

Dear Reader: Thank you for downloading this free book from Brian W. Kelly's finished book catalog. I finished the book: **Kill The EPA!** <https://letsgopublish.com/political/killepa.pdf> in January 2012. This is an eye-opening book. Tells how EPA agents would prefer we die rather than burn fuel for heat, etc..

Most of my books had previously been published on Amazon.

Click below if you would like to donate to help the free book cause:

<https://www.letsgopublish.com/books/donate.pdf>

Enjoy!



**Kill
the
EPA**

So humans can live

BRIAN W. KELLY

Kill the EPA

So Humans Can Live!



B R I A N W. K E L L Y



Copyright © 2012, Brian W. Kelly
Editor Brian P. Kelly
Kill the EPA

All rights reserved: No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, scanning, faxing, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the publisher, LETS GO PUBLISH, in writing.

Disclaimer: Though judicious care was taken throughout the writing and the publication of this work that the information contained herein is accurate, there is no expressed or implied warranty that all information in this book is 100% correct. Therefore, neither LETS GO PUBLISH, nor the author accepts liability for any use of this work.

Trademarks: A number of products and names referenced in this book are trade names and trademarks of their respective companies. For example, iSeries and AS/400 are trademarks of the IBM Corporation and Windows is a trademark of Microsoft Corporation.

Referenced Material : The information in this book has been obtained through personal and third party observations and copious reading over many years. Where unique information has been provided or extracted from other sources, those sources are acknowledged within the text of the book itself. Thus, there are no formal footnotes nor is there a bibliography section.

Published by: LETS GO PUBLISH!
Brian P. Kelly, Publisher

P.O. Box 834
Scranton, PA 18503
brian@brianpkelly.com
www.letsgopublish.com

Library of Congress Copyright Information Pending

Book Cover Design by Michele Thomas

ISBN Information: The International Standard Book Number (ISBN) is a unique machine-readable identification number, which marks any book unmistakably. The ISBN is the clear standard in the book industry. 159 countries and territories are officially ISBN members. The Official ISBN For this book is:

978-0-9802132-8-7

The price for this work is :
\$35.00 USD

10 9 8 7 6 5 4
3 2 1

Release Date:
January, 2012

**LETS
GO** 
PUBLISH 

Dedication

To Brian Patrick, Michael Patrick, Kathleen Patricia

My Wonderful Children

At the Top of All My Lists for a Long Time!

And Forever!

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank many, many people for helping me in this effort.

I would first like to thank my immediate family, starting with my lovely and dear wife, Patricia. Pat is as lovely as a bright and sunny day. She is still a kid and she makes me feel younger just watching her in action. My Pat is number one. She is my hero. She works harder than anybody in the house to make sure all five of us are OK! It does seem like yesterday that we met and, I am happy that life happens for real and not just in fairy tales, as my lady has added a magical sense to my life and our family's lives.

Thank you Pat for being there all the time for me and for our loving family. Thank you for quietly taking care of everybody else's problems and making them your own. Thank you for the care you extend to all our children, including our dog Bennie and our cat, the huge tabby tomcat, Buddy. Nobody can get by a day without you. I am glad you are feeling better.

You are my beauty and my lady. Four weddings in a month and we are still dancing. I love when you announce yourself after coming in from school or from shopping, "Hello You Lucky People!" I can't wait to see you tonight as you are back to work after having been down for a few days. You were buzzing around the house before you went to work as I was writing and as always, it puts a smile on my face.

Your daddy, Smokey, became a best friend to me and I loved how he always called you his little girl "Packy." The "Smoke" and the "Skip" are now with the Angels and the Lord, but the memories are forever. I do smile thinking of you because I love you dearly and I love how you make our family, a family.

I would also like to thank my twenty-six year-old daughter, Katie, who has been Daddy's little girl now for all of her 26 years. You are one of the brightest people in the whole world but more than that, you are among the kindest and the sweetest. You are our Irish Rose. You have been able to put life's struggles in perspective and you face things and work them out positively like no one else ever could. I am very proud of you and even more proud as I saw you work with the clients in your past profession and now as you are changing jobs, I know you again will be the nicest, and the little babies will love you! You are just wonderful and that is that.

I love that great band of yours "Ashes for Trees," and your beautiful voice, and the duo. How about your winning the best band at the Scranton Cultural Center. Your original music is often in my mind, and it is wonderful.

I love when Mom and I meet people for the first time and they can't wait to tell us what a sweetheart you are. We do already know. You are all grown-up and quite capable on your own, but I still want to thank you for always being Daddy's Little Girl. I love you very much. And thanks for all your help!

Thanks also go out to my twenty-nine year-old son, Michael, who graduated from Law School and who passed the BAR exam first time. You are the lawyer I would pick because you have it in you. You make winning look easy. Congratulations Attorney Michael on gaining a substantial client base and congratulations on your record in court, which is unassailable. Thank you for the recent help in my own situation as your work was masterful. You are a fine person and a fine lawyer. I am continually proud of the person that you are and the person that you continue to become. You are on your way to a great career. You have learned that nothing in life worth having is easy and you have knocked down barrier after barrier to be a person who can do just about everything. Congratulations Son! You are a good man, and that is the best compliment of all. You are also a good son! I'm proud of that big heart and my wonderfully wonderful good son.

Thanks to my tall and handsome thirty plus-old son, Brian, who knocked 'em dead in Law School and graduated Magna Cum Laude and then killed the BAR exam. You continue to be an essential ingredient in helping me pull many of my books together, and your writing talent is as good as it gets. In my books and in my other writings, when I need some good phraseology, you are there with the solution. You are blessed with many talents.

Your musical talent is second to none and your dedication to perfection makes it even better. I know that your first love is music and that Law is on the side for now, unless the family needs you. Thanks for that too! You have my blessing in all your endeavors.

I see your work on the Internet all the time with many, many views and great accolades. Your projects number in the hundreds and your videos are a phenomenon. You are a master musician with the organ and the piano and I still remember the trumpet and the Xylophone. Your snappy arrangements of music that others have written and your creativity in your own pieces is beyond belief. You have many an option in life and being a living Mozart can certainly be one of them. Enjoy to the world:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bksqP5gp1ZQ>

You have no idea how hard it is for regular people like your Mom and I to be able to come close to creating the beautiful music you make with seemingly effortless motion. I suspect that it is not effortless, but you are about the best I have ever seen. I am very proud of you, son. You are a wonderful son and I love you deeply. Again, thank you as you help me like nobody else can.

Mom and I are very proud of all of our children and we thank each of you for your work in academia, in life, for the family, and your efforts on our behalf.

To sum up my acknowledgments, as I do in every book that I have written, I am compelled to offer that I am truly convinced that "the only thing you can do alone in life is fail." Thanks to my family, good friends, and a wonderful helping team, I was not and continue to be --- not alone.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 The “God” of the EPA is Mother Nature	1
Chapter 2 Barack Obama Has Awakened a Sleeping Nation? ...	15
Chapter 3 Was Silent Spring Too Loud?	23
Chapter 4 Obama Snake Oil	43
Chapter 5 The Delta Smelt.....	53
Chapter 6 The EPA Is Obama’s Tool to Marginalize America	61
Chapter 7 Who Thinks the EPA Should Die?	71
Chapter 8 The End of Incandescent Light	77
Chapter 9 We’re Broke!.....	101
Chapter 10 Turn EPA Over to States.....	117
Chapter 11 DDT & World Population Control	139
Chapter 12 The Truth about CFCs.....	165
Chapter 13 The Best Solution to the Freon Non-Problem	179
Chapter 14 Some Final Thoughts	201
Lets Go Publish! Books.....	214

Preface:

Jobs are hard to come by anywhere in the world today including the United States. Even some liberals are starting to say that “you can blame the government for that.” In this day and age, you can blame the government for lots more than that, and nobody would think you were kidding.

Despite no jobs for anybody else, the US government is growing in terms of employees at a record pace. Yet, there is less and less real work for government workers. And, so agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that originally did good work in its advisory role to the President have taken more than one step into what Rod Serling would call the Twilight Zone of “regulation theory.” Before we go there, let’s look at the EPA in its best light, as provided for us all from Wikipedia:

“The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or sometimes USEPA) is an agency of the federal government of the United States charged with protecting human health and the environment, by writing and enforcing regulations based on laws passed by Congress. The EPA was proposed by President Richard Nixon and began operation on December 3, 1970, after Nixon submitted a reorganization plan to Congress and it was ratified by committee hearings in the House and Senate. The agency is led by its Administrator, who is appointed by the president and approved by Congress. The current administrator is Lisa P. Jackson. The EPA is not a Cabinet department, but the administrator is normally given

cabinet rank. The agency has approximately 18,000 full-time employees.”

That is just about 18,000 too many. My original statistics showed the EPA at 17,000 but the Wikipedia quote above is just a bit more current.

The EPA sold its million seller hits to the President from days past, and many would call those hits right on the mark. That was the EPA when it was new. That was the fledgling EPA. That was the EPA that took the charter shown above and did its best to do all it could for America and Americans. Those days are long gone.

This new EPA cares very little for our country. The EPA of today is working on a number of new best sellers, one edition is even more silly than the next, but equally harmful. When you are introduced to the new EPA regulations in detail in this book, in the media, or on the Internet, they will appear to be even sillier than the list of “about to be released” EPA best seller titles that we show immediately below. The list below is facetious but telling. The real list is dangerous and it threatens our freedom and our sustenance as a country. Ask the EPA about it while they exist. I hope this book places them on the endangered species list.

The EPA's Top 12 Hits
The Clean Toilet Act
The Better Urine than Mine (pronounced my-in) Act
The Mother Nature First Act
The Single Ply Toilet Paper Act of 2011
The Don't Drive after Midnight or Noon Act.
The Chinese Light Bulb Act
The Greenhouse Gases Are Not Found in Greenhouses

Act
The Sulfur Dioxide Restroom Purity Act.
The Rotten Egg Act.
The Rotten Tomato Act a.k.a. the Leachate Act of 1979
The My Globe Is Warming Act
The Act Act
And many others.

So much for EPA humor for now!

It really was not too long after its inception that The EPA became a monster in size and in its intrusive tactics. The typical victims of the EPA are small businesses who do not have the legal staff to withstand the continual onslaught. People had been affected indirectly through increased costs but with the Light Bulb act, the EPA now even terrorizes US households.

Lately, to gain more even notoriety the EPA is trying to become a monster to large businesses. Around this time of year, when Halloween is close by, it would be natural to create a mask about the monster EPA. However, nobody has ever seen the entirety of this 18,000 headed hydra. But, we can imagine how ugly it would be.

The EPA has also become a monster to other large US agencies. For example the Environmental Protection Agency EPA likes playing big sister to the Department of Transportation (DOT), Department of Energy (DOE), and others. . In addition to other missions, the DOT is responsible for minimizing the exhaust gas emissions of automobiles and other vehicles. The EPA stepped in recently and gave DOT a new assignment.

The agency was forced to add greenhouse gases to their list of things that must be OK with your automobile when it is inspected. Considering the science on greenhouse gases is incomplete, many wonder exactly what will be measured. In all silliness, but truthful nonetheless, CO₂, a gas humans freely exhale when breathing, has been declared a noxious greenhouse gas. Clearly the EPA has gone wild. They do not mention whether the exhalant must contain garlic or other malodorous scents in addition to the CO₂. For right now, CO₂ exhalant may be just enough for the car to have a problem passing inspection with this picky set of regulators.

You may recall the government-sponsored Car Allowance Rebate System (CARS). You and I knew this as “Cash for Clunkers.” It was an economic porkulus program that ran between July and August 2009. Owners of drivable, registered vehicles less than 25 years old and rated at 18 mpg or less (EPA combined) were able to scrap those cars and trucks in exchange for \$3,500 or \$4,500 credits toward the purchase of more fuel-efficient new vehicles. The only sure long-term winners were those who cashed in low-value clunkers for \$3,500 or \$4,500 new-car credits. The air sure does not seem much different.

Quite suddenly during the program, you may recall, Obama’s EPA ran out of money because Americans can recognize a deal when they see one. Thank the EPA for saving the air from all those clunkers.

By the way, I know some families who have adult children who are college graduates but cannot get employment in the EPA-controlled Obama economy. They are not happy with the Cash for Clunkers program for non-environmental reasons. They thought the program was to help Americans get better cars. They did not tune into the

rationale for the program, which was to kill all the old exhaust emitting clunkers so the air would supposedly be cleaner for us all. So, now, when these frugal new college grads who have to live with their parents to break even in the new economy, go looking for their next car in the \$3000 to \$5000 range, there were few choices. Obama's EPA took them off the road. They have been crushed. Those left are actually more expensive than they would have been.

Obama literally crushed all those cars. So, overall, who did the program help? In typical EPA fashion, it stole from taxpayers to put something into somebody else's pocket so that somebody else, another taxpayer, would be left without, when they needed transportation. Thank you EPA! Did the taxpayers benefit by this EPA driven program. No, we did not.

This is a serious book. I take leave of a serious tone periodically and more often in this preface because I cannot believe the EPA thinks the things it does are serious problems. Their solutions are never harmless. They prescribe preposterous things and then they dig in and make sure that they are enforced. All other Americans lose.

Why did I write this book?

The quick answer is because it needed to be written.

In all my years of eligibility to vote, I cannot recall voting for any of the powerful brood of 18,000 members of the EPA. Yet, they have become more important than the

President and the Congress in 2011. That is simply unconstitutional.

The President and his coterie figured out ways to get “legislation through the Congress” without Congress even being in session.” The notion of an executive order is a Constitutional privilege of the President and has been for some time. It is to be used as a gap-filler. Executive orders are not intended to create battles over separation of powers. They are not intended to overrule the Congress of the United States.

All of that made sense until now, forty-three presidents after our founding. The difference now is that the President is Barack H. Obama. As a former Constitutional Law Professor, he has decided that he need not have any regard for the Founders and their chief work, the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps this President is the first of many to come that never received the proper grounding in American History. Perhaps Obama wants his way or his minions get to go on the highway. Perhaps he has instructed his team to act accordingly. It does not matter. This President has become a tyrant. That makes the EPA a tyrannical agency, and indeed they are, and indeed they must be eliminated.

I wrote this book not because of the nice Obama qualities but because he is a progressive Marxist and his actions show disdain for our country. With his executive orders, the unaccountable czars, and the many agencies that mindlessly do his bidding, he has intentionally usurped the power of Congress. This has permitted his major enforcer agency, the EPA to accomplish what he could not accomplish with Congress when he tried working with them.


As you read this book, think of two phrases. In our future, we have but two choices: 1 “Kill the EPA,” or (2) Bring on the Donald and “Fire the EPA!” Either choice works for me.

I hope you enjoy this book and I hope that it inspires you to take action to help change the members of the government of the United States by replacing every member of Congress and the Senate (up for reelection) unless you have verifiable statements that they are not responsible for perpetrations against the people. Also, think seriously about replacing the big head of the EPA, today’s President, Barack Hussein Obama.

I wish you the best

Brian Kelly (For US Senate)

About the Author



Brian W. Kelly is a retired Assistant Professor in the Business Information Technology (BIT) program at Marywood University, where he also served as the IBM i and midrange systems technical advisor to the IT faculty. Kelly developed and taught many college and professional courses in the IT and business areas. He is also a contributing technical editor to IT Jungle's "The Four Hundred" and "Four Hundred Guru" Newsletters.

A former IBM Senior Systems Engineer, he has an active consultancy in the information technology field, (www.kellyconsulting.com). He is the author of dozens of books and numerous articles about current IT topics. Kelly is a frequent speaker at COMMON, IBM conferences, and other technical conferences and user group meetings across the United States.

This is the sixth political book Kelly has written and it joins his other great informers, Taxation without Representation, Obama's Seven Deadly Sins, Healthcare Accountability, Jobs! Jobs! Jobs!

And Americans Need Not Apply! This is Mr. Kelly's 45th published book.

Chapter 1

The “God” of the EPA is Mother Nature

Mother Nature Über Alles

Terms such as hypocritical and a few other contemptible non-virtues at first may appear to be over-kill in describing the Environmental Protection Agency until you look just under the covers to find that the EPA is simply outrageous. The EPA is malevolent and their decisions are shockingly corrupt, biased, and almost always anti-American. The EPA has a god. Its name is Mother Nature.

When the EPA sees man punishing their god in any way through pollution or even perceived pollution, EPA regulations are cast to punish humankind to the point of death. Ask the millions who have died or almost died in poor third world countries because the EPA believes that DDT negatively affects Mother Nature. Then ask the real scientists who have proven that DDT is safe. You will learn about this issue in detail in this book.

The EPA Is Born

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was formed in December, 1970 in the US by the Nixon administration to deal with pollution.

Nixon was certainly not an environmental whacko and there were lots of reasons at the time to create an agency to advise the president on matters of the environment and pollution. The stated mission of the EPA was to “conduct environmental research, provide assistance...[in] combating environmental pollution, and assist the Council on Environmental Quality in developing and recommending...new policies for environmental protection...to the President.” That’s it. The EPA was not supposed to become a guerilla anti-capitalist, pro-Mother Nature stand-alone army engaging war against all humans and all businesses run by humans.

For those who remember the Nixon years, there is no way our President Richard Nixon would have put an agency in place that would serve as an ideologically driven monstrosity with a mission to usurp executive power to mandate the most severe eco-centered, brazenly anti-capitalist environmental regulations imaginable. Even the EPA guidelines are off the wall. The regulations have become deadly. All Richard Nixon hoped to achieve in the creation of this agency was a research and advisory role for both himself and future presidents. Nixon’s EPA were not enforcers.

The slippery slope is alive and well and it is fully manifest today in the EPA, and agency that at least in its present form, simply should not exist. The EPA is a case study in mission creep. If you are wondering who the EPA’s next

victim will be look no further than the closest mirror. Forget about Uncle Sam, the EPA wants Y-O-U.

Ron Paul: Pollution exists because of EPA

In late 2011, Ron Paul had demonstrated how, in his presidential administration the budget would be balanced in three years by eliminating five federal agencies. Specifically, he wants to eliminate the departments of Energy, Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Interior and Education. Ironically, of the five huge agencies that Paul targeted, the EPA was not on his list. So, many of us are very interested in how the champion of liberty views this rogue agency.

On the Ron Paul forum, a blogger by the name of GoodA\$Gold asked a question about Dr. Paul's position on the EPA. His forum question follows:

“What will Ron Paul try to do with the Environmental Protection Agency and what are his reasonings? Thank you.”

The Ron Paul forum answer is as follows:

“As with any federal agency, it [the EPA] is not authorized by the Constitution and is therefore not to be funded by your money. If you wish to fund a private organization, then that is your prerogative.

“His way of dealing with pollution is to examine and respect property rights within the courts. That means that if someone pollutes on your property, you sue them. Private property ownership is always better maintained then public ownership. By recognizing in the courts that you can sue

the government or a company that pollutes on your land will cause the polluters to be hurt by pollution instead of taxpayers. This will create incentive to eliminate pollution instead of just creating rhetoric and doing nothing about the problem.

“The EPA stands to lose their jobs if they solve this problem so they are on a tight wire of having to make it seem like they are working to fight pollution but having every motivation for pollution to continue to be a problem.”

Don't Breathe! Literally!

Among items that should make the late talk shows get a real chuckle, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recently (so to speak) declared Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) as harmful to humans. What joke was ever told on late-night TV in which the exhaled carbon dioxide was less than the normal emission? When a talent is hitting crescendo on a hot joke, you can hear the extra breathing and of course that means more exhaled pollution in the form of CO₂. So, does that make late-night TV hazardous to the health of the studio audience? Maybe so! Check the fine print in the EPA's greenhouse gas regulations.

Can it be that the EPA checked its own CO₂ emissions with a government provided meter and the readings got them concerned about the action they would have been forced to take if it had been us, instead of them? The evidence from their website is inconclusive.

A trip to the EPA website says that CO₂ is naturally occurring, as well as man-made. I don't have a problem with that statement. What I have a problem with and what you should have a problem with regarding the EPA

is their claim that CO₂ is harmful. If so, to whom? Without CO₂, we would have no plants as they breathe in CO₂ and exhale oxygen.

By the way, only a small percentage of the CO₂ produced on earth is man-made. The oceans are the largest contributor and most of the “emissions,” therefore are natural, unless, of course the EPA figures out how to ban the oceans from producing waves.

EPA ignores own rules

The Daily Caller on September 28, 2011 announced that there was an EPA report available dating back to April 2011. It was about how the agency ignored their own rules to push out damaging regulations. Yet, somehow the report was kept a secret until Oklahoma Republican Senator James Inhofe demanded its release.

The inspector general had found that the EPA had failed to follow the Data Quality Act and its own peer review process. Therefore, it did not have the authority to take any action on greenhouse gases. Yet, it did anyway. Under its own rules, it did not have enough proof that it could issue the determination that greenhouse gases cause harm to “public health and welfare.” Since it did not have enough proof, it did not have enough authority by law, yet they chose to proceed without having sufficient evidence. They were above their own rules. Sorry EPA, that is just not good enough for what we pay you.

Inhofe said. “This report confirms that the endangerment finding, the very foundation of President Obama’s job-destroying regulatory agenda, was rushed, biased, and flawed. It calls the scientific integrity of EPA’s decision-

making process into question and undermines the credibility of the endangerment finding.”

The Obama administration blamed Congress for inaction about a greenhouse gas claim that the EPA had not ever proven. Obama actually threatens to go around the Congress against the Constitution and take matters into its own hands. Obama would more than bless the undertaking. He would order it. His executive orders would permit the EPA to directly regulate greenhouse gases despite it not having completed its work. In essence, Obama has challenged the Congress to act on its own, or his plan would empower his agency, the EPA, full of government loving bureaucrats, to do it for the Congress. And, all Americans as well as our Constitutional Republic would suffer.

If you want to reduce government spending, one key accomplishment and the major recommendation in this book is to eliminate the entire department. More and more conservatives are convinced the solution is a big roll back in power or a full elimination of the agency. “The EPA has got to go!” We show you how to eliminate these tyrants in this book.

The EPA is not the only waste

While we are eliminating waste, we should also consider for that matter, eliminating the government’s youth propaganda machine, the Department of Education. Future members of the EPA breed from the propaganda spewed from the Education Department.

There are a number of other governmental agencies on my short list of things to go, all of which can be eliminated or at least severely shrunken. They are

literally killing us. Getting rid of a ton of them would help Americans breathe easier. It would also help us get our fiscal house in order. Our breath is not something that is owned by any governmental agency.

If we were to work hard to reduce our multi-trillion dollar debt, and if we decided that one good way would be to provide an environment in which corporations would not have to be prodded to participate, we would need to eliminate those government agencies that scurrilously, intentionally and directly hurt the private industries in the United States without really providing any countervailing benefit to the people. The EPA is the chief culprit. It is simply outrageous.

A brief EPA abuse egregious example:

California farmers know how contemptible and outrageous the EPA can be. The farmers of the highly fertile Central Valley are being starved out of existence and denied water for growing crops because of a small fish called the delta smelt.

The EPA offers no compromises; this bait fish used by salmon fishermen, is winning in the courts for the EPA. California farmers who can no longer provide irrigation for their crops and all other Americans lost as food is in shorter supply and it is more expensive. The progressive courts in California always take the fish's side against the farmers. The fish lives on but the crops died, and the farmers are on welfare. So, who really won that battle?

If it were a nasty mosquito instead of a stinky little smelt, the EPA would still have insisted the farmers pay the price with their livelihoods. Meanwhile American food prices are skyrocketing. The key fact here is that farmers

are human, and mosquitoes, nasty as they are, exist in Mother Nature's domain. The EPA loves Mother Nature and as a rule does not like humans.

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) had done positive things in the past, but in recent times it has been putting people out of work while increasing the price of food. So, if the EPA loves you and your family, why do they favor little fish over humans and why do they try to regulate CO₂, which is a human exhalant? The EPA says it is a greenhouse gas and all such gasses are bad?

Knowledgeable scientists, not those on the EPA payroll, see the EPA's callous disregard for humankind as impacting about every industry in the United States.

Natural transition--coal to other energy

The earth is neither always warm nor always cold. Before the EPA came into existence, people on their own had begun to gravitate to electric heat and / or gas or oil heat from individual coal fired stoves and furnaces.

Before the EPA came into existence, people lived productive lives without the threat of their power being turned off by some biased, fact-less bureaucrat. The move of the American population over many years to oil, gas, and electric energy happened because it was more convenient and it was overall cheaper to burn than coal. The EPA did not inform Americans that coal was not the best bet for their homes as the EPA did not exist when the transition began.

In the home, the transition from coal to other energy sources was one little furnace at a time. One family replaced their coal fired units at a time though the

conversion cost them a substantial percentage of their take-home pay.

They did it because it was good for them in the long haul. Uncle Sam had no input as it should be in America. People are not dummies. Yes, it was a lot of dollars in future savings for each and every family that convinced them to make the costly move. The environmental result was that over time, less and less pollution from coal occurred without the EPA guiding the people's every move.

My family and my parents' families never even had coal furnaces. We had two coal stoves on the first floor of my parents' home. One was a Heatrola which stood in the Dining Room and provided the major heat for the house. There was also a kitchen stove that heated part of the house and the water, and it also provided a means of cooking things on the top or the middle sections. In retrospect, it was impressive.

Anything needing to be boiled sat on top of the old Wilkes-Barre or Pittston Stoves in my home town and anything that needed to be baked went in the oven. We had both brands of stove over the years in our home as one would die and another would replace it.

An innovative invention called a "hot water back" permitted water to circulate within the stove and the house's plumbing system carried that "heated" water to the bathtub upstairs. We did not know that it was unusual at the time, but all nine of us in the six room home brushed our teeth and washed our faces from the water running in the upstairs bathtub. There was no bathroom sink in our house – ever. There was just one commode and yes, patience is a virtue.

The hot water back permitted people like me in the 1950's and 1960's to bathe in hot water. In the summer, when all stoves were off it was a bit tougher but we managed. Eventually, we got gas and a gas stove. So, we bought some galvanized buckets and two buckets of hot water drug up to the tub made a reasonably OK bath. Showers? What were they? We did not find out about them til we went to high school. No, I am not kidding.

People moving from coal to gas, to electricity, and even to oil were better deals for the environment than the coal and wood smokestacks of every house in every city sending up their own emissions to the chagrin of Mother Nature.

As desirable as the move might have been, there were a lot of hard working parents who could not afford the move to other technology and so coal was a way of life and for some it remained their only means of cooking and heating for some time to come. For some, it still is.

In this book, you will see that the EPA is not concerned about life as we know it and care about it. The EPA cares little about the struggles of humans and so don't trust that their clean air mantra means that they hope you are around to breathe it.

We all want to breathe fresh air and drink clean water but we also must live first. Regardless of the impact on humans, the EPA, if it could, and it is trying like hell, would force all to go either cold or go totally green. I think they would prefer us to go cold, because no energy use has less impact on the environment than even a green home.

Looking at it objectively, you would conclude that the desire of the EPA is un-American and unconstitutional to

boot. An agency whose 18,000 workers collect paychecks because their charter is that they work for the needs of Americans, should not be paying homage only to Mother Nature and Barack Obama. As quickly as possible, the EPA, an agency gone badly, must die or they will enact legislation that forces us to die quietly so there is no noise pollution.

EPA says wear thick clothing in bed

Some say that we must rely on foreign oil because we “cannot” drill for it here in our own country. Much of our energy problems would be solved just by allowing oil drilling. The EPA bristles at the thought of us having enough energy because of its impact on Mother Nature. The “cannot” part of that sentence is because there are people in the US who would be warm regardless of the EPA policies. They are OK with regular people like you and I, no longer being warm as long as Mother Nature is happy. Most of these people are part of the EPA, and the others are big rich Democrats who know their tax policies will not cost them.

The EPA abhors fossil fuels. They like the so-called renewable fuels, such as solar, geothermal, and of course, their onetime fav, Ethanol. This inefficient fuel is mixed with gasoline at a 10% level. The EPA does not send out email blasts, however, to notify the American customer that they are being cheated at the gas pump as Ethanol does not burn as efficiently as gasoline. In other words, you need more of it to go each mile.

Moreover, Ethanol is made mostly from our corn crop. So, this little trick by the EPA hurts us in automobile efficiency and it hurts us by increasing pressure on food prices. With all the farmers bustling to get on the Ethanol

bandwagon, 40% of US corn is now burned in automobiles. With people starving across the world, we simply should not be burning food.

Permit me to offer a corollary to the notion that small town farmers are the culprits. Nope! It is the corporate farms who have figured out how to make a huge amount of dollars by sending their huge farm crops to the oil companies while the price of corn for Americans skyrockets. Why is the EPA in bed with the corporate farmers? Good question. The EPA is impure and Ethanol is less pure but the EPA, even though they now know their notion was wrong, insists that Ethanol is a good deal. Unfortunately, the dollar still rules even in large farm corporations. Which member of Congress will vote against the farmers? What if I said which member of Congress will vote against the blood sucking corporations that grow corn for Ethanol?

Respected scientists say global warming is a hoax!

But, Al Gore, who is quickly heading to be the first green billionaire, disagrees. No matter what the commoners, like Al Gore speculate, the scientists know better. The scientists that I read say that Global Warming is a hoax. More and more scientific evidence says it is a hoax. Even the EPA bypassed its own data to release their greenhouse gas warning. Why would they do that if their warning were accurate?

In the last several years we have all seen the documentation about the dishonesty from the mainstream environmentalists trying to scare us all into dying early so they can save Mother Nature. There were forged emails, and even raw data was manipulated (and then lost) to fit the testing constraints. Some data was

fabricated from thin air to hit on target with the premise that the earth was in peril and the EPA had the only solution. Hogwash! This is a hoax perpetrated by environmental zealots who want it to be so. But, despite their best wishes, it is not so.

On the far-out side, I think it will be a long time before we see the zealots one day trying to make human sacrifices to Mother Nature. That is good. On the contrary, when we examine the callous disregard for the thousands of children across the world, dying of malaria and other preventable diseases each day, we can easily conclude that the human sacrifices have already begun.

Evidence has been continually mounting against the notion that global warming is real. So, faced with an eternity of not understanding simple thermometer logic, the environmentalists, including our beloved EPA, decided to fight the truth, rather than switch their basic thinking.

They had been defeated and proven to be corrupt cheats in the environment game, though Al Gore, getting richer every day, continually vouched that the data was right. They could not find real proof but their zeal for Mother Nature caused them to continue their cause when they should have packed it up and left town. But, what would they do for a living. So, they had no choice but to keep the myths alive.

To help them out once the term, “global warming,” fell into disrepute, they changed the name of the war to “climate change.” It makes me want to laugh out loud! This literally means if it is cold, it is caused by “climate change” and if it is warm it is caused by “climate change.” Climate change is their new villain. They don’t really want to comment on the notion of the four seasons as that is “weather change,” but they also do not want to prove climate change to be able to

declare that the climate is changing. Their ideology cannot exist unless they purport the preposterous to be true. And, so they do.

I urge you to not let them win the semantics battle. Let us keep using the term, "global warming." The semantic and the real battle continue on the Internet as mankind tackles the ever present fraud in the global warmer mentality. "Tonyhubble" netted it out perfectly when he said, "It [the rename] means that they cannot be proven wrong, regardless of what actually occurs." Amen! And, that is their goal. So, why do we need the EPA? Why should we pay them \$10.5 Billion per year to exist and torment us?

Here we are in 2012, and no matter how hard the laughter comes, nobody on the eco side has admitted that the thesis was incorrect in the first place. Besides, zeal there is funding and of course, the very jobs of the EPA proponents are at stake. Funding would stop if they told the truth. Good environmentalists, even those "fine" people in the EPA, would be forced to discover another hoax if funding stopped.

So, let's stop the EPA funding!

What a great idea!

Chapter 2

Barack Obama Has Awakened a Sleeping Nation?

Gary Hubbell Via Email

When this came into my email box, I was impressed as now I am hard pressed to explain to those not as deeply into what is happening, how the President is quickly destroying America on many fronts. This could be any chapter of any political book about this historical period. It is not specific to the EPA but is sure is a quick look-see into what is going on while we contemplate whether the EPA is bad or good for America.

I need to tell you that I had not intended to write a book about the EPA. I am running for the US Senate in 2012 and to help me understand why things are as bad as they are, I knew I needed to deeply examine the EPA and its job killing regulations. It was a must as a topic so I could be prepared for my Senate candidacy.

I already knew a lot but like many of us, I needed to verify my facts. My best avenue for research was to read a lot and then synthesize what I read along with my prior knowledge. My idea was that I would put it into text form

that would make it easy to examine and test my hypotheses.

“Kill the EPA” was the natural title of every segment of every essay that I wrote. My intention originally was to stop after just one essay I naively thought I could describe the total fallacy of the EPA in just one essay. The topic of the “EPA” was a gift that just kept on giving as their faults are so egregious that my research turned out to be far more fruitful than I could ever have imagined.

In my research, I verified my original thesis that the agency hurts Americans and that was my major premise. From that I concluded that it does not deserve to exist. Humans deserve to breathe clean air and eat safe food but this EPA has too many other items in its agenda. I have concluded that the EPA cannot be trusted to do what is right for America. I am not alone in this belief.

Along the way to this book, I wrote ten original essays to explain this phenomenon known as the EPA. When placed in book form along with some other material, the work blossomed into thirteen chapters. You are reading Chapter 2. Thank you.

The chapters are all here for you to read. There are eleven more after this one. In addition to the printed version of the book, I will host the text of the book on my new website, www.kellyforussenate.com for the duration of my senatorial campaign. Anybody can download the full book for free. You may also read it online. All pages are copyrighted but you are all welcome to use this book for any non-commercial endeavors that you may choose.

If you want your own copy of the book in its paper form, it is available at www.itjungle.com/store.html. IT Jungle is my long time book distributor. IT Jungle has been distributing

my technical books for a very long time. They also distribute my political writings as a courtesy. I am not suggesting you help me politically, but each book that is purchased helps me get through life a little easier. If you would like hard copy, they are easy to come by at www.itjunlge.com.

It will not take you long from here on in to see that I have little regard for the EPA and from my research, I now am sure that they have little regard for you or for me. The difference between us, of course is that they do not pay \$10.5 billion per year for my existence. My cohorts and I (fellow citizens such as you) pay a whopping \$10.5 billion for these charlatans to do their best to make life miserable for all of us. When I am elected senator, I will do my best to end this travesty.

The guerrillas in the EPA will have to leave their Obama fatigues behind and be re-clothed when they come back on the streets after we fire them. Perhaps we can send the tailor, who prepares Obama's clothing. You know who it is! It is the tailor who masqueraded and then created the Emperor's clothes with no threads at all. This tailor is highlighted in the Hans Christian Andersen classic, The Emperor's New Clothes. Is Obama wearing his latest designs? I do think so.

We are closing out this chapter with a tremendously popular email sent around the Internet, forwarded by hundreds of thousands of geeks and/or ordinary users every day. It is that good. This is Gary Hubbell's classic email on Obama waking up the public in the US. Remember, as you read this: Everybody in the EPA works for Obama.

Anybody for some TEA?

“Barack Obama has awakened a sleeping nation” by Gary Hubbell

The original piece was published by the Aspen Times Weekly in February 2010, just a year after Obama took full control of the government.

Figure 2-1 – The Aspen Times Web Look



Thank You BHO

This appeared in my inbox over 18 months after it had been originally sent out -- September 26, 2011.

Can you believe it?. Hubbell believes that finally Barack Obama has awakened a sleeping nation. Here is Gary's email:

“Barack Obama is the best thing that has happened to America in the last 100 years. Truly, he is the savior of America 's future.

Despite the fact that he has some of the lowest approval ratings among recent presidents, history will see Barack Obama as the source of America 's resurrection. Barack Obama has plunged the country into levels of debt that we could not have previously imagined; his efforts to nationalize health care have been met with fierce resistance nationwide; TARP bailouts and stimulus spending have shown little positive effect on the national economy; unemployment is unacceptably high and looks to remain that way for most of a decade; legacy entitlement programs have ballooned to unsustainable levels, and there is a seething anger in the populace.

That's why Barack Obama is such a good thing for America . Here's why.

Obama is the symbol of a creeping liberalism that has infected our society like a cancer for the last 100 years. Just as Hitler is the face of fascism, Obama will go down in history as the face of unchecked liberalism. The cancer metastasized to the point where it could no longer be ignored.

Average Americans who have quietly gone about their lives, earning a paycheck, contributing to their favorite charities, going to high school football games on Friday night, spending their weekends at the beach or on hunting trips - they've gotten off the fence. They've woken up. There is a level of political activism in this country that we haven't seen since the American Revolution, and Barack Obama has been the catalyst that has sparked a restructuring of the American political and social consciousness.

Think of the crap we've slowly learned to tolerate over the past 50 years as liberalism sought to re-structure the America that was the symbol of freedom and liberty to all

the people of the world. Immigration laws were ignored on the basis of compassion. Welfare policies encouraged irresponsibility, the fracturing of families, and a cycle of generations of dependency. Debt was regarded as a tonic to lubricate the economy. Our children left school having been taught that they are exceptional and special, while great numbers of them cannot perform basic functions of mathematics and literacy. Legislators decided that people could not be trusted to defend their own homes, and stripped citizens of their rights to own firearms.

Productive members of society have been penalized with a heavy burden of taxes in order to support legions of do-nothings who loll around, reveling in their addictions, obesity, indolence, ignorance and "disabilities." Criminals have been arrested and re-arrested, coddled and set free to pillage the citizenry yet again. Lawyers routinely extort fortunes from doctors, contractors and business people with dubious torts.

We slowly learned to tolerate these outrages, shaking our heads in disbelief, and we went on with our lives. But Barack Obama has ripped the lid off a seething cauldron of dissatisfaction and unrest.

A former Communist is given a paid government position in the White House as an advisor to the president. Auto companies are taken over by the government, and the auto workers' union - whose contracts are completely insupportable in any economic sense - is rewarded with a stake in the company. Government bails out Wall Street investment bankers and insurance companies, who pay their executives outrageous bonuses as thanks for the public support. Terrorists are read their Miranda rights and given free lawyers. And, despite overwhelming public disapproval, Barack Obama has pushed forward with a

health care plan that would re-structure one-sixth of the American economy.

Literally millions of Americans have had enough. They're organizing, they're studying the Constitution and the Federalist Papers, they're reading history and case law, they're showing up at rallies and meetings, and a slew of conservative candidates are throwing their hats into the ring. Is there a revolution brewing? Yes, in the sense that there is a keen awareness that our priorities and sensibilities must be radically re-structured. Will it be a violent revolution?

No.

It will be done through the interpretation of the original document that has guided us for 220 "FANTASTIC" years-- the Constitution. Just as the pendulum swung to embrace political correctness and liberalism, there will be a backlash, a complete repudiation of a hundred years of nonsense. A hundred years from now, history will perceive the year 2010 as the time when America got back on the right track. And for that, we can thank Barack Hussein Obama.

Gary Hubbell is a hunter, rancher, and former hunting and fly-fishing guide. Gary works as a Colorado ranch real estate broker. He can be reached through his website, aspentranchrealestate.com"

In my email, it said:

IF YOU AGREE, FEEL FREE TO SHARE THIS

Hubbell's email is not intended to be a history lesson. It is one man's opinion about how bad things have gotten. It does that quite well. I thank Gary Hubbel for writing this

and for sending it along on the Internet for us all to enjoy.
Feel free to visit

<http://www.aspentimes.com/article/20100228/ASPENWEEKLY/100229854> for this article and for others you may enjoy.

On Wednesday October 12, 2011, I contacted Gary to gain his permission to reprint this article in its entirety and to credit him and the Aspen Times.

His web site responded at 13:14:19 -0600 (MDT)

Chapter 3

Was Silent Spring Too Loud?

Are good solutions always bad?

There is no question that Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* led to greater public awareness of pollution in the 1960s. Was there pollution? Absolutely there was pollution and there still is. Americans and other citizens of the world do need protection from dispassionate corporations who would unscrupulously create an environment in which carcinogens are produced in the industrial process, and there is no accountability. Can you be anti-EPA and anti-pollution and "trust but verify" on corporations all at the same time? Absolutely! The sins of the EPA are so egregious; however, it has outlived its usefulness.

The EPA as a response to Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* has become the moral equivalent of killing a mouse with an A-bomb. Ironically, the EPA would fight for the mouse to be saved even if humans would die. The EPA is a plague worst than the worst delivered by a herd of mice and rats.

My position remains that we need to kill the EPA because it continues to work on the wrong problems. But, more so than that, the agency has little regard for humankind. They devise cures for prevaricated illnesses that are worse than the supposed diseases. The EPA is not a people-first

agency. People do not even have a ranking in the EPA priority list. As nature first, people come last as the EPA is always concerned about what man is doing to nature and not whether man can survive in nature. One thing for sure, man cannot depend on the EPA for help in surviving.

Corporate thugs, union thugs, EPA thugs, government thugs, and all political thugs, must be kept tame by the people. Yes, it is a tough task but more and more people are signing up. More and more Americans have simply had enough. Many people I meet every day want to scream out loud, "Get off our backs!" How about you?

The truth about the lies of Silent Spring

Dr. J. Gordon Edwards notes in his powerful expose on Silent Spring, which he titles, "The Lies of Rachel Carson," that despite environmentalists wanting so much for her words to be all true, Rachel Carson did not measure up. Her words were not true and in many ways they were intentionally deceitful. Rachel Carson is the patron saint of the EPA, and they take her lying license for granted in the major body of their work. If you are looking for nothing but the truth, do not read Silent Spring and do not visit the EPA web site.

Dr. Edwards and many environmentalists in his camp were delighted that somebody had finally addressed the environment in a meaningful way. However, as he was moving through Carson's book, his enthusiasm diminished. He began to clearly see the big holes in Carson's story.

Dr. Edwards is an environmentalist. He is not a conservative as many of us who read this book may be. He has been published by the Sierra Club, *The Indiana Waltonian*, *Audubon Magazine*, and other environmental

magazines. A well-known entomologist, Edwards is not a lightweight on environmental topics.

The following are direct quotes of Dr. J. Gordon Edwards from the cover story in:

<http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/articles/summ02/Carson.html>

“...As I read the first several chapters I noticed many statements that I realized were false; however, one can overlook such things when they are produced by one’s cohorts, and I did just that.

“As I neared the middle of the book, the feeling grew in my mind that Rachel Carson was really playing loose with the facts and was also deliberately wording many sentences in such a way as to make them imply certain things without actually saying them. She was carefully omitting everything that failed to support her thesis that pesticides were bad, that industry was bad, and that any scientists who did not support her views were bad.

“I then took notice of her bibliography and realized that it was filled with references from very unscientific sources. Also, each reference was cited separately each time it appeared in the book, thus producing an impressive array of “references” even though not many different sources were actually cited. I began to lose confidence in Rachel Carson, even though I thought that as an environmentalist I really should continue to support her

“I next looked up some of the references that Carson cited and quickly found that they did not support her contentions about the harm caused by pesticides. When leading scientists began to publish harsh criticisms of her methods and her allegations, it slowly dawned on me that Rachel Carson was not interested in the truth about those topics,

and that I really was being duped, along with millions of other Americans.

“As a result, I went back to the beginning of the book and read it all again, but this time my eyes were open and I was not lulled into believing that her motives were noble and that her statements could be supported by logic and by scientific fact. I wrote my comments down in rough draft style, and gathered together the scientific articles that refuted what Carson had reported the articles indicated. It was a most frustrating experience.

“Finally, I began to join the detractors of Silent Spring, and when hearings were held to determine the fate of DDT in various states of this nation, I paid my own way to some of them so that I could testify against the efforts to ban that life-saving insecticide.”

...

In coming chapters we examine much of the underlying evidence that proves Carson was well off the mark. Her main proof comes from begging the argument. Yet, the EPA continues to remain one of her devout disciples.

The quick case for the EPA

At 18,000 people strong, the EPA is dedicated to destroying the economy of the United States. The choice for those who love America is clear: “The EPA must go.” Let’s say for argument reasons that we keep the EPA, which is Obama’s primo regulatory instrument against the American people. What happens next?

The answer is clear. We would get 18,000 people working against John / Jane Q. Public. That’s us! How is that a

good deal for any of us? Most American people would not even be aware there was a war going on between the EPA and the people. When you are unaware, you most often lose big time. Yet, the EPA would still get its \$10.5 billion in salaries and costs per year.

The people would have to deal with things like large fertile farmland areas being banned from using available irrigation. We would get a few more endangered little fish and perhaps a few more bug species that we are prohibited from eating or swatting. And, we would get brownouts and a group of bureaucrats determining how much water, gas, and oil, we are permitted to use. They would also determine how much CO₂ we could exhale.

In addition to Obamacare's rationing, the EPA would see to it that a lot of other precious items on their lists were rationed. Forget about double dipping. The EPA might not let you get even the first dip.

As a bonus, we would get to turn off our lights because there would be no power available. We would get seven to ten percent more unemployment because businesses would have no choice but to close. We would find asthmatic children being denied the use of the best-made inhalers, while permitted to use sub-quality EPA approved inhalers that were just a bit more effective than a placebo.

Overall, we would get more than we bargained for from an agency commissioned to help the people. The more research I did for this book, the more I was convinced that this agency has no use for people. It is time to return the favor by electing representatives strong enough to take them on.

The quick case against the EPA

Now, if we get rid of the EPA, what do we get? We get a bunch of thick headed dinosaurs (the EPA staff) that immediately get pink slips. We also get a lot more happy and productive people (us). We get more jobs and we get businesses that can grow instead of being forced to stagnate and die.

We also get farmers who again can farm on rich, irrigated soil without requiring driver's permits and major government tests to work with typical farm equipment. We get a country full of people who are permitted to heat their homes in the winter, cool them in the summer, and light them with Edison's own incandescent light bulb any time when there is darkness.

And, on top of that, we get energy independence from people who want to kill us. Perhaps more importantly, we escape the outright tyranny of the EPA. How does that sound?

Corporations are not princes either!

For the rest of the Chapter until the Conclusion, we take a break from Rachel Carson and the EPA, and we examine the role of the corporation in government today. We also take a look at the major legislation such as The Clean Air Act, which brought about the EPA.

Life is a balancing act. Corporations were not even permitted to exist as we know them today in early America because they had previously worn out their welcome in old world civilization. Huge corporations such as the British East India Company had dominated trade in the new world

before the revolution. Colonists had long decided from this experience that they wanted no corporations in the New World.

The colonists not only freed themselves from England; they got out from under the yoke of English corporations. You remember the Boston Tea Party and the British East India Company. Such corporations decreased the wealth of the people and controlled everyday activity. As you would expect, they were not held in high regard by early Americans.

The founders therefore had a healthy respect for the capability of corporations to dominate all business through ruthless, nasty practices. So, after fighting a revolution to end their exploitation by corporate powers and huge governments, the colonists wisely limited the role of corporations and governments in America. No longer were corporations permitted to have a role in elections, public policy and other aspects of life.

However, corporations were permitted to conduct business that benefitted the public. As for the government, legislators held fast to the Constitution so that bad men could never appear in the future and claim they were good men. Besides God's Bible for "we the people," the Constitution became America's credo for all citizens, one by one. It is not for the powerful. The Constitution was created to protect us all from the more powerful.

To assure that citizens, not collectives or agencies or other artificial entities controlled our country, the founders carved out very limiting rules, which corporations were required to follow. In essence, they reluctantly permitted corporations to exist. The rules made corporations diminutive participants in US trade. They were not permitted to gain the power that they hold today.

You may know the story of the legal slippery slope. It also applies in most aspects of life. Any lawyer will remind us that once in, an entity can gain power, most often they become more and more powerful until eventually, their power is a burden on us all. Because of this fear, for the first 100 years after the revolution, corporations were kept in check by honest legislators. Today, most people think the term “honest legislators” is not much more than an oxymoron. Because we elect thieves and scoundrels into office continually, we do get the government we deserve.

The early public still had memories passed down about the issues with the English corporations and they wanted none of that for America. Citizens controlled corporations; and through their legislatures, they prohibited corporations from taking any action that legislators did not specifically allow.

Much control over corporations came from the corporate charters, which are still granted by the states and not by the federal government. It was the states, and not the federal government that were in control of corporations. The most effective tool in the early days was the notion of an expiration date or as it was called, a time limit. Corporations had an expiration date and were therefore forced out of business after being operational for a set time period.

They were chartered to exist for only a specific period of time and when the time was up, they ceased to exist. Their assets were then divided among the shareholders.

There were lots of other controls, which kept corporate power to a minimum. In many ways, they were the good old days. Greed, however, is a powerful force of change.

During the first half of the 19th Century, the Supreme Court tried numerous times to usurp the power of the states' charters in regulating corporations. The public was outraged and the states fought back with modifications to their Constitutions and other measures to assure that the federal government would not steal their power.

Eventually, it seemed that the Supreme Court had heard the people and the states. In the 1855 case of *Dodge v. Woolsey*, for example, the court reaffirmed state's powers over "artificial bodies." Of course these artificial bodies were known to the citizens as the corporations.

The Captains of Industry continued to expand their businesses by forming more and more corporations. They were not about to be stopped. They kept pressing in one way or another for politicians to view the corporate light in their favor, They worked subtly and openly with politicians and crooked legislators and eventually they were able to gain more power for their corporate entities.

Though It is unpleasant to consider, they gained more power through quid pro quo actions with those corrupt officials, which they could buy-off. These corporate moguls were able to "hire" legislators and judges who believed the limits of corporate power could be expanded. How convenient! Eventually, the courts and the legislatures acknowledged the power of the chieftains and granted their wishes. Corporate power was on the rise.

Why do people go bad?

Greed is a powerful motivator and lust for power is a close second. Early Americans had an America almost as exactly as they had wanted it, without major league important

entities like corporations or huge government agencies. The early colonists were not interested in giving up the sovereignty of the people to forces more powerful than ordinary citizens. Once the powerful band together to control the people's government, the people are inevitably left behind.

Without a vigilant watchdog in the government, corporations in the late 1800 period gained substantial power inch by inch. They grew stronger, and for the most part, ordinary people were unaware of the slippery slope of the power creep, and the nasty ways the titans used their power.

When power is not in the hands of the people, the government and the courts become easier prey. The industry captains about 100 years or more ago had their way. By keeping lawmakers and judges squarely in their pockets, corporate mahoffs were able to freely reinterpret the U.S. Constitution to transform the meaning of common law doctrines to suit their selfish purposes rather than serve for the common good.

Unfortunately for us all, it got even worse. In 1886, the Supreme Court stole more states' rights when it noted that a corporation henceforth was to be treated as a "natural person."

Once corporations had the right of personhood, they increased their control over resources, jobs, commerce, politicians, even judges and the law. For 100 years the corporate powers were kept in check but ultimately corruption and powerful corporate titans ruled the day.

Corruption of public officials is one of the most insidious enemies of freedom and liberty. Corporations have the resources to buy people who are weak. As the first means

of preserving the Republic for as long as possible, the Founders protected the people against such huge sources of power. Unfortunately, the people's representatives, the early Congresses of our nation sold out the people to the corporations and permitted the rich and powerful to gain control of the government. Today's Congresses seem to continue the tradition that American is on the auction block.

As another means of guaranteeing the Republic, the founders provided elections to assure that the people were in control of the government. The Founders believed that the people would elect the best citizens to hold office for brief periods and that the citizens would come back to their farms or work places after serving in Congress. They did not expect that the people would reelect thieves into office.

The Founders perhaps did not realize that when the thieves have power, they can grant privileges to the commoners. A problem with human nature is that there are many people who like to pick the thief they know and permit them to represent their needs to the government. For helping the cheats get elected, the people are then rewarded by the thieves with largesse, such as jobs and other important benefits.

To keep such political favors coming their way, the people can become as corrupt as the rascals they elect to assure that spoils and largesse continue to come their way. It is a shame but we all know it is true. We get the government we deserve.

Giving up one's vote and taking favors that are not justified is just as corrupt as politicians taking from the corporations. So, to straighten out this mess, and to defang the EPA, and the corporations and the causes the EPA represents, we must all become better people. Only then can we be worthy

of better representatives. Only then will we choose the best for the country.

As another major means of assuring the Republic, the Founders gave us the second most profound document of all time after the Bible – the Constitution. Like other constitutions, the Constitution of the United States of America is a set of fundamental principles and/or established precedents according to which a state or other organization is governed. Our Constitution is a most eloquent document and though short, it is very comprehensive. It has been amended twenty-seven times. The first ten amendments, including freedom of speech, are known as the Bill of Rights.

The Constitution, when strictly adhered to by government, is intended to control even the most corrupt of politicians. But, as we have seen, even with all these instruments of excellent government, as provided by the Founders, we continue to have greed and corruption because humans are not perfect, and are prone to sin. We must become better people to deserve a better government. I believe we can do that.

I introduce the rise of corporate power in this essay because if the corporations were not so powerful and so self serving, the people would be able to again control them and keep them from committing acts against the people, including acts against the environment.

Yes, the air must be clean and breathable

In the 1960's in the post-war boom, more and more people were driving those magnificent automobiles of those times and the air quality, from exhaust emissions along with

corporate smokestacks was becoming noticeably bad. In Los Angeles, for example, on a few particularly bad days, it was so bad that some people even died. They could not breathe with all the smog— (Smoke that hovered like fog).

Congress took action at the time. They passed the Air Quality Act first in 1967 and later the Clean Air Act in 1970. In many ways, enforcement of the Clean Air Act made the air much better though nothing good ever happens over night. It takes time for improvements. And, improvements did come and the air became very breathable in California again. The rest of the nation was not suffering as they were in California.

The formal objective of the acts were (1) to protect and enhance the quality of the Nation's air to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population; (2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution; (3) to provide technical and financial assistance to state and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and (4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution prevention and control programs.

Clearly the most important of these acts was # 1 and because of this act, the air today is much better. It got better fairly quickly in a five year period after the act had become law. Air quality can always get better but from this experience we learned that we must move in incremental steps.

For years now, people are no longer dying from bad air, even in Los Angeles. Consequently, it should not serve the EPA well to put farmers out of business and create food shortages; to put coal and oil and gas companies out of

business and create energy shortages; or to wreak other havoc on Americans that is unjustified. Yet, because they seemingly have no constraints, the EPA believes there should be no countervailing authority to their power, and they simply do as they please. The needs of people do not matter to this agency.

The Clean Air Act

The Clean Air Act came out in 1970. It evolved from the Air Quality Act of 1967 and it has been “improved” by a series of detailed control requirement amendments in 1970, 1977, and 1990. The regulatory parts of the Clean Air Act are as follows:

- (1) All new and existing sources are prohibited from emitting pollution that exceeds ambient air quality levels.
- (2) Ambient air quality program is implemented through state implementation plans (SIPs).
- (3) New sources are subject to more stringent control technology and permitting requirements.

The Act addressed specific pollution problems, most of which scientists agreed were real. These included hazardous air pollution and visibility impairment.

- (4) In 1990, a fourth program was added - a comprehensive operating permit program to focus in one place, all of the Clean Air Act requirements that apply to a given source of pollution.

Man and Nature Together

A balance must be made between the requirements of environmental acts and the ability to live. When man and nature conflict, it is not man that should choose to die.

Please note this major Act was not passed by the EPA. It was passed by our Congress to help the people gain clean air. It was a good idea. We should not kill Congress, just the EPA, which has gotten out of hand. Congress is vital to our Nation's health but we could use a nice new broom to sweep many of the most entrenched and corrupt politicians out the door.

Quite often we don't know why the EPA does what it does. The clean air act was and continues to be good for America. Most of the good in the act, however, has already been done and it was done well. Having a group of guerrillas, such as the EPA using semi-terroristic acts to harass Americans at home or in their businesses is not a good idea and it was never the intention of the act or the EPA. That is the problem with the EPA. Now that the air is reasonably clean and states have huge environmental departments, the people can breathe without the job-killing EPA.

Corporations are built to survive!

So, now that we have defined the notion of a corporation and we looked at the general points of the clean air acts, why can't everything just be OK? Left on their own, we know that corporations are beneficent citizens and will always do what they can to make America a better place – even if it cost them a bit of bottom line profits. Of course I

am kidding. I sure wish that was the case but corporations have only selfish motives. Their most powerful motivation is survival.

Perhaps corporations are simply enterprises of self interest, whose one and only goal after survival is to increase shareholder profitability. I would agree to that if the corporate moguls would agree. Corporations are surely more like greedy collectors than beneficent benefactors.

Corporations do anything to survive. When environmental regulations come their way; for the sake of survival, and no other reason, corporations will do for the public only what is needed to survive, and typically not much more. When regulations are such that they are unreasonable and unwirkable, corporations as well as we the people will do our best to not comply so that we can all survive.

Are corporations really bad for the environment?

Yes, it is true that large unincorporated entities and large corporations have been documented to be some of the worst polluters of all time. Moreover, they have been documented to have been engaged in systematic cover-ups to avoid detection. Escape and Evasion has always been their best avenue for survival.

Corporate chem scams?

As you look for issues, consider that when the EPA guerillas are outside your fences, you are most typically inclined to hide your important stuff. Expect the same from corporations—even though it is not right. The US chemical

industry, in particular, intrinsically believes that it can be put out of existence with one bad report. With today's cutthroat EPA, they are correct.

So, before a chemical company concludes that it can ever comply with regulations, as a rule, it hides from regulations and the regulators using whatever escape and evasion techniques that it can invent. The companies in many ways are like kids that discovered they had actually eaten so many cookies that the bottom of the jar was beginning to show. Chem companies know when they are in trouble as soon as they get into trouble.

To protect themselves and to survive, chemical companies conjure plans over time to privately fund research. Their objective is not compliance but a desire to gain information needed to devise responses to any potential threat from agencies or environmentalists.

Perhaps if they thought the EPA was a fair and reasonable agency (not that they needed to jump in bed with them), corporations would spend their dollars incrementally improving their predicament, rather than paying tons of lawyers to make the problems go away on technicalities.

Industry understands the risks of pollution better than anybody but the leaders of the companies do not trust that they can share identified risks with the EPA or the public or their days would be numbered. "Guerillas in fatigues," which is how I would characterize the EPA do not evoke the notion that cooperation is the best strategy. Therefore businesses, large and small, chose escape and evasion as their strategy and lawyers are very good at such techniques.

Company tactics were to release just enough information to reassure people of the safe nature of their products, and that they worked, and they would cover up any uncertainties or potential problems tirelessly, to stop any government regulation or intervention.

Plastics in the Food Industry

As you are sipping on your water bottle or a Gatorade right now, or drinking a nice cold cocktail in a huge plastic goblet, you may be oblivious to the possibility of toxins from the plastic seeping into your libation. Yet, we know from published reports that certain plastics have been found to be more toxic than others. In the 1970's however, when chemical companies were all excited about the potential use of plastic in the food and beverage industry, the data was not always available that things were safe or unsafe. Don't forget the Chemical Company's credo of escape and evasion.

You may remember or you may have read that in the 1970's negative data emerged from European investigators that certain plastics were linked to cancer. Can you imagine how this spooked the chemical industry? Plastics were becoming the most successful products ever produced from chemistry techniques. Yet, there were potential health dangers. What would you do if you knew there was even a potential risk of poison from a food container? That's why chemical producers felt escape and evasion was their best tactic.

Companies were worried that the public might view all plastics as threatening to health if there was full disclosure, and so items like plastic wrap, hairsprays, floor coverings, and a ton of other consumer products would be at risk. So,

the US chemical industry's response was to deceive the government and mislead the public in order to hide the link between plastic and any potential for health dangers.

By the way, the EPA, persistently and religiously follows its "love nature first" agenda. Because of this, one might think that there was an EPA war against chemical companies. Contrary to popular belief, however, it was not the EPA agency that blew the lid on chemical company issues.

In 1973, the EPA was just a startup agency. It was the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that took on the chemical companies. Today, the FDA often is forced to take orders from the EPA. Back in the early 1970's however, the EPA was the agency that learned that plastic liquor and wine bottles were leaching vinyl chloride into the liquor and wine. Ultimately the FDA banned its use for liquor bottles. Today, Boxed wines with the special plastic bag inserts are considered food safe as are specially made plastics for liquor containers.

The kind of plastic that booze comes in is polyethylene terephthalate (PET). This leeches much less toxin than the other types of plastic bottles. Most of who consume such products are noticeably still alive. Overall, the FDA considers them safe today but then again, there is nothing like glass.

There are some Seniors of today who are thankful that the FDA found the problem a long time ago. In the 1970's many of today's oldsters were just in their late teens and early 20's. Looking back, however, the penniless college coed of that era would have not had a worry anyway as the popular beverages of the time for the "I'm broke, how about you crowd!" were Ripple and Swizzle and other potent

“wine-like” products. These were packaged in glass containers.

Ripple and Swizzle were the lowest cost products (rotgut) that a young person with limited funds could buy. It seems the only ones whose brains were affected negatively now serve in Congress. We know it was not caused by the plastic.

One of the honest industry studies did find that vinyl chloride residues from bottles and packages had also migrated into vinegar, apple cider, vegetable oil, mineral oil and onto meats. Over time, after these variants of plastic products were withdrawn, better and safer food-grade plastic products were developed. The FDA is continually double checking that all is OK, and for that I am grateful. The FDA has its own issues but they actually do protect the people from the corporations.

Under FDA guidelines when new packaging materials are developed for food use, the FDA reviews the submitted test data and must be satisfied with the product for its intended use before it gives the OK.

The FDA checks out a lot of factors in its attempt to assure human safety. For plastics, it checks the migration potential and the substances with which they are made. The objective of course is for the packaging not to migrate into the food. Tests are conducted to assure that there is just a minimal amount of transfer between a plastic package and the food it contains and that any transfer does not pose a risk to human health. The FDA’s mission is to assure that humans are safe from factors that affect food and drugs. The rule of thumb continues to be that if you can taste the plastic, discard the container.

The EPA operates differently from the FDA. From my perspective, they work like a bunch of thugs, with their major purpose to assure that nature is not harmed by man. If it were up to the EPA, I would bet that the harmful plastic products would still be on the market as it would shorten human life. In this way, each human would have less of an impact on nature. Maybe that is too harsh a thought. Maybe not! I have no proof of this per se, just a conclusion formed by reading and observation. In summary, the FDA is mostly good; the EPA is mostly bad.

Conservatives are on fire

Conservatives on Fire at

<http://conservativesonfire.wordpress.com>

offer a smorgasbord of stories on the various government agencies. When I say, the FDA is mostly good; I think that is about right. The EPA is downright corrupt and very dangerous to the economy. The other agencies also get carried away sometimes with their excessive power but their adopted charters, unlike the EPA's is not to mess up the country. Moreover, they typically like to help the people at large, rather than position people as subservient to nature.

Conservatives on fire (COF) is a group that is up in arms over the FDA, USDA, and EPA, who they refer to as "Obama's Storm Troopers in Action." They got their stories originally from the Daily Caller but their blog posts are ripe with comments about the government agencies under Obama. A commenter at the end of a number of stories noted the TSA also needs to be on the list of bad agencies and the COF agreed.

Conservatives on fire think that the governmental agencies charged with monitoring and "helping" us are

all out of control and they picked these stories because they “make their blood boil.” At first, you will be inclined to laugh but please hold back the laughter because unlike some light-hearted stuff in this book, this is silly, but in a very hurtful way to those directly affected. In many ways, we are all affected.

“The first story has to do with the FDA and an Amish farmer.

“In April 2010, federal agents descended on the dairy farm of Dan Allgyers in Pennsylvania. The Amish farmer produces unpasteurized milk on his farm and sells it to families who prefer dairy products in their natural state.

“The sale of unpasteurized milk has been illegal under federal law since 1987, but that doesn’t keep clever farmers and customers from making it work, usually by forming private clubs where raw milk is a benefit of club membership. Selling unpasteurized milk is legal inside 10 states.

“So, back in 1987 the FDA determines that there is ‘some’ risk to consuming raw milk and writes a law prohibiting the sale of unpasteurized milk. But some people believe there are actual health benefits to drinking raw milk and they want raw milk for their families. To get around the law, these people have worked with dairy farmers to form private clubs, which allow club members to buy the milk they want. But the FDA Storm Troopers put a stop to Farmer Dan’s illegal operation. However, this time the Storm Troopers have stirred-up a hornets’ nest. “

The farmer joined a group protesting the FDA’s heavy-handed approach to raw dairy. Most of the protesters get their products from Farmer Dan, and are hoping a Ron

Paul-sponsored bill will prevent the FDA from getting in theirs and Dan's business in the future. ---

<http://dailycaller.com/2011/05/24/raw-milk-it-tastes-like-freedom/#ixzz1abTYQOf4>

Ron Paul is the best person on freedom and liberty in the country from whom I think Farmer Dan could expect help.

“The second story has to do with the USDA and little bunny rabbits. Here are some excerpts from the story:

“It started out as a hobby, a way for the Dollarhite family in Nixa, Mo., to teach a teenage son responsibility. Like a lemonade stand.

“But now, selling a few hundred rabbits over two years has provoked the heavy hand of the federal government to the tune of a \$90,643 fine. The fine was levied more than a year after authorities contacted family members, prompting them to immediately halt their part-time business and liquidate their equipment.

“A fine of over \$90,000 seems a bit steep, doesn't it? The family's lawyer thought so too.

“ ‘My client rejects that proposal,’ wrote their attorney, Richard Anderson, in a May 19 letter, noting that according to USDA's own literature, its 6,000 annual enforcement cases average ‘a penalty of \$333.33 per case, and yet you contend it would be appropriate my client tender a penalty of \$90,643.00.’

“From an average case fine of \$333 to over \$90,000, I'd say that is a bit of overreaching by the Storm Troopers. But here is what a USDA spokesperson had to say:

“USDA spokesman Sacks said the \$90,643 fine ‘looks curious to say the least.’ But, he insisted it was necessary for USDA to punish violators to ensure businesses across the country register, putting them on the USDA’s radar screen for inspections and possible enforcement [in other areas besides milk.]”

Above is from Stormtroopers piece on Conservatives on fire; below is from a Commenter on Stormtroopers:

“May 25, 2011

“Don’t forget the TSA! They sent a letter to Texas saying that if they passed the law that would make some of the pat-downs illegal and a felony, that they would establish a no-fly zone over Texas. Re-blogged about it this morning. Can this possibly be legal?”

The moral of the story is don’t mess with Obama. He will get you with one agency or another.

Chapter Summary

This chapter contains peripheral and background information that will help in understanding how far out of the mainstream of rationale thought the EPA has drifted. From the Silent Spring days of Rachel Carson, Americans have been blessed by an attentive Congress and the Office of the President in keeping the air and the water safe for all humankind in the United States. As we move further on in this book, however, you will see that Silent Spring was way too loud in its prescription for overkill on the protection front.

Nobody thinks that America is not better off for the environmental protection that we have received over the years since the big smog episodes in LA in the 1960's. Some of the help came from the EPA and lots came from the states' Departments of Environmental Resources. With the plastics issues and food issues, a lot of good help also came from the F.D.A.

As you will see in subsequent chapters, when something gets so big like the EPA; it takes on a life of its own, and when it no longer works for the people, it is time for it to go. The EPA has long outlived its usefulness to the American people. It now appears that it is more powerful than the Congress that once drafted the legislation creating this *agency gone wild*. President Obama would like nothing more than to help marginalize the power of Congress through the use of his EPA.

The EPA over the years has morphed into something that is dangerous for Americans. Though we are all interested in clean air and clean water, it helps to remember that the Clean Air Act and other such positive legislation were enacted by Congress, not the EPA. They were well needed and they did their job for years. The EPA, as an agency of the US government, had a job to create regulations that were in the spirit of the laws created by the Congress. For awhile it did its job well, but as it got bigger, it decided that it would solve all of the problems of the planet, and along the way, it decided that mankind was the biggest problem.

As the Holiday Season has past us in 2011, it helps to recall that the EPA came up with just one clever wish for Christmas...if only it could do something about all the people who were exhaling CO₂. Thankfully, the EPA is not powerful enough yet to actually take action to reduce the number of humans on the planet.

For the EPA, as we repeat often in this book, Mother Nature does come first. Humans have been documented for ages as the biggest polluters. So, why should the EPA like humans?

Chapter 4

Obama Snake Oil

EPA delivers large doses of snake oil

EPA regulations are often silly but they are always hurtful. Most regular human beings, who have not overdosed on Obama Snake Oil (OSO), see the sins of the EPA for what they are. OSO is a substance which the EPA should ban one day as a mind pollutant. Who knows what the next banned substance will be? Will it be two-ply toilet paper, outdoor dining, fireworks displays, or perhaps human flatulence? I should not give the EPA any ideas; they are already silly enough. Their latest target is antibacterial hand soaps. Maybe they make hands too clean.

EPA ignores dihydrogen oxide threat

On August 9, 2011, Patrick Hedger put forth a hypothesis on a dangerous substance that he said should be regulated by the EPA because it can be harmful and it can be toxic if breathed in small quantities or ingested in large doses. The problem, according to Hedger is not being addressed. It is the chemical, Dihydrogen Oxide, which is also referred to as Hydric Acid.

Hedger laments that the substance is everywhere. He asks whether such an insidious chemical should not have more priority than others for the EPA due to its broader availability in the environment. Hedger writes:

“Dihydrogen Oxide is everywhere and it is killing people through over exposure and the adverse weather and other environmental conditions it creates. The EPA has worked to create and implement regulations that have either banned or labeled hazardous far less lethal substances. So we must demand the EPA take action and regulate hydric acid right? After all the spread of Dihydrogen Oxide is so great that every single human being has close to a 70% contamination level. So where is the action? The dangers are proven. Why do we allow Hydric Acid to kill so many people and destroy so much? Simple:

“Dihydrogen oxide’s chemical formula is H₂O. Hydric acid is water.

“So clearly it would be silly for the EPA to take action against water. Sure it can kill you, but you can’t live without it. If we safely use and recycle water, we can prevent most of the dangers it poses. Sure we can’t stop the thunderstorms and floods can be a bear to prevent, but just about everyone knows how to avoid drowning or that sticking your hand in boiling water is a bad idea. So if we can safely use a chemical or substance, despite its inherent dangers, it would be silly to impose government regulations on it. Right?”

The honeybee scare

You may have heard of the decline in the honeybee population in this country and across the world. What you

may not have heard is that honeybees are not indigenous to America and probably came over with the pilgrims on the Mayflower. The phenomenon is true and it has been diagnosed but the cause is not known with specificity. The name of the problem is colony collapse disorder, or CCD, and it typically manifests itself with an abandoned hive with just the queen bee as the only occupant, apparently unable to reproduce.

Hannah Nordhaus has a great new book on the topic called "The Beekeeper's Lament," which is now available in popular bookstores. She offers a great perspective on why bees may be dying and it is not necessarily that clothianidin pesticide by Bayer, one of a number in the neonicotinoid (systemic) family is killing them.

This reasonably new pesticide now does the work that DDT once did. It is taking the blame by some environmentalists. Can it be that since it replaced DDT it must be bad? Nordhaus notes the pathetic rush to judgment on the subject as she observed just how quickly environmentalists want to blame somebody or something for any problem in nature, often without having any facts.

This is the story of the EPA that we tell in this book. In fact, I predict that neonicotinoids will be found to be partly culpable in the reduction in honeybees and quite frankly the reduction in an insect population once robust enough to support animal predators such as tons of birds of all kinds. Now even the bird population is dwindling and the ornithologists are looking at the lack of insects as that problem. DDT is hardly in use at all in the world, so it is not this one time environmental fall guy that is causing the problem. The EPA would say that it is not nice to fool Mother Nature, and right now it is looking for a culprit to blame, right or wrong.

The three dirty letters DDT however, are not coming up. You see it is well known that DDT is a type of pesticide that is not harmful to bees, whereas neonicotinoids appear to be harmful to just about everything that is alive. Sometimes the cure is worse than the problem.

Ironically it may be the bad politics of possibly having to back off their DDT ban that has the EPA in a quandary currently. It appears the DDT replacement is a far more lethal substance than DDT. Can the EPA face that as a possibility? Anyway, I thought you would like a summary of Nordhaus's take on all those quickly trying to solve the problem—with or without facts. It is a great theme and it describes the EPA to a tee.

“Dying bees have become symbols of environmental sin, of faceless corporations out to ransack nature. Such is the story environmental journalism tells all too often. But it's not always the story that best helps us understand how we live in this world of nearly seven billion hungry people, or how we might square our ecological concerns and commitments with that reality. By engaging in simplistic and sometimes misleading environmental narratives -- by exaggerating the stakes and brushing over the inconvenient facts that stand in the way of foregone conclusions-- -- we do our field, and our subjects, a disservice. “

Amen!

Keep nature happy

Many of the EPA regulations are not only silly but they are very hurtful to people and to business and a good part of those that are hurtful are stupid also. You can tell that Hannah Nordhaus feels similarly to me about environmentalists as she eloquently puts the scenario in

perspective in the quote above. It helps for all of us to remember that the EPA, as the enforcer for the environment movement, has just one goal—to make sure nature is happy. If you can actually come to accept that major premise, then everything the EPA does makes perfect sense.

There are no constraints for Obama's EPA. Nature comes first. If life gets a little bit or even a lot uncomfortable for humans because of the EPA and Mother Nature is happy—so be it. *C'est la vie.*

A few stupid EPA regulations to ponder

Let's talk about a few really bad EPA regulations that have become well known over the agency's 40-year life. There are far too many to get more than a sampling as there are hundreds of regulations that most normal people would call stupid. Most are still on the books.

Early regulations once pinpointed real problems and addressed them point on. Today's regulations are reflections of somebody's ideological agenda and they are structured such that attempts to kill, say one amoeba, would be done with a bunker buster bomb. But somebody in the EPA would object to the killing anyway. More than likely EPA personnel would be lining up on the side of the one celled parasite rather than working to help humans get rid of such threats to human health.

The new EPA regulations appear designed specifically to inhibit job creation and growth by private industry at a time we are in economic chaos? Our parents would not believe we would let this happen. Let's take a look at a few of the most egregious!

The EPA loves life on the farm. Unfortunately, the EPA is too busy punishing farmers for tilling the soil and taking out precious minerals. The EPA also has a lot of time to crack down on farmers for their fine work in feeding mankind. Consequently, the EPA gives farmers little credit for fighting insects and fungi and all kinds of pests and diseases to bring a crop to market that they can sell and we can use at our tables.

If we had full access to their wish lists, we would find that there are more than a few insects or fungi that the EPA would like to put on the endangered species list. Perhaps that is a big reason for their angst and their dissatisfaction with American farmers.

The EPA sees things differently from those of us who go to market and enjoy the fruits of the farmers' labor. It has whacked farmers but good, with a lot of costly and expensive rules and regulations. If their intention is not for farmers to give up, pack it in, and let us all eat cake, it sure seems like it is.

CO2 Emissions

As an example of the pain caused upon farmers by the EPA, those in the industry know that American farmers consider Title V of the Clean Air Act as a major threat to their survival. This is a CO2 emissions standard which applies to small farms such as those with over 25 cows. You and I exhale CO2 and so do cows and pigs and other animals. To get a permit to operate under Title V, it cost farmers a mere \$46,500 and the pre-construction permit to get things in order costs \$84,500. That is pretty menacing don't you think? In fact, it is legalized extortion. Yet, that is how the EPA does business.

Dust Regulations

Then, of course the EPA has its so-called “Dust” regulation that the agency posted as *not true* in mid September right after Herman Cain, Godfather Pizza CEO, nailed them in a Republican Presidential debate. I bet after the debate the EPA’s thoughts quickly went to banning the harmful effects of Godfather Pizza. Unfortunately for the EPA, right now at least, Godfather Pizza is under the purview of the FDA.

The EPA now says dust is not one of their priorities. They admit they are considering / studying it. Farmers are always on notice because the EPA does not need Congress to OK its regulations. So, dust is definitely on the EPA agenda. In fact, no matter what lies they tell, the EPA is looking to crack down on farm dust. Its proposal is already well formed and it involves treating farm dust as an air pollutant. Any dust from farm equipment, dusty farm roads, or those nasty farm animals kicking up dust would therefore be regulated by the EPA, when the rules are fully formulated and in place. Don’t laugh, it is true. Can you see why more and more long-time business owners are saying, “enough,” and simply retiring. Thank our friends at the EPA for that.

Manure Regulations

The EPA gets its kicks from getting into other people’s dung. For example, they are into farm manure big time. They force the farmers to measure excrement as if they are trying to determine if the farm is large enough to warrant the big licensing expense as noted above. If a ton of excrement per month is the count, it may mean that the farm has 26 head of cattle and not the 24 as reported to the EPA. In this case, perhaps the farm needs to upgrade to the more expensive licenses.

Not only is it a burden measuring and providing exact counts for things that we would call crap, farmers also must complete a ton of oppressive paperwork on EPA forms to properly account for the manure.

Unfortunately, God has not yet invented an animal that can go a lifetime without any excretory action. To satisfy the mounds of paper required by the EPA, there are documented cases in which farmers have spent upwards of 15 hours a week just filling out the forms so the EPA can track each load of manure that her animals generated. Maybe next year, they can add an excrement fee or perhaps ban excrement made (dropped) anywhere close to a rural area.

Figure 4-1 Manure Happens



Power Plant Regulations

In addition to farmers, The EPA hates utility companies and they inflict big pain on this industry, which then is forced to raise utility rates. In addition to harming today's economy, the actions taken by the EPA reduce the competitiveness of US industry and negatively impact our national security.

Figure 4-2 Nasty Power Plant



More and more utilities including American Electric Power, Duke Energy, and Southern Company have announced they are not going to take it anymore and they are preparing to close a number of coal-fired power plants. The cost of EPA regulations for them and many others is just too high. When the plants close, there will be layoffs, higher electricity prices and the possibility of power outages. It does help to remember that it is not the EPA's responsibility to assure that humans are comfortable.

EPA is anti-energy

The EPA can and does hurt businesses in many ways and at the same time. They are truly ambidextrous. While blocking coal as a fuel source for electric power plants, the EPA is also blocking an easy means for the same plants to use natural gas or petroleum. It simply does not like fossil fuels and so its intent is for Americans to pay through the nose for power produced by oil, gas, or coal, The EPA does not really understand nuclear that well. It is regarded by scientists as a clean source of energy; nonetheless, the EPA is against it.

The Keystone XL pipeline saga

The EPA is active along with their environmentalist cronies and Hollywood celebrities with the intention of blocking the building of a new pipeline known as the Keystone XL pipeline. It would bring a huge amount of oil from Canada to Texas. It would be a good thing for America and it would assure that this valuable source of energy from Canada will not be diverted by the Canadians to Asia.

Every drop of oil counts when you are energy short as we are in America today. This Canadian Oil would supply start by providing 900,000 barrels of oil a day and provide billions of dollars of tax revenue. The EPA is against it and so is Obama but Obama must appear that he is undecided to please his union friends.

Since it is you and I who pay the 18,000 EPA employees their salaries, one would think they would work for us. Unfortunately, we do not get to evaluate their job performance regularly. However, we can elect new officials who can change their mission statement in a moment, and they can also eliminate the agency completely.

Our employment contract with the EPA says they get paid anyway, whether they help the people or hurt the people. Since during the building process, the pipeline may hurt nature a bit while in the future it would clearly be helping humans, the Obama's EPA is not interested in the pipeline ever being built. Apparently, this is a direct order from Obama himself who recently placed the deal on hold. Obama has many rich and prominent political donors to his electoral warchest who raised environmental concerns. They are part of heavy activist environmental group, who threatened to withhold future campaign support if the project went ahead. It is no secret that Obama wants to get elected again far more than he wants to serve the people.

The EPA has identified Coal as its big target and it is trying to get Power plants that use coal to shut down or convert to something more enviro-friendly. Yet, the EPA and Obama are blocking needed oil by not permitting the direct pipeline to Texas to be built. So, what does Obama's EPA want us to do, bring land-based oil in from Canada on tankers? Maybe they really want to create a heating and cooling crisis in the US? Can that be the plan?

President Obama is not very good at making any decision. We all know that not making a decision however is a decision. Obama gets away with it because the media is corrupt. He was a very ineffective Senator and he leads from behind so that he can second-guess all results. Obama is the same Obama who voted *present* innumerable times in the Senate and thus he had no real record when he ran for President.

Present, however was the only way Obama could vote when the unions were looking for 20,000 construction jobs and the environmentalists were pushing for magic, rather than the pipeline to deliver energy to homes in the US. A

real leader would have OK'd the pipeline because it was the best thing for our country.

Obama never says never! Thus every issue, upon which he has ever had to decide, remains open today. In this latest non-decision, the President delayed and perhaps killed the planned \$7 billion Keystone XL pipeline project until after the next election. Obama does not care about America but he does care about holding title to the office of President of the United States.

The President knew that about 20,000 union jobs were likely to go elsewhere but his major mandate to the EPA has been to keep the US in a bankrupt energy position until the economy completely collapses. The more Americans he can fool, the closer his wish for a permanently weak America is to coming true.

The President's decision to table the pipeline rather than go hog wild to make it happen hit a lot of dependent people right between the eyes. Which project developer or supporter can take a year off waiting to see if the temperamental Obama will ever say "yes." The Keystone XL organization has already pumped \$1.7 billion in steel pipe as well as millions of dollars to obtain right-of-way easements to assure a proper construction path.

The project has been under study for three years and the environmentalists have assured that there were the requisite volumes and volumes of impact statements produced to properly characterize the work effort. It should have been a go but emotion and the win at all costs mantra of environmentalists often trumps the facts.

Since the pipeline crosses US borders, the State Department had previously determined that it would have "no significant impacts" from their perspective as they had

controlling jurisdiction. They were prepared to offer their formal approval by the end of 2011. Unfortunately, this self-imposed timetable provoked environmental activists to push hard for the administration to reject it. The White House, under control of BHO rejected it. The EPA and Obama campaign supporters had a party. America wept for itself.

It is really tough for those who expect the best from this administration. Disappointment has been the lesson to all of us who hoped for a good change. All of the agencies—EPA, FDA, USDA, DOE, etc.—are in lock-step with Obama regardless of how off the mark the President's demands take them.

So, we all must stay well awake as this President will not give up until he is clearly defeated and his surrogates, such as the EPA will not give up until there is no hope. Their life's missions appear to be aligned so closely with the President's that they move like twins in simpatico.

None of the President's agencies, especially the EPA seem to really care about America or Americans. The sooner Americans realize that we are on our own, the sooner we all will be able to fend off the incessant volleys and move in only one direction – the direction that helps America the most. It is always the direction opposite that to which the president is heading.

It is really inconceivable that a president who blames everybody else for job losses can turn his back on 20,000 jobs plus the opportunity for a few percentages towards energy independence. What motivates such a president to turn away from things that help America if it is not that he wishes the worst for America?

BP Oil Spill—not Obama’s finest moment

It is not the first time for Obama to vote against American energy. The US Interior Department got a piece of the action in the Gulf in 2010 after the BP spill. Wherever the government was involved, things stalled. Additionally, thanks to the government, the people in the gulf suffered more than even the Katrina disaster. Who would have expected after the southern states were hit with such drastic job losses that the President’s men would increase, not decrease the time period in which they would be unemployed. Is this our Job’s President or is it just a little snake oil?

You may recall in 2010 that U.S. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar’s declared a six-month moratorium on deepwater drilling following the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. If you were working someplace else in the US, you may not have noticed. This action by Salazar from Interior, and Obama the ideologue erased access to 7.5 billion barrels of oil and nearly 60 trillion cubic feet of natural gas along with tens of thousands of job opportunities they would have created.

Just like the pipeline crews are not holding in place since these men need to work, those Gulf drilling rigs and jobs went overseas. They did not sit around hoping Obama and Salazar would start playing nicey nicey with them. They left the gulf for greener pastures.

By the time the courts told Obama he did not have the authority, the damage had already been done. And, to show the judge who the President was and that judges are just puny little things compared to presidents, Obama changed a few things in the Salazar regulations and then ignored the court order to drop the moratorium. Yet,

nobody, D or R really challenges this powerful prince as he destroys America piece by piece with his agency power.

In this big 2010 BP Gulf Oil spill, it appeared that the EPA was hurting rather than helping in the cleanup. Why was that? It was because they actually were hurting the cleanup and not offering any real help. They operate under Obama's direct orders.

They were a constraint to all those trying to help the people of the Gulf to get rid of that nasty oil. But, then again their job is not to help man. The EPA job is to help nature and most of the time man is guilty and nature gets hurt simply because there are too many people.

Some may recall during the Gulf disaster that the Dutch had offered four huge skimmers that would suck up tons of the toxic water and oil. The oil would sink into the tanker's tank, and the water would be pumped off back into the Gulf. This was not acceptable to Obama's EPA.

The EPA had a regulation that water that contained oil could not be pumped back into the ocean. Rather than waive it, they stubbornly stuck by that regulation because after all, they had written it. So for 50 days nothing was permitted in the Gulf while the oil was racing in. After 50 days, the EPA relented and of course there was no problem from the Dutch skimmers once they went into operation, but by then the big damage was already done. The EPA expressed no remorse.

Dinesh D'Souza is one of America's most influential conservative thinkers. He wrote a book titled, "The Roots Of AObama's Rage in which he explains the unexplainable about the conundrum in chief. He has choice words to say about Obama in the gulf:

“Next let’s consider Obama’s response to the devastating oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. As torrents of black oil gushed toward southern shores, Obama sounded lethargic, almost bored, with what was going on and what needed to be done to stop it. Even Democratic strategist James Carville expressed amazement at Obama’s personal and emotional remove from the situation. “I have no idea why they didn’t seize this thing. I have no idea why their attitude was so hands off here.” Listening to Obama talk on the subject, TV host Keith Olbermann responded: “It was a great speech if you were on another planet for the last 57 days.”

“Finally, addressing the TV cameras on May 14, 2010, Obama managed to work up some enthusiasm. Time and again he condemned “British Petroleum”—an interesting term since the company long ago changed its name to BP. Given our anti-colonial theory, it’s no surprise that Obama wanted to remind Americans of what BP used to stand for. He was equally outspoken in whacking the other oil companies for their “ridiculous spectacle” of “pointing fingers of blame.” Actually these companies were not responsible for the spill, and the only blame, in addition to that of BP, belonged to the Obama administration for its Katrina-like incompetence in responding to the disaster.

“Addressing the nation on the spill on June 15, 2010, Obama stressed that Americans “consume more than 20 percent of the world’s oil, but have less than 2 percent of the world’s resources.” Obama went on to say that “for decades we’ve talked and talked about the need to end America’s century-long addiction to fossil fuels.” Unfortunately, “time and again the path forward has been blocked” by, among others, “oil industry lobbyists.” Now, on the face of it, this is a perfectly reasonable statement from a liberal politician who thinks this is what the American public wants to hear. But ask yourself, what does any of this have to do with the oil spill? Would the oil spill have

been less of a problem if America consumed a mere 10 percent of the world's resources? Of course not. The point is that for Obama the energy and environmental issues reduce to a simple proposition: America is a neocolonial giant eating up more than its share of the world's resources, and in doing so America is exploiting the scarce fuel of the globe; consequently, this gluttonous consumption must be stopped. This is the heart of Obama's energy and environmental agenda: not cleaning up the Gulf or saving the environment in general, but redressing the inequitable system where the neocolonial West—and neocolonial companies like BP—dominates the use of global energy resources.”

Brazil can drill

Ironically, after the US had invested over \$2 billion with Brazil's state-owned oil company Petrobras to finance offshore exploration in their home oil field in the Santos, which was close to Rio de Janeiro, Obama came out of Gulf hiding and pledged that America would become one of their best customers. I wonder if Brazil offered a Plexiglas flexible pipeline between our two countries, whether Obama would have given the OK. Can it be that Obama only says “no” if America has a chance to gain?

No pipeline, period

Considering the Keystone XL pipeline was an inland connection between Canada and the US, it is hard to understand that on March 19, 2010, President Obama explained his decision to give Brazil a head start against America in this way:

“At a time when we’ve been reminded how easily instability in other parts of the world can affect the price of oil, the United States could not be happier with the potential for a new, stable source of energy.” Dear President Obama: What about Canada and Montana?

Obama’s delay on the pipeline may force developers to kill the pipeline project altogether. Why an oil customer that depended on the pipeline would be reassured by a president who cannot make a decision favorable to America, would want to invest in America is anybody’s guess. Customers who have already signed up to take delivery of oil will surely lose money, and there will be added expenses to get new permits.

All Americans are set back by Obama’s pipeline decision. No matter what we can do for ourselves, Obama, the environment prince, will veto it, and the EPA will enforce his veto.

Why does putting off the real decision til after the election make any sense for America. We must face it with no false hope. Obama has made the decision. He just did not announce it as the decision. There will be no Canadian / US pipeline.

According to TransCanada CEO Russ Girling, who knows more about the situation than even the know-it-all Obama, says that if crude delivery can’t begin as scheduled, “Those shippers will only wait so long, and then they will start looking for other markets. Similarly, the refiners can only wait so long for Canadian crude oil to come into their marketplace.” A key prospective market is Asia. Will this be known as the big Obama jobs loser of November 2011? I think so!

Obama is the reason we are not doing well. Look no further than the White House for why there is no economic or jobs recovery. Recovery would get in the way of the President's ideological agenda. If any other president were in control of the EPA, for example, nobody would expect that president to advocate courses of actions that would hurt America. With Obama, it is not the case. We expect the worst from him and we get it.

Kill the EPA in self defense

It is not silly but it is true that the government through the EPA plans to gain control over as much of American industry as possible. Their intent is to kill off American industry and American energy. I say kill the EPA monster first.

Newt Gingrich repeatedly has suggested the replacement of the EPA with a new agency called the "Environmental Solutions Agency." I fear that would be a political trick and the same bums would simply be in new offices. Let's start by ridding ourselves of this scourge. Kill the agency and let the EPA employees get jobs on farms or oil rigs—or collect unemployment.

I can't think of a better way to end this Chapter on Obama Snake Oil than by quoting Thomas Sowell, who on June 15, 2010, writing for the National Review Online titled his piece as: "Obama's Snake-Oil Spill" I think Sowell has Obama pegged pretty well. Here it is:

"Nothing will keep a man or an institution determined to continue on a failing policy course like past success with that policy. Obama's political success in the 2008 election

campaign was a spectacular triumph of creating images and impressions.

“But creating political impressions and images is not the same thing as governing. Yet Obama in the White House keeps on saying and doing things to impress people, instead of governing.”

Chapter 5

The Delta Smelt

Central Valley Cal. Fertile Farmland?

Let's look at one or two more egregious issues with the EPA and its surrogate agencies. This one is both heartbreaking and as most EPA adventures, it is also silly. But, again, please remember, the EPA is not about making humans happy or comfortable. It is to protect nature regardless of the cost to mankind. If you noticed that I have said that before, you are getting the overriding message of the book.

Until 2009, California's Central Valley was once considered by many to be the richest and most productive farmland in the nation. Add their rich soil to a long growing season and California's Central Valley was tough to beat, and so for years it was the most productive farming region in the US. The EPA stopped all that by taking away the rights of the farmers to irrigate their crops.

For years, California provided a substantial percentage of the produce for America. Because of the EPA, this land is being threatened by a small, harmless-looking minnow called the delta smelt.

Recently, the smelt has landed on the endangered species list, causing a federal court to shut down vital irrigation pumps to farmers in the Central Valley. As the smelt, a small bait fish for Salmon Fishermen has been preserved; the Central Valley has become a desert. Pictures courtesy of www.biggovernment.com

Figure 5-1 The two-inch Delta Smelt



Figure 5-2 Farmers Looking for Relief



As an aside, it will be quite awhile before you find California tomatoes out East, but don't worry, Mexico has taken up the slack and they are ready to deliver all we need. Check this link when you have the time:

<http://biggovernment.com/asparks/2011/02/18/californias-delta-smelt-is-raising-your-food-prices/>

I have been pointing out throughout this book that the EPA is not in business for humans. They are fully supported by the liberal left and the progressives and Marxists. If you know the strange things that progressives and liberals advocate then you can appreciate that it will help their agenda if the US farmers have to buy their food from other countries or they have to go on Food Stamps.

This smelt deal is fundamentally anti-human. You can now see the full EPA agenda. Animals and even inanimate objects have been given the same moral status as human beings. The EPA wants to please nature, not man. The EPA wants nature to live and in order to permit that, their posture is that less humans need to be on the planet. The less creature comforts, including food, that there are for human beings, the more humans may get the hint and go someplace else. But where? Mars?

The fertile Central Valley has just about turned back into desert; thousands of jobs have been lost; family farms have been lost and the list goes on. It is truly shameful what the Obama administration is doing to America with help from its whacko friends from California and the EPA.

Who will ultimately win this battle? Some with a dog in the fight believe that the progressives will have to go hungry, and find their kids dying of starvation—before anything is done in California. If it is not you that is hungry and it is not your kids that are dying, perhaps nothing will change. Like me, those in the Central Valley see the EPA as one of the worst things to ever happen to this country. For them, it has been devastation.

Figure 5-3 Central Valley Dust Bowl



The US government, through its regulations, has choked the life out of the Central Valley. This is Obama tyranny and it must come to an end before more and more breadbaskets in states across the Nation, become deserts.

Some of us believe the Obama progressive agenda has always placed government at the top of the food chain. It helps to keep in mind that a government that wants to control its citizens must control the food supply. Watch for more atrocities from the EPA when the smelt finally wins this game.

Population control is another unspoken precept of the environmentalists and the EPA. Nature is king and man is a known polluter with not many redeeming qualities.

Would the EPA knowingly make it difficult for humans to be able to find food? Here are a few salient quotes from some real nature lovers.

"In order to stabilize world population we must eliminate 350,000 people per day." Jacques Cousteau, French

oceanographer, United Nations Development Fund for Women 1994, page 84-85

“Phasing out the human race will solve every problem on earth, social and environmental.” -Dave Forman, Founder of Earth First!

With policies such as these, you can see why mostly all of our food, oil, and consumer products now come from outside of the US. We have been regulated and taxed almost to the point where we can no longer function independently as a country. Not only is this bad for our economy. It makes us more and more vulnerable to attack. It is time to end that. Let's kill the EPA before it kills America.

The smelt continues to win

On Friday, September 23, 2011, the federal government (Obama and Eric Holder) filed its opposition to the Pacific Legal Fund's (PLF) petition for writ of certiorari in *Stewart & Jasper Orchards v. Salazar*. This is the case against the delta smelt. The Natural Resource Defense Council's (NRDC) opposition to PLF's petition had been filed in July. What this means is that after three years of drought, the federal government is still fighting tooth and nail to assure that the smelt wins in its battle against human beings.

Just because 80,000 people are out of work in the Central Valley and California's jobs picture is in the toilet, and farmers throughout this area are now on unemployment and / or collecting food stamps, it does not seem to move the leftist progressives on these courts. Meanwhile, Governor Jerry "Moonbeam" Brown continues with his "Hey, what's happening man!" mantra at the Governor's Mansion in Sacramento. So, nobody expects any action

from him. When California comes to the rest of us in a few years for big time contributions, let's tell them to ask the thriving smelt for help.

Since it is California, it seems the problems have to do with the "red diaper dooper babies," that Michael Savage likes to talk about. Savage defines these as the children of leftist intellectual baby boomers, raised from birth on Marxism and a drug tolerant environment, and now in places of political and intellectual influence." I think that about does it.

Add a little Obama Snake Oil (OSO) to the mix, and you have a situation that can only work if Obama moves his preferred constituents to his private island.

Read more: <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/brad-wilmouth/2009/05/09/fnc-drought-stricken-farmers-lose-fight-water-endangered-fish#ixzz1Z6dFyTnL>

Chapter 6

The EPA Is Obama's Tool to Marginalize America

EPA v. mankind

Some may see the EPA as a rogue agency that seemingly began to do its own thing as the demands of environmentalists became more and more political. Over time, however, more and more are seeing it as a plan to teach America, the EPA perceived land of pollution, a big lesson.

Under the control of Obama, the agency is viewed more as an extension of Obama and it does his bidding without question. It is an Obama enforcer. I concur with some of that thinking but I submit to all that one of the worst parts of the EPA is that, as the Obama enforcer, it has been complicit in the undermining of the separation of powers provision in the US Constitution. What does this mean?

Congress makes the laws and the president uses the executive branch of government—many, many employees, to enforce the laws. Presidents are also able to use their power for executive orders when Congress does not seem to have the time to address an issue adequately, and a decision must come out swiftly or the

country will be harmed. These are called Executive Orders and are most often temporary.

When Congress has voiced its opinion on a matter by producing legislation, as the voice of the people in the US government, the President is prohibited from invoking an Executive Order contrary to the will of the Congress.

Moreover, it is the President's duty to enforce all laws put forth by the Congress. If the Executive branch begins picking and choosing laws to enforce and it uses Executive Orders in a dictatorial way, then the executive branch is engaging in tyranny, and it is up to the Congress to take action against the President.

Many people see Obama as a tyrant but nobody seems to take it as seriously as they should. I found this syllogism on <http://obamalies.net/obama-the-tyrant.html>. The first interesting comment from the author was that Obama the Tyrant told sixteen lies in just seven minutes in his last state of the union message. How is that for a "factoid"

The Obamalies site believes it has the proof we all have been looking for that Obama is a tyrant. This is directly from the site:

"Here is the proof that Obama is a tyrant. Now this may seem like complex logic for some as it does use what in math we call a transitive relation. But it should be right at home with the Elitist types that seek to control every aspect of the general populations' lives through Big Government.

- A. Obama likes Big Government
- B. Big Government is Tyranny
- C. Obama is a Tyrant

“For those that need a little help. A (Obama) is related to B (Big Government). B (Big Government) is related to C (Tyranny). Meaning A (Obama) is related to C (Tyranny). Or in other words, Obama is a Tyrant. Since Obama continues to support measures that seek to increase the size of government even in the midst of one of the biggest recessions in years. I think it's safe to state that point #1 is true.

“Therefore the truth of this proof lies in the strength of point #2. So, is Big Government Tyranny? Unequivocally, YES. Big Government seeks to oppress the people. It seeks to burden the people with extreme taxes. To regulate every aspect of their lives; robbing the people of their very freedoms. The peoples' right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of property!

“The Founding Fathers of this country tried to strike a balance between Tyranny and Anarchy when they framed the United States Constitution. They strove to create a system of government that wasn't weak, yet wasn't oppressive. They did a good job.

“It's time that Obama the Tyrant stopped oppressing the people, and started easing their burdens. Reduce taxes. Quit growing the size of government. Help businesses, and quit punishing people for making money. Do it now! Quit waiting! It is not evil to make money. Obama needs to quit punishing people that do, or we will never get out of this recession.”

A big AMEN for the folks at Obamalies,

House chickens out on EPA showdown

Rather than kill the EPA, which they did not have the guts to do, the House introduced legislation in September of 2011 called the "Train Act." This is a bill that is designed to slow down the EPA's regulatory train wreck and determine whether the EPA should be permitted to go ahead with an onslaught of job-destroying regulations. I say: "Why bother? The proof is already in! Just kill the EPA!" However, the elitists in the Senate, such as Pennsylvania's own Bob Casey Jr. might not approve.

There are a host of new EPA regulations that are scheduled in the near future. They are specifically targeted at coal-fueled power plants. One is called the "MACT Rule" and another has been dubbed the "Transport Rule." These are products of an agency gone wild with the full permission of a tyrannical president.

These rules will significantly raise energy prices, impact the reliability of America's electricity supply and destroy hundreds of thousands of high-paying American jobs. Ironically this stuff is supported by Obama at the same time he is trying to convince the public that his 'Jobs bill' is not a farce. Rest easy, the "jobs" bill is a farce.

America's mining, manufacturing, and energy producers warn that this onslaught of regulations will significantly weaken economic growth. The EPA does not care about the economy as witnessed by forty years of decrees. And so it continues to push these burdensome dictates with impunity. The 2011 House "Train" legislation was intended to slow it down.

Some say the EPA has done this all without examining the consequences they will place on America's economic and global competitiveness. I disagree. The EPA knows full well that this will inconvenience Americans. The EPA simply does not care. Obama will try to make the

EPA the straw man in this one, but do not be fooled. The EPA is Obama's enforcer. The President knows exactly what is going on and in fact he has ordered it.

Congress seems inept to tackle all things Obama. It is time to stop the EPA in its tracks, not by slowing action down to assess the cumulative impacts of its job-destroying rules. Any sane person knows the agency is an Obama tool and is being used to downgrade America's capabilities. Don't waste time slowing it down. It is time to defund it and shut it down for good.

There are well over 26 million Americans who are now either unemployed or underemployed. To be underemployed means that people take small jobs to make a quick buck on a temporary basis. In this economy, however, it is a rare day when a good job comes along.

Obama knows that. The EPA knows that. They do not care. So, while speaking about a jobs plan on one side of his mouth the other side of Obama's mouth is barking out orders to the EPA to shut down the energy industry. And as a good servant, the EPA answers with many new regulatory burdens at a time of much needed economic growth.

Who cares? Not the EPA! Not Obama! Those of us, who are out of work do care but they we do not count! Instead of punishing Obama by not reelecting him, my fear is that many will vote for him because in the eleventh hour he will promise twenty more weeks of unemployment or some other grab-bag that many feel they must have to survive. Then what? Four more years of Obama means America will no longer exist four years from now.

EPA's fight against boilers

Jim Hoft posted an article on June 26, 2011 on thegatewaypundit.com site about the current controversy about factories with boilers and the EPA's intentions to put them out of business. He titled it "Obama's EPA Sets Out to Destroy US Factories With Boilers; Affecting Millions of US Jobs."

The Environmental Protection Agency is not fully immune to criticism if Big Boss Obama tells them to slow it down. So, in June, the EPA decided that it would postpone issuing final regulations aimed at cutting pollution from factory boilers until April 2012. I predict this will be postponed again until after the November 2012 elections.

There had been a lot of media action discussing the pressure from industry groups and lawmakers and so, Obama acted—more than likely on the advice of his campaign staff, because he definitely does want to get reelected. Rather than have the regulations take place in 2011, he postponed them to avoid political suicide.

Who would be affected by this outrageous set of regulations? The right question is who would not be affected? We're looking at thousands of power plants, manufacturing plants, paper mills, refineries, chemical plants, schools and hospitals that use boilers at their facilities. With 26 million already unemployed, why would we force more organizations to close their doors?

When these regulations come into effect, millions more jobs will be lost. These particular jobs cannot exist unless there is affordable energy from coal powered / boilers. If these boilers can no longer be installed and run in a cost effective manner, kiss millions more jobs good-bye.

Additionally, in the winter of 2012-2013, we will find out what it is like to not be able to heat our homes. When the chill sets in, the global warming academy of junk science will have some reason to celebrate.

EPA claims they help the sick

The EPA claims their latest job-killing regulations will prevent thousands of heart and asthma attacks. There is a word that starts with bull and ends in a synonym for manure that best describes my reaction to that EPA statement. They are really full of it.

This caring EPA uses the notion of asthma attacks as a reason to stop providing heat for buildings while at the same time it demands that asthmatics no longer use CFC inhalers that work. Asthmatics needing the most functional inhalers now must use less effective methods because of the “caring EPA.”

The EPA not only buys all the global warming junk science that the progressives put out as reality, they also sell it and they make bad policy from it. Along the way they hurt little kids and make them gasp for air to breathe.

Let's be frank here. The small amount of CFCs in inhalers hardly matters to the atmosphere—even if the science behind it was not junk. The EPA knows that. But, this is the same EPA that held up the Dutch skimmers from cleaning the gulf for 50 days because it violated one of their regulations. There is no “greater good,” notion for the EPA.

Please don't get sick of me saying this. The reason the EPA takes no action is because it is not concerned about humans and human comfort or human lives. The EPA is concerned about nature first and Obama is tied with nature and the EPA is his nature agent. Why Obama does not step in and help the asthmatic children—now that is cause for concern. What is on his mind?

By-by boilers

You and I know that boilers have been around since the 19th century. The reason boilers are being targeted is because they are necessary for industry and commerce. The EPA, from Obama's direction wants industry and commerce to slow down so nature can recover from the devastation inflicted on it by mankind. The EPA does not mind at all when a factory closes because it is just one more thing that will no longer harm nature.

If you think my conclusion that the EPA wants to destroy America may be off base, rather than begging the argument, I would ask you to check out what the Canada Free press has to say about it. It makes a fitting end to our chapter on Obama's tool to marginalize America – the EPA. A piece of it follows:

<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/39717>

“Most of America understands common sense guidelines and regulations that protect our environment, food sources and water. No one of whom I am aware, wants forests to be clear cut and pollution smog to take over and darken a city. However, long ago, simple and clear protective guidelines turned into an orgy of invented paranoia and schemes, designed to fulfill the vision from the progressive left and Obama. This vision is simply to

destroy the American economy, business and energy systems.

“The last few years we saw the rise of the global warming mythology, Al Gore emerged as one of the messiahs, even getting the Nobel peace prize for this fraud, then everything smelly hit the fan. Real science leaked out; the lies and lack of real data was exposed enough that the US and the world were slapped out of their drunken and ‘warmed’ tilt.

“You mean there was no global warming that would destroy the world if the UN didn’t tax and control the US? The Polar Bears would live after all? instead there is global cooling and these cooling and warming cycles have been going on for thousands of years... We saw idiot speech after idiot speech and billions spent on this contrived, international looming disaster. This was lead by the progressive left and Obama...

Scientists finally exposed it all....”

Chapter 7

Who Thinks the EPA Should Die?

Newt Gingrich proposes killing the EPA?

From his website, Newt Direct: “The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has transformed from an agency with the original animating and noble mission of protecting the environment into a job-killing, centralizing engine of ideological litigation and regulation that blocks economic progress at every turn while also frustrating the EPA's original mission of protecting the environment ... The EPA's activities have gone well beyond protecting the environment; instead, the EPA is focused on centralizing and asserting unlimited federal power over the economy.

The EPA should be replaced with a new and improved agency dedicated to bringing together science, technology, entrepreneurs, incentives, and local creativity to create a cleaner environment through smarter regulation...”

Democrats & Republicans on the EPA

Of the 112th Congress, it appears only four brave Democrats have risen up to stop the EPA in its tracks and

none of them want to kill it dead. Rep. Nick Rahall of West Virginia, Rep. Collin Peterson of Minnesota, Rep. Dan Boren of Oklahoma and Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia expressed support for a bill backed by 43 Senate Republicans that would bar the EPA from using federal law to control greenhouse gases from power plants, refineries and other industrial facilities. In other words, only four Democrats, and Pennsylvania's Bob Casey Jr. was not on the list, care enough about Jobs to force the EPA to back off its destructive path.

How is it that the party of the working-man, traditionally the Democratic Party, no longer wants anybody to work and doesn't care how many jobs the EPA steals from this dismal economy.

Newt is not the only Republican who is fed up with the EPA. Democrats for the most part love the EPA. Michele Bachmann wants to padlock the E.P.A.'s doors, and Rick Perry thinks an immediate moratorium on EPA regulations is in order. Ron Paul wants the EPA eliminated. Herman Cain thinks a private commission should determine the validity of regulations and he wants the committee to include oil and gas executives. Huntsman is in the Perry camp as he agrees that new regulations should be put aside until the economy improves.

Mitt Romney somehow likes the EPA, believes in global warming, thinks ethanol is good and ethanol subsidies are good. So, Mitt will not be collecting my vote in the Republican Primary. Well, I can't vote for him in PA anyway because I am a Democrat but I hope that the party with the conservative message actually puts up a conservative candidate who will unequivocally disband the EPA and kill it dead. So, I would encourage Republicans not to vote for RINO Romney in the primary or like John McCain, we will all have buyer's remorse.

I think the only real conservatives running who would also have the guts to take on the EPA are Ron Paul, Michele Bachman, and Herman Cain.

All is not lost, however, if even before the 2012 election, Republicans, industry groups, and corporations would only dare to challenge the EPA ozone standards on the basis of health. The science suggests that in most cases, the EPA is off base.

What's worse than Ozone? Starvation?

Because there is no evidence that typical ambient ozone levels have affected actual public health, the EPA resorts to dubious laboratory tests to provide a rationale for its claim that there is no safe threshold of exposure to ozone. They don't know what they are talking about but it does not stop them from talking.

To put this in perspective, we should consider that starvation, exposure to the cold (no heat) and/or stress from loss of income are probably greater threats to human health than any reasonable amount of Ozone or other flutter proposed by the EPA.

Many bloggers on the Internet offer thoughts about the negative impact of the EPA on US civilization. One particular blogger on the Internet suggested that EPA regulations would change substantially if Congress modified the Clean Air Act with some repercussions to say that for every 10 private sector jobs lost due to an EPA regulation, one EPA employee who worked on writing the regulation would lose their job. His thoughts were that the EPA would suddenly find that maybe this or that supposed pollutant wasn't really that bad for

humans after all. Of course my plan to kill the EPA will work even better.

Obama is the EPA energizer bunny. Obama is full of unlimited energy no matter where he gets it. When Sarah Palin killed him from the podium in her convention speech, just a few weeks later, the energizer bunny was back alive and soon Sarah Palin was the victim rather than the perpetrator. Obama is good at fooling everybody and his prevarication engine is always in the ON position.

To help his 2013 election chances recently, Obama issued an executive order postponing a plan by the EPA to tighten ozone standards. He was not interested in those paying attention, to think he was the bad guy so a postponement appeared like a presidential thing.

As much as Obama really does want to stop progress in the US, and he has done quite well in this regard, he does not wish to be blamed for stopping it.

The President does not want to provide the truth about his real feelings about America. Most Americans who would learn that their president does not particularly think their country is any more important than any other country would not actively hope that he would be reelected. Obama wants nothing more and let me repeat that, nothing more, than to be reelected. In the Obama reelection scheme, real Americans do not count other than he would like your vote.

Obama thinks America takes too much of the world's resources for itself. His presidency is based on taking as much as he can from America, and giving it to other countries. His "fair share" notion also extends to taking the hard earned money from regular Americans and so

he can give it to illegal aliens and then when he makes them citizens, he will be President for life.

He will also try to create class warfare along the way as he suggests that it is OK for him to take more and more out of the economy to feed the huge government machine he created as well as his deep desire to make the rich, less rich. He also wants to give to the non-producers / non-workers the bounty produced by the labor of working Americans. He is ready to use the tax system to accomplish this and he will use the EPA to suck the blood out of US industry. So, don't expect any jobs any time soon, regardless of the last Obamalies you may have heard.

Ironically, Obama sucks in a lot of Americans, especially now that things are not going so well for many families. By suggesting that the government can take care of all the needs of people who are riding on hard times, Obama is a plague on America.

Americans love America for many reasons. One of them is the notion of the American Dream. Every one of us can be rich if we devise a notion that everybody loves or we are the best at what we do. Obama wants to eliminate the American dream by never permitting anybody ever again to get rich or taking all of their proceeds if they happen to succeed. What fun would that be? It would be like communist Russia, the USSR!

Even those folks down on their luck would not want to hit the jackpot and have somebody from the Obamaworld show up and snag 98% of it? So, to prevent the dream from ending, we all have to watch the class warfare games this President likes to play.

He plays the games because he does not care about

America or Americans. He cares only about Obama. Notice that the Obama's have not given up any of their vacations which they like to take on the taxpayer dime. They have given up nothing while they ask everybody else to put in a "fair share." Is BHO the real deal or is he a fraud and a charlatan? Will he be the only one left on the American Dream as he talks everybody else out of its meaningfulness?

Obama of course thinks he can talk to Americans in their neighborhoods and in their living rooms because he has the gift of gab, and he thinks they will feel differently about him simply because, as a narcissist, he knows he is the one and only true Obama. Since he is the real Obama, and even I am not denying that, he is convinced that all Americans will therefore love him and vote for him in the next election. What can be more important to any American than Obama getting reelected? How about having a nice life for starters?

Is anybody really concerned about Obama and his presidential czars? The conservative base is enraged about how he is using America for his own benefit. Any postponement of doom for taxpayers or industry is simply temporary and it is because the election is getting closer. Postponing regulations is something the Obama can do and will do simply because he wants to get reelected. You may recall that Obama backed off Obamacare temporarily, until the right political climate emerged. The EPA regulations will be out there to plop in whenever he is ready. If he is reelected, he will be ready indeed.

Any postponement of bad medicine gives the prevaricator in chief the opportunity for some identity protection for the election. Watch that Obama does not

make any of us think his mission is not to deny America its # 1 rating in the world. It sure is.

The annual cost of these new EPA regulations is staggering. We're looking at from \$19 billion to \$90 billion. Private sector analysts estimate they would also result in the loss of 7.3 million U.S. jobs. That would bring the total unemployed to 33.3 million from 26 million. No wonder Obama postponed the start date. He is not politically suicidal but again, this will happen after Obama assures he wins in 2012.

Mackubin Thomas Owens wrote a great article in mid September 2011 for the Boston Herald titled, "Obama's EPA not a 'rogue' agency at all."

It is a perfect and a compelling read:

http://www.bostonherald.com/news/opinion/op_ed/view.bg?articleid=1365720

Owens notes that Obama really does have an energy policy though it is not one that is helpful to America. It is simple and it has one objective-- to reduce access to fossil fuels by raising their price, thereby making "alternate" or "green" energy sources more attractive. If the economy collapses along the way as long as the second term has began, who would really care?

It is too bad for this fine campaigner that the words he uses to solidify his base cannot be used for the rest of Americans. You see, Obama's base is really far left. The dribble he delivers to them, he hopes will never reach us. His base of progressives, Marxists, and socialists is so far left that even the cliffs of the US West Coast cannot stop them. They are half way to China. Perhaps that is why they like the Chinese so much that they keep giving American businesses reason to build their facilities and operate them

in the People's Republic. Ask GE why they are moving to China.

You see when he was speaking to the liberal press in San Francisco while campaigning in 2008, Barack Obama promised to bankrupt anyone foolish enough to build coal-fired power plants. How would this help the American economy? That line could have been delivered by an EPA spokesman as the two are in synch. He also discussed his "energy plan." He said that his policies would intentionally make energy prices 'skyrocket' as the energy industry passed along the exorbitant costs of his cap-and-trade (energy) policy. Now, as the election is approaching, he is postponing the impact until after yet another election.

There are those who think the EPA does its own thing and when Obama finds out about it, he reins them in. Not so. The President uses government policy to raise oil and gas prices, subsidize alternative energy sources, then he mandates the use of the latter. If SOlyndra did not go out of business, we would all be mandated to use solar. Yes, the Solyndra gang are also heavy Obama campaign contributors. It may be distorted but clearly this is a win-win for Obama. The people unfortunately are on neither of the sides. Somebody has to lose.

Owens writes: "The EPA is not rogue. It is a very important tool for implementing Obama policy."

Another blogger wrote The progressives "are using our dependence on energy to regulate and control Americans, The EPA is Obama's brownshirts, who have long since moved on from clean air and water and now tell us what appliances to buy, siding, roofing, massive regulations on pickup trucks, increased energy bill taxes, and how to build our houses. It's easy to see what is

going on in America, with Obama's use of the EPA..."
And it is not good.

Owens has listed a number of other items that Obama has in store for us in addition to the postponed Ozone plan:

"First, the agency recently issued final regulations curbing power plant emissions of sulfur and nitrogen oxides in 28 states and the District of Columbia. The so-called Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, which takes effect in 2012, aims to slash power plant emissions that drift across state borders.

"The new rule comes only six years after the EPA ordered a 70 percent reduction in the same emissions by 2025. The new rules have the potential to severely impact nearly 20 percent [more] of the nation's coal-fueled power plants. Financial analysts estimate that the cost of this rule will be \$130 billion by 2015.

"In March of this year, the EPA proposed new standards for coal-fired plants that would establish a "maximum achievable control technology" standard for mercury and other hazardous air emissions, requiring utilities to install equipment that is prohibitively expensive or, in some cases, doesn't yet exist. The resulting closures of coal plants due to the ruling would reduce the output of electricity by 30,000 to 70,000 megawatts.

"The EPA is considering regulating coal ash as a hazardous waste, based on the claim that it contains toxic metals.

"But coal ash contains only trace quantities of such metals. Since coal ash is used in many beneficial applications, e.g. road construction, its regulation as

hazardous waste will result in the loss of as many as 316,000 jobs and a cost to the American economy of \$110 billion over two decades, according to financial analysts.”

Mackubin Thomas Owens is professor of National Security Affairs at the U.S. Naval War College in Newport, R.I. The quoted areas above are his views but they do make a lot of sense and they explain a lot. Job loss in America is intentional. It is the Obama plan as executed by the EPA!

Who thinks the EPA should die?

The Chapter title hoped to suck all of the readers into considering the EPA as a disposable item in much the same way as it considers human beings that live in America. That would be us!

So, I can certainly say that if by the Lord's graces, I am elected the next Senator from Pennsylvania, I will work to eliminate the EPA. I think the EPA should die.

I sure hope after this chapter or as many more as you need to read, you too feel the same.

Chapter 8

The End of Incandescent Light

The EPA is nuts!

It is daylight as I write but there are still lights on in most homes in most cities in Pennsylvania. That really drives the EPA nuts. More than likely they are incandescent light bulbs. That too drives the EPA nuts. By now, the EPA is plenty nuts.


Over the years, the people have grown accustomed to the warm glow of the incandescent light bulb invented by Thomas Alva Edison. You may know that Edison was born in Ohio, a neighboring state to Pennsylvania and he grew up in Michigan. Edison invented so many things that were useful in his day and ours, that he received 1093 patents.

He lived the spirit of Americanism at a time when even Presidents enjoyed being American. Such exceptionalism was the order of the day in Edison's time. There was much to be invented, and America was a welcoming place for inventors. Today Edison would need so many EPA permits to conduct his experiments, that he would be lucky to invent much of anything.

The Obama EPA for example, as you may know, orders everybody around, including simple homeowners like you

and I. The thinking around the EPA is that homeowners are culprits and are to blame for bad air, bad water, and a host of other maladies. One of our big sins is that we burn light bulbs. And, so by order of the EPA, in December 2011, all of us will learn the depth of the disdain the EPA has for home-town America.

Figure 8-1 Thomas Edison – Source Internet Unknown



No 100 watt incandescent light bulbs will be available for purchase in 2012. The EPA won this battle. Over the next few years, all incandescent light bulbs will be off the market. Selling and buying incandescent light bulbs will be against the law. Can you imagine the light bulb luminaries who get arrested and find themselves doing time in the big house on a light-bulb rap? After over 100 years, the EPA found out that light bulbs were bad for the health of Mother Nature. They are, by the way, OK for human nature. So, how did this happen?

Congress did it and Obama likes it

Obama's EPA does not get the full whack on the notion that the incandescent light bulb is about to become illegal. Politicians in Washington, including our own from Pennsylvania voted for a goofy law in 2007 that banned cheap incandescent bulbs in favor of the more expensive and carcinogenic compact florescent bulbs (CFCs).

Obviously the people we elect think we cannot make good marketplace decisions in our day-to-day lives. So, Congress proposed and passed legislation to protect all of us dummies from ourselves. In mid 2011, Congress began to rethink the ban and brought it up again, even after the TEA party had cleansed the house of all of the supposed florescent lovers. Yet, the bill did not pass because of some unknown reason making me suggest that even the freshman in Congress need to be extricated in the next election. Who do they think they represent: morons? The 2010 elections brought with it representatives who do not trust their constituents. It's time to repay the favor.

What is wrong with consumer choice and soft yellow lighting or less expensive incandescent light bulbs? Why every home should instead be subjected to the unnatural, office-like white light of Chinese-made pricey mini fluorescents confounds the logical mind. Have even Republicans given in to the Nanny State?

The most annoying proponent of the light-bulb ban by the EPA is the Secretary of Energy Steven Chu. This guy is not with most Americans on the notion of needing government to make decisions in our every-day lives. Chu loves the notion that all Americans get to buy their lightbulbs from China instead of America. Imagine him saying these words as he did, and you will have his speech verbatim:

“We are taking away a choice that continues to let people waste their own money.”

Obviously, Chu likes the notion of Big Brother as the government can preselect everything for the dumb citizens and of course illegals, also so there is no guesswork for the feeble brained population. Government will do the selecting and it will be perfect.

One time Senator John Warner (R–VA) thinks Chu is spot on and he offers his thoughts on the one time potentiality of repealing the 2007 law. : “We’ll be dropping backwards in America’s need to become more energy-efficient.”

Jim Presswood, who is with the environmental activist group, *Natural Resources Defense Council*, has his own perspective: “Clearly, consumers, the economy and the environment will suffer if these standards are repealed.” His organization claims that the ban would save consumers \$85 per year. So, let me ask, what is the real cost of freedom if a piece of it can be purchased for less than \$100.00 per year? Is freedom worth the price-tag in dollars or must it be in blood?

Let me ask you this one question: Do you think our forefathers came to America so that some bureaucrat someplace could make all of their decisions for them? Do you think that either government is much better today or do you think that people are more incompetent? What is the rationale for government being the sole arbiter as to what is good and what is bad for the public? What does the public get to say? Will government actually punish those who break the rules?

So, when the stores run out of incandescent bulbs, and since they are not making them anymore, must we all

switch from these simple and cheap light-bulbs that we now use to expensive, dangerous halogen or fluorescent bulbs? Is this an order from the government?

The EPA says these new expensive Chinese-built bulbs are OK but incandescent bulbs are bad. OK, they don't really say it exactly that way but it sure sounds like it. What they say is that the 100 watt bulb cannot be sold any more as of January 1, 2012. So, shop for all you can while you can. Over the next two years, 75, 60, and 40 watt bulbs will no longer be able to be sold.

The law is being phased in over the next three years. Here are the dates when you must be ready to change your bulbs if they burn out. Thank the EPA or kill them!

Today's Bulbs	After the Standard	Standard Effective Date
100 watt	≤ 72 watts	January 1, 2012
75 watt	≤ 53 watts	January 1, 2013
60 watt	≤ 43 watts	January 1, 2014
40 watt	≤ 29 watts	January 1, 2014

According to the EPA, the second part of the law requires that most light bulbs be 60-70% more efficient than the standard incandescent today; this will go into effect in 2020. Many compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFLs) and many Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs) can meet this requirement today, shaving energy usage compared to standard incandescent bulbs by 75%.

What the EPA doesn't tell you is that these new bulbs are very expensive and there are special procedures to assure your family is safe if one of them breaks. So, don't break one.

Why is this law needed and how does it benefit consumers?

This is direct from the EPA site: "*EISA is eliminating unnecessarily wasteful products from the market.*"

Should we be pleased? EISA is the name of the congressional act but we know that the 2007 act is a brain child of the EPA. I have a question for you. Did you ask for the EISA or the EPA or Congress or anybody to unilaterally eliminate unnecessarily wasteful products? I did not ask them either. I think the iPad is unnecessary. Will that be banned eventually? If not, Why not?

This is just another big intrusion of big Obama government in the lives of regular people. If you don't see enough of him on TV, wait until Obama is in your doctor's office! He is already in your light fixtures. The Obama intrusions are not fully appreciated, but when all the pictures in the Doctor's office are replaced with pictures of Obama you will know what Obamacare really means. It will be a lot more Obama than care... but that is another book.

Perhaps the EPA guerrillas will take the time to visit your neighborhood and mine to see if there are any other issues. Maybe you are an energy perpetrator and you keep certain of your lights on too long? Maybe you use too many garbage bags. Maybe your dog excretes amounts that are dangerously over the farm manure limit? What's next? Don't worry! Obama has a few surprises in store and you'll see them when the thousands of regulations that are being held for campaign reasons are released once the big election is over and the campaigner in chief emerges again as our president.

GE, Thomas Edison and Jeffrey Immelt

By now, many Americans have heard of Jeffrey Immelt, the head of General Electric, the company originally created by Thomas Edison. Founded in 1890 as the Edison General Electric Company, the company merged with the Thomson-Houston Company, its major competitor, in 1892. The name of the new company became the General Electric Company.

Jeffrey Immelt is no Thomas Edison. He couldn't tie Edison's shoes. Yet, over the last year or so, Immelt has served as Obama's Job's Czar. Despite all the tax credits gained by GE for its green jobs program and its friendship with Obama, in all the years since Edison, the mighty GE has been unable to figure out how to make a better incandescent light bulb in America—one that meets the Obama EPA standards displayed above. That's almost as hard to believe as the EPA telling us we can't use these light bulbs anymore.

So, since GE could not meet the government standard, it is taking its light bulb manufacturing business overseas along with a lot of other jobs, even some that may be giving a few defense secrets to the Chinese. But, hey, Obama wants all countries to compete equally so for him, helping the Chinese develop better weaponry may be good. It is also possible that President Obama did not tell Mr. Immelt that the jobs he created as the "Jobs Czar" were supposed to be US-based and Obama was looking for net gains-- not net losses in jobs. But, then again maybe Obama thinks Immelt is doing fine.

Despite Americans not really wanting to give up any rights to any US agencies, in the fall of 2010, the EPA agency's regulations forced the last major GE factory that was

making ordinary incandescent light bulbs in the United States to close. This factory was around for most of the time from the 1870's when Edison first shed light on all subjects. GE admitted that a lot of the jobs at the facility were already gone when the remaining 200 workers at the plant lost their jobs in 2010.

In 2011, most Americans know that GE had some good fortune. It got some extra funding from taxpayers – about \$7 billion dollars in tax credits, rebates, and in gifts. One would think GE would be motivated to set off a boom of industrial activity and job growth in the U.S. by taking the \$7 billion tax refund bonanza and using it to create and then manufacture whatever the EPA required as the replacement for the incandescent light bulb.

Hey even if they sold bulbs for a slight loss, GE would still be way ahead. Why did they not do that? Did Obama tell them to go to China to make the world a fairer place in which to compete? Since 60% of Americans agree that Obama does not hate America, is it a fair question to ask if Obama really wants America to win? Don't forget that 40% of Americans think the President actually hates us all.

Let me rephrase my negative rant from above. No matter what it happened to be, since \$7 billion came from taxpayer pockets, why would the Jobs Czar, Jeffrey Immelt, the head of GE, the guy who was gifted with \$7 Billion from the pockets of US taxpayers not build the replacement bulb, if it needed to be built, in America. A lot of American plants could have been built for the \$7billion. A corollary to that question is "Why did Obama not fire him as the Jobs czar?" Maybe Obama does not like manufacturing jobs in America?

Regardless, GE makes its own decisions and it chose not to invest in America. Thank you GE. I know I will buy any

product, including light-bulbs, from any company other than GE. Actions have consequences. Don't bother stamping GE on anything anymore for it will not motivate me one iota to buy it.

Many of us are learning that the class of light-bulb favored by the EPA is known as a compact florescent or CFL. Unfortunately, the EPA is not in the Jobs business and they have been rightfully accused of killing a lot of jobs. It doesn't seem to bother them. In this case, the leading replacement bulbs for incandescent bulbs are made entirely overseas, mostly in China. How can Obama claim he has a jobs bill when he cares nothing about real jobs in real businesses?

So, all of America's light-bulbs now will come from China, and the bulbs will not be incandescent. They will mostly be CFL's. Maybe this is good news for Obama, but not for me. The bulbs made by GE will also be made in GE's many China plants.

To be cynical about it, and we should be, the brainiacs in Congress, the White-house, and the inglorious EPA have no problem forcing Americans to stop using US products so they can buy products made in foreign countries. Pat Doyle, 54, a former GE worker, who put in 26 years working at this plant, summed it up. "First, we were sold out by the government. Then we were sold out by GE."

Figure 8-2 GE Plant Once Operating Test the bulbs



We can blame this on the cronyism and the corruption of the Obama regime and the worst Senate of all time--the 111th and 112th. Add the fact that the EPA has learned how to be Obama's chief enforcer and you have enough reasons for why there are no jobs in America-- so stop the search.

Back when Edison was innovating in the 1800's, he had the freedom to invent and manufacture because the government back then respected the Constitution. Many jobs were created from Edison's inventions. Today, the Obama EPA has the power to inhibit liberty and freedom and invention. And it has the power to ship jobs overseas. It is ridiculous but it is true. Regulations are just one of the ways the Obama regime, with Senator Bob Casey's full concurrence, is dismantling America, and assuring we have high unemployment for a long time.

You see, the Obama EPA and most regulators do not like inventions because most require power.

Regulators do not like anything powered by anything. They don't even like humans from Pennsylvania or Ohio or Montana needing to burn anything just to be warm in the winter or to be able to see to read.

The EPA has found that human breath contains a noxious gas that also needs to be banned. No, it is not garlic. It is CO₂, and I wish I were kidding. There are elements in the EPA, who because of their zeal for a nature-first, human-last environment, are also for population control. They believe that, because of his very existence on the planet, man is a major polluter. They would love to reduce the footprint of mankind on this planet so it can be safe for animals, insects, and even some nasty flora and fauna.

Blaming people for exhaling gives those in the population control circles more reasons for wanting less and less people on earth. Some suggest the EPA won't be happy until 90% of humans disappear from the planet. Knowing that, it makes me question the EPA's motivations for any of their often silly regulations.

What if humans have no breath? Don't worry! They're not going to take us off the planet that easy. I don't think the "Ban Breath Act" would pass Congress. Even the most corrupt politicians still have to breathe.

That's not all that the "blame America first crowd" of far left progressives find fault with today. They find people, especially American people to be major polluters and therefore responsible for most of the earth's global warming problems. They worship Al Gore as if his bad breath and his bad medicine is from a prophet. For returning their love, Al Gore has picked up over a hundred million dollars in net

worth since leaving the vice presidency. And since I cannot verify it either way, I would suspect his breath is no better.

As much as the environmentalists love Al Gore, they must have a great disdain for the legacy of Thomas Edison and of course for Philadelphia's own Ben Franklin. Considering that Franklin is one of those credited with discovering electricity through his lightening & kite experiments, he would not be in the favor of the EPA.

With the work of some other scientists, who helped to perfect electricity for major uses, Thomas Edison never could have invented the incandescent light bulb in the first place without Franklin's electricity. The ban on incandescent light bulbs would be unnecessary if there were no electricity. Of course that also means that Americans would not have to begin to buy light-bulbs from China next year—again if there were no electricity. How far back to nature does the EPA want us to go? We know that teepees are out because paintings of early America show smoke coming out of the teepees—again because humans occupied these dwellings.

Concluding thoughts

Let's end this chapter about the end of incandescent light with some thoughts from Jack Cafferty of CNN, a certifiable liberal / progressive. Cafferty is often going after the wrong causes but he is right on in his analysis of this one about GE and Jeffrey Immelt.

Remember, Jeffrey Immelt is the CEO of GE, the one time maker of Edison's incandescent light bulbs. It is also the company that moved its light bulb business from the US to

china in 2010 because of the EPA's banning of incandescent light, it.

Once companies find they can offshore with impunity—moving jobs to China and they still make a big buck and still get big tax breaks from Obama, they have a tendency to keep doing it. Corporations are not in business to please presidents or any other American.

Let's say the EPA forced them to learn how to get by without Americans and they learned so well, they can do it well on their own now without any help from EPA bans.

Hold on to your hats. GE is moving its X-ray business to China, and that is driving CNN's Jack Cafferty nuts. In Cafferty's words:

“Here is more evidence of the suicide mission this country is on: General Electric announced it's moving its 115-year-old X-ray business from Waukesha, Wisconsin to Beijing, China. The X-ray business is part of General Electric's GE Healthcare unit, and this move is just part of a broader plan by GE to invest \$2 billion in China.

This will become the first GE business to be headquartered there. A handful of the unit's top executives will be transferred to China but otherwise, the company says, none of the 150 staffers in the Milwaukee-area facility will lose jobs or be transferred. However, GE plans to hire more than 65 engineers and a support staff at a new facility in China.”

Cafferty can't get over that General Electric's Chief Executive, Jeffrey Immelt, is one of President Obama's advisers on U.S. job creation! Obama picked Immelt, a self-described Republican, hoping to have a man in the Jobs seat that could help in negotiating with the Republican-

controlled House on a number of important items such as deficit reduction, jobs programs, and health care.

Overall, it has been a bad PR move for Obama but the President has stuck with it for some reason. On top of moving much of its business to China, and of course no trade secrets will go with the move, GE paid no income taxes last year and it qualified for a huge \$3 billion tax credit. In other words, taxpayers paid GE for operating its business.

Because he was so irate on this, Cafferty opened it up for comments from the public. Since GE has basically turned off the lights and closed the door on America, I will close this section of the final thoughts with some of the comments from Americans, which Cafferty accepted when he asked this question about GE:

“Here’s my question to you: General Electric is moving its X-ray business to China. What message does this send Americans?” Some of the ones that made it on the air include the following:

“Brad in Portland, Oregon: It tells the U.S. that free trade is a scam, and we need to have fair trade instead. It’s too easy for companies to outsource to China and bring the goods and services back to the U.S. with few restrictions. We need to have tariffs on imports to account for the difference in labor costs between the two countries, and then China can compete with American manufacturers on the basis of quality instead of cheap labor.”

“Donna: Does anyone see a conflict of interest here? Why would a corporate chief executive move an arm of his business to China when he is responsible for jobs in America? I find it outrageous!”

“Lori in Pennsylvania: It says that U.S. company executives and stock holders are greedy, and want to share as little of the profits they make as possible. I guess the national debt crisis hasn't opened their eyes as to what happens when millions of average citizens don't have a paying job.”

“D.W. in St. Louis, Missouri: Thanks for all the tax breaks, Suckers!”

Chapter 9

Humans are EPA Enemy # 1

Humans are polluters by nature

As bad as it can be when regulators go wild, under Obama it is actually worse. The more people you have in a regulatory agency, the more regulations they will come up with. Can you imagine the personal pride of a bureaucrat in framing a new regulation—especially one that really whacks the taxpayer, who typically is already, by definition, a human polluter?

Americans who do not pay attention think that the price of everything being so high is just inflation. It is a lot more than inflation. The cost you pay for products is continuing to increase because the companies that make the products pass on the cost of the EPA regulations to the consumers.

It may not affect you if you die prematurely, though that premature death thing would not make the EPA one bit unhappy. If you are here to stay for awhile, or you have children, expect your family to pay big time for the EPA. As we have discussed many times in this book, unlike the FDA, the mission of the EPA is not to make human lives better. Besides, only those who heat their homes; who buy and cook food; who turn lights on; who watch TV; who use the Internet; who cool their homes; who store food in a

refrigerator; etc. will be paying excessive prices for their necessities and services thanks to the EPA.

The nation's fleet of over 100 coal plants is responsible for 57 percent of the electricity generated in the U.S., more than any other single electricity fuel source. The EPA hates coal and it would like coal plants to cease operating. r

The proposed Obama regulations for 2012 target a number of coal plants that make electricity. Since most of the plants won't be able to comply with the regulations, without the regulations being altered, plants will have to close. Will the EPA and Obama push to have all plants in full compliance to avoid involuntary shuttering?

If all coal fired electric plants close, and it is highly unlikely they will, the loss will be substantial. Theoretically, there would be 57% less electric power available to the grid. Less power would create a happier EPA. However, their happiness would be our chagrin.

What do you think would happen to the cost of electricity? Will there be brownouts and involuntary periods in which no power comes through the line? You already pay for all the EPA's regulations in the cost of everything you buy. I pay the same price but the price will be going way up because of Obama's EPA. It won't just be electricity. It will be everything.

The EPA is in your house and my house and they are already commanding how you need to live. Their "work" is not free and unfortunately, they are still at work. Every product imaginable costs more because of EPA regulations.

Though the notion itself is not funny, I have an item to share with you that if I did not offer proof, you would not

believe me. The EPA is made of many eco—religionists that live and breathe for the opportunity to help Mother Nature, even if it hurts people. Try this rant from an environmentalist and don't stop laughing. I found it on belch.com and the scribe had found it on the Guardian:

“The tenderness of the delicate American buttock is causing more environmental devastation than the country's love of gas-guzzling cars, fast food or McMansions, according to green campaigners. At fault, they say, is the US public's insistence on extra-soft, quilted and multi-ply products when they use the bathroom.

“This is a product that we use for less than three seconds and the ecological consequences of manufacturing it from trees is enormous,’ said Allen Hershkowitz, a senior scientist at the Natural Resources Defence Council (NRDC).”

By the way, these guys (NRDC) will defend the EPA to a fault. I would say they are even more nuts than the zealots in the EPA.

Higher prices will continue for everything, including toilet paper, and your choices will be more limited. The EPA wants things its way, not your way. Everything from couches to cupboards, to radios to TV sets, to dryers and washers, to ovens, refrigerators and freezers, toilets, showerheads, and even bicycles—everything will go up in price to absorb the cost of regulations.

Yes, the EPA has gone wild under Obama and it is not just with Obama's full blessing; it is because of his direct orders.

Their job killing regulations are set to limit the energy you can use even if you can afford it. Their decrees go well

beyond safety. Paying homage to the EPA way is the only way for businesses to be permitted to operate. So, many businesses will simply close shop rather than comply.

The EPA, as the only agency whose mission it is to please Mother Nature, will be pleased when businesses close and when mortuaries have unexpected upturns in their business outlook. As an environmental agency first, the EPA is interested in keeping the number of people down and the number of businesses down.

They view businesses of all kinds as polluters, and therefore harmful to the ecosystem. They actually do feel the same about people, especially those who create backside methane, a noxious “rotten-egg-like” smelly greenhouse gas that is often mixed with sulfur dioxide upon expulsion. Since CO₂ is now a greenhouse gas, all of us are in the EPA’s sights. Even if your breath is fresh, your exhaled CO₂ and the flatulence gases you produce are typically not welcome in the EPA’s perfect atmosphere.

The one area that I did not discuss much yet is EPA paperwork. Even if you fully comply physically as a business, you must comply in the paperwork area to keep your license. This is often the most time consuming and most costly area. Lots and lots of new EPA documentation sets are now necessary to run a company.

The paperwork load is already onerous and is becoming even more onerous. Its very nature will force large businesses to use their legal and computer teams to get that work done easily while small businesses will choke on the excessive work. Many will simply say, “Enough! It is not worth it!”

According to the Small Business Administration (SBA), ‘The smallest firms (fewer than 20 employees) spend 36 percent

more per employee than larger firms to comply with federal regulations' – or roughly \$10,585 per employee for all federal regulations. Can the country afford that? Can you imagine how many more jobs could be offered if this business cost did not exist?

Since small businesses, especially startups have always been the nation's job engine; with the EPA preparing to steal all the ignition keys, there will be few jobs started.

And so, reasonably prudent American males and females would conclude that the EPA is the great jobs snatcher! Where have all the good jobs gone? Gone to the EPA every one! When will they ever learn?

The EPA is far more harmful to the American economy than anything you could ever have imagined. To prove the point, we have some statistics that show the number of regulations imposed by the Obama administration up to April 2011.

During this time, Obama and his coterie have created 75 new major regulations with reported costs to the private sector exceeding \$40 billion. Because businesses were complaining about this burden, in 2011, Obama offered a few rollbacks. In fact, there were six major rulemaking proceedings that reduced the regulatory burdens by an estimated \$1.5 billion.

That still leaves a net increase of more than \$38 billion in additional costs for businesses to absorb. This is a direct result of the EPA being on the playing field while companies are trying to conduct business.

What if those dollars could be used to employ a few more people? Of course the government workforce has expanded to handle all of the new requirements but more

government is more of a problem than a solution to anything. Perhaps the worst news is that instead of easing off and giving business a chance to be successful, the number of regulations continues to grow. There were over 2,785 new unissued rules in the pipeline, yet to be announced, when these statistics were captured.

Can / will Congress help stop the EPA?

Yes, kill it quickly would be my first suggestion. Will Congress kill the EPA? Unfortunately no! The Congress, for its own reasons are like scared rats when it comes to doing something without lobbyist approval. They have forgotten already the lesson of November 2010 that the people have taken back the power of the vote. If this Congress cannot undo the incandescent light bulb law to show they have any say in government, or at least scream and scream about it individually so we hear them, there cannot be a bright light among them and all of them need to be thrown out into the darkness they have created.

There are other things a real American Congress can do to protect Americans and the economy against too many rules and regulations. One is to require congressional approval of new major rules put forth by formerly autocratic agencies. Another helpful act would be to create a Congressional Office of Regulatory Analysis that would examine proposed and even existing rules independently. Additionally, many rules of the past were put forth, supposedly at least, for one or two years but they never ended. So, a sunset date for federal regulations would also be helpful so that laws and regulations can automatically expire.

In October, 2011, a few months before this book was going to press, The House passed the EPA Regulatory Relief Act. The intent of the act is to slow down the EPA's impact on the economy and energy. As of now, the bill is not expected to pass the Senate. Obviously, my suggestion is to replace all the Senators that did not vote for this bill

The U.S. House of Representatives' passed the proposed EPA Regulatory Relief Act of 2011 (H.R. 2250) by a bipartisan vote of 275-142, Pennsylvania Chamber members urged the U.S. Senate to follow suit. Pennsylvania's own Bob Casey Jr. votes with the party 95% of the time so there was little chance he would vote with the people.

Eighty Four percent of constituents that offered their opinions are in favor of the Senate passing its version of the bill. Bob Casey Jr. is pro-EPA and anti-energy. Therefore, little is expected of him. In his constituent letter on drilling, he clearly states that he is not in favor of drilling for oil in the US, period.

In summary, the legislation was authored in response to costly and potentially economically damaging rules developed last year by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Clean Air Act to regulate emissions from commercial, industrial and institutional boilers (Boiler MACT). Harry Reid, the Senate majority leader typically chooses to keep legislation favorable to the country from the Senate floor. The only way to change this is to replace Reid as Senate Leader by making the Democrats a minority party.

It is confusing watching Congress work. In April, 2011, for example, a measure to limit EPA power came up and 64 senators agreed that the EPA must be stopped from ruining America, but then they voted along Party lines and the April

bill failed. Just 50 senators voted for the bill while the other 50, including the fourteen who believe the EPA should be stopped voted for the EPA to remain strong.

They sat on their duffs and purposely allowed the EPA to usurp the legislative responsibility with which voters had entrusted them. Though the house bravely passed new legislation in the fall, do not expect the Senate to attempt to handle the EPA. Harry Reid and Barack Obama will not let them. Please do vote in 2012 to eliminate the many bad apples in this Congress, as well as the big rotten apple in the White House.

Endorsement of the Independence Hall TEA Party

On a beautiful Tuesday morning in October 2011 along with my sister Nancy, and my best friend, Dennis, we enjoyed a fine breakfast at the historic Thomas Bond Bed and Breakfast in Philadelphia. We had stayed the prior night at the Inn and were preparing for an 11:00 A.M. speech. On October 18, the TEA Party PAC and the TEA Party from the tri-state Independence Hall TEA Party were to announce their endorsement of my candidacy for the US Senate against Robert P. Casey, Jr. of my home state of Pennsylvania. It was a wonderful event and the TEA Party people loved my speech.

A fine couple from Seattle Washington was seated at the same breakfast table with us. Eventually, I told them why I was in Philadelphia but even before that we discussed national affairs. Their biggest complaint was that there was no courageous and effective leadership in Congress “just petty bickering.” for no apparent purpose.

“Why can’t somebody just stand up and do something that is right because it is right.” Their perspective is that there are a bunch of wimps in Congress who know how to help America but choose, by default, not to help out. Time passes and the bad guys win because the bad guys have tireless energy and the good guys, if there really are any, sit idly by.

Don’t you feel the same way?

I do!

Chapter 10

Obama Is the Master Game Player

Congress does not know how to win!

Congress is the source of our problems—not the solution—especially when the President is a winner-takes-all player and he plays the voter sales game so well. He is so adept at winning conversations, speeches, and debates that most Americans know Congress will lose each time he is in the game. In between skirmishes, Congress chooses not to gain the skills to beat him. He is surely a gamesman of the finest caliber, and no Congress has ever seen the likes of this President.

Unfortunately, Obama has no substance and the conservatives do not know how to even suggest that he is a shill in debate, without appearing to beg the argument. Since the President does have this inglorious power of persuasion, if only he cared about Americans, we might not be having this conversation.

The fact is Obama cares nothing about real Americans or real life. He lives in a Rod Serling twilight zone of perceptions. He is not concerned about being a real president, and he proves it every day. But, at the end of the day, Obama has the uncanny talent to convince many Americans that despite his not looking out for them that

day, he is their only hope for tomorrow. He is just so well practiced at it that many buy it. His essence in fact depends on the people buying his game.

So, when he engages with his kindergarten ideology, which no one in Congress is willing to take-on effectively, inevitably Obama wins the day because his energy is superior, and his fervor to win is unmatched. Obama never runs out of the juices he needs to continue campaigning. Americans see him battling everyday and they admire him for that simply because we are all taught to stick with it—don't give up. Obama never gives up and he has more lives than the strongest cat.

Sticking with it and not giving up is the Obama way. It is extremely effective. The first time Americans hear his nonsense, it sounds like nonsense. After a hundred more times it sounds like facts that they have heard before. This makes Obama very dangerous and very difficult to marginalize. People may get sick of seeing him on TV but somehow, he keeps at it incessantly and somehow, it is very effective for him.

Conservatives ought to find out why this is so and create an effective strategy to stop Obama baloney from becoming the accepted standard for purity.

In each appearance, there is no improvement. He is armed with the same foolish and illogical stuff but he actually transcends the asininity of his message. Normal Americans cannot fully analyze all of his empty rhetoric. Nobody in history has ever been able to lie so well. All together the package most often sounds good. So, many buy it without analysis.

Those who pay attention hate his message, but even these Americans admire his tenacity. Obama takes fire and he is

still standing. It is the only thing American about Barack Hussein Obama. He is not willing to give up on Barack Hussein Obama. He believes 100% in Barack Hussein Obama. He is obviously narcissistic but he is very effective at the same time.

That certainly does not mean he is a good president, but it shows that Obama is the most important thing Obama has ever encountered. Somehow, that form of confident delivery is the message structure for which conservatives have no answer. An answer must be found or I fear Obama drivel will be able to conquer reason.

Earth to conservatives: You are losing and nothing substantial is on the table because gamesmanship is beating you. Figure out what you need to do to get ordinary Americans to demand the gamesman in chief to put something real on the table to discuss.

One additional suggestion: Obama and his surrogate the EPA would be pleased to place anything on the table after he has won the battle. Watch out, the fight will be very unfair. The only thing conservatives have on their side is the truth, which by itself is unconvincing. When Obama lies, most believe he is telling the truth. That is a big problem for conservatives. Somebody out there in the conservative world is smart enough to build a strategy to defeat Obama rhetoric, and it needs to be done quickly.

This President has great political resiliency. Even when he is buried, I have seen him rise again to destroy conservatives with his rhetoric. Eric Holder and the EPA are his enforcer units so they stay no matter what and it is Congress—even with the fall 2011 EPA legislation, who will begin to doubt themselves and I fear that the fervor of Obama will again win the day. No wonder America is disappointed with Congress. Obama slaps them around

every day and they do not know how to combat his poignant jabs.

In Pennsylvania, Obama gets lots of help and it really assists him with the regular people. I suspect he has surrogates in all states who are supposed to be members of Congress but like the children, they too are mesmerized by the Pied Piper of Chicago. Each time he is needed for an extra boost, for example, our Senator from Pennsylvania, Bob Casey Jr. rises to the occasion to assure the people of Pennsylvania that Obama is the real deal and it is circumstances, not substance that make the President appear to be failing. For those of us really tuned in, we know Obama has no substance and he is failing without doubt.

If you are not paying attention, it is easy to buy the Casey balderdash!

Each time Obama wins, the EPA wins and the people lose.

Obama, as he is losing appears to many to be a winner while the conservatives, who really are winning appear to many to be losing. It is a matter of energy, consistency, and an overwhelming desire to win. The Obama people are trained more than likely by football coaches to never die until the biggest game is well over and it is tucked away in the win column.

Obama looks at each of the little issues as some coaches' view the unimportant games before the big games. But, their training says that they cannot afford to lose even a scintilla because each little piece adds up cumulatively to become something substantial. Conservatives need to go to the same trainers as the Obama team.

The Obama's never seem to accept anything other than positive press from any media, anywhere. The media is on notice that Obama takes no negative press. They liberal press loves him anyway and they hardly ever report the truth.

The conservatives seem to evaluate the value of the loss when the media slanders them, and if it is small, they don't argue with the press, even when they are right. Obama argues when he is wrong and he argues immediately, and thoroughly, and is unrelenting until he wins. Right or wrong does not matter. Winning is all important to Obama. His compulsion to win is so strong, I'll bet he beats Malia and Sasha in Parcheesi and Checkers. All other things being equal, regardless of the facts, Obama's persistence wins.

That is the only reason why a guy with such a miserable record as president can stand in front of the American people and brag about how well he is doing. He tells lies so well because he believes them. Potential next election voters, many of whom are asleep, think the great prevaricator, is the man with the truth. Those conservatives bearing the truth have little chance against such a master liar.

That makes Obama tough to touch when there is no substance in the debate or when he has the last word. He and his team are the most formidable campaign opponents who anybody on the side of righteousness and justice could ever conceive of having to compete against. From day one of his term, Obama has been campaigning. Eventually, you get pretty good at what you do when you do it all the time. A lousy president, he is for sure, but he is the greatest campaigner of all time. Forget about the issues for awhile. On the issues, conservatives win. The Obama rhetoric is really the problem. It is tough to defeat the master of rhetoric but it is vitally important.

By the time he is finished, Obama, with his split tongue and his team, without regard for the people they affect, care about one thing—winning the game.

Unfortunately, because conservatives see the Obama game as reality, they are not as prepared to compete and thus, the unprepared conservatives, as expected, inevitably lose the game. And, when inevitably that happens, America also loses.

Can Americans be persuaded again in 2012, by snake oil and snake charm to forget about all the times they said the “guy is a jerk” and “bad for America?” It is dangerous to say “no” as the answer to that question. If he orders the EPA to hold off on the light bulb regulations and he promises a little something for everybody—something everybody thinks they need—as a post election gift, will Americans get sucked in and say: *Bravo, Obama is the man?*

Of course the contingency for any Obama gift is that Obama wins the presidency. But, one must be paying attention to know that. Will the promise of having Obama in office again mean some people will have more, rather than less in their stomachs? You know which way the prevaricator in chief will move the public. Expect it; defend it; and defeat it!

It is a masterful strategy to “lead from behind,” and take credit for all the gains and complain about all the losses. Having the EPA run the bad messages through the press so the White House can remain aloof is also a great strategy. It makes Obama appear presidential and not like the puppet master we really know he is—the master behind the EPA.

So, conservatives who really agree that the “EPA must be killed,” need to understand they are dealing with the master of persuasion, Barack Hussein Obama. They must be well armed intellectually and strategy-wise to engage, in order to have a chance at success. If Obama wins all the little battles, the conservatives will lose the big battles and the EPA will survive and therefore, America will not survive.

Of course there is always the hope that the people of the United States, who love the country, are greater in number than it appeared they were when the Obama vote count was tallied in 2008. The people, when united for a cause, can stop anything when the people pay attention. But, if the message comes only from the media, there may be a big problem in 2012. Obama may become the next president because real Americans may think it is OK to sleep when boring politicians are speaking.

Might there be a psychologist somewhere who can train conservatives to win when faced with a talking blank page of paper—BHO, a handsome head with no substance? So far, I agree with the fine couple from Seattle. I have yet to see a person in Congress ready to face and beat the campaigner in chief. It takes an awful lot of energy.

I would suggest to Congress that it add the kind of staff that the President has for its outside communication efforts. This should include multiple press secretaries and strategy analysts so that Congress has people working full time just like the President has. Having the Speaker or other ranking conservative members of the House or Senate do all the talking may help at times, but Obama’s message needs to be defeated every single day. The Congress cannot govern the nation from Congress (a huge committee) every day and also have an answer to the Obama senseless snipe of the day. It is a full time job for a full time staff.

As a point of fact, when I informed the folks from Seattle that I was running for the Senate, they repeated the same charge for my benefit. I am unproven and so far at least, unelected. However, I clearly understood that this sample of America wants a Congress that is not concerned about their inept leadership but instead care about the courage of their own convictions. I think when I take my seat, I will be ready for the big fight but I can understand why nobody in America thinks Congress-- House and Senate-- are worth two cents.

Sources:

<http://obamalies.net/obama-the-tyrant.html>

Chapter 11

We're broke!

Is financial help from Mars our last hope?

In this chapter we take a slight break from the EPA per se. As we know, the EPA is part of a much larger entity called the federal government. This government of ours is broke. When we are broke, we have no money. When the federal government is broke, it too has no money.

We all know it but we pretend all is well most of the time. The EPA is one of the major reasons why we cannot recover from being broke and from this terrible recession from which we suffer. The fact is the US treasury is empty.

So, let's sit back for this chapter, and take a spoofy look at the dire straights our financial house is in. Then, in subsequent Chapters, we will continue to look at the impact of the EPA, and how its being out of the picture for the next twenty years would improve our prospects for economic success.

Earth to Mars: send cash!

Sometimes I get thoughts that the citizens of my country, mostly on the left, believe that we live on planet earth but our funding comes from planet Mars. In other words, as a nation we have somehow been lulled into thinking that we do not have to pay for our stuff.


We think it is OK that we can incur huge deficits (loans) to the tune of over 70% of our total income. In other words, if the country makes \$100 a week, we think it can spend over \$170 per week. Nobody can do that; not even the government of the USA. To get the 100% clear picture about where we really are in terms of total income, total spending, and total debt, I looked up the statistics today at www.usgovernmentrevenue.com/#usgs302a and they are very alarming.

This is the deal. The U.S. spends 70% more than we bring in. The revenue for 2011 is expected to be 2200 billion and we will spend 3850 billion leaving a loan of 1650 billion as the deficit. Do we expect to ever have to pay this loan back? If we do not pay it back, rather than one day expecting our creditors to forgive our debt, we can expect that the United States will dissolve as a nation and any money based securities, such as guaranteed pensions and IRAs will be used behind the scenes to pay off as much debt as possible and then our country will have no debt. It will no longer be the United States of America either and chaos will reign supreme. You and I and the rest of the country will all be broke.

Nobody can spend 70% more than they bring in for too long without going bankrupt. I hope I am not the first to tell you this but if we don't do something fast; we will no longer

have a chance. The end of the US will not be very pleasant.

Figure 11-1 The Urkelization of America



<http://michellemalkin.com/2009/03/05/the-steve-urkel-ization-of-the-economy/>

As a final statistic that shows that overspending is not a recent trend, the national debt at the end of 2011 is expected to be well over \$15000 billion. This is the total of all our loans. One third of this debt occurred in the three years of the Obama presidency. Nobody has hurt the prospects of an American economic recovery worse than President Barack Hussein Obama. Yet, he still smiles in a Steve Urkel sorta way (See Figure 11-1) as he continues to

destroy things. Does he know what he has done? Does he know what he is doing? You bet he does!

The deficit began to be uncontrollable in 2007 and 2008 in the last two years of the Bush Administration when there was a huge democratic / progressive majority in Congress—in both the House and the Senate. The deficit numbers seem like pennies compared to the 1650 billion for 2011. In 2007, the deficit was over \$200 billion and in \$2008, the Pelosi Congress doubled the deficit to over \$400 billion. As good as Pelosi was by herself on spending, she had George Bush available to veto extremely large expenditures so there were no trillion dollar deficits, but they were huge, nonetheless. Progressives simply love to spend, even when the piggy bank is empty. After Bush was gone, President Obama and his administration have made an art of the deficit process.

That is why the experts say the economy is unsustainable at such high levels of debt and deficit. Only somebody living on Mars would not be able to believe that the system is going to crash unless the debt and the deficit are addressed. The worst news that many Americans on the left want to hear is, “stop spending more than you bring in.” Yet, nothing else will save us.

If you want to know how awful it really is; consider this: If all we did was pay our national debt and there was zero interest on the debt (loans), it would take us about seven years to pay it all back. 15,400 / 2200. Can you imagine in your households, if you were no longer permitted to buy anything until you first paid back seven years worth of loans?

Now you know how bad it really is.

If you are reading this Chapter, you are no dummy. You already know that we are going bankrupt. Nobody could ever pay back such a debt. I cannot believe that there is anybody out there who would loan the US another penny. I know I would not. Anybody who does is going to lose it eventually.

Figure 11-2 Will cash come from the angry red planet?



On top of the huge and mounting debt and the massive deficits, government accounting puts Social Security and Medicare off the official financial records so their "trust funds" are not counted. Why? There is nothing to count. They are bankrupt already. Social Security is easier to talk about, and the record of the fund's caretakers, the Congress, has been abysmal. Congress has stolen every nickel from Social Security for the last 40 years. They

cleverly replaced real dollars in Social Security with IOU's payable by guess who? You!

Figure 11-3 Madoff & Social Security & Ponzi



But, from his vacation roost in MARtha'S Vineyard, in late summer 2011, the same President Obama said he would not be able to send checks out to retirees if the debt-ceiling were not increased. Confused by the conflict and the apparent misinformation, Fox's Charles Krauthammer did his own analysis and wrote a column about it in damning detail about the Administration's chicanery.

Krauthammer's point is that if there are all these liquid assets in the fund, then how could failure to reach a debt-ceiling agreement threaten Senior's checks? Either there are no assets and it is a "Madoff-like" Ponzi scheme or Obama was using seniors as a ploy?

Krauthammer is going with the former. There is no cash. The federal government has borrowed all of that trust fund money and spent it. The IOU's are there; but try collecting money from yourself. Just like you—when you spend all you have—you have to borrow. You can't borrow from yourself. Therefore, the only possible truth about the reason the debt-ceiling prevented the checks flowing from the liquid assets is as follows:

1. There are no liquid assets
2. Government could not borrow the money for the social security checks because of the debt ceiling.

It isn't the first time we have been lied to by the Treasury Secretary and the President and it won't be the last.

Near the end of the summer of 2011, there was a big trifecta of disasters that slammed Washington DC—an earthquake, Hurricane Irene, and then Hurricane Lee. Times were surely trying.

Despite all the facts available to all Americans about the debt and the deficit, in September 2011 legislators were getting hammered by many who chose not to understand our bleak financial picture. The liberal media actually tried to nail Congress for doing something right for a change.

You may be aware that Congress had no budget for 2011 as the progressives in the Senate would not pass one. It was intentional because it would prevent the people from knowing what they were doing. Therefore, they funded government with tricks called *continuing resolutions*.

In this latest round of tricks in September 2011, the Congress asked for a lot more than what would be needed. A number of experts weighed in that they were trying to pull a fast one on the public but this never makes it to the

mainstream media. So, prudence reigned this time in Congress and the bill got shot down. Along with it, the disaster relief bill for flood victims without spending offsets also got shut down.

The Media and the progressives, who are in lockstep for uncontrolled spending, began a verbal onslaught against the Conservatives. They got the usual labels such as "heartless" for not rubber stamping the disaster relief money without any offsets.

It is good that the bill was shot down. It is not good that the Congress played games including the blame game with the public. "Offsets" mean that somebody in Congress has to give up a few billion for things like bridges to nowhere. Those holding the earmarks and the legislation that is of the pork variety must agree that it is OK to divert those funds to disaster relief. Without the offsets, this would be a huge wad of spending authorization to a Congress that spends like it has money in the bank, and like it does not matter. It is our Congress that is killing us so we should not damn them when they do not spend uncontrollably; we should praise them.

Thankfully it did not pass as proposed. But something that helped those who are helpless in the afflicted disaster areas and paid for by offsets needed to pass. It just should not have been added to our national debt. As noted, the demand was far in excess of the total apparent needs so even with disaster relief the Congress was prepared to use chicanery as its master tactic. "Don't ever let a crisis go to waste."

My thinking was that those with pet pork projects would pony them up so that instead of a library in Waukegone, or a study on the effects of the tsetse fly on homemade bread, the money could be used for disaster relief. If not from

existing allocations, where do we think it would come from? Those who held onto their pet pork projects were the perpetrators, not those looking to keep America solvent.

My basement was flooded from Hurricane Lee. I was lucky. I have flood insurance. I am not making a claim. Other than infrastructure costs this should not have been a big financial burden for the country because almost all of us have flood insurance. Just because citizens like me get hurt does not mean that the government needs to liquefy hundred dollar bills and provide us with an ointment to ease the pain. That's what charities do! Government has no hundred dollar bills left to liquefy.

During the Hurricane Agnes disaster of 1972, the government solved the problem of people with no flood insurance by granting a 1% loan to those who were devastated. Then, the government made cheap flood insurance available for all the people, even renters.

For example, for \$50,000 renters' (contents only) flood insurance costs \$134.00 from FEMA per year. For a \$250,000 pad with \$100,000 contents, the fee from FEMA is \$365.00 per year. It is very affordable and it is simply dumb for anybody in the flood plain to be without it. I would not mind funding a 1% loan for these people but to pay for the fact that they chose no flood insurance -- I don't think so. The government is not Catholic Social Services and taxpayers should not be on the hook people's poor choices. Besides, there really is no money.

Through this and other irresponsible spending tricks, government hoped to come up with a bunch of billions of dollars that we simply do not have so they could continue to buy votes? There is no money left with which Congress can buy votes. Who would want to be the first to contribute to this Congressional slush fund?

The big problem for lawmakers in September 2011, you may recall was that FEMA was moaning that it would run out of money early in the last week of the month when all the action was taking place. The reason that a settlement was able to be brokered was that the budget director called FEMA's bluff and found they actually did have enough money to get beyond the crisis period. Can you imagine that they were only kidding about being broke? They simply wanted more money for more tricks.

This fact was not lost on Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, who realized the whole thing was an exercise to extort more unnecessary spending from the Republicans. It was a ruse that went unreported by CBS, FOX, MSNBC, CNBC, ABC, CBS, NPR, and anybody with a big name. The people therefore did not know the Democrats were only kidding around.

McConnell could not help but give the majority leader a slam after taking all that time on a hoax. "The majority leader has found a path forward," said, a Kentucky Republican. "In my view this entire fire drill was completely and totally unnecessary, but I'm glad a resolution appears to be at hand." There is more on this topic at www.newsmax.com.

So, the Democrats in the Senate were willing to take the FEMA "crisis" and make good use of it to get more spending approved. Who can you believe?

So, now that we are living on after that "close one;" what do this irascible media expect the country to do about the debt and deficit?

The only possible explanation to all the dumbness we see is that there is an intelligent master plan in a lockbox

someplace that will make us all right-- if they can only find it. We would all be happy about that if there were such a plan.

Stop hoping. There is no such plan. Now that gold is so high in price, perhaps someone might find some Revolutionary or Civil War era coins in the archives of the US Mint. Perhaps enough can be found to cover the debt? Chances are that will not happen. Where else could we get the funds to pay it off? If we took all the wealth of all the billionaires, we would not even touch the debt. It is that huge.

Debt ceiling & the super committee

Our Congress is simply incompetent and deceitful. They always hope we don't catch on when they knowingly lie about how things really are. You may recall that in August, 2011 as part of the much ballyhooed deal to raise the debt ceiling and avoid a U.S. default on our obligations, the Congress appointed a super committee. In essence the Congress admitted they could not get the job done so they subcontracted it to 12 of their members—six Democrats and six Republicans. Their job was to reduce the deficit by \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years. They had to present their bipartisan plan to the full Congress by Thanksgiving. They failed.

Therefore, the penalty phase begins in 2013—yes 2013, not next year, which anybody really wanting to cut spending would do. So, now Congress theoretically must endure \$984 billion in automatic cuts as, which includes interest payments. So, by failing, the cuts are less than if they were successful. The big spenders must really like that one.

None of the cuts are draconian but Congress, which apparently does not want any cuts, are boo-hooing the deal as if the country is going to explode. The country is going to explode because these boneheads can't get anything right, and even when they lie about how much they are cutting, they can't make even those cuts. The debt and the deficits are real but Congress is pulling a tiny Tim and they are tip toeing through the tulips rather than getting out a big pair of scissors and making real cuts. Worse than that; they continue to lie to us about the substance of the reductions in the first place.

They ought to be put in jail for such a prevarication. Obama, the prevaricator in chief could not have told as big a whopper as the Congress did and continues to do.

Let's look at the facts. As noted, total federal expenditures for 2011 are expected to be 3.65 trillion. To make this easier to do the math, we'll use round numbers. Let's say it is \$3.5 trillion. The big lie is that Congress does not use real numbers at all. They use a trick called baseline budgeting. With this process, the spending for each subsequent year is forecast at the prior year's amount plus approximately 5.5 percent. In other words, they first plan to increase the spending by 5.5% and any reduction would come from the increase, not from the real budget. If they simply left the budget as is, they would save much more than the \$1.5 trillion but they do not want you to know that. Congress wants to spend to make us happy so we will reelect them. But, will we do that this time?

They like to budget over a ten year period. So, with the 5.5 percent compounded increase over the next 10 years, total expenditures will total about \$45 trillion. That is an average of \$4.5 trillion per year if it were straight-line. Already you see it starts off at \$1 trillion per year more than it is right now.

The Super Committee had a real simple job. They were to cut just \$1.5 trillion out of \$45 trillion. To meet their mandate, all they had to do was cut 2.6 percent of all future federal expenditures. In other words, the 2.6 percent would not come from \$3.5 trillion current level, but from the projected total of \$45 trillion. That means that if they met their goal, the total expenditures would have had to “decline” from \$45 trillion to \$43.5 trillion. Most importantly, had they met this goal, the feds would still be spending an average of \$4.35 trillion per year over the next 10 years. That average is almost 25 percent more per year than the government now spends.

Why would anybody want to provide this group of incompetents any additional funding through increased taxes. They would blow it on excessive spending. Democrats and Republicans are not willing to cut enough to make it matter to save the country but the Democrats actually want more revenue so they can spend even more. This notion of baseline budgeting is a trick to make taxpayers think Congress is doing an OK job. It is the second biggest government lie of all time. The lie about social security having anything left in its fund is the biggest government lie.

Geithner & Obama at MARthaS

Enough about the really serious stuff; maybe there is a high-tech way out of this jam if we give it a chance? Try this on as a possibility as long as we are still permitted to think out of the box.

What if Timothy Geithner and Barack Obama did not really go to Martha's Vineyard for vacation this summer (2011)

when the country was going through the debt ceiling crisis? Suppose they actually went to MARthaS Vineyard, which is now an administration code word for MARS.

Suppose Mars is really years behind the Earth in development as in US retro. Suppose the year on Mars is really 1977.

And, suppose Geithner and Obama made lots of progress in their trip to Mars as if Mars is in many ways an alternate Universe. Suppose again that they got to Mars using the last Russian Soyuz Mars Special spacecraft. Under all of those suppositions, let's say the following happened on the trip.

First of all, they met with Jimmy Carter the President of Mars. Because Carter is reliving his US years with a few desirable (for Carter) future alterations in place, and because he is an honest man, he admits again his faults to the esteemed emissaries from earth. You may remember the Carter confessions from back in the 1970's: "I've looked on a lot of women with lust. I've committed adultery in my heart many times." How truthful could he possibly be? Obama and Geithner then use that warm up to talk Carter into sending us about \$1650 billion from the Mars treasury to cover our entire 2011 deficit.

Carter, who on Mars is permitted to behave as an avowed socialist, has dictatorial powers there—something he and Billy always wanted for the US when they had the power. The 1977 Mars that Geither and Obama found has two major industries -- Billy Beer and Peanuts! One of the industries is doing well.

Anyway, Carter promised the US emissaries that we would not ever have to pay back the loan and there would be no interest. Carter noted the Martians would up their standard

workday in the collective from 10 hours per day to 18 to make up the difference. He mentioned how important it was in the future for Mars to be a net peanut exporter and he thought this overture would help.

No beer will be exported. After Billy has his way with the beer, there is not enough to export so beer was not involved in the inter Solar System trade talks.

Of course none of the Mars story is true.

Unless we really can get financing from a kinder and gentler Mars, and not the good ole angry planet, perhaps we really have no right to exist as a country—especially if progressives keep piling on more and more debt.

Maybe China is on to something.

When your deficit is already 1650 billion, you simply cannot continue to spend and spend and spend when there is nothing left to spend. Moreover, in our universe, as nice as it is to dream, there is really nobody willing anymore to loan US a thin dime.

Perhaps Jimmy Carter from Mars or Obi Wan Kinobe from deep space are our only hopes but then again, even as slight a chance as we have on that one, it is even dimmer because of recent Obama actions.

You may recall that there was a big disturbance in THE Force in Summer 2011. Obama defunded NASA and the space program is now caput. The space shuttles are now museums in towns other than Chicago. Shucks!

If the dream (other than the reality of no Space Program) can be made real and Mars really is in the late 1970s, perhaps Jupiter is in the mid 1920s and just maybe AI

Capone, a good guy from Chicago can give the US even more loot than Jimmy or Obi Wan.

Cross your fingers. Maybe Jupiter also has a space program.

OK, that is yet another daydream. The fact is all we can do is dream about a fix because Congress and the liberal media will not address the reality of impending doom. We could vote out all elected officials and turn off the TV to get some truth.

Is it possible that nobody will help us? Is it possible that nobody can help us? Can we save ourselves by spending? Is it time to learn Chinese?

One thing on which we can all agree is that the secret to a solution when all else fails is not to keep doing the same thing (Spend, Spend, Spend) and expect different results.

While I was writing and editing this section hoping to give ordinary Americans a better perspective on the bleak financial outlook we face, and why we must take action immediately, ironically, the following email crossed my desk:

Subject: Why S&P Downgraded the US credit worthiness

Why S&P downgraded - this puts it in perspective...

- U.S. Tax revenue: \$2,170,000,000,000
- Federal budget: \$3,820,000,000,000
- New debt: \$1,650,000,000,000
- National debt: \$14,271,000,000,000

Recent budget cut: \$38,500,000,000

Let's remove 8 zeros and pretend it's a household budget:

- Annual family income: \$21,700
- Money the family spent this year: \$38,200
- New debt on the credit card: \$16,500
- Outstanding bal. on the credit card: \$142,710

Total budget cuts: \$385

Does somebody actually think such a pittance can make a difference? If it seems futile with chicanery men in charge of our government, remember the last hope may be to fire Congress and the President, and start a government with honest representation.

Now, that is a very good dream.

Chapter 12

Turn EPA Over to States

The EPA is against the 10th Amendment

Getting to the point quickly, this chapter again is about the EPA. Knowing that we now have no money (From Chapter 11), it makes even more sense that we stop wasting \$10.5 Billion on the EPA each year.

In this chapter we spend more time evaluating whether the EPA deserves to exist at all in this modern era when state's rights have reappeared as a very real issue in American politics and more importantly in American government. If a state wants an EPA in its state then I would suggest "go for it"... Just don't make any state be forced to pay homage to a Washington entity that usurps the control of the people's buying decisions and the laws of the states.

As we learned in the last chapter, the EPA is just one part of a real sick country. If a corporation were in the sick condition of our country, the officers would be fired and thrown into prison, and a search for competent leadership would ensue.

We have five hundred forty five (545) officials at the top of our government. That is larger than most committees in any business of which I am aware. I have a good friend from my IBM days, Jack Lammers, who likes to opine that “the committee invented the giraffe.” All the parts are fine. It’s the whole that seems to have a problem. I don’t think we can agree that in our government even the parts are fine.

The good news about government is that it does not have to make or sell anything so the job of running it ought to be easier than being a corporate CEO. It brings in just so much money and it is supposed to spend just that much. In many ways the government parallels us in that it should not spend any more than it brings in. But, it does.

What corporation or what person for that matter would hire a politician to manage its / their affairs? For years and years, the US was in good shape and all of a sudden, we now have a major leadership gap because it seems the “me” generation is OK having poor leadership as long as they are taking care of “me.” When there were tons of money in the treasury it appeared to be OK, but not anymore.

As noted in last chapter, we are broke. So, each of us needs to understand more about this behemoth country we have and what are its good parts and what are its bad parts. Nobody wants to go back to the smog filled roads of the 1960’s and we won’t but we should not be making public policy on unproven science either. We have constraints on our fiscal resources but our friends in the environmental movement do not care. Since they work for us, it is time that they must care or we must get them out of the way for about twenty-years or more until we can get this country running OK again.

If I wanted to be unkind, I would have said we have 545 buffoons who we elect or appoint regularly to run the biggest country in the world and they have no idea how to run a business. They may be great politicians but they have messed up in running this country.

When our leaders see a problem, they go to the medicine cabinet and they find a band-aid because band-aids are easy to deal with for untrained leaders and untrained financial and operations planners. Richard Nixon did this in the late 1960's.

After Rachel Carson scared the heck out of everybody with *Silent Spring*, Nixon's band-aid was to create a small agency called the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to assure that Americans are not blowing car smoke in people's faces. He was not concerned that after being outside for hours, the first time one's finger entered one's nose (accidentally of course), it would be pristine with no tell tale signs of dirty air. Even Nixon did not think the air needed to be that clean.

The nature of man is to increase things that do not need to be increased and enlarge things that do not need to grow. Some businesses ought to stay the same size rather than switch from say building car engines to running convenience stores. Sometimes largeness and diversity bring unintended consequences. Besides, nobody ever accused the government of being the best in anything.

So, what do we really expect when we simply send these people off without real instructions and then no matter how poorly they do; we make war heroes out of them when they come home from Washington for the holidays? Oh! And this crap about the "honorable so and so from such and such..." Come on already! It's time we the people got

serious and our “politicians” perhaps would become leaders.

So, as expected the EPA like everything else in life grew, not because it was successful but because it just grew. The Nixon band-aid took on a life of its own and here we are 40 years later and the skeleton EPA staff now is puffed up with 18,000 people on board giving orders to each other and anybody else who will listen to them.

The EPA thinks it works for Mother Nature, not the US government. Therefore, it follows that its job now is to regulate man for the good of nature, and that man, the human being that through its government pays all the EPA staffers, does not matter as much in the scheme of things. Die Natur uber alles (nature over everything)

The EPA also has its own mind about how to do things. Working for itself, and in this administration, the EPA and all of the radicals in its horde are completely aligned with the wishes of the President in over-controlling the country. Their joint plan is to run roughshod over Congress and the people, and rule by the autocratic dictate of regulations. It's time the EPA realizes it really does not work for Mother Nature.

My plan is to shrink the EPA function to 100 or 200 employees who have no decision authority at all. With all of the job losses and the misery the EPA has caused humans in America, the staff that loses their jobs when the agency is eliminated-- 17,800 of the most radical and uncaring people in existence, should be retrained to replace migrant workers to do the jobs that Americans won't do. By the way, I am not promising that we can salvage even one or two hundred from their lot for a shell “EPA.” That's how bad they have become.

If we eliminated most of the EPA, it would still not save us from ourselves fiscally. As seen in the last chapter, we need to do lots more, but it would be a great start. It would return almost the entire 10,500 million dollars to the treasury each year and it would give businesses and the states a chance to get strong again.

Since the Congress likes to do cost estimates and revenue estimates in ten year chunks, that means eliminating the out-of-control EPA would return over \$100 billion to the treasury. This organization has lost its focus, concentrates on nature over man, has a track record of hurting the very people it is supposed to help, and therefore it has outlived its usefulness.

On March 15, 2010, Byron Moore wrote a piece titled “An argument for killing the EPA.” It is available at <http://www.dcbureau.org/20100315951/bulldog-blog/an-argument-for-killing-the-epa.html>

In the March 15, 2010 article, Moore singled out Senate Candidate Bill Johnson from Kentucky as a fanatic who wants to disband the EPA. Moore presents Johnsons arguments for disbanding the EPA and then he shoots holes in them, but he has poor focus and misses even when he thinks his arguments are sound.

The hallmark of his piece is that he highlights the role of the EPA in instituting the ban on DDT and then the ban on CFCs and also managing those two processes as the biggest triumphs of the EPA and he concludes that because of the DDT and CFC bans, the EPA is indispensable and thus the United States needs the EPA.

In the next several chapters we examine some of Byron Moore’s generic points about the EPA, plus and minus. In the process, we specifically examine DDT and CFCs, and I

am sure you will not be surprised that Byron Moore and Brian Kelly do not agree. I see the DDT ban as one of the worst overall decisions the EPA has ever made and the CFC ban seems to be based on corporate corruption more than a problem with the Ozone layer.

<http://www.capitalismmagazine.com/science/environment/epa/5268-epa-fascism-versus-america-the-epa-plans-are-immoral-2-of-7.html>

In September 2008, John Lewis Paul Saunders, writing for Capitalism Magazine, penned a seven part article titled, EPA Fascism versus America. The link for part 2 is above. His thesis is that the rationale behind most of the “work” of the EPA, including the global warming scare—and the resultant political proposals—has nothing to do with actually trying to identify a real problem. Instead it is rooted in idealism and the notion that nature is more important than both God and man. Have I said that yet?

In fact, it presupposes that man is the problem, and a logical solution of course would be that there should be fewer humans on the planet because, according to the zealots at the EPA, we are mucking it all up. Sanders notes that it is these erroneous moral ideas that are leading us to political disaster.

He writes:

“...environmentalists and advocates of socialist planning alike presume the right to assert what is good and right for others, and to impose this right by force--to the point of taking their property in the name of animals, and denying to the victims even the right to protest--as Greenpeace claims that merely to discuss the EPA plans is immoral.

“Given this moral premise, the man-made global warming claim meshes easily with other programs intended to destroy individual rights: economic redistribution of all kinds, control or confiscation of private property by the government, denial of technology and industry to non-industrialized nations, ever-increasing taxation, and most of all the establishment of a self-appointed environmentalist elite to tell us what the proper values are, and to enforce the sacrifices needed to ‘Save the Earth’ ” from us.

“The claims to scientific legitimacy made for the hypothesis of man-made global warming have been harnessed in service to a political agenda. Politics, not science, is driving the advocates of these political proposals. Lust for a dictatorship under the EPA permeates this movement—because it is the EPA who is to enforce the alleged interests of nature over man's interests.”

There are only two solutions when a strong enemy appears on the scene and is ready to eliminate you. The EPA is such an enemy. Option 1 is to convince the enemy that you can coexist. Ronald Reagan took this approach with the Soviet Union with “trust but verify.” Option 2 is to fight the enemy to the point of its elimination as a threat and achieve a major victory which keeps the enemy down for a long time.

The EPA is the enemy of the people of the United States. Therefore, we need to shut it down and stop funding it. In so doing, we must get rid of all its entrails—harmful legislation and regulations. The responsibility for the environment is the responsibility of the states and the individual through the courts system.

The federal government has no place in the environmental regulations business. Individual states are more informed about their own environment than any biased artificial

arbiter in Washington. The mere existence of such an agency is an affront to the rights of states. No place in the Constitution will you find reference to the EPA, and according to the 10th Amendment, it is clearly unconstitutional for the EPA to conduct business.

There may be a minimal need for an umbrella agency with a small staff to serve the advice and research function originally intended by President Nixon. But we must be very careful not to seed a chaotic future by putting the same ideologues into the EPA that set it on its radical course after the Nixon years. Minimal regulations could be handled somewhere else in the federal government as part of some other agency's duties. The bottom line is that this is a state's issue and the polluters are in the states, and the potential danger is in the states, and thus the best solutions will come from the states.

Trying to find actual environmental budget numbers in states is quite difficult because dollars are scattered in many different budgets from the general fund to those with names that include "conservation," "environment," "oil, gas, cleanup," etc. Though difficult to find the exact numbers, the state environmental budgets are huge, regardless.

For example in our state, Pennsylvania, just the environment budget along with the conservation lands budget comes in close to \$400 million dollars per year. With all the other set asides in the budget, such as hazardous cleanup funds and underground storage cleanup funds, oil and gas funds, etc., it looks like the Pennsylvania budget comes in well over a billion dollars. If we assumed that Pennsylvania was the largest spender on the environment in the country, which it surely is not, and that other states are just half of Pennsylvania's outlay on the average, the total of the state numbers is still huge.

We can extrapolate that the total of the state budgets would be anywhere from \$25 billion to \$50 billion dollars per year. This number dwarfs the huge federal expenditure of \$10.5 billion. Clearly, based on their budgets, the states are already doing the job and so there is no need for the federal government duplication or attempt to preempt the states with federal one-size fits all solutions that take away states' rights.

Everybody wants clean air and clean water but that does not mean the federal government needs 17,000 or 18,000 bureaucrats to wreak havoc on every business in every state with excessive regulations, especially in this time of a poor economy. The EPA has taken its toll on an already poor economy by scaring small businesses from expanding and hiring, and by picking winners and losers in large manufacturing, such as giving its friends like GE excessive tax breaks. The states should be the final authority on environmental policy, period.

There are no environmental issues in the lands (ceded by Maryland and Virginia on December 23, 1788) encompassed by Washington D.C. other than the odor of corrupt politicians. If there were something more onerous or odiferous in Washington for which dollars needed to be spent, Minnesotans and Pennsylvanians should not have to pay the freight for Washington D.C. In fact, the public should not be paying at all. Get the money from the polluters who cause the issues. If states have certain industries in their state that pollute their state, those industries have to be made responsible by the individual states for cleaning it up.

Citizens should elect officials at the local level who are accountable for protecting the environment in which they live. I do like the idea of a lot of FBI officials continually overseeing the actions of the local officials so the

temptation of big money does not over-influence the decisions of the locals. A more effective response than an out-of control autocratic agency can be brought about by honest elected officials who are inherently closer to the people affected by environmental issues. This of course is in contrast to the bloated EPA system in which biased, faceless Washington bureaucrats dictate regulations to the states.

Mountaintop Mining

As an example of federal interference, The EPA is currently looking into the practice of mountaintop mining in places like Kentucky. This is a practice that most Kentuckians passionately support. The EPA is against it. Kentucky is for it. It happens in Kentucky. Who should have the authority?

The EPA thinks mountaintop mining is just terrible because the surface look of the mountain often changes. Ironically, sometimes it changes for the better. The mine operators do build back from what they take and often create marvelously great mountain parks in the process. Yet, that is not enough for the green team. They don't like coal, period. Yet, none of them have committed to do without heat next winter to prove their point.

Perhaps the EPA would like Kentuckians to become helpless so they could get their livelihood from Obama's stash in Washington. Kentuckians would like Kentucky to stay free from Obama's regulations. Kentuckians should decide what happens in Kentucky. Pennsylvanians should decide what happens in Pennsylvania.

When states are concerned about major environmental matters, they can do their own studies. States are less

affected by radical ideas such as the ones that suggest that nature is more important than man. States will do what is best for the people in the states whereas the EPA wants what is best for radical environmental extremists who care little about human life.

While we shift the onus back to the states from the central bureaucracy (EPA), a small part of the \$10.5 billion that the Feds gobble up in the EPA budget can be kept for helping the states coordinate interstate work. Ideally, states that make the money from an environmentally sensitive industry such as coal should also pay the full price of reclamation. Build it into the price of the product. The federal government should not be in the business of subsidizing any industries. The fruit growing states don't ask Kentucky or Pennsylvania to pay for their winter frosts and so they should not be forced to pay for any reclamation projects in Kentucky or Pennsylvania. In other words, keep the feds out of it. It is a states' issue.

What about interstate pollution? The state DEP offices can solve that problem quite simply. Each state is responsible for the cost of its own pollution in whatever form, period. In the few cases where you have DEPs that cannot cooperate, certain things might be an issue for the courts. The bottom line is that there is no need for a huge \$10.5 billion power-hungry, job killing agency while the country is at 20% or better unemployment.

The EPA has gone too far placing the lives of aphids and white flies above the ability to grow healthy tomatoes and to sustain healthy businesses of all kinds. There should be less, not more government. In Pennsylvania, even big spenders like Ed Rendell, before Governor Corbett stepped into the Governor's mansion, have been reducing the DEP budget because environmental agencies have actually

begun to make life unhealthier, not healthier for Pennsylvanians and others across the world.

Clean air is something we all want

EPA apologists sometimes cite the “air pollution episode of 1966” as another example of why the EPA is needed. This was a deadly episode in which an estimated 24 deaths occurred because of bad air during the week of Thanksgiving. Clearly this was a tragedy.

This event predates the EPA, and the implications of the EPA cheerleaders are this may not have occurred if the EPA were around to have the right regulations in place. They suggest that this is a stark example of the fallacy of waiting for politics and industry to decide the appropriate regulations. Did this occur because there was no EPA? Here’s the truth:

Smog was terrible in Los Angeles in the 1960’s as for the first time; almost every family had a car—some two or three, and the freeways were booming with traffic, often at a standstill. The result was smog. There was no EPA. So, Congress (not the EPA) passed a law in 1970 called the Clean Air Act, which, with or without an EPA has done wonders to clean the air.

After the Congress passed the Clean Air Act of 1970, nobody challenges that U.S. air pollution levels dropped dramatically. The problem that we have with the EPA today is that it did all its great work years ago before it picked up all of its excess and its anti-American agenda items.

Now, to survive, the EPA is into limiting personal freedom and liberty, and other minutia to the extent that it is having a negative impact on the economy and on the choices Americans have when shopping for home solutions. The

EPA is actually the incarnation of “Big Brother,” that we have feared all our lives.

Somewhere between the groundbreaking Clean Air Act and today, the EPA has decided to work on minutia to annoy human beings, which the agency believes are the world’s primary polluters. The EPA does not want humans to drive or thrive. In fact, the EPA would love there to be about 90% less humans.

Today, the states do a good job on their own of handling air quality issues. For example, California lobbied the EPA and now they set their own clean air standards that are even more stringent than the EPA’s. So, how does the EPA help the states regarding clean air? It is the other way around. As noted, California writes its own regulations / standards and many other states have adopted California’s standards, not the old EPA set.

Because the EPA is busy protecting tsetse flies, ringworm fungus, potato beetle larvae, etc., other states may now choose to follow either the old EPA standard (when the EPA worked for the people) or the new stricter California standards as developed by California for California. To demonstrate that states are perfectly capable of making their own environmental decisions, it would help to know that the states adopting the California standards include Arizona (2012 model year), Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, as well as believe it or not, Washington D.C.

EPA supporters and apologists persist in defending this out-of-touch behemoth as if it were necessary for the states to survive. Instead of showing any science behind their arguments, which they cannot because it does not exist,

the apologists attack people with solid arguments, as the real problem.

Americans need to join together to remove the scourge of politics from the American landscape. A goodly number of the 18,000 strong EPA personnel are politicians of the worst kind. They have not and will never be elected and so they do whatever they think is right, as wrong as it may be, regardless of whether their prescriptions are deadly to humans. They do care a lot about nature. In fact, they care so much they do not mind hurting human beings when they believe it is for the theoretical good of the planet.

We in Pennsylvania and all other states, including California, already pay for environmental protection so let the EPA go to a suburb of Washington to show its wares. The environment is not a federal issue. I breathe Pennsylvania air. If Washington DC is suffering from a huge beer malt cloud from an Obama Beer Summit, chances are that neither Gaithersburg Maryland nor Baltimore will be affected. All environments are local. Big Government just doesn't work.

The onus for a clean environment is on elected officials and an informed public as watchdogs of the environment. Elected officials are the people's conduit to the government. Members of the EPA are not elected, yet they are the worst kind of corrupt political hacks operating in their own halogen sphere. Their political objective is to keep real people from having a clue about the proper way to handle the environment simply so they can have their way.

Apologists say the EPA is necessary because there is no advantage to any endeavor of getting decent environmental regulations if we have elected officials in charge. Can we

conclude from this that they would prefer unelected officials?

Surely, the corrupt EPA is not America's only hope for a clean environment. Paying one-thirtieth of a percent of the U.S. budget for the EPA is simply a bad investment.

The arguments to keep the EPA intact made by agency apologists have not convinced the homeowners of Kentucky, and other states that heat their homes with coal that is mined within their states by Kentuckians who like making a buck.

Hopefully, the apologists will not get bit by a West Nile infected mosquito; will not need relief from asthma; and will not need to heat their homes; cool their vehicle; or consume a nice cold beer in the summer time—any time soon. Their model agency is against all creature comforts.

The EPA has got to go. They are hurting Americans by throwing a ring of bull around the great science that makes this country the pinnacle of the world.

Congressman Bill Johnson (R-Ohio) has lashed out at the environmentalists in the EPA. He writes:

“The Obama Administration’s *War on Coal* is one more battle in their *War on Jobs*. With the EPA pursuing a scorched-earth campaign against job creators and the White House’s denial that their misguided policies are driving our economy over the cliff, a direct assault against the coal industry will be the death knell for too many of our communities. The EPA’s ‘train wreck’ of rules coming down the track will result in higher electric rates for working families who are already struggling to make ends meet in this fragile economy.

“As a candidate, then-Senator Obama said that he would bankrupt the coal industry. His EPA is carrying out the marching orders. The coal industry supports many communities in eastern and southeastern Ohio that would be devastated by the White House’s ongoing *War on Coal*. With distressingly high unemployment levels throughout our state and nation and too many people giving up looking for work, it’s unconscionable that the EPA would purposefully take steps that would cost jobs.”

The EPA is simply an instrument with which the Obama administration can exercise more power over the people. The people get it and it is not sitting well. It is time to kill the EPA.

In all states in which the EPA makes a friendly visit, carnage to the state economy is the direct result. Some suggest the EPA ought to rethink its onslaught to avoid strangling the economy of certain states such as Kentucky and Ohio. Both are looking for economic recovery but EPA policies are driving utilities with older coal-fired plants to simply shutter many of them, thereby hurting these states directly and straining the US power grid.

If we were in a real war against a visible enemy proposing unnecessary regulations, Americans would be fighting for Americans. In this scenario, if we saw the EPA raise its ugly head, we would swat it down like a fly. The EPA is a parasitic fly which seems to help the few at the expense of the many.

The EPA makes its job to hurt everybody in every state, and they hurt Pennsylvania big time—from simple things like the Brownfield reclamations in Allentown to the new regulations that have PA companies beside themselves wondering how the EPA has such power. Unless the EPA is de-fanged, jobs will remain on the decline in

Pennsylvania as the EPA is one of the biggest problem children of the federal government. If we put the EPA up for adoption, it would starve to death as it is too nasty a child to ever be adopted.

Our own Senator in Pennsylvania is not for his own people. The US Senate, including Robert P. Casey, Jr. of Pennsylvania defeated four amendments on April 7, 2011, that would have blocked the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from regulating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. What was he thinking?

Though anthracite coal in Northeastern Pennsylvania is no longer the king, the state is currently the fourth largest coal producer in the country. Pennsylvania uses various mining techniques including underground mining and surface mining. Moreover, Pennsylvania is home to the nation's two largest underground bituminous coal mines. The EPA regulations will definitely hurt the economy of Pennsylvania. Why is Senator Casey's voice not the loudest heard from coast to coast while defending Pennsylvania jobs?

Pennsylvania gets nearly half of its electric power from coal-fired plants. It is estimated that Pennsylvania will lose another 59,000 jobs with these regulations. The last thing we need is EPA regulations that inflict Pennsylvania businesses with higher energy costs and eliminate even more Pennsylvania workers from good-paying jobs. The EPA needs to be closed down, not Pennsylvania's factories. Electricity rates will rise by more than 17% under Obama's proposed EPA regulations ready to take effect.

Who can afford that?

The Obama administration and its regulatory toy, the EPA do not care a darn about Americans. There are so many

bad EPA regulations, they are hard to count. Two particular EPA regulations that are new are viewed as quite onerous and experts suggest great damage to the US economy and the economy of Pennsylvania. These EPA proposed regulations would be among the most expensive ever imposed by the agency on coal-fueled power plants, dramatically increasing electricity rates and natural gas prices and leading to substantial job losses.

The National Economic Research Associates (NERA) organization analyzed the combined economic impacts of the EPA's proposed Transport Rule and its Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) requirements for power plants. The analysis projects that the two regulations alone would cost the American electric sector nearly \$18 billion per year, making them some of the most expensive EPA regulations ever imposed on power plants and as everything the EPA does, leading to higher electricity rates and lost jobs.

People in the state of Pennsylvania who are paying attention, see that instead of fighting back against the Obama Administration's job-killing regulations, Bob Casey Jr., the senior senator, is busy jetting around raising campaign cash with President Obama. Our Senator thinks we do not care. As the "unknown Senator," maybe he thinks Pennsylvanians do not see him. Pennsylvanians can show the Senator that we all care by making him live in his Scranton compound for the next 50 years without even one more trip to Washington on the taxpayers.

On top of all the ineptness in the EPA and its terrible effect on our economy with its many regulations, Americans simply do not need to pay \$10.5 billion or more a year for a Gestapo-like set of guerrillas that terrorize our population and the businesses that would otherwise hire the people of this great country.

Who will be the first to say, Bye, Bye, EPA!

Chapter 13

DDT & World Population Control

Malaria is not bad, unless *you* get it!

On June 1, 2003, the Senate was preparing to enact an international treaty that had been dubbed the POP's (persistent organic pollutants) treaty. Thirty some years after DDT was banned in most of the world, the purpose this time was to ban all use of DDT in all countries. How noble? This is despite the millions of people who had already died as a direct result of the U.S. EPA's "no excuses" ban on the chemical. I would have asked: "What about the millions that are still being saved every year by unauthorized use of DDT? What about them? Do they die now?"

It will be forty years on June 14, 2012 that the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) first administrator, William Ruckelshaus, disregarded the advice of his scientific advisors and for political reasons announced a ban on virtually all domestic uses of the pesticide DDT. This was done despite the fact that DDT had earlier been hailed as a "miracle" chemical that repelled and killed mosquitoes that carry malaria, a disease that can not only be fatal to humans, but is difficult to diagnose. The creator of DDT had received a Nobel Peace Prize.

Once bitten, the malaria parasite heads for the liver. It reproduces quickly before re-entering the bloodstream where it attacks the red blood cells. It can take from about one week to a year after being bitten for malaria to appear. Depending on where you are at the time, you live or die. About 2000 British hikers every year, who love to frequent malarial countries, come home very sick with Malaria. It takes weeks to get better. Nine of the 2000 die.

You may know that a number of famous kings, emperors, popes, singers, and adventurers, either contracted malaria or died from Malaria. Al Jolson, Mahatma Gandhi, Genghis Khan, Pope Gregory V, and Davy Crockett are among those who have had serious bouts or died from malaria. At least eight US Presidents from George Washington to Lincoln, to Teddy Roosevelt to JFK were malaria victims in their lifetimes. When malaria does not kill a person, in many cases it weakens them severely, as was the case of Teddy Roosevelt's who did not live much longer. This disease has no right to still be in existence. It is a killer, and it has gained strength during the EPA "reign of terror."

Malaria, yellow fever, hemorrhagic fevers of all kinds had killed millions and millions of humans long before DDT came along. DDT is responsible for over a centillion infectious mosquitoes being eliminated. Yet, it has been outlawed in the US by our own EPA. Additionally, the US EPA supports efforts to ban the substance in all countries. Knowing the tactics of the EPA, you can bet they demand compliance regardless of the country. Think of all the deaths this has caused when no other effective treatment has replaced DDT!

From the outset, the real scientific community was outspoken in their opposition to Ruckelshaus for imposing such a ban. Their hypothesis indicated that there was no

evidence that DDT posed a hazard to human health. Yet the ban still took effect. The EPA takes no prisoners.

As expected, there has been a return of the long-gone diseases in the world. Simple diseases like malaria, which had effectively been wiped out, have come back with a vengeance. Years ago malaria had been eradicated by science. The scientific world had helped mankind. The EPA used junk science to push its secret agenda of world population control in the United States and through its surrogate agencies across the world. So, DDT, the miracle chemical that had been permitting people to live was banned from the globe. That's how powerful the EPA is. That is just one reason why the EPA must be eliminated. The world would be better bringing back DDT and killing the EPA.

The case for bringing back DDT is strong but so is the EPA. Four hundred quadrillion or more nasty mosquitoes—perhaps even a centillion, had died but millions of people, who would have died in other times, lived substantially longer lives while DDT was available. Despite its miracle properties, the EPA and its dependent surrogates across the world successfully banned the mosquito / malaria killing pesticide from where it was needed the most. Since that fact is irrefutable, it comes with this fact; the EPA for years has been one of the principal agencies responsible for millions of deaths worldwide from malaria.

With DDT (dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane) banned, in many mosquito-infested countries, there was no longer an effective way to control the disease carrying mosquitoes. The EPA would not want to take the blame for unneeded deaths for political reasons, but they are to blame, nonetheless. Malaria has killed lots and lots and lots more people than DDT ever could have. The EPA and its

politically motivated surrogates across the world need to be held responsible.

History and uses of DDT

There is much information on DDT on the Internet and in libraries across the world. This short introduction to DDT has some basis in a short introductory chemistry course from Duke University.

http://www.chem.duke.edu/~jds/cruise_chem/pest/pest1.html

The formulation for the compound known as DDT was first created by a German chemist, Othmar Zeidler in 1874. Zeidler was a putterer and very bright. He had made hundreds of chemical compounds before DDT but he had not documented any purpose for them, and so his notes offered no clue about a productive use for any of them. Over sixty years later, a Swiss scientist, Dr. Paul Müller, in 1939 followed Zeidler's formulation and created his own DDT. From this, he discovered that it was very effective in killing insects. We might add, "to say the least."

Almost ten years later, in 1948, Müller won the Nobel prize in medicine for this work.

In World War II, soldiers were literally being eaten alive by bugs such as bedbugs, fleas, body lice (cooties) that were known to carry the typhus disease (*Rickettsia* bacteria). To combat the diseases, soldiers were dusted with Müller's compound which was DDT. It was so effective as an insect killer that some who observed the landscape before and after nicknamed it the "atomic bomb" of pesticides. It is documented as saving the lives of thousands of soldiers in its first usage. For two weeks the soldiers were doused, and though they reported clouds of dust from the chemical

compound, there are still no documented DDT deaths. However, as we have cited in this chapter, there had been lots of deaths from the pestilence caused by the bugs.

DDT later was used on farms in the US to control some common agricultural pests that would destroy crops in short order.

- ✓ various potato beetles
- ✓ codling moth (which attacks apples)
- ✓ corn earworm
- ✓ cotton bollworm
- ✓ tobacco budworms

In addition to its use in farming, DDT was used extensively to control certain insects which carried other diseases such as encephalitis, hemorrhagic fever, malaria, yellow fever, and West Nile virus. These diseases are deadly to say the least. DDT as a weapon against the freight carrying bugs is even deadlier.

From the mid 1940's to the 1970's DDT was used extensively in the US and throughout the world. In the United States, at one point we were producing 220 million pounds of DDT a year. In other countries, where the major mosquito carried diseases had been infecting and killing many people, mostly children, DDT wiped out diseases such as malaria for many years.

In 1955, as an example of its effectiveness, the World Health Organization commenced a program to eradicate malaria worldwide, relying largely on DDT. The program was highly successful in many countries and death rates came down in some countries to zero.

Environmentalists began by trying to save human lives from the toxic effects of too many chemicals in the air. Over time, the emphasis changed so that their purpose became to save nature from their perception of its future decimation because of the footprint of human lives. That is a not so subtle change and it explains why people are not very happy with the EPA and other environmentalists who have gone “whacko.”

For example, “People are expendable to save nature,” is one of the major yet understandably quiet mantra’s of the EPA, whereas the agency itself was formed because *people* needed help from excessive contaminants in nature’s air.

The early EPA mantra was “Nature is expendable to save people.” Nature of course had no official spokesperson so the EPA took on that role and it has been arguing against regular human beings and the needs of humans, especially for light and heat, ever since. No sane person can permit an organization that cares nothing about humans to protect humans. It is ridiculous.

Back to the history lesson... By the 1970s, the US began to get worried about DDT's environmental and health effects. The Environmental Protection Agency was formed in December, 1970 in the US by the Nixon administration to deal with pollution. With environmental activism becoming very big in the 1960's, the elitist money people backed a notion called the Environment Defense Fund. This group won a huge victory in the US and the courts ordered the EPA to deregister DDT as a usable pesticide. Very shortly thereafter, in June 1972, the EPA cancelled all use of DDT on crops. For certain cases of disease control, the EPA allowed very limited use. Knowing one of their priorities is population control it is hard to trust them with the life of a house fly.

By the way, the EPA and other environmental groups love to use the courts rather than the rigid scientific method to prove their opinions. With the courts, all they need is a sympathetic judge and an attorney who is a good persuader. So, there is not always exact science behind EPA decisions and court orders. There is however, a lot of emotion and opinions.

DDT usage today – back to the present

While no longer manufactured or available in the US, DDT continues to be used in other parts of the world, wherever it is available. Despite its documented benefits and the lives it has saved and still could save, the world's environmental agencies, championed by the EPA have substantially limited the supply and the use of DDT worldwide.

Spokesmen for the mosquito population and the Malaria Disease Propagation Agency (MDPA), when consulted were quite pleased with the DDT ban. There is speculation that for the interview, since the mosquitoes and the parasites are still learning English, EPA personnel had masqueraded as mosquitoes and parasites in order to make those statements appear to have been made by the affected organisms. Even the wicked will do anything to survive.

I hope you are getting my humor. The Trans Malarian Parasitic Orchestra in parasitic circles often plays in deadly spaces. For years it had labeled DDT as Malaria Enemy # 1. These bad guys, when unwrapped from their host mosquito, come from the protozoan parasite from the genus Plasmodium. If this were a total joke, I would tell you that Captain Kirk's main man, Dr. McCoy, or "Bones," using

a special tricorder app, which could transvobulize the ship's dilithium crystals into a hermeticsic mélange that could reinfect the infectious plasmodium parasite with neon micro lights along with a subdural implantation of the doofus buffooni virus.


This mélange and its effects have always proven to be deadly to creatures, from one cell in makeup to over five cells, but only in cases when the villains have originated from the planet Plasmodium, once occupied by the Kardashian sisters. As I hope you realize, in the last three paragraphs I jest for effect. Unfortunately the EPA work is no joking matter.

This all boils down to the fact, that when DDT was no longer available for purely political reasons, malaria came back with a vengeance.

Over the last few years, many tropical countries began to thumb their noses at the environmentalists as the people in their countries were dying almost as quickly as the mosquitoes had been when whacked with DDT. So DDT, by popular demand is in use again in some brave countries that either do not depend on US foreign aid, or who have somehow gained waivers from the EPA. Its use is simply to control malaria and other major diseases to help the people. Its use is not intended to irritate the EPA but yet it does.

From the Duke site, they suggest we all check out this graph from Ceylon, which charts malaria over time. Note that during the 1960's the disease was just about eradicated in Ceylon from DDT spraying, Note also that when DDT was no longer permitted, malaria made a big comeback. Who are these people that think they can play God with human beings?

DDT and Malaria in Ceylon



We must consider that the battle over DDT use and non-use is like a religion. The environmentalists do not care how many lives are lost as long as the environment is safe for all life—even if the mosquitoes that are saved kill humans in the process.

The environmentalists would actually be mollified if the mosquitoes live and they die. The only thing similar to this death wish is the zealot who places a belt of explosives on his body. Try arguing cases about religion and that is why you will find so many zealots who want DDT to continue to be banned worldwide. After all, only people die.

Now, consider you wake up as the leader in a country in which the infection rate is overwhelming and people are sick all the time and many, mostly children are dying. How much do you care if the EPA tells you that you are not able to help stop the deaths of the many children in your country? What about your own children?

Suppose again that you have a cheap solution to the problem but the source of foreign aid if you cross them will stop you from getting the money to buy DDT? Will you use your own resources to find DDT anywhere you can and pay for it yourself? Of course you will! Shame on the EPA for putting countries through that exercise, and that is why it must be gone.

The following DDT / malaria stories from some spots in Africa show the thinking of some brave African leaders:

The use of DDT for spraying the inside walls of houses, a proven way to quickly stop the rate of malaria incidence, has made a comeback in African nations. The EPA would rather families starve and to avoid getting malaria, they should use their food money to buy the pesticide soaked expensive netting they claim is safer for the environment than DDT. That would be OK maybe, if lives were secondary. Lives are now the primary motivator and saving them, especially the lives of children is a major priority for African leaders—not the EPA.

Saving lives now in Africa has priority over the fears and the lies of the environmentalists and the environmentalists are not happy about that. So much for population control, which had been that added benefit of the DDT ban—for the whackos.

Logic suggests that when children are taken out by malaria or yellow fever or some other painful death, the earth and nature suffer even less than when an adult dies of malaria because the number of pollutants a human throws off into the atmosphere in a lifetime is much less when the lifetime is short. With this logic, it is surprising the EPA lets any of us live. Maybe that is why Obama wants control of healthcare.

Let's go to Uganda. In Uganda, caring more about people than the EPA; the Minister of Health, Brigadier Jim Muhwezi, renewed house spraying in the most "malarious" areas. He had the approval of the Ugandan Cabinet.

Muhwezi had critics including the EPA surrogates, but he dismissed them all, saying "How many people must die of malaria while these debates continue? If DDT can save lives, why not use it as we wait for the alternatives."

His words were reported in the Kampala newspaper, *New Vision*.

The program has been successful, and when Uganda's story was originally written, the country of Mauritius was about to be declared malaria free because of its use of DDT.

Zambia is another example. From the time of the DDT ban, malaria incidence and deaths had been climbing. To address this, just as in Uganda, the Health Minister aggressively pursued the use of DDT to fight malaria. The theory came well tested after the great success Zambia had using DDT in the copper mining areas beginning in 2000. After just two years, there were no malaria deaths in the copper mining areas.

Zimbabwe is yet another example of leaders saying "environmentalists are killing our people." Minister of Health David Parirenyatwa reintroduced DDT to save the children because, according to his words, it was, "cheap and more effective, with a longer residual killing power." He is quoted in the *Bulawayo Chronicle* in October 2003:

"So many people have died of malaria since January and we are doing our best to control it... DDT is very effective,

because it sticks for a long time on the walls and kills a lot of mosquitoes with a single spray... South Africa and Swaziland are using it, and I don't see why we should not use it."

Why should DDT not be used until something can be made that is safer?

The US government has no business in environmental regulation for the states or for the rest of the world, especially when their scientific premise is wrong—dead wrong. In the US as we have said many times, there should be no federal regulations at all, since we have the individual states to do that work. The tenth amendment of the Constitution demands that anything like an EPA should be run by the states.

The biggest stain on America is a government that has grown so large that it has in many ways turned against its own citizens. The EPA is an agent of such a government, and it spreads its wings into less powerful countries commanding, for the sake of population control, not environment protection, that children die of major diseases and the earlier the better.

Before we close this Chapter on DDT, let's review the two big items that the EPA says will kill us while it advocates the deaths of little children to complete its sordid green agenda, which embraces world population control. Let's answer these two questions though we have been discussing DDT for awhile already in this chapter.

What is DDT and what is the other major chemical that the EPA does not like?

DDT: Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, $\text{CCl}_3\text{CH}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{Cl})_2$, a synthetic organic compound introduced in the 1940s and used as an insecticide.

CFC: Chlorofluorocarbon: a fluorocarbon with chlorine; formerly used as a refrigerant and as a propellant in aerosol cans.

We have already given a brief picture of the DDT issues but we will look at its ban in a little more detail as a sordid means of population control before we move to the next chapter. In the next chapter, we examine the CFC ban in detail so you can get a full picture of what the EPA really is, and why it cannot be trusted to act on our behalf even in a matter in which nobody has to die.

Whereas EPA apologists identify just these two EPA actions (DDT and CFC bans) as the defining items in the EPA's legacy of greatness, I submit that the EPA response to the perceived issues with DDT and CFCs is exactly the reason why the EPA must go.

EPA apologists, thinking rational human beings will believe they cannot do without the nasty and corrupt EPA, ask how the banning of DDT and CFCs would have been managed in a world in which there was no EPA-devised national standard. To be honest, answering that presumption makes me feel like throwing up. Sorry!

Of course they are referring to the assertion that the EPA should be eliminated. Then what would we do? Hah? Then what?

My answer is that if there were no ban on either of these products, life would be better and safer for all people, and more people would be living with less government harassment.

To help the EPA apologists remember that the people are tuned into their agenda, let's go back and review some facts about malaria, add to the fact list, and then close out and go on to Chapter 11 The truth about CFCs.

A quick check of the facts shows that well over a million people continue to die worldwide each year because of the EPA supported ban on DDT and the rise of malaria and other such mosquito borne diseases. And, just as sure as Global Warming, and the possibility of Al Gore donating all his money to charity are both big hoaxes, the DDT ban and in fact, the CFC ban are also big hoaxes perpetrated by an EPA agency gone wild.

There is also a sinister side to the EPA DDT ban that is difficult to swallow – population control. You may not believe it so we came here to explain why after we first examined where we are worldwide with DDT. Let's review what Walter Williams has to say:

Dr. Walter Williams, writing for the Jewish World Review in July 2004, <http://www.eco-imperialism.com/content/article.php3?id=68> highlights the demagoguery and the ideological agenda of the EPA. Dr. Williams is an economist and he is a faculty member at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia. Like you, Dr. Williams is not a dummy!

His work rips big holes in any notion that this body uses real science for its conclusions. Millions have paid with their lives for the EPA's idealism, and thirst for power. Instead of Americans and other world citizens leading miserable lives and even being killed off by bad regulations, let's get together and kill the EPA!

Williams writes:

“Ever since Rachel Carson's 1962 book "Silent Spring," environmental extremists have sought to ban all DDT use. Using phony studies from the Environmental Defense Fund and the Natural Resources Defense Council, the environmental activist-controlled Environmental Protection Agency banned DDT in 1972. The extremists convinced the nation that DDT was not only unsafe for humans but unsafe to birds and other creatures as well. Their arguments have since been scientifically refuted. “

Despite this, EPA zealots and apologists from around the world, armed with little to no supporting science, take on honest overtures to close down this killer agency. They use arguments that have long since been proven to be falsehoods, and pure lies.

I have lifted a few more paragraphs from William's piece to show the really sinister, downright sick rationale for the banning of DDT. When you read this you may find yourself muttering: “Maybe somebody did not like poor people. Maybe somebody did not like black people. Maybe somebody did not like the high birthrate in poor black countries, and just maybe somebody is actually using malaria as a form of population control.” Why? Because they are powerful enough; that they can do so.

Williams continues:

“While DDT saved crops, forests and livestock, it also saved humans. In 1970, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences estimated that DDT saved more than 500 million lives during the time it was widely used. A scientific review board of the EPA showed that DDT is not harmful to the environment and showed it to be a beneficial substance that ‘should not be banned.’ According to the World Health Organization, worldwide malaria infects 300 million people.

About 1 million die of malaria each year. Most of the victims are in Africa, and most are children.

"In Sri Lanka, in 1948, there were 2.8 million malaria cases and 7,300 malaria deaths. With widespread DDT use, malaria cases fell to 17 and no deaths in 1963. After DDT use was discontinued, Sri Lankan malaria cases rose to 2.5 million in the years 1968 and 1969, and the disease remains a killer in Sri Lanka today. More than 100,000 people died during malaria epidemics in Swaziland and Madagascar in the mid-1980s, following the suspension of DDT house spraying. After South Africa stopped using DDT in 1996, the number of malaria cases in KwaZulu-Natal province skyrocketed from 8,000 to 42,000. By 2000, there had been an approximate 400 percent increase in malaria deaths. Now that DDT is being used again, [shhhh!!!! – don't tell Byron Moore] the number of deaths from malaria in the region has dropped from 340 in 2000 to none at the last reporting in February 2003.

"In South America, where malaria is endemic, malaria rates soared in countries that halted house spraying with DDT after 1993 -- Guyana, Bolivia, Paraguay, Peru, Brazil, Colombia and Venezuela. In Ecuador, DDT spraying was increased after 1993, and the malaria rate of infection was reduced by 60 percent. In a 2001 study published by the London-based Institute for Economic Affairs, "Malaria and the DDT Story," Richard Tren and Roger Bate say that "Malaria is a human tragedy," adding, "Over 1 million people, mostly children, die from the disease each year, and over 300 million fall sick."

--Temporary End of Williams quote---

The EPA should be disbanded for lots of reasons but none greater than the politically corrupt / correct ban on the pesticide known to help people live by wiping out many

diseases. For example, check out this quote from The National Academy of Sciences made in 1970, just two years before the political murderers in the EPA imposed their will on the world.

"To only a few chemicals does man owe as great a debt as to DDT. In only some two decades, DDT has prevented 500 million human deaths due to malaria that would otherwise have been inevitable." A reasonably prudent person would conclude that on balance, DDT is a very helpful product. So, why does the EPA think otherwise? Answer – their mission is not to save lives.

Read more: <http://www.yumasun.com/opinion/ddt-37645-malaria-year.html#ixzz1Yb9armZD>

Williams Quote continues:

"The fact that DDT saves lives might account for part of the hostility toward it. Alexander King, founder of the Malthusian Club of Rome, wrote in a biographical essay in 1990:

'My own doubts came when DDT was introduced. In Guyana, within two years, it had almost eliminated malaria. So my chief quarrel with DDT, in hindsight, is that it has greatly added to the population problem.'

"Dr. Charles Wurster, one of the major opponents of DDT, is reported to have said,"

'People are the cause of all the problems. We have too many of them. We need to get rid of some of them, and this [referring to malaria deaths] is as good a way as any.'

Let me translate. These people in the environmental community and the EPA have another agenda going on and saving human lives is not part of their agenda. It is

called world population control and when DDT was banned, people began to die again and that was not an accident. It was a plan. And the EPA staff was able to smile.

The apologists / zealots will tell you that there are many other “safer” ways to solve the malaria problem. For example, there are these nets sprayed heavily with insecticide that offer protection. But, they cost a zillion dollars and in undeveloped countries that is enough for parents to make a decision as to whether their children die either of malaria or of starvation.

Moreover, requiring the netting as a way of life is like having the people in the undeveloped countries live their lives with a dog-like Elizabethan collar around them to prevent them from getting in trouble and ultimately getting killed by malaria. Forget about stickball or even dancing while wearing the insect net. No wonder people die.

DDT simply kills the perpetrator and the person defended by DDT gets to live a normal life. No net boys or bubble boys are necessary when the country is armed with DDT. Just spray a house with small amounts of DDT and it costs a measly \$1.44 per year. For \$1.44 nobody is going to die, and there is no net needed that offers protection to just one person at a time. The net and other alternatives are five to 10 times more costly, making them effectively unaffordable in poor countries.

Poor countries often have leaders, who have a great understanding of the rest of the world, and that is why they are the leaders. Unfortunately, the “greater than thou” rich country emissaries, such as those from the US-EPA that once used DDT themselves to eliminate the problem; threaten reprisals against poor countries if they use DDT. Brave leaders find DDT rather than permitting their people

to be killed by diseases as powerful as a biological population control WMD.

It seems to me that many black and brown people, more than white people are being affected by these major diseases due to the warm nature of their native climates. I think this is outrageous. I do not understand why black and brown religious groups, perhaps the Congressional Black Caucus, Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, and Latino leaders in the US and elsewhere, government and non-government organizations, politicians and others who profess concern over the plight of poor people around the world do not join together to stop the killing of young children, who simply want to have fun. Children do not want to live under nets or in bubbles.

The fact is that most of those who die are black or brown children. These young people should be enabled to live long and productive lives. Nobody, including the EPA should be gunning for them. Somebody should step up and become a face to this huge problem.

A little investigation would tell them that because the killer mosquito a.k.a. the mosquito borne parasite cannot be killed by ordinary means, something extraordinary is necessary. Lots of washing and looking good in the mirror does not help.

Tell me it is not possible that what I would call mostly comfortable Americans, in the Hamptons, (who work for the EPA?) or perhaps EPA people who live in other comfortable places, while making a good buck for the EPA, have determined that poor people, especially those in other countries are expendable?

The EPA prescribed and promoted DDT bans, which created needless suffering and death. Was population

control an expressed or implied goal of the EPA? The population control aficionados know that mosquito-borne malaria not only has devastating health effects but stifles economic growth as well, and thus more and more deaths can occur in poor countries and their populations can thus be controlled!

Amen, Dr. Williams!

I admit that the topic of population control is way beyond my pay grade. I am, however, very sympathetic to those needlessly killed when solutions are available.

Greg Baxter wrote what I see as a chilling article on population control and malaria for The Irish Medical Times. It is titled, *Is malaria the solution to population control*. I do not endorse or not endorse any of what is in his article but it surely demonstrates the point I am making and it brings in the serious notion that population control is not a topic to be taken lightly regardless of your position on population control or the means of control.

You can see this line of thought at <http://www.imt.ie/opinion/guests/2010/04/is-malaria-the-solution-to-population-control.html>

Those arguing for population control take the issue as seriously and perhaps even more seriously than I take the issue of interference by the EPA from keeping the world disease free.

This is one of those chilling excerpts from Baxter's article:

"Neither famine nor disease control population growth anymore. Nor does war. Professor of Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology at Yale University, Robert

Wyman looked at nuclear war as a way to control population growth in a public lecture last year.

“ ‘The Hiroshima bomb killed 75,000 people, the Nagasaki bomb killed 25,000 people. That’s 100,000 people dead in two quick flashes,” he said. “But the population on earth grows by approximately 200,000 a day. What that means is that if we can imagine that some wars are going to balance births and deaths on earth, that means that every day you have to blow up two Nagasaki bombs and two Hiroshima bombs, killing that equivalent number of people, just to keep even.’ ”

“Prof Wyman argues that the eradication of malaria, as well as the development of family planning and economic stability, will decrease population growth in Africa – putting the emphasis on fertility, instead of mortality, as a solution. He points out that the demographic transition from high fertility and mortality to low, already completed in places like Europe, Tunisia and Japan, is still ongoing in much of Africa.”

There are two sides to every story. In my story, the EPA does not have the right to play God. Its value as a force in the pollution debate is diminished by its apparent leanings towards world population control. Nobody in my government, of which I am aware, gave the EPA such power.

Chapter Summary

Going back in summary, we have learned from the EPA proponents that the DDT and the CFC bans are two of the EPA’s actions that have supposedly made it a great agency. Obviously “decreases in the death rate” is not an

EPA statistic that is measured or cared about or this legacy would have a big cross-out mark on it.

I am not suggesting that DDT and CFCs are the EPA's only sins but the DDT story shows the EPA has been a non repenting killer of people. The economic impact of the major regulations against fossil fuels and other necessities of life demonstrate that the EPA is also a jobs killer. The CFC story, in which you can engage in detail in the next chapter, is pure corruption, and a marriage of government and industry that should warrant a quick divorce.

So, I had concluded even before I had given you any facts in this book that the EPA itself needs to be killed. It should not be credited with great acts for the well-being of mankind as zealots and apologists might slant the facts. The EPA is a killer of men—with no apologies.

The EPA at best is a pack of liars interested in their own power and self preservation. They have no concern about a sane person's perception of the greater good, especially for we the people! The EPA is pro-nature, and thus, they are anti-people as they have concluded that nature—animals, vegetables, and minerals are more important than people.

Even though they do not use guns or knives, the EPA murders people, nonetheless. Sometimes they murder with WMDs (malaria, yellow fever, etc.) simply to suit their sordid agenda. Sometimes it is by denying the spirit of a farmer who can no longer work the land.

This agency cannot be trusted with our lives.

Tell the EPA it's time to go!

Chapter 14

The Truth about CFCs

EPA Ban on CFCs (Chlorofluorocarbons)

We're switching gears now in this book to what EPA proponents like to claim as their second greatest triumph—the EPA ban on CFCs. Let's see what they think when they read this chapter!

Many already know what CFCs are. But, for those that do not know, and for those who could use a reminder, and for those who want to know more, here we go:

CFC: Chlorofluorocarbon: a fluorocarbon with chlorine; formerly used as a refrigerant and as a propellant in aerosol cans. Freon is a CFC as is R-12, its generic name.

When I had Freshman English at King's College, it annoyed me that the professor kept pointing out how all of the men (King's was all male) in the class consistently begged the argument. In other words, they made it seem that what they said was fact simply because they said it. Since those days, I have always tried to give credit to the source of the information as I hate begging anything, including the argument. To the best of my knowledge, and after hours and hours and hours of research and analysis, I

believe the facts that I present here are true. But, it is tough to believe that even the EPA is capable of such treachery.

Most people know the state of Oregon to be quite a liberal state and the EPA is a very liberal organization. The EPA as a proponent of nature over man is far more liberal than Oregon. Yet, as a state, though there are some hard and fast conservatives, few states if any are more liberal than the liberals in Oregon.

So, if Oregon is unhappy with the EPA that says an awful lot. By the way, many think the honor of most liberal state falls to California. Most Californians, however, actually know their positions are wrong but they hold them anyway because, after all, they are Californians. Oregonians actually think they are right. As a side bar fact, the state bird of Oregon is the banana slug. Actually, the state bird is the Western Meadow Lark but there are so many slugs in Oregon that locals joke about the state bird being the slug. I was out of my car in Oregon for just a few minutes, when I encountered the first slug I had ever seen in my life, so I believe this rumor for sure. What separates Oregonians from EPAians is that Oregonians have a sense of humor.

Many the following facts are from the Oregon Observer at the following citation:

<http://www.zianet.com/web/freon1.htm>

Most normal people would think that environmentalists are pretty good people who are deeply concerned about the impact man is having on nature. Most would not believe that the EPA would ever put the profit needs of corporations ahead of the needs of the people of the US? Though I have a far more practical stance on most issues in life than the idealists in the environmental community championed by the EPA, I once held the view that overall, they were good people who were way too zealous about

one topic in life. I now think they can be bought and sold like anybody else—even for their root cause.

DDT and the EPA's leaning towards global population control opened my eyes. Yet, this was an ideological issue about chemicals and pesticides and a "few" deaths. CFCs are more of an economic issue. Will the EPA fare better on this side of the debate?

Let's see!

We have already learned that the EPA uses its regulations for population control, which is completely abhorrent and inhuman. So, would it be a lesser sin if we discovered that the EPA is in bed with select corporations that help this huge agency to better accomplish its agenda?

I think you already know the answer. That is the beauty of rhetorical questioning.

There is no other conclusion that can be made than that the EPA is now way too big for its britches and it needs to be shut down completely before it inflicts more harm on Americans and others across the world. It cannot be trusted; it cannot be repaired; it must be eliminated. Check out this piece of a telling article from the Oregon Observer about CFC's, a major problem as seen by the EPA's closest lenses:

"First of all, most of the people in the refrigeration industry know that the CFC ban is a scam and that since the article '*Idaho Man With Answer To International CFC Ban,*' many people now realize that the EPA is in bed with DuPont on the CFC ban, so it can maintain the near-monopoly on refrigerants that it enjoyed in the Freon days. The whole world knows it also."

As a result of this article, printed in the May 1996 edition of *The Oregon Observer* (www.oregonobserver.com), a paper not likely to take the truth lightly, many people now know the truth of the DuPont / EPA relationship.

Using their pull, the huge chemical corporation has been able to maintain its near-monopoly on refrigerants in similar fashion to when it controlled its profits in the Freon hay days. If DuPont has a problem with that statement, check out the Oregon Observer or let's just say "it appears that way to me." I would be happy to publish comments from DuPont in this regard in a subsequent printing of this book and/or on my Web site.

When DuPont held the patent on Freon, ironically, there was no problem with CFCs. But, as you know, patents expire, and so when others could make Freon legally, without DuPont's permission, and without any kickbacks, it meant that DuPont no longer could receive all the royalties. Out of nowhere, the best gas for refrigeration products ever, and thus the most efficient for air conditioners— industrial and automotive as well—all of a sudden, was not an acceptable choice. How did that happen? Enter the EPA!

There were big issues found by you know who—the EPA investigators—regarding ozone depletion yet these guys never seemed to care about Freon while DuPont held the patent. Perhaps it is just coincidence.

Perhaps, perhaps, just perhaps, Freon's inventor and once protected patent holder, DuPont, might have had its revenue stream compromised if the EPA, the "watchdog of the people," permitted all "nobody's in the world" to compete for refrigerant gas substitute business. So, an argument in favor of the EPA would be that the agency saved the world from "nobody's" being successful. What an

argument. What a legacy. Could either the EPA or the DuPont Corporation possibly have been so crooked? Surely either or both would be pleased to give all comers complete access to their records on the matter.

If someone else found the marbles first, that would not make DuPont, the EPA's buddy for a very long time, very happy. If a competitor or a "nobody," happened to create a product that would be able to engage DuPont for this lucrative "refrigerant" business, large profits would not be as assured for the chemical giant. I can't quite figure out what was in it for the EPA other than controlling the game, and maybe that was enough.

Of course the EPA received no such profits as its staffers were paid by our generous treasury. So some might suggest they had no dog in the race. But, did they?

If you choose to do research on the Internet for Freon and DuPont patents, you will find that information is not readily available for easy reading, but there are a host of opinions out there. Could there be a stink worse than the scent of Freon emerging on this topic any day?

After the Oregon Observer article, and after watching government agencies in operation, I am inclined to believe that Americans (that's US) were duped by DuPont (has a certain ring to it) and the EPA into believing that Freon was a real bad guy. Who has the power to take them on—certainly our Congress; but our Congress no longer has the will to fight for the people.

Just remember this potential conclusion as we go along in this chapter. There is nothing less enjoyable in a real game than a replacement player. Wait 'til you see the Freon replacement that DuPont cooked up, and wait 'til you see the better player that showed up, but would not play ball for

DuPont. Thankfully for the DuPont team, the EPA declared the new player “ineligible to play.” Many wonder why.

There are a lot of citizens in Kentucky and other states with an opinion of the EPA. W. Ed Parker is one of those with a real opinion as far as things affect Kentucky. The following long quote is taken from his article because Ed says it so well. He does like to use CAPS a bit more than some prefer, so watch your ears if you hear Ed screaming:

http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/environment/ozonefreon_fraud.htm

“The excuse used by the EPA for the ban on Freon was it somehow seeps into the atmosphere and depletes the Ozone in our air. There is no scientific data available, in or out of government, to describe this "claimed" process. Freon is one of the most useful substances ever created by man; and it has many uses. In refrigeration, its prime usage is as the substance inside the sealed refrigeration systems that allows cooling to take place during the evaporator operation, and heating during the high temperature condensing part of the refrigeration cycles. Without Freon or some similar substance, refrigeration cannot occur, and the best known alternate would be to return to ice boxes.

“Freon was developed and patented by the DuPont Company. Ironically, the DuPont patents on Freon ran out at about the same time the government decrees to ban the use of Freon were issued. The leading replacement substances for Freon were also developed by DuPont. The Freon (HCFC) substances are far more costly and far more complex, to the extent that DuPont stands to make untold billions of dollars on the change out of this substance, and consumers will have an inferior product. Further, the DuPont substitutes have no supporting data to prove they meet environmental needs.

“Freon, the ‘villain’, is an odorless, tasteless, chemically neutral substance, which is HEAVIER THAN AIR, and by the laws of physics cannot rise into the atmosphere. If [it] is spilled on the ground, it will settle in the soil and become plant food. It meets the Biblical standard of “ashes to ashes and dust to dust.” Freon can be commercially produced at a very low cost of \$.50 to \$1.00 per pound. Some recent news reports indicate that since the banning, it is now one of the leading items sold in the world’s black markets. Some reported costs of Freon on the black market run as high as \$50.00 per pound.

“With the expiration of the DuPont patents, Freon would have been readily available as an air conditioning and refrigeration substance for the entire world, including Third World Countries, at affordable rates. According to THE FACT FINDER, P.O. Box A, Scottsdale, AZ 85252, (1/16/95), DuPont owners have direct ties to the NEW AGE-ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT which, in turn has ties to the EPA and such luminaries as Vice President Al Gore. Gore has ties to THE NEW WORLD ORDER of George Bush and Bill Clinton. According to THE FACT FINDER, Charles Bronfman of Seagrams, who controls the Board of Directors of DuPont, led the fight against Freon, his own product, because the DuPont patents to control Freon had run out. “

You may say that Ed Parker is a conspiracy theorist or you may say that Ed is sick of being lied to. I have found a number of scientists including the great team hosted by www.junkscience.com that do not trust the government on any issues because they use lying as one of their chief tools for imposing their will on the people.

When Al Gore, who is not only a non-scientist, but he may also be a non-human, (OK, too cruel perhaps, but let's

check it out before we rule it out!) became a hundred millionaire because of “green,” those with noses and nose hair scensed (OK I invented the word) that something stunk, and it was not the pre-Gore air.

There is a scientific debate about whether Freon actually makes it to the stratosphere but with major wind gusts it is certainly probable. But, how many cars over the years leaked quart after quart of Freon (R-12) on the roads and in the back yards and people are still breathing, and breathing fine. Ozone is also heavier than oxygen and it makes it up there also. The real experts see this all as a big hoax, and lots of big shots including Al Gore, and the DuPont’s are making lots of money on scaring people. Thank God there is somebody out there telling the truth. I have no evidence that anybody at the EPA is making money on the deal but I have no proof otherwise, either. The truth and the EPA seem to have intentionally separated years ago. I would suspect that soon the “TRUTH” will be filing for divorce.

EPA and DuPont

Despite its clear connection with DuPont, the EPA would never publicly announce that it was in bed with the chemical giant. However, when it smells like a rat, there is typically a rat on the scene. Once the DuPont patent ran out, the EPA declared Freon bad and thus it created the need for an alternative to Freon. It makes me want to know: “Who does the EPA serve?”

When the best solution to replace Freon was brought forward, as written up in the Oregon Observer, the EPA rejected it and chose the solution put forth by DuPont. When a story is a little fishy, there is normally a stinky dead fish someplace close by. Is the EPA that stinky fish?

Let me go through this one more time. The EPA created the dilemma when, without proper scientific evidence it declared CFCs, such as Freon as “Ozone depleters,” a bad label. To further its agenda and DuPont’s agenda, the EPA then scared Americans into thinking that they needed protection. Then, the EPA set itself up as the protector for the masses from Freon, the same gas that for years had made the masses comfortable. Luckily after Freon was declared “bad,” DuPont had another “fine” product available.

On the road to pulling off the caper for DuPont undetected, an even better solution to Freon was brought forth and demonstrated to the EPA. However, some say, simply because DuPont would not hold any rights to that “nobody” solution, it was rejected by the EPA. Can that really be true? That just about does it for a recap on the Oregon Observer story.

I haven’t seen such a good protection racket since the Capone boys in Chicago in the 1920’s. All the little guys—you and I—the consumers, would then be protected by the only protection racket in town – the EPA. Thank you for the protection, Mr. EPA.

Protection from what?

Should we thank the Lord that the EPA had not been eliminated when it used its junk science to protect us all? First the ever merciful and opinionated EPA determined that Freon was not a harmful gas? Then, when the patent ran out for DuPont, the EPA dutifully declared Freon a harmful gas. This is confusing only if you trust that people, even the EPA people, will do the right thing in all cases.

After all the repetition of the issue in this article so far, I would bet we all know the big issue here.

Should we also be thankful that the EPA set itself up so that protection from harmful refrigerants could only be rendered by the EPA? By the way, it is not just Freon. The EPA banned all CFCs for refrigeration along with a number of CFCs that provide medically needed functions such as inhalers for asthmatics.

We have minimally discussed the need for inhalers in other chapters but the banned substance in this chapter is why the EPA thinks it is OK for children to wheeze when they otherwise would be able to gain real comfort. The EPA ordered that the best inhalers all be taken off the market before there was a substitute that could do the job. The irony is the EPA did this theoretically so that we could all breathe better.

Neither the EPA nor Mother Nature was available for comment about the CFC ban for asthmatic inhalers. Perhaps the EPA would say it this way: “Sorry that you are not breathing well! But, a little wheeze may not be all that bad for children if they only knew how much their suffering could benefit Mother Nature.” I too think that is a bit trite but what can you expect from the EPA—the truth? Let’s ask Mother Nature, the adopted Mom of the EPA, her opinion! Whoops! She was busy saving arachnids, cornucopia, mosquitoes, spider ants, and loci, and thus was unavailable for comment.

Americans had reason at the time of the bans to trust the EPA since none had yet read this essay. Trusting Americans were unaware of the DuPont connection with the EPA and until recently (Obama Administration), most of us tended to trust most aspects of government. Now, like many, I trust few aspects of government, and I see the EPA

being an Obama tool and as treacherous and as deadly as any organization on the planet. It does not serve Americans. How many other connections to big corporations do you suppose there may be?

A few facts:

In this section we discuss the scientific work of Dr. Wm. Robert Johnston. This is not to be confused with Bill Johnson, the candidate for Senate from Kentucky who was vilified improperly in the last chapter.

<http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/environment/wrjp365o.htm>
!

Dr. Wm. Robert Johnston is a research physicist in the field of space physics: the study of the space environment, encompassing realms from the ionosphere to the magnetosphere to interplanetary space. His current concentration is in the study of the earth's radiation belts. He is a well respected scientist on the notion of Ozone Depletion. He writes:

“With the phaseout of CFCs, alternative chemicals are being introduced for air conditioners and refrigerators. Several replacement chemicals have been developed, none of which are as efficient as Freon. Many of these are toxic, flammable, or corrosive. Refrigerators and air conditioners are more expensive as a result.

“This will especially affect people in the third world, who need them for health reasons. Even in the United States, the phase-out of CFCs is costing everyone indirectly. Opponents of the CFC ban say that scientifically, the evidence that man is destroying the ozone layer is too weak to justify policy decisions that harm people.”

In other words, Johnston, a real expert, thinks the work being done by the EPA is extreme and unnecessary, and he notes that there is no such evidence that the CFCs are hurting the stratosphere.

Other information on Global warming from Dr. Johnston can be found at:

<http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/environment/gw.html>

When you read Dr. Johnston and the consensus from the scientific (not the environmentalist) community, it is easy to conclude that even if there were issues with Freon and other CFCs, and even CO₂, a human exhalant, the public response by the EPA and other agencies is exaggerated and self-serving. Additionally, the EPA may have the needs of corporations in mind, rather than the needs of the public.

Chapter 15

The Best Solution to the Freon Non-Problem

Oregon Observer and Gary Lindgren

These facts are a continuation of the Oregon Observer story.

In 1992, Gary Lindgren, just a regular smart guy, a former aerospace engineer, got wind of the opportunity to create a solution to satisfy the fraudulent need for a Freon replacement. So, he began experimenting to see if he could come up with something while working in his home town of Post Falls, Idaho. He was toying with some old refrigerators, which he had lying around—so he had a nice sandbox in which to play.

Like many inventors before him, Lindgren hit the jackpot with a combination of chemicals that emitted no Ozone depletion factors, and was well within all of the numbers as specified by the EPA. Moreover, since his formula worked in all the old refrigerators, no major refrigeration unit would have to be replaced when his concoction replaced Freon. R-12 (Freon) could simply be taken out and Lindgren's OZ-12 (a.k.a. HC-12a) put back in as a replacement, according

to the Lindgren studies. Refrigeration experts across the Internet have certified this as fact.

Lindgren had in fact discovered the alternative answer to what was then the looming refrigeration dilemma—an inexpensive, harmless, non corrosive alternative to Freon. When the EPA moves out of the way, Lindgren's brew may be found to be the safest for all commercial applications. But, we won't know until we move the EPA and Obama out of the decision process.

Though Freon still remains scientifically OK, and it has never been proven to be an Ozone depleter, the fact is that the EPA, using what scientists consider bogus science, banned it and unless Congress eliminates the EPA, that ban will hold. Therefore Freon can no longer be used commercially.

To lighten that statement a bit; this made Freon's use problematic at best. Lindgren's solution is actually as efficient as Freon, and it is far better than the witch's brew DuPont cooked up as its solution. Do you think that the *malcontents at the EPA* really liked the DuPont brew? Is it possible that there was something else in play?

Knowing this was an important discovery; Lindgren founded OZ Technology to market his discovery. HC-12a became his answer to the international chlorofluorocarbon (CFC, Freon) ban as per the Montreal Protocol of 1987, of which the US was a signatory. The intention of the treaty was of course to limit global warming and ozone depletion. Both of these notions are hocus pocus and in great disrepute as I write this book.

However, the EPA is indefatigable in its insistence that Freon and DDT must not ever be used again. It is carved in the precepts of their religion. When the EPA is gone, my

recommendation would be to simply bring back Freon, unless we find Lindgren's solution, when the light of day analysis is permitted, to be even better than Freon.

Lindgren had actually solved a "non-problem" with a wonderful and acceptable solution. This expose shows how the EPA could not accept a non-DuPont solution even though it is still recognized as the best solution of all by other opinionists in the **world** refrigeration marketplace.

Because the statement is true, we do like to say that there is substantial speculation that Freon was and is not really an air-quality or atmospheric problem, but it served as a straw man—a declared problem to give the EPA a cause to act. Any solution that did not come directly from DuPont to replace Freon apparently was DOA at the EPA. Was it trust or was it corruption?

The EPA loved DuPont for its own reasons. The thinking is that the EPA and DuPont had been good bedfellows and the EPA did not like Lindgren's HC-12a because DuPont could not make as much money on it. I am not suggesting the EPA got kickbacks but there is speculation something other than the facts had to create such a love affair.

Even the EPA does not take issue with the fact that HC-12a can immediately replace Freon (R-12) without any changes to the refrigeration / AC system. However, since HC-12a is a hydrocarbon blend, it is by definition, flammable. This is the claimed EPA big issue. Yet scientists and engineers, and even technicians know that all refrigerants in operation are flammable—even Freon. By itself, Freon is non-flammable but it becomes flammable when used.

How flammable is HC-12a? It is in the family of butane and propane and so, by itself, just like the component butane

and propane gases, which are used for cooking and for lighters, HC-12a is highly flammable. Before we move from this thought, however, think of all the things in a car that are flammable, including gasoline and motor oil.

Some readers may like to get an immersion education about hydrocarbons. Butane and propane and Lindgren's HC-12a are hydrocarbons, as is OZ-12, the OZ version of HC-12a. For your edification, I found this site to be the most helpful in providing me with a basic knowledge about what the hydrocarbon debates against the EPA are all about. Feel free to take a trip when you can:

Learn more about hydrocarbons at
<http://www.hydrocarbons21.com/faq.php>

For your information, I have reproduced the hydrocarbon list from this hydrocarbons21 site for your convenience:

The following hydrocarbons can be used as a refrigerant in cooling & heating applications:

- ✓ R170 - ETHANE - C₂H₆
- ✓ R290 - PROPANE (Dimethylmethane) - C₃H₈
- ✓ R600 - BUTANE (N-Butane, Butane) - C₄H₁₀
- ✓ R600a - ISOBUTANE (2-Methylpropane) - C₄H₁₀
- ✓ R1270 - PROPYLENE (Propene) - C₃H₆
- ✓ R1150 - ETHYLENE - C₂H₄

However, the most commonly used HC refrigerants are propane (mainly in commercial and industrial freezers, air conditioning and heat pumps), and isobutane (in domestic refrigerators and freezers).

Gary Lindgren's HC-12a is a mixture of hydrocarbons. Gary, who once was an aerospace engineer, used propane (R-290) and isobutane (R-600a) to create his effective

concoction. So, for the EPA, the good news was that this is considered nearly non-ozone-depleting when compared to dichlorodifluoromethane (R-12, Freon-12), the banned substance.

The part the EPA did not like was it was actually more environmentally friendly than the newly adopted compound approved by the EPA known as 1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane (R-134a) created by DuPont. Despite its great qualities, the EPA remained unimpressed with Lindgren's solution. My perspective is that the EPA should have looked to either Lindgren's solution or a derivative so the world would not now have to deal with the residual effects of R-134a, which are not very pleasant.

HC-12a can directly be used in refrigeration systems designed for R-12. Moreover, it provides substantially better cooling than an R-12 system retrofitted to the approved DuPont R-134a, with much greater energy efficiency as well.

Since 1996, HC-12a has been sold in Canada as Duracool but the EPA ban on HC-12a goes all the way to Canada. It cannot be used in automobiles even in Canada though it is a drop in with no work involved. HC-12a can be used in commercial units but cannot be used in mobile air conditioners due to the EPA blockage. Why is the EPA so much against the non-DuPont solution? Can it be its non-DuPont-ness?

Energy efficiency has always been very important to the EPA. As of January, 2012, the EPA has begun its process to eliminate incandescent light bulbs—not because the bulbs have any problem but because the power plants have to work too hard to light them. See Chapter 8. So, why choose a refrigerant that causes a car engine to have to work harder to cool a car?

Can it be that the playing field is not fair? Though the official word is that HC-12a performs better than R134a (the DuPont blend), unofficially, refrigeration experts will tell you that HC-12a is actually more efficient than Freon (R-12).

Unlike R-134a, the DuPont solution to R-12 (Freon), HC-12a is completely compatible with the hoses and oils used in R-12 systems, making the conversion much easier to accomplish if it were only permitted by the EPA. Though Lindgren did hold a patent for the specific mix, HC-12a was still considered to be patent-free due to its non-synthetic nature. That made it even more desirable as a replacement for Freon. Somehow, the EPA did not buy any of those arguments. Then again, the EPA is the EPA.

The documentation indicates that the flammability characteristics caused the EPA to declare HC-12a illegal to replace R-12 units in vehicles in the United States. It is not illegal to buy HC-12a in the US, but EPA approval is necessary today for corporations to adopt anything. So, nobody is trying to override the EPA even though they should.

The consolation prize for Lindgren is that his HC-12a product may be used legally in refrigeration systems that were not originally charged with R-12. However, using EPA guidelines, there are certain states that prohibit the use of flammable refrigerants in automobiles.

If we were not sure the EPA was pure, we should now think the EPA is not pure.

Those in the refrigeration business think that if Gary Lindgren, who unfortunately died in a fire in his trailer in 2009, was Mr. E. I. DuPont, or even Mr. Gary DuPont,

speculators would think that all the stops would have been removed so that DuPont could market HC-12a free and clear. Lindgren, may he rest in peace, was harassed by the EPA until the day he died.

HFC R-134a

In my career as a Senior Systems Engineer with IBM, I was called upon often to evaluate one system against another over multiple criteria to ultimately determine and present which one was the best for a given situation. Fox Tools Supply Company sells HC-12a in America and they hope to wait it out until this phenomenal replacement for R-12 is in widespread use.

The company built a matrix very much like the ones I used for comparing computer systems so that it is easy to see the various characteristics and how HC-12a compares with the DuPont recommended solution HFC R-134a. Please notice in the chart that both are non ozone depleting. That is the only positive characteristic of the DuPont solution, though I do not claim to be a refrigerant expert.

The only real problem with R-12 that the EPA cared about was that they said it was ozone depleting (Real scientists do not agree with their premise.). If the EPA wanted non ozone depleting, that is what they got with the DuPont solution but it comes with a lot of other nasty baggage issues. If I were you, I would not want to ever touch HFC R-134a. The non-ozone depleting HFC R-134a is hazardous to the health of human beings and animals. But, why would the EPA care about that. Perhaps it is a tool that can be used to aid in population control? I copied the Fox Tools chart from their site for our full review:

<http://www.foxtoolsupply.com/hc12vs.htm>

The chart on the next page shows the major differences between the HC refrigerant product and HFC R-134a

Notice the last item in the chart. It is not in the original document. I added it because from all the literature out there it is true. It tells you in no uncertain terms that all refrigerants are flammable when in use. The EPA ruled out HC-12a because it is flammable. Yet in system, all refrigerants are flammable so why is the whole story not being told to the public?

R-134a (and other refrigerants) is just as flammable as HC-12a when mixed with refrigerant oil, yet the quantity of refrigerant and oil in a typical system is so low that the danger of a fire issue in any case (including HC-12a) is minimal.

One would have to believe the EPA was asleep when they approved R-134a or they thought nobody would catch them. When R-134a is exposed to flame, it releases one of the worst gasses of all time. Perhaps you already know of the toxic phosgene gas. Contrast this with HC-12a, which is completely non-toxic.

In the interest of full disclosure, do you find it strange that the EPA does not discuss the phosgene gas as a problem in case of an auto accident? After all, this colorless gas gained infamy as a chemical weapon during World War I. It is more lethal than mustard gas.

I would like to see burn tests on R-134a. In most refrigerant information sites they offer the same response as the wiki.answers site I reference below:

HC Refrigerant Products such as HC-12a	HFC R-134a
Non Global Warming (GWP negligible)	Global Warming (GWP of 3200 for r134a on Greenpeace calculations and publications. In other words it is a light greenhouse gas.
Non Ozone Depleting	Non Ozone Depleting
Non Toxic	<p>- Animal Testing has indicated that with repeated exposure Benign testicular may develop</p> <p>-Postmortem will indicate increased organ weight</p> <p>-r134a Human Testing has indicated that with repeated and/or high concentration single exposure humans may experience any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced oxygen intake Temporary alteration of heart's electrical activity Irregular pulse / palpitations Inadequate circulation Heart irregularities Tremors and other Central Nervous System symptoms Unconsciousness or death Thermal decomposition (exposure to open flame, glowing metal surfaces) forms <p>"Hazardous" hydrofluoric acid and possible carbonyl fluoride (both of which can cause severe Central Nervous System reactions.)</p>
Compatible with both mineral and synthetic oils including PAG and Ester oils	r134a not compatible with mineral oils. Need ester and PAG only. Ester oils are very hydroscopic. PAG oils are subject to toxic registration in certain states/regions. .
Non Corrosive	r134a Highly Corrosive
Pressure "high side" of MVACS approx. 150 psig	Pressure "high side" of MVACS approx. 300 psig
Energy efficient compared to R-12	r134a not energy efficient compared to R-12
Flammable – non toxic emissions when burning	R-134a (and other refrigerants) appear to be just as flammable as HC-12a when mixed with refrigerant oil, yet the quantity of refrigerant and oil in a typical system is so low that the danger in any case is minimal. Additionally, when R-134a and R-12 is exposed to flame, it releases toxic phosgene gas , whereas HC-12a is completely non-toxic

“R134a, when exposed to a flame, such as from a candle, a cigarette or a gas range, decomposes into phosgene gas, which can be deadly if inhaled in sufficient amounts.”

[http://wiki.answers.com/Q/Is it legal to add freon to a leaking air conditioner#ixzz1agbEYgCw](http://wiki.answers.com/Q/Is_it_legal_to_add_freon_to_a_leaking_air_conditioner#ixzz1agbEYgCw)

It is strange that the EPA bans HC-12a but permits R-134a. Gasoline is flammable. Motor oil is flammable, and R-134a in system is also flammable. But, the EPA is right. You are likely not to die of burns in an R-134a equipped vehicle perhaps because the WMD gas released during burning will get you (phosgene is a deadly WMD gas) before the flames burn any part of your body.

The EPA does not suggest that and it is possible that the amount of phosgene in a potential accident may be minimal or something not to be concerned about but that is a risk not too many would want to take. Why does the EPA not fully explain phosgene gas? Would you rather be burned or would you rather inhale something that did not kill you until a few weeks after it was inhaled?

In the first combined chlorine/phosgene attack by Germany in WWI, against British troops at Wieltje near Ypres, Belgium on December 19, 1915, 88 tons of the gas was released from cylinders causing 1069 casualties and 69 deaths. Nobody ever died from HC-12a gas, so you tell me which is more dangerous to humans. Clearly the EPA believes that Freon Gas (R-12) and is more deadly to Mother Nature; but what about humans?

If you would like to learn a bit more about air conditioning in very, very, easy to understand terms, feel free to go to <http://www.misterfixit.com/aircond.htm>. You may not be interested. I too was not interested originally but I am glad I took the trek. If you want to learn more about lethal gases used in wars, we have no additional references. However,

as you, we are shocked about the notion of phosgene gas close by humans after a decomposition of an AC refrigerant.

Let me go over this flammability issue one more time and you tell me whether the EPA ought to approve HC-12a since the flammability issue is not as clear-cut as the EPA would like us all to believe.

As discussed, all refrigerants are blended with oil in the actual system, and all refrigerants are violently flammable under catastrophic system breach conditions (refrigerant rushes out, creating aerosol mist of oil—a big flame-ball erupts whether it's R-12, R-134a, OZ-12, or whatever). So, should fire be an issue with HC-12A? It does not seem so.

Is the reason that HC-12a is not approved because it is not very expensive and anybody—not just DuPont can make it? It is a fact that the hydrocarbon blends (HC-12a, etc) are very cheap (about \$1.25 for enough to charge a few systems), But they aren't approved by the EPA for use in automotive A/C systems.

I am so suspicious about getting my facts from the EPA that I searched many other sites for corroborating evidence before I came to any conclusions. Again, I am not a scientist but I do have a B.S. degree in IT. I was not conducting experiments either. I was assessing analysis done by experts. I would love somebody to do an expose on why HC-12a is really being held up.

Apparently trying to avoid a defamation suit, the Oregon Observer in its expose, danced around the issue as it noted that “There is evidence to suggest that the CFC ban is another enviro-hoax based on bad science so big business can open up a brand new marketplace enforced by an international treaty and rape the people of the world for

\$billions. The estimated ‘chiller change’ market in the U.S. alone is \$40 billion.

“The actions of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with a self-admitted policy to drive Lindgren and other small hydrocarbon refrigerant producers out of business, make the enviro-hoax evidence all the more compelling.”

HFC-134a as documented in the Oregon Observer and as we have shown in the chart has many undesirable properties, but the EPA knew it was an original product by DuPont. Among its undesirable “retro” characteristics it was found to be an unstable, expensive, corrosive, toxic, inorganic, greenhouse gas-producing product. Somehow, none of that mattered to the EPA or to DuPont.

To make HFC-134a, any other producer would require a chemical plant that cost at a minimum, \$2 billion. That just about assured DuPont would get all the refrigerant business at the time. HFC-134a was the EPA strategy, and they made sure it worked from a business standpoint for DuPont.

When market entry (\$2 Billion) is expensive or difficult, the dominant player gets what the business people call a “monopoly.” As a casual observer, my research shows that is exactly what DuPont needed to rescue itself from its malady—what were once its Freon profits.

Somehow, a man from OZ became a threat, but he would not have been able to come up with a \$2 Billion bogey to beat DuPont in a rigged market. Then again, if DuPont held the patent any plant-building would be moot.

Clearly, patent restrictions as well as hostile market entry terms made it highly unlikely that any other company would

ever be able to make the HFC-134a product. So, the EPA saw its job to prevent any other “nobody” solution from getting the light of day.

Working further on the list of retro characteristics, nobody in the mainstream media will report that 10 percent of the total 134a production volume always ends up as toxic waste. This nasty stuff needs its own disposal methodology. Besides what appears to be potential corruption in the approval process, I would suggest that the worst part of HFC-134a from a commercial perspective is that it requires those who switch from Freon to suffer through an expensive conversion or get a new air conditioner or refrigerator. The new box, of course can use any legal EPA approved refrigerant. Moreover, if your Freon unit, needs to simply be recharged, the EPA will not permit it. The system needs to be changed and 134a will be your new game. That is a very expensive proposition.

In other words, every refrigeration system in the world had to change so as to accommodate the corrosive nature of HFC-134a. The DuPont invention was really bad overall. DuPont perhaps knew it would be adopted by the EPA regardless of faults, and they may have thought they could come up with something better sooner, but there is no documentation supporting that line of thinking. In a nutshell, HFC-134a is a poor product, and America would be better without it.

When it needed to become the product released to market, and it needed to work for consumers, DuPont needed to augment it with some hellish chemicals including expensive, carcinogenic, synthetic compressor oils. The profit motive for some companies is a huge driver of product change. Without the bad stuff, whatever good HFC-134a promised could not be delivered.

HC-12a, a product of one man's garage, needed none of this extra duty work; but, then again, it was not made by the EPA-friendly DuPont Company.

Most of the people in the refrigeration industry know that the CFC ban is a scam and thanks to the Oregon Observer, the late Gary Lindgren and others, now you know also.

Based on what we now know, why should we, the forgotten taxpayers of America, pay the salaries of 18,000 people in this un-American Agency that works against all of US. It costs US \$10.5 billion per year, and each time they do anything, we lose!

Regardless of the opinions of ideologues and zealots, the EPA deserves nothing. Hopefully a quick end to its existence will come very soon.

Medical Evidence -- CFCs Help Asthmatics

The EPA CFC ban used a broad brush on CFCs. There are no exceptions. The EPA is all-knowing! *No exceptions* is the EPA hard-nosed style. Even if your product helps living people live better than any other product, the EPA says it must be removed as the EPA is unmoved by human needs. If the EPA thinks X; X it shall be!

Even if your company was using just a few ounces of a CFC for your product, it would still be banned. You would not be permitted to make the device. It did not matter to the EPA that products that used just a miniscule amount of CFCs were proven to be the best products in their marketplace and they could actually help people live better. For example, Doctors of asthmatics believe that CFC

inhalers are unmatched in their ability to relieve the symptoms of mostly younger Americans.

In other words, in the marketplace, if the EPA were not a participant, the inhaler that helped children the most would have been the one doctors prescribed the most. Can you imagine if the EPA is the agency Obama selects to enforce the medical provisions of Obamacare?

Just like the EPA stopped the Gulf oil spill from being cleaned up in short order, they have stopped the use of the best inhaler for asthmatics while concurrently claiming their organization is the reason humans can breathe.

The ideological EPA knows what it is doing. CFC inhalers will be banned forever as long as the EPA can control Congress. Despite proof from the medical community that the EPA ban causes deaths and discomfort for young Americans, the EPA continues to be unmoved.

The bottom line for the EPA on the CFC ban on inhalers is that they are still banned and will continue to be banned as long as the EPA has any say. Children in this case are the ones who suffer while the EPA executes its agenda without scientific proof a ban is needed. The EPA says “No.” to any exception. Congress unfortunately remains powerless as the Obama team controls the Senate.

The EPA created a medical issue out of its major scheme or as some called it, a scam. The issue they wanted to assure was put out to the public was “CFCs hurt all people.” The medical community disagrees with the EPA, but this regulatory body overruled the doctors and nurses and instead won one for the environment at the expense of our children.

Doctors and medical practitioners are upset that the EPA has placed its agenda over what is good for Americans, especially those with bronchial issues—mostly young people.

Here are some unaltered comments from medical professionals about CFCs. Again, you must make your own decision: Check out the site when you have time:
http://www.savecfcinalers.org/Doctors_Speak_Out.html

Here are the quotes introduced by the site above.

"I occasionally have bronchospasm after I get a cold, and I personally can say that the HFA version of albuterol doesn't work. My patients say the same thing. How CFC inhalers were banned and more expensive, less effective medications substituted for dependent patients is beyond me. Dr. Howard Schulman, RI #4916

"Many say that they feel like the inhaler isn't delivering the medicine."

Dr. Mario Castro, pulmonologist and associate professor of medicine for Washington University's School of Medicine, December 29, 2008

"During my twenty five years of practicing medicine, I have had occasion to treat hundreds of asthmatics, from mild cases to severe cases requiring hospitalization. I can report that during this time, I had many patients who responded better to the CFC inhalers than to the HFA inhalers. The relief response was faster and more pronounced, and these patients were much more satisfied with the CFC inhalers."

"Fifteen years ago, I developed the sudden onset of adult asthma, which was frequently severe to the point of crisis, requiring oxygen as well as injections of epinephrine and

steroids. I feel that the CFC inhalers provide faster and longer lasting relief from difficult breathing than the HFA inhalers.”

“The amount of CFC’s released into the atmosphere by the MDI’s from asthmatics is trivial in comparison to the numerous other causes of contamination, and to withhold an effective therapy for one who feels suffocated and unable to breathe is callous and grossly misdirected. Many physicians feel that there is an emotional component to the causation of asthma.”

“Even if studies claim that the two types of inhalers are of equal effectiveness, to deny to an asthmatic in crisis the medication he or she feels is more effective is cruel and might well aggravate the asthmatic symptoms instead of providing the treatment (i.e. CFC’s) the asthmatic person feels is more effective.”

“CFC’s are not available because of the influence of medically untrained persons prevailing upon the legislature to ban them from the marketplace. It has been widely noticed that when a patented drug’s patent protection expires, and cheap generics become widely available, the manufacturer of said patent medication immediately produces a new patent-protected medication said to produce much better clinical results. Note that universally, the new medication is considerably more expensive than the former patented drug, and many times more expensive than the generic version.”

Summary

The EPA worships nature and abhors man. The more humans that live on earth, the more unhappy is the EPA.

The more comfortable humans are made the more likely they will want to live longer lives.

Would the EPA care if children with bronchial issues died because of the CFC ban? That is already on the table. If they cared, for the amount of traceable pollution, the ban would be lifted in these circumstances.

At

http://www.consumeraffairs.com/health/hfa_inhalers.html, there are a number of complaints about inhalers and ironically there are also ads for inhalers. Here are some comments from the site.

“The ProAir brand inhaler does not reach the lungs and does not contain more than 20 doses when it is supposed to contain 200. I and 6 children all have had lifelong asthma and we cannot get relief resulting in many trips to the ER. Every doctor and pharmacy argues with me that they work just fine and they have had no other complaints.

“Type in ProAir on the Internet and complaints come up one after the other. Why is the FDA not correcting this when people are literally dying? And why are these doctors and pharmacists lying to us?

“All insurance companies will only cover the red ProAir canister and that is usually with a hefty co-pay. Then when they only last a few days, they will not let asthmatics get any more because they insist it was a 30 day supply!

“A few weeks ago there was a big deal made about a college girl who "died from overuse of her inhaler." Her classmates stated that she had been puffing on it more than usual until she finally died. It was all over the news until the comments from those of us that use these inhalers were very negative stating that this poor girl died because

she kept trying to puff on her medication, but it was not reaching her lungs and did not stop the attack that killed her. Those comments stopped any reporting of this case and the poor girl's death is just going to go down as her doing something wrong. These cases are too many to mention so they are just being disregarded. This needs to stop!"

Closing Note

In the war against humankind, in which the EPA may already be engaged, a desirable "end game" would be that 90% less people live on the planet after the war. Mother Nature would finally be appeased. If you buy that, do you think there is any collective weeping in the EPA for a soul that passes on because they could not breathe without help from a banned CFC?

Chapter 16

Some Final Thoughts

It is not a Democrat or Republican Issue

You may not be able to tell by my writing, but I am a conservative Democrat as in the days when the Democratic Party leaders were not progressive / Marxists. I am running for the Senate in the State of Pennsylvania and I think Pennsylvania Democrats are sick of the progressive notion that the new American Dream is a *handout*.

While we are still a robust and strong country, it is up to all Americans to stop the encroachment of the redistributive mentality and the socialist zealots and the environmental apologists, while we still have an America to save. I think Democrats can do it if we pick new leadership. In the meantime, as tough as it is to say: “The Republicans are thinking more clearly and therefore are better equipped to help America today.” Democrats need to begin demanding more from leadership than abusive regulations and giving American jobs to foreigners.

We have gone way too far left. It is good Democrats who are being hurt by tactics that prevent Americans from finding good jobs. The EPA is one of the greatest examples of a tool the progressive / Marxists Democrat leaders use to limit job opportunities for Americans while making the

country weak and vulnerable to our enemies. It's got to stop. With new leadership in the Democratic Party in the future, there can be both a better Party and a better America.

I am sure I will be called radical for suggesting that the EPA is an instrument of population control. Yet, the evidence is strong. An honest look at the proof that I present in this book and there can be no doubt about it. No other conclusion is possible.

The Internet is loaded with excellent opinion and fact pieces discussing in detail the science and the politics of the EPA. We are witnessing the intentional, systematic destruction of America as well as other countries as a result of the callous creation and the execution of edicts from this too-powerful, corrupt body of regulators.

This Congress can't stop the EPA; Obama knows it.

For their attempts to rein in the EPA back in April and again in the fall 2011, I congratulate the Republicans in Congress. I blame my Party, the Democrats, for permitting this treachery to continue. The Republicans tried using legislation to mitigate the damage about to be caused by the EPA's ban on greenhouse gases, boilers, and basically energy in general. But, the progressive / Marxists in the Senate, including my Senator Robert P. Casey, Jr. from Pennsylvania defeated the attempts.

The EPA had decreed the ban on greenhouse gases before there was conclusive proof that there was a problem. There still is no proof. They are out-of-control but since they have the backing of the Democrats in the

Senate, they can do as they please and no reasonable person or body can stop them.

After the regulations went on the books, the EPA admitted that it had not followed protocol. Legally, it had no choice but to follow protocol but the EPA likes to make its own rules. Instead of facts, the EPA chose to speculate that the perceived problem was real, and then, without proper authorization issued their ban on greenhouse gasses. In other words, they banned the gasses before they had actually gone through all of their own required tests and procedures.

A six-month old Inspector General Report was made public in the fall 2011. It had been swept under the rug until the EPA was forced to make it available. The report clearly demonstrates that the EPA does not care if it has all the facts, as long as it can execute a prescription that meets its ideology. As we noted in Chapter 1 of this book, the EPA was called out on this by the Inspector General long before Congress got involved but it chose to not reverse its tracks. It is too powerful for our good!

Some may say, so what? However, be cautioned that the EPA enforcers are the last agency to which to say “so what?” They will do as they please and there will be carnage in their wake. The “what,” is the survival of a viable America. The economy is being toppled and the EPA is a prime force behind assuring that it collapses.

EPA regulations work the opposite of attempts to resuscitate the economy and create jobs. No recession in the past had to deal with the countervailing force of a powerful EPA, working to defeat all initiatives intended to get businesses moving again.

The EPA does not want a robust economy if it means humans have to be served, our garbage disposed, CO₂ exhaled, and a broad range of other polluting activities that do not occur when people are out of work. When people are not employed, they do not create exhaust driving to work. The EPA loves Mother Nature, not mankind. Mankind is a big threat to Mother Nature and the EPA is Obama's personal army protecting "her" from harm.

If this were a cartoon this might be a nice ending and there could be a big Ha! Ha! But this is real life. The EPA unfortunately for America and Americans would rather you choose to end your life than have your sorry butt around to pollute even one more day. If you have been through all these chapters, by now, I suspect after all the confirmation, you believe in my initial premise and resulting conclusion. Keep checking the body of work from the EPA and ask: "Who is this for?" It is not for you or me. That is for sure.

In early October 2011, a bill trying to curb the EPA's power (the TRAIN act because the EPA train is off the track) did not pass in the Senate 50-50, with 60 votes required. Undaunted, Republicans still passed an identical bill in the House later in the week by a vote of 233-180, mostly along party lines. They did so even though it had little chance of becoming law so the people could see what was going on.

Democrats own the Senate and in fact, they own the EPA. As a Democrat, I take no ownership pride in this monster organization, and I would have voted to kill it if given the opportunity. By the way, there were four Democrats – Sens. Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Joe Manchin of West Virginia, Mark Pryor of Arkansas and Ben Nelson of Nebraska who did support the Senate Bill to limit the EPA. One Republican, who insiders have labeled a "RINO," Sen. Susan Collins of Maine, voted against it.

The President threatened a veto of any bill that reached his desk so the Republican's chances of getting something done for Americans had little opportunity to become law. A hard core of stubborn Democrats including Bob Casey Jr. of Pennsylvania and Barack Obama of Washington D.C. chose to go against the people. From what we have seen with Obamacare, who would have expected anything differently?

Unless in 2012 more Democrats can be elected to the Senate, who have the same mindset as Senators Landrieu, Manchin, Pryor, and Nelson, I regret to say that the country will have to find its EPA solution by voting for Republicans. Hopefully, the EPA will not have reduced the power on our power grids by the time we can get these important laws passed or perhaps we'll have brownouts or other power disruptions in which we will have no heat or light and perhaps even those big network towers will have to be shut down at times making 24-hr texting a thing of the past.

Figure 16-1 Texas Power Plant EPA with EPA Bulls-Eye



AP PHOTO/DAVID J. PHILLI

The W.A. Parish Electric Generating Station in Thompsons, Texas, one of the largest power plants in the United States. A bill passed by the House would delay a requirement that such coal plants slash their mercury emissions.

Clearly, the EPA's regulations are an overreach of government that we know will push the economy deeper into a slump. It will lead to even more job losses. That is why the EPA must be stopped and stopped for good. Republicans as well as the Democrats who supported the bill are trying to prevent the agency from shutting down coal fired power plants such as the one in the picture. Legislators promise that their efforts would not affect other positive parts of the Clean Air Act—the parts that actually protect people from toxic and lung-damaging pollutants.

In working to get the bill passed, Rep. Fred Upton, R-Mich, chairman of House Energy and Commerce Committee and chief sponsor of the House bill, hit the nail on the head: "This legislation will remove the biggest regulatory threat to

the American economy. This is a threat imposed not by Congress, but entirely by the Obama Environmental Protection Agency."

Nobody is suggesting that we not work for a cleaner environment. We should continue these worthwhile efforts but we should win through science, not through power plant closures. Shutting off power is a radical notion but then again, the EPA is a radical agency.

We do not need to crush the economy to achieve environmental goals. We're all for clean air. What good is clean air, however, if there is no food and no warmth?

The EPA is a long-term tyrannical agency that must be shut down as each day they cause more damage to the country. Most of the recent fuss is about a new EPA rule that was scheduled to be rolled out in November 2011. It required coal plants to slash 90 percent of their mercury emissions. That rule is required under the terms of the 1990 Clean Air Act. It has been delayed for more than 20 years because the coal plants cannot comply and remain profitable. So, the EPA is OK with shutting them down and removing 40% of that power source from the grid. Most Americans will not stand for that.

The EPA solution is to let the plants close if they do not comply. This agency is made up of uncompromising bullies, and Obama and the Senate have chosen not to rein them in. The best solution is to shut down the EPA but there is a way we all may have our cake and eat it too but the Department of Energy would have to pay the price.

Since the EPA likes to lord over other agencies, and since solar power is a game of chance in which taxpayers always lose, why not consider allocating what may be left (there was \$9 billion) in the DOE budget before they can give

more money to companies like Solyndra (\$535 million) or SunPower, the proud recipients of \$1.2 Billion.

As hard as it is for prudent Americans to believe, SunPower got their \$1.2 billion in guaranteed loans from DOE even after Solyndra had already failed and right after the company (Sun Power) had announced it was building a plant in Mexicali Mexico, and right before it received \$900 million in private financing.

The \$1.7 billion from Solyndra and SunPower could have been given to coal plants to help make their processes cleaner. I am not for industry subsidies but I am against the government propping up alternative energy companies as an excuse for unfettered crony capitalism.

The cash would sure go a long way to clean up the dirty coal plants and reduce their emissions into EPA compliance. There is no sense in taking whatever is left in DOE, (\$9 billion perhaps) and wasting it on another solar or geothermal deal.

If we remember that the EPA is as much against fossil fuels as it is against DDT and CFCs, the incandescent light bulbs, and unmeasured manure, then we already know why solar projects are destined from the get go to fail. Despite our best efforts, DOE will still get the funding cash while clean coal plant fossil fuel projects that could help America will get nothing. The EPA, the Senate, the Department of Energy, and the president must go.

This can be netted out by saying simply that the inmates are running the asylum, and apparently we can do nothing about it other than throw out our elected representatives—which we will surely do the next chance we get.

Can you imagine even considering taking 40% of the coal power plants off the grid? What would this do to jobs and the economy, the price of energy and the ability of regular people being able to provide light and heat for their homes? Besides delaying the 90% reduction standard for emissions, which is almost impossible, the bill also would have stopped the EPA from implementing a rule known as the cross-state air rule.

This cross-state bill is scheduled to require coal plants to limit toxic emissions that cross state lines and contribute to health and environmental damage. These are all good ideas to implement incrementally when the country has money and when the economy is not already in the toilet.

When you hear Republicans and a few Democrats, talking about job killing regulations imposed by Obama agencies without Congress acting, this is what they are talking about. To please Mother Nature, the EPA sees no problem in shutting down the coal industry, the power industry, or any other industry, few as there may be in today's America. For every job Obama claims to create, the EPA is prepared to take twice as many away.

We go back to the new charter of the EPA which does not include helping humans. It sees its main purpose as to protect nature. So, when EPA actions raise electricity prices, cause plant closures, and eliminate jobs, the EPA as an entity really does not care.

Officially the progressives and the EPA say they are saving lives and protecting public health. They claim that by slashing emissions of toxins that contribute to birth defects, lung disease, premature death, and asthma in young children, the cost to the economy is worth it. Yet, the science on their solutions is not settled and many scientists say the EPA is all wet.

Recently, the EPA had a chance to specifically help asthmatics. We discussed this in Chapter 15. The big, bad powerful yet, “caring” EPA said “no!” to children. The EPA said “no!” to asthmatics. They are an abysmal group of people.

Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky, who chairs the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power spoke on behalf of Americans who will not be able to eat or feed their children or heat their homes if the EPA has its way.

“Over 14 million Americans are unable to find work and millions more have stopped trying. The breaking pace at which EPA is cranking out new regulations is creating obstacles to job creation in America and also to stimulating the economy.”

This is the debate taking place in Congress right now even though the President is prepared to veto anything that helps the American economy. It is good that this debate is occurring but it is not good that Obama has given the EPA the upper hand. Once coal mines go out of business and coal power plants go offline, it will be too late to make sure we have enough energy to run the country.

How clean does air have to be?

If you knew that your air would be, say, .00000001 cleaner if you used no power, would you go ahead and turn off the main switch to your home? I can bet you a dollar to a donut that emissions would be reduced by at least that amount. Not driving would bring it down even further. So, at what point would you turn off the main? At what point would you stop driving? How much cleaner would your air have to be

for you to be willing to turn off the main and use no more power?

Isn't "shuttering power plants," a lot like turning off the main before the power has a chance to reach your house? The difference of course is that you have no choice. It would simply be lights out.

Everything in life is a trade-off but the EPA does not have to trade anything. They can take your job, bankrupt you, turn your lights off, make food prices unaffordable and make you use Chinese light bulbs at ten times the price, and you have nothing to trade. What do you get for that? Well, at least a .00000001 improvement in air quality. Would a rational person make that trade?

I do not think so.

Would a rational agency ask you to make that trade?

I rest my case.

Together, let's vote out all the bad senators, the bad representatives, the bad president, and then let's kill the EPA!

After God, the power of your vote is the source of all real power in the United States. Use your power.

God bless America, and opposite wishes for the EPA!

LETS GO PUBLISH! Books:

Sold at www.itjungle.com/store.html ,

Lets Go Publish! www.letsqopublish.com Our titles include the following list:

Kill the EPA!

An extended look at the troubles with regulations and the biggest perpetrator.

Obama's Seven Deadly Sins.

In this Presidency, there are deep concerns about the long-term prospects for the US. We examine each of the seven sins in detail, offer warnings and a number of solutions. This book may nudge you into moving to Canada or Europe.

Taxation Without Representation

At the time of the Boston Tea Party, there was no representation. Now, there is no representation again but there are "representatives."

Healthcare Accountability

Who should pay for your healthcare. Whose healthcare should you pay for? Is it a lifetime free ride on others or should those once in need of help have to pay back?

Jobs! Jobs! Jobs!

Where have all the American Jobs gone and how can we get them back?

The All Everything Operating System:

The story about IBM's finest operating system, its facilities, and how it came to be.

The All-Everything Machine

The story about IBM's finest computer server.

Chip Wars

The story of the ongoing war between Intel and AMD and the wars of Intel v. IBM This book may cause you to buy or sell somebody's stock.

Can the AS/400 Survive IBM?

Exciting book about the AS/400 / IBM i in an unfriendly world.

The System i Pocket Developers' Guide.

Comprehensive Pocket Guide to all of the AS/400 and IBM I development tools -

The System i Pocket Database Guide.

Complete Pocket Guide to IBM i integrated relational database (DB2 for i)

The System i Pocket SQL Guide.

Complete Pocket Guide to SQL as implemented on IBM i..

The System i Pocket Query Guide.

If you have been spending money for years educating your Query users, and you find you are still spending, or you've given up, this book is right for you.

The System i Pocket RPG & RPG IV Guide.

Comprehensive RPG & RPGIV Textbook -- Over 900 pages

The System i RPG Tutorial and Lab Guide - Revised in 2010.

Your guide to a hands-on Lab experience. Contains CD with Lab exercises