

Miscellany 29: Ian Fleming's *Goldfinger*; Avoiding Blame for the 9/11 Fiasco; Why Boycott Cuba and Not China?; I Told You So on Racial Profiling and the War in Iraq; The Latest Drug Scam: Take Fosamax, Get GERD, and then Take Nexium

Copyright © 2006 Joseph George Caldwell. All rights reserved.
Posted at Internet website <http://www.foundationwebsite.org>.
May be copied or reposted for non-commercial use, with attribution to author and website. (18 August 2006)

Contents

Miscellany 29: Ian Fleming's <i>Goldfinger</i> ; Avoiding Blame for the 9/11 Fiasco; Why Boycott Cuba and Not China?; I Told You So on Racial Profiling and the War in Iraq; The Latest Drug Scam: Take Fosamax, Get GERD, and then Take Nexium	1
Miscellany: Commentary on Recent Events and Reading	2
A Visit to the Relatives	2
Ben-Gurion Understood	5
Some Background on Ian Fleming's <i>Goldfinger</i>	6
Mankind Presses to Destroy the Earth.....	21
A Premonition.....	23
Time to Go Home	23
US Fails to Deport Chinese Illegal Aliens	24
Federal Judge Refuses to Uphold the Law	31
ICE Refuses to Deport Illegal Alien.....	31
If the Federal Government Chooses Not to Act on Immigration... ..	36
Empty Chinese Shipping Containers	39
US Government Convicts the Law-Enforcement Agents and Frees the Criminal	42
Parkland Memorial Hospital Doctor Wants You to Pay for Delivery of Mexican Anchor Babies	48
Lou Dobbs Is Sadly Mistaken: All Mass Immigration Is Bad for the US	49

High-Tech Soldiers Cannot Win the War in Iraq	49
I Hate to Say, “I told you so” (How to Win the War in Iraq)	52
I Hate to Say, “I told you so” (Racial Profiling Is Good).....	53
Avoiding Blame for the 9/11 Fiasco	56
Donald Rumsfeld to Hillary Clinton: “My Goodness”	58
Why Boycott Cuba and Not China?	59
Using Willie’s Biodiesel Means Killing People.....	59
Do Hot Dogs Cause Cancer?.....	60
Low-Cost Medicine: A Crime against Capitalism	61
The Latest Drug Scam: Take Fosamax, Get GERD, and then Take Nexium	63
Thank God I’m a Country Boy	64
Talladega Nights	64
No Loitering	65
Mother Theresa and Abe Lincoln	65
Fish Don’t Swim with Their Fins	66
Osmosis Is Not the Answer	66

Miscellany: Commentary on Recent Events and Reading

A Visit to the Relatives

I returned to the US on July 8 from my trip to East Timor, Australia and Bali, Indonesia. Since I had no other consulting assignments lined up, my wife suggested that we take a trip to the Gaspé Peninsula in Canada to visit my relatives. Our last visit there had been in 1998, just after the famous Quebec ice storm.

We traveled by air to Burlington, Vermont, took a bus to Montreal, and took the overnight train to New Richmond on the Gaspé. We had a delightful time renewing contact with my many relatives in that area. After a few days of introductions, I got to thinking that I was related to almost everyone in the area. Most of my immediate relatives live in the Cascapedia-St. Jules area. One

day we took a day trip with my cousin, Rose, to visit the Percé Rock at the end of the Peninsula. My Uncle Bob lives in what was formerly called Grand Cascapedia (or Grande Cascapédia), not far from the farm that my grandfather, Leslie Barter, carved out of the wilderness.

The progenitors of my relatives in that area – mainly Barters and Dows – were what are called “United Empire Loyalists.” They had settled in what is now the New England part of the United States in the 1600s and 1700s (the Barters from England and the Dows from Scotland), and moved to the Gaspé in the late 1700s when the thirteen British American colonies rebelled from Great Britain.

We stayed with my cousin Tracy and his wife, Clair, in their delightful “log cabin” cottage in St. Jules.

Our trip was from June 18 through June 29, but two days were lost on each end for travel, so that our stay in Gaspé lasted just a week, June 20-27. We spent most of the time chatting with relatives. In that long a time, you cover more than just reminiscing, and I got some insight on my relative’s political and philosophical views. Tracy passed along an interesting observation on current-day lifestyles: “Now that we have given up smoking, drinking and eating, we don’t necessarily live longer – it just feels that way!”

My Uncle Bob has led an interesting life. During the Second World War, he served with the Royal Rifles of Canada in the war in the Pacific. His unit was captured by the Japanese in Hong Kong on Christmas Day, 1941, and he spent four hard years working as a prisoner of war, initially on Hong Kong and then, for the last three years, in a coal mine in Japan.

While we were in Gaspé, the Israelis attacked Lebanon. Canada has opened its doors to mass immigration from Asia and the

Middle East, and there are now many thousands of Lebanese immigrants in Canada. As soon as the fighting started, many people in Lebanon holding foreign passports evacuated. Among these were 13,000 holders of Canadian passports. Bizarrely, the Canadian government has a policy of paying for evacuation of any holder of a Canadian passport, and so these people quickly lined up for a free trip to Canada. From the television coverage, it was rather obvious that for many of these people, their roots were in Lebanon, not Canada, and that they were simply using their Canadian citizenship as a “safety net” in case things turned bad in Lebanon. The August 5 issue of *The Economist* has an article about these “Canadians of convenience.” This article included the observation that until the 1960s Canadian immigration law explicitly preferred Europeans to black and Asiatic races.

During our stay, the Lebanon evacuation received extensive coverage on the television news and the newspapers. Because Canada was not instantly prepared to evacuate thirteen thousand people from Lebanon, there were some delays in the process. One Lebanese-Canadian woman was interviewed while waiting for her evacuation. She complained loudly about the incompetence of Canada in handling the operation. She said that she had lived in Canada for 28 years and up to now thought that it was well run, but she was now having second thoughts about “that country.” My cousin Tracy really bristled at her reference to Canada – which had granted her citizenship – as “that country.” The *Economist* article pointed out that under Canadian income tax law, the Lebanese-Canadians living in Lebanon did not have to pay Canadian income tax, yet Canada was footing the bill for their evacuation.

In referring to the free evacuation of Lebanese-Canadians, and to the recent terrorist activity of Canadian Moslems against Canada, my Uncle Bob made the following observation (quoted as best I can recall): “Our fathers restricted immigration to white

Europeans, and the country ran pretty well. Now that our current leaders are letting all of these people from the Middle East into the country, all hell has broken loose, and they are trying to destroy the country. Our ancestors were evidently wiser than we are.”

Ben-Gurion Understood

One of the newspaper articles I read while visiting Tracy and Clair was a letter to the editor in the Friday, July 21 edition of the (Toronto) Globe and Mail. Entitled, “Ben-Gurion Understood,” it was submitted by Mariam Sheibani of Ottawa. It read as follows:

Norman Rosencwaig (Israel's Success – letter, July 19) is not the first to claim that the goal of the Arab community is to "destroy" Israel. I fail to understand why Israel and its proponents are so shocked that it has not been welcomed in the Arab and Muslim world with open arms.

I am certain that if someone has been unjustly occupying your property, killing and kidnapping your children and threatening your very existence for six decades – regardless of who supported this person – your reaction wouldn't be very different from that of the Palestinians and those honest enough to sympathize with their plight.

This truth was well understood by Israel's early leaders. David Ben-Gurion, one of Israel's founders and its first prime minister, once told Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress: "If I were an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural: We have taken their country.... We come from Israel, but 2,000 years ago, and what is that to them? There has been anti-Semitism, the Nazis, Hitler, Auschwitz, but

was that their fault? They only see one thing: We have come here and stolen their country. Why should they accept that?"

At least Israel's founders didn't feign innocence. That's more than can be said for its current leaders and for those who support them.

Mariam Sheibani, Ottawa

[End of Sheibani letter.]

Prior to 1948, the modern state of Israel did not exist. Its existence owes to promotion of the idea by European Jews and sponsorship of the British Empire following the breakup of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East. Support for this state is not at all universal, and, in view of all of the trouble its existence has caused and is causing, it is time to reconsider whether its establishment was a good idea. At the very least, establishing it in the midst of a region occupied at the time entirely by Arabs seems to have been a very big mistake. Perhaps it should be abolished, as it has been for thousands of years. Or perhaps it should be moved somewhere else, e.g., to somewhere in Africa, where it would fit more harmoniously. Based on six decades of experience, the evidence seems overwhelming that it is a state in the wrong place at the wrong time. Its time was several millennia ago. Its time is not now.

Some Background on Ian Fleming's *Goldfinger*

A number of my relatives live along the Cascapédia River in Gaspé. The Cascapedia River is one of the world's great salmon-fishing rivers. My grandfather's farm was located about a mile from the river. My Uncle Bob owns fishing rights to a portion of it, behind his home, and he fishes (fly fishing) there on a regular

basis. During my recent visit, Tracy and Clair drove me and my wife, Jackie, north along the Cascapedia River toward its source. The source is located in a provincial park, the Parc National de la Gaspésie. We had lunch there in a grand old lodge called the Gite du Mont-Albert.

People come from all over the world to fly-fish for salmon in the Cascapedia River. There are some fabulous lodges along the river. One of them, near Tracy and Clair's house in St. Jules, was owned by Charles Engelhard, late owner of Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals Corporation. Here is an excerpt from an article written by Robert Stewart for the Atlantic Salmon Journal (Winter, 1997, Vol. 46(4)) about Warren Gilker, former head warden of Engelhard's lodge (named Camp Chaleur).

Warren too became a guide when he was not cutting timber, driving logs down river, or working on prospecting parties in the bush alongside the famous convicted murderer, Wilbert Coffin. Early pictures of him show a Hollywood image of the rugged woodsman: tall, handsome, muscular and sharp-eyed with a loose, shy grin.

The lodge he worked at, Camp Chaleur, eventually came under the ownership of Charles Engelhard, president of Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals Co. of Newark, New Jersey. Gilker had a job grading lumber at a local sawmill from which he took a leave of absence during the fishing season. He was about to return to it in 1957 when, as he recounts, Engelhard said: "No, I got more money than them mill people, and you're staying."

Engelhard could well afford it. His vast precious metals empire was said to have controlled, among other things, the world supply of platinum. But his passion in life was salmon fishing, especially on the Cascapédia, where he kept three lodges for his family and guests: Chaleur, New Dereen and Lorne Cottage. Gilker became

full-time manager of Camp Chaleur, which was reserved for Engelhard's favorite guests.

Among them were Harry Oppenheimer, the South African diamond king; Robert Oppenheimer (no relation), chief builder of the atomic bomb; Ian Fleming, creator of James Bond; and band leader Benny Goodman. Warren knew them all, plus a succession of other celebrities and chief executive officers of some of the world's largest corporations. He was a particularly close friend of "the good old musician from New York," as he calls the late Benny Goodman. Bobby Orr, who is almost as good a fisherman as he was a hockey player, remains a personal pal.

He became a cherished friend of the Engelhard family, frequently visiting their grand estate in Fair Hill, New Jersey, on business and social occasions. There he met the likes of the Duke and Duchess of Windsor and John and Jacqueline Kennedy. He once drew giggles from a serving maid in the family mansion when he looked over a table setting of crisp white linen and a confusing array of cutlery and announced: "Don't laugh if I make a mistake. I'm a lumberjack from Canada. I'm used to eating on logs."

Life was good, but the fishing was bad. In 1960, Charles Engelhard caught one salmon all season. There were two reasons why the Cascapédia, which has all the natural advantages of a great salmon river, was so bereft of fish. One was that the company that drove pulp logs down to its mill, Consolidated Bathurst, had placed a boom at the mouth of the river that blocked off access to returning salmon. The other was that poaching was running amok.

The local attitude was that "those goddamn rich Americans" had no moral right to every salmon that came upstream, so it was okay to take all you could get illegally. Poachers used nets, dynamite and weighted hooks designed to jig fish.

[End of Stewart extract – the entire article appears at <http://www.asf.ca/Journal/1997/Wint97/groldman.html> .]

Tracy told me that after Charles Engelhard died, his five daughters took over the lodge, and use it to this day (it costs about a quarter of a million dollars to operate the lodge for the three summer months, each year).

Here is a little more on Charles Engelhard. He is the man on whom Ian Fleming reportedly styled the character Auric Goldfinger in his classic spy novel, *Goldfinger*. (The following excerpt is from Chapter 18, “The American Conspiracy,” of Edward Jay Epstein’s book, *The Diamond Invention*, at <http://www.edwardjayepstein.com/diamond/chap18.htm>).

The founder of Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals, Charles Engelhard, was a well-connected American entrepreneur who had inherited a small metal fabricating company from his father. In the late 1940s, he had journeyed to South Africa to make his fortune. South African mines had a surplus of gold, but government regulations prohibited the exporting of gold bullion from South Africa without permits from the central bank, which were very difficult to obtain. Great Britain, which still controlled the financial affairs of South Africa, wanted to retain as much gold as possible within the sterling bloc. Engelhard found a loophole through that regulation: while it was illegal to export gold bars, it was legal to export *objets d'art* made of gold. Engelhard formed a company called Precious Metals Development that bought gold from the mines and cast it in the form of statues and other religious items. Engelhard exported these religious *objets d'art* to Hong Kong, where they were melted down and turned back into gold bullion, which could then be sold on the free market. (This ploy was later used by Ian Fleming, who was a business partner of Engelhard, in his novel *Goldfinger*.)

While living in Johannesburg, Engelhard became a close friend of Harry Oppenheimer. Both men were approximately the same age and came from the same German-Jewish background. Both men were born millionaires, who later owned and controlled their own family businesses. And both men also shared a passion for racehorses (at one point, Engelhard owned 250 thoroughbred horses). Oppenheimer invited Engelhard to join the board of Anglo-American Corporation, and for his part, Engelhard invited Oppenheimer to participate in a number of mutually profitable joint ventures.

[End of Epstein quote.]

Here is some more on Engelhard, taken from an article "Goldfinger Buys a Library: Dirty Money," by Jonathan D. Ratner in The Harvard Crimson (October 13, 1978), <http://www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=109852> .

"The policy of South Africa as expressed by the new Prime Minister [John Vorster] is as much in the interests of South Africa as anything I can think of or suggest. I am not a South African, but there is nothing I would do better or differently." – U.S. multinational businessman Charles W. Engelhard, 1967

"...the library in the new building will be named the Charles Engelhart Public Affairs Library, in recognition of a gift of one million dollars from the Charles Engelhard Foundation." – JFK School of Government Spring 1978 Bulletin.

When the rich and the powerful of the land converge on Cambridge next weekend to dedicate the new facilities of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard hopes it will be inaugurating a new era in the training of American public servants. Harvard will also be honoring Charles W. Engelhard, the man who for two decades served as the United States' largest corporate backer of the apartheid regime in South Africa. Not just

any small-time mogul who has run roughshod over the political and economic rights of 18 million people, but the very epitome of U.S. corporate complicity in apartheid. It is a situation that demonstrates philanthropy at its self-serving worst.

Without any consumer products that bear his name, Charles Engelhard has never attracted much publicity or fame in the U.S. In black Africa, however, the man whose money built the Charles Engelhard Public Affairs Library at the Kennedy School was notorious. In less than 20 years, Engelhard built an inherited \$20 million dollars into a global empire worth more than a quarter billion dollars at the time of his death in 1971.

South African investments were the lynch pin, the growth point of his global empire. "American and European millions are cigarette money to Engelhard's operation; the real money comes from South Africa," Paul Jacobs wrote for Ramparts magazine in 1966. It is difficult to know exactly how large the Engelhard family's interests in South Africa were and continue to be. Charles Engelhard was a master of the secret stock deal, the creation of the paper corporation. He owned companies that were subsidiaries of subsidiaries of subsidiaries. Through a wide range of company chairmanships and directorships, and minority and majority stock participation, Engelhard is believed to have controlled at one time no fewer than 23 different South African enterprises, in fields ranging from chemicals to timber to plastics. The center of the network was Engelhard Hanovia, the family holding company that started the foundation in 1940.

By far the largest of Engelhard's stakes, however, was in the South African gold mining industry, which for decades has mined sub-economic gold by employing Africans at wages half the poverty datum level. Largely through his chairmanship and stock holdings in Rand Mines, Engelhard's interests controlled an estimated 15 per cent of South African gold mining industry during

the '60s. Indeed, it was through his entry into the South African gold industry during the early '50s that Engelhard first started to turn his father's relatively modest metals business into a global powerhouse. Setting himself up as a bullion dealer in South Africa, Engelhard beat restrictions on the export of newly mined gold by manufacturing solid gold art items – solid gold pulpit tops, dishes, bracelets. Once legally exported in this manner, they would be melted down into bullion again.

Perhaps just as significant as the huge direct economic holdings of the Engelhard empire is the role Engelhard played as the leader of the U.S. business community in South Africa. Wrote Forbes, "Success in South Africa has imposed its obligations, and Engelhard has dutifully fulfilled them." In 1958, Engelhard founded the American-South African Investment Co., Limited, a closed-end trust designed to stimulate portfolio investment by Americans in South African enterprises. Throughout the '60s, Engelhard served as chairman of this trust, which was hugely successful.

In the aftermath of the 1961 Sharpsville massacre in which South African police killed 67 unarmed African demonstrators, foreign capital took flight, bringing the white minority regime perilously close to collapse. Ever true to his friends, Charles Engelhard engineered the American bank loans that helped refloat the South African economy and its instruments of repression.

In her book *The South African Connection*, the anti-apartheid author Ruth First writes that "by many South Africans Engelhard is regarded as the savior of the post-Sharpsville economy." Individuals of somewhat different political sensibilities hold exactly the same view. Anglo-American, the multibillion dollar conglomerate that dominates the South African economy, offers this official word on Charles Engelhard: "In difficult times, when South Africa was badly in need of capital, Engelhard played a vital

and significant role in helping to bring it from abroad. He thus not only restored confidence in the country's economy, but actively assisted in boosting it."

Engelhard had his own self-serving arguments to explain his lack of criticism of the white minority regime. In 1966, Engelhard received a "brotherhood" award from a New Jersey religious council while hundreds outside the banquet hotel protested Engelhard's support for apartheid, chanting "Brotherhood can't be bought." Inside the hotel, Engelhard tried to justify his activities to the guests assembled to honor him: "You have certain obligations as a guest in the country in which you do business. One of these obligations consists of not criticizing what they do at home, since you don't want them to criticize what we do at home. Perhaps if we were perfect, we could criticize people. But we are not perfect, and I think perhaps that is my argument with people outside tonight."

A more self-serving argument has perhaps never been made by an American earning millions off the slave-wage labor of black South African gold miners. But upon closer examination, one finds it was not even simply a matter of "make your money and keep quiet" for Charlie Engelhard. More than any other American, Charles Engelhard gave direct political support to the Nationalist government. Engelhard sat on the boards of Witwatersrand Native Labor Association and Native Recruiting Agency, two South African government agencies which recruit cheap African labor to work in the mines.

Engelhard also served as a leading officer of the South African Foundation, a South African government businessmen's public relations front on which no other American would agree to serve. This foundation was set up in the words of its leaders "because there is a systematic, well-organized, well-financed attack on South Africa, conducted on a world scale by a number of

organizations supported by Afro-Asian and Communist interests." And while Engelhard was busy telling American detractors that U.S. corporate involvement could play a constructive role in helping bring South Africa's black majority toward full political participation, his foundation's book, *South Africa in the Sixties*, was arguing that "in regard to overall direction, white hegemony is to prevail."

It would be misleading, however, to paint a picture of a Charles Engelhard who only palled around with the South African officials whose policies made it possible to build his empire. Engelhard had friends in high political places in the U.S. as well. A generous contributor to the Democratic party, Engelhard was confidante to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Often, Engelhard's cultivation of American politicians caused embarrassment for the U.S. Johnson, especially, made a habit of sending Engelhard as a U.S. representative to African state ceremonies. In 1964, for instance, Engelhard asked the president to send him as U.S. representative to Zambia's independence ceremonies. Johnson agreed, and throughout black Africa, where Engelhard was universally viewed as a *persona non grata*, African leaders reacted with shock and indignation.

Budding technocrats at the Kennedy School may find cause to admire the fiscal prudence with which Engelhard built his father's \$20 million nest egg into a quarter-billion dollar empire. In his non-corporate life, however, Engelhard was not exactly the thrifty sort. His expenditures on life's luxuries make his philanthropic pittance pall by comparison. Before he died, Engelhard owned nine homes on four continents, including a hunting lodge in the Transvaal, and a mansion outside Johannesburg.

Engelhard stabled race horses in North Carolina, England and South Africa, \$15 million worth of race horses -- about the same amount that the Engelhard Foundation has in assets. He needed

three private jets and a helicopter to transport him to his international business and pleasure appointments.

A 1965 Forbes magazine article suggested that Engelhard even served as the model for Ian Fleming's notorious character, Goldfinger, who attempted to monopolize the world's gold reserves. (Fleming and Engelhard had some business dealings in London during the late '40s, just when Engelhard was starting to build his gold empire.) Engelhard never denied this possibility, and often seemed to delight in the suggestion.

Kennedy School officials approached the Engelhards with its gift application last year after Charles' daughter, Sophie Engelhard, a 1977 Kennedy School graduate, suggested the family foundation as a possible source of funding. Kennedy School Associate Dean Ira Jackson, the Kennedy School classmate of Sophie who drafted the gift proposal, said his knowledge of Engelhard business operations at that time "was virtually nil, and still is. There was no research or probing, no background effort was made to study Engelhard's corporate activity," he said. "There never is when we're approaching a legitimate foundation that has made large gifts before. We're more concerned with the projects and orientation of the foundation, not the source of the money they give." Needless to say, the proposal Jackson drafted, requesting \$1 million to build a library to be named for Charles Engelhard, won the quick approval of the family foundation, and by spring, the Kennedy School was graciously thanking the Engelhard Foundation for the gift in its alumni bulletin.

The Charles Engelhard Public Affairs Library is now a reality. Within a matter of months, its now-empty shelves will be filled with books. All that's left for Harvard to do is sing the praises of Engelhard's family at next week's dedication ceremony and to fasten the sign on the wall of the library that will make it hard for

anyone to fail to recognize, however unconsciously, the charity of Charles Engelhard.

With all this understood, there is no doubt a large element of moral catharsis involved in an exposition of Engelhard's misdeeds. Nevertheless, the question – now clearly moot – must be asked: Should Harvard have accepted this gift?

Some may argue that very little of the clean stuff circulates among the foundations that offer such gifts, so to start singling out the gifts of some as unacceptable is hypocritical. A Kennedy School official, attempting to explain his approach to gifts such as the Engelhard million, said he found some validity in the argument President Lowell used to make, that "to reject one gift on moral grounds would be to certify the moral validity and rectitude of past gifts." This argument seems as much an abdication of social responsibility as Engelhard's explanation of why he chose not to criticize the South African government.

The moral calculus that determines whether individuals or institutions should accept money they feel is tainted is ultimately a subjective, individual one. There are certainly no hard and fast rules to invoke in making the determination. But criteria can be employed, distinctions can be made.

The argument that universities should always accept "no strings attached money" no matter how objectionable the source is a fairly forceful one. But here the standard definition of "no strings attached money" is in need of revision. A gift must not only have no conditions placed on its use; it must also be agreed that the source of the gift remain anonymous. Harvard, by allowing the Charles Engelhard Foundation to be publicly associated with the new facility legitimizes, however subtly, Engelhard's business practices.

This leads one to a second criterion for evaluating gifts: the currency of the reprehensible business practice in question. Some will argue that time cleanses dirty money. In a sense, it does, for if a family no longer earns its money in questionable ways, the public gift does not have quite the same self-serving legitimating impact. But while the Cabots may now be hundreds of years removed from the wealth they earned in the slave trade, the Engelhard family South African connection lives on, albeit without Charles W.

Shortly before his death, Engelhard, in a complicated series of transactions, sold off much of his South African interests to Anglo-American and other companies. The current Engelhard family parent corporation, Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals, still has diversified holdings in South Africa, but in the recent climate of intensified criticism of U.S. operations there, the Engelhard company has refused to disclose the extent of the assets and activities of its privately held South African subsidiary. In October, 1976, the company refused to cooperate with Sen. Dick Clark's committee studying U.S. investments in Southern Africa.

Meanwhile, the Engelhard family has shifted much of its formerly South African capital into the manufacture of pollution control devices. But somehow it doesn't seem to make their money much cleaner.

"The key to the misery of these people is to let them get enough to eat, enough clothes, a car and some financial stability. I don't care what the college professors say, I know this is what the black people of Africa want." – Charles W. Engelhard, 1966

[End of Rattner article.]

The contribution by the Engelhard Foundation to the Harvard Library caused quite a stir. Here is the text of an article,

“Foundation Will Not Force K-School to Name Library After Industrialist Engelhard”, by Susan D. Chira and The Crimson Staff in the 11 May 1979 issue of The Harvard Crimson at <http://www.thecrimson.com/printerfriendly.aspx?ref=107304> .

The Engelhard Foundation, after discussions with representatives from the Kennedy School of Government's Committee on Gifts, will not require the Kennedy school to name its library after Charles W. Engelhard, whose \$200 million financial empire was based largely on investments in South African gold mines.

In discussions with the Engelhard family that three students from the committee initiated a month ago, the two groups agreed – subject to the final approval of Kennedy School and University officials – that the school will place a plaque inside the library acknowledging the gift of the foundation "made in memory of Charles W. Engelhard."

No plaque or signs will be placed on the library calling it the Engelhard Library, and Kennedy School administrators will not officially refer to it as the Engelhard Library, students on the committee said yesterday.

President Bok and Graham T. Allison Jr. '62, dean of the Kennedy School, must approve the agreement before it becomes final, however, the students added. Allison and Bok, who is vacationing in Austria, could not be reached for comment today.

"The foundation accepts the fact that the library is not named for Charles W. Engelhard," Bernard Fennell, a member of the committee, said today.

The agreement "perpetuates and institutionalizes the status quo – the operational fact that until now the library has had no name," a member of the gifts committee said today. The Kennedy School

has never held an official naming ceremony, and in its official announcements, it has not referred to the library as the Engelhard Library, but as its public affairs library. "Sophie Engelhard is aware of how the phone has been answered and how the bookplates read," Dean Pineles, a Kennedy School student and participant in the discussions, said today.

Representatives of the Engelhard family could not be reached for comment today.

During their discussions with members of the Engelhard family, members of the gift committee proposed an alternative wording for the plaque that would have dropped the phrase, "In memory of Charles W. Engelhard," a source close to the discussions said. Family members reportedly unilaterally rejected this alternative.

The agreement does allow for "a recognition of Charles Engelhard in the library," a member of the committee said today. "It is not an absolute denial of everything the foundation wanted and gave the money for," he added.

The foundation's gift, with its stipulation that the library be named after Engelhard, angered many students and faculty because of Engelhard's extensive financial involvement in South Africa.

"I thought it represented a gross insensitivity on the part of a school that is supposed to espouse lofty ideals, and I got involved in the discussions because I felt very strongly about that," one of the students who participated in the discussions said today.

The two groups regard the agreement as a permanent resolution of the issue, Pineles and David Kelston, Kennedy School students who participated in the discussions, said today. "This will be a final solution and not an invitation for a back door solution – it's not an ideal solution, but a real life compromise," Pineles added.

A letter signed by five students on the committee and Jonathan Moore, director of the Institute of Politics, explaining the terms of the agreement and asking Allison to establish an advisory committee on gifts was delivered to Allison's office late yesterday afternoon. Allison said last night he could not comment on the letter until he reads it.

The committee recommended April 11 that the K-School review the benefits of potential gifts and the donor's public record to ensure that facilities are not named after persons "who do not deserve to be honored." It also suggested that donors have no right to force the school to accept its wishes regarding names.

Sources in the Kennedy School said today that although the original contract between the school and the foundation required that the library be named after Engelhard, the present agreement does not violate the terms of the contract. "The foundation feels its interests are protected," Kelston added.

Daniel Steiner '54, general counsel to the University, said today as a general principle, contracts can be modified if both parties agree.

A spokesman for the Southern Africa Solidarity Committee (SASC) said today the agreement "represents a triumph of majority opinion within the Harvard community. Student and Faculty protest has succeeded in altering official University policy." He added, however, the SASC believes the agreement is incomplete because the school will put a plaque in the library. "The Harvard community has made clear that it abhors any public memorials," he said. A spokesman for the Black Students Association declined to comment at this time.

Pineles said, "If you give a literal reading to the wording on the plaque, you will see it is a memorial but only on the part of the foundation. That's a key distinction, one I hope other groups will recognize."

[End of Chira article.]

The episode of Harvard's accepting a gift of a million dollars from the Engelhards and agreeing to name the Kennedy School library after Engelhard, and then refusing to do so on the ground that it did not approve of apartheid or the low wages paid in South African mines – but not returning the money – makes the administration, faculty, and students of Harvard out as little more than shameless whores and prostitutes – they are willing to trade their virtue for cash. Their hollow screams of righteous indignation are drowned out by the peals of laughter of ridicule at their incredibly hypocritical and inconsistent position. If they were sincere, and they really did not want to profit from activities that they criticized as immoral, they return the million dollars – they would not be able to stand the shame of using, every day, a library built from what they claimed were ill-gotten gains.

My cousin, Tracy, related to me an interesting anecdote about a relative of mine, Ernie Coull, who was working as a guide for Mr. Engelhard. One day, when getting into the fishing canoe, Mr. Engelhard commented to Ernie, "It's a terrible thing to be so rich and feel so poor," to which Ernie replied, "Yes, but it's also a terrible thing to be so poor and feel so well."

Mankind Presses to Destroy the Earth

My cousin, Tracy, subscribes to the magazine, The Atlantic Salmon Journal, from which I quoted above. It is a very interesting magazine. The issue (Summer 2005, Vol. 54, No. 2)

on Tracy's coffee table contained an article, "Foul Air, Poisoned Water," by Martin Silverstone. Here follows an excerpt from this article.

It took a head-on collision with bad smog days [in Montreal] to wake me up to the fact that air pollution has not gone away. In fact, it has gotten worse. There are strict rules on car emissions, but we are driving more cars, lots more. SO₂ emissions are down, but there are more factories, more homes, more electricity being produced than ever before.

...acid rain probably originated way back during the 1730s, at the height of the industrial revolution in big cities like London. It was more or less "discovered" in the 1950s and started really being noticed in the 1960s. Tall chimneys on factories that allow the wind to transport pollutants far away from their source compounded the problem. Despite some famous examples of large-scale destruction – decimation of half of the trees in the Black Forest in Germany, for instance – acid rain remained a very contentious issue through the 1980s.

Atlantic salmon often have difficulty reproducing in water of pH 5.5. A pH of 5.0 is toxic to them. Currently, 14 rivers in Nova Scotia have a mean annual pH of less than 4.7 and the salmon runs in once celebrated salmon streams like the Jordan, Clyde, and Sable are extinct.

Another 20 rivers, with a mean annual pH of 4.7 to 5.0, have only remnant populations in one or two tributaries. These include streams such as the Bear and Nictaux.

A further 16 rivers have mean annual pH values of 5.1 to 5.4. Salmon stocks are depleted in some tributaries, but in the main stream and less affected tributaries production appears normal. Rivers in this category include such well-known streams as the

Gold, LeHavre and Medway on the South Shore; and Moser, St. Marys and Liscomb on the Eastern Shore [of Nova Scotia].

A Premonition

One evening while my wife and I visited relatives in the Gaspé, I had an interesting conversation with Harry, my cousin Phyllis's friend. Harry is about my age. As a youth, Harry had always had a premonition that his father would be killed. When he was about 20, Mrs. Charles Engelhard arranged a job for him in Florida. He boarded the night train in Grande Cascapedia, headed for Montreal (the train no longer stops at Cascapedia-St Jules, but nowadays only at nearby New Richmond). At Mont Joli, the conductor awakened him, and told him that he had to get off the train and return home. A policeman was standing there. Harry asked the policeman, "Is my father dead?" The policeman refused to answer, and told him that he should telephone home.

In those days, there was a lot of logging done, and a large paper mill operated in New Richmond. A truck loaded with logs was on its way to the mill. As fate would have it, Harry's father was driving a car behind the truck, with his wife at his side. It was nighttime, and no one saw the log at the top of the truck sliding slowly backward. As it slid off the load, it pierced the windshield of Harry's father's car and drove straight through his chest into the back seat of the car.

Time to Go Home

When I was young, the English controlled the Gaspé. At that time, my relatives did not even bother to learn French. Things have really changed. Now, it is forbidden to display English-only signs, and the French control the economy, and the jobs. My

Uncle Bob had little use for the changes, and so at one point he moved out west, with Aunt Bertha, to British Columbia. Things were much better there. The culture was English. The money was great, and his employer expressed appreciation for his work – something that he, as English, no longer experienced in the Gaspé.

But Aunt Bertha could not leave her roots. All of her family and friends were back in the East. Bob did his best to make her happy, but her heart was not there. He built a home for her, but she refused to occupy it, knowing that if she did, they would never return to the Gaspé. One night, after five years in BC, they were headed back to town – Dawson Creek – late in the evening. From their location, the town was a pretty sight – the lights of the houses sparkling like diamonds in the cold, clear night air. Bob commented how pretty it looked, and how nice it was to be back home. The tears welled in Bertha’s eyes as she said, “This is not my home.” Bob looked at her and said, “No, it’s not. We’re going back home.” They returned to the Gaspé soon after.

US Fails to Deport Chinese Illegal Aliens

The March 16, 2006 edition of the CNN television program Lou Dobbs Tonight included a report about the conviction of a lady who has smuggled many Chinese into the US. Here follows a transcript of that report:

The woman found guilty of financing the deadly voyage of the Golden Venture more than a decade ago today was sentenced in New York City. Sister Ping, as she is known, was sentenced to 35 years in prison for financing the Golden Venture voyage and other human smuggling operations from China to this country.

During her sentencing, Sister Ping was called one of the most powerful and successful illegal alien smugglers in American history. The Golden Venture, filled with 300 illegal alien Chinese nationals, ran aground off New York City in 1993, 10 people drowned trying to make it to shore.

Chinese human smuggling operations into this country have only grown since the Golden Venture. It is now a multi-billion dollar a year business. Chinese nationals will do and pay just about anything to make it into the United States.

Christine Romans reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CHRISTINE ROMANS, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Indentured servitude is thriving in this country. Asian smugglers, called "snakeheads," charge up to \$70,000 to bring a Chinese immigrant here illegally.

KO-LIN CHIN, RUTGERS SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE: They know that once they got here to the United States, they will have no problem finding a job. And secondly, and that's the most important reason, and that is sooner or later, they were able to find a way to become U.S. citizens.

ROMANS: Professor Ko-Lin Chin has interviewed hundreds of smuggled Chinese immigrants and their snakeheads. Their families pay the bill and it takes six years of work, 70 hours a week to pay it back.

Once free of their own debt, they're expected to pay for their extended families, ensuring an endless cycle of smuggling. They come largely from Fujian Province, the majority by land. So common is the trip via Mexico, many Mexican smugglers, called

coyotes, now speak Chinese. They also come by commercial air travel and by ship in dangerous shipping containers and they settle all over the country.

It's a \$10 billion a year criminal enterprise with tens of thousands of willing participants. Once here, parents fulfill the dream of an American-born child, but can't work off their debt and care for them.

CHIN: A lot of these illegal immigrants are now sending their babies back to mainland China.

ROMANS: Dr. Henry Chung has studied this trend in New York City's Chinatown and says it's happening nationwide.

DR. HENRY CHUNG, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY: All the parents report that they are doing this because they must work and that typical work schedules require a minimum six days a week, sometimes seven days a week at a stretch.

ROMANS: Once they pay off their debts, they bring their children back. There are 35 million people living in Fujian Province and the greatest accomplishment there is to have a family member smuggled into the United States.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

ROMANS: Once here, many file for asylum (ph), they have American-born children and frankly face little risk of being sent back. The Department of Homeland Security says China is, by far, the least cooperative country in taking back its own citizens. DHS says China refuses, Lou, to take back 39,000 Chinese nationals the Department of Homeland Security has identified must go.

DOBBS: And it's correct, that's the only country in the world that is refusing to take back its citizens, right?

ROMANS: At this point there are a couple of others, that the DHS won't say who they are, but that they're having trouble getting those to take them back too.

DOBBS: OK, Christine Romans, fascinating, thank you.

[End of Lou Dobbs report.]

On the August 1, 2006 edition of Lou Dobbs Tonight, it was reported that there are an estimated 40,000 Chinese illegal aliens in this country, but that the US is powerless to deport them to China, because China insists that we must prove that they are in fact Chinese citizens.

Here follows a transcript of the segment.

But first, the U.S. government tonight is trying to deport some 40,000 Chinese illegal aliens back to communist China. But the government of communist China refuses to allow them to be sent back. So our Department of Homeland Security has decided to respond by simply letting them go.

Kitty Pilgrim has the report.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

KITTY PILGRIM, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice over): If Chinese illegal immigrants are caught in the United States and U.S. immigration officers try to deport them, China routinely refuses to take them back. Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff recently said out of all the illegal immigrant groups, they're the largest population that we've had difficulty returning.

There are about 40,000 illegal Chinese immigrants in the U.S. today with orders to be sent home. They are routinely released because China won't accept them. Only 600 are now in custody.

In a recent speech, Chertoff appears to cave in to the Chinese government and the illegal influx, saying, "If illegal immigrants are not accepted back, then for all intents and purposes, they are free to remain in this country, because we have no place to remove them to."

Chinese gangs have operated the lucrative smuggling rings for years, taking thousands of dollars in fees to bring illegal Chinese immigrants to the United States.

PAUL VIRTUE, FMR. GEN. COUNSEL, INS: It sends a message to people who might come to the U.S. illegally that -- that it may be very difficult for them to be returned, and if they make it here, they may end up being here for years and years, or possibly even be able to live here.

PILGRIM: The United States is highly dependent on trade with China, so some say the United States has no real way to take action. Normal retaliatory measures like withholding visas would hurt business travel and would also hurt U.S. business.

BATES GILL, CENTER FOR STRATEGIC & INTERNATIONAL STUDIES: China is an important country. It has a lot of influence in all different aspects of the global system. And so it's not going to be as easy for the United States to apply pressures or seek these sorts of concessions from China as it might be with other countries.

PILGRIM: China is clearly breaking with international protocols and standards without consequences.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

PILGRIM: Now, China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs has denied the charge. They say they're cooperating with U.S. immigration authorities. That cooperation is turning out to be a mere token gesture.

In June, a charter flight of 100 illegal Chinese immigrants went back to China, but that's a mere fraction of the tens of thousands of Chinese illegal aliens that have been caught here in the United States, Lou. And the best part of it is China says they have to make sure that they're really citizens of China before they take them back.

DOBBS: I wouldn't trust our Department of Homeland Security either. They can't confirm anything. They seemingly are impotent and incapable in everything they attempt to do.

PILGRIM: This is one of the most unbelievable stories.

DOBBS: I think the idea of Michael Chertoff, the secretary of Homeland Security, just throwing his hands up and saying, well, I guess they're going to get to stay here because there's no cooperation from China, this man is running a department that is an utter and complete joke and sham. Can't secure the ports, can't secure the borders, can't deport people.

I wonder what the impact would be -- most of the illegal immigrants in this country, those illegal aliens, come from Mexico, from Central America. What if Vicente Fox, George Bush's big pal, decided he wouldn't take any back?

Oh, that's right. We're not sending them back anyway. Never mind.

Kitty Pilgrim, the absurdity goes on, brought to you by your federal government.

Thank you. Appreciate it.

[End of Lou Dobbs report.]

I have an easy solution to get rid of the 40,000 Chinese illegal aliens. First, pass a law making illegal immigration a capital crime. Give them 30 days to leave the country (at their own expense – the same way they got here), or face execution. At the end of the thirty days, start executing them, publicly, one each day. Very soon, there would be no Chinese illegal aliens in this country. If the American public is too squeamish to execute illegal aliens, who are destroying their culture and their environment and murdering US citizens, then here is an alternative. Allow the Chinese illegal aliens 30 days to leave the country. At the end of this period, round up all who remain and intern them in a concentration camp. Put them to work at hard labor. Any one who wants to leave may be conscripted in the US Armed forces, and sent to Iraq (or other similar project). At the end of his tour of duty, he will be given mustering-out pay sufficient for him to take a tramp steamer back to China. If he still refuses to leave the US, he must return to the concentration camp to continue hard labor, or he may volunteer for another term in Iraq.

This approach would help solve two problems facing the US – it would get rid of a large proportion of the illegal aliens, and it would generate a lot of non-US-citizen “cannon fodder” for the war in Iraq. If this “pilot test” using Chinese illegal aliens proved successful, it could be extended: round up all twelve million illegal aliens now in the US, and ship them all to Iraq.

Federal Judge Refuses to Uphold the Law

The August 1, 2006 of Lou Dobbs Tonight presented an incredible report about a US federal judge who refuses to order illegal aliens deported on the grounds that he believes that US law may change soon, and that under the new law, they will be allowed to stay. This country has really degenerated when federal judges will not uphold the law, and are allowed to continue to practice.

On that same report, it was noted that it is easy to cross US borders with fake IDs. That problem is readily solved – just close the borders.

ICE Refuses to Deport Illegal Alien

The August 17, 2006, edition of Lou Dobbs Tonight contained a segment about an illegal alien who is seeking refuge in a church in Chicago, hoping to avoid deportation. Here follows the report:

DOBBS: Tonight, in Chicago, an illegal alien trying to avoid deportation to Mexico again remains in a Methodist Church seeking sanctuary. The case is becoming a flash point in the battle over illegal immigration. Elvira Arellano violated numerous American laws and has been deported before. U.S. immigration authorities say they will arrest her at a time of their choosing. Jonathan Freed is in Chicago tonight with the story. Jonathan?

JONATHAN FREED, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Lou, I'll set the scene for you. We are in day three of this where the woman is inside this church with her seven-year-old son claiming the ancient right of sanctuary trying to avoid deportation. Outside the building, depending on the time of day, you can have from a dozen to two dozen supporters. We were there midday today and the numbers were sort of in between there. The big question,

though, outside up until now, we have not seen any immigration authorities. And the question is when might they show up? Now, I spoke to the people at ICE [Immigration and Customs Enforcement] today, Lou. They say let me put in it context for you – they said there are 590,000 immigration fugitives, as they call them, right now in the United States. I'll give that you number again, 590,000.

And they say that they're going after what they call the more dangerous criminal cases first. So I said, so does that mean that she might have to make herself a little bit comfortable inside that church if she intends to wait it out? And you kind of got a chuckle on the other end of the phone there.

Now, we spoke to the woman's lawyer as well. He denies – he disputes the fact that they have classified her as a fugitive, saying that she told ICE where she is, and that she would not resist arrest. Lou, the lawyer also told me that they are looking at going to federal court to try to argue that deporting the mother would effectively be deporting the son who is an American citizen. Lou?

DOBBS: And the – in other words, you're saying that Arellano is the one who is trying to create a confrontation here?

FREED: They're saying – I said, so, in this case we're looking at somebody who is being very vocal, who is drawing attention to herself, but that in your mind, you don't see her as a dangerous case that needs to be addressed immediately. And that's the – you sort of listen to what they don't say. And that effectively is the conclusion that you draw.

DOBBS: Well, let's take a look at another thing that ICE has been saying and we've been reporting on this show for a very long time. Almost 600,000 fugitive illegal aliens in this country, and there are just about 3,000 ICE agents and only a fraction of those

available to pursue those unknown illegal alien fugitives in this country.

Add to that anywhere between 12 million and 20 million illegal aliens living in this country and you can see why this country really is in a crisis when it comes to illegal immigration and border security. We will continue to follow this case, obviously, very carefully. Jonathan Freed, we thank you very much for that report from Chicago.

FREED: Thanks.

[End of Lou Dobbs report.]

It is very clear that the ICE has no intention of ever deporting the woman, hiding behind its claim that it has more important things to deal with. It is clear that 3,000 ICE agents cannot possibly deport 12 million illegal aliens, or even the 600,000 fugitive illegal aliens. As long as the US does not impose severe penalties for the crime of illegal immigration, the illegal aliens already here will remain here, and millions more will come. The US policy of “catch and release” shows clearly that the US has no intention of deporting them. It will never deport them, unless forced to do so by a furious electorate, because they generate massive wealth for the oligarchy of wealthy elite who own and control the country through their plutocrat government.

The US could rid itself of all illegal aliens in a matter of days or weeks, if it would simply pass a law making illegal immigration a capital crime, and executing one illegal alien in public each day. It will never take this or any other effective measure, however, because it wants massive immigration, to make the wealthy wealthier. It does not matter to the government whether it is legal or illegal migration – that is clear from the government attempts to put all illegal aliens on a “path to citizenship.”

The United States is being destroyed by massive population growth, all of which is being fueled by immigration and the offspring of immigration. The US birth rate dropped to replacement level by the 1970s. All population growth in the US for the past several decades has been from immigration (including progeny of recent immigrants). For each additional person added to the US population – whether legal or illegal – an acre of natural land is destroyed, by conversion to homes, road, hospitals, schools, commercial buildings, and other infrastructure. Illegal aliens are responsible for the deaths of about 1400 US residents every year, through murder and automobile accidents. By continuing its policy of mass immigration, the US government is condoning this slaughter of US residents. All in the name of money.

The US president has taken an oath of office to uphold the US Constitution, which requires him to defend the country from invasion. President Bush and the presidents who have preceded him since 1960 have abrogated this oath, and are guilty of malfeasance of office and high treason. Nothing will be done about this, however, because the oligarchs who control the government want the mass alien invasion to continue. Under the US policy of massive international free trade, it is no longer possible for US businesses to compete with foreign firms whose labor costs are as low as a dollar a day. To protect US business and the middle class from decline, it is necessary to close US borders and stop massive international free trade. The US is not going to do this, because it would reduce the generation of wealth for the wealthy elite. Immigration will continue, on a grand scale. Illegal immigration will quickly be converted to legal immigration. Legal immigration has already skyrocketed to about a million people a year, and it will go higher, since the government is getting “flack” over its seeming incompetence in allowing illegal immigration on a massive scale.

Mankind's large population and industrial activity were made possible by tapping the massive amount of energy in fossil fuels, in particular, petroleum. These fuels are, of course, finite. In the case of oil, the world's reserves are about half used up, and the remainder will be gone by 2050. The annual rate of global oil production is now peaking. As global oil production peaks, the world economy will collapse, food production will decline, and billions of people will begin to starve to death. Global war will rage. No country, including America, will be secure and immune from destruction. At that time – and that time is just around the corner – there will be mass slaughter in the US, as the long-term residents exercise their right of primacy and turn against the alien invaders and alien-culture recent immigrants. The streets will flow with blood, as all illegal aliens and alien-culture recent immigrants are slaughtered.

The world's current large human population and industrial activity are causing the extinction of an estimated 30,000 species a year, and are destroying the biosphere in which we exist. They have been enabled by fossil fuel, particularly petroleum, which will soon be gone. The human population is in a serious "overshoot" condition, far exceeding the long-term carrying capacity of the planet. As global oil production starts to decline, human population will decline along with it. But the decline will not be a "graceful" or peaceful one – it will be sudden, violent, and catastrophic: "overshoot and collapse," in the words of William R. Catton, Jr.

The current high levels of human population and industrial activity will not continue, for either of two reasons: (1) they are destroying the biosphere, which is essential for our existence; and (2) the world's deposits of fossil fuels, on which they depend, will eventually exhaust. Both of these facts are well known and undisputed. Some people optimistically imagine that when fossil

fuels exhaust, mankind will miraculously discover some new form of energy (despite years of fruitless search), but even if it did, that would not save us, since it would simply enable the high levels of human population and industrial activity to continue, and those are what are destroying the biosphere. Although it is very clear to scientists that collapse is imminent, politicians are in total denial. They either ignore these facts, or they deny them. They opt instead for making a “quick buck” while the oil lasts, and sacrificing the lives of those living in the future to satisfy their own present gluttony.

Had America’s leaders planned for “peak oil,” and moved to decrease the population to a level that could be supported by solar energy, this future of catastrophic collapse might have been avoided, or at least mitigated. But America’s greedy, wealthy elite care not for anyone other than themselves, and certainly not for people living in the future. They have known full well what was coming, and what was required to avoid it, and they chose to adopt a policy of maximizing their current wealth instead of taking steps to preserve and protect the biosphere and avoid a global “die-off.” As it becomes obvious to everyone that it the oligarchs caused the destruction of the planet, the population will turn against them, and they, too, will be slaughtered in a global neo-Luddite uprising. No one will escape the carnage that will follow the passing of “peak oil.”

If the Federal Government Chooses Not to Act on Immigration...

The following article, “Town Sued over Strict Immigration Law,” by Jon Hurdle, appeared on the August 16 Reuters web page. PHILADELPHIA (Reuters) - Civil rights campaigners sued the Pennsylvania town of Hazleton on Tuesday, seeking to block one of America's toughest local laws against illegal immigrants.

The suit says Hazelton's City Council violated the U.S. constitution when it passed a law denying business permits to companies that hire illegal aliens and fining landlords who rent homes to them.

The measure, which also establishes English as the town's official language, has made Hazleton a focus of the national debate on immigration. The plaintiffs say their suit is the first in the country to challenge a local immigration ordinance.

The suit was filed in federal court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania by groups including the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund and the American Civil Liberties Union. They accuse Hazleton of overstepping its authority on the federal matter of immigration and say the law discriminates against immigrants.

"This mean-spirited law is wrong for many reasons but the most obvious is that the city does not have the power to make its own immigration laws," Omar Jadwat, an attorney for the ACLU's Immigrants' Rights Project, said in a statement.

Hazleton Mayor Lou Barletta, a proponent of the Illegal Immigration Relief Act Ordinance, says illegal immigration from Mexico and Central America has increased crime, overburdened schools and hospitals, and eroded the quality of life in the town of some 31,000 people.

Barletta predicted the law would survive a court challenge and said he would take it to the Supreme Court if necessary. "We're not going to be bullied," he said in a statement.

About a third of the Hazelton's residents are Hispanic, up from around 5 percent in 2000, officials say.

At the federal level, the House and Senate are trying to reconcile starkly different immigration bills that call for tougher border

controls and provide routes to citizenship for the estimated 12 million illegal immigrants in the country.

[End of Hurdle article.]

Under the US Constitution, those powers not specifically reserved for the federal government are reserved for the states. According to the Constitution, the federal government should be regulating immigration. But Congress is paralyzed, and the country is overrun by 12 million illegal aliens. The President simply refuses to defend the country against the alien invasion, in flagrant violation of his oath of office to uphold the Constitution and defend the country from invasion. The federal government has abrogated its responsibility to control the country's borders and keep illegal aliens out of the country. In this case, is it not reasonable for states and localities to act in this critical area?

We now have a situation in the United States where the President refuses to obey his oath of office to defend the country from invasion, where the Justice Department refuses to obey the law to deport illegal aliens, and where the Congress is unwilling or unable to pass any legislation to effectively address the problem. All three branches of US government – the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative – simply refuse to deal with the problem. Since simple and effective solutions are readily available (e.g., make illegal immigration a capital crime, and enforce it), it is obvious that they do not wish to reduce illegal immigration. In thrall to the oligarchs who run the country, they are determined not only to allow all illegal immigrants to stay, but they are pressing hard to make the problem go away by setting all illegal aliens on a “path to citizenship.” But since they will not admit to the real reason behind their refusal to deport illegal aliens, they look ineffective, incompetent, and stupid at best, and corrupt, venal, and treacherous at worst. This perception is earning them contempt from the electorate. It is rather clear that the country has

abandoned the guiding principles that made it strong and great, is rotten to the core, and exists only as a means of generating wealth for the oligarchs. Its days are numbered.

Empty Chinese Shipping Containers

The July 31, 2006 edition of CNN's Lou Dobbs Tonight contained a segment about the massive number of empty Chinese shipping containers in the US.

In this country, there's a powerful new symbol of the United States' exploding trade deficit with communist China. Shipping containers, thousands of them coming from China carrying all those cheap Chinese goods into the United States, don't go back to China with a lot of American products. So what happens is they stay right here, and in some cases they're being used as housing for poor Americans.

Casey Wian reports.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE) CASEY WIAN, CNN
CORRESPONDENT(voice over): Welcome home. No, not here.
Back there. These stacks of shipping containers near the port of
Los Angeles may soon be used to build your next house.

PETER DEMARIA, DEMARIA DESIGN: This custom home is just
over 3,000 square feet.

WIAN: Architect Peter DeMaria is designing homes out of
shipping containers. They're pre-insulated and already have
hardwood floors. They're strong, resistant to mold, termites, and
fire, and above all, they're plentiful.

DEMARIA: The cost of steel and the cost of concrete has gone through the roof recently. That forced us to explore some alternative materials.

WIAN: China's voracious appetite for building materials has driven up costs of traditional construction. And the nation's massive trade deficit with China and others has left hundreds of thousands of empty shipping containers piling up in storage yards all over the country.

So a growing number of architects and builders are using the container glut to save their clients hundreds of thousands of dollars. Custom home construction in southern California can easily cost \$250 a square foot. This house is being built for about half that. But the mountains of containers are a big problem for others.

Last year, seven million containers arrived here full of imported goods, but only 2.5 million left carrying American exports. Many of the rest are now polluting residential areas near the ports.

JANICE HAHN, LA CITY COUNCIL: This is the unintended consequence, really, of the whole international trade industry, but particularly because of this gap that we have between imports and exports. But it is a blight that really no other community I think in America suffers.

DEMARIA: This is a slab floor here.

WIAN: Architect DeMaria says recycling the containers for home construction will help improve the environment. He's also working with the city of Los Angeles to use shipping containers in low-income housing.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

WIAN: The city of Los Angeles recently passed an ordinance prohibiting the operation of new shipping containers storage yards near residential neighborhoods.

Lou, the situation is so bad that in some areas the sun sets an hour early because of the high stacks of shipping containers – Lou.

DOBBS: Casey, that's just an amazing, remarkable story. And what a metaphor for what is happening to this country. The Chinese becoming so wealthy, they can leave millions of these containers in this country because there's certainly no American goods to be shipped back to China. I mean, that's incredible.

WIAN: It really is. And as one shipping industry executive put it recently, he said one of the things -- the thing that's most often moved around Los Angeles in these shipping containers is empty air because we're simply not sending anything back to China.

DOBBS: As I say...

WIAN: A brand new world.

DOBBS: ... just a terrific story, Casey. Thank you very much. And a sad commentary on our times.

Thank you.

Casey Wian from Los Angeles.

[End of Lou Dobbs report.]

I hope that no one is foolish enough to be paying for these shipping containers, which have been abandoned by the Chinese.

US Government Convicts the Law-Enforcement Agents and Frees the Criminal

Here follows a report from the August 9, 2006, edition of CNN's Lou Dobbs Tonight, on the remarkable story of the case in which a US prosecutor has granted immunity from prosecution to a known Mexican drug smuggler, in order to pursue charges against the Border Patrol Agents who apprehended him.

Tonight two border patrol agents face 20-year prison sentences. They were prosecuted after pursuing a Mexican citizen illegally in the United States who tried to smuggle hundreds of pounds of drugs into this country. The drug smuggler has been given immunity. He violated the law by trying to smuggle more drugs, and guess who's in jail?

We'll have that special report on outrageous justice on the part of our federal government in Texas, and Senator Joe Lieberman's defeat rocking the country's political establishment. Three of the best political analysts in the country join us to assess the reverberations and the likely results. Stay with us.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

DOBBS: Support is flooding in from all across the country tonight for two border patrol agents in Texas who could be sentenced to 20 years in prison for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler. Amazingly, federal prosecutors allowed the smuggler to walk free – they gave him immunity – in return for testimony against those agents. That drug smuggler subsequently smuggled more drugs.

Casey Wian reports from El Paso, Texas.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

CASEY WIAN, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Border Patrol agent Ignacio Ramos shows us the Texas road where he first encountered a suspected Mexican drug smuggler last year.

IGNACIO RAMOS, BORDER PATROL AGENT: As soon as they passed me here, I just did a U-turn and followed them into town.

WIAN: Ramos and other agents followed his van which had earlier had tripped a hidden sensor near the border through the tiny town of Fabens, and then back toward the border.

RAMOS: To us, after many years of voting this area, when there's a vehicle away from a sensor and people running back south from that sensor, it usually means – to us, that usually means that's a narcotics load.

WIAN: Ramos continued to pursue the suspected drug smuggler down this road, past fields, and to a canal just a few yards from Mexico.

RAMOS: He decided that he wasn't going to make it and he dumped the van right here, but the front of his van went right over the edge of the canal right there.

WIAN: The suspected smuggler fled into the canal, but another Border Patrol agent, Jose Compean was waiting for him on the other side. A scuffle ensued. The suspect fled, despite agents' orders to stop.

RAMOS: He made a move on Agent Compean to get around him. He got around agent Compean. It was at that time that I jumped into the canal to go help Agent Compean.

WIAN: Agent Ramos heard shots fired while he was in the canal.

RAMOS: I had to run up this area here, get over the levee, and when I got over on the other side, Agent Compean was on the ground. The suspect was running away from Agent Compean.

WIAN: Ramos said the suspect turned and made a motion as if to fire a gun at him.

RAMOS: I had my weapon in my hand, I picked up and fired.

WIAN: The suspect disappeared into the Rio Grande and reemerged on the Mexican side. Ramos said he appeared uninjured. It sounds like a simple story of a drug smuggler who got away, but 18 months later, Agents Ramos and Compean are facing 20 years to life in prison convicted on a variety of charges, including assault with a firearm, civil rights violations, and obstruction of justice for not reporting their weapons had been fired.

T.J. BONNER, NATL. BORDER PATROL COUNCIL: This is really the most outrageous miscarriage of justice that I'm aware of in my entire 28-year career as a Border Patrol agent. I've never seen anything so – I can't even think of the word. This is like diving into a trash can. The deeper you dig, the more it stinks.

WIAN: That's because the smuggler whose van contained nearly 800 pounds of marijuana was shot in the buttocks by the Border Patrol agents. The assistant U.S. attorney in El Paso gave the smuggler immunity from prosecution in exchange for his testimony against the agents. And the smuggler was encouraged to cooperate by the relatives of another Border Patrol agent in Arizona.

RAMOS: I was doing the job the public entrusted me to do. They entrusted me to stop a drug smuggler and I did.

WIAN: Joe Loya is the Agent Ramos' father-in-law. He and other family members have wiped out their savings trying to help with Ramos' defense.

JOE LOYA, FATHER-IN-LAW: I was preparing for retirement next year. Now, I guess I'll just have to work forever but, you know, our faith and our prayers is what keeps us going, and we're not giving up on this.

WIAN: Sources say the smuggler has since been arrested for carrying an even bigger load of drugs into the United States. The U.S. attorney prosecuting the agents would not comment on the case.

Ramos says he was offered several plea bargains and every time he refused, prosecutors added more charges to his case. Ramos is expected to be sentenced later this month and will immediately file an appeal. Despite the ordeal he says he would return to his job as a Border Patrol agent.

RAMOS: It may sound crazy, but yes, I'd still do it. It's what I am. It's what I do. It's what I love.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

WIAN: U.S. Customs and Border Protection just released a statement to us, saying it takes "all allegations of impropriety seriously. Mr. Ramos and Mr. Compean were investigated by an independent office and afforded due process." The statement goes on to say, "CBP respects the decision made by the court as well as the rights of the agents to appeal that decision."

What's particularly striking to me, Lou, in that statement is that the agents' actions were not criticized by superiors in Washington – Lou.

DOBBS: And to each one of those so-called violations – and we should pin down who the prosecutor is here and where it originated with the U.S. attorney's office and why, because there are huge questions.

Firing a weapon is one issue. That's an administrative breach. Pursuing – and we should go to this case as well. Pursuing a fleeing suspect is – these agents are actually restricted by their own administrative guidelines, correct?

WIAN: That's correct. That's one of these things that really frustrated Border Patrol agents. There is a policy that they're not allowed to pursue suspects above the speed limit, but the agents say that that policy is routinely ignored. They have to ignore it or else they would never catch anyone.

It's winked at by their superiors, reports, they say, are doctored. They say that if shots had not been fired in this case there would have been no mention in the reports that there was a pursuit, that it would have just been that they followed the suspect. So there are a lot of questions still to be answered in this case, and that's why T.J. Bonner at the Border Patrol Union is calling for an independent investigation of the entire matter, Lou.

DOBBS: Independent investigation in this case should mean an investigation of the inspector – the inspector general's office as well, the Office of the Inspector General as it's framed.

There should be an investigation of the U.S. Attorney's Office who would even suggest that the rights of an illegal alien, drug

smuggler, caught with the goods has rights superior to those of the agents that we depend on to enforce the law.

And admittedly, not many of our laws are enforced when it comes to border security and immigration, but my God – and the U.S. Attorney's Office wouldn't even talk to us, Casey?

WIAN: We made several attempts to contact the office. They responded saying they would – they referred us to the original press release, when these officers or these agents were first charged, but they would not agree to be interviewed by us, Lou.

DOBBS: Well, I have to say that the U.S. Attorney's Office, the assistant U.S. attorney who prosecuted this has a lot of explaining to do, and we're going to be relentless in giving them the opportunity to do so on this broadcast.

Casey, I know you're going to be there covering this story for sometime, and we appreciate your report here tonight on what is by all appearances just an outrage and a miscarriage of justice perpetrated for whatever reason by the Justice Department, the U.S. Attorney's Office in El Paso, Texas, and we will get to the bottom of it with or without the help of the federal government.

Casey, thank you very much. Casey Wian, reporting tonight from El Paso, Texas.

Agents Ramos and Compean will be sentenced on August 22nd. And this broadcast will be following their story each and every day and every step of the way and we will be reporting to you on what in the world this government of ours is thinking.

[End of Lou Dobbs excerpt.]

It is a sad day indeed when officials in our government prosecute law-enforcement officials for administrative errors, by granting illegal-alien drug smugglers immunity from prosecution. The prosecutor is really befuddled. If she wanted to take the easy way and grant immunity from prosecution as a way of promoting her case, she should have granted immunity to the two Border Patrol agents for their administrative errors, in exchange for their testimony against the Mexican illegal-alien drug smuggler. This country would be a welcome guest at Alice-in-Wonderland's Mad Tea Party.

Parkland Memorial Hospital Doctor Wants You to Pay for Delivery of Mexican Anchor Babies

The August 3, 2006, edition of the NBC Evening News with Brian Williams had an interesting segment about Parkland Memorial Hospital, in Dallas, Texas (Parkland is the hospital where John Kennedy was treated after being shot in November of 1963). Parkland has a policy of delivering babies free for anyone who cannot pay, and they have been delivering massive numbers of babies at no cost for Mexicans. Parkland is a public hospital, and the cost of all of these "free" deliveries must be picked up by US taxpayers (most of whom are not Mexicans!).

One of the physicians working at the hospital was interviewed and asked about the wisdom of this policy. He pompously responded that "we provide care to all who come." That was very easy for him to say. He is not paying the bill for these deliveries, many of them done for illegal aliens, and resulting in "anchor babies." No matter whether he delivers a baby for a responsible US citizen who pays his own medical bills or an illegal alien who does not, he draws the same salary. I am sure that he would sing a different tune if his salary were docked for the full amount of each baby he delivered, whose parents could not or would not pay. It

is very easy to be loose with someone else's money. It would have been interesting if NBC had interviewed a private-practice doctor and asked him the same question.

Lou Dobbs Is Sadly Mistaken: All Mass Immigration Is Bad for the US

On a number of occasions, while interviewing guests on his nightly CNN television show, Lou Dobbs has made the statement that it is not all immigration to the US that he opposes, just illegal immigration. It is sad that a person with such an audience has taken this point of view. As I have observed, it is mass immigration of any kind, whether legal or illegal, that is destroying the US environment and culture (see "Some of the Nonmonetary Costs of Immigration," at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/Miscellany28.htm>).

High-Tech Soldiers Cannot Win the War in Iraq

In its war in Iraq, the US has to date suffered relatively few casualties – 2600 killed and 19,000 wounded, 9000 seriously – but it has made very limited progress in winning the war. But the cost of the war, now estimated at around 308 billion dollars, is extremely high (see http://nationalpriorities.org/index.php?option=com_wrapper&Itemid=182 for a running count of the war's cost). Part of the cost is high-tech weapons, such as smart bombs and missiles, but these were used mainly at the beginning of the war, and the cost of that segment of the war is a small portion of the current total. What is driving the costs through the roof is that the US is employing "high-tech" soldiers with much close-air support. What is needed at this stage, after the initial pounding with air weaponry, is a large number of low-cost soldiers – cheap cannon fodder. But the US

strategy for infantry is highly computerized soldiers backed up by massive communication and information-technology infrastructure, in addition to high-cost mechanized infantry and air support. At present it has only 140,000 soldiers on the ground – too few to accomplish the mission – and those few very high-cost soldiers are driving the costs through the roof. The US cannot continue to spend at the current high rate, and so the pressure is intense to “cut and run.”

Since passage of the Immigration Act of 1965, the US has adopted a population policy of massive population growth. US population has grown from 150 million in 1950 to 300 million today. From the point of view of numbers, it can easily afford to send a very large number of soldiers, such as half a million, or a million, or even more. But they cannot be high-tech soldiers that cost about \$700,000 per year (100 billion dollars per year divided by 140,000 troops). To win this war using its current military strategy, the US needs to get the cost per soldier down to perhaps one-tenth this number (\$70,000 per year), or even one-hundredth this number (\$7,000). And with the current high level of unskilled, low-paid labor to the US – about three million people per year (one percent of the population) – it could easily do so. At present, there are about 12 million illegal aliens in the US, most of them earning very little. They could be rounded up and transported to Iraq, and the cost of waging the war would drop precipitously.

In its recent foray into Lebanon, Israel encountered the same problem as the US. It tried to minimize its human casualties by waging war from the air. In that respect, it succeeded – it lost only a few hundred soldiers, and it severely damaged Lebanese infrastructure. But before a month had passed, it had lost the war and was making a hasty retreat, tail between its legs, back to Israel.

Pressure is mounting in the US for the government to remove its troops from Iraq. Judging by the recent experience of Senator Joseph Lieberman (losing the democratic primary in Connecticut), it is clear that anyone who proposes continuation of the Iraq war is going to suffer defeat in the upcoming elections. The problem faced by the US government is that it is sending the sons and daughters of its native middle class to die in Iraq to fight a “political” war, and the middle class has had enough. People are willing to put their children in harm’s way when their very survival is at stake, such as in the Second World War, but not otherwise, or, at least, not in large numbers and not for very long. There is no reason, however, for the US to send the sons and daughters of its citizens, when it could be using voteless, nameless illegal aliens as cannon fodder. In our “classless” society, this may appear to be a difficult thing to do, but the alternative strategy of losing every war that we start (Korea, Vietnam, Iraq) is not very appealing; and anyway, the illegal aliens who have invaded the US are not US citizens – they are criminal invaders. (Moreover, as our government officials are so fond of saying, they are willing to do jobs that US citizens are not willing to do.) America has chosen to get into this “asymmetric” war, and it cannot win with its current strategy of pitting very high-cost resources (aircraft, missiles, and high-tech soldiers) against very low-cost resources (near-zero-cost suicide bombers, improvised explosive devices). To prevail against this enemy – and to obtain support from the electorate for continuing to wage the war for some time to come – it must also employ low-cost means.

President Reagan knew the power of economics in waging war. The US did not defeat the Soviet Union militarily. Not a shot was fired. Instead, it simply outspent the Soviets, and their empire collapsed while trying to keep up with us. The Iraqi insurgents are doing the same sort of thing to us. They have millions of lives to spend on this war, and they know that we have but a few thousand. So they simply continue until we give up. They know

that this strategy will work, because it worked in Vietnam against the French and the Americans, and it worked in Afghanistan against the Russians. America will not win the war in Iraq militarily unless it totally destroys Iraq (which it will not do for fear of destroying its oil-production capacity, access to which was the reason for the war in the first place) or unless it starts waging a symmetric war by sending hundreds of thousands of low-cost soldiers into the fray.

I Hate to Say, “I told you so” (How to Win the War in Iraq)

On May 8, 2004, I posted an open letter to the President, entitled, “How to Win the War in Iraq,” which is posted at my website at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/HowToWinTheWarInIraq.htm> . In that letter, I proposed following one of Machiavelli’s three approaches to controlling a conquered country, viz., set up “puppet” governments controlled by local leaders who are beholden to the conqueror. Specifically, I proposed balkanizing (partitioning) Iraq into three parts, called Shiastan, Sunnistan, and Kurdistan, and representing the three dominant ethnic groups in Iraq.

It is gratifying to see, in the press and on television, that other people are now expressing the same view. One thing that I find bothersome, however, is the way that “equity” is being injected into the discussion. To this end, some people have observed that if the new “borders” are drawn along the lines of the areas currently controlled by these three groups, the Sunnis will not have any oil. These people claim that for partitioning to work, the Sunnis must be guaranteed a share of the oil in areas occupied by other ethnic groups (i.e., the Shias and Kurds).

This is nothing short of preposterous. Equity has nothing to do with our real objective in Iraq, which is to have access to Iraqi oil.

Just because Russia has a lot of oil, should we insist that they give a portion of it to the rest of the world, simply because that is “fair”? Should we give a portion of our Alaska oil to poor countries, simply because it is not fair that they happen to be located in areas that are oil-poor? Should Canada be forced to give its oil, diamond and uranium riches to the poor countries of the world, because it is not fair for her to have so much? Should Australia be forced to share its iron and uranium riches with poor countries, out of a concern that it is not fair that she have so much?

No, no effort should be wasted on trying to “share” Iraq’s oil among its current inhabitants. As Machiavelli suggested, simply split the country into parts, put a strong local family in charge of each – so long as they deliver the oil to us – and be done with it.

I Hate to Say, “I told you so” (Racial Profiling Is Good)

On September 11, 2001, I wrote the following comments on the topic of racial profiling (at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/Platform.htm>).

Profiling. “Profiling” to assist the apprehension of criminal suspects is authorized and encouraged, particularly with respect to race, gender and ethnicity. Profiling is the logical, scientifically well founded practice (Bayes' Rule, search theory) of taking account of distinguishing characteristics of a criminal in the quest to apprehend him. These characteristics may be of any type, but the more unusual the characteristics are (i.e., the more nearly unique they are to the suspect) the more useful they are in helping to track down a criminal. For this reason, membership in minority groups, such as minority ethnic/racial groups, are particularly useful (e.g., it is much more useful to know that a suspect is a Hmong or Japanese than a white man, since there

are fewer of the former than the latter). To hamstring the efforts of the police by requiring them to ignore crucial information in their work is not only stupid and wasteful, but criminal.

If a man commits a rape, it is common sense to look for a man, not a woman. If a black man commits a crime, it is common sense to search for suspects in the black community, not in the white community. If an Hispanic or Arab commits a crime, it is common sense to search for the perpetrator in the Hispanic or Arab communities. These examples are obvious, since the characteristic of the suspect is known. But the logic of profiling is just as relevant if particular characteristics are not known with certainty, but are simply known to be correlated with a particular crime. Some examples.... If most or all of the embassy bombings last year were done by Islamic fundamentalists and another embassy is bombed, it is prudent to concentrate the search for the perpetrators in the Islamic community. If a group of men in white sheets are seen lynching someone, it makes sense to interrogate members of the local Ku Klux Klan. If the drinking-while-intoxicated hit-and-run rate is several times higher for Mexican drivers than others, it is right to focus more attention on that segment of the population than on others. If a sex crime is committed against a child, it makes sense to check out local residents with a history of child molestation. If a kidnapper cannot pronounce "els," it is reasonable to suspect an oriental and allocate more effort investigating that group. If a young girl is abducted from her family, it is commonsense to spend more time investigating men than women, who rarely commit this type of crime. All profiling is prejudicial and discriminatory, but it is the logical approach to use to apprehend a criminal. Profiling based on any characteristic correlated with a criminal act -- even if based on race, gender, religion, language or ethnicity -- is the proper way to investigate a crime. To deliberately ignore characteristics that are known to be correlated with a crime may be politically correct in today's US society, but it is wrong.

The hands of our police will not be tied by an irrational demand to ignore race (or any other known characteristic) in the attempt to apprehend a suspect, if race is an evidential factor in a particular case. If race (or any other characteristic) is uncorrelated with a particular crime, then of course it makes no sense to target people of a particular race in the search for the criminal -- but that is not racial profiling: it is racial persecution. On the other hand, if a crime is committed by a "one-armed man," then police will be permitted to and expected to look for a "one-armed man," despite the prejudicial aspersions that this casts on the minority population of one-armed men, and notwithstanding the inconvenience or indignation that may be felt by innocent one-armed men who are interrogated.

[End of "Platform" excerpt.]

In the press and on the television, I am now seeing articles describing how Britain is using racial profiling very effectively in its "war on terror," and asking why the US continues to act like an ostrich with its head in the sand on this issue. Mark my words, the US will be doing racial profiling big time, and very soon. The US could afford its stupid policy against racial profiling when it was a peaceful, homogeneous nation, with secure borders and low levels of immigration from European cultures. Because of its policies of open borders, mass immigration from alien cultures, and mass international free trade, that time is gone. The rich can afford to be virtuous, but the US is no longer in that category. In the process of converting its country from the most powerful nation on Earth to a weak and feckless third-world nation, it is no longer strong, and it is no longer secure. It encourages its enemies to destroy it, and they are taking up the invitation. It is now very vulnerable, and, in desperation, as it begins to realize that it has made itself hopelessly vulnerable to conquest, it will soon use any means at its disposal to slow its destruction at the

hands of its enemies. Racial-ethnic profiling will be back in vogue very soon.

Avoiding Blame for the 9/11 Fiasco

I have written on numerous occasions that the US government is fully to blame for the 9/11 attack on the US, through its policies of open borders, mass immigration and massive international free trade. I have also written that the New York City officials were to blame for the massive loss of life of New York City firefighters in the collapse of the World Trade Center buildings, in which 343 firefighters perished.

My wife and I were watching television when the airplanes flew into the buildings. As soon as it was clear what had happened, I commented to my wife that the building would collapse. When the second airplane crashed into the second building, I told her that it, too, would collapse. Both did. I am not a civil engineer, but I do have an engineering background (Carnegie-Mellon University). Had the airplanes crashed into the top floor of each building, there would have been a large fire, and that would have been it. But they crashed into the buildings many floors below the top. It was obvious that a massive fire would weaken the structure so that the massive weight of many floors would cause a collapse like an accordion, just as we see on television from time to time when a building is collapsed on purpose in a demolition exercise.

Despite the imminent collapse of the buildings, New York City Fire Department officials sent hundreds of firefighters into the buildings. The firefighters were ordered to climb by the stairs almost a hundred floors to where the fires raged, to try to put them out. In the aftermath of the disaster, city officials proclaimed that no one could have foreseen that the buildings would

collapse, and that the department officials acted properly. Except for me, it appeared that no one ever contradicted their claim of blamelessness.

Until now.

All this week, the History Channel has been having a series of programs on the collapse of the Twin Towers. On Thursday, August 17, the segment, entitled, "Grounded on 9/11: Stairway B," chronicled the experience of 14 people – 13 firemen and a woman – who escaped death when the building collapsed around them. The presentation was very informative, and corroborated my view that it was quite obvious that the buildings would collapse, and that the firefighters should never have been ordered into the buildings and to their deaths.

A key person in the presentation was Captain Jay Jonas of the NYFD. He was one of the 13 firefighters who survived in Stairwell B. During the interview, he related how he received orders from his superior to enter the building with his men. He returned to his men with the orders, and exclaimed to them, "They are going to kill us!" It was obvious to him that the building was going to collapse. A loyal, disciplined, and brave man, he carried out the orders that he was given, even though he knew that the building was going to collapse and that he and his men would be killed. They got as far as the sixtieth floor in their ascent, when the other Tower (the South one, I believe) collapsed. He realized what had happened, and he immediately ordered his men to descend. Although his orders had not been changed, it was now incontrovertibly obvious to everyone that both buildings would collapse, since one just had.

It is sad that in our day, when the government goes on and on about responsibility and transparency and accountability, that it goes so far to protect its own from retribution for malfeasance.

The US government leaders were directly responsible for the 9/11 attack, because of their foolish policies of open borders, mass immigration and massive international free trade. And the NYPD officials were directly responsible for the deaths of 343 firefighters, by ordering them to enter buildings that were in imminent danger of collapsing. But all we have ever seen is scenes of government leaders claiming that no one could ever have anticipated the 9/11 attack or the collapse of the Twin Towers, patting each other on the back and congratulating each other that they did a fabulous job. They are disgusting creatures. With the airing of the History Channel's report about Captain Jonas' experience, the truth is now finally getting a little exposure.

Donald Rumsfeld to Hillary Clinton: "My Goodness"

On the August 3, 2006 edition of CNN's Lou Dobbs Tonight, Senator Hillary Clinton delivered a blistering harangue to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, while he was testifying before a Senate committee. At the end of Clinton's diatribe, Rumsfeld turned slightly to one side and commented, in a humorous, mildly incredulous manner, "My goodness." He could not have uttered a more devastating rebuttal to her remarks. It was a real put-down.

Hell hath no fury like a woman scored, however, and later that day Mrs. Clinton called for Secretary Rumsfeld to resign.

On the Yahoo news today (August 21), I read that Senator Joe Lieberman has joined with Senator Clinton in calling for Rumsfeld to resign. His position on the war cost him the Connecticut Democratic primary, and he is now desperately clawing to "stay in the game," no matter what.

Why Boycott Cuba and Not China?

On his news program of August 7, 1006, Lou Dobbs pointed out the glaring inconsistency of US policy toward Cuba and China. Our decades-long boycott of Cuba was ostensibly because Cuba was a communist nation. But China is communist also, and we bend over backwards to promote trade and good relations with that nation. The tremendous difference in our position with respect to these two communist nations shows clearly that our relationship with them has nothing to do with their being communist. It is either time to state clearly what it is about Cuba that we do not like, or it is time to reassess our relationship with Cuba and with China and decide on a foreign-policy position relative to them that is rational and consistent. Otherwise, although we may certainly reserve the right to be inconsistent in our foreign policy, we will continue to look rather foolish.

Using Willie's Biodiesel Means Killing People

As "peak oil" occurs, the price of a barrel of oil has reached 80 dollars per barrel (up from ten cents a barrel in the 1930s). It is now more profitable to convert cereal grains to "biofuel" (ethanol, biodiesel) for use in automobiles and trucks. But this means that the mountains of grain that the US formerly exported to starving countries all around the world will now be converted to fuel, instead of being used for food. Each barrel of biofuel used will cause the death of many people. Now that peak oil is occurring, we are beginning to see the start of global starvation on a grand scale. We are already seeing, in Iraq, the start of the "resource wars" over the control of the world's rapidly diminishing oil reserves.

Do Hot Dogs Cause Cancer?

The following article, "Hot Dogs May Cause Genetic Mutations," by Charles Q. Choi, appeared on the LiveScience website on August 14, 2006.

Everyone knows hot dogs aren't exactly healthy for you, but in a new study chemists find they may contain DNA-mutating compounds that might boost one's risk for cancer.

Scientists note there is an up to 240-fold variation in levels of these chemicals across different brands.

"One could try and find out what the difference in manufacturing techniques are between the brands, and if it's decided these things are a hazard, one could change the manufacturing methods," researcher Sidney Mirvish, a chemist at the University of Nebraska Medical Center in Omaha, told LiveScience.

Mirvish and his colleagues examined hot dogs because past research had linked them with colon cancer. Hot dogs are preserved with sodium nitrite, which can help form chemicals known as N-nitroso compounds, most of which cause cancer in lab animals.

Extracts from hot dogs bought from the supermarket, when mixed with nitrites, resulted in what appeared to be these DNA-mutating compounds. When added to Salmonella bacteria, hot dog extracts treated with nitrites doubled to quadrupled their normal DNA mutation levels. Triggering DNA mutations in the gut might boost the risk for colon cancer, the researchers explained.

"I won't say you shouldn't eat hot dogs," Mirvish said. Future research will feed hot dog meat to mice to see if they develop colon cancer or precancerous conditions, he explained.

James Hodges, president of the American Meat Institute Foundation in Washington, noted this study is "a preliminary report that the author concedes requires further investigation. The carcinogenic risk to humans of the compounds studied has not been determined."

The possible hazard presented here is not just limited to hot dogs. Salted dried fish and seasonings such as soy sauce may contain similar levels of these chemicals, Mirvish said.

Mirvish and his colleagues reported their findings in the Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry.

[End of Choi article.]

When I was a boy, colon cancer was rare, as were asthma and attention-deficit disorder. Now, these diseases seem rampant. It seems rather clear to me that we are simply poisoning ourselves with all of the chemical additives in food.

Low-Cost Medicine: A Crime against Capitalism

When my first wife was dying of cancer, there were three things that made her life livable near the end: steroids, to give her an appetite; morphine, to kill the pain; and marijuana, to quell the nausea. There was no problem in getting prescriptions for the steroids, and, once she entered the "hospice" program, there was no problem getting prescriptions for morphine. But marijuana was illegal in Arizona, even for medicinal purposes, and so our physician told us that, despite the fact that it would stop the nausea cold, he could not prescribe it. He told us, however, that if we were able to obtain it from an illegal source and were arrested, he would willingly testify that it was his belief that the marijuana

was a good treatment for her condition, and he would prescribe it if it were legal.

So we were faced with a choice: obey the law and continue to have my wife sick as a dog in the last days of her life, or break the law and have her have a good quality of life. Obviously, we chose the latter.

There were plenty of legal anti-nausea medicines on the market, but none of them worked. This did not bother the powers that be – the pharmaceutical industry and the government – a whit. If they cannot make vast sums of money off new drugs that cost millions to develop, they are not interested in them at all. There is no way that the pharmaceutical industry or the government is going to promote the use of marijuana to fight nausea, since this would cut into their incomes.

A similar situation arose recently with my son. He has a serious back disease, ankylosing spondylitis, which causes him great pain. Morphine could stop this pain, but physicians are reluctant to prescribe it, fearing that government monitoring of their prescription of morphine will cause them to be closely monitored and hassled. The big problem for my son is that none of the medicines that have been prescribed for him kill the pain. He is in agony many days, to the point where he cannot work. As a result, he has lost his job. With no income, he can no longer afford health insurance, which costs about a thousand dollars a month. The only drugs that his physicians will prescribe for him cost about one thousand dollars per month. Morphine, on the other hand, could suppress his pain for pennies a day. That solution is not desirable for the pharmaceutical industry or the US government, which seeks to increase gross national product. The US system of medical care is a perverted one, in which all decisions are based on maximizing the return to the medical industry and the government.

The Latest Drug Scam: Take Fosamax, Get GERD, and then Take Nexium

The latest drug scam is the intense promotion of the drug, Fosamax, to help slow prevent osteoporosis (weakening of the bones, a common condition in the elderly). The ads promoting Fosamax are “in your face” every night on television during prime time. These ads are powerful “scare” campaign aimed at America’s elderly. The big problem with Fosamax is that it may give you a very serious disease called Gastro-Esophageal Reflux Disease, or GERD. With GERD, you have indigestion, belching, chest pain, heartburn, diarrhea, and violent reactions to some foods. It is not a nice disease, and it is definitely not worth acquiring simply to lower your risk of osteoporosis. I know what I am talking about here from a personal perspective, because my wife has just come down with GERD after taking Fosamax.

As soon as you have GERD, your doctor is likely to prescribe another powerful – and expensive – drug, called Nexium, to try to fix it.

Fosamax pills cost about ten dollars apiece, as do Nexium pills. They, and their generic “knock-offs,” are real “cash cows” for the pharmaceutical industry – that’s why there are so many of these million-dollar-a-minute ads on prime-time television. The pharmaceutical industry knows that the major audience for osteoporosis medicines are the elderly, who have a certain portion of their drug expenses covered by Medicare.

One pill to make you sick, and another pill to counter its effects. A capitalist doctor’s dream!

Thank God I'm a Country Boy

My mother read me the following quote, dealing with Jewish prayers, from Erich Segal's *Acts of Faith* (Bantam Books, 1992):

In the men's morning prayers, there were benedictions to the Lord for every conceivable gift:

Blessed art Thou Who has enabled the rooster to distinguish between day and night.

Blessed art Thou Who has not made me a heathen.

Blessed art Thou Who has not made me a female.

While the men were giving thanks for their masculinity, the girls had to be content with:

Blessed art Thou Who has made me according to Thy Will.

Talladega Nights

My son was visiting us recently, and a cousin of his invited us to see the movie, *Talladega Nights*. It is a juvenile comedy about stock-car racing in the southeastern United States. It is really a bad movie. It is not funny. Typical "jokes" include grandchildren ridiculing their grandfather at the dinner table to the approbation of the dimwitted parents, and a caricature ridiculing a Christian meal blessing. The movie is but one more example of the ongoing effort of the Jewish-controlled Hollywood media to weaken white Christian culture.

There was, in the movie, one item of “down-home” philosophy: “God needs the Devil; the Beatles need the Rolling Stones, and Diane Sawyer needs Katy Couric.”

No Loitering

When I was a boy, “No Loitering” signs were posted all over – and enforced. You did not see bums and vagrants loitering on the street. Over the years, most of those signs have disappeared. It seems that society is willing to accept laziness and sloth, and the police are “so busy” trying to deal with more important crimes (now that society is falling apart), that they don’t bother to enforce minor laws, or laws that may get them accused of racism in places where it is mainly racial minorities who are lolling around.

It was, therefore, very refreshing to see, the other day, in the parking lot of the Best Buy store in Spartanburg, SC, the following sign: “Best Buy. NO LOITERING. Enforced by Spartanburg County Sheriff Dept.”

Mother Theresa and Abe Lincoln

In his sermon of August 8, 2006, in a sermon on praise, the pastor of our church related two interesting anecdotes, one about Mother Theresa and the other about Abraham Lincoln.

After being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, Mother Theresa was bombarded by news reporters about her reaction to the prize. Her view was that the praise was due the Lord, not to her, and she responded that she wondered whether the donkey who was carrying Jesus into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday thought that the palm fronds being laid along the way in front of him were for him.

An old woman asked to see President Lincoln, and he agreed to see her. She had no request for help from him – she just wanted to give him some cookies that she had baked. Lincoln was stunned by this gift, and remarked that she was the first visitor that he had ever had who had asked for nothing, but just wanted to give him something.

Fish Don't Swim with Their Fins

At one time in my life, I did a fair amount of SCUBA diving. Two things really impressed me about fish. One was that an entire school of small fish could all simultaneously change direction, and, without any confusion, all head off in a different direction. It seemed very clear that the school was controlled by some sort of group consciousness. I have seen the same behavior with small flocks of birds, such as Lillian's Lovebirds.

The other strange thing was that fish could swim without using their fins, or “waving” their bodies. To be sure, they often do use their fins, but in many cases they simply move through the water with minimal motion of their fins or serpentine waving of their bodies. I have seen an entire school of hammerhead sharks swimming across in front of me, without any motion of their bodies or fins. I often saw small fish move slowly or even dart, with no movement that could possibly explain their locomotion through the water. Can you explain this?

Osmosis Is Not the Answer

When I was in eighth grade, I took a “general science” course. During that course, we were taught that the mechanism by which plants work is osmosis – the transfer of chemicals through a semipermeable membrane from a more dense solution to a less

dense solution. I could see that by this means nutrients in the soil could make their way up a plant – such as a stalk of celery – but I could not see how this same process could explain how the sugar manufactured in the leaves (by photosynthesis) could then migrate back down the plant. Was the sugar solution far more concentrated than the nutrient solution, so that the osmosis process would now “turn around” and flow the chemicals from the top of the plants to the roots? What was the explanation? It seemed that osmosis could explain migration in one direction (from concentrated solution in the soil to less concentration in the plant), but not in the other direction. It seemed rather obvious to me at the time that there must be some sort of “control” mechanism at work, directing the flow of the chemicals in one way or another, as desired. If osmosis were the only phenomenon at work, it would take place, the concentration would become the same across the plant, and nothing further would happen. My teacher had no explanation. Do you?

FndID(99)

FndTitle(Miscellany 29: Ian Fleming’s Goldfinger; Avoiding Blame for the 9/11 Fiasco; Why Boycott Cuba and Not China?; I Told You So on Racial Profiling and the War in Iraq; The Latest Drug Scam: Take Fosamax, Get GERD, and then Take Nexium)

FndDescription(Miscellany 29: Ian Fleming’s Goldfinger; Avoiding Blame for the 9/11 Fiasco; Why Boycott Cuba and Not China?; I Told You So on Racial Profiling and the War in Iraq; The Latest Drug Scam: Take Fosamax, Get GERD, and then Take Nexium)

FndKeywords(Ian Fleming; Goldfinger; blame for 9/11; boycott Cuba; racial profiling; war in Iraq; overmedication; medicine side effects)