

**Miscellany 60: US Citizenship for Sale; Never a Republican President Again?; Senator Lindsey Graham's Telephone Town Hall Meeting; A. C. Grayling on Terrorism; On Dan Brown's Inferno; On Laura Hillenbrand's *Unbroken*; On Bradley Manning and Nidal Malik Hasan; On Hillary Clinton; On Gay Marriage; On Islamic Terrorists**

© 2013 Joseph George Caldwell. All rights reserved. Posted at Internet web site <http://www.foundationwebsite.org> . May be copied or reposted for non-commercial use, with attribution. (23 August 2013)

Commentary on recent news, reading and events of personal interest.

**US Citizenship for Sale**

A recent newspaper article (Associated Press, 19 June 2013) reported that the Congressional Budget Office estimated that granting legal status on eight million illegal aliens would reduce the federal deficit by an estimated 197 billion dollars over a decade. In response, the White House issued a statement that the report was "more proof that bipartisan commonsense immigration reform will be good for economic growth and deficit reduction."

Arguments in favor of increased immigration and population growth to promote economic growth are deceptive. The only real issue facing the planet is the long-term state of the biosphere. Increasing population invariably increases total economic activity, and it certainly increases the wealth and power of those in control. The amount of money being earned and in circulation are transitory, however, affecting only the comfort of the current generation. The adage "A king's glory is in his population" is true. But it ignores the many costs of immigration, especially the long-term ones. Each person added to the US population causes the destruction of one acre of natural land, through conversion to homes, roads, schools, hospitals, stores and factories. Large-scale industrial human population is causing the extinction of an estimated 30,000 species per year. It is destroying the planet on which we exist, as a habitat for other species and ultimately, for our own.

The current estimated 11 million illegal aliens murder an estimated 12 people per day, and kill another 13 through automobile accidents. See Joseph Farah's article, "Illegal Aliens Murder 12 Americans Daily," posted at <http://www.wnd.com/2006/11/39031/> for discussion of the slaughter of US citizens caused by illegal aliens. It is not generally recognized that about these same numbers apply to legal immigrants, as well. Legal immigrants are estimated to cause more damage to the environment, since they possess a larger economic "footprint" (use more energy and resources).

The current population growth rate of the United States is about one percent a year, or about three million people. As the US population explodes and the country becomes more crowded, the quality of life deteriorates. In the 1950s and 1960s, when I was young, my father, on an average salary, could easily afford several cottages on lakes, and people could camp in state and federal parks without having to make reservations a year in advance. Owning cottages on lakes is now reserved mainly for the wealthy, and state and federal parks are severely overcrowded. The price of oceanfront property is now out of reach for most Americans. From Fodor's *The Carolinas and Georgia* (18 edition, 2009), on the Myrtle Beach area of South Carolina (my home state): "Myrtle Beach was a late bloomer. Until 1901 it didn't have an official name; that year the first hotel went up, and oceanfront lots were selling for \$25. Today, more than 13 million people a year visit the region...." My sister pays about \$5,000 per year for "lot rent" on perhaps one-tenth of an acre in Myrtle Beach, several blocks back from the ocean.

The US government does not have an explicit, publicly stated population policy, but its *de facto* population policy is reflected in its immigration policy, which adds almost three million people per year to the country. Logically, immigration policy should flow from population policy, not vice versa. The US' religion is economics, which thrives on scarcity. Increasing the population to intolerable levels causes the prices of fixed resources, such as land, lakefront, and oceanfront properties to skyrocket, denying their low-cost access to most people.

The argument to spend billions of dollars to construct a fence along the US-Mexico border is a complete red herring. The number of illegal aliens entering the US each year is estimated to be about 300,000 (see Wikipedia article on Illegal Immigration for statistics). What is the point of building a fence to keep out 300,000 per year, when almost three million per year are admitted legally? The border fence is a complete boondoggle. It is a "make-work" project whose only purpose is to keep US citizens working harder. The fence does not make any difference in the long-term size of the US population when three million immigrants are admitted to the country each year. The US government wants massive immigration, legal or illegal, in support of its policy of continued economic growth, which serves the interests of the economic controllers of the country. Mass immigration will continue whether the fence is built or not.

It is estimated that about 340,000 anchor babies are born to illegal aliens every year. All of these anchor babies are granted "birthright" citizenship. If all illegal aliens were deported immediately, this would stop, immediately.

Senators Marco Rubio and John McCain have both said publicly that deportation of illegal aliens is not a practical or reasonable option. It certainly is both practical and reasonable. It could be accomplished within 30 days – give the illegal aliens 30 days to leave, or send them to hard-labor concentration camps. Most would be gone in 30 days, and most of the remaining in the camps would be gone in another 30 days. Immediate deportation is decried by some as being "not fair." Illegal aliens are criminal invaders of our country, each of whom is taking up space and causing the destruction of one acre of natural land. It is not necessary or desirable to be "fair" to them. They should be deported immediately.

The estimated 11 million illegal aliens cause an awkward problem for the US government. It wants massive immigration, and it does not really care whether it is legal or illegal. But allowing so many aliens to invade our country makes it look weak and feckless. It would prefer simply to grant unconditional amnesty to them, as Ronald Reagan did for eight million of them, but that, too, makes it look bad. So it feels that it must do something, like making them pay a nominal fine and wait a few more years than legal immigrants before they are granted citizenship. Once again, US citizenship is up for sale. Invade our country, rape and murder our people, join the "path to citizenship" and pay a small fine, and you are a US citizen, joining any anchor babies you may have had during your stay. About the only thing more disgusting than selling US citizenship is giving it away for free, via the "Green Card Lottery," in which, each year, 50,000 Schumer Diversity Visas are granted to randomly selected individuals. US citizenship used to be highly valued; now it is available to criminal invaders and for free via a lottery.

All US presidents since Dwight Eisenhower have failed to uphold their vow to support the US Constitution, which requires that they defend the states from invasion. They have aided and abetted illegal aliens. Eisenhower implemented "Operation Wetback" to halt the flow of illegal immigrants. All US presidents since Eisenhower are guilty of gross malfeasance in office, and of high treason.

The 11 million illegal aliens currently in the country have already destroyed an estimated 11 million acres of natural land. That damage has already been done. What is relevant to the future is the damage that can be avoided in the future, if they are deported. If all of the estimated 11 million illegal aliens are deported immediately, the benefits are: (1) 340,000 anchor babies will not be born each year; 25 US citizens will not be killed each day by illegal aliens; the US population will drop immediately by 11 million, avoiding the cultural, social and environmental destruction that this large number of criminal invaders causes each year. Of course, if the US continues to allow the entry of three million legal immigrants to the country each year, the benefit of deporting the 11 million illegal aliens will disappear within four years.

Mass immigration from poor cultures and globalization are destroying the quality of life for the US middle class. When I was young, a man of the large US middle class could support his wife and children and own a home and car. That level of living is now beyond many of the shrinking middle class, even when both the man and wife work. The US government is straddling the middle class with the burden of costly overseas wars and a massive welfare state at home.

When George Orwell wrote *1984* in the late 1940s, he observed that a major problem of modern industrial society was overproduction. Overproduction was a major cause of the Great Depression, which was not really ended until the US joined World War II. Keep the citizens busy building things, and keep blowing them up, is a recipe for success for industrial society. That policy continued to work fairly well with the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the two Iraq wars, the Afghanistan War, and the War on Terror. Wars against large enemies, such as Germany, Japan, Russia and China no longer work well, because of the massive destructive power of modern weapons. The wars in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan, and the War on Terror, work well for the US government since they are very asymmetrical – the superpower US against a weak foe. We can blow up all the exquisitely expensive weapons and enemy infrastructure as we want, with few American casualties. All it takes is an enemy, no matter how small or weak. With drone warfare, the US warrior is at no risk at all. While massive casualties are acceptable to the citizenry for a defensive war for survival (the US Revolution, the US War between the States, World War II), they are politically unacceptable for political wars of aggression or wars to destroy surplus industrial production.

The US could implement its policy of using war as a means of destroying surplus production without increasing the population by three million per year. So why does it continue to do this, when it is destroying the environment, traditional US culture, and quality of life afforded by a low-density population? There are two major reasons. The first is that the US is in dire danger of losing its hegemonic position in the world to China, as it industrializes. With 1.2 billion people, it will blow the US away as it industrializes. China is working to stabilize its population, and the US is working to increase its population as fast as it can. The US could destroy much of China's population in a nuclear war, but that approach is a double-edged sword, with US population, cities and infrastructure as vulnerable as Chinese ones. The second reason is simple greed. Capitalists such as Jeff Bezos, Steve Jobs, Bill Gates and Larry Ellison make far more money in an economy of 300-400 million people than in an economy of 135 million (the US population in 1942, the year in which I was born).

### **Never a Republican President Again?**

Here follows a copy of a letter I sent recently to my local newspaper.

**Joseph George Caldwell**  
503 Chastine Drive, Spartanburg, SC 29301

Tel. (864)541-7324, e-mail [jcaldwell9@yahoo.com](mailto:jcaldwell9@yahoo.com)

17 June 2013

Dear Sir:

In the June 17, 2013 edition of the Spartanburg Herald-Journal, Senator Lindsey Graham laments that if Republicans do not relax US immigration standards, they will not put a president in the White House in 2016. Who cares? The US president, of whatever political party, is nothing more than an agent (puppet or stooge are perhaps more appropriate terms, but less polite) for the economic religion and banking establishment that control this world and country. Whether the president is a Democrat or Republican, he is required by the moneyed interests who place him in that office to promote a policy of economic (and population) growth, no matter what the cost to the environment, living space, or traditional cultural values.

Illegal immigrants are criminal invaders of our country. They should be deported immediately, and this action should have nothing to do with whether our borders are secure. They should be subject to criminal punishment, not rewarded with a path to US citizenship, which, it is now clear, is for sale for the payment of a small fine for the criminal act of invading our country.

The estimated 11 million illegal aliens take up space, destroy the environment (an estimated one acre of natural land is destroyed per new resident, for homes, schools, hospitals, factories, parking lots and roads), and kill or maim thousands of US citizens through murder and automobile accidents. They will add thousands or millions of "birthright" citizens to a population that is already far beyond what solar energy can support.

Sincerely,

Joseph George Caldwell

### **Senator Lindsey Graham's Telephone Town Hall Meeting**

16 August 2013

Senator Lindsey Graham:

About two o'clock this afternoon I received a telephone call inviting me to attend a telephone-conference-call town meeting. Thank you for asking me to participate. I listened for a while, and then pressed \*3 to participate. After some time (three other callers), I decided not to wait further to participate. Here follow the issues I would have addressed, and some of the points I would have made:

1. Health Care: The pre-Obama-care insurance system did not work well (the most expensive system in the world, but not the best medical care in the world), but it did contain a rationing element in which people could acquire as much in the way of benefits as they could afford, and the rest went to hospital emergency rooms for "stabilization." "Obamacare" does not contain an effective rationing element: everyone is provided insurance for a high level of care, but not everyone must pay – the government picks up the tab for a very large proportion of citizens. Such a system, with the best level of care for everyone,

and no rationing element, will collapse. The insurance-based model, even with rationing (via price) has not worked well. When my first child was born in Spartanburg in 1960 at what was then Spartanburg General Hospital, the physician's bill was \$125, and the cost of the hospital room was about the cost of a first-class hotel. I was recently in the hospital for an "outpatient" procedure, and the hospital bill for my six-hour stay was sixteen thousand dollars. What I propose is a national system of local clinics that provide basic medical care to all citizens for no charge, and let people who want more than basic care to buy insurance in the free market, as in the past. This system contains a rationing element – the government decides what level of care is provided in the clinics, and people buy as much additional care as they can afford.

2. Taxation: The main problem with the current tax system is that it is an income-tax system. Changing to a "flat tax," as you mentioned in the discussion, does not address the fundamental problem. I propose to eliminate the income tax system and replace it with a consumption tax system, such as a value-added tax (VAT). With an income-tax system the government must monitor and tax a hundred million or so taxpayers, instead of a few million businesses. Businesses are set up to do the recordkeeping associated with taxation. To force private individuals to do this is extremely inefficient, burdensome and intrusive. I wrote a book on this topic, posted at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/VAT.htm>.
3. Immigration: Immigration should be driven by a nation's population policy, not the other way around. The nation's unstated but *de facto* population policy is continued growth at an average rate of 1.16 percent per year, or almost three million people per year. This population growth rate is not only unsustainable in the long run, but it is very destructive of the environment and the quality of life for US citizens. Each additional resident in the US causes the destruction of one acre of natural land, for homes, roads, schools, hospitals, parking lots, and businesses. (Illegal immigration is a separate issue: illegal immigrants murder an average of 12 US citizens per day and kill an average of 13 US citizens per day (see Joseph Farah's article, "Illegal Aliens Murder 12 Americans Daily," posted at Internet web site <http://www.wnd.com/2006/11/39031/> for details). Illegal immigrants are criminal invaders of our country, and should all be deported immediately.) The nation is addicted to continued economic growth, which is not sustainable. *Steady-state economics* is an alternative, sustainable economic system. See Nicholas Georgescu Roegen's book, *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process* (Harvard University Press, 1971, 1999); *Beyond Growth* by Herman E. Daly (Beacon Press, 1996); *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future* by Herman. E. Daly and John B. Cobb, Jr. (Beacon Press, 1989, 1994).

Sincerely,

Joseph George Caldwell  
503 Chastine Drive, Spartanburg, SC 29301  
Tel. (864)541-7324, e-mail [jcaldwell9@yahoo.com](mailto:jcaldwell9@yahoo.com)

### **A. C. Grayling on Terrorism**

A. C. Grayling is a noted British author of many books on philosophy. Two of his books that I have read are *The Choice of Hercules: Pleasure, Duty and the Good Life in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Phoenix, 2009) and *The Form of Things* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2006). In the latter book, in writing about the loss of liberty by many in the so-called war on terrorism, Grayling raises the question of why the rights of so many law-abiding citizens should be curtailed to guard against attacks from Arabs and Islamists (who have perpetrated most of the major terrorist acts in our time), simply to avoid infringement of the rights of a very few (i.e., Arabs and Islamists). Instead of profiling Arab-looking airplane passengers, all passengers are uniformly subjected to onerous inspections, simply to avoid the appearance of singling out a particular religious, ethnic, or racial group for warranted closer inspection, when it would be much more efficient to focus resources on likely suspects (via "profiling").

Here follows an excerpt from Grayling's chapter on Free Speech.

It should by now be a commonplace, though alas it is not, that the right response to attempts by violent enemies to coerce our society is to reassert the very liberties and values that make them attack us in the first place. To restrict ourselves out of fear of what they might do is to give them the victory they seek. If they were able to impose their will on our society, they would deprive us of many of the liberties distinctive of a Western democracy. Why do it to ourselves?

Here is an oddity of the situation. The terrorists responsible for the atrocities of 9/11 in New York and Washington, the Madrid train bombings and the London bombings are known to be Muslims and to be inspired by radical Islamist views. The government's proposed new illiberal laws are not, however, aimed only at the Muslim community, from among whom the terrorists are known to come. To do this would seem to be unduly provocative and discriminatory. So the government proposes to place the entire population of the United Kingdom under these illiberal laws, failing to see that if it would be a bad thing to subject a small portion of the population to them, it is considerably worse to make them indiscriminant.

Racial and ethnic profiling make sense. If you see a black man (or Hispanic-looking man or Arabic-looking man) steal something, it makes sense to look for a black man (or Hispanic-looking man or Arabic-looking man) in a search for the suspect. That is racial or ethnic profiling. It is a logical procedure, based on the principles of statistics, for apprehending criminals.

### **On Dan Brown's *Inferno***

I recently read Dan Brown's new book, *Inferno* (Doubleday, 2013). I enjoyed it, and I recommend it. The plot of the book is that a scientist is alarmed at the exploding human population, and decides to do something about it, by sterilizing much of the human race. Unfortunately, Brown does not realize is that if even a few human being remain alive, and they are able to breed as before, the world will quickly become filled with human beings again.

Here follow some excerpts from the book:

Page 104:

"Well, I can assure you that saving lives will become increasingly difficult in the coming years. Overpopulation breeds far more than spiritual discontent. There is a passage in Machiavelli –"

"Yes," she interrupted, reciting her recollection of the famous quote. ""When every province of the world so teems with inhabitants that they can neither subsist where they are nor remove themselves elsewhere...the world will purge itself."

Page 105:

"Any environmental biologist or statistician will tell you that humankind's best chance for long-term survival occurs with a global population of around four billion."

Page 139:

“...If you want more available clean water per capita, you need fewer people on earth. If you want to decrease vehicle emissions, you need fewer drivers. If you want the oceans to replenish their fish, you need fewer people eating fish.”

“...Ozone depletion, lack of water, and pollution are not the *disease* – they are the *symptoms*. The disease is overpopulation. An unless we face world population head-on, we are doing nothing more than sticking a Band-Aid on a fast-growing cancerous tumor.”

Page 213:

“Not surprisingly,” Sienna continued, “Zobrist was immediately attacked from all sides – politicians, clergy, the World Health Organization – all of whom derided him as a doomsdayer lunatic who was simply trying to cause panic. They took particular umbrage at his statement that today’s youth, if they chose to reproduce, would have offspring that would witness the end of the human race. Zobrist illustrated his point with a “Doomsday Clock,” which shows that if the entire span of human life on earth were compressed into a single hour...we are now in its final seconds.”

Page 214:

Sienna gave him a solemn shrug. “Robert, speaking from a purely scientific standpoint – all logic, no heart – I can tell you without a doubt that without some kind of drastic change, the end of our species is coming. And it’s coming fast. It won’t be fire, brimstone, apocalypse, or nuclear war...it will be total collapse due to the number of people on the planet. The mathematics is indisputable.”

Page 216:

“Exactly. Zobrist once said publicly that he wished he could put the genie back in the bottle and erase some of his contributions to human longevity. I suppose that makes sense ideologically. The longer we live, the more of our resources go to supporting the elderly and ailing.”

Brown’s book, *Inferno*, is a fast-paced, interesting novel, about the most important issue facing the planet. Although Brown is very much aware of the problem, he does not appreciate its nature. The planet cannot support four billion human beings long-term. Long-term, it can support about 500 million at a low standard of living and about 5 million at a high standard of living. See the book, *Can America Survive?* posted at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org> for more information about the long-term-sustainable human population of Earth.

Brown’s plot line is somewhat ludicrous. The plot is to sterilize most of the human population, to reduce the population to a low level without having to kill anyone. As long as technology continues and human beings continue to breed at any positive rate for a long time, the population quickly grows to unsustainable levels. See *Can America Survive?* for a long-term-sustainable solution to the population problem (the “minimal-regret population”).

### **On Laura Hillenbrand’s *Unbroken***

I recently read Laura Hillenbrand’s book, *Unbroken: A World War II Story of Survival, Resilience, and Redemption* (Random House, 2010). It is the true-life story of Louis Zamperini, who was a Japanese prisoner of war for a couple of years in World War II. I found the book particularly interesting because two of my uncles (Robert Barter and Frank McColm of Grand

Cascapedia, Quebec, Canada) were captured in Hong Kong on Christmas Day of 1941, and served as Japanese prisoners of war for four years.

When Japan saw that it was losing the war, its leaders issued an order to execute all prisoners of war, so that they would be unable to describe their mistreatment under the Japanese. This order was not carried out solely because of the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August of 1945.

The horrific treatment of Japanese prisoners of war is also described in the following books:

Bérard, Léo Paul, *17 Days until Christmas*, 1997 (published In Canada by Léo Paul Bérard; out of print) (Bérard served in the unit in which my two uncles served.)

*McIntosh, Dave, Hell on Earth: Aging Faster, Dying Sooner, Canadian Prisoners of the Japanese during World War II*, McGraw-Hill Ryerson (Canada), 1997

Bishop, Arthur, *Canada's Glory: Battles that Forged a Nation*, McGraw-Hill Ryerson (Canada), 1996

### **On Bradley Manning and Nidal Malik Hasan**

On July 30, 2013, PFC Bradley Manning was convicted of espionage for leaking massive amounts of classified material to WikiLeaks. For this treacherous act, he should be severely punished. At the same time, all of his superiors, to the President of the United States, should be punished equally severely. They approved and supported the system and circumstances that led directly to Manning's actions.

The US government has adopted a ludicrous policy for handling of sensitive material. Tens of thousands of people, including Islamists and people of Arabic descent (the ethnic groups accounting for the most serious recent terrorist attacks), have been granted high-level security clearances. From the Wikipedia article on Bradley Manning: "The decision to discharge him was revoked, and he started basic training again in January 2008. After graduating in April, he moved to [Fort Huachuca](#), Arizona, where he trained as an intelligence analyst, receiving a TS/SCI security clearance ([Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information](#)). According to Nicks, this security clearance, combined with the digitization of classified information and the government's policy of sharing it widely, gave Manning access to an unprecedented amount of material. Nicks writes that he was reprimanded while at Fort Huachuca for posting three video messages to friends on *YouTube*, in which he described the inside of the "[Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility](#)" (SCIF) where he worked."

The US government is incredibly foolish in its system for handling of classified material. Manning was unstable, and should never have been granted a security clearance or access to classified material. Those who have approved and support this ridiculous system are as guilty as Manning, and should be punished as severely as he is.

When I was young, I worked in the field of military systems analysis (game theory, optimal allocation), and possessed high-level security clearances (higher than Manning's). Back then, classified was kept in analog form. When a report was to be distributed, a specific number of copies were made, cataloged, and distributed. All copies were kept in special "security" safes. The only way a classified report could be compromised was for someone to physically steal it. Security clearances were not granted to persons who were knowingly unstable, such as

someone who had seen a psychologist or psychiatrist. People who could be blackmailed, such as adulterers or those having relatives in enemy countries, were not granted clearances. Granting a security clearance to an unstable person, such as Manning, is foolish enough. Setting up a system where he could easily disclose 700,000 classified documents is vastly more foolish. Manning is a simple fool. It is the people who gave Manning a security clearance and access to a million classified documents who are the real criminals in this incident.

The same logic applies to the perpetrator of the Fort Hood Massacre (November 5, 2009), Major Nidal Malik Hasan. His instability and animosity toward the United States was well known, and his superiors willfully chose to do nothing about this. All of them, up to the President, are as guilty as Hasan, and should be punished comparably.

Coincidentally, as I write this article (18 August 2013), an article appeared in the Spartanburg Herald Journal today, reporting on the needless death of an English bulldog, who was left in a car for 45 minutes (in the shade, while it was raining), and perished. The article's author asserts the same point as I made above, that those who condone wrongful actions are also guilty. Here follows an extract from Pam Stone's article:

Like everyone else, I was devastated to learn of the heat exhaustion and subsequent death of the young English bulldog, Thor, made known to us in local news.

"How could anyone be so stupid!" fumed animal lovers on social media. "The owners need to go to jail!"

And many nodded in agreement for a more draconian measure: "Make the owners sit in a hot car with cracked windows for 45 minutes!"

Reports tell us that, indeed, Thor was locked in his car, windows cracked, for 45 minutes while the family was on a bathroom break in the mall upon returning from a trip to the beach. They are said to be heartbroken because it's not that they locked their beloved pet in a broiling car in the sun. They parked in the shade, and it was raining.

Many might be surprised that a dog would die in that situation.

But this is the South, and while last weekend was showery, it was also exceedingly warm and humid — it would have been torture for any living thing to sit inside a car that, with its windows rolled nearly all the way up, was basically a terrarium, particularly for those short-snouted animals that we have learned are even more susceptible to heat stroke and exhaustion.

The biggest crime of all, I think, lies not at the owner's feet as they truly were simply ignorant to their dog's welfare, but to the state of South Carolina, which not only has no legislation to protect animals locked inside cars but also has a long and baffling history of being far too lenient with animal abuse in general.

On August 21, Manning was sentenced to 35 years in prison for his crimes. All those who have worked to digitize classified material and grant security clearances willy nilly to people who have no business having them should be similarly sentenced.

## **On Hillary Clinton**

In hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the attack on the US consulate in Benghazi (January 24, 2013), then-US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton defended her failure to defend the consulate and avoid the deaths of four US citizens. Here follows an excerpt from the New York Post on this issue:

In her afternoon appearance before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the secretary of state fenced with Rep. Michael McCaul (R-Texas) over a cable calling for more security sent by Libyan Ambassador Christopher Stevens a month before he died in the terrorist assault along with three other Americans.

“A million cables a year come to the State Department. They’re not all addressed to me,” Clinton barked, distancing herself from the massacre.

“This cable went unnoticed by your office,” McCaul shot back. “That’s the bottom line.”

That is indeed the bottom line. Clinton headed an organization of 30,000 employees. She was responsible for processing all cables received by the state department. She failed to set up management systems to notice this important report. She failed miserably in running a large organization, and she refuses to accept responsibility for her failure. She has demonstrated very well her lack of competence to run a large organization.

### **On Gay Marriage**

I bear no particular feelings of ill will toward homosexuals. As long as their activities don’t corrupt my children and others, they are of little concern. But it is a fact that their activities are a biological perversion. Why should US taxpayers be asked to subsidize biological perversion, by granting the economic benefits associated with heterosexual marriage to homosexual people? I see no compelling reason to subsidize biological perversion, and so I am opposed to gay marriage.

### **On Islamic Terrorists**

A few days ago (August 15, 2013), the Egyptian military dispersed protest camps set up by supporters of ousted President Morsi, killing hundreds of citizens. The reaction of the world was to decry this violence, and call for an end to it. These calls were made primarily by leaders of Christian nations, who do not appear to understand the heavenly rewards granted to martyrs under the Islamic religion.