuine gold standard that prevailed before that in which actual gold was in circulation and bills were redeemable by anyone. “The historical Bretton Woods system had inherent flaws that led to its slow-motion inflationary collapse,” Salerno said. “This did not stop supply-siders, including Shelton, in her 1994 book Monetary Meltdown, from penning proposals for an updated version of Bretton Woods.”

But overall, Salerno, widely respected among liberty-minded free market economists, said he considered Shelton to be “among the most politically palatable (at least to Republicans) candidates for the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.” But, unfortunately, he added, “this is weak praise, given that the very existence and function of the Fed is a destructive influence on the U.S. and global economy.” Others at the Mises Institute, while noting that she was “no Austrian,” still sounded pleased that she would bring some “much needed ideological diversity to the central bank.”

Whether she can get approved is now the question. According to CNBC, Cowen investment bank analyst Jaret Steinberg argued that there were “enough flash points” to potentially get her blocked. “Shelton would be a perfect fit as she would be a Trump loyalist who won Senate confirmation,” Steinberg was quoted as saying in a note. “We suspect there are enough Republicans who question her views on the gold standard and on excess reserves to put her confirmation in real doubt. To us, the Senate is unlikely to reject her nomination. The most likely outcome is that it just never votes to confirm her.”

The Trump administration, however, fully expects her to be confirmed, according to Chairman Larry Kudlow of the National Economic Council. Speaking to reporters last month, Kudlow added that Shelton would be “a good addition to the board.” Two previous Trump nominees for the Fed board, Stephen Moore and Herman Cain, failed to get the job amid vicious media criticism and establishment pressure about their alleged lack of qualifications to hold the positions.

But there may be some strategy at work. Alongside Shelton, Trump also nominated Christopher Waller, research director at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, to an open spot on the Federal Reserve’s seven-member board. He is a much more conventional pick — a nominee who would work to preserve the status quo rather than rock the boat. By pairing the two together, analysts said Trump may have a better chance of getting Shelton on the board, and eventually into the top post. Senate hearings are set to be held on February 13 featuring both Shelton and Waller.

If confirmed, it remains to be seen whether Shelton would retain her maverick views, or succumb to establishment pressure. Former Fed boss Alan Greenspan was once a hardcore advocate of gold money and a free market, saying fiat currency was a tool to loot the public. Once in office, he became just another Deep State toadie. Despite Shelton not being openly in favor of former Congressman Ron Paul’s famous battle cry to “End The Fed” — a cry that reverberated across college campuses all over America — sound money advocates have expressed hope that Shelton may be at least an “ally” in the fight to rein in the shadowy central bank. Time will tell.

**The Space Fence**

The U.S. Space Force will turn on a new and improved radar system as early as this month that's designed to track small objects in space. The “Space Fence” is built on a remote island in the South Pacific and will allow the military to keep an eye on thousands of objects orbiting the Earth, up to 22,000 miles from the surface of the planet.

The Space Fence, located on the Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific, will also help the military monitor space junk, keep track of enemy satellites, and help prevent satellites from colliding with one another. NASA estimates that up to a half million such objects with a diameter between 0.4 and four inches are circling the Earth, at a speed of 22,000 miles an hour. Any man-made spacecraft entering orbit with these objects, particularly manned spacecraft or space stations, risks a catastrophic accident.

A previous version of the Space Fence, shut down in 2013 due to budget cuts, could only track items in low-Earth orbit. The new Space Fence is designed to detect objects as small as four inches from low-Earth orbit (roughly 99 to 1,200 miles) but also medium-Earth orbit (1,200 to 22,000 miles) and geosynchronous orbit (22,000 miles and beyond).

The new fence will also track more objects. The old fence could track up to 2,000 objects in orbit, while the new Space Fence, as Popular Mechanics wrote in 2018, is "expected to detect five to ten times more.” This will allow the Space Force to anticipate collisions between satellites or between satellites and space junk, allowing satellite operators to adjust to a safer orbit if possible.

It can also track the satellites of countries such as Russia and China, predicting when their satellites will be over the United States and U.S. forces abroad. The heart of the Space Fence is a new Gallium Nitride (GaN) powered S-band radar system. Gallium Nitride “can operate at higher voltages, greater radio frequency power density, and in smaller sizes than their Gallium arsenide predecessors.” This allows both the greater sensitivity and boost in range for Space Fence 2.0.

The new Space Fence will cost $914 million, and the Pentagon plans to build a second site in Western Australia in 2021.

**The New Immigration Plan: Democrat Style**

Fox News host Tucker Carson revealed the details of a piece of impending Democratic-led House legislation that would “entirely remake” the United States immigration system.

Discussing the proposed New Way Forward Act during a Thursday night “Tucker Carlson Tonight” monologue, Carlson noted that the bill is currently “sponsored by 44 House Democrats, including Ilhan Omar and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez,” yet has “received almost no publicity.”

“It’s roughly 4,400 words, that means it’s almost exactly as long as the U.S. Constitution,” said the Fox News host. “Like the Constitution, it’s designed to create a whole new country. The bill would entirely remake our immigration system with the explicit purpose of ensuring that criminals are able to move to the United States, and settle here permanently, with impunity.”

Carlson called the act the “single most radical single piece of legislation we have ever seen proposed in this country, ever” and a plan that “makes the Green New Deal look like the status quo,” then went into the nuts and bolts of how the proposed legislation would severely relax the immigration laws that require convicted illegals to be deported.

“Under the New Way Forward Act, ‘crimes of moral turpitude’ are eliminated entirely as a justification for deportation,” said Carlson. “And the category of ‘aggravated felony’ gets eliminated too,” meaning “there will no longer be any crime that automatically requires deportation.”

Additionally, any crimes that do allow for deportation would require a prison sentence of at least five years.

“According to federal data, crimes like car theft, fraud, and weapons offenses all carry average prison sentences of fewer than five years,” he said. “And that’s just looking at averages. There are people who commit rape, child abuse, even manslaughter and get sentences of fewer than five years. Lots of them. If the New Way Forward Act passes, immigrants who commit those crimes, and receive those sentences, would remain in the country and, of course, they’ll be eligible for citizenship one day, too.”

The bill would “grant sweeping new powers to immigration judges” to “nullify” deportation orders at their own discretion. It also eliminates the statute that makes “drug addiction grounds for deportation” as well as paves the way for those convicted of drug crimes in other countries to immigrate to the U.S.

The proposed legislation “decriminalizes illegal entry into America, even by those we’ve previously deported,” Carlson said. “According to a document promoting this bill, criminalizing illegal entry into America is quote, ‘white supremacist.'”

“The bill would also effectively abolish all existing enforcement against illegal immigration,” said the Fox News host. “To detain illegal immigrants, ICE would have to prove in court that they are dangerous or a flight risk. But of course, ICE wouldn’t be allowed to use a detainee’s prior criminal behavior as proof of danger. That’s banned. ICE would have to overcome even more hurdles if the detainee claims to be gay or transgendered, if they’re under 21, or if they can’t speak English and an interpreter isn’t immediately available, they get a pass. In other words, it would be much harder to arrest an illegal alien in this country than it is to arrest you. They’re the protected class here. You’re just some loser who’s paying for it all.” (RELATED: ‘The State Is Too Crowded. Will You Concede That?’ Tucker And Liberal Radio Host Spar Over Unlimited Immigration)

Saving the “nuttiest part” for last, the Fox News host revealed that the legislation would use “taxpayer money to bring deported criminals back into America.” Calling it the “right to come home,” the New Way Forward Act would order the government to create a “pathway for those previously deported to apply to return home to their homes and families in the United States,” at taxpayer expense.

“The New Way Forward Act fundamentally inverts every assumption you have about America,” Carlson said. “Under this legislation, the criminals are the victims. Law enforcement is illegitimate. It’s racist, just like the country you live in, just like you are, and the only solution is to get rid of both. America would be better off as a borderless rest stop for the world’s worst predators and parasites. That’s the point of this.”

The media empire does not think you should know about it.

“Whether the press cares or not, these are the stakes of the 2020 election,” he said. “A growing wing of the Democratic party views America itself as essentially illegitimate — a rogue state in which everything must be destroyed and remade: our laws, our institutions, our customs, our freedoms, our history, our values. That’s the point of all this, of course. An entirely new country, in which resistance is crushed, and they’re in charge forever.”

**The China Syndrome**

There is no doubt in anyone’s mind that the Coronaviruse is a Chinese engineered bioweapon. What is confusing to everyone, is why was it released in China? I may have the answer. On February 6, the Financial Times bannered a scoop under this headline: “Donald Trump ‘apoplectic’ in call with Boris Johnson over Huawei.”

The argument was over the decision of the British prime minister to allow the Chinese-government-controlled tech manufacturer Huawei to participate in Britain’s next-generation cellular network, known worldwide as 5G. In other words, the United Kingdom has just made an enormous decision, full of consequences for not only the U.K., but also for the U.S.

5G, of course, is the new big thing in tech; it will accelerate the speed of Internet networks by a hundred-fold. And as such, 5G will be in the middle of every communication and every transaction. 5G also includes the Internet of Things, which has the potential to link together just about any object, man-made or natural, in a “smart network.” That will be great for manufacturing, inventory, logistics—and, oh yes, for better or worse, for surveillance.

Moreover, 5G will reach deep into the military; the vital variables of situational awareness and command-and-control—governing everything from missile defense to satellite surveillance to nuclear deterrence—will be shaped by 5G.

Yet most of this is in the future, because the 5G hardware, including stations and routers, has yet to be purchased and installed. And when it is, that will be a multi-hundred-billion-dollar infusion for the seller, as well as a huge security vulnerability for the purchaser.

Thus the idea that Huawei, which is nothing more than a cat’s paw for the People’s Liberation Army of China, could soon be making Britain’s 5G equipment is, indeed, alarming. This author has long supported Boris Johnson’s efforts to extricate Britain from the European Union—and applauds the successful conclusion of the Brexit process under Johnson’s leadership—and yet it would be an epic tragedy if the U.K. were to emancipate itself from the E.U. only to surrender itself to China.

**What was the Plan?**

Moreover, since Britain is so closely integrated with America—culturally, economically, and militarily—any decision by London on 5G becomes, in effect, a decision for Washington, DC, to grapple with. So yessiree, Trump was right to be “apoplectic” about the Brits’ 5G decision. As the FT also reported, Trump was “livid” and the conversation “very difficult.” Good for Trump!

What will happen next in the United Kingdom on 5G is unclear. All we know for sure is that the sovereignty of the U.K. includes the sovereign right to make a mistake.

Of course, the decision to de-couple the two countries was made back in 1776, and so in the final analysis, whatever the mistakes the British might make, the United States must look out for America, first. And if that means carving out a different path on 5G, so be it.

Interestingly, also on February 6—the same day that FT reported on Trump’s angry phone conversation with Johnson—U.S. Attorney General William Barr delivered a speech in which he outlined a plausible, if imperfect, solution.

Speaking to the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC, Barr said that the U.S., and the West, faced a dilemma on 5G—the dilemma being that the Chinese are currently the best in the world at making 5G technology. As Barr put it, “It’s all very well to tell our friends and allies that they shouldn’t install Huawei, but whose infrastructure are they going to install?” Barr added, “There are only two companies that can compete with Huawei right now: Nokia and Ericsson.”

We might pause to note that Nokia is headquartered in Finland, while Ericsson is based in Sweden. In other words, Barr was conceding the fact there’s no American company competitive in 5G hardware. That’s an astonishing admission about the current sad state of the U.S. tech manufacturing, and we’ll come back to that, but first, let’s hear what else Barr had to say.

The U.S., Barr continued, should be “actively considering” investments in Ericsson and Nokia, to accelerate their ability to develop 5G hardware: “We and our closest allies certainly need to be actively considering this approach. The risk of losing the 5G struggle with China should vastly outweigh all other considerations.”

The stakes, the attorney general continued, are high: “If the industrial internet becomes dependent on Chinese technology, China would have the ability to shut countries off from technology and equipment upon which their consumers and industries depend. For China, success is a zero-sum game.”

We can add: The “industrial internet” Barr refers to overlaps, very much, with the “military internet.”

Reacting to Barr’s speech, William Evanina, director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, a federal defense agency, added, “This is a call to arms for all of society. We have to look at our economic security as part of our national security.”

So Trump, Barr, and Evanina are correct: *5G is a very big deal, and for both economic and military reasons, the U.S. can’t afford to lose this tech-competition.*

So now to the most immediate question: Does Barr have the right prescription, namely, that Uncle Sam should invest in a Finnish or Swedish company—or perhaps both?

Critics will say, of course, that Barr is advocating “socialism.” And in a limited sense they’re correct, although, in truth, Barr is pushing for the kind of ad hoc military socialism that’s been standard practice in the U.S. for centuries. That is, this capitalist country has always invested directly in vital defense production.

For instance, from the dawn of the republic through World War Two, the U.S. Navy built almost all of its ships in publicly owned shipyards, from Brooklyn, New York, to Charleston, South Carolina, to Puget Sound, Washington State. More recently, the Pentagon and related national-security outfits have invested directly in private companies through such entities as [DARPA](https://www.darpa.mil/) and [IN-Q-TEL](https://www.iqt.org/).

And even more broadly, all of the Pentagon’s spending on goods and services can be seen as a kind of permanent public-private partnership with defense contractors. To be sure, not everyone is a fan of what’s known as the “military-industrial complex,” and yet there it is, spending a trillion dollars a year—and it’s not going anywhere.

So Barr’s idea of investing in 5G is fully in keeping with this tradition, except for one thing, which merits more attention: *Nokia and Ericsson are foreign companies.*

Assuming that Barr is correct when he says that there is, in fact, no domestic company that can compete in 5G, then we might reluctantly agree that the attorney general has the optimum solution in the short run: *Invest in those foreign companies.*

Indeed, Barr’s vision of harmonious cooperation with those European firms and their countries offers the prospect of a new kind of cooperation with Europe, based on making a better deal than our current arrangement with, say, NATO—which, as Trump says, has been plagued by freeloading member-countries.  So again, hats off to Barr for grappling seriously with a serious problem.

Yet still, we Americans have the right ask:*What the heck happened to our industry? What is wrong with us and our know-how?  Why can’t we make 5G here at home?*

Yes, indeed, those are good questions. What *did* happen to the old high-tech manufacturing companies, such as Atwater-Kent, RCA, and Zenith? And what about more recent manufacturers, such as Cisco, Gateway, Hewlett-Packard? And whatever became of that multiple-Nobel-Prize winning tech crown jewel, Bell Labs?

The fates of all those companies are worth studying in detail, albeit some other time, because they provide many different lessons for us today. Some failed or faltered through mismanagement and bad luck—and that, of course, is the way things go in a free-enterprise system, which provides no guarantee of success, only the right to give it a try.

And yet other tech companies faded because of destructive U.S. government policies, including, of course, flabby trade policies. And still others were enfeebled by the aggressively nationalist-mercantilist export policies of Japan, South Korea, and, most of all, China.

To be sure, many American companies have adapted to this reshaped global-industrial reality and done quite well for themselves. For instance, Apple is a trillion-dollar American company, and yet it makes all its iPhones—including the ones used by the Department of Defense—in China. That might be good for Apple, but it’s not so good for the economic prosperity, or national security, of the United States.

**Made in USA—and What Say American Presidents?  Or the Pentagon?**

Yes, of course, there’s still plenty of tech genius in America—maybe more than any other country in the world, including China—and yet somehow, those American smarts have failed to stay focused on the brass tacks of actually *making* electronic hardware.

For sure, it’s great to know how to code software and thus make gobs of money on the Internet, as the Silicon Valley tech giants prove every day. And yet at the same time, if all that profitable software runs on Chinese-made equipment, then it’s likely that China will soon know absolutely everything we know. Moreover, it’s possible that they’ll soon enough be in control of it all, too.

All these issues, of course, were mostly ignored in the last three decades, as China was emerging as a major technological power—and as a strategic threat.

For President Bill Clinton, the overriding goal was more free trade with China, culminating in the [permanent normalization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Permanent_normal_trade_relations) of trade relations with that country, as well as its entry into the World Trade Organization.  (And oh yes, there was that matter of all the [U.S. technology that made its way to China](https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-CRPT-105hrpt851/html/ch6bod.html) in return for donations to the Democratic National Committee.)

For President George W. Bush, the overriding goal was to bring “democracy and freedom” to the Middle East, all the while mostly ignoring China. And we know how that worked out: The Middle East is even worse off, and the Chinese ate our lunch.

For President Barack Obama, the overriding goal was, well, unclear, because he had many goals. He wanted to fix the Middle East, of course, and yet, through incompetence, succeeded only in making it even worse. And he had lots of other ideas, too—none of which had much value in countering China.

So now, finally, to Trump and his administration: Having brought in China-hawkish advisers such as Peter Navarro—who never would have been hired in the administration of any of Trump’s opponents in 2016, Republican or Democrat—the president is causing a broad shift in U.S. thinking, of which Barr’s speech is a welcome contribution.

But just one last thing: Why was it that inside the administration, Attorney General Barr was the figure articulating this new and important step to counter China? Okay, somebody had to go first, but why was it the Justice Department and not the Pentagon?

After all, since 5G is a key component of national security, shouldn’t the secretary of defense, Mark Esper, have been the man taking the lead on this critical national security matter? Yes, of course, Esper has been on the job only since July, and in those few months he’s had his hands full with Iran. And yet it’s still true that if one wishes to make a national security argument, it’s probably best if it comes from the Defense Department.

As we have seen, in addition to its overall mandate on national security, the Pentagon is the biggest financial player in defense technology. And in fact, no doubt there are plenty of generals, experts, and contractors with strong and considered opinions on 5G. So why haven’t their voices bubbled up to the secretary’s office in the E-Ring of the Pentagon, and from there to the nation as a whole?

In fact, there’s even a glorious tradition of using American military muscle to establish entire new industries—industries that have won wars and gone on greatly to enrich the nation in the subsequent peacetime. As this author [noted](https://dailycaller.com/2019/09/16/no-american-company-5g-huawei-qualcomm/) last year, during World War Two, we cooked up, if that’s the right word, a spanking-new synthetic-rubber industry. And similar stories of effective government-industry cooperation during World War Two can be told about aviation, nuclear power, medicine, and, of course, electronics.

So now today, three-quarters-of-a-century later, we might step back and ask: What happened to the Pentagon’s voice on these defense-industrial issues?

And the answer, of course, is that it’s been swallowed in the sands of the Middle East and issues of counter-insurgency and nation-building. As everyone knows, the biggest budgets, and the most honors, have gone to those fighting, or supervising, the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Syria, and Yemen, among other places. That’s why the names of the generals that ordinary people are most likely to have heard of—Petraeus, Mattis, McChrystal, McRaven—have all been associated with these “endless wars.”

We can stipulate that these generals didn’t start these “endless wars,” and that they all have served their country honorably. (Instead, we can focus our ire on the civilian politicians who started those quagmires, and weren’t all that smart, and weren’t always honorable.)

Yet still, there’s the question of whether the Pentagon has been focused enough, these past few decades, on the rise of China. And actually, that’s not much of a question: *It hasn’t been*.

In fact, it’s hard to think of a flag-rank officer—or top civilian presidential appointee at DOD, active or retired—who has sounded the alarm on the twinned threats of China’s high-tech industrialization and America’s high-tech *de*-industrialization. And that’s how we got to where we are today: We can’t make 5G, at least not right away.

So now it’s Bill Barr, a civilian, scoping out the path to a better industrial future for the U.S. He’s pointing to a danger far greater than the failure of nation-building in Fallujah or Kandahar—although, of course, we already knew that those nation-building efforts have been costly failures, even if the military itself is still in denial, at least officially.

Yes, let’s hope that the Pentagon wakes up from its Middle East mirage and gets focused on the tech challenge from China.

Before it’s too late.

**Target: Britain**

What does this have to do with the CoronaVirus? Well, remember, it was a Chinese engineered bioweapon? Now, consider the possibility that there was someone inside the Wuhan bioweapon lab who did not think what the Chinese government was planning was good for the world. Instead of packaging the viruse for transport to Britain, he or she leaked it in Wuhan. Instead of the outbreak happening in Britain, it happened in China. The scientist who co-discovered the Ebola virus in Africa has today revealed that there was a plan for a major outbreak of an ebola-type virus in Britain.

As the death toll for the coronavirus officially surpasses that of the SARS outbreak in 2003, the director of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Peter Piot, said that he is “increasingly alarmed” by the rapidly spreading virus, saying that it is a “greater threat” than Ebola.

“It’s a greater threat because of the mode of transmission. The potential for spread is much, much higher. If the number of people who get infected is huge, then that will also kill a number of people”, Piot [told](https://www.thetimes.co.uk/edition/news/uk-faces-major-coronavirus-outbreak-warns-world-expert-wxf628g75) The Times.

“In today’s world, no epidemic remains just a local affair. What happens thousands and thousands of miles from here in China has the potential of causing a major outbreak here”, warned the professor.

Mr. Piot said Britain’s socialized medical system was a perfect target for the virus. Socialized medicate puts sick people in a queue for cheaper bulk treatment that is a perfect model for spreading the Coronavirus. The National Health Service (NHS) would absolutely be unable to cope with an outbreak of the virus.

“You know how already overburdened the NHS is and if you’ve got a sudden major rise in cases of pneumonia or milder respiratory infections… The NHS can hardly cope with the normal situation,” he explained.

Professor Piot said that he believes the virus may not reach its apex until March and that the development of a vaccine before then is “unlikely”.

The professor said that a major concern for this virus is the number of people who remain symptomless despite carrying the coronavirus, saying that this new virus is more akin to swine flu and H1N1 in its ability to be transmitted than SARS.

Over 37,000 people have been confirmed to have the virus, with most cases happening in China, however seven British citizens have been confirmed to have contracted the coronavirus. The number is likely over 300,000 by now, and the infection model means that within two more weeks, we could easily be looking at 2 million people infected.

According to numbers from the Chinese Communist Party, 811 people have died from the virus. That is ridiculously underreported, given the cremation operations running around the clock. The British government today chartered its final flight from Wuhan, the epicentre of the outbreak. The flight evacuated 105 British citizens and 95 Europeans, who will now be placed under quarantine at a conference center in Milton Keynes, England. Two Britons were prevented from boarding the flight after they failed temperature checks in China, the British ambassador, Dame Barbara Woodward [told](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-51430654) the BBC. That doesn’t mean a thing, since fevers show up 7-14 days after the person is exposed to the virus. More than likely, but the time the plane landed this afternoon, every single person on the at plane is infected.

**Solar Orbiter**

 [Solar Orbiter](https://www.space.com/35865-solar-orbiter-facts.html), an international collaboration between the European Space Agency (ESA) and NASA, is scheduled to launch from here on Sunday (Feb. 9). Its goal: to study the sun up close.

To do so, the craft is outfitted with a suite of 10 instruments — four in-situ instruments and six imagers — that will make detailed observations, providing a comprehensive view of our star. The spacecraft will also capture the [first images of the sun's polar regions](https://www.space.com/solar-orbiter-mission-sun-poles.html). Liftoff is set for at 11:03 p.m. EST (0403 GMT on Feb. 10).

"Solar Orbiter will be the first time we send a satellite out to take images of the sun's poles, and we'll get the first-ever data of the sun's polar magnetic fields," Daniel Müller, the mission's ESA project scientist, said in a prelaunch science briefing on Feb. 7. "We believe this area holds the keys to unraveling the mysteries of the sun's activity cycle."

Müller added that [Solar Orbiter](https://www.space.com/solar-orbiter-clean-room-photos.html) will also gather data about the sun's far side, and the science team will use this data to create the first 3D view of our star.

The $672 million Solar Orbiter will act as a mobile laboratory in space, using its instruments to track the evolution of eruptions on the sun from the surface out into space, and all the way down to Earth.

"Our entire solar system is governed by the activity that comes from the sun," said Nicky Fox, director of NASA's Heliophysics Division. "There's a continually streaming kind of soup of energetic particles that moves away from the sun and bathes all the planets. We call that [the solar wind](https://www.space.com/22215-solar-wind.html)."

The solar wind and the sun's magnetic field together create a huge bubble called the heliosphere, which  protects our planet from powerful interstellar radiation called cosmic rays. According to Fox, very energetic eruptions of plasma called [coronal mass ejections](https://www.space.com/11506-space-weather-sunspots-solar-flares-coronal-mass-ejections.html) (CMEs) that originate on the sun also become embedded in the solar wind.

When a CME makes it way to Earth, the solar particles can interact with our planet's magnetic field to produce powerful electromagnetic fluctuations. These geomagnetic storms are troublesome because they can disrupt technologies here on Earth like communications systems and even power grids, and can also be dangerous to astronauts and satellites in space.

Solar Orbiter will link the sun to the heliosphere as never before, helping to establish a cause-and-effect relationship to what happens on the sun and what we observe in the near-Earth environment, mission team members have said.

"The majority of [the solar wind] comes from the polar regions we've never imaged," added Thomas Zurbuchen, Associate administrator of NASA's Science Mission Directorate. "We will see it for the first time with Solar Orbiter."

Müller said that one of the mission's goals is to understand how the solar magnetic field works and how it affects [the solar cycle](https://www.space.com/11974-solar-cycle-sun-activity.html), a periodic change in the sun's activity.

"People have been observing the sun since telescopes were invented 400 years ago, but we don't really know what drives this 11-year cycle or the amplitude," said Müller. "We cannot predict how strong the next cycle will be."

The key to understanding it all may lie at the sun's poles. "We know the sun's magnetic field is transported a little like on a conveyor belt: from the equatorial regions of the sun, to the poles and presumably back — that part we don't know yet," Müller said.

In order to crack this solar mystery, a spacecraft needs to orbit at an angle out of plane with the sun's equator and stare down at the poles. And that's just what Solar Orbiter will do.

The spacecraft is equipped with three instruments that will measure the sun's magnetic field. With the data collected, the team will try to connect the dots between magnetic field observations on the sun's surface to the magnetic field measurements where the spacecraft flies.

But Solar Orbiter isn't the only spacecraft tasked with studying the sun. It will join a fleet of sun-observing probes that have been busy collecting data about our host star for decades, including NASA's record-setting [Parker Solar Probe](https://www.space.com/40437-parker-solar-probe.html) (PSP), which launched in 2018.

"It's a great time to be a heliophysicist," Fox said. "All of our spacecraft have their own specific science missions,but work together as a team."

Günter Hasinger, ESA's director of science, said that Solar Orbiter will stand on the shoulders of the sun-observing spacecraft that came before it, including two other joint ESA-NASA missions — [Ulysses](https://www.space.com/15836-ulysses-mission-preparations.html) and the Solar and Heliospheric Observatory ([SOHO](https://www.space.com/18501-soho-solar-heliospheric-observatory.html)).

Hasinger explained that Ulysses was the first spacecraft to actually fly over the poles of the sun. "Ulysses flew at a very large distance and with its eyes closed," he said, "so we didn't get the information that Solar Orbiter will get."

**More:**[**Solar quiz: How well do you know our sun?**](https://www.space.com/15706-sun-quiz-solar-showdown.html)

He compared the fleet of solar spacecraft to an orchestra: "Every instrument plays a different tune, but together they play the symphony of the sun."

Thanks to data collected by Ulysses, the Solar Orbiter team knows that the sun's poles are incredibly dynamic, and there are major differences in the sun's magnetic fields at the poles compared to the magnetic fields elsewhere.

"In general, the sun's poles look like the rest of the solar surface," said Müller. "The difference lies in the magnetic field." He and the rest of the science team think they will observe the early stages of the next solar cycle at the poles first, which is why Solar Orbiter's mission is so important: It will fill in major gaps in our understanding of how the sun works.

Every 11 years, Müller explained, the sun flips its global magnetic field — the north pole becomes the south pole and vice versa. By sending Solar Orbiter on a journey outside the ecliptic (the plane in which Earth and the other big planets orbit), scientists will capture unprecedented views of the region, shedding light on its processes.

Solar Orbiter is scheduled to launch on Sunday (Feb. 9) atop a United Launch Alliance Atlas V rocket. It is expected to make its first science measurements as early as May, with full science operations commencing in November 2021 when the craft's imagers come online.