

Obama's Carbon-Cutting Plan Is London's Genocide Agenda

by Marcia Merry Baker

June 9—The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on June 2 issued its “Clean Power Plan” assault on coal and the power base of the nation, which dictates that states must produce schemes by 2016, to drastically cut carbon emissions from existing electricity plants in their states, to add up to a nationwide emissions reduction of 30% by 2030 (from 2005). The 600-page document is in keeping with the June 2013 Obama decree, “The President’s Climate Action Plan,” whose premise is the falsehood that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas pollutant, which is overheating the Earth. (Tell that to a green plant!)

In reality, planetary weather and climate are determined by far larger patterns of solar and galactic dynamics. The “man-made global warming” hoax is part of a set of concocted beliefs, packaged as the “green” movement, over the last half century by the Anglo-Dutch Empire crowd, to stupefy citizens, subvert nation-states, and create conditions for mass depopulation.

Full of it, the 2013 Obama “Climate Action Plan” states: “President Obama is putting forward a broad-based plan to cut the carbon pollution that causes climate change and affects public health.” Prior to this month’s anti-coal salvo, there were Obama announcements against other sectors of the economy, such as the March 2014 anti-methane hit on livestock production. (Will the next step be a ban on exhaling?)

These moves are blatant attacks on the very means of existence of the United States—power, food, fuel, water. A chorus of opposition has arisen from the coal states, from Democrats as well as Republicans. Without having even seen Obama’s proposal, Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia had previously passed laws designed to mitigate the effects of the EPA regulations on the power production in their respective states, with similar measures pending in Louisiana and Ohio.

What is required is to mobilize to see that Obama is removed from office immediately, by impeachment or acclaim, for which the EPA emissions insanity is just one set, among many, of impeachable offenses which are destroying the nation.

De-Powering America

The EPA's new orders will affect the nearly 600 coal-fired generating facilities, responsible for some 37% of the nation's electricity. The EPA has set specific emissions reduction targets for each state, for which state leaders have until June 2016, to come up with a mix of actions—shutting down or converting existing plants to natural gas; increasing wind or solar; or reducing the electricity “demand side” (reducing consumption)—to meet the state-by-state goals.

Perhaps needless to say, there is nil encouragement for building up nuclear, the necessary step toward real economic progress, and a thermonuclear fusion-powered economy. At present, there are 100 nuclear reactors operating in the U.S., a net loss of four in recent years; there are three new reactors under construction at a slow pace.

The insane EPA exercise mandates that state leaders must engage in deciding how to undermine their own existence. Kentucky and West Virginia, for example, are over 90% dependent on coal for their electricity. Pennsylvania, over 65%. Another 17 states are dependent for over 50%. In a few states, carbon emissions are already reported down by more than 30% since 2005. In Maine, New York, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, for example, emissions dropped over 40% from 2005 to 2012.

But up or down, the greenie emissions metric is no test of progress, or lack of it. The actual metric of whether an economy is advancing is whether it is rising in terms of energy-flux density—higher forms of production and utilization of power. By that standard, the United States has fallen drastically from where it was headed 50 years ago.

As of the time of Presidents Eisenhower, then Kennedy, the commitment was to “go nuclear”—for power, and for the higher production platform that implied across the board, from medicine to metallurgy. The first commercial nuclear power plant in the United States opened in 1956, at Shippingsport in western Pennsylvania. Under Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace program, begun after 1953, nuclear-powered desalination of seawater and other applications were under development.



White House

President Obama's “carbon reduction” plan is a key part of his overall offensive against the very existence of the United States. Obama is shown here with his [anti-]science advisor John Holdren, at the White House.

By the turn of the 21st Century, it was presumed that the U.S. power base would be nearly all nuclear, with hundreds of commercial reactors, and fusion power would be a reality, allowing whole new realms of activity on Earth and in space.

Instead, U.S. nuclear development was thwarted. U.S. energy-flux density has been drastically lowered, down to the retrograde level of windmills, solar power, and biofuels. For lack of nuclear power, and the build-up of water and land infrastructure it would support, the Western states are now in an acute water crisis, which is a national food production crisis. The so-called shale boom of hydraulically fractured oil and gas is a U-turn from nuclear, backwards, destroying land, water, and infrastructure in the process.

So how does Obama peddle his energy destruction plan? He mockingly speaks of it as being good for your “health”—presuming you will still be alive! He extolled clean air on a conference call earlier this month, in conjunction with the American Lung Association. He gave statistics about lowering asthma attacks, and imposes a program that will kill you by lack of jobs and food instead.

Green Math for Genocide

The publicity wheels are rolling. On June 8, the *New York Times* ran portions of an exclusive interview with Obama, titled, “Obama on Obama on Climate,” stressing his advice to state leaders: “Put a price on carbon.” He told them to say, “We're going to charge you if you're releasing this stuff into the atmosphere, but we're going to let you figure out—with the market-

place, and with technology”—how to get emissions reduced.

This is a script Obama has been following since the first months he was put in office in 2009, and a stream of British operatives came to Washington, to hold forth to Congress, and at large, on how to trade, tax, and otherwise diminish carbon, as “good for the Earth.” Obama’s line is precisely that of his British models, including Lord Nicholas Stern, Professor of Climate Change Economics in London, and the top advisor to the British government on this hoax, who extols the “low-carbon economy,” and Prince Charles himself, who just last week keynoted a conference with the very same demand to “put a price” on such things as carbon emissions.

In turn, this policy goes back to the sequence of international conferences, notably since the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, all pushing low technology and population reduction as “good for the planet.” The intent: genocide.

One figure stands out in the process, when it comes to “green math:” Hans Joachim Schellnhuber—the fascist greenoid who led the international charge against “carbon pollution” in the countdown to the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Change event and thereafter.

Schellnhuber, trained as a “mathematical physicist,” did the math on how carbon emissions heat up the Earth. His conclusion: The Earth has a carrying capacity of only 1 billion people! Fossil fuels and human activity must be downscaled, to provide “stability” (as in the peace of the graveyard).

Schellnhuber is a close collaborator of John P. Holdren, Obama’s Science Advisor, and a backer of drastic population reduction. Schellnhuber’s base of operations is the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany, whence in 2011, he provided the “expert advice” which led to Germany moving to destroy itself by shutting down its nuclear plants.²

The Obama “Climate Action Plan” is applied Schellnhuber. All the new “Clean Power Plan” rhetoric about cleaning the air and aiding asthmatics is bunk.

Internationally, Obama has joined with London to implement the Schellnhuber track. There was the 2009 Copenhagen Conference of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, at which CO₂ targets for

reduction were set; then came the 2011 year-end climate meeting in Durban, South Africa. The “President’s Climate Action Plan” stated last year: “Countries agreed to negotiate a new agreement by the end of 2015 that would have equal legal force and be applicable to all countries in the period after 2020. This was an important step beyond the previous legal agreement, the Kyoto Protocol, whose core obligations applied to developed countries, not to China, India, Brazil, or other emerging countries....”

Kick Him Out

An American President with this deep commitment to British genocide policies cannot be convinced to change; he has to be removed from office, as more and more Congressmen should be aware.

Lawmakers from West Virginia are among the most vocal and united voices against Obama. Rep. Nick Rahall (D) charged last week that the EPA is “overzealous”; the President and his policies are “basically picking winners and losers”; the EPA “is truly run amok.” Rep. Shelley Moore Capito (R) said, “West Virginia is on the losing end” of fairness. Sen. Joe Manchin (D) on TV June 3, asked, why not develop clean coal? “Our Department of Energy has not released one penny of \$2 billion sitting there for clean coal technologies.”

West Virginia Reps. Nick Rahall (D) and David McKinley (R) vowed to introduce legislation to block the EPA pronouncements entirely, with Rahall saying in a statement, “There is a right way and a wrong way of doing things, and the Obama Administration has got it wrong once again.”

Likewise, West Virginia Democratic Senate hopeful Natalie Tennant told the *Washington Times* June 2, “I will fight President Obama, the EPA, the Senate, and anyone else who tries to undermine our coal jobs.” In Kentucky, both Republican Sen. Mitch McConnell and his Democratic challenger Allison Grimes condemned the EPA move, with McConnell calling the proposal “a dagger in the heart of the American middle class,” and vowing to introduce legislation in the Senate.

But the idea cannot be simply to “save coal.” Real progress means applying the highest technologies available for breakthroughs to energy sources such as magnetohydrodynamics and thermonuclear fusion power, all of which will require *increasing* energy production—and carbon emissions—dramatically. Obama, to the contrary, is on record opposing technologies such as fusion power. His energy policy is death.

2. See “Bertrand Russell from the Grave: Schellnhuber and John Holdren” and “The WBGU Master Plan For Imperial Eco-Fascism,” *EIR*, May 13, 2011.