

A case for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness through the exposure of Liberalism as founded in Godless Marxism and a road to tyranny and poverty. Two things that should not be discussed, religion and politics, are proudly presented.

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

**Buy The Complete Version of This Book at
Booklocker.com:**

<http://www.booklocker.com/p/books/4496.html?s=pdf>

The Audacity of
Common Sense and
Scripture

Joseph Russo

Copyright © 2010 Joseph Russo
Cover art by Ana Ramirez
ISBN 978-1-60910-037-7

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the author.

Printed in the United States of America.

BookLocker.com, Inc.
2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Liberal Socialism and the philosophy of Karl Marx.....	5
Chapter 2: A Mix of Marxism in America.....	22
Chapter 3: The Welfare State and Charity as a Personal Responsibility.....	46
Chapter 4: Business and the profit motive.....	65
Chapter 5: Taxes and the National Debt.....	71
Chapter 6: American Foreign Policy.....	94
Chapter 7: Universal Health Care.....	137
Chapter 8: Environmental Politics.....	157
Chapter 9: Abortion, the Crimson Holocaust.....	184
Chapter 10: Immigration.....	202
Chapter 11: Gun Ownership.....	224
Source Notes.....	243
About the Author.....	245

Chapter 4: Business and the profit motive

Many believe that the profit motive is corrupt and evil. People who work hard and have little to show for it can easily be led to feel jealous about profit. If businesses profit, it is sometimes thought, it must be because they are not paying their workers fairly. It makes many mad that businesses seemingly profit immensely and that executives get large bonuses. While we only get paid a little for so much work, they get millions. It just doesn't seem fair, but have you ever worked for a man who didn't work hard to excel?

Profit makes it possible to pay bonuses to executives and sometimes workers. Usually bonuses are based on performance and that seems acceptable to many. Some are highly offended by the idea, that some executives are given huge bonuses that seem unfathomable to the average worker. Most people don't mind if a major league sports figure is paid insane sums of money because they are in part responsible for the earning of insane sums of money for the sports franchise. Why isn't it reasonable that major league business talent can earn major league bonuses when they help a company create significant increases in business and profit? Sometimes bonuses are not clearly tied to performance. Many sports figures negotiate their high pay before they earn it, so why is it unfair that talented business people do the same?

In the non-governmental world, profit makes business possible. Without profit, a business can only operate until there is no more investment capital to keep it running or it has a money-losing period. But generally isn't business hugely profitable?

Joseph Russo

Don't owners make a fortune calling their own shots and making their own schedules? In short, no! Usually businesses start out small, perhaps in a spare room in the house or a garage. Many ambitious people save up for years or borrow from their retirement accounts, families or credit cards. However they come up with the start up capital, small business owners usually have to work 80 hours a week to get started. Many go broke quickly, devastated, disenfranchised, embarrassed and heart sick. No matter how many businesses succeed or go broke, one thing they have in common is that the government feeds off of them like a leech, taxing them in a multitude of ways, while giving them back almost nothing in return. It is of course the buyers of goods and services who are really paying the taxes, since the government collects the taxes from the public through the middleman collection agencies, the businesses. Government usually profits even if business loses.

If you don't believe that, start looking through the yellow pages from the past and see how many of the dated listings are still in the new book. Some of you will know what I am talking about, because you have tried to start a business. Whether you are still in business or not, you came out with a much greater respect for business and the profit motive. So if it is so profitable to be in business, why do so many go broke? Simple, it's not easy! It is actually very difficult. Successful small businesses often survive only when an entrepreneur marries the business and works at it 80 hours a week for years. If they stay very small and can keep an eye on all operations, that helps their survival odds significantly. Making it to the next step of growth is quite a challenge. It is difficult to rely on others to care as much as you do for your business, reputation and cliental. A few have made it and fewer yet have made it really big. Some have made it so big that they are failing in the current recession. Expansion

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

of credit, investment, hiring personnel and taking on more locations can be devastating errors when an economic bubble bursts. If a company is big enough to lobby key congressmen, some mega corporations can negotiate sweet loans or government contracts and survive the tough downturns. If business were easy, we would still be watching American Motors build less desirable cars and Studebaker build reliable but odd-looking cars that didn't sell well enough. Imagine if you could still buy 'Pop' brand soda, Lava brand soap or a Stinson airplane. Who wouldn't enjoy flying Braniff Airlines or riding a private owned passenger rail such as the 'California Limited?' Wow, how the scene has changed in the past few years. Remember when the local hardware store, dime store, drug store and grocer were as unique as the town and people they served. In today's world we have become accustomed to the super-size box stores and mass merchandising with a defined lack of local taste and talent.

People who have not invested their lives into a business may not realize how much time and money it takes to stay in compliance with dozens of government entities demanding fees, paperwork, accounting, audits and worse. This, in some cases may be considered by some important for the 'greater social good,' but it also takes a significant portion of the owner's time and revenue. Many times, it takes so much time and energy that hard working dedicated owners throw in the proverbial towel and give up because of financial failure, frustration and exhaustion. According to the Small Business Administration, one third of business fail in the first two years, by four years, 56% fail, by 5 years 70% fail, by 20 years only about 5% are still in business. The leading causes of failure are over expansion, poor capital structure, overspending, lack of reserve funds, bad location, poor execution and internal controls,

Joseph Russo

inadequate business plan, failure to change with the times, ineffective marketing and self-promotion and understanding the competition. Business is very hard, despite the common misconceptions; if it were easy, everyone would be doing it. Incredibly difficult regulatory environment also makes it a miserable experience too often. Years ago, in the United States, if you wanted to start a business, all you needed was ambition and some money. Now you need to overcome extensive regulations and record keeping and spend wasted days with auditors. The fact is that business is not for everyone. Most people are in fear of the unknown and prefer the comfort of a regular job working for the person, company or entity that can manage the business challenge. Most people do not want to marry their job, work eighty hours a week, spend the energy required, wear the numerous hats and get it all right or lose it all. Perhaps being jealous of the company profit may not be fair or justified. Why be angry with the job maker if you are afraid to make your own? Did you know that entrepreneurs provide about 70% of jobs in the United States?

Talent is special! Don't we all wish we had more of it? Some people are superhuman in some talents and most of us are not. I wish I could swim like Michael Phelps or play football like Brett Favre. We all have special gifts and callings and cannot all be super stars in areas of our choice. In God's eyes, a super star may be the mother who keeps the commandments and rears respectable children.

Like any parent, God likely loves us all the same, but he may not wish to reward us all the same here on earth. The parable of the Talents is one example we can look at (Mathew 25:14-30) ***“For it is just like a man about to go on a journey who called his own slaves and trusted his possessions to them. To one he***

gave five talents, to another two and to another, one, each according to his ability; and he went on his journey. Immediately, the one who had received the five talents went and traded with them, and gained five more talents. In the same manner, the one who received two talents gained two more. But the one who received the one talent went away, and dug a hole in the ground and hid his master's money. Now after a long time, the master of those slaves came and settled accounts with them. The one who had received five talents came up and brought five more talents, saying, 'master, you entrusted five talents to me. See I have gained five more talents.' His master said to him, 'Well done you good and faithful slave. You were faithful with a few things, I will put you in charge of many things; enter into the joy of your master.' Also, the one who received two talents came up and said, 'Master, you have entrusted two talents to me. See, I have gained two more talents.' His master said to him, 'Well done good and faithful slave. You were faithful with a few things, I will put you in charge of many things; enter into the joy of your master.' And the one also who had received one talent came up and said, 'Master, I knew you to be a hard man, reaping where you did not sow and sowing where you scattered no seed. And I was afraid and went away and hid your talent in the ground. See you have what is yours.' But his master said to him, 'you wicked, lazy slave, you knew that I reap where I did not sow and gathered where I scattered no seed. Then you ought to have put my money in the bank, and on my arrival, I would have received my money back with interest. Therefore, take away the talent from him and give it to the one who has ten talents.' For to everyone who has, more shall be given and he will have an abundance; but for the one who does not have, even what he does have shall be taken away. Throw out the worthless slave into the outer

Joseph Russo

darkness; in that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

Wow, what is this talk about slaves? Could slavery have been commonplace in antiquity? In today's world, we might choose to use the word employee. Of course, since much of the employee's wages are taken without his personal approval by the government, perhaps slave is a good word to use. It does appear in this scripture that God will reward hard work, investment and ambition and punish those who fail to work or invest. (Mathew 25:29) ***“For to everyone who has more shall be given and he will have an abundance; but for the one who does not have, even what he does have shall be taken away.”*** Is that fair? Is it for us to judge? God clearly appreciates work and investment, so perhaps it isn't wicked to invest and profit. Perhaps poverty is not necessarily righteous. Perhaps the seemingly overpaid super stars and corporate leaders are justified. Perhaps the profit motive is not immoral by itself. Maybe we are wrong to envy the rich and be envious of the super compensated. Maybe we should focus on our own efforts and look to those with greater success for career inspiration.

On our earthly stay, we may or may not earn a fortune or even a sustainable living; however, after graduation to everlasting life for the chosen, the rewards are promised to be much greater. (Mathew 6:19-21) Jesus said: ***“Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth where moths and rust destroy and where thieves break in and steal, but store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys and where thieves do not break in or steal. So where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.”*** Clearly, some will have their reward on earth and some will have their reward in heaven.

Chapter 8: Environmental Politics

We have been taught for decades, that human and industrial energy use is causing the air to be pumped full of carbon dioxide (CO₂), leading to catastrophic global warming. Global warming is the great challenge we face today, or so we are led to believe. Al Gore and the environmental movement would lead us to believe that our comfortable standard of living and industrial economy is wrecking the global environment and leading us to certain doom. His brush paints a picture of catastrophic global warming, coastal inundation and global temperatures rising beyond human habitation. Gore, a life long politician lacking scientific education, predicted in his book, 'An Inconvenient Truth,' *a rise in sea level of 18 to 20 feet by the year 2100*. In his New York Times op-ed, Gore stated the following: *"In the last 150 years, in an accelerating frenzy, we have been removing increasing quantities of carbon from the ground, mainly in the form of coal and oil, and burning it in ways that dump 70 million tons of CO₂ every 24 hours into the Earth's atmosphere."* According to Gore, *"many scientists are now warning that we are moving closer to several 'tipping points,' that could, within 10 years, make it impossible for us to avoid irreversible damage to the planet's habitability for human civilization. Earth and Venus are almost exactly the same size, and have almost exactly the same amount of carbon. The difference is that most of the carbon on Earth is in the ground, having been deposited there by various forms of life over the last 600 million years, and most of the carbon on Venus is in the atmosphere. As a result, while the average temperature on Earth is a pleasant 59 degrees, the average temperature on Venus is 867 degrees."*

Joseph Russo

Any reasonable person would laugh at Al Gore's assessments. Every second grader knows that Venus is much closer to the sun, so of course it is much hotter. Of course, less CO2 emission equals less green plant and tree growth, since plant life takes in CO2 and gives off oxygen. What is being attacked as a planet killer is really plant friendly. CO2 is what we exhale! Follow the logic and we are killing the planet by breathing. Eliminate us and perhaps the planet has a chance. What is Gore trying to accomplish with his version of fear mongering? Gore is a big government guy. Gore, in his insider arrogance, may believe in complex government solutions to simplistic problems. Greater government is his hope, in order that; we the people can be properly managed. Growing government is his goal. Fear mongering environmentalism is the tool used to create a false Marxist based anti-capitalist, anti-God religion, 'the Green movement,' in order to dupe voters into following along. Gore states that there would be, for our generation, ***“a privilege of experiencing: a generational mission, a compelling moral purpose, a shared cause and the thrill of being forced by circumstances to put aside the pettiness and conflict of politics and to embrace a genuine moral and spiritual challenge.”*** We can have the pleasure of giving up our wonderful life style for the cause, while Gore jet-sets around the world in a jumbo carbon footprint jet to sell doom. (1 Corinthian 2:14-15) ***But a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually appraised. But he who is spiritual appraises all things, yet he himself is appraised by no one.***

How can it be you ask that Gore is wrong? The major news media play stories, frequently supporting the claims made by the environmentalists. My children are taught about greedy

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

capitalist businesses polluting the environment in the name of profit, you say. Surely there must be something to it you might also say. Even the President of the United States is on board as are every one of his environmental advisors. President Obama is pushing for an 80 percent reduction in CO2 by the year 2050. I hope you took time to think that politicians may not be forthright at all times. Nazi propaganda minister Goebbels stated: ***“If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe in it.”*** These lies are being pounded into our consciences through media, education, advertisement, marketing and dishonest or inept politicians. A lie is still a lie and the truth is still the enemy of a lie. We do not have a Nazi government, but Goebbels stated an undeniable truth about the power of a lie, that is in wide practice even in the US.

Consider the possibility that the global disaster thesis may not be right. Their scenarios are suspect, and likely based on flawed or corrupt statistical models. Global warming is not a new concept. In Greenland, Vikings grazed cattle a thousand years ago, when it was much warmer than it is now. A recent Rasmussen poll shows that 51% of US voters do not believe that man is the cause for global warming, but rather long term planetary trends are responsible. Only 41% believe that man is to blame. What people think does not change what is or is not, but it does change the politician’s ability to pass new tax legislation such as ‘Cap and Trade’ or other carbon fuel based taxes.

Even with a majority of our citizens believing otherwise, the major media ignores or laughs at dissenting views. How is that fair and balanced? Even President Obama, at the UN, recently spoke about certain catastrophe if we do not implement ‘Cap

Joseph Russo

and Trade' policy. His message was welcomed, because everyone there knew that 'Cap and Trade' is about instituting international wealth redistribution or welfare from us to them, under the dishonest cover of 'saving the environment.'

Of course you remember learning in high school, that a dozen millennia ago, sea levels were much lower. Ice formed a bridge connecting Asia, America and Europe. Half the United States at that time was covered in Ice. Had it not warmed up; it could hardly sustain human life. The internal combustion engine is just over a century old and we are led by the loons to believe that it is the cause of our coming demise. Long before man introduced carbon fuel based carbon dioxide emissions, global warming occurred on a grand scale. The nice thing is, as the planet has warmed and become more hospitable to man and agriculture. As the ice cap melts, the oceans rise. We know of ancient coastal communities that were inundated and lost to rising sea levels, but that has taken thousands of years. We suffered a mini ice age a couple centuries ago and once again, global warming, un-aided by man's carbon fuel emissions occurred. Researcher Alan Carlin has data showing that both solar activity and Pacific decadal oscillations were far more likely causes of the rise in global temperature that started at the end of the Little Ice Age in the late 1800s that continues today. If global warming is so bad, why do so many people travel to warm climate zones for vacation, ha ha?

Common sense is not in agreement with Gore and the environmentalists. Science too is not soundly on board with the thesis of Gore and his supporters. Many scientists are firmly against the global warming thesis and point to a trend of global cooling in recent years. Recently the Second International Conference on Climate Change was held in New York City.

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

The mainstream media consider that the science is settled and ignore those in disagreement with the current orthodoxy. Several highly respected keynote speakers provided testimony to the contrary. Arthur Robinson, Ph.D. and Professor of Chemistry at the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine directs the 'Petition Project.' The Petition Project has obtained the signatures of more than 31,000 scientists, including over 9,000 with Ph.D.s, who oppose the 'human-caused global warming' hypothesis. Richard S. Lindzen, Ph.D, Professor of Meteorology at MIT is one of the world's most respected atmospheric physicists. He specializes in climate, planetary waves, planetary atmospheres, and hydrodynamic instability. He is a critic of global warming catastrophe theories from anthropogenic sources. Lord Christopher Monckton, Third Viscount of Brenchley and adviser to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, produced a documentary DVD 'Apocalypse, No!' Monckton found major errors in the IPCC data that were overlooked by the 2,000 IPCC signatory scientists and government officials. Willie Soon is Ph.D. astronomer at Mount Wilson Observatory and physicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center. Astrophysicist Dr. Soon is author of 'Maunder Minimum: And the Variable Sun-Earth Connection,' and is a chief de-bunker of the myths of increased hurricane activity and polar bear population declines associated with global warming. Polar bears numbers are increasing, not decreasing.

Professor Nigel Weiss is a scientist, a Professor Emeritus at the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics at the University of Cambridge. He is also a past President of the Royal Astronomical Society. Professor Weiss claims that we may be on the cusp of a period of global cooling. Weiss thinks it possible that humans can have an impact on the climate, but it is not possible to determine the nature of that impact at present.

Joseph Russo

Weiss notes factors other than man are known to impact climate considerably including variable behavior of the sun. Weiss stated the following: ***“There is increasing evidence that Earth’s climate responds to changing patterns of solar magnetic activity. The sun has been unusually active over recent decades. If you look back into the sun’s past, you find that we live in a period of abnormally high solar activity. That pattern has been getting quiet lately, but every so often, perhaps every 200 years or so, solar activity subsides. These hyperactive periods do not last long, perhaps 50 to 100 years, and then you get a crash. It’s a boom-bust cycle, and I would expect a crash soon. No one knows precisely when a crash will occur, but some expect it soon, because the sun’s polar field is now at its weakest since measurements began in the early 1950s. Some predict the crash within five years.”*** ⁽¹⁷⁾ Professor Weiss is not alone in his opinions, but you wouldn’t know that by trusting the major media outlets, which insult anyone who is against the Gore type hype and lies.

The Kyoto Protocol is a 1997 UN environmental treaty said to be aimed at achieving, ***‘stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere.’*** As of 2009, 183 parties have ratified the treaty. Under this treaty, industrialized nations agreed to reduce green house gas emissions by 5.2% on average from 1990 levels. Some nations have been awarded an increase in emissions. The United States has not yet signed on, because many congressmen understand the political implications of the treaty. The treaty will require a reduction of carbon fuel use and will produce a devastatingly depressing effect on the economy. President Obama is currently pushing for the **‘Cap and Trade’** bill, which is essentially the same thing. The Kyoto Protocol sets up emissions trading credits as a method of charging fuel tax on a global scale. The plan is based on wealth redistribution

from industrialized nations, through global government, and after they shave off their piece, on to developing nations. It is much like a giant welfare administration program. The UN will have a substantial and reliable funding source. Citizens in developed nations will incur a substantially reduced standard of living as energy and product costs rise. Developing nations will get a subsidy award for their supposed unused carbon credits.

Al Gore would like to force the US into joining an international treaty aimed at cutting global warming pollution or CO₂ by 90% in the Western nations and at least half by the developing nations. That sounds like a great idea, but it is economically devastating and will likely make no significant difference in the global climate.

The San Francisco Chronicle reported that Senator Barbara Boxer is planning to make fighting global warming a major legislative crusade. The article cited a recent speech by Boxer describing the generational challenge of global warming. Boxer claimed the following: **“Melting of the polar ice caps will cause a 20’ rise in sea levels along California’s coasts.”**

The Senate under the leadership of Democrat Harry Reid is pushing for passage of its version of the Clean Energy and Security Act, known as ‘Cap and Trade,’ which is a carbon based CO₂ tax. What is one more tax you ask and how does it affect me? ‘Cap and Trade’ may limit Carbon emissions that businesses can produce by an estimated 30%. Basically, with today’s technology, businesses will have to use 30% less energy or reduce business by 30%. Surely the emerging nations who refuse to cooperate with these draconian conservation plans would love to have our lost business and provide our companies with all the energy they need. Jobs will follow the energy

Joseph Russo

supply! Senator Orin Hatch claimed that, ***“if the bill passed, we are expected to loose 1.7 to 2.7 million jobs per year, but the supposed benefit to be gained was an expected reduction of .007°F in global temperature after 100-years.”*** The tax will increase the cost of all carbon based fuels, including: Coal, natural gas, propane, oil, heating oil, gasoline, kerosene, Jet A, Aviation gas, diesel oil and so on. Your electricity is most likely generated with carbon-based fuel. According to a Heritage Foundation Study, the bill would boost the price at the gasoline pump by an inflation-adjusted \$1.38 per gallon by 2035, on top of other price increase that may occur. The bill would make fuel producers cut emissions by 44% in transportation sectors, which would make our refiners far less competitive than foreign producers. American businesses will be at a significant economic disadvantage, since many developing nations have said they will not participate in global greenhouse emissions restrictions.

Basically, energy costs for business, home and transportation will go up substantially. Perhaps you might pay an extra couple hundred dollars or so per month in direct fuel tax and that can be a high price for many households. But isn't it worth it, if it helps save the environment? No, it is not worth it, because the tax will not make any significant change to the environment as stated already. In case it didn't already sink in, global warming has occurred for thousands of years without man's assistance. The tax will be used to fund global government that will further manage global citizenry. Do you want to be further managed? The tax will fund global programs and paralyze our economy without 'saving the planet.'

The bad news is that the extra money you pay for fuel tax is just the beginning of your increased cost. The tax will in effect

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

become very similar to a European style value-added tax. It will tax the energy use at every step of product research, development, exploration, shipping, manufacturing, distributing, marketing and so on. Every one of the scores of businesses that participate in getting finished goods and services to you, will pay higher taxes and higher wages to their more tax burdened employees, which will all be passed on to you! Companies do not pay tax; they just collect taxes, from consumers and workers and send them to the appropriate government agencies for mandated mismanagement. You the consumer will pay the taxes and they will not be an easy burden. Your purchasing power will be greatly diminished as you move rapidly towards poverty. You might get increases in your wages, but it will never be enough to make up for the erosion of your money's buying power.

Democrats, under Nancy Pelosi, are working to create a 'special legislative committee,' to study new programs to cut greenhouse gas emissions. The House of Representatives recently passed its version of 'cap and trade,' H.R. 2454 by a slim margin, though it is not yet law. Cap and Trade would establish a system where energy credits are bought, sold, traded and speculated for profit. The sales pitch is that a US company's carbon dioxide emission would be capped, and in order to exceed that limit, they would have to purchase credits from companies who have more credit than they need. Do you see that it doesn't limit, or cap emissions, it just forces companies to buy and sell credits through a brokerage house and in the process, pay the government tax. Brokerage houses will make a lot of money. Government will make a lot of money. We the people will be burdened with substantially higher taxes and product costs in order to fund global government that will work against our independence. According

Joseph Russo

to the Heritage Foundation, “***The Waxman-Markey version of the bill would cost the average family \$1,870 when enacted, and as the bill’s restrictions kick in, that number would rise to \$6,800 for a family of four by 2035. By 2020, the tax would cost the US economy \$161 billion.***” Can you think of one good reason you should want to fund this nonsense?

Can you guess where manufacturing and business will move? They will move anywhere away from the US and other industrialized nations, so that they may remain competitive in the global economy. When businesses move to China or India or wherever they find a more business friendly environment, how many US jobs will be lost? That isn’t right you say; make a law forcing them to stay here! Nice try, but if they stay, they will go broke and we will lose the jobs anyway. That is the way it works in today’s brave new global economy; both people and businesses seek out the best deal. I bet you would drive across town to pay less at a store in someone else’s neighborhood!

Environmental lobbyists are applying pressure to the Senate to adopt the measure and according to the USA Today, are willing to spend a great deal of money in television advertising trying to get it passed. Mainstream media tends to side with the Social Liberal side and will most likely be sympathetic with the environmentalist cause. If that alone doesn’t throw the fight, Washington globalist insiders are also trying to ram the legislation through, in order to advance their global governance agenda. This is not a onetime fight. If the legislation fails to pass this time, it will keep coming back around until it does. In the end it is about taxing Americans to fund global government and provide for the international welfare state. Why the Marxist elite cannot export our success rather than import European style tax rates and third world style poverty is a mystery to me.

The 'Green movement' religion is leading the global governance call in part to promote population control. It is full of radical animal rights and environmental groups that promote a belief that all life forms are divine or a potential god. Paganism is at the heart of the issue. In their view, society must turn away from outmoded monotheistic religions and turn towards a one-world government capable of caring for the planets non-human resources. Their view is omnitheistic and is clearly against any monotheistic concept such as Christianity, Judaism and Islam, which are seen as an assault to the earth with their pro human life teachings. The Judeo-Christian scripture clearly gives man a position of mastery over other life forms. In the first chapter of the Bible you find the following: (Genesis 1:28-30, 3:21) ***God blessed them (Adam and Eve), saying "be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth and conquer it. Be masters of the fish of the sea, the birds of Heaven, and all living animals on the earth." And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife garments of skin, and clothed them.***

Environmentalists are leading a religious green movement eco-revolution towards population control. Some of their outspoken preachers include Ted Turner, who calls pro-life citizens "bozos." He also said: ***"I do not want to go to heaven since there are no trees, no animals, just fundamentalist Christians."*** Sylvia Cohen of Midstream Magazine noted: ***"There is a distinct and explicit anti-Jewish tone. These Animal Rights activists apply the imagery drawn from the Holocaust to describe conventional farming, fishing and the killing of animals for food. They use the same imagery in harassing Jewish biomedical researchers and they direct recurrent attacks on kosher slaughter."*** David Foreman, founder of Earth First said: ***"Famine ought to be allowed to run its course in Ethiopia,"*** and called for an end to

Joseph Russo

immigration from Mexico and Central America. Eugenicists Adolf Eichmann, and Edward Abbey, author of an eco-sabotage novel, complained of the wilderness degradation caused by ***“millions of hungry, ignorant, unskilled, and culturally-morally-genetically impoverished people.”*** Chris Manes authored ‘Green Rage,’ and wrote a column for the ‘Earth First Journal’ asserting: ***“AIDS could assist in population control, thus lessening the ‘ecological load’ caused by human beings on this planet.”*** Ingrid Newkirk, founder and director of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals PETA stated: ***“When it comes to feelings, a rat is a pig is a dog is a boy. They are all mammals. They all feel pain. There is no rational basis for saying that a human being has special rights. 6 million people died in concentration camps, but 6 billion chickens will die this year in slaughterhouses.”***

Clearly, the eco radicals are anti-people and anti-Christ. Their distaste for people has driven their de-population planning efforts. Chlorine has been used since 1850 to reduce infectious diseases found in drinking water. It is probably the most effective E-coli bacteria killer known. Chlorine has probably saved more lives than penicillin. President Clinton proposed the ‘Chlorine Zero Discharge Act,’ in order to limit PCBs, Dioxins and CFCs. Of course, chlorine is natural and found in sodium chloride. The bill did not pass here in the US, but Greenpeace followed with a campaign to ban chlorine worldwide, claiming increased cancer and erectile dysfunction, based on very limited studies. In a report by Joe Thornton, entitled ‘The Product is Poison: The Case for a Chlorine Phase-out,’ Greenpeace said: ***“Enough is known about the toxicity of organochlorines already, all uses of chlorine must be phased out.”*** Radical environmentalists generally support population control; for fear that our planet cannot sustain increased population without

great degradation. Banning chlorine will lead to a significant rise in water borne disease and increased death rates, thus their desired population reduction.

Scientific evidence does not clearly support a need for the ban. Dr. Gordon W. Gribble, Professor of Chemistry at Dartmouth College, in a letter published in 'Environment, Science, and Technology,' stated: ***“Immense quantities of natural organochlorines occur in more than a dozen known natural sources, including lightning-induced forest fires, volcano eruptions, and the secretions of marine organisms. 400,000 tons of natural chlorophenols in Swedish peat bogs alone, 40 times that produced by the paper and pulp industry are enzymatically produced from humic acid degradation and the natural enzyme hloroperoxidase.”***

Another banned substance is dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), a very effective pesticide. DDT was very effective in controlling the spread of malaria and typhus by killing mosquitoes and lice. It was such a great blessing to humanity that Swiss chemist Paul Hermann Muller was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physiology of Medicine. DDT has been shown to remain in the ecosystem and the food chain long after its original use, causing harm and even death to animals considered harmless or useful to man. Author Rachel Carson published 'Silent Spring' in 1962, which claimed that the spraying of DDT may cause cancer and was a threat to wildlife. Her writing led to an outcry for the substance ban in the US in 1972 and at the Stockholm Convention, which, for the most part, banned its use worldwide in 2004 as an agricultural pesticide. Supporters claim a resurgence of endangered bird species, but at high cost in human life.

Joseph Russo

Malaria remains a major health challenge in many parts of the world. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that there are 250 million cases every year, resulting in about 1 million deaths, 90% of which occur in Africa, and mostly to children under the age of 5. Robert Gwadz of the National Institute of Health said in 2007 that: ***“The ban on DDT may have killed 20 million children”*** DDT is the most efficient and practical method of mosquito control known. Life saving benefits outweigh the limited environmental concerns by a wide margin. Anyone who has lost a child understands the value of life. We are talking about 20 million lost children! Arrogant elitist population control advocates may lean towards population control through disease, assuming the world will be a better place for themselves with less third world population. A pro-life stance would dictate that life is preserved first and environmental science is advanced to work away from any ill effects as practical.

In contrast to the organized-religion hating environmentalists, Pope John Paul II and Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew signed ‘Common Declaration of Environmental Ethics.’ Their goal was to shape and guide the ecological awareness concerning the degradation of basic natural resources such as water, air and land, brought about by technological progress. Both point to the mission of the human creature in God’s plan: ***“To be stewards called to collaborate with God in watching over creation in holiness and wisdom. The Christian form of ecological awareness builds on God’s ongoing and continual creation of the world, which allows us to discern a moral order and a code of ethics about the use of creation and the limits of that use. Common Declaration includes six ethical goals, which they invite all men and women of good will to ponder the importance of the following ethical goals: 1. To***

think of the world's children when we reflect on and evaluate our options for action. 2. To be open to study the true values based on the natural law that sustain every human culture. 3. To use science and technology in a full and constructive way, while recognizing that the findings of science have always to be evaluated in the light of the centrality of the human person, of the common good and of the inner purpose of creation. Science may help us to correct the mistakes of the past, in order to enhance the spiritual and material well being of the present and future generations. It is love for our children that will show us the path that we must follow into the future. 4. To be humble regarding the idea of ownership and to be open to the demands of solidarity. Our mortality and our weakness of judgment together warn us not to take irreversible actions with what we choose to regard as our property during our brief stay on this earth. We have not been entrusted with unlimited power over creation; we are only stewards of the common heritage. 5. To acknowledge the diversity of situations and responsibilities in the work for a better world environment. We do not expect every person and every institution to assume the same burden. Everyone has a part to play, but for the demands of justice and charity to be respected the most affluent societies must carry the greater burden, and from them is demanded a sacrifice greater than can be offered by the poor. Religions, governments and institutions are faced by many different situations; but on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity all of them can take on some tasks, some part of the shared effort. 6. To promote a peaceful approach to disagreement about how to live on this earth, about how to share it and use it, about what to change and what to leave unchanged. It is not our desire to evade controversy about the environment, for we trust in the capacity of human reason and the path of dialogue to reach agreement. We commit

Joseph Russo

ourselves to respect the views of all who disagree with us, seeking solutions through open exchange, without resorting to oppression and domination. It is not too late. God's world has incredible healing powers. Within a single generation, we could steer the earth toward our children's future. Let that generation start now, with God's help and blessing." (18)

The new Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church dedicates an entire chapter to environmental issues, in recognition of the subject's increasing importance. The opening numbers urge Christians to view the environment with a positive attitude, to avoid a gloom-and-doom mentality, and to recognize God's presence in nature. (19)

Pope Benedict recently produced 'Protection of the Environment: A Step Towards Integral Human Development.' The following is an excerpt of his work: ***"The created world, structured in an intelligent way by God, is entrusted to our responsibility and though we are able to analyze it and transform it we cannot consider ourselves creation's absolute master. We are called, rather, to exercise responsible stewardship of creation, in order to protect it, to enjoy its fruits, and to cultivate it, finding the resources necessary for every one to live with dignity. Through the help of nature itself and through hard work and creativity, humanity is indeed capable of carrying out its grave duty to hand on the earth to future generations so that they too, in turn, will be able to inhabit it worthily and continue to cultivate it."***

In contrast to the Papal guidance towards sustaining human life and love of environment, let's look again at some radical environmentalists who are dedicated to the health of the earth so much that they propose elimination of the human species. If you

think that anti-life forces are not hard at work, consider these examples: Alan Wiseman produced a book, *'The World Without Us,'* which calls for reducing the earth's population by 5 billion or 5 out of every 6 citizens. He calls his idea *'population based environmentalism.'* His idea is simple, that *reducing the population will reduce CO2 emissions.* The idea led Lee Wexler of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis to add in a proposal that *'parents should pay a tax or fine of \$28,200.00 per child, in order to offset their potential carbon footprint.'* 'The Voluntary Human Extinction Movement' is dedicated to phasing out the human race by asking citizens to cease procreating. Their motto is *"May we live well and die out."*

Former Soviet mastermind of the plot to murder Pope John Paul II, Gorbachev, heads UN affiliated Green Cross International and co-chairs the Earth Charter Commission. These organizations head up the UN version of environmental radicalism aimed at growing international government. They sell the false religion of environmental radicalism, the 'Green movement,' in order to gain a following to their global taxation schemes. The governmental and tax burdens placed on citizens of industrialized nations will lead to substantial increases in poverty in the developed nations. The G-8 group of eight leading and five added industrial nations wish to confront global warming and recently agreed to prevent the world's temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius, as though they could! Along with President Obama, the G-8 agreed to cut greenhouse emissions (CO2) by 80 percent by the year 2050. China and India are talking boldly about refusing to cooperate, since the program would destroy their economic growth.

Joseph Russo

Shifting gears, President Obama revealed recently that there would be 48 recipients of \$2.4 billion in federal grant money. The grants are supposed to stimulate domestic production of batteries and other 'green' car components, while saving or creating jobs. Critics complain that much of the \$2.4 billion in stimulus money from the 'American Recovery and Reinvestment Act' will be spent abroad. According to Alan Tonelson at the US Business & Industry Council, ***“The US is already running a trade deficit in most green products, there’s no reason to expect it will be any different on electric cars. We’re already quite reliant on foreign-made content.”*** Department of Energy (DOE) officials inspected applications for grant money with supposed industry experts and granted substantial contracts to non-US companies. French battery maker, Saft America will win almost \$100 million. LG Korea will be granted \$150 million for battery production. How can it be wise to give US taxpayer money to foreign manufacturers to stimulate the US economy? How can it be wise to give taxpayer money to industry sectors that the private sector is unwilling to support? Is the government wiser than business investors? There is no constitutional provision for this kind of government stimulus investment. Some new jobs will be created at taxpayer expense and many will be lost in the process, from the private self-supporting market sector. Government should stick to the business of law and the private sector should be left free to develop technology as the market dictates.

Electric cars are being promoted as a green technology of choice. Aside from the toxic batteries that must eventually be replaced, recycled or detoxified, electricity is not in adequate supply to make this a practical solution. As it is now, electric utilities often charge a tiered rate with a stingy subsistence allotment of power available at a base rate, a greater usage at

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

about double that rate, higher usage at about triple rate and a final rate topping 400% of the base rate. Essentially, the average homeowner with air conditioning, electric clothes dryer or water well ends up paying approximately double or triple rate for electricity. If people begin to charge electric cars at home, their electricity rates will climb accordingly. Energy cost savings claimed by electric car promoters are not taking into account the tripling of rates consumers will likely pay. They are not talking about the lack of adequate infrastructure available to transmit the needed power. Of course the electricity is not carbon neutral, unless it is nuclear. Since electricity has to be generated somewhere, the so-called carbon footprint is just being shifted to another area for non-nuclear sources. Electric cars will make sense when nuclear power is readily available, when power providers do not charge an escalating tiered rate, when the infrastructure is improved or when household solar generation improves dramatically.

In 1973 during the OPEC oil crisis we were importing 24% of our fuel. Today we import 70%, equal to \$700 billion dollars a year. Billions of dollars per year are flowing out of the US and into places; who are not necessarily friends of the US. The export of cash equals an export of domestic jobs, profit and US investment. Foreign governments, through shell corporations, use some of our energy money against us by lobbying our lawmakers to continue our foreign oil dependency policies. National defense and prosperity demands an affordable, reliable, steady supply of energy. Enemies from within are undermining our security. Environmentalist groups including: The Center for Biological Diversity, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, Earth First and others, have filed lawsuits, blocking every single oil lease issued in this country and all future oil leases.

Joseph Russo

Due to gasoline prices spiking over \$4.00 per gallon recently, Democrats were pressured into backing off their long held anti-drilling stand and acting to ease oil and gas drilling restrictions off our shores, or so it would seem! On September 16, 2008 the House passed the so-called 'Comprehensive American Energy Security and Consumer Protection Act' (H.R. 6899). The bill is a bundle of lies and does not promote more drilling in the US as it suggests. The majority Democrat party refused to allow any Republican debate or amendments. The bill states that its top priority is to prohibit leasing in areas not expressly authorized in the measure or a subsequent statute: SEC. 101-(a): Prohibition "The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act notwithstanding, the Secretary shall not take nor authorize any action related to oil and gas pre-leasing or leasing of any area of the Outer Continental Shelf that was not available for oil and gas leasing as of July 1, 2008, unless that action is expressly authorized by this subtitle or a statute enacted by Congress after the date of enactment of this Act. (20) No offshore drilling would be allowed closer than 100 miles from the coast, except that drilling could occur between 50 and 100 miles, so long as royalties go to the Federal government and none would go to the States. This alone would eliminate any interest in drilling in the somewhat lucrative 50 to 100 mile zone. The bill would ban all drilling between 3 miles and 50 miles, making off limits about 80% of our known reserves. The 100-mile restriction would require very expensive new exploration; investment, infrastructure and significant cash risk. Known reserves and infrastructures are mandated left idle; Meanwhile, we depend on foreign energy sources and loose domestic jobs and security. Don't you love politicians?

H.R. 6899 punishes oil and gas drilling by taxing consumers with higher priced energy. \$19 billion in tax savings will go to

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

alternate energy producers on the back of oil and gas producers and users. By 2020, energy producers will be required to obtain 15% of their power from renewable sources. Basically, you and I will pay much more for fuel since government put up roadblocks to utilization of our abundant oil and natural gas reserves. Increased taxes on fuels that we use daily will force consumers to buy higher priced imported fuel and local alternative energy before technology makes it a more affordable option.

Carbon credits will be traded through a brokerage house, which makes a commission on every trade and forwards a tax on every trade. Every entity that uses energy will have to obtain permits to utilize every kind of energy they will use. The emissions credits permits will have to be purchased or traded. Energy and products may be rationed as energy emissions credits may limit production of energy, goods and services. All products will increase in cost since no product or service can be produced or utilized without the use of energy. Non politically correct forms of carbon fuel producers such as gasoline, heating oil and coal will have their allotted credits reduced over time to force a move towards greener technologies. This will create shortages of fuel, since they will have to pay up to buy adequate credits to operate. Your energy and other costs will already be escalating, but you may still have to purchase carbon credits in order to utilize air conditioning or other energy dependant luxuries. Farmers will likewise trade credits and may benefit from taking crops out of production in order to sell their carbon credits. This could lead to food shortages and perhaps starvation in poorer countries, which would play nicely into the population control advocate agenda.

Joseph Russo

Recently, there has been a big push for corn ethanol in the US for use as a 10% oxygenate mixer in gasoline. It may not be as efficient as gasoline, but it burns. Sadly, private general aviation and ultra light aviation engines approved for auto fuel cannot use of automobile gasoline that contains more than 5% alcohol, forcing the use of higher priced, higher lead content aviation gasoline.

Politicians are so often short sighted. They promoted corn ethanol as a renewable energy source with little thought to the international corn market or even the water use required to grow the corn. As a result of corn being used as an additive to gasoline, corn prices have recently skyrocketed to record prices, leading to a worldwide food price escalation, since corn is a very important staple in so many products. Livestock feed is corn based, so meat production costs have risen. High corn prices are good for corn farmers and bad for everyone else. Others are promoting ethanol produced from waste cellulose debris such as wood pulp, rice straw and other organic waste. Switch grass is another ethanol producing crop being explored, as is seaweed. Some form of ethanol will probably gain in popularity and become a sensible use of renewable waste products or crops, but it is not likely to become a mainstay power source in the US.

The US has fallen behind Pakistan, Argentina, Brazil, Iran and India in development of natural gas for transportation fuel. Oil Magnate, T. Boone Pickens proposes to reduce our dependence on foreign fuel by running fleet cars and commercial trucks on natural gas, which is abundant in the United States. He stated: "Natural gas makes up 22% of our power generation through steam driven turbines. A switch to natural gas would reduce our consumption of foreign oil by \$300 billion per year." Natural

gas must be compressed to run in vehicles and that will take a fueling network infrastructure. Commercial trucks will require a significant engine and drive-train design change since it takes significantly more engine revolution to harness equal amounts of energy from natural gas as it does from diesel fuel in a given engine size. Once in place, we would have a nearly limitless supply of cleaner burning, low cost domestic fuel. It is estimated that we have approximately a 1000-year supply, at current usage, of natural gas available in US territory that can be harvested using known technology. Natural gas burns more cleanly than other fossil fuels, such as oil and coal, and produces less carbon dioxide per unit energy released. For an equivalent amount of heat, burning natural gas produces about 30% less CO₂ than burning petroleum and about 45% less than burning coal. Not that it will reduce global warming, but if reducing CO₂ is the goal, natural gas utilization is a good option. It is speculated that the CO₂ produced from burning natural gas in power generation plants could be captured and used to promote algae growth, which can then produce bio-fuel.

Solar energy is irregular or non-existent with cloud cover and nighttime. Solar is also expensive and somewhat unsightly. Solar farms can be effective producers of electricity, but take up large sections of land in areas that are often long distances from the desired energy destinations. Desert climates are ideal for producing the power, but transmission line loss and infrastructure construction are very expensive. Germany recently commissioned a 2-megawatt solar field with 702 rotating panels. The yearly energy production is estimated at 2.3 million kilowatt hours. We could replace one politically incorrect efficient nuclear power plant with 3,405 of these solar field facilities, assuming adequate acreage is available. Again,

Joseph Russo

infrastructure capable of carrying the energy to market is very expensive.

Wind generated power is another option that is growing in popularity. The reality is that adequate wind is not readily available in most communities and is not a constantly reliable source. Most windmills don't begin producing energy until the wind blows at least 12 miles per hour and don't develop full rated output until the wind speed reaches about 29 mph. That is a lot of wind. When used, wind must be supplemented with steam-powered turbines fueled by natural gas, coal or nuclear, when inadequate wind is available. Wind energy is not free, since it costs a great deal of money in construction and infrastructure to employ. Most wind farms have been built because of substantial government subsidies and not because they are profitable. They are also a visual nuisance and significantly hazardous to birds. Each wind turbine can produce about 1.66 million kilowatt-hours of electricity per year. For every politically incorrect efficient nuclear plant, we can generate the same amount of energy from a fleet of 4759 wind turbines sized at 144 feet in diameter. Adequate wind is not readily available in all areas, and clearly, it is not as viable an option as the major media would have us believe.

Coal is in great supply in the US, especially a high quality low-sulfur variety mined in Kane County Utah. Perhaps it was only coincidence that after receiving a significant campaign contribution from a low sulfur coal producing Indonesian contributor, President Clinton established and signed the 'Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument,' making this \$1 trillion coal deposit off limits. This cache of coal would have provided many decades worth of low emission energy, scores of jobs and greater independence from foreign fuel sources. The US has

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

more coal than any other nation but rather than utilize most of it here for affordable energy, we are increasingly selling it abroad. Time magazine expects coal exports to reach 120 million tons, making coal a key fuel in the world. Why is it OK for foreigners to burn coal but politically incorrect for us? Is it OK to pollute in their neighborhood but not ours? Is the pollution really that bad? Coal burning particulate scrubber technology has made coal, especially low sulfur coal, a real viable option for energy independence. Shouldn't we utilize our cheap, abundant energy right here at home?

Nuclear power is the most dependable source of power we have. It is the cleanest and produces no carbon or sulfur emissions. The US has never had a tragic nuclear accident. Environmentalist hysteria has all but ended the development of this eco-friendly energy source in the US, especially after the Three Mile Island accident, which produced no deaths, no adverse health effects and no environmental damage. Currently, France generates up to 80% of its electricity from nuclear power plants. 104 nuclear reactors provide power in the United States, supplying one-fifth of the nation's electricity. To date there have been no deaths due to incidents at nuclear power facilities in the US. Nuclear power facilities in the US run at full capacity about 90% of the time, producing about 7.9 billion kilowatt hours per year. Did you get that? They produce nearly 8 Billion kilowatt hours per year! They cost only 1.66 cents per kilowatt-hour compared to 7.5 cents for our very affordable natural gas fueled plants. Nuclear plants can be sited close to power distribution locations, thus saving a great deal on infrastructure.

But what about all that nuclear waste, you ask? There is a process in use since the 1980s called 'Plutonium Uranium Extraction,' which extracts uranium and plutonium from spent

Joseph Russo

nuclear fuel rods to form a mixed oxide fuel for reuse in light water nuclear reactors. In the process, $\frac{3}{4}$ of the plutonium is burned into other elements, thus significantly limiting nuclear waste. The US Department of Energy (DOE) is actively investigating methods to clean up nuclear waste sites. The DOE has a goal of cleaning all presently contaminated waste sites successfully by 2025, however the task can be difficult and the DOE acknowledges that some may never be completely remediated. It is a promising start.

Despite the great economic and life improving advantages of super reliable and low cost nuclear power, tremendous regulatory burdens and constant litigation by environmentalists stand in the way of new plants being constructed. Reducing the draconian regulations and litigation associated with new nuclear facility construction would move us quickly towards affordable and abundant energy and independence from foreign oil. In the mean time, foreign governments are moving ahead at great speed with nuclear power generation, making them more competitive in the global economy, while we fall farther behind. Russia has 42 plants under construction at the same time we are constructing one. I wonder which nation will be prospering in the near future.

Cheap abundant energy is essential for life sustaining society, security and economy. Any lack of cooperation in energy independence and abundance will work to reduce our standard of living, life expectancy and freedom. Failing to keep up with other nations in energy development will drive us out of our super power status, as our reduced standards of living will reduce our ability to support military supremacy. Perhaps military supremacy is over rated, but what would the world look like if Russia, China or some other Marxist leaning regime

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

becomes globally dominant and we are unable to project authority for freedom and liberty, or even protect our citizens from other nations? Will the UN become our nanny state guardian and protect us, or remain as impotent and ineffective as it is now? Globalists would have us believe that empowering the UN will be the best answer for policing the world. Are we to believe that the same UN full of tin-pot dictators, racist, terrorists, and loons will agree to a course of action that will be good for us?

The world has arguably been a better place with the US economic miracle and projection of power around the globe keeping a check on radical Marxist regimes which would tyrannize more nations full of citizens. Our strength and generosity are products of our abundant freedom and energy. The course our environmentalist movements have us on are akin to a family that burns their car to the ground so that it can reduce pollution output, with no thought as to the pollution created in the burn, how they will get to work, earn a paycheck, bring necessary life sustaining supplies to the home or make an emergency trip to the hospital if need be. We must not cannibalize our great success in the name of an unproven scientific thesis; one that is driving us into poverty and transferring our wealth around the globe, where it will most likely be spent by corrupt politicians and not to help the needy. Rather than punish our citizens with devastating energy taxes, we should promote energy development of all kinds through low tax policies on energy and related technology development. Rather than destroying our economy and standard of living, our methods of success should be shared with the world so that others succeed and improve their standard of living. Are we men or mice? Oh, I forgot, to the radicals like Ingrid Newkirk of PITA, there is no difference.

A case for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness through the exposure of Liberalism as founded in Godless Marxism and a road to tyranny and poverty. Two things that should not be discussed, religion and politics, are proudly presented.

The Audacity of Common Sense and Scripture

**Buy The Complete Version of This Book at
Booklocker.com:**

<http://www.booklocker.com/p/books/4496.html?s=pdf>