





Surfing Amtrak with “Dr. Death”;  
Obama/Trumpcare Architect Ezekiel Emanuel

by Bobby Fontaine

2017 Unplugged Publishing

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">Introduction</a>	1
<a href="#">Off the Hook in the Club</a>	5
<a href="#">POLITICAL DANCING WITH THE STARS</a>	7
<a href="#">Big Dog, Little Train</a>	11
<a href="#">MTBE Crashes into Housing Market</a>	13
<a href="#">HIGHER ETHANOL PRICES = HIGHER GASOLINE PRICES</a>	15
<a href="#">ETHANOL NO LONGER AN OXYGENATE</a>	19
<a href="#">ETHANOL GETS MARKET BOOST</a>	27
<a href="#">RISING GASOLINE PRICES</a>	30
<a href="#">DR. DEATH</a>	33
<a href="#">AFFORDABLE CARE ACT</a>	34
<a href="#">Tier III</a>	38
<a href="#">Chandra</a>	40
<a href="#">VISCON USA</a>	56
<a href="#">DEAD ROCK STARS, DROUGHT ENDS</a>	57
<a href="#">ENDOCANNABINOID SYSTEM</a>	61
<a href="#">SHINDELL</a>	63
<a href="#">Weekly Weather Patterns</a>	71
<a href="#">Crescendo</a>	74
<a href="#">Back to the Beginning</a>	79
<a href="#">Encore</a>	93
<a href="#">Kick the Can Back to Hillary, Trump cheated</a>	96
<a href="#">“No, he can't read my poker face”</a>	98
<a href="#">Conclusion</a>	100
<a href="#">Trump Ethanol Campaign</a>	109
2008 - <a href="#">Health Care</a>	111
2010 - <a href="#">Political Reality TV Show</a>	117





## Introduction:

In all the years healthcare's been debated in Washington, even going back to Hillarycare in 1993, the notion of health itself hasn't surfaced in the related arena of political ideas. We hear about costs like they're fixed as if our political and health leaders don't know that less sick people means less healthcare costs. You see if everyone had insurance that nobody uses, premiums, copay's, and deductibles would go way down. From there, if we allowed a few sick people so physicians don't forget how to treat them, they'd get very special attention from the whole industry because it would be their only chance to ply their trade. The point is less sick people means less cost and better treatment.

I brought this up in passing with a health practitioner at a hospital in Philadelphia the other day. She immediately leaped to the conclusion "ah yes, preventive medicine, we can always use more of that". Well yeah, that's good, sounds great even, but that's not what I meant. What I was referring to is poisoning the American people for profit, to wit, stop poisoning us so we get less sick. Ain't rocket science, not even science if you think about it, more like simple logic, common sense, so simple it makes my brain hurt.

When I say the fact that we don't approach it from that direction makes it look like a conspiracy to make us sick for profit and high minded people get twitchy, well yeah, ok, so you own a major portion of a tobacco company's stock while also investing in lung cancer research. I believe who I'm talking about is the legendary 1% who own the lion's share of stock in everything. You can say since they invest in everything, so we can't hold them responsible for fallout from products they're only trying to make money from. Ahh, but what about boards of directors, how many do they sit on, or have people who answer to them sitting on.

Like with tobacco, they add nicotine and other chemicals to tobacco. Tobacco by itself is not near as dangerous as when they get through with it. Do you know straight tobacco's nicotine only enters the bloodstream while the nicotine they add to it forces its way into the nervous system and brain making it far more addictive and dangerous? Or that when cigarette sales go down, they add more nicotine so existing smokers pick up the slack by becoming even more addicted. It also makes second hand smoke that much more dangerous.

This all came out in the 90's, there were lawsuits, tobacco companies were forced to pay billions to, of all people, governments who should have prevented them from doing any of it. After that they were allowed to go back to business as usual.

This is how the system really works. In 1990, a Clean Air Act (CAA) was passed requiring nationwide use of a gasoline additive called MTBE (ether/ methanol blend). MTBE was known then to pollute groundwater while worsening air quality. These dangers were well known in the CAA debate. When environmentalist groups balked at using a gasoline additive that would pollute



air and water nationwide, it won them a seat at a negotiation that ended with a 278 million dollar slush fund being set up by Enron and related MTBE interests to support environmentalism. After that, MTBE had their support.

Yes, that's what I said, we were sold out, even worse, groups accepting that money were required to allow the donors to appoint their own seats on boards of directors. Since this was all done very hush hush, even to this day, the green movement has no idea in its lower ranks who's running the game and how they got there. My point is just like with tobacco, there's always a telltale left behind about how the game really works, you just have to find it for yourself because no one "in the know" will tell you the truth about it.

MTBE was made a federal requirement. That didn't mean the mandate would ever make it to market. It was lobbied for by Enron and had merely crossed the first hurdle. The truth is there was nothing stopping the oil industry from adding it to gasoline on their own. They'd done it years before with disastrous results polluting groundwater in California. That's what the mandate was for, because the oil industry wouldn't use it for fear of lawsuits. That's what I mean by them, whoever "they" are, to stop poisoning us. It's a mentality, such as "we can't do it for fear of lawsuits" verses "we can't do it because it poisons land and people, we'll simply have to find a better way".

I don't mean companies should police themselves, nor that we trust agencies like the EPA who oversee the MTBE mandate. They were in Enron's pocket. Now they're in the ethanol industry's pocket. Like with the war on drugs, we created the DEA to fight it only to find out if they win, they all lose their jobs. So they do what all self-respecting government agencies do, they make the problem they were created to solve worse so their budgets balloon out of control, thus making them so powerful no one can ever get rid of them.

I'm thinking more along the lines of a new main street spirited mentality that instills values like "we can't do it because it poisons people, and if we do it anyway, "they" (the other they, meaning us), will break out the pitchforks and axes". What we rather do is offer poisoners the opportunity to bribe our public officials through the political system to tell us everything is fine, then we believe them. So it's pretty hard to figure who's to blame here, I guess everyone on all sides of the equation, them for wanting to poison us, and us for forgetting what shovels and pitchfork are for.

Lying to us is easily accomplished for another reason. We lie to ourselves through apathy while calling it trust. They lie back through the mainstream news media owned by, nope, not a bunch of left wing socialists who saved their food stamps until they could afford to buy hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of news sources, but the same 1% buying stock in tobacco companies and lung cancer research. You might say it has to be a left wing conspiracy because Hillary and Obama want to nationalize free market medicine. But if you cut through the right wing blitz of the issue, you'll quickly find socialized medicine is a booming victory for the medical and insurance industry, also capitalism. This

is because more people will have their health care paid for, maybe by taxpayers, but still paid for, which means a lot of people will profit from it. Of course when a medical stock heads south because government run anything is bound to fail, the 1% will be the first to jump ship moving their money where it will best serve them while leaving 401K's, pension, and mutual funds high and dry.

More importantly, it gives them control over us. For them, without control, what is the point of overseeing trillions of dollars in wealth that we can walk away from any time we want? Without us, meaning workers worldwide, being willing to work for their money, it's worthless. If somebody came along with a plan we like better than pretending that what we're building for them is out own trap, every one of us who's willing to walk away from them in favor of it will be moving money from their coffers into the new plan. Like with environmentalists who took their money and sold us out, their shortsightedness caused them to miss a very important opportunity. Rather than wasting so much money fighting losing battles against deep pocketed industries; like coal, there really is clean coal technology, it's just expensive and cuts into profits; or oil, there are ways to refine it so it provides much more mileage with almost no resulting pollution.

Oil giants, who are not the oil industry, they're rather the 1% who own the most stock in it and all other big corporations who also control their boards of directors, they will never allow the government to tell them what to do. So why bother trying when you can freely and legally organize investment funds supported by citizens willing to make less profit for cleaner air and water. The damn thing is, if you stage a financial coup to take over the board of a refinery, you could simply produce cleaner fuels with better mileage, then watch the profits roll in as everyone else is forced to follow your lead. And if they don't, buy them out when their stock plummets after no one buys their polluting fuels anymore.

Activist unfortunately don't think that way. They rather latch onto issues in ways that will never solve them, that way they can count on still being fighting the good fight 30 years later after they've paid off their mortgage and saved enough money to retire. After that their, a new generation takes their place at the helm of the movement as the never ending struggle continues.

In 1990 environmentalists took a buyout from big industry. In 1991, a trillion dollar federally backed loan was approved for building MTBE production infrastructure. This meant the mandate moved to the next phase. Between then and 1992, they built refining capacity to produce enough MTBE to service the nation's fuel supply totting it as the greatest engineering feat of all time - the largest expenditure of resources in such a short period of time in the history of mankind. Since MTBE was federally required to be bought by us, Enron was granted a special waiver by head the FCTC Wendy Gramm (wife of then infamous Republican Senator Phil Gramm from Texas who played a major role in forcing MTBE into our fuel supplies and securing the trillion dollar loan to get it done) to book the trillion dollar debt as cash since the loan was guaranteed to be paid off by MTBE's mandated use. She then promptly left the FCTC to work

for Enron.

Booking that loan as an asset rather than debt allowed them to use it as reserve currency to build a ten trillion dollar capital investment pyramid on top of it. This was fine as long as MTBE didn't run into problems the mandate couldn't solve, which it did, that's the real reason Enron crashed, also why the housing bubble burst, but that's a story for later in the book.

In 1993 MTBE began finding its way into our air and water. As illness rates began to rise, first lady Hillary Clinton went on a endless failed campaign to force universal health care on the American people. In 2008 she ran for president on a version of it. Obama ran on a similar version, which later became Obamacare. There was only ever one mistake that tied this conspiracy theory together, too bad everyone missed or ignored it, at least maybe until now. Still though, I don't think most Americans are willing to accept the fact something from 1990 binds most of the scandalous issues we face today together on one contiguous thread.

Believe it not, which don't mean it ain't so if you don't, truth is like that sometimes, there are many reasons Democrats and Republicans fear Donald Trump. Of course the most common unspoken one is he's not part of the problem, he's not an insider, not yet anyway, in fact he's very much an outsider. So there's less incentive to keep him from exposing what's really going on in the depths of the murky swamp waters we call Washington DC.

The other is he has a big mouth, or so he wants us to think, a wise strategy to say the least, that way he can instill fear that translates into respect with nothing more than an attitude, that is if you can call walking on eggshells around POTUS respect. With nothing but a seeming loose lips, words can conquer liars when simply spoken publicly (or tweeted). That's the true beauty of this country, if we know they're lying, they're in it up to their eyeballs. It however don't matter if we don't know what's really going on, or don't care when we do.

## Off the Hook in the Club

When accompanying my wife on a train from Union Station in Washington DC to Philadelphia for chemotherapy, I was met with the honor and privilege of meeting famed ex-congresswomen Marjorie Margolies and the infamous master designer of government mandated health care Ezekiel Emanuel. We used our one time free pass to the Amtrak lounge where I found Marjorie, or Marge now that we're friends, talking to the receptionist showing off her Lady Gaga high heeled shoes. I don't know how women wear them things, but gotta hand it to her for being able to travel like that at her age, although they did appear to be walking her more than she was walking them.

About that same time came an impatient pounding on the door to the club, then again a few seconds later. The receptionist, a proud black woman, proud of her daughter she later introduced to Marge explaining she got accepted to Johns Hopkins University. She buzzed the door open to let in an anxious, at the same time exhausted, Ezekiel Emanuel. I didn't know who either one of them were at the time. OK, let me clarify, I'm well aware who both of them are, just not that these two people were them.

Marge was dressed to kill, must have been wearing a pirates hoard worth of fashion statements. He on the other hand was dressed down from what I was wearing. If you know me at all, you know I dress at bottom of the barrel, one rotten apple above homeless. That's because I spent 12 years living on the streets of Virginia just outside Washington, D.C. Now that I'm homefull again, my dress code is one cut above my previous peers while still far below the social landscape that surrounds me. So no matter how I dress, people here, who are better than most people everywhere, even each other, always giving me that "how did he get in here?" look. Only that evening they were giving it to Ezekiel Emanuel first.

So here's this guy looking like he'd been dragging the gutter with my Salvation Army donations frustratingly explaining how tired he was as Marge tried to calm him. I thought he was a drunk looking for a fight and almost stepped in to rescue these two ill perceived damsels in distress, then realized they knew each other, an odd couple indeed.

I was surprised to see when I got back to my seat in the lounge that this funny looking little women with the Lady Gaga shoes was sitting next to me. She was between my wife and this women curled up in a chair trying to sleep. My suitcase was sitting in front of my seat while the rest of the lounge was all but empty. Then there was us, strangers packed together like winners of a round of musical chairs.

I was glad because I like bothering people with longer political discussions than they usually care to have. This was made easy by the TV a few feet away. It was tuned to CNN and their relentless coverage of the president selling the country out to the dastardly Russians who cheated Hillary out of her rightful heir to the

throne of the United States of America. Such a tragedy, poor dear, no worries, she's out of the woods. Don't know what woods she's talking about, but she's out of them just the same. I lived in the woods when I was homeless, but that's probably not what she means. She's also ready to take back what's rightfully hers along with her followers who are still with her even though she rightfully lost the election.

## Political Dancing with the Stars

It didn't take long before I had Marge disagreeing with me. It's always good to start a long winded political dissuasion with a passionate disagreement when you want to argue longer than the other party wishes. Our train was proving to be an hour and a half late. Lucky she walked right into my better than CNN ambush.

Shortly thereafter I realized she was more than somebody with just another opinion. She very soon after told me who she and Ezekiel were, and how he was working with Trump to sort out what to do about Obamacare. This lead to my overriding Marge's opinions on Trump being a Russian agent to telling her my version of how Obamacare came to be.

It seemed important enough a topic for her to entertain. It was only later I read that she'd worked with Hillary in the 90's trying to pass a universal health care bill. Her son just recently married Chelsea Clinton. Just a few days before, she hinted she may run for her mother's ex-senate seat. I efficiently explained my Obamacare theory to insure I got it all in before she had enough hanging with the common folk. This is my issue and I had one shot to make it count. So I tried not to mince words in case she told me to buzz off. It essentially goes like this.

Whenever you overinflate part of an economy, like with the housing bubble, too many people bought homes they couldn't afford. This gave the false impression that property values were going up. When the market finally corrected itself to real values, the bubble burst with lots of Americans made homeless, going back to renting, or moving back in with Mom and Dad.

When we unnecessarily pollute, we create unrealistically high levels of sick Americans who need health care. This causes unrealistic increases in medical related investments, a balloon that can pop by simply lowering pollution levels because so much money is invested in ever increasing illness rates. With medical investments being long term because of high degrees of confidence in their profitability, just like real estate, they're considered safe and high yielding. So medicals are invested in by literally all manner of retirement and pension funds.

This means less sick people would 1) cause a collapse of the medical industry, only rather than people losing homes, they'd die until the government figured a way to bail it out, and 2) since medical investments are such a significant portion of the economy, the financial system would collapse even worse that 2008 taking world trade and civilization as we know it with it. Of course this should not prevent us from lowering pollution levels so we don't get sick at unrealistically high rates. The question is how to do it without causing a meltdown of mankind when we do.

In the 2008 presidential campaign, Obama sought to undo Bush changes at the EPA that made it harder to regulate polluters.

**DECEMBER 22, 2008 - New Ozone Rules -**

[http://pubs.acs.org/cen/email/html/cen\\_86\\_i51\\_8651gov1.html](http://pubs.acs.org/cen/email/html/cen_86_i51_8651gov1.html)

Bush's Legacy at EPA - Agency's close links to Bush yields a mixed bag of decisions, some of which may tie the hands of the next Administration

After elected, he first had to put his health care plan in place so when hundreds of thousands less Americans were made sick by ozone and the chemicals that produce it, a government bailout plan for the medical industry to absorb the fallout would already be in place.

9/16/2009 - **Controversial Bush smog rule under review** - EPA will look at the tougher standard its advisers proposed in 2008

[http://www.nbcnews.com/id/32878841/ns/us\\_news-environment/t/controversial-bush-smog-rule-under-review/#.WO0COEXyvc](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/32878841/ns/us_news-environment/t/controversial-bush-smog-rule-under-review/#.WO0COEXyvc)

The Obama administration said Wednesday it will review a controversial Bush-era smog rule, saying it might have fallen short of scientific recommendations. "This is one of the most important protection measures we can take to safeguard our health and our environment," EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson said in a statement. "Reconsidering these standards and ensuring acceptable levels of ground-level ozone could cut health care costs and make our cities healthier, safer places to live, work and play."

You see there was enough sick people to keep the medical bubble from bursting, just not enough who can pay for treatment. Under Obamacare, as less people with health insurance got sick, Americans who couldn't previously afford it would make up the loss, thus creating a financial cushion for the medical industry to land on as its balloon slowly deflated. This would allow investment markets to slowly adjust to what otherwise would be a "too much too fast" correction.

With Obamacare slated to begin in the Fall 2010, attention was turned towards lowering ozone causing pollutant levels. It long before surfaced how ethanol added to gasoline is a top producer of an ozone forming pollutant called acetaldehyde. This is the same chemical that causes hangovers after drinking too much. With Obama in the White House, the ethanol industry made a big push to add 5% more than the usual 10% (E10) ethanol to gasoline (E15). This inspired a resurfacing of E10 emission concerns raised over the years, a reminder for some of ethanol's shortcomings while new to others like Obama. His a promise of lower ozone levels at the same time supporting ethanol meant an end to the political support he enjoyed from corn country if he chose clean air.

### **Health care: A timeline of the overhaul bill's passage**

[http://www.nbcnews.com/id/35986022/ns/politics-capitol\\_hill/t/health-care-timeline-overhaul-bills-passage/#.WO0RTEUrLcs](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/35986022/ns/politics-capitol_hill/t/health-care-timeline-overhaul-bills-passage/#.WO0RTEUrLcs)

February 24, 2009 - Barack Obama in first address to congress pledged “health care reform cannot wait, it must not wait, it will not wait another year.”

March 5, 2009 – White House held first health care summit “The status quo in one option not on the table”

April 21, 2009 – Senate finance committee begins discussion on how to finance health insurance for the uninsured

February 25, 2010 - Obama holds televised summit to address concerns about cost containment

March 23, 2010 – Obama signs Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act

This is significant for a number of reasons, most importantly to Obama was the fact that he ran as a Senator from Illinois where ethanol and the CME (Chicago Mercantile Exchange) are king. Ethanol requires huge amounts of corn to produce enough to mix with the nation's gasoline supply. The CME is where the corn is traded along with the resulting ethanol. Being federally mandated gives a huge economic advantage to the Midwest states that grow corn and produce ethanol, especially Chicago where Obama lived. If he instituted his new ozone rules, the just ripened ethanol industry would rot on the vine. So he backed off his lower ozone level campaign promise at the same time Obamacare proceeded full steam ahead.

### **September 02, 2011 - Obama Administration Abandons Stricter Air-Quality Rules**

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/03/science/earth/03air.html>

WASHINGTON — President Obama abandoned a contentious new air pollution rule on Friday, buoying business interests that had lobbied heavily against it, angering environmentalists who called the move a betrayal and unnerving his own top environmental regulators.



This meant illness rates continued to skyrocket, only now we're paying for everyone, including the previously uninsured next to previously insured who would not have been made sick by ethanol if he lowered ozone emissions. The previously uninsured were supposed to be adsorbed as medical expenditures for the previously insured lowered. This meant across the board premium increases for the insured because they're now picking up the tab for everyone who can't pay at the same time paying for themselves.

MONDAY, MAY 18, 2009 – Environmental Working Group –  
**HIGHER ETHANOL BLENDS MAY HARM HEALTH AND ENGINES**

<http://www.ewg.org/research/ethanol-gasoline-fuel-blends-may-cause-human-health-risks-and-engine-issues>

Acetaldehyde Increases by two- to three-fold (Australian Government 2004; DOE 2009), especially when the vehicles are started at cold temperature (Whitney 2007).

Respiratory toxicant, irritant, inhalation carcinogen, strongly contributes to ground-level ozone formation (U.S. EPA 2007a)

Formaldehyde Increases for all ethanol blends compared to E0 (Australian Government 2004; DOE 2009)      Respiratory toxicant, inhalation carcinogen, contributes to ground-level ozone formation (U.S. EPA 2007a)

Ethanol (precursor to acetaldehyde) Released during both ethanol production and ethanol fuel combustion (Brady 2007; DOE 2009) Health effects due to acetaldehyde formation in the air (U.S. EPA 2009a).

Volatile organic chemicals (VOCs) Emitted by ethanol production facilities (Brady 2007) Respiratory toxicants, contribute to ground-level ozone formation (U.S. EPA 2007a).

Ozone May increase with increased ethanol use due to the projected increases in VOCs and NOx emissions (American Lung Association 2009; Jacobson 2007; U.S. EPA 2007b) Aggravates respiratory and cardiovascular disease, higher rates of asthma, and respiratory infection. Increases premature death. Causes damage to vegetation such as trees and crops (Jerrett 2009; NRC 2008; U.S. EPA 2008)

Particulate matter (PM2.5) Significant increases due to corn ethanol production compared to conventional gasoline (Hill 2009) Aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, decreased lung function, increased asthma and premature death. Environmental influence: impairment of visibility, effects on climate (U.S. EPA 2008)

- In addition to potentially increased vehicle emissions, ethanol blending in fuel is also associated with several hidden costs that are passed directly to consumers.

Compared to gasoline, ethanol is a lower energy fuel. As a result, ethanol fuel blends are associated with significant decreases in fuel economy, which has been observed by car owners nationwide (Learn 2009). According to DOE research, E10 has a 3.6% fuel economy loss compared to E0, E15 has a 5% loss, and E20 has a 7.7% loss (DOE 2009).

This is a real American tragedy that was unavoidable if Obama planned to win a second term in 2012. This is because he only won in 2008 after convincing Midwest corn farmers he was a staunch supporter of ethanol.

### Big Dog, Little Train

The irony of the next part of the story can't be overstated. Perhaps you'll agree once I share it with you. When the train finally arrived an hour and a half late, I saw Marge get on the business class car, a good idea for serious famous people in order to keep a safe distance from deplorable common folk. I assumed Ezekiel Emanuel was riding business class as well, so I dropped all hopes of talking to him personally hoping Marge might relate it to him. This way my message still had a chance to resonate in Washington. However when I saw the train car number I was getting on was 82747, I thought otherwise.

I believe in a certain amount of fate in this complex universe of ours. I also believe it sometimes announces itself in subtle ways. So I pay attention to nuances in my daily life that seem out of place, or more importantly, too perfectly in place. In this secret world of alphabetic and numerical codes listing their way through time like we live in a digital Matrix, 8 means big change is just over the horizon. So what, there's 8's everywhere, and nothing ever changes right? However an 8 followed by 2747 (BGDG – Big Dog) meant only one thing, Ezekiel Emanuel was on the same car I was. Sure enough, there he was just a few seats in front of me.

After we got moving, I took a trip to the restroom so on the way back I could ask if he was himself. When he affirmed that he was, I mentioned how Marge told me who he was and how we was helping Trump sort out what to do with Obamacare. I noticed I do the same thing when I mention anything positive or supportive of The Donald in public, how I look around to see if anyone's shoes are heading towards my head, meaning he lifted his eye above the seats looking to the front and rear of the train with an expression on his face that said “geez dude, why don't you tell the whole car”.

I briefly explained how I had something important I'd been trying to get into Trump's hands regarding health care, and how Emanuel might benefit from hearing it. He was obviously busy and tired, had his laptop out pretending to be writing something about “recent wave of scandals. He also bags on the other seat. I was well aware of these factors and merely setting up the next phase of my plan. When he gave me a “you're putting me on the spot” look, I quickly related that if he wanted to hear about it later, simply gesture and I will come talk to him. He nodded affirmatively as I walked back to my seat.

This all got me thinking about his brother Rahm, the mayor of Chicago, and how when ethanol hit Obama's health care fan like an incurable healthcare disease, Rahm left his White House Chief of Staff position to enter Chicago politics. When this happened, I saw it as an effort to protect ethanol from being purged following studies showing how bad it is for air quality, at least until after the 2012 elections.

#### **SEP 28, 2010 - Why Is Rahm Emanuel Leaving So Suddenly?**

<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/09/why-is-rahm-emanuel-leaving-so-suddenly/344022/>

White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel is reportedly planning to leave his position this week to return to Chicago, where he is expected to run for mayor.

## MTBE Crashes into Housing Market

There's also the matter of ethanol being much more expensive than gasoline. So oil futures markets, therefor oil and gasoline prices, are allowed to be speculated to unrealistic highs in order to keep ethanol competitive with gasoline. This is what truly led to the housing crash of 2008. Indeed, a lot of people who previously couldn't afford homes bought them under George Bush's "Ownership Society" program. This was where lending standards were lowered through the use of credit default swaps in order to sell homes to low wage earning blacks and Hispanics.

I followed the story closely as it happened, how The Congressional Black Caucus had very successfully campaigned for a minimum living wage of \$11 an hour. If this had gone through, the housing market might not have collapsed because low wage workers might have been able to keep up with rising food and energy costs. Many low wage workers worked 2/3 jobs in multiple income homes. They however were stuck renting even though they paid more in rent than mortgages.

The problem was minimum wage requirements for home loans were based in hourly income rather than weekly income. If a worker put in 12 hour days 6/7 days a week, but didn't make the minimum loan requirement hourly wage, they didn't qualify for loans. The Congressional Black Caucus won support to raise the national minimum hourly wage above the minimum hourly wage requirement of \$11 for home loans. When Wall Street didn't want to give it up, Bush came to the rescue with his "Ownership Society" plan where standards for who got loans were lowered so they didn't have to raise the minimum wage. This way low wage workers could buy homes while the minimum wages remained stagnant.

This worked out great for bankers in the end because 1) Wall Street got to trade in trillions of dollars of worthless paper they put on the market thinking MTBE sales would support it. When MTBE failed, therefor the trillion dollar loan that supported the pyramid scheme they built on top of it began to also fail, the banks were stuck with trillions of dollars' worth of nothing, paper not back by anything of value, not even paper, electronic digits that had to be turned into real dollars because the interest they owed on it were very real. So they dumped their worthless wealth into the housing market knowing full well they'd get bailed out when it crashed, because we, meaning taxpayers, would have to be or the world's economy would go up in smoke.

This is something that's always bothered me about Black Lives Matter. Yes there are bully cops out there, and it's no small thing that they are. But what they're really mad about is what happened to the economy that cost so many of them their hopes for the future. Even worse it cost those whose American Dreams were coming true their jobs along with homes they thought they owned because they had jobs.

Their leadership in Washington, the Congressional Black Caucus, is not telling them the truth about what happened to the economy. That's because they sold out their people just like environmentalists did to the environment in 1990 by supporting MTBE for money. They almost didn't. They almost held fast to their \$11 an hour living wage demand. If they had, they would have gotten it and everything would have been different. It might not have been better, in fact it might have been worse. All I can say for sure would have been different is I wouldn't have been able to say they weren't part of the solution, they were the problem itself.


One way or another Enron's multitrillion dollar MTBE pyramid was going to collapse. It was just a matter of who it landed on when it did. You'd think as long as it didn't pull the rug out from under working people, the economy could recover because working people are what give any economy value. Without workers, there's no product or services available to purchase by anyone with money. But the way bankers set up this new Enron based economy, money itself had more value than workers, worthless money that is. This because the economy runs on debt financed by workers who didn't and don't know is backed by nothing but them. At the end of the day, workers have to give money value or everyone loses everything

In the beginning, the Congressional Black Caucus didn't support lowering lending standards, in fact they expressly didn't want to go down that road for fear it would create a housing bubble followed by a market collapse. This would mean short term gains for blacks would have been lost over the long term. If I remember correctly, Elijah Cummings (Democrat congressman from Baltimore) was the last holdout. It was so sad. He really had Bush up against it, all he had to do was huff and puff to get an \$11 minimum living wage. But Bush convinced him money markets would be safe with lower loan standards as long as Wall Street followed Enron's credit default swap model.

Bush personally toted it like a magic silver that allowed endless credit with no risk of a financial crash. This was while economists were saying that in theory it could work as long as nothing triggered massive home loan defaults at the same time, like increasing food and gasoline prices with no increase in minimum wages. That's my point, they not only provided value for their worthless trillions of dollars by trading them to low wage workers for real dollars in exchange for thinking the houses they thought they owned would one day be their homes. They also hid their worthless money in oil futures speculation that drove the cost of gasoline so high the housing market crashed. No worries, the government would have to bail them out by making all their worthless money whole at taxpayers' expense or the world's economy would crash taking civilization as we know it with it.

## Higher Ethanol Prices = Higher Gasoline Prices

What nobody talks about is how when ethanol invaded, rather conquered, the fossil fuel industry, gasoline markets had to make room for it with increasing prices. As they went up, more ethanol was produced creating unprecedented demands on corn. So corn prices also rose causing ethanol prices to go up even more. This of course meant gasoline prices had to keep rising.




The switch from MTBE to ethanol began in May 2006. This was when the trillion dollar MTBE loan was supposed to have been paid off. It didn't work out that way, it was rather made to look like it had by the Union Bank of Switzerland (UBS). In the chart above, notice at the beginning of 2005, ethanol and gasoline prices are moving in different directions, then adjust to following each other around May. In May 2006, when the regulatory requirement changed from MTBE to ethanol, ethanol prices climbed ever so slightly passed gasoline, then dipped back below it where it's remained tracking ethanol ever since.

This looks like the ethanol industry came out of the gate swinging with a federal mandate to enforce its high prices and was quickly shown the door. MTBE was required as well, but was always much cheaper than gasoline, so its cost was never an issue, in fact oil companies made money using it because it was cheap, meaning they made bigger profits adding it to gasoline at 15% than adding 15% of their own more expensive gasoline. On the other side of the coin, when ethanol is more expensive than gasoline, they lose money.


The way ethanol's managed is all mixed up. Trump is talking about changing it while running into a lot of resistance from the ethanol industry. The way it works is refiners are required to add ethanol to gasoline at the same time it can't be added until loaded in trucks at fuel depots. When ethanol is added at fuel depots, fuel depots get RIN (Renewable Identification Number -) credits for doing it. These RIN's are turned in to the government at the end of the year to avoid paying fines for not adding ethanol. The problem is fuel depots are not required to add ethanol, refiners are. So refiners have to buy RIN's from fuel depots or they get fined. I know, it makes no sense, none of it makes sense, unless of course you look at how the difference between ethanol and gasoline tracks about the price of a RIN. You see fuel depots need an incentive to add ethanol other than regulations, so they give them a monetary credit, a RIN coupon they can

cash in with refiners. Obviously it's not enough to make it all work. Like with most things government, it's the thought that counts.

Corn and ethanol prices don't track each other until late 2006, after which corn prices skyrocketed as ethanol followed. Notice how ethanol is forced to remain in corn's shadow, not able to climb at parallel rates with corn without over pricing itself so fuel depots refuse to add it to gasoline, I mean why would they while sitting on a pile of RIN's they don't need.



Notice how gasoline follows corn, not in 2005, not even in 2006 after ethanol replaced MTBE. It wasn't until the end of 2007, after congress passed the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. The Energy Act of 2005 changed the EPA's oxygenate requirement from MTBE to ethanol. The MTBE industry demanded a loophole protecting them from MTBE lawsuits. They never got it. I actually prevented it from happening. Every time congress tried to secretly pass the MTBE liability waiver, I exposed them over the internet.



In the end, Bush started a fake war in Iraq as they tried one last time thinking the no one would listen to me because the invasion of Iraq would be too big a story. The FBI even kicked in my doors and took my computers on the morning they began more secret hearings in days before the invasion. Maybe calling the hearings secret is a little bold, they were public, just not well publicized. So in order follow the proceedings, you've had to know where and when to look for them before they were over, which meant very little or no reporting on the details, meaning no public debate as long as American concerns over Iraq were front center.



The FBI told me leave the issue alone or they would come back to arrest me. I let congress pass it through the House of Representatives to prove they really meant to do it under the cover of lies used to start a war. Then I went after them when they tried to pass it through the Senate. By then the Iraq war was said to be won. As news media's focus shifted to other issues, they hurriedly tried to get an energy bill on Bush's desk to be signed before anyone took a hard look at what was in it. And there I was telling everyone what they were doing.

Next thing I knew they were back putting me back in handcuffs to be sent me to Texas where I was given to a judge (Ewing Werlein) who worked for Enron (Vincent and Elkins) helping set up the MTBE industry. He was then appointed to the federal court by old man Bush just as MTBE was being added to nationwide gasoline supplies.

**SEPT. 7, 2006 - Trial Is Scheduled in Enron Case**

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/07/business/07enron.html>

In rejecting the defense motion that he (Ewing Werlein) remove himself from the case, the judge said that the implication of his former law firm, Vinson & Elkins, in the case would not prejudice him. He severed his ties to the firm 14 years ago, he said. The law firm helped Enron create the special-purpose financial entities that led to the former bankers' indictment.

Ewing was supposed to fix me. Little did any of them know I knew about his Enron history and appointed role supporting the crooked industry that sent me to him. The story of how I beat him and the rest of them is posted in the final pages of 'Surfing Amtrak with Dr. Death'.

It should however be noted here that the original MTBE requirement in the Clean Air Act of 1990 would never have become a reality if old man Bush had not allowed Saddam Hussein to invade Kuwait. If the Iraq's invasion of Kuwait hadn't happened, there wouldn't have been the level of distraction needed for Enron to get away with bribing environmentalist groups into supporting the oxygenate mandate.

**September 23, 1990 - CONFRONTATION IN THE GULF;  
Excerpts from Iraqi Document on Meeting with U.S. Envoy**

<http://www.nytimes.com/1990/09/23/world/confrontation-in-the-gulf-excerpts-from-iraqi-document-on-meeting-with-us-envoy.html?pagewanted=all>

July 25, 1990- A week before Iraq invaded Kuwait - April Gillespie - US Ambassador to Iraq talking to Saddam Hussien - "I think I understand this. I have lived here for years. I admire your extraordinary efforts to rebuild your country. I know you need funds. We understand that and our opinion is that you should have the opportunity to rebuild your country. But we have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait."



September 19, 1990 - **FOREIGN AFFAIRS; Between-Lines Disaster** - by  
Flora Lewis

<http://www.nytimes.com/1990/09/19/opinion/foreign-affairs-between-lines-disaster.html>

In September 1990, a pair of British journalists confronted Glaspie with the transcript of her meeting with Saddam Hussein, to which she replied that "Obviously, I didn't think, and nobody else did, that the Iraqis were going to take all of Kuwait." [4]

It also needs to be noted that the truth about why Enron crashed, which was because the trillion dollar MTBE loan collapsed after I exposed MTBE was effecting weather patterns, would not have been kept off front pages if the so called terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 hadn't occurred when they did. If 911 hadn't occurred, another fake war started by a Bush to protect the interest of their biggest donors (Ken Lay and Enron), the cover-up might, even likely, would have failed.

5 years later, Ken Lay died before serving his prison sentence after being convicted of 10 counts of securities fraud. He was arrested around the time I was released from the same courthouse in Houston. As hard as they tried to see to it that I did, I did not die. I probably would have if I didn't know the dishonorable judge Ewing Werlein was an Enron hatchet man. By knowing it, I was able mop up the floor with all of them,, bigly.

## Ethanol No Longer an Oxygenate

After the Energy Act of 2005 set in motion replacing MTBE with ethanol in May 2006, California pushed it's court case proving oxygenates worsens air quality in order to get a waiver from continued compliance with the oxygenate requirement. Bush's EPA however said it was no longer required as an oxygenate but a fuel/fuel additive to make us less dependent on imported oil.

Wednesday June 13, 2001 - **EPA says California must use gasoline additive**

<http://www.berkeleydailyplanet.com/issue/2001-06-13/article/5413?headline=EPA-says-California-must-use-gasoline-additive&status=301>

The Environmental Protection Agency on Tuesday ordered California to continue using gasoline additives to reduce air pollution, providing a boost to the ethanol industry and raising concern about California gas prices. "Their decision means significantly higher gasoline prices at the pump and calls into question whether California will have an adequate gas supply," said California Gov. Gray Davis in Sacramento. "(It) does nothing to improve air quality."

July 18, 2003 - **Court Orders EPA to Reconsider Ethanol Gasoline Requirement -**

By Gary Polakovic - Times Staff Writer

<http://articles.latimes.com/2003/jul/18/local/me-fuel18>

Under the ruling, the court concluded that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency acted improperly two years ago when it denied California's request for a waiver from a federal requirement to add ethanol to its gasoline. The state maintained that although ethanol would eliminate water pollution problems associated with a fuel additive it replaced, it was of no value in improving the air in the nation's smoggiest state.

"We conclude the EPA abused its discretion in refusing to consider and weigh the effect of the proposed waiver on particulate matter pollution along with its effect on ozone levels," Justice William C. Canby Jr. wrote on behalf of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco.

Applauding the ruling, Gov. Gray Davis said, "It tells the U.S. EPA that my administration has been right for the past four years as we have moved to protect our air and water while minimizing the risk of gasoline price spikes."

<https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P1002LUQ.PDF?Dockey=P1002LUQ.PDF>

With these revised estimates, total VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are likely to decrease with a waiver while CO emissions are likely to increase. The decreases in NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs would be expected to directionally reduce ozone. The increase in CO may have an adverse impact on ozone. However, CO is far less reactive in contributing to ozone production than either VOC or NO<sub>x</sub>.

The Agency is aware of studies that suggest the production of ethanol consumes more fossil fuel than it displaces (e.g. see "Ethanol Fuels: Energy Balance, Economics, and Environmental Impacts are Negative," by David Pimentel, Natural Resources Research (Vol., 12, No. 2); -

“The forgoing analysis, for which all major energy inputs required in ethanol production were assessed, confirms that ethanol production produces a 29% negative energy balance. Ethanol is not a net additional energy source, is an uneconomical fuel, and its overall production system causes serious environmental degradation. This analysis agrees with the findings of the U.S. Department of Energy”.

(<http://www.projectpore.org/files/4314/0236/4642/pimentel-ethanol.pdf>)

- However, the EPA has reviewed these studies and supports the findings, cited in footnote fifty-six above, from the Department of Energy’s Argonne National Laboratory that indicate a net positive fuel balance achieved with ethanol

([http://www.energy.ca.gov/papers/2004-02-09\\_PEREZ\\_NASEO.PDF](http://www.energy.ca.gov/papers/2004-02-09_PEREZ_NASEO.PDF) - 13 page Power Point presentation selling benefits of ethanol to corn farmers without refute the fact that it costs more energy to produce than gives back in mileage)

EPA Conclusion - “Even if EPA adopted California’s view and determined that the evidence before the agency demonstrates that compliance with the oxygen content requirement prevents or interferes with attainment (ozone reductions), EPA would exercise it’s discretion and deny the waiver for the reasons described above.”

What nobody has ever addressed, among other ignored issues related to MTBE and ethanol, is the fact that, although admittedly by the EPA, ethanol costs a 2-3% mileage loss compared to straight gasoline. That’s a lot more than it sounds like when looking at a country that consumes -“According to the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the average American driver logs 13,476 miles each year” With the current U.S.

population hovering around 326,474,013, that's 4,399,563,799,188 gallons a year. 3% of 4,399,563,799,188 is 131,986,913,976 gallons.

However the 2-3% mileage loss is a farce. It's a calculation based on the lesser energy content of ethanol (1/3) compared to gasoline. Pure ethanol has 33.3 percent less energy than gasoline, therefore provides 1/3 less mileage than gasoline, or so the EPA claims. Since ethanol is added to gasoline at 10 percent, the EPA's version of reality is that this means a 2-3% loss of mileage.

Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology - March 1990, Volume 24, Issue 1, pp 735-753  
- **Ethanol: Fundamentals of production from renewable feedstocks and use as a transportation fuel**

<http://www.cert.ucr.edu/research/ses/wymanpublications/Ethanol-%20fundamentals%20of%20production%20from%20renewable.pdf>

Neat (100% hydrous ethanol) ethanol further reduces smog formation since it has a low volatility, the photochemical reactivity of ethanol and its combustion products is low, and low levels of smog producing compounds are formed by ethanol combustion. Neat ethanol also offers good engine performance owing to its high heat of vaporization, high octane, and low flame temperature.

Conclusion - Neat hydrous ethanol achieves better mileage than predicted from its energy content alone, apparently owing to its high octane and high latent heat of evaporation. Thus about 1.25 liter of ethanol as far as 1 liter of gasoline.

When actual mileage loss are based on actual mileage losses, in the real world, gasoline's typical fuel efficiency of 20%, meaning around 80% of the energy in gasoline does not translate to power upon combustion. This varies from engine to engine. Diesel engines are more efficient, but still loses about 70% of their energy potential to heat and pollution out the tailpipe.

It's not just engines compared to other engine that decides how power efficient fuels are. It's also due to how well an engine is performing as well as atmospheric water vapor and pressures effects on combustion. When nationwide ethanol use began in 2006, there was wide reporting from many citizen sources claiming mileage losses of 10-30%. My vehicles all lose a noticeable amount of mileage while running like crap with ethanol compared to how smooth and cool they run along with great mileage without it. I doubt I would notice a 2-3% mileage loss without going to great lengths to measure MPG.

This is probably the biggest lie about ethanol, not only does it cost more to produce than it gives back in mileage even if the 2-3% loss was accurate. But that is a lie as well. The truth is that after growing all that corn, refining it into ethanol, the transporting it from the Midwest where it's refined to gasoline depots all over the country by truck and train because it corrodes pipelines, once it finally gets splash blended into our gasoline at 10% by volume on its way to filling stations, we actually lose up to 30% mileage in some vehicles, less in

others. Don't know how much we lose on average, but I would not be at all surprised if it's more than 10%.

However when ethanol is used at 100% hydrous ethanol, it only costs a 20-25% loss of mileage in Brazilian engines. We don't know what kind of comparison we might find if we put American ingenuity on the task here on our own soil like Ford's done in Brazil, I imagine we could do a whole lot better.

8/30/2004 - **Brazil buys into flex-fuel cars: They run on gas, ethanol or any combination** – by Iano Andrade/AP file

[http://www.nbcnews.com/id/5829046/ns/us\\_news-environment/t/brazil-buys-flex-fuel-cars/#.WQThNtLyves](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/5829046/ns/us_news-environment/t/brazil-buys-flex-fuel-cars/#.WQThNtLyves)

Even Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva has gotten behind the flex-fuel concept, here driving GM's first factory-produced car that runs on gasoline, alcohol, or natural gas.

But these Gols and other models produced by Fiat SpA and General Motors Corp. have modified engines that, given the rising price of oil, are making Brazilians smile at the gas pumps. They run on gasoline, alcohol or any combination of the two and now represent nearly 20 percent of the new cars sold in Brazil.

With alcohol — also called ethanol — cleaner and selling at half the price of gas in South America's largest country, Brazilians who have bought 200,000 “flex-fuel” cars since their launch last year say deciding which fuel to use is a no-brainer.

“Alcohol, all the time,” said office manager Roseli Santana as she filled up her 2004 subcompact GM Montana pickup at a Shell station in Sao Paulo, Brazil's largest city and home to 5 million cars. “I was using 52 reais (\$17) of gas every week, now I'm paying 30 reais (\$10) for the same amount, except it's alcohol.”

See how we do it for Brazil, we give them what they want, good things that help rather than hurt their lives, future, and country. I guess since GM doesn't own their government the way they own ours, their government gets what they're willing to pay for while we have no choice.

You might say our ethanol program was shoved down ours and GM throats by corn and ethanol lobbyists paying off our crooked politicians with votes and free money. And you'd be right if you did. But it's not like GM don't have a horse in the same race, it's not like they can't go to bat with the system to make it work the way they know it ought to after their success in Brazil.

Check out the next one, it's even better, or worse, yes, much worse.

July 15, 2009 - **GM Investing \$1B in Brazil for New Cars** - CBS/AP

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/gm-investing-1b-in-brazil-for-new-cars/>

General Motors announced plans to invest \$1 billion to develop two new car models in Brazil. The president of GM's operations in Brazil and the Mercosur countries said it is GM's biggest investment since the onset of the global financial crisis.

GM emerged from bankruptcy protection last week, with CEO Fritz Henderson announcing the "business as usual was over" for the automaker. But GM, whose 40 days under court supervision was far shorter than anyone predicted, faces the worst auto sales slump in a quarter-century. The company plans to cut 20 percent of its salaried U.S. workforce by the end of the year, including around 35 percent of its executive employees.

To keep this in a more proper context, don't forget it was ethanol's influence on gasoline prices that drove up the price of everything, especially gasoline in 2008, so much so that our economy crashed. It was so bad that Obama had to bail out General Motors. But hey, this is America, we're a resilient people who stand behind our industries through the hardest times. And when we get them back on their feet, even though nobody is investing in the future of this country, our bailed out corporations still have the stamina to invest a billion dollars in Brazil to help them support energy markets done the right way even though we're stuck back here in the homeland doing it assbackwards. That's true freedom, a real example of what free markets and patriotism look like.

It's hard to believe we're collectively ignoring these realities when hydrous ethanol is so cheap to produce while gasoline is so expensive, ok, not actually expensive, pretended to be expensive. Although we do sell, or the ethanol industry tries with very little success, to sell an ethanol fuel that's 85% anhydrous ethanol and 15% gasoline (E85). You have to buy special "flex fuel vehicles" that can burn E85 and E10 because hardly anyone sells E85.

In order to get the auto industry to produce these flex fuel engines, they were allowed to ignore mileage and emissions regulations required on other engines so flex fuel vehicles could be made attractive to buyers with cheaper price tags than same models designed to just use E10. In this way the EPA's claim ethanol gets 1/3 less mileage using E10, as per the EPA's 1/3 less energy content theory leading to E10 causing a 2-3% loss of mileage in non-flex fuel engines, is upheld by the fact that E85 engines get the worst mileage in the country no matter what kind of fuel they use. I mean I suppose if we did what Ford does for Brazil, we'd all be asking why ethanol's lesser energy content doesn't cost a third mileage in flex fuel engines, and the whole scam would be blown.

Any or all of this is often not told to customers who buy flex fuelers. They actually get worse mileage when using E10 because they were not required to follow Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards other vehicles are required to do.

I've read car dealers are not required, or weren't at the time, to disclose mileage for flex fuelers like other vehicles at new car dealerships are required to by the EPA. So they put them near their counterpart models that use E10 to give the impression they get the same high mileage while telling customers they also run on this very cool fuel called E85.

This is not the kind of American ingenuity I was talking about earlier that might allow us to figure how to parity hydrous ethanol mileage efficiency with gasoline's. This is more of a 'Please drain the swamp Mr. President' type of ingenuity, not American at all, in fact very un-American.

Oxygenates cause bigger mileage losses than the amount of it added to gasoline. This is by design, also another Washington secret about oxygenates. They're meant to emit high levels of formaldehyde (MTBE) and acetaldehyde (ethanol), which comes at a great loss of mileage. The reason, among many, is that in the 90's, dark smog clouds caused by coal burning and diesel engines hung over American cities. This smog was mostly nitrogen oxide (NOx). When NOx mixes with aldehydes (non methane volatile organic compounds(NMVOC's) in the sun, a photochemical process occurs that results in ozone formation. Every aspect of this process is more dangerous than the original NOx smog, but far less visible. That way the EPA can claim better air quality even though it's not.

On top of that huge lie is the fact that ozone formation effects atmospheric water vapor, which in turn causes dramatic changes to weather patterns. No worries for the swamp dwellers (no disrespect meant to real swamp dwellers) in Washington, blame it on a whole new pack of lies called global warming caused by carbon dioxide (CO2). It's a brilliant plan really, while everyone is chasing phantom CO2 greenhouse gases (GHG), weather patterns keep getting worse because we're after the wrong GHG. This gives the impression that global warming caused by CO2 is worse than ever.

To understand the full scope of what we're dealing with, we gotta look at biochar. I make this myself, have been working on an invention for the last year to produce enough heat from wood burning to melt glass for glass blowing. It got more complicated than I thought it would be, but after many mistake and alterations, hopefully the next burn, maybe tomorrow if weather permits, I'll have my first successful run.

I load a 30 gallon metal drum with wood and seal it air tight except for a 3/4 inch hole in the top. Then load it in a 55 gallon metal drum and surround it with wood between the sides of the 55 and 30 gallon drums. Lastly I start a fire on top. As the wood in the 30 gallon drum heats up, since there's no oxygen for the wood to burn, it gasifies while the pressure of the process forces it out the hole in the top.

### **Biochar Workshop Part 1, How to Make Biochar**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=svNg5w7WY0k>

Biochar Workshop led by Bob Wells, soil scientist Jon Nilsson

You can get an idea how this works by filling a clean empty paint can with a hole drilling in the top with wood chips, sealing it, and tossing it in a fire. Let it burn with the hole down at first so the first gases coming out get burned in the fire. Once the initial gases are gone, you can turn it on its side to watch it torch up like a jet engine. This of course I do on a larger scale routing after filtering the gas before burning to heat glass.

### **Making Homemade Charcoal with Paint Cans**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=65H0AyyehVk>

Biochar Workshop led by Bob Wells, soil scientist Jon Nilsson

If you actually try the paint can experiment, once the torch is out and can cooled, what you have when you open it is biochar. This is actually atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> that's been captured by trees, turned into wood, now you've used a process called pyrolysis (burning biological matter in an oxygen starved chamber) to turn it into charcoal. This charcoal is a carbon byproduct of CO<sub>2</sub> after the O<sub>2</sub> (oxygen plants exhale after breathing in CO<sub>2</sub> using photosynthesis) is removed.

When we emit CO<sub>2</sub> from cars or anything else man caused, it doesn't head for the upper atmosphere it's alleged to cause global warming. What does makes into the upper atmosphere (what wasn't absorbed by plants or ocean water) takes years to get there. This leaves plenty of time for it to be harvested biochar first.

Is it costly? No way, like I said, I do it in my back yard with materials I scrounged. What I do pollutes (smoke from fire) unlike when done on an industrial scale. Biochar production is an energy positive process, meaning more gases are produced from wood pyrolysis than needed to heat it in order to extract the gases. So not only can we sequester atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in charcoal before making it to the upper atmosphere, it produces extra energy doing it, which can be used to produce electricity, heat, and products made from hydrocarbons like chemicals and plastic.

It's really just upgraded WW II technology (used to run vehicles in WW II when gasoline was not available) being use all over the world on massive scales for municipal waste disposal. It's slow to start in the US because so much effort has been put into another failed environmentalist initiative, recycling. Don't get me wrong, not all recycling is a waste of energy, but a lot of it is, especially when stacked next to hydrolysis energy production from one way waste streams.

Hydrocarbon based municipal waste imported from outside a community can be exploited for energy much like gasoline and other fossil fuels, only it first serves another purpose such as packaging for products, or as products. Once their initial



use is complete, rather than being transported for reuse or dumped in landfills, it's gasified. On the other hand biochar made from biological waste is an incredible soil amenity that can turn non arable soil rich for agricultural use. And it stays in soil for hundreds of years.

**July 2008 - Energy Balance and Emissions Associated with Biochar Sequestration and Pyrolysis Bioenergy Production**

[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/John\\_Gaunt/publication/5263646\\_Energy\\_Balance\\_and\\_Emissions\\_Associated\\_with\\_Biochar\\_Sequestration\\_and\\_Pyrolysis\\_Bioenergy\\_Production/links/552fb4410cf27acb0de61d73/Energy-Balance-and-Emissions-Associated-with-Biochar-Sequestration-and-Pyrolysis-Bioenergy-Production.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/John_Gaunt/publication/5263646_Energy_Balance_and_Emissions_Associated_with_Biochar_Sequestration_and_Pyrolysis_Bioenergy_Production/links/552fb4410cf27acb0de61d73/Energy-Balance-and-Emissions-Associated-with-Biochar-Sequestration-and-Pyrolysis-Bioenergy-Production.pdf)

Our results show that the energy yields remain positive and competitive with alternative technologies even when biochar is retained for soil amendment (*rather than charcoal also burned for energy*). This offers the realistic prospect of combining a bioenergy system with a strategy for the return of biochar to soil. It should also be noted that under operational conditions significant heat is produced that could be used to further offset fossil fuel use. This additional benefit is not considered in the present analysis.

Thus our understanding is that a project utilizing biochar and pyrolysis will deliver “Kyoto compliant” net-negative emissions. However, there are currently no projects that have used this approach. An important next step is to propose a methodology to the UNFCCC for approval.

Most of the planet is not fit for growing crops. Here we got this simple technology, like hydrous ethanol, small startup companies can be built from the ground up without Wall Street or Washington funding or regulations that solve jobs, energy, soil, and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, all huge social problems. But the people who want to change our whole way of life taxing carbon dioxide by writing themselves trillions of dollars a year checks to solve a problem that doesn't exist, and I bet some of you think I'm making this up because it's so unbelievable. 15 trillion dollars though, can you blame them

**04/25/2017 - Al Gore's Group Demands \$15 Trillion for Global Warming**

<http://dailycaller.com/2017/04/25/al-gores-new-group-demands-15-trillion-to-fight-global-warming/>

A group of executives who want to fight global warming has published a new report calling for countries to spend up to \$600 billion a year over the next two decades to boost green energy deployment and energy efficiency equipment.

The Energy Transitions Commission's (ETC) report claims “additional investments of around \$300-\$600 billion per annum do not pose a major macroeconomic challenge,” which they say will help the world meet the goals laid out in the Paris agreement.

## Ethanol Gets Market Boost

Even after MTBE was gone, ethanol was entering the market at a sluggish pace. It wasn't trusted to have staying power. So investments in new refineries weren't occurring. In 2007 congress passed the Energy Independence and Security Act requiring biofuels to make up a percentage gasoline and diesel markets. Since corn ethanol was the only source of biofuel added to gasoline (soy bean oil for diesel), money was invested to expand the ethanol industry. Then demand for more corn drove prices through the roof causing food and ethanol prices to skyrocket. That meant gasoline also had to rise or ethanol couldn't compete with it. The problem was the art of how to allow speculators to bid up the price of oil to the ideal price to allow ethanol into the market, but no higher because high oil is bad for the economy, all of which had to be done with a bare minimum of insiders knowing how and why they were doing it, had not been perfected yet. So they got a little carried away.

With gasoline over \$4 a gallon, the economy unraveled (summer 2008) causing the housing market to crashed. Democrats and Republicans, so called liberal and conservative pundits, Wall Streeters, industry insiders, all have different versions of what crashed the economy outside of the truth. And it still goes on today, they're still crashing the economy and everyone knows it. What do you think is the number 1 reasons Trump won in 2016, jobs and national security.

The Bush's started multiple wars as cover for their MTBE projects, which permanently destabilized the Arab world. Obama perfected keeping ethanol prices competitive with gasoline with a permanent flushing of the economy. In comes the art of the deal guy to drain the swamp without having a clue how Washington works. Then there's me, the wild card, a joker in a deck of numskulls, a little dog on a train with a big dog. Actually I'm twice Dr. Death's size, I could roast him for supper and not gain a pound

JUNE 13, 2008 - **A Bull Market Sees the Worst in Speculators** - by DIANA B. HENRIQUES

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/13/business/13speculate.html>

Just this week, Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, the Connecticut independent, said he was working on a proposal to ban large institutional investors from the commodity markets entirely. The same day, the Bush administration endorsed another Senate proposal to create a new federal interagency task force to investigate commodity speculation. At least four public hearings have explored the topic in just the last two months, and Senator Lieberman will hold another session on June 24.

On September 30, 2008, all but elected senator Obama threatened to go after speculators when elected. The price of oil dropped over a hundred dollars a barrel in the coming months, over \$10 the day before the Obama speech. The drop in oil prices, therefor gasoline, all but ended the ethanol industry. This brought down the cost of corn at the same time forcing Washington to figure out

how to allow speculators to drive up the cost of crude oil just enough to keep gasoline competitive with ethanol without killing the economy. If it was on life support for a few decades, no problem. As long as their wealth held its value, it was all good in the swamp.

: September 29, 2008 - **Oil prices drop below \$100 benchmark** - By  
ASSOCIATED PRESS

<http://www.eastbaytimes.com/2008/09/29/oil-prices-drop-below-100-benchmark/>

NEW YORK — Oil prices fell more than \$10 a barrel Monday, dropping back below \$100 as a U.S. financial bailout failed to win legislative approval, raising fears of a prolonged economic downturn that could drastically erode global energy demand.

The way they blamed it on the failure of the bailout package, I watched it as it happened, all in one afternoon, in just a few hours, oil dropped like an anchor from a hot air balloon beginning just after ranking members of the senate threatened to investigate oil speculators.

September 30, 2008 - **Senator Barack Obama's Remarks on the Economic Crisis**


-

[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2008/09/obamas\\_remarks\\_on\\_the\\_economic.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2008/09/obamas_remarks_on_the_economic.html)

This financial crisis is a direct result of the greed and irresponsibility that has dominated Washington and Wall Street for years. It's the result of speculators who gamed the system, regulators who looked the other way, and lobbyists who bought their way into our government. It's the result of an economic philosophy that says we should give more and more to those with the most and hope that prosperity trickles down to everyone else; a philosophy that views even the most common-sense regulations as unwise and unnecessary. And this economic catastrophe is the final verdict on this failed philosophy - a philosophy that we cannot afford to continue.

But while there is plenty of blame to go around and many in Washington and on Wall Street who deserve it, all of us now have a responsibility to solve this crisis because it affects the financial well-being of every single American. There will be time to punish those who set this fire, but now is the moment for us to come together and put the fire out.

As you can see in the chart below, by early 2009, gasoline and corn were keeping a steady side by side pace allowing ethanol to find a comfortable home in our fuel markets.



This is in spite of the fact that it continues to cost more mileage than the amount added to gasoline, pollute air, and negatively affect weather patterns. This is all being hidden from Donald Trump by Dr. Death. This is why Dr. Death was on that train complaining about having to be back at the White House the next morning, in order to lie about what he, his bother Rahm, and Obama did with Obamacare before the Trump administration took over.

This is without saying anything about of the wars Obama and Bush started or continued in the Middle East in their ongoing efforts to poison the American people. Either that or Trump is in league with them. His working with Dr. Death and support of ethanol may well demonstrate that to be the case. I don't see a lot of middle ground other than his not knowing what he's doing, or knowing and not having any more gumption to do something to fix it than Obama did. He's either different or the same, a potential part of the solution, or a definite part of the problem, it's simply too early to tell.

## Rising Gasoline Prices

For gasoline to keep pace with ethanol, the CFTC (Commodities Futures Trading Commission) has to turn a blind eye to oil traders unreasonably driving up oil futures prices as key placed regulators and elected officials closely monitor to see that it doesn't go too high or low.

Goldman Sachs plays a key role in overwhelming oil futures markets with enough capital to stabilize prices in spite of the legitimate speculations going on underneath them. This way it takes more money than anyone else is willing to risk in order to shift prices. If legitimate concerns such as war with Iran drives up prices, or too much oil available for sale (an oil glut) causes them to sink, Goldman along with select regulators, and politicians jump into action to force the price back where ethanol needs it to be no matter what real world market forces dictate

The day to day price of crude oil futures ultimately determines the price of gasoline. This is even though crude oil futures prices are the average price speculators think crude oil will be in the future. This has nothing to do with how much crude oil trades for today or in the future. It's rather what oil futures are trading for today. Some real oil actually changes hands in oil futures trading, but the bulk of it is like quarters being put in a slot machine or bet on horses, it's gambling whether oil futures, not oil itself, goes up or down.

Until 2007, speculating in oil futures was not allowed above a certain level without a waiver to prove a futures buyer is driving up prices based in real world supplies, and demands on those supplies.

### DEFINITION of 'Position Limit'

<http://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/positionlimit.asp>

The highest number of options or futures contracts an investor is allowed to hold on one underlying security. Exchanges and/or regulatory bodies establish different position limits for each contract based on trading volume and underlying share quantity. The **Chicago Board Options Exchange** is one entity that calculates position limits for options exchanges.

These waivers were mostly given out to the air travel industry and trucking companies who could show fossil fuel demands by their industry was going to rise enough to justify their escalating oil futures trading. Bush changed that rule so speculators could bid oil as high as they wanted whether they had any real market interests for doing so or not. The problem in 2008 when gasoline went over \$4 a gallon was the kind of low wage working people buying homes could not afford to make mortgage payments unless food and fuel was cheap. Ethanol was causing both to rise so much that they were forced to choose between eating, transportation, and making mortgage payments. No mystery what they chose.

2 May 2008 - **Rigging The Oil Market: 'Perhaps 60% of Today's Oil Price is Pure Speculation'**

by F. William Engdahl (from Federal Trade Commission website)

[https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public\\_comments/prohibitions-market-manipulation-and-false-information-subtitle-b-energy-independence-and-security/535819-00038.pdf](https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/public_comments/prohibitions-market-manipulation-and-false-information-subtitle-b-energy-independence-and-security/535819-00038.pdf)

Enron has the last laugh...

As US Senate report noted:

“Until recently, US energy futures were traded exclusively on regulated exchanges within the United States, like the NYMEX, which are subject to extensive oversight by the CFTC, including ongoing monitoring to detect and prevent price manipulation or fraud. In recent years, however, there has been a tremendous growth in the trading of contracts that look and are structured just like futures contracts, but which are traded on unregulated OTC electronic markets. Because of their similarity to futures contracts they are often called “futures look-alikes.”

The only practical difference between futures look-alike contracts and futures contracts is that the look-alikes are traded in unregulated markets whereas futures are traded on regulated exchanges. The trading of energy commodities by large firms on OTC electronic exchanges was exempted from CFTC oversight by a provision inserted at the behest of Enron and other large energy traders into the Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000 in the waning hours of the 106th Congress.

Then, apparently to make sure the way was opened really wide to potential market oil price manipulation, in January 2006, the Bush Administration's CFTC permitted the Intercontinental Exchange (ICE), the leading operator of electronic energy exchanges, to use its trading terminals in the United States for the trading of US crude oil futures on the ICE futures exchange in London

Persons within the United States seeking to trade key US energy commodities – US crude oil, gasoline, and heating oil futures – are able to avoid all US market oversight or reporting requirements by routing their trades through the ICE Futures exchange in London instead of the NYMEX in New York.

In January 2006 when the CFTC allowed the ICE Futures the gaping exception, oil prices were trading in the range of \$59-60 a barrel. Today some two years later we see prices tapping \$120 and trend upwards. This is not an OPEC problem, it is a US Government regulatory problem of malign neglect.

The point is after Obama took office, this practice allowing oil prices to rise to unrealistic levels continued, it had to or ethanol was done. So not only was brother Rahm needed in Chicago to watch over ethanol pollution concerns at a plausible deniability distance from Obama, the oil futures manipulation aspect of ethanol needed attention the same way, through the CME and the Chicago Board Options Exchange.

The thing is that back when I put all this together, I used to wonder who the genius fixer behind it all was. It's not like Obama or Rahm could put it together on their own. And there I was looking at the back of the head of the Big Dog himself, I mean it has to be him right, the “Architect of Obamacare”, this guy’s resume reads like a top ten member of Mensa International.

#### Wikipedia - **Ezekiel Emanuel**

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ezekiel\\_Emanuel](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ezekiel_Emanuel)

##### Education -

A straight-A student in his youth, Emanuel was so interested in science at an early age that his grandfather brought home a cow heart and lung from his meat business for his grandson to dissect.[4]

Emanuel graduated from Amherst College in 1979 and subsequently received his M.Sc. from the University of Oxford in Biochemistry. He simultaneously studied for an M.D. and a Ph.D. in Political Philosophy from Harvard University, receiving the degrees in 1988 and 1989, respectively.[11] Emanuel completed an internship and residency at Beth Israel Hospital in internal medicine. Subsequently, he undertook fellowships in medicine and medical oncology at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute,[11] and is a breast oncologist.[2]

Emanuel received dozens of honors and awards, including the Toppan Dissertation Prize, the Harvard award for best political science dissertation of 1988.[11][12]

##### Career -

After completing his post-doctoral training, Emanuel pursued a career in academic medicine, rising to the level of associate professor at Harvard Medical School in 1997.[11] He soon moved into the public sector, and held the position of Chief of the Department of Bioethics at the Clinical Center of the U.S.

National Institutes of Health. Emanuel served as Special Advisor for Health Policy to Peter Orszag, the former Director of the Office of Management and Budget.[13] Emanuel entered the administration with different views from the president on how to reform health care, but is said by colleagues to be working for the White House goals.[14] Since September 2011, Emanuel has headed the

Department of Medical Ethics & Health Policy at the University of Pennsylvania, where he also serves as a Penn Integrates Knowledge Professor, under the official title Diane S. Levy and Robert M. Levy University Professor.



## Dr. Death

I figured the mastermind behind it all had to be, as Rush Limbaugh calls him, “Dr. Death”. This is for allegedly creating “death panels” included in Obamacare. These death panels are said to decide which of the elderly get to live or die. In reality it's when resources are limited, young patients are chosen for treatment before the elderly.

I can see both sides, yes it makes perfect sense to choose younger patients with a better chance of surviving to live fruitful and productive lives than the elderly. However Limbaugh's death panel comments are made in the context of Obamacare being such a failure that it stretches resources to the point these kinds of life and death decisions need to be made so frequently that they'd have to set up panels to strictly focus on who lives or dies.

I'd wager Obamacare would have worked if they followed the original recipe of reducing ozone levels to lower illness rates in order to pay for treatment of the uninsured. As far as Obama saying he wasn't going to do it for fear of lost jobs (corn farming jobs), ethanol and gasoline only mix because the ethanol used has all its water content removed. If it later comes in contact with water between its production, blending with gasoline, and the spark plugs of your car, it separates and fails to ignite efficiently. This includes when mixing with the water vapor of the air inside an engine's combustion chamber just before ignition.

Not removing the water content after distilling (first distillation ethanol is actually moonshine) in order to make it anhydrous is much cheaper. Hydrous ethanol is a viable high octane fuel by itself. This is in lieu of adding it to gasoline and ruining both fuels.

The Midwest could easily become transportation fuel self-sufficient by skipping the dehydration process that makes it anhydrous to simply produce hydrous ethanol (E100). The reason why they don't is simple, anhydrous ethanol is expensive and dangerous to produce, meaning big money and government need to control the market for it, government to force a worthless product on the market, and big money to make money off it because nobody else can.

Hydrous ethanol on the other hand is so simple it can be made from pretty much anything by anybody. In fact the first Model T Fords came with stills in the trunk to brew their own fuel in rural areas that didn't have filling stations yet. I always found it interesting how prohibition stopped hydrous ethanol from becoming a fossil fuel alternative. Then it ended after gasoline supplies and stations were plentiful and cheap enough to out-compete existing ethanol production technologies. After many decades, ethanol has returned, but only as a gasoline additive that ruins both fuels.



## Affordable Care Act

As it sits today, health care prices are skyrocketing as resources become limited after health care industries and insurers choke on the bureaucratic nightmare suffered under the Affordable Care Act. So just as Limbaugh predicted, death panels are theoretically just around the corner. And there I had the designers of Obama's failed health care plan whose brother was sent to Chicago to become mayor in order to make sure Obamacare continued to fail until after the 2012 election sitting a few seats on front of me. Now he's advising Trump on how to fix what he and Obama broke, presumably without anyone figuring out what he, his brother, and Obama, were really up to, something these coconspirators expected to be dealing with Hillary over.

That's the thing though, Hillary tried to use her status as first lady to push through a universal health care bill in the 1990's. In 2008, she and Obama had separate but similar health care plans (below).

### NOV. 30 2007 - **Obama vs. Clinton on "Universality"**

[http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/chatterbox/2007/11/obama\\_vs\\_clinton\\_on\\_universality.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/chatterbox/2007/11/obama_vs_clinton_on_universality.html)

At issue is how "universal" we can expect any health-care reform to be. Obama's plan creates various mechanisms to make both private and public health insurance more readily available. Hillary's plan does the same, but also creates an "individual mandate" requiring every American to buy health insurance. Obama's plan creates an "individual mandate" too, but only for children. Otherwise, under Obamacare, citizens would remain free to buy private health insurance or not as they pleased.

What I always thought happened was whichever plan was put in place, it would take more than 8 years to embed it so deeply into the bureaucratic, financial, and health care systems that it couldn't later be gotten rid of by Republicans. So Hillary and Obama made a deal where she would stand down to let him have the White House for 8 years. In exchange he would put her health care plan in place, which was almost the same as his anyway. Then she would take over in 2017 to run it for the 8 years needed to institutionalize the new system forever.

The reason she lost to Trump is because from 2008 when she conceded the Democrat thrown to Obama she's been thinking she'll be the president come Inauguration Day January 2017, otherwise why did they do all this. In the recent book about her campaign, (Shattered by Jonathan Allen and Amie Parnes), the fact that she never defined her campaign to explain to the American people why she wanted to be president is exposed. She rather lackadaisically treated the whole process as a kind of formality to her eventual coronation, why bother with the details, especially when they're top secret. It's not like she could have said "Elect me because I made a deal with Barack in Obama in 2008 to get elected in 2016. Besides that, you need our socialized health care system after the way

Obama and the Emanuel brothers have been poisoning the American populace”.

April 18, 2017 - **'Shattered' Picks Through The Broken Pieces Of Hillary Clinton's Dream**

<http://www.npr.org/2017/04/18/524338718/shattered-picks-through-the-broken-pieces-of-hillary-clintons-dream>

"For both sides, Hillary was the perfect symbol of everything that was wrong with America," the authors conclude. "At times, Trump and Sanders would act as the right and left speakers of a stereo blaring a chorus on repeat: Hillary's a corrupt insider who has helped rig the political and economic systems in favor of the powerful."

But in the end, Allen and Parnes contend, the worst blows Clinton suffered were self-inflicted. If the controversies and corruption memes came to define her, they write, it was largely because she never managed to define herself.

It doesn't take too deep a scrutiny of how the Clinton Foundation was run to figure she had a platform, a definite agenda for the future of United States. She just couldn't say what it was or she'd get thrown in prison along with most everyone else in Washington. Her response to that problem was rather "So what, that's the way absolute power is supposed to work, why explain myself and ruin it? Would a future queen explain herself and she's not in control? Why open myself up to critique when my victory is a done deal?"

1/19/2017 - **The Clinton Foundation Is Dead — But The Case Against Hillary Isn't**

<http://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/the-clinton-foundation-is-dead-but-the-case-against-hillary-isnt/>

The Clinton Foundation was little more than an influence-peddling scheme to enrich the Clintons, and had little if anything to do with "charity," either overseas or in the U.S. That sound you heard starting in November was checkbooks being snapped shut in offices around the world by people who had hoped their donations would buy access to the next president of the United States.

Unfortunately for her, and fortunately for America, that's not how this country works. We don't appoint leaders because it's "their turn". We rather elect whoever we want even if they have no experience in politics, or so it seems we have now.

If you look at the way Republicans ran their nominees in 2015/16, outside of Trump, it looks like they pretty clearly supported Hillary by not trying to impress us more than her. They might not have said so, but as far as competing against her, Trump, an outsider whom they didn't appreciate sticking his nose in their election process, was the only one intent on beating her, which angered everyone

on both sides. They also seemed to resent the fact that within the Democrat Party, Bernie Sanders was also serious about beating her. Poor guy, when she cheated him, nobody cared, so he was forced to throw his weight behind her rather than Hillary be hauled away in shackles after being mirandized.

It got so bad that even the Bush's publicly announced they were going to vote for Hillary. Think about that, old man Bush (41) and his Enron pals MTBE started the health care crisis Hillary was going to solve with her universal health care system in 1993, ok, not solve, not for us anyway. Then his son, Bush 43, replaced MTBE with ethanol followed by Obama starting us down a deep dark road to a socialized single payer system that Hillary would put the final touches on.

When most people think of Houston, they think of oil. They also might think about pollution because Houston, where the Bush's and Enron are from, used to be the worst polluted city in the country with the highest cancer rates. That was

#### Wikipedia - Economy of Houston

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy\\_of\\_Houston#Health\\_care\\_and\\_biomedical](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy_of_Houston#Health_care_and_biomedical)

*First sentence on page* - The economy of Houston is based primarily on the energy industry, particularly oil. However, health care, biomedical research, and aerospace also constitute large sectors.

just before MTBE was forced into fuel supplies that was the solution to their carcinogenic air pollution problem, rather than burning it safely to make electricity, they packaged it as clean fuel to make gasoline pollute less, then poisoned the whole country with it.

If you know Houston, you know oil is not their only highly profitable industry. They've also been leaders in medicine and pharmaceuticals, which can be more profitable than oil depending on the price of oil. I read an article when I was locked up in the Houston Federal Detention Center calling for a region wide disposal system for refining pollutants. The writer said it would spare the city great expense and high illness rates. In the coming weeks and months, there were no reported follow up stories, which made me realize somebody was making all the money that would be saved if Houstonians breathed cleaner air.

This posed the question whether the Bush's and Ken Lay (Enron), along with Senator Phil and Wendy Gramm, all central players in starting this whole MTBE mess, or whoever was pulling their puppet strings, did they realize they were making a lot of money polluting Houston, not just from the oil refining, but by the people refinery pollution made sick needing health care. Then under great pressure to clean up Houston's polluted air, rather than losing all those great medical profits, they thought "The country wants products made from oil, oil pollutes, so why shouldn't everyone share the pollution that comes from

producing those products”. Of course they could only consider this if they ignored the reality there are a lot better ways to deal with byproducts of oil refining, just none that make so much money off resulting medical care.

With Hillary expected by everyone to drive home the socialized health care bacon from 2017 onward, Trump was just a citizen who didn't know anything about any of it, he saw Washington turning into a corrupt swamp, something obviously a majority of Americans agreed with him about, at least in the Electoral College anyway. Now we got this Dr. Death slithering around in the Oval Office trying to drag Trump down in the same muck and poisonous goo the rest of them are stuck in, or rather were relishing in like pigs until Hillary lost the election.

Seriously, can you even imagine, yes, evil and diabolical, all of them. But on a more personal note, can you consider what it must be like to be them with their worst fears being standing in a courtroom in handcuffs crying to the judge “But you're honor, we wouldn't have done it if we thought we'd get caught. Not in our wildest dreams did we even consider it could come to this. We were supposed to get away with it, then this Trump character came out of nowhere and ruined everything. That's who you should be talking to, not me, I'm one of the biggest crooks in the world, crooks like us are not supposed to get caught or there would be no crooks like us. Seriously your honor, where would civilization be without people us doing what has to be done?”

### Tier III

As Ramn Emmanuel moved to Chicago to become mayor with Obama's much needed blessing, a new plan was put in motion called Tier 3 Gasoline Sulfur Regulations. It went into full regulatory effect at the end of 2016, although it appears to have begun in 2012. This is where rather than getting rid of ethanol (or using it alone instead of ruining both fuels by adding it to gasoline), the government put the burden on refiners to produce gasoline so clean that adding ethanol to it results in similar emissions levels to previous gasoline blends with no ethanol added to it. This in turn reduces air pollution so less people are made sick, that way Obamacare functions the way it's supposed to, only a few years behind schedule.

September 20, 2016 - **Overview of EPA's Tier 3 Gasoline Sulfur Regulations**  
40 CFR Part 80, Subparts D, E, H and O (mostly O) 1

<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-10/documents/overview-tier3-gas-sulfur-regs-2016-09-20-webinar.pdf>

Gasoline must contain no more than 10 parts per million (ppm) sulfur (sulfur dioxide - SO<sub>2</sub>), on an annual average basis, beginning January 1, 2017

"Early" Tier 3 credits may be generated from 1/1/2012 through 12/31/2016 by producing gasoline containing less than 30 ppm sulfur on an annual average basis

Refiner or importer assumes ethanol contains 5 ppm sulfur if they don't know the actual sulfur concentration of the ethanol blended into their BOB or gasoline

With gasoline at 10 parts per million (ppm) sulfur and ethanol around 5 ppm, with sulfur the new villain of air quality, ethanol becomes good to add to gasoline because it has a lower sulfur content than the new gasoline. This is all quite ludicrous because gasoline, diesel fuel, jet fuel, and heating oil, can be refined to produce 20% more power with 70% less pollution by more efficiently combusting fossil fuels so they produce more power from what otherwise is wasted fuel going out the tail pipe.

24-AUG-2000 - **Put a polymer in your tank** - AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY

[https://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2000-08/ACS-Papi-2408100.php](https://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2000-08/ACS-Papi-2408100.php)

Polyisobutylene can produce a 10 percent increase in horsepower, a 20 percent increase in mileage, and a 70 percent decrease in emissions of such environmental pollutants as carbon monoxide, unburned hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides, according to Paul Waters, Ph.D., a professor emeritus at American University in Washington, D.C. He is also a scientific advisor to General Technology Applications, in Gainesville, Va., the company that developed the additive.

In 1989, stories surface about research being not far from here in Virginia. A Navy contract with a small company called GTATech tasked them with finding a way to make jet fuel less volatile so it would be less likely to ignite when fueling or during crashes. They were working with a polymer called polyisobutylene (PIB).

PIB is already in gasoline, also just about everything else we use, even chewing gum. It's refined right into gasoline because it's made from crude oil. However the additive they were working with is a longer molecular form of PIB than what's added now. While experimenting with the jet fuel, Professor Paul Waters wondered what PIB would do if added to gasoline. So he started using it in landscape equipment they used maintaining their compound in Gainesville.

May 25, 1999 - Patent - **High molecular weight fuel additive** -  
US 5906665 A

<https://www.google.com/patents/US5906665>

A method and composition for improving the mechanical efficiency of a engine is provided. Ultra-high molecular weight polyisobutylene (PIB) added to the fuel changes the momentary mechanical properties of the fuel during induction. The additive provides a more uniform spray droplet size, increases the extensional viscosity of the fuel, and adapts other physical properties, under induction conditions.

- Sixty percent of the energy in gasoline is not converted to useful mechanical energy in the combustion process. The Nissan 280ZX showed immediate improved performance in both acceleration and engine smoothness and gave gasoline mileage improvement. The Quad 4 showed a significant increase in gasoline mileage and engine smoothness immediately. The driver (Ford Cosworth racing car) estimated an improvement in fuel consumption of more than 20%. Additive was added to the tow truck,, an increase in fuel mileage of more than 25% was recorded.

The additive was added to a 1992 Nissan 300ZX and acceleration and mileage tests were conducted by EG&G Automotive Research Center on a runway in San Antonio, Tex. The 300ZX showed significant improvement in rate of acceleration and fuel consumption.

He noticed how the engines ran smoother and cooler at the same time putting out more power. So he tried it in cars to find they got more mileage while emitting almost no pollutants compared to gasoline without it. It was actually this research that lead to the Clean Air Act of 1990 debate. Environmentalists found out about it and demanded refineries use it. Wanting to campaign as an environmentally friendly president when coming up on his second term, Bush supported them.

The oil companies however said no way, I mean can you blame them, 20% more fossil fuel for the world without drilling any more drilling, which translates to us buying 20% less fuel, yeah, no way. That's without looking at all the sick people who would no longer be sick, therefor no longer need highly profitable medical treatment. Of course a 20% hike in fuel prices back then would have been a drop in the bucket compared to prices now, in fact even doubling the price would be cheaper than now. Like I said though, what about the lost profits from too many healthy Americans.

I often wonder how much it would take to get them to stop poisoning us. Or if there's simply no dollar amount that can end it because it's just too much doggone fun. I once thought perhaps if we signed everything we own over to them, even our bodies so we'd be their slaves, if they'd grow to better appreciate us and the planet. Yeah, again with the "no way", what would be the fun in that.

Then there's also the fact that the more of us they make sick who then need their treatment, the bigger the pool of physicians there is for them to choose from to get the best money can buy when they their loved one become ill, something that likely doesn't often happen, unless of course their stupid enough to be poisoning themselves as well. And you know, that might just be the way it has to be, it's not like they can tell the people they care about what they're doing.

They can create markets of safe expensive products that the rest of us can't afford followed by a culture of consuming it so they don't have to breach the topic. But some of them are bound to stray, and when they do, I guess they just have to let them go knowing the obstacles they face staying healthy in a world where only we the deplorables are meant to be poisoned and experimented on in their quest for cures to diseases that only they can afford.

Can you even imagine, that must be so hard for them to see somebody like their son or daughter, they don't turn to drugs or alcohol, but rather junk food along with toxic water and air. Next thing you know they're being treated with your pharmaceuticals meant to make us sicker than we already are. So tragic, I really feel for them now.

## Chandra

Rather than bore you being redundant, here's 6 action packed pages I put together for Babs Proller, also known as Babs Washington for her role in a popular Netflix series called 'House of Cards'. She called to ask me to produce a paper telling how my story relates to the murder of a Washington n D.C intern, Chandra Levy. Proller blew the case wide open by exposing the government's key witness against the alleged murderer was a fraud, a jail house snitch who's still a gangster.

July 28, 2016 - **Why prosecutors dropped charges against the man accused of killing Washington intern Chandra Levy** – by Lynh Bui, Keith L. Alexander, and Scott Higham

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/public-safety/charges-dropped-against-man-accused-of-killing-washington-intern-chandra-levy/2016/07/28/36f36630-54ee-11e6-bbf5-957ad17b4385\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.936afb4f4fe8](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/public-safety/charges-dropped-against-man-accused-of-killing-washington-intern-chandra-levy/2016/07/28/36f36630-54ee-11e6-bbf5-957ad17b4385_story.html?utm_term=.936afb4f4fe8)

"I want the true person who did this to be found," Babs Proller said. "The system failed and took attention away from somebody who really did it. It's a never-ending nightmare for this poor family, and they need closure."

Babs wanted my story for a miniseries true crime investigation TV show called American Crime produced by a producer from House of Cards, Keith Huff. I know, it all wreaks of some kind of nefarious plot. The jailhouse snitch Armando Morales was or is a member of the notorious Fresno Bulldogs. He was actually featured in a TV show about the gang. He met Bab's staying in a hotel while under witness protection. She then allegedly recorded him saying he lied on the witness stand saying his cellmate Ingmar Guandique confided in him how he killed Chandra.

JULY 29, 2016 - **Chandra Levy Miniseries in the Works at TNT** - by Lesley Goldberg

<http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/live-feed/chandra-levy-miniseries-works-at-915897>

Following the genre's breakout success with The Jinx, Making a Murderer, and People v. O.J. Simpson: American Crime Story, the Turner-owned cable network is developing a miniseries exploring the Chandra Levy case, The Hollywood Reporter has confirmed.

- 
- 
-



- **17FEB17 CHANDRA FOR BABS**

It's been a while, lot's of facts now buried in archives or removed from easy public access. Period hard copies are all that supports some of it, although a researcher who knows how to dig around Washington would likely find ample evidence to support it all.

1) 1989 – *Washington Times* (may have been removed archives) - Idea for gasoline additive introduced around Washington as way to end smog. It would create high emissions of VOC's to mix with emissions from coal stacks and diesel engines causing an ozone forming photochemical reaction in the sun that would make tropospheric water vapor rise into the jet stream where it would float out over the ocean to fall as rain. It was dead on arrival.

2) 1990 – *Washington Times* (may have been removed from archives) - Reports of gasoline additive that provides 20% more mileage with 70% less pollution emissions inspired a renewed Clean Air Act (CAA) debate. Bush 41 said if oil companies would not use it, he would sign legislation forcing them to. They said no, but agreed to use another additive said to be almost as good called MTBE.

3) *August 1990 - Kuwait Invasion* - When it was reported by scientists who supported the other additive that MTBE would cause air and water pollution, environmentalists balked. As the CAA debate was breaking down, Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. Tradition required Bush telling Saddam to pull his troops back from neighboring borders. The international community was up in arms that Bush said nothing thinking Saddam would take it as a nod that it was ok to attack. After the invasion, with all eyes on Kuwait and Bush, Enron and oil industry hacks met with environmentalist, they sang kumbaya together, a mega slush fund was set up to finance environmentalists causes, environmentalists came back to the CAA table supporting MTBE.

4) *MTBE turns to be the failed additive promoted around Washington in 1989* - MTBE got rid of smog, which was not a selling point when passing the CAA into law. It was rather supposed to lessen carbon monoxide emissions, which were not a problem at the time. Weather patterns started to change when MTBE was first added to gasoline nationwide in 1992-93. MTBE is made from methanol (liquefied natural gas/methane) and ether. Methane is an exceptionally potent greenhouse gas because of it's volatile reactions with atmospheric water vapor. Ether is also a volatile organic compound that mixes with water vapor to become radicalized when converting to ozone, thus causing it to rise into the upper atmosphere and jet stream. MTBE was the brainchild of Ken Lay, head of now defunct Enron, also both Bush presidents biggest donors.

5) *Trillion dollar loan gives birth to Enron Loophole* - After passing MTBE requirements into CAA, it's backers needed to come up with a trillion dollars to build refining capacity to produce enough MTBE to service the nations gasoline supplies. If memory serves me correctly, it had to be done within a year. The whole deal almost fell apart when low and behold they found the money. The loan would not be paid off until 2006. But since MTBE was required to be added to gasoline by federal law, the loan was allowed to be booked as cash rather than debt because it's sales were promoted to be good as gold. Booking debt as cash was only allowed for Enron. This kind of transaction served to model what later became known as the "Enron Loophole". This allowed banks to book debt as cash for highly rated loans. These kinds of unregulated derivatives were later used to create the housing bubble that burst in 2008.

6) *MTBE and Me* - In 1998, I drank well water polluted with MTBE. Once I recovered, I was highly sensitive to MTBE emissions from highways where I live. This made my life a war zone during workweeks because of high levels of MTBE pollution caused by rush hour traffic. It's not as bad on weekends. Weather also effected how sick I might get at any time of the week. That's when I noticed weather following weekly patterns. This made me wonder if MTBE was causing it.

7) *NASA says MTBE might be causing drought and weekly weather patterns* - There was a year and a half long drought at the time. I wondered if MTBE was also causing it and contacted a NASA climatologist Drew Shindell, who was top of his field. He'd been saying methane and ozone causing emissions directly affect weather patterns. Without referring to MTBE, he directly and candidly agreed the scenario I was laying out would do just as I assumed. When told the source of the emissions I was referring to was MTBE, he did not respond again.

8) *July 1999* - I called the Washington Times (WT) because they always seemed to report sides of these stories no one else did. I talked to a reporter who said she couldn't write about unsubstantiated allegations even if there was evidence to support it as possible fact unless it was already in a public record. She said she'd snoop around Washington to see if she could find a public source to report it from.

9) *The administration reacts* - A few days later, president Clinton, VP Gore, the head of the EPA, and head of the Department of Agriculture, came out saying MTBE had to be removed from gasoline immediately. This was noteworthy with regard the WT reporter asking MTBE/weather related questions around DC. MTBE was not an issue anyone in Washington liked to admit was a problem because 1) Enron spread a lotta money around DC and state capitals, and 2) the original trillion dollar loan booked as cash was used to collateralize trillions of dollars in investment capital. This fueled the economically booming 90's. So any

problems effecting MTBE sales negatively, therefor risking interrupting loan payments being made on time, threatened to undermine the foundation of a multitrillion dollar pyramid scheme. Later that week she published an MTBE story about MTBE polluting groundwater that didn't include its effects on weather or drought. I was named in the story.

**10) *MTBE use stopped*** - My sensitivity to MTBE soon eased, then went away over the following weeks. Or rather I stopped getting sick from MTBE exhaust fumes, which could only have meant MTBE was not being used. The political aspects of it however disappeared from headlines, thus giving the appearance it was still in use. This meant any stories about it's effects on weather would be met with "what do you mean it effects weather, weather is normal".

**11) *Enron losing money*** - With MTBE not being used, Enron was losing money and was unable to keep up with loan payments. Meanwhile they were bankrolling George Bush's run for the White House to position him to bail them out. This side of the story is highly nuanced including an unbelievable angle regarding Bush and Gore's run off over hanging chad votes in Palm Beach Florida that left the final elections result in limbo for over a month after the election. Leading up to the election, I was in jail using an activist strategy I read how to do in a book that told how to use the justice system to create a public record of any issue so the news media could report on it. ('How You Can Manipulate the Media: Guerrilla Methods to Get Your Story Covered by TV, Radio, and Newspapers' by David) I was released from jail after getting the court record a few days before the election.

**12) *2000 presidential election*** - What I saw was an election where if the MTBE effect on weather could be kept secret, Bush would have been the ideal choice for the industry so he could cover it up while helping Enron get back on its feet. If not, Al Gore would have been better able to soothe public concerns over altered weather patterns because of his support of CO2 caused global warming theories.

**13) *Global Warming a hoax*** - To this day the left lies about global warming at the same time the right doesn't want anyone to know how industrial pollutants directly impact regional weather patterns. Since we pollute on a global scale, it looks like global warming when the truth is changing to using gasoline that works the way it should would end much of the adverse changes in weather that get attributed to climate change.

**14) *Additive that works*** - The fact is that the additive that was said to provide 20% more mileage with 70% less pollution is being used discreetly around refineries in California and Texas to help them conform to EPA required pollution levels.

**15) *Bush comes in as MTBE goes out*** - MTBE use was on/off from July

1999 until Bush was in office. They put it back in gasoline a few times, I got sick, then started sending emails around the country making a case for it effecting weather patterns. It's use would then end again, I'd stop getting sick, weather patterns returned to normal, so I wasn't able to make the case that it was effecting it, so I'd stop. I didn't get sick after Bush took over until February 2002.

**16) *MTBE Safe Harbor Provision*** - In February 2002 congress tried to discreetly pass a safe harbor law protecting MTBE from defective product lawsuits. Justification for this was based on its known polluting of groundwater, but was written so if the truth came out about it effecting weather, the industry and Enron would also be protected. This was quietly sold around Washington as a matter of national security, because if MTBE failed, the trillion dollar loan would not get paid off, and the pyramid built on top of it would collapse taking the value of the dollar along with much of the world's economy with it.

**17) *MTBE put back in gasoline to pass Safe Harbor*** - When they secretly tried to pass the MTBE safe harbor amendment into the Energy Bill, they put MTBE back in gasoline so it couldn't be proven it wasn't being used when the Energy Bill went public on the floor of the House and Senate. As always, I got sick and sent emails all over the country exposing what they were doing to news outlets.

**18) *01May2001*** - All was quiet on the MTBE front, I wasn't getting sick, weather patterns were normal, so I had no choice but to mind my own business. I don't know if people remember how quiet and inconsequential Washington was before then, nothing like it is now. That's why the Chandra Levy story blew up, it was the only thing going on in Washington worth reporting. I wouldn't have thought much of it regarding MTBE related issues except for the fact that Gary Condit had the second best alibi on the planet for where he was when Chandra went missing. He was meeting with Dick Cheney regarding Cheney's Energy Task Force.

**19) *Cheney's secretive Enron/Energy task farce*** - These were my adversaries, so I had an idea what Cheney was doing. Researchers are still trying to get them to release records of his meetings with Enron officials, which appears even to them that this was really what the task force was all about.

**20) *Condit takes stand against MTBE*** - The first thing I did when the part of the Levy story broke about Condit being with Cheney when Chandra went missing was search Condit's record on MTBE. It showed much groundwater in his home district being polluted by MTBE with his response being a bill to end its use in California.

**21) *Enron caused Rolling Blackouts*** - At the time California was

experiencing “rolling blackouts” in Condit's district. This is where they lost electricity over huge swaths of California as Enron hacks bilked California utilities out of billions of dollars by create energy shortages to falsely inflate prices. This happened during heat waves, which cost some lives due to lack of air conditioning. It wasn't revealed until years later that Enron was behind it, I assume as punishment for MTBE lawsuits and proposed legislation that drew negative attention to the additive. This caused MTBE profits to dwindled putting their trillion dollar loan scheme at risk.

**22) Condit with Cheney when Chandra went missing** - This is when Condit met with Cheney and Chandra went missing. The key to understanding what really happened to Chandra lies primarily in the fact that although he was with Cheney, he was 1) the prime suspect in her disappearance, and 2) the fact that he was with Cheney wasn't looked at as evidence, therefor proving he couldn't have done it. Neither did he ever use that fact as a defense. It was only ever reported in the first articles about her disappearance, then seemed to disappear as if it wasn't part of the story. What should have happened was Dick Cheney stepped forward to address these facts, out of which whatever they were meeting about would have been highlighted. To this day, that aspect of her murder has not been seriously looked at.

**23) 9/11** – Anyone who knows Chandra's story well knows it dried up and disappeared as planes flew into buildings in downtown Manhattan. Chandra woke up the sleepy little town of Washington DC, a mystery to distract us from nothing else going on here. By then I'd put my theory in a format people were starting to pay attention to, the connection between Chandra, Condit, Cheney, Enron, and MTBE. By my schedule, 9/11 and the day that followed were going to be crucial to the success of the past few years struggling to expose the truth about MTBE. I gleefully cut up melons in front of the TV. The soil where I live was too polluted by MTBE residue for me to eat the produce I'd grown because of my chemical sensitivity disorder. So I was experimenting with sun drying it, and was in great spirits because I knew I was on the edge of winning my war against Washington D.C. Then boom, plane number 1 flew into WTC as I wondered “no way?” When plane struck 2, I came out of my seat yelling “you dirty mfrs” as I saw my hopes and dreams of ending MTBE use go up in smoke.

**24) Senator Phil Gramm** – As a prelude to 9/11, on September 4, 2001, U.S. Senator Phil Gramm (R-Texas), big shot on Capitol Hill and Republican presidential hopeful gave notice he wouldn't be running for reelection. He left the Senate in November 2002 to work for UBS (Union Bank Switzerland), the same bank that facilitated the trillion dollar loan, the same Senator who set the loan up, the same bank that took control of what was left of the trillion dollar loan after Enron collapsed.

**25) Wendy Gramm** - As head of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), Senator Gramm's wife Wendy solely exempted Enron from regulations outlawing the kinds of financial actions that later became legal under what's now called the "Enron Loophole" It's a form of economic transaction that caused the collapse of the housing market in 2008. Her actions allowed Enron to book their trillion dollar debt as cash rather than debt. Directly after doing so, she resigned leadership of the CFTC to work for Enron.

**26) MTBE's Masterminds** - Wendy and Phil Gramm along with the Bush's, Enron, and Dick Cheney, were the puppet masters, maybe even masterminds, behind everything MTBE. Now here was Gramm, whom most in Washington thought, not even thought, knew for a fact, could never be drug out of DC until after serving 8 years as POTUS, deciding to go work for a bank on Park Avenue. This happened just as I was making it known around town I'd figured out and started publically broadcasting the connection between 911 and Enron, MTBE, Cheney, Condit, and Chandra Levy. I thought I finally had them, which put me in a great mood that week, because seeing one of my arch enemies Phil Gramm take a dive told me I was hot on their trail. As soon as I saw the second plane hit the WTC and heard about the attack at the Pentagon just a few miles up the road from me (across a parking lot from where my wife worked), I realized no one was going to care about what I had to say for a long time, maybe never.

**27) Enron Collapse** - By September 11, Enron execs were dumping stocks and jumping ship. By the end of October, it was over. They strung it along for a few months with another energy company (Dynergy) planning to buy them out and assume their debts. That lasted until they got a better idea of the extent of real losses buried under multiple layers of lies and accounting gimmicks they were hiding the truth behind. To me, 911 looked like nothing more than a distraction away from the Chandra Levy story and my connecting Enron and Cheney to it. It also gave Enron insiders a better chance to grab as much loot as they could and run. To me 911 looked and smelled like Bush's father allowing Saddam Hussein invade Kuwait to distract the news media while they discreetly bribed environmentalists into supporting MTBE.

**28) Safe Harbor for MTBE** - They say three times a charm. In this case, three wars. Congress began trying to pass an MTBE liability waiver into the Energy Bill in early 2002. I hadn't been sick since Bush got elected. When I started getting sick again, I searched the internet to find out what they were doing different. It turned out they were having hush hush hearings preparing an MTBE liability wavier for passage through the House and Senate. So I did what I do and sent emails all over the country telling small town newspapers what their congressmen were doing. After a brief fight, the hearings shut down and I stopped getting sick.

**29) August 2002, getting sick again** - Knowing where to look first, I quickly found they were at it again. So I did what I do again shut down the hearing, only this time without a fight. This made me think they had a plan B, which worried me because, if I was as up to my neck as deep as they were, it would have at least crossed my mind that removing me from the equation was the only way they were going to get what they wanted. As for me, there was really no choice but to go after them, yes I could wind up in a shallow grave like Chandra, but then MTBE emissions made me feel deathly ill anyway. At least fighting back, who knows, maybe I'd beat them.

(WARNING; **Susan Levy** – this paragraph may be too graphic)

**30) Chandra's remains found** - This was long after Chandra went missing. She was found a year later in a wooded area searched a few times by cadaver dogs when they first went looking for her. I remember the news reports, they had buses of police recruits come in with trackers and dogs. It was hot as blazes. When they failed to find anything, they came back a couple days later and tried again. If there truly was a corpse out there, it would have been pretty ripe after a few months in the heat, yet they found nothing. Then a year later she was discovered by a man walking his pet dog after there was nothing but bones, in fact There was so little left by then that they were unable to determine how she died, yet she was discovered by a pet after having been missed numerous times by trained cadaver dogs in the not summer months following her disappearance.

**31) Conspiracy Theory** - I'd assumed in the beginning she was still alive so she could be used as leverage to keep Condit quiet as his career went down the toilet. It was so bad that if he ever talked about Enron being behind it, nobody would have believed him. Then just after his political career was over, her body surfaced. This was in 2002. Ingmar Guandique was arrested for her murder in 2010. He'd been a suspect from the beginning who'd never been looked at seriously. That all changed when a known jailhouse snitch/known gang member, Armando Morales, told prosecutors his cell mate Guandique confessed to killing Chandra

**32) Plan B** - It finally dawned on me what plan B was. I realized there was no way they were going to risk my screwing up there MTBE liability waiver while Bush was talking like nobody was going to convince him not invade Iraq. Fake reports about WMD or not, he was going. And there it was as bright as the sun beaming in my eyes, the Iraq invasion of Kuwait, which Bush 41 allowed to happen, was used as cover for bribing environmentalists into supporting MTBE so laws requiring its use could be quietly added to the Clean Air Act. 911 distracted from Enron crashing due to sluggish MTBE sales, also the Cheney/Chandra connection. So “what the hell”, one more war to distract from me exposing their MTBE liability waiver hearings was no big deal right. As the first hearing began

on March 5, 2003, the same day Halliburton was told they won all contracts servicing the coming invasion of Iraq, the same day Cheney got a memo he was not supposed to receive notifying him as well, the FBI kicked in my doors.

They took my computers (except the one I had hidden in the litter box dump behind my house) and told me to leave the issue alone. I gave them enough time to pass their waiver through the House to prove they meant to go through with it. After more than a month being made sick by MTBE, when they brought their energy bill to the Senate floor, I went after them and stopped them cold. The FBI showed up at my door the next day (they got stuck in the ditch in front of my house, so I was able to get the door open before they kicked it in) and arrested me.

Then I was sent to Houston where without ever seeing a judge (no lie, I have the court records sitting here to prove it), they tried to permanently incarcerate me in a federal mental hospital, ok, not permanently, they told my family if I got on medication and stopped talking about MTBE, I might come home someday. Funny how the system works though, Federal Marshals and Corrections Officers are not all crooks likes federal judges and prosecutors. They know how the system works, so when they see something out of place, they look into it even if they can't do anything about it. In this case, although they couldn't do anything, I could if I knew what was going on behind my back before it was too late. So they screwed up my being processed to a federal mental hospital, which alerted me to what was going on, that way I knew what direction to fight back against them.

It took 13 months, but I mopped up the floor with all of them. Whether purposely or not, thank you for the error United States Federal Marshals, I owe you one.

**22 July 2001 - Cheney could be Condit witness - Special report: missing intern -**  
by Duncan Campbell

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/jul/23/usa.dickcheney>

Leaks from the Condit camp now suggest that Mr Condit had a private meeting with Mr Cheney on May 1, just 30 minutes before Ms Levy logged off from her computer for the last time. A Condit source told ABC News that the meeting lasted 45 minutes. This would put Mr Condit away from Ms Levy's apartment at the time the police believe she went missing.



October 17, 2002 - **Enron 'Mastermind' Pleads Guilty** - By BRIAN BERNBAUM

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/enron-mastermind-pleads-guilty-17-10-2002/>

A former top energy trader, considered the mastermind of Enron Corp.'s scheme to drive up California's energy prices, pleaded guilty Thursday to a federal conspiracy charge.

"These charges answer questions long troubling California consumers: whether the energy crisis was spurred in part by criminal activity. The answer is a resounding yes," Ryan said.

JAN. 9, 2002 - **Enron and Cheney Aides Met 4 Times** - By JEFF GERTH

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/09/business/enron-and-cheney-aides-met-4-times.html>

- In addition to the four staff meetings, Mr. Addington said that Mr. Cheney met for 30 minutes on **April 17, 2001** (*two weeks before Chandra was taken*) to discuss energy policy with Enron executives, including Kenneth L. Lay, the company's chairman and chief executive. The meeting with the vice president had previously been disclosed by Enron officials and Mr. Cheney.

January 12, 2002 - **Follow The Enron Money** - By CBSNEWS.COM STAFF

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/follow-the-enron-money/>

- More than 250 members of Congress - Democrats as well as Republicans - received political contributions from now-bankrupt Enron and at least 15 high-ranking Bush administration officials owned stock in the energy company last year, according to two government watchdog groups.

Enron was Mr. Bush's biggest political patron as he headed into the 2000 presidential election. In all it has made \$623,000 in contributions to his campaigns since 1993, when he was raising money for his first Texas gubernatorial race, according to the Center for Public Integrity, another watchdog group.

## Wikipedia - **California electricity crisis**

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California\\_electricity\\_crisis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_electricity_crisis)

Arnold Schwarzenegger [edit] On May 17, 2001, future Republican governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and former Los Angeles Mayor Republican Richard Riordan met with Enron CEO Kenneth Lay at the Peninsula Beverly Hills Hotel in Beverly Hills. The meeting was convened for Enron to present its "Comprehensive Solution for California," which called for an end to federal and state investigations into Enron's role in the California energy crisis.[29][30][31] National Energy Development Task Force[edit] -

Vice President Dick Cheney was appointed in January 2001 to head the National Energy Development Task Force. In the spring of that year, officials of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power met with the Task Force, asking for price controls to protect consumers. The Task Force refused, and insisted that deregulation must remain in place.[citation needed]

This is a good one, almost forgot about it. When I write, I try to connect with readers by showing as much of myself as I can without chasing them away. Sometimes that gives me a kind of subsense that you're right here with me knowing details of what I'm writing about where there's no way you could. Since there's nobody here to ask questions to bring clarity to these mind boggling assertions, at the end of the day I come away thinking I've conveyed the story well enough for you to understand how serious it is even when I've left something out.

This part is critical, at least for me anyway, in order to get the whole picture, which I almost forgot, guess because it's new evidence surfacing 15 years after her disappearance that hasn't worked its way into my Chandra Levy lexicon yet. I always said in response to allegations about Condit having an affair with Levy was at the core of her disappearance is ludicrous for 2 reasons. One is his wife stood by him, and still does to this day. She even got on a flight back to DC in May 2001 to stand by her man in front of cameras giving what I thought was a very sincere speech supporting him.

She didn't come across as the kind of woman who would let a philandering husband walk all over her the way the news media portrayed it. She was simply too confident and genuine for that to be the case, didn't seem at all pretentious, very real and serious. Wish I could find a video of it. I remember after watching it thinking it was going to help Gary in a big way, like I said, the guy was with the vice president when she went missing, so in my eyes, looking at him was pretty lame.

Condit's wife Carolyn on the other hand was in DC when it happened. So allegations Gary and Chandra were having an affair made her a suspect. There's reportedly also a 911 call the morning Chandra went missing saying there was blood curdling screams in Chandra's building coming from the direction of her

apartment. Recordings of the call were requested by her alleged murderer Ingmar Guandique's lawyer. He however got his charges were dropped by Babs Proller's recordings before anything came of it. If there truly was a 911 call, I really don't know what to think.

This story is so full of twists and turns, so convoluted that it's very hard to form an opinion about what really happened. One thing I do know is Cheney's connection to it, whether it had anything to do with her murder or not, was swept under the carpet. And nobody seemed think it should be part of the story but me. A few months later 911 was used as cover to keep the MTBE side of the Enron story from going public. This is also true whether 911 was an inside job or not. And again, I was the only one talking about it. I however was not the only one who noticed 911 removed Chandra from headlines, which happened just as I was closing in on Cheney's connection to Levy through Condit.

From Wikipedia - **Chandra Levy**

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chandra\\_Levy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chandra_Levy)

Intensive coverage continued until news of the September 11 attacks superseded the media's coverage of the Levy case.[17]

According to Condit, there were about a hundred reporters camped out in front of his apartment during the morning of September 11, 2001, but they all left after news spread about that day's terrorist attacks in New York and Washington.[89] Media critics and cable news executives later cited the Levy case, as well as the concurrent sensationalist coverage of a string of shark attacks, as a reflection of the manner of news coverage in the United States before the September 11 attacks had taken priority.

Now we have these voicemails, one where he appears to be saying his wife left town - "It's 11:45, I'm sorry I've been tied up for the last few days, but you already know that,". His DNA was discovered in Chandra's underwear. So there's no great mystery there.

In another voicemail he says "Give me a rundown on kind of what your schedule is. Things are looking pretty good for me today anyway. Bye.". Sounds he's ready for a long awaited hookup.

The last one though - "Maybe you're out of the country or something, anyway, give me a call if you get this message, bye." What was that, why did he ask that, why would she be out of the country without him knowing about it if they were having an affair. One is she's running from his wife. She had just been in town. But then he obviously hadn't been in touch with her for so many days, perhaps for that reason.

NOVEMBER 4, 2016 - **Gary Condit Heard in Voicemails Trying to Reach Chandra Levy After She Went Missing –**  
by CHAR ADAMS • @CICIADAMS\_

<http://people.com/crime/gary-condit-heard-in-voicemails-trying-to-reach-chandra-levy-after-she-went-missing/>

Never-before-heard voicemail recordings of former California Rep. Gary Condit are shedding light on his interaction with Chandra Levy, the former federal government intern, who vanished while jogging in the spring of 2001.

“It’s 11:45, I’m sorry I’ve been tied up for the last few days, but you already know that,” Condit is reportedly heard saying in one voicemail.

In another, he is heard seemingly trying to arrange a get-together with Levy. “Give me a rundown on kind of what your schedule is,” Condit is reportedly heard saying in the voicemails. “Things are looking pretty good for me today anyway. Bye.”

In another voicemail, Condit says, “Maybe you’re out of the country or something,” adding, “Anyway, give me a call if you get this message, bye.”

Was there really blood curdling screams in Chandra’s building that day. Could it all be a cover up of a congressmen’s wife murdering a DC intern who was her husband’s mistress?

I can see it. They start building political careers in their home districts where they find out they’re like rock stars to some women. But if they make a move to take advantage of it, it will eventually go public to ruin their career and family. However when they later come to Washington, they discover 1) they’re free from the prying eyes of peers, local gossips, and family, 2) they still get treated by rock stars, I suspect especially by young interns who want to change the world so much they see politician actually doing it as gods, and 3) there’s a DC culture of silence about such affairs because they all come to the big city to learn about wicked city woman who enviably come from the same kinds of small towns they do

But why then have an affair with a girl from his home district? Why come all that way here to discreetly sleep with women outside of his marriage only to have a fling with one from back home. OK, file it under philandering doesn’t always make perfect sense, “it happens”. There’s also the possibility of his having a kind of open relationship with his wife. It also happens more often than you think, often for perfectly logical reasons.

Why still, even if Condit’s wife was on the prowl looking for Gary’s mistresses, would she leave the country, why not simply stay with a friend until she leaves. And why wouldn’t he have talked to her about it, it’s not like his wife knew his every move to the point he couldn’t call Chandra because his wife was in town.

Isn't that what people do when they're sneaking around, coordinate to duck and dodge spouses. Maybe Condit's wife did murder her, and it was covered up because it would have drawn too much attention to Washington's culture of philandering with interns. But why out of the country?

My view from the beginning, whether they were having an affair or not, was Chandra first came to Condit after doing her own investigation into who was causing rolling blackouts back home in Modesto. She interned for the Bureau of Prisons with dreams of becoming an FBI agent some day. Enron's rolling blackouts were killing people in her and Condit's home district. Her family and friends were there while she had access to investigative resources and DC insiders.

I always figured Condit was meeting with Cheney because Chandra put him onto something that gave him leverage to make demands on Cheney to stop it or he would go public. If I was Chandra and in that position, wait a second, I have been in that position, in fact I'm in it right now, I'm just a lot more used to it than I used to be. When I first started turning over slimy DC swamp rocks out from under slithered the most hideous looking creatures you can imagine, I was all kinds of scared. Little did I know they're just a bunch of clowns. Yeah, they're dangerous, but not personally; and they don't like bringing in outside help to do their dirty work.

For the most part our country is run by crooks/cowards who think they'll never get caught. They've been right about it so far. No matter what kinds of obstacles gets thrown into the middle their shadiest deals, they always overcome it while keeping everything under proverbial carpet they swept it under. It might become a little frayed around the edges allowing unfortunate leaks that give glimpses into the backdoor nature of the more seedy sides of their lives. But they're always able to contain it. This is even if they have to start multiple wars to do it, it still comes with the simple stroke of a pen behind a lot of lies.

I always wondered if the reason they killed Chandra and not me, that is if they did, not Condit's wife, is because I get in the middle of their game where everyone can see and hear me. So they really can't touch me without risking investigators looking at them. Like I always tell potential activists, occasional personalities who come along with their own issue, when they create plans to fight back, they often involve to some extent going underground so they don't get killed. They always seem to think being secretive and incognito to make moves against evil people is the only way to go. I tell em it's better to put it all on the table where everyone can see it, leave a trail of breadcrumbs that leads right back to what they're doing so they can't be touched without it all being looked at.

Obviously with Chandra Levy, no matter what the truth is, Cheney got a free pass out of the center of it just like the MTBE side of the Enron story. But it required a terrorist attack bringing down WTC and the Pentagon to make the

Chandra and Enron story go away, all very costly. So it's not like they do this every day, or like to do it when they have to. I assume looking back, after all the years no one has listened to me, they feel pretty foolish. The truth is Americans don't care about heavily nuanced stories regarding gasoline. They don't even care about simple stories regarding gasoline, even if it comes with a highly salacious scandal attached to it. I can see why they so radically covered up mistakes that might blow up in the news media. But the truth was and is, if it's about gasoline, the American people don't care.

My point is if she wasn't murdered by Condit's wife, but was rather abducted and held as leverage to shut Condit and her up about Enron, MTBE, and rolling blackouts, I guess I was right about never going clandestine when dealing with these scum bags. I rather always do everything on the table where everyone can see it. This while the idea of running to another country, I mean I guess it worked so far for Jillian Assange and Edward Snowden. Still though, for my tastes, I would feel like I was leading them far away where no one cared what happened to me while staying here so my enemies risk blowing story up their where everyone sees it seems the more obvious choice.

Most people don't think that way, in fact most think I'm crazy for doing it because I get right up in their face where I can be swatted like a gnat. Yeah, but see, I'm not a bug and they're not fly swatters. They're not as powerful as we give them credit for, they're still just men in suits and ties pretending to be something they're not. Like when you see motorcycle clubs with outlaw patches on the backs of their jackets, you might think they're bad guys, and some of them might be. But they don't lie about who they are, they put it right out there for everyone to see unlike Catholic priests pimping themselves as master of morality, saints whose real motivation for wearing frocks is to gain enough of trust to rape children.

These are the kinds of men who are afraid of gangsters who don't hide who they are because they know if they ever get caught and sent to prison, the real criminals there will hunt them for sport. These are the kinds of people who run our country and the world, wanna be tyrants that democracy no longer allows practice their evil craft openly like the Romans. They've rather found what the Catholic Church has apparently known all along, it's more fun to bend over humanity in secret.

## Viscon USA

Do you remember the good gasoline additive that produces better gas mileage with little pollution? I called Viscon USA yesterday to see if one of the emissions it converts to power rather than pollution is sulfur. I was referring SO<sub>2</sub> removed via Tier III fossil fuel regulations asking if that could be accomplished simply by adding PIB to gasoline without removing the sulfur. Their technician Mike said that in all their emissions testing to get state or foreign government approvals for use of PIB in fossil fuels, they'd never been asked to measure SO<sub>2</sub> emissions except for heating oil used for industrial power production in South America. In that one case, it did reduce SO<sub>2</sub> at the same time energy production became more efficient, meaning less heating oil was needed to produce the same amount of energy.

So it's highly likely new Tier III sulfur removing regulations are just another instance of throwing good money after bad following the Clean Air Act of 1990/MTBE/ethanol boondoggle. Tier III still results in lots of unnecessary illness and death because ethanol is still being added to gasoline. Yes there is less sulfur in the air we breathe, so there might be less sick people. But there would be a lot less if we weren't still exposed to excessive levels aldehydes, PAN's and ozone.

If they used PIB while switching to hydrous ethanol as its own fuel (so the Midwest economy doesn't crash when ethanol use ends), Obamacare can do what it was designed to do acting as a cushion for medical investments to land on as illness rates caused by air pollution drops. That way the world's economy doesn't crash again on this same issue.

And like I said earlier, the Midwest is perfectly groomed to become energy independent from imported fossil fuels if we went this route. This is without saying how using PIB would mean a 20% mileage increase worldwide, therefor 20% less need for gasoline and diesel fuel, also less heating oil, kerosene, and jet fuel, therefor less imports from countries who hate us.

Then there's the matter (maybe the most important matter) of fact that since 1989 we've been sold a bill of goods about better fuels that are actually worse. That way the people at the top of the game can make money selling us more fuel than we need at the same time making us sick in order to sell us medical relief. With our bodies full of all these poisons for the last 25 years, really a lot longer than that, that's just when they started to really amp up the doses like they're trying to kill everyone, not just send us to early graves.

The questions are where would we be finding cures if they hadn't done this? And how much medical research needs to start over if we detox society so we're not the same animals we are today? What about fuel and engine efficiency research, is that in the same predicament, lots of wasted years heading in the wrong direction?

The good news might be “what the hell, we’re hear and can’t change the past, only the future, so maybe all the good stuff stolen from us in favor of whatever all this insanity is about is right around the corner” That is assuming we turn the country and world around to make America and mankind great again.

### Dead Rock Stars, Drought Ends

Under Trump instead of the presumed Hillary, there's no telling what will happen. One thing we do know is that wherever this Obamacare political disaster lands, Dr. Death will have a hand in guiding it there unless Trump puts all this together on his own; or of course this book sets off a firestorm that reaches his ears. Here's a little bug to put in it in case it does. Dr. Death ought to love this one too.

You know how when an alcoholic or junky goes cold turkey, they suffer severe withdrawals symptoms that can kill them. We adjust to pollution levels we're exposed to on a daily basis much like drug doses. Human beings can adapt to incredibly high levels of toxins in their body. It's only when the amounts abruptly shift downward that we notice it; and only then if we’re paying attention on a personal level.

Multiple famous people deaths is my canary in a coal mine, such as when MTBE was removed from gasoline, or when oil prices drop so low ethanol can't compete with gasoline, so it's use stops or dwindles. Something else also always seems to happen during these periods, weather patterns freak out, much of the time catastrophically. This is because man caused low level ozone formation effects atmospheric water vapor in unnatural ways by exaggerating an ongoing natural process.



Plants give off ozone forming pollutants along with water vapor, which combine to find their way into the upper atmosphere where it forms into rain clouds before coming back down to water the plants these naturally occurring pollutants and water vapor came from.

November 20, 2011- NASA Earthdata - **Volatile trees: Forests fill the air with more than just a fresh scent –**

by Laura Naranjo

<https://earthdata.nasa.gov/user-resources/sensing-our-planet/volatile-trees>

Trees are often considered the lungs of the Earth, inhaling the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide, and exhaling harmless chemicals like water vapor and oxygen. Trees give off other particles, however, that may not be so benign. Once in the atmosphere, these fine particles can transform into aerosols, a component of air pollution.

The chemicals trees give off, called volatile organic compounds (VOCs), are already common in the atmosphere. We tend to think of VOCs as an indoor air quality problem, being released when people paint, clean, or spray pesticides, or as the unhealthy smog that hangs over cities. Yet scientists estimate that trees and plants emit about two-thirds of the VOCs currently in the air.

So if these compounds are already prevalent, why are they a problem? The natural VOCs produced by trees are not as toxic to human health as those emitted by paint and pesticides, which can cause headaches and irritate our eyes and lungs. However, once in the atmosphere, all VOCs react with other airborne chemicals to form air pollution.

Unlike global warming, this is proven fact, we just don't hear about it. This is because weather pattern changes caused by these kinds of short lived gases are temporary. Since we steadily emit them causing constant weather pattern changes, it can be blamed on long term global warming without us being the wiser as long as enough scientists and politicians go along with the illusion. This allows a lot of powerful people to make very good livings off, not just promoting lies, but selling us fuels behind those lies to say nothing of expensive health treatments to cure the ailments and deadly diseases their toxins cause, much of which involves drugs that are also very dangerous.

Consider Marijuana which is only recently becoming more universally legal for medical treatment. It's long been known to counter dangerous side effects for chemo therapy patients. This is important because with cancer treatment drugs being so dangerous, they kill many of the patients that use them before the cancer would have. Marijuana far lessens that risk at the same time helping lessen detrimental losses of appetite.

The question then should become, or should have become many decades ago, what does this means for other dangerous drugs, also toxins that cause illness that require the use of poisons to cure? Does marijuana neutralize or partly

neutralize the dangers of a lot more than chemo drugs? Chemo drugs are the worst of the worst toxins we're exposed to that don't kill us, except of course when it does.

Now it's turning out that medical marijuana doesn't just counter the side effects of dangerous drugs, it can actually cure disease on its own. Yet it's still not widely used or understood by the medical continuity. It's as if they're really not all that interested in it, I mean why would they be, they go to school to become licensed to prescribe dangerous drugs. Marijuana is a plant you can grow and treat yourself with leaving physicians questioning "how will that help me pay for my mansion, Mercedes, and mistress"

Can't you just hear the arena of gasps pounding through your skull as you read that last sentence. Why is that even though we all know cops and doctors are just like every other group of human beings, like pedophile priests, it took centuries for Catholics and the church to face the issue: Why are we finally willing to except that some of God's vicars have no problem stealing our children's souls, yet doctors would never make us sicker than we already are for money, lots and lots of money

Indeed, correct me if I'm wrong, but this is how I see the suit and tie world. Money and power are their only objectives. It's like how like how they say most cops are good to answer for the few that aren't. Don't you think before they put on the clubs, guns, and badges we give them to protect us from each other, they should first police their own to make sure there's no such thing as a bad cop on our streets.

Although some doctors speak out about the reality of the medical profession, with cops, we're supposed to think it's ok that some cops are bad when even that is very wrong. Cops are like the people they convict who lose their rights, they have no right to police us. So we shouldn't have to pussyfoot around about how we vet them to get rid of the bad ones. If there's a hint of their not doing their job with 100% good faith, "sorry fella, find another place to work", it's just that simple. My point is few physicians speak out, meaning, unlike cops, there are a few good ones. And that is just plain wrong, wrong of them for being that way, and wrong of us for letting them. Perhaps somebody needs to start a Patients Lives Matter movement to counter the side effects of doctors who don't put our health before their personal interests.

I once called the National Institute of Health (NIH) and asked why they didn't approve safer herbs for treatment in ailments when they work better than dangerous drugs. I'd had trouble breathing for a year and a half after drinking well water polluted with MTBE, then came across an ad for a product that promised to heal lungs naturally. It was \$60 dollar a bottle, which I couldn't afford after related health problems caused me to lose everything. The flier however listed the ingredients. So I checked out the top two, both of which were cheap to buy in bulk over the Internet.

I got the cheaper one called astragalus (root powder). 20 minutes after a pinch under the tongue and I was breathing normal for the first time in a long time. So I went ahead and bought the more expensive one cordyceps (powder) as well. When using them together, I felt like I had brand new lungs. This opened my eyes to so much about how the medical system works, or rather doesn't work.

I was told by a couple NIH reps that they research dangerous drugs to provide warning labels for the side effects they cause. Yes the drugs had to actually work, although not all the time while they might cause even worse problems than they treat. However the main focus of what they do is find out the dangers involved using them in order to provide the government with liability protection from patients they're prescribed to. That's what those warning labels with the small print that come with your drugs are for, to transfer the blame for side effects from the government, drug companies, and physicians, to you. That way once you've been warned, anything after that is on you.

They said legal herbs that you can grow or buy over the counter present no threat of liability. This is at the same time they spend billions of dollars a year researching unsafe drugs. With stretched budgets, they said drugs take priority. It's as if they have no idea that most Americans are not going to use herbs that may work better than their drug counterparts at the same time being safe or safer unless NIH, the FDA, and their doctors tell them to. These are often herbs and national supplements that cure as well as provide better overall health to parts of the body that aren't being treated rather than risking worse health.

## Endocannabinoid System

Do you know we have something called an endocannabinoid system (ECS)?

### Wikipedia - **Endocannabinoid system**

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endocannabinoid\\_system](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endocannabinoid_system)

The endocannabinoid system (ECS) is a group of endogenous cannabinoid receptors located in the mammalian brain and throughout the central and peripheral nervous systems, consisting of neuromodulatory lipids and their receptors. Known as "the body's own cannabinoid system", [1] the ECS is involved in a variety of physiological processes including appetite, pain-sensation, mood, and memory, and in mediating the psychoactive effects of cannabis. [2]

Cannabidiol (CBD) oil can be made from federally illegal hemp, which has no psychoactive side effects. It cures or prevents many severe disorders, some incurable by NIH/FDA approved drugs, like deadly seizures in children.

August 7, 2013 - **Marijuana stops child's severe seizures** - Sandra Young,

<http://www.cnn.com/2013/08/07/health/charlotte-child-medical-marijuana/>

"We were pioneering the whole thing; we were guinea pigging Charlotte," Paige said. "This is a federally illegal substance. I was terrified to be honest with you." But the results were stunning.

"When she didn't have those three, four seizures that first hour, that was the first sign," Paige recalled. "And I thought well, 'Let's go another hour, this has got to be a fluke.' "

However hemp is not the most efficient or effective plant to extract CBD oil from. A strain of marijuana called ACDC is. To be labeled legal hemp grown in states that allow it, it has to contain less than 0.3 percent tetrahydrocannabinol (THC). THC is the psychoactive compound in marijuana that gets people high. Under the right conditions, a strain of marijuana called ACDC can meet this threshold. It however sometimes goes over the limit by containing 0.5 percent THC. This is still nowhere near enough THC to cause a psychoactive reaction, yet whole crops of it have to be destroyed for that reason. However drug companies are allowed to produce THC rich products that get you stoned out of your gourd and sell them to patients with prescriptions for them.

Take for instance:

25 Mar, 2017 - **DEA approves synthetic marijuana for big pharma company against legalization**

<https://www.rt.com/usa/382254-dea-synthetic-marijuana-big-pharma/>

Syndros is a synthetic version of tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), the main psychoactive component in the plant. In July 2006, the company (Insys) announced the FDA approved their liquid form of synthetic THC to treat anorexia associated AIDS patients, and nausea and vomiting induced by cancer patients going through chemotherapy.

In 2011, Insys wrote a letter to the DEA, urging them to maintain the Schedule I (no medical use) status for non-synthetic marijuana, citing “a longstanding policy of the United States to disfavor domestic cultivation of narcotic raw materials because of concerns about the abuse potential from farming of this material.”

Insys also opposed legalization in Arizona, donating \$500,000 to Arizonans for Responsible Drug Policy, a group opposing Proposition 205, an initiative to legalize and regulate marijuana like alcohol in Arizona. In a statement, Insys said it opposed Prop 205, “because it fails to protect the safety of Arizona’s citizens, and particularly its children,” according to the Arizona Republic.

In 2007, Insys filed a disclosure statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission, directly stating that marijuana legalization would threaten their products. “If marijuana or non-synthetic cannabinoids were legalized in the United States, the market for dronabinol product sales would likely be significantly reduced and our ability to generate revenue and our business prospects would be materially adversely affected,” the company said.

The company is currently under investigation for illegally marketing Fentanyl, an opioid that is 50 times stronger than heroin, which has been linked to the death of Prince last year.

In December, several executives at the company were arrested and the CEO was forced to step down after they were charged with using speakers fees to entice doctors to prescribe Subsys, a medication for cancer patients that contains Fentanyl.

Yet:

March 28, 2016 - **Sourcing CBD: Marijuana, Industrial Hemp & the Vagaries of Federal Law** - by Martin A. Lee

<https://www.projectcbd.org/article/sourcing-cbd-marijuana-industrial-hemp-vagaries-federal-law>

Last year, Ryan Loflin, a Colorado farmer, was forced to destroy his entire crop (ACDC for CBD oil) because it tested at 0.5 percent THC, a smidgen over the arbitrary legal limit.

### [Shindell](#)

Professor Drew Shindell, the only NASA scientist to be recognized in America's top 50 scientists. In 1998, I drank well water polluted with MTBE. his caused a chemical induced amnesia. I was lost in haze of blackness that descended over who I was. The thing is, being an imbecile, I didn't know I didn't know who I was. After a few days of fearing I wouldn't wake up if I went to sleep, I started doing better. I felt like myself for most of the day until evenings set in where I would slowly lose myself again. It took a long week to feel reasonably normal again. After that, the darkness came back when exposed to MTBE laced exhaust fumes. Since I live in a highly traffic congested region, life became a battle for my life.

I found that on below freezing days, I felt normal. I'd read in the Washington Times (article now removed from archives) that in the beginning of MTBE use, it was only used during the winter because it condenses in the cold, sinks to the ground, and washes away with snow and rain. One cold day when I felt good enough, I went jogging. When I stopped to do pushups, I found there indeed was a cloud of noxious gas near the ground. I later realized it also filled my basement, then worked its way to the rest of the house through the heating system. And where does it wash away to, it's notorious for polluting ground water while almost impossible to mitigate.

Like ethanol, MTBE causes high emissions of VOC's (formaldehyde), which mixes in the sun with nitrogen oxide to produce ozone. This whole process has a dramatic effect on atmospheric water vapor that can cause warming in winter. So on mild days following a string of cold days with no snow or rain, when MTBE emissions near the ground were heaviest, I had to hide in my room, the door shut, wearing a charcoal filter respirator with oxygen pumped into the mask to avoid the darkness.

The ill effects on my health were worst during and after rush hour. Just think of all the people poisoning me with their exhaust fumes stuck in traffic unwittingly breathing it themselves, most with no clue to set their vent system so it recirculates air in the car rather than drawing it from outside. It's not like we can't be taught how to manage dealing with the dangers of poisonous gasoline without giving away that fact that it's been poisoned. Somebody could have gotten creative enough to figure out how to warn us without giving away the MTBE culprit, like simply saying "to avoid breathing any and all nonspecific pollutants, use the recirculate feature." I just don't think anyone wanted to, I mean of course they didn't or they would have, like click it or ticket for seat belts, we'd all know about it if they wanted us to.

I know these are a highly provocative statements to make, although obviously the case without saying it. This was all done to make us sick so trillions of dollars could be made selling us cures that don't work as well as Mother Nature's outlawed cure-alls we can grow like weeds in our backyard - what would be the fun in that.

I learned if I could make it to the weekend when there was no rush hours traffic, I got some amount of reprieve from my symptoms. Mondays were not as bad as Tuesday with each day consecutive workday making it worse through the week. The thing is though, where I live, there's lost traffic all the time, in fact during the day on work days, there's less because everyone's at work while on the weekends, everyone is our running around all the time.

It took me a while to realize that when I start my wife's car to warm it up on workday mornings, I had to go back inside before scraping the frost off the windows because emissions from her cars cold tailpipe are so bad before it warms up. Catalytic converters burn all that wasted fuel, therefor wasted energy, our inefficient fuels produce. Once catalytic converters gets hot, emission levels

are greatly reduced.

This is something the EPA ignores. They say pollution levels from cars have gone way down to counter allegations that ethanol and MTBE pollute worse. Well yeah, when catalytic converter are hot. But what about when starting engines when catalytic converter are cold. "Well that only lasts a few minutes" OK, but what about during the workweek when millions of people start their engines at the same time for a few hours in the morning, then again in the evening.

I'll tell you what the worst is, on mildly cold days in parking garages when work lets out, or a train or bus drops a load off at a park and ride, when everyone starts their cold engines at the same time without enough coolness to condense it, or warmth to expand it. I later figured out the reason I was so tired and irritable on weekends was the withdrawal symptom caused by the lack of rush hour pollution dosing.

I found an MTBE lawyer named Scott Summy, My opinion was and is that he had a backdoor deal with Enron to string along people made sick by MTBE in drinking water for two years until the statute of limitations on suing the industry was up. Either that or he didn't want to ruffle feathers by pushing too hard over MTBE caused illness in order to get a better deal to the table with his groundwater lawsuits.

**May 7, 2008 - Partial Settlement Requires Oil Companies to Pay Substantial Settlement and Treat Wells for MTBE Over the Next 30 Years**

<https://baronandbudd.com/environment/water-contamination/mtbe-settlement-press-kit/mtbe-settlement-press-release/>

"Today's landmark settlement marks a significant step toward protecting the long term viability of drinking water resources across the United States" said, Baron & Budd shareholder **Scott Summy**, one of the nation's most experienced water attorneys and Co-Lead Counsel for all Plaintiffs in the MDL. "Many of these public water providers were facing federal legislation that would grant immunity to the oil companies for MTBE product liability lawsuits at the time these cases were filed. I am proud to have represented the courageous and responsible water providers and municipal governments who took this step to protect their communities."

The truth is, although required by law, very toxic MTBE, the most prolific chemical the American people have ever been exposed to, was never tested to find out what symptoms or illness it causes, also therapies for treating it. So there was no way to prove it was the cause of illnesses worthy of bringing lawsuits against the industry. This is what you can do when you're so rich and powerful that our elected leaders answer to your interests rather than the American people, you can poison our air and drinking water, make us deathly ill with admitted carcinogens while restricting our personal use of natural cures like medical marijuana. So we're forced to buy their dangerous drugs.



Can you even imagine being cast into this state of victimhood and having a top rate attorney say “oh well” instead of fighting to get MTBE tested. I argued the point when he dumped me after two years. His investigator agreed I was right and told him so. But he refused to budge even though forcing federal testing of MTBE would allow him to bring lawsuits for all the people made sick by it. Since nobody can prove MTBE caused their downfall because no testing was done, but it's illegal to not test, sue the EPA for not doing it. Not a peep as if he was treading lightly in that area. Whatever right?

Following weekly pollution levels while being keen on how weather effects the process, I started to notice weekly weather patterns. I'd already made a connection between MTBE and the Northeast drought we were having, had even found a scientists who's work supported the theory, the highly respected climatologist Professor Drew Shindell of NASA. He builds computer models mimicking how GHG's effect weather.

**11.08.04 - NASA Climatologists Named in Scientific American Top 50 Scientists**

[https://www.nasa.gov/vision/earth/everydaylife/sa\\_top50.html](https://www.nasa.gov/vision/earth/everydaylife/sa_top50.html)

For the first time, NASA researchers have been awarded the Scientific American Top 50 Scientist Award. NASA Climatologists Drew Shindell and Gavin Schmidt of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, NY, have been named by Scientific American Magazine as research leaders with the 2004 Scientific American 50. This is a prestigious annual list that recognizes outstanding acts of leadership in science and technology from the past year.

I contacted him to ask a series of questions without saying the source of pollutants I was referring to was MTBE. I was pretending to be curious about his work wanting clarification on what he was saying about VOC effects on weather. He agreed that I had it correct, that the conditions I described could indeed cause warming in winter, dramatic storm activity, and finally, yes, even a drought.

When I then told him the source of the pollutants I was talking about was MTBE, he didn't respond back. That wasn't before explaining the notion that CO2 can cause warming on a global scale was a hoax. He's changed that position quite a bit since then, especially after testifying that the results of his work was being altered to reflect political views rather than science by the Bush administration. Seems the understanding ear he got from Democrats turns out to be in exchange for supporting Al Gore's CO2 caused climate change hoax.

Jan. 30, 2007, U. S. House of Representatives -  
**Testimony for the hearing on political interference with the work of government climate  
change scientists, Congressional Oversight and Government Reform Committee -**  
Dr. Drew T. Shindell

<https://democrats-oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/migrated/20070130113315-90082.pdf>

Shindell - While it was frustrating for me to see my work suppressed, even more importantly it is a disservice to the public to distort or suppress the information needed for decision-making. But that experience is only one example of a series of actions that attempted to suppress communication of climate science to the public.

Also during the fall of **2004**, NASA Headquarters insisted that a NASA press officer monitor all interviews either in person or on the phone, a measure unbefitting a democratic society. Some scientists were told their scientific presentations had to be cleared by NASA in advance. Policies such as these were conveyed orally, with no written documentation even when one was requested.

As with the interference with press releases, these restrictions were not imposed on our NASA colleagues in Space Science, or even those in areas of Earth Science other than climate change. Broadly similar experiences of interference in communication with the press and public were related to me by colleagues in NASA and NOAA.

Suppression of results demonstrating ever increasing scientific knowledge of the principles underlying global warming, of the data demonstrating its rapidity and its consequences, and exaggeration of the remaining scientific uncertainties, certainly gave the appearance that scientific evidence that could undermine a rationale for inaction on climate change was being targeted.

What he told me was yes, CO<sub>2</sub> absorbs sun light to become warm, but doesn't reflect it back to earth. Since heat rises, even in the atmosphere, warmth collected by CO<sub>2</sub> could never cause warming down here where we are. And even if it could, there's so small a ratio of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere compared to other gases like water vapor, it wouldn't make a noticeable difference. He further said that in order for CO<sub>2</sub> to cause ground level warming, so much if it had to accumulate near the surface that every living thing would die from suffocation long before we got to that point, that first plants would go, then everything else. It would only later be followed by some warming if CO<sub>2</sub> levels kept rising.

**2012 - Global Air Quality and Health Co-benefits of Mitigating Near-Term Climate Change through Methane and Black Carbon Emission Controls -**  
by U.S. EPA, Harvard School of Public Health, and NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies

<https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/1104301/>

Controlling methane emissions may be a promising means of simultaneously mitigating climate change and reducing global ozone concentrations, compared with controlling shorter-lived ozone precursors [nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), and non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs)] (West et al. 2006, 2007). The latter may have larger and more immediate air quality and health benefits near the areas with emission reductions but smaller benefits (CO, NMVOC) or net disbenefits (NO<sub>x</sub>) for climate.

Climate benefits of reducing BC may be partially offset by associated reductions of coemitted pollutants that may have a net cooling effect on climate (and a net warming effect when reduced), either directly (organic carbon) or after chemical transformation in the atmosphere (organic carbon, SO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub>). However, all emission reductions leading to reduced ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations would be expected to have health benefits.

Mitigating ozone and BC may benefit climate and health simultaneously (e.g., Jacobson 2002; Smith et al. 2009; West et al. 2006); because methane and BC are short-lived relative to the long-lived greenhouse gases [e.g., carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)], mitigation would reduce the rate of climate change in the near-term (Jackson 2009; Ramanathan and Carmichael 2008). Studies examining the health impacts of all fossil fuel and biofuel emissions (Jacobson 2010), percentage reductions in ozone precursors (West et al. 2006) and BC (Anenberg et al. 2011), and adoption of European vehicle emission standards in the developing world (Shindell et al. 2011) suggest that controlling methane and BC emissions may substantially benefit global public health, particularly in Asia where large populations are exposed to high PM<sub>2.5</sub> and ozone concentrations (Ramanathan et al. 2008).

The latter may have larger and more immediate air quality and health benefits near the areas with emission reductions but smaller benefits (CO, NMVOC) or net disbenefits (NO<sub>x</sub>) for climate. Major anthropogenic sources of methane include fossil fuel production and distribution, landfills, livestock, rice cultivation, and wastewater treatment. BC is a product of incomplete combustion from sources such as biomass burning, transportation (mainly diesel vehicles), residential combustion, and industry, and is coemitted with other pollutants, including NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOCs, CO, sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and organic carbon. Climate benefits of reducing BC may be partially offset by associated reductions of coemitted pollutants that may have a net cooling effect on climate (and a net warming effect when reduced), either directly (organic carbon) or after chemical transformation in the atmosphere (organic carbon, SO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub>). However, all emission reductions leading to reduced ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations would be expected to have health benefits.

I talked to Shindell (email) a few times over the years. I don't know if I influenced his direction. But in 2012, he did come out with a few papers (above) reflecting what I'd suggested soon after I had. They point out that non CO2 pollutants cause weather pattern changes that can be stopped by mitigating emissions of those pollutants. He doesn't attack the CO2 hoax the way he should, but he did say dealing with these other GHG's would end man caused changes to weather for 20-40 years, which is an attack on CO2 caused global warming fans who claim changes in weather we're seeing now are due to increasing atmospheric CO2 emissions. If it's caused by CO2, how can we stop it by dealing with these other pollutants? He also says that by doing it, we'd lessen illness rates, therefor lessen medical expenses, creating a self-financing loop to finance the plan.

Much of Shindell's paper points to it being produced to directly answer Tier III sulfur regulations and related ethanol concerns. Here they say 'Controlling methane emissions "may" be a promising means of simultaneously mitigating climate change and reducing global ozone concentrations, compared with controlling shorter-lived ozone precursors [nitrogen oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs)] (West et al. 2006, 2007).'

It is true that hydroxyl radicals, a naturally occurring hydrogen peroxide referred to as the "detergent of the troposphere" breaks down aldehydes to lessen its ozone producing potential. Also true that methane competes with the limited supply of hydroxyl radicals. So by lessening methane emissions, there would be more hydroxyl radicals to bleach ethanol emissions out of the atmosphere. He long ago argued methane can be mitigated at a profit to natural gas drillers because less leaked natural gas means more natural to sell. So why pussyfoot around the fact that using ethanol as a fuel rather than adding it to gasoline to produce ozone would be a boom to our domestic fuel supply when so would mitigating methane emissions.

They do then clarify 'The latter may have larger and more immediate air quality and health benefits near the areas with emission reductions but smaller benefits (CO, NMVOC) or net disbenefits (NOx) for climate.', meaning focusing on ethanol will have a greater impact on bettering health with limited changes to weather patterns than methane. This makes sense because we breathe ethanol emissions and the resulting peroxyacyl nitrates (PAN's) and ozone before it climbs into atmosphere to be cleansed by hydroxyl radicals.

Hydroxyl radicals are formed by the breakdown of ozone in the sun. The whole process has a volatile effect on atmospheric water vapor. Methane requires a lot more hydroxyl detergent to wash it from the atmosphere than the other pollutants. So limiting methane emissions means a great deal more hydroxyl radicals to deal with everything else. Only why reduce one instead of the other to do favors for lobbyists when the people the lobbyists serve would be better off turning their corn into hydrous ethanol.

This one is confusing, to me anyway. It's all over the place like it was edited by a political hack. I'm not sure how to connect the first half - 'Studies examining the health impacts of all fossil fuel and **BIOFUEL emissions** (Jacobson 2010), percentage reductions in ozone precursors (West et al. 2006) and BC (Black Carbon - Anenberg et al. 2011), and adoption of European vehicle emission standards in the developing world (Shindell et al. 2011)' with the second half explaining 'suggests that controlling methane and BC emissions may substantially benefit global public health, particularly in Asia where large populations are exposed to high PM2.5 and ozone concentrations (Ramanathan et al. 2008).'

Don't see the connection between methane emissions from sloppy oil and gas drilling and black carbon (BC) from coal or wood burning and biofuel emissions next to reductions in ozone precursors. To me it looks like he's making a case for getting rid of all of it. Then a politically appointed hack for the ethanol industry stepped in and edited it to focus solely on black carbon and methane. But then I'm not an expert in any of these issues, or anything else. And I admit a lot of this may be over my head. This much I can say as an expert in not being an expert, when scientific papers are published of great public concern, or even limited public concern, they should come with an idiots guide to how to understand them so we can understand them. That way they could not so easily be hacked.

## Weekly Weather Patterns

I showed earlier how new Tier III gasoline regulations remove most of the sulfur from gasoline in order to allow ethanol to be added to it without making gasoline pollute worse than it does when no ethanol is added without sulfur removed. This is even though ethanol still makes gasoline with sulfur removed pollute more than if ethanol was not been added to it at all, either before or after the sulfur is removed.

I claim that as Tier III went into full federal effect leading up to January 1, 2017, many movie and rock stars died. We've already seen where Shindell shows sulfur reductions will have health benefits. My experience with chemical sensitivity has taught me pollutants don't just cause negative side effects when entering the body, there's also a dangerous withdrawal that occurs when toxin levels are lessened. I also claim complying with Tier III sulfur removal leading up to the 2017 deadline ended a 6 year never ending drought there.

The reason I have doubts that it was solely my suggestions that lead to Shindell's new approach is he published these papers in 2012, the election year where I concluded Obama, Rahm Emmanuel, and Dr. Death, were waiting to arrive hoping to keep ethanol in full use until after Obama was elected to a second term because the corn farmer vote was critical to this success. This means the research supporting these papers was done during critical years of the evolution of Obamacare and the ethanol cover up. And they do more perfectly reflect my theory behind Obama's strategy than anything I ever said to Shindell. This is at the same time I don't know that the emails I sent were responded to or ignored by interns rather than the professor himself.

**Dec. 2, 2014 - Drew Shindell - Written Testimony to the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works Hearing on the "Super Pollutants Act of 2014"**

[https://www.epw.senate.gov/public/\\_cache/files/d0c623bf-e442-47c2-b5a3-d82730f1cc62/12214hearingwitness testimonyshindell.pdf](https://www.epw.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/d0c623bf-e442-47c2-b5a3-d82730f1cc62/12214hearingwitness testimonyshindell.pdf)

Air pollution is literally killing people. It is the leading environmental cause of premature death, leading to ~7 million premature deaths per year (outdoor and indoor) globally. Air pollution in the US causes about 135,000 premature deaths, 180,000 non fatal heart attacks, 150,000 cases of hospitalization for respiratory and cardiovascular disease, 130,000 emergency room visits for asthma, 18 million lost work days and 11 million missed school days.

At the same time, in comparison with projected emissions based on current legislation worldwide, an analysis of one approach to implementing these reductions showed that the improved air quality under such a strategy could save ~45 million lives and increase crop yields by about 1 billion metric tons due to ozone reductions

I later found a NASA scientists doing work on weekly weather patterns, Professor Thomas Bell.

27 October 2011 - **Why do tornadoes and hailstorms rest on weekends?** -  
by Thomas Bell

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2011JD016214/full>

The weekly cycle in summertime storm activity for 1995–2009 was found to be statistically significant and unlikely to be due to natural variability. It correlates well with previously observed weekly cycles of other measures of storm activity. The pattern of variability supports the hypothesis that air pollution aerosols invigorate deep convective clouds in a moist, unstable atmosphere, to the extent of inducing production of large hailstones and tornadoes.

This gave me a strong sense that what I was sensing about weekly weather patterns here around Washington DC was real. We are the wealthiest region of the country, yet we don't produce anything but the world's biggest bureaucracy. Every other region of the country is required to create industries that produce enough revenues to support the populations that produce them as well as send us trillions of dollars a year so we can screw up everything the rest of you try to do. And if all else fails, we still win by poisoning you, or requiring you poison yourselves as well as us with whatever you produce.

This means the District of Columbia metropolitan area is polluted by almost nothing else but surface transportation vehicles, thus the perfect laboratory for examining the effects of gasoline additives on weather patterns. Since it takes CO<sub>2</sub> years to go from tailpipes to the upper atmosphere where it's alleged to cause warming, there's no way it can cause weekly weather patterns. This leaves pollution levels rising and sinking on workweek to weekend patterns. We already discussed how weekend traffic can be just as congested as workdays, even worse than workdays, the difference being during workweeks, they all go to work and come home at the same time leaving the hours between rush hours reasonably uncongested.

After combining these factors in my mind to conclude it was a worthwhile effort to undertake even though I didn't have a clue what I was doing, I did it anyway.




There is such a big difference in the amount of pollution emitted during the workweek as compared to weekends around Washington DC that climate change can be watched first hand if you know what to look for. It's easiest to observe in the fall and spring. It does not always happen but at times can be witnessed over many consecutive weeks as can be seen in the graphs below.

### Fall 2006




*Graphs* show high temperatures for 9 days with one day added at the beginning and end of the week charted. *Sat. and Sun.* are marked by **RED DOT**


### Fall 2008



### Spring 2008



### Spring 2009



Weekly weather patterns are caused by vehicle emissions that build up through the 5 day workweek that then diminishes over the weekend. To watch for these weekly weather patterns, look for the workweek to begin cold, then get warmer as the week continues. Saturday's are unseasonably warm, then temperatures drop considerably through Sunday evening to Monday morning. This is significant because most current global warming theories don't account for climate changes happening where pollution is emitted as it is

emitted. Theories that focus in this direction are not popular amongst our political leaders in Washington, D.C. The kinds of pollution that cause these weekly patterns are dangerous and unnecessary. The solutions mean cheaper fuel, less dependency on foreign oil, better air quality, and more miles per gallon. Cleaning up polluting industries can pay for itself through lesser health care costs because less pollution means less illness.

go to [ClimateChangeDC.com](http://ClimateChangeDC.com) for more info



## Crescendo

I showed earlier how recent enforced Tier III gasoline regulations remove most sulfur from gasoline. This allows ethanol to be added to it without making gasoline pollute worse than it does with no ethanol added, also without sulfur removed. This is being done even though ethanol still makes gasoline with sulfur removed pollute more than it would if ethanol had not been added to it.

My position is that as Tier III went into effect leading up to January 1, 2017, (when it was federally required), an inordinate amount of movie and rock stars died. We've already seen where Shindell shows sulfur reductions will have health benefits. My experience with chemical sensitivity tells me pollutants don't just cause negative side effects when entering the body, there's also a dangerous withdrawal that occurs when toxin levels I'm regularly exposed to drop (even a little).

I also claimed complying with Tier III sulfur removal leading up to the 2017 deadline ended a 6 year never ending drought in California.

MAY 9, 2016 - **California Braces for Unending Drought**

<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/10/us/california-drought-water-restrictions-permanent.html>

LOS ANGELES — With California entering its fifth year of a statewide drought, Gov. Jerry Brown moved on Monday to impose permanent water conservation measures and called on water suppliers to prepare for a future made drier by climate change.

“Californians stepped up during this drought and saved more water than ever before,” Mr. Brown said in a statement. “But now we know that drought is becoming a regular occurrence and water conservation must be a part of our everyday life.”

In Professor Shindell's paper 'Global Air Quality and Health Co-benefits of Mitigating Near-Term Climate Change through Methane and Black Carbon Emission Controls' talked about above, I show where they say -

“Climate benefits of reducing BC may be partially offset by associated reductions of coemitted pollutants that may have a **net cooling effect on climate** (and a **NET WARMING EFFECT** when reduced), either directly (organic carbon) or after chemical transformation in the atmosphere (organic carbon, **SO<sub>2</sub> (sulfur)**, and NO<sub>x</sub>). *However, all emission reductions leading to reduced ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations would be expected to have health benefits.*”

Weather Channel - Mar 1 2017 - **Where Winter 2016-17 Ranked as One of the Warmest, Coldest**  
- by Brian Donegan

<https://weather.com/news/climate/news/winter-2016-2017-warmest-coldest-wettest-driest-records>


Winter 2016-17 was much warmer and wetter than average for parts of the United States, according to preliminary data compiled by the Southeast Regional Climate Center. One region, however, saw much colder temperatures than average, while a few areas reported one of the coldest winters on record.

I can't prove multiple stars dying just as Tier III took effect was an actual canary in a coal mine demonstrating how Tier III regulations, although saving lives over the long term, murdered many others along the way. I've tried to warn politicians, government authorities, universities, the news media, and environmentalists about the health risks of too radical pollutant reductions, even gone to war with Enron for not heeding my warnings and won. But no one listens. This is because in order to solve a problem like slowly reducing toxin levels so we don't die when they reduce it too fast, they'd have to admit the problem exists.



What I can do is make a pretty good argument for Tier III's effects on weather, not just the drought ending in California but the warm winter the rest of the country's experienced ever since Tier III took effect. The Weather Channel map below shows the Eastern half of the country experienced an exceptionally warm winter. Here in Virginia it's been more like Georgia, even Florida at times. Great savings on the electric and heating oil bills though.




It's also clear badly drought effected regions of California and Nevada got some sorely needed record breaking rains.




Although a severe drought has emerged in the Southeast, little changed for California drought concerns from April to December (above). The final month of the year are when most companies comply with new air quality regulations due to be enforced the beginning of the following year. (below)




December 27, the Southeast and California droughts are showing noticeable shrinkage. By January 3, the worst is over for the Georgia drought while the California drought severity lessens (above).



This drought ending series continues through January.



By March California's never ending drought was gone while marginal dry lands persist in the Southeast (below).




Does this prove Tier III changes to sulfur (SO<sub>2</sub>) content in gasoline ended or lessened the severity of these droughts? It might, depends on if it actually did or not. If it did, I just proved it. But I didn't prove it did, just provided definitive evidence that it might have hoping somebody with the necessary expertise might one day prove me right. This was a lot of work for "might" or "likely". How about baring with me through a few more pages while I shoot for something between "more than likely" to "probably".

## Back to the Beginning

I had to go back to the beginning of 2000 to the earliest U.S. Drought Monitor maps in their archive. I was making a good case looking at the few years leading up to 2017. But I always found myself having to explain what went before that date, which was always so relevant to my overall case that I had to go back far as records allowed in order to run out of material that need sharing. Too bad there's no weekly maps going back to 1992 when MTBE use began. Maybe I can approach that from another angle at a later date.

In the beginning (of records), it's not a lot different than it is today. It's worse then, but not a lot worse. No telling which direction we're heading from today. As for 2000, it gets worse, then better, really all over the place. For California, which is my primary focus because they're the most prolific air quality regulating state, no noticeable drought remained the norm, and for the most part remains that way until the middle of May 2002.




I encourage you to visit the U.S Drought monitor archives page (link below), or search “Drought Monitor archives” on Google. The best way to see what I see for yourself is select a date to begin from (pull down menu in upper left hand corner of web page), then find the week before and after “double arrow” links on the outside of the menu link.



What's important to know is that going from map to map using the before and after links involves a slight hiccup between maps. This makes it cumbersome to look at droughts over long periods to see how they evolve. However you can click the before or after links multiples times in a row, which you can do just about as fast as you can click. Then go back to the date you're searching from and click through the dates again with no hiccups. This provides a clear movie like perspective on how a period of droughts changes over time.



<http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/MapsAndData/MapArchive.aspx>


Notice below in the (August 8, 2000) map below how the slight drought occurring in Nevada and Arizona follow California's border as if restricted from crossing it by a wall. Could it be these state borders were chosen for geographical reasons that explain it, such as bordering on deserts or mountain ranges? Or could it be different drought data reporting equipment some times give false impression that drought is effecting states with respect to their borders? Then there's the fact that different states follow different laws with regard to air quality. So different pollution rules in different states could cause different effects on state weather patterns.







The answer is I don't know. Maybe by the end of this exercise, we will have a better idea.

Below is a series of maps demonstrating the premise that air pollution regulations taking effect at the beginning of any year can cause immediate changes to weather. At the end of 2000, California is still drought free. The beginning of 2001 however comes with a slight and temporary change to followed in the coming months by states north of CA enduring new droughts that appear to respect California's border.







Notice as the Oregon drought worsens (darker regions), it does so with strict respect to its borders, then finally breaks through at the end of the year.





By January 1, 2002, drought in states north of California are dwindled to all but ending by January 8









This is as drought moves into states southeast of California, seeming to begin worsening to an extreme after April 15, tax day. This makes me wonder if it's not just the beginning of new years when new pollution regulations take effect that leave behind telltale signs of man caused effects on weather, but also tax day for reasons regarding corporate decisions related to their tax status.




On the map (left below) reporting the week ending April 23, 2002, shows the beginning of a worsening drought region primary in Colorado migrating south to New Mexico and Arizona. A week later it's followed the northern border of Arizona until it gets to Nevada and California where it stops.




By May 21, the most extreme drought regions still don't seem to want to cross California or Nevada's border have begun a northerly migration with whatever is causing it to worsen appearing to go no further than the border. By July 23, an extreme drought evolved and peaked in the Four Corners states. California is also beginning to be effected over most of the state.




By October 8, the drought settled into a steady pattern through December 31.



It does change after January 1, but not dramatically.





Again, Tax Day (April 15) appears to preempt change, but dramatic enough to prove anything.







Here though, this one is oddly compelling. On the left below we see extreme drought on the state borders between Iowa, Wyoming, and Utah, also at Four Corners between Arizona and Utah. So what right?



The following week a new extreme drought has evolved between Idaho and Montana while the one between Iowa, Wyoming, and Utah migrated to the Nevada border and followed it directly to the Oregon border. Does this prove different states pollution regulations cause droughts to follow state borders? Absolutely not, but it is interesting, maybe even a big enough a mystery to inspire experts to find the answer.







By November 4, some regions extreme drought have evolved outside state borders while the most provoking one between Idaho, Nevada, and Oregon has remained constant, then begins to grow together the following week.




By November 4, 2003, some regions extreme drought have evolved outside state borders while the most provoking one between Idaho, Nevada, and Oregon remained constant. Then it began to grow together the following week.



As a new year began, extreme drought conditions along Idaho, Nevada, and Oregon's border all but dissipated, although the region still suffered from a bad drought. Through 2004, overall drought conditions slowly and steadily lessened. There was a more noticeable lessening leading up to, then again at the year change to 2005. Not dramatic enough to point to changes in air quality regulations causing it while it's certainly a possibility.



It's hard to show here, much better view from the Drought Monitor archives web page (<http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/MapsAndData/MapArchive.aspx>). As April (Tax Day) 2005 arrives, there appears to be a rapid withdrawal to the Northwest of overall drought conditions. It settles by May 18 with seeming great respect for California and Nevada's borders.




#### **TAX DAY IS NOW GREENHOUSE GAS DAY**


<http://www.techenv.com/E-News/TE%20E-News%200110.htm>

In July 2009, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) finalized the Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reporting Regulation. This regulation requires the first reporting of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions for many Massachusetts facilities by April 15, 2010.









Coming into December 2005, what's left of the Northwest drought in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho still pays strict attestation to California and Nevada's borders, then retreats as the first of the year arrives. By December, other states develop new border restricted droughts while California has mild conditions suddenly invade its border from the South.



With multiple droughts throughout the country, most seeming to confine themselves to state borders, California's grows worse through 2007. CA's then lessens intensity heading through 2008 until December when it appears to roar back with a vengeance heading into 2009. It doesn't though. By March, the worst conditions settled back to mild throughout the state for the rest of the year




Come January 2010, a dramatic drought ending progression begins that results in no drought in California or Nevada by the end of the year. It remained constant until December 2011 when another CA drought began rolling into 2012.














In June 2012, Northwestern Nevada developed an intense drought region strictly following its border with California. It's within a milder drought region that crosses into CA. As it grows, it maintains strict respect for the CA border through December before it begins to quickly pull back heading into January 2013. Then it reasserts itself in June. By July it developed a more severe drought region in the shape of a horseshoe within itself. California is engulfed in drought by this time. This makes me wonder if looking at isolated regions suffering severe drought that appears to have an anecdotal time line relationship with regularity changes to air quality might reveal man made sources of the drought, like a city or industry.



By August 13, 2013, severe drought conditions evolved north of Los Angeles. It held steady through November 12, after which it grew to engulf most of the state in extreme drought by the end of July. It remained at peak drought through December 8.





California drought remained pretty much constant until mid-December 2014 when it appeared to pull back, then picked up again after April 2015. It remained extreme throughout the state until March 2016. It dropped back significantly through April remaining in a holding pattern until January 2017 when Tier III kicked in, after which it ended.




## Encore

For those of you hoping for an encore, ok, maybe this is the best song I got, so I'm just playing it last: In the series below beginning with the first week of December 2016, there's two major drought regions of the country. One is around



Northern Los Angeles. The other is perfectly surrounding Atlanta Georgia like a doughnut.

**U.S. Drought Monitor**  
**Georgia**  
December 6, 2016



**Georgia State Map**



Oddly enough, it looks like a woman with heavy lipstick kissed Atlanta on a map. I supposed a man with heavy lipstick could have accomplished the same doughnut effect, but it really does look like female's lips, even got a woman's tongue inside the mouth, which is Atlanta. Very cool actually, like Mother Earth is trying to tell us something. Guess it don't matter if we don't listen. Or is there more to it than that?

On the one hand I'm trying to expose a conspiracy of ungodly diabolical and irresponsible proportions. On the other, are we looking at evidence of man controlled weather patterns? Certainly that's what this is, it's just being done haphazardly, in many cases hazardously.

I began researching these phenomena when I saw repeated evening rush hour thunderstorms where I live disappearing as they crossed an 8 lane section of highway. It gets congested both ways twice there every work day. Then storms reappeared a little east of there. What I mean is that as the storm hit the highway, it disappeared from the Doppler radar broadcast following the perfect path of the highway. It did this two evenings in a row, same storm pattern, same section of highway. Wish I could have recorded it.

Of course there might be a reasonable explanations for it outside of the heavy MTBE use having such dramatic effects on water vapor that the storm was pushed into the upper atmosphere by a wall of pollution causing rain to stop until the storm passed.

Whatever the case, this got me looking in these directions while feeling sure I would find something that mattered if I looked hard enough. Just because I looked hard, and just because I found what I was looking for, doesn't mean there's no other explanation for what happened to those storms over that highway. What I'm saying is that this Tier III circumstance reminds me of it, the way the milder drought is directly over Atlanta while surrounded by a doughnut of extreme drought.

My point is, one way or another, actually there are many ways we control weather, and we've obviously been doing it along time while recording the effects in great detail over the past few decades, so much so that I have to wonder what a select group of experts could come up with if they started looking at it all for what it is. Might they one day come up with a way to safely manipulate Mother Nature, gently caress her so she responds lovingly instead of violently? Who knows if we spend all our time lying to ourselves and each other about how the world really works, not just the one we created, but the one we live in.

You won't get the full of effect from these grayscale maps (next page) that you would by going to the Drought Monitor website and seeing it for yourself. As 2017 arrives with Tier III regulations going into full effect, droughts everywhere melt away like sun shining on an inch of snow in above freezing temperatures


where you can watch it disappear in a few hours.

I encourage you to visit the U.S Drought monitor archives page (link below), or search “Drought Monitor archives”. The best way to see what I see for yourself is select a date to begin from (pull down menu in upper left hand corner of web page). Then find the week before and week after links on the outside of the menu.



What's important to know is that going from map to map using the before and after links involves a slight hiccup between maps. This makes it cumbersome to look at droughts over long periods to see how they evolve. However you can click the before or after links multiples times in a row, which you can do just about as fast as you can click, then go back to the date searching from and click through the dates viewing with no hiccups. This provides a clear movie like perspective on how a period of droughts changed over time.

<http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/MapsAndData/MapArchive.aspx>



## Kick the Can Back to Hillary, Trump cheated

Seems like a lotta Americans, maybe even most people on the planet, think Obama was kicking the can down the road to Hillary on a number of issues; more like dragging the can kicking and screaming. Politicians don't like to solve big ticket problems because it means they need to find a replacement issue requiring the same level of support as the one they're letting go. Or they can go for it and declare a successful career before going home, or in Obama's case, staying to lead "the resistance".

Watching the way Obama and Hillary play the game like they're running a relay passing the baton to each other at predestined locations, then perhaps in the future to Michelle or Chelsea, whoever was to be next in line to be coronated, is like studying royalty in old Europe. I guess on that note, I don't blame them for trying to oust Trump and the Constitution, ok, maybe I do!

So there we were, on the eve of Trumpcare's downfall in the Big Dog's coach class car looking at a bigly liar, or rather big league liar,,,, or is he? What if all the circumstantial evidence is just that, coincidental? What if Rahm Emmanuel didn't go to Chicago to safeguard ethanol for Obama's 2012 reelection? What if ethanol had nothing to do with Obama's decision not to strengthen ozone emission standards? If so, this guy is not as diabolical a political actor as I was thinking.

This made a certain amount of sense after having the opportunity to view his personal demeanor and traveling habits. Obviously fashion was not his primary concern, neither his privacy since he took coach instead of business class. Yeeeah, but then when I spoke up about his working with Trump, he winced at the possibility that anyone might have heard me. So maybe privacy is an issue, he's just too cheap to spring for a business class ticket.

Ahh, but maybe that wasn't the point, maybe that is the point, maybe he took coach for privacy away from the prying eyes of people who know who he is and what he was doing in DC, like good ole Marge. That might explain why he was so impatiently pounding on the door to the Amtrak club lounge, to escape being seen only to run smack-dab into the enemy.

I sat there contemplating how to get to this guy. I was pretty sure he wasn't going to be willingly to talk to me while there didn't seem to be much of an upside to imposing myself on him. So I came up with a plan, drink lots of water, then the next time I went to the rest room, stop and ask him a one word question he didn't have to answer. This might have allowed me to see if his facial expression change in demeanor gave away his position.

As the water kicked in, I made my move only to find the back of the head I thought was his was the guy in front of him. He on the other hand was curled on in the fetal position between his two seats reading a newspaper, I assume hoping to fall asleep, or simply hiding from prying eyes like mine. Don't know how I



could have been so dumb as to not grab a pic of him lying in the seats like that, kick myself every time it comes to mind, I had him nailed to the tabloid cross and didn't know it. I would have done it but I didn't know enough about him. I tried to look him up, but the trains WiFi was too weak. Still though, I could have used my wife's phone to Google him, so stupid. Anyway,,,,,,,,,

That must have been his plan, that's why he had his laptop and bags strewn across both seats, to make it look like too much trouble letting somebody sit next to him, so nobody would even ask. Then once the train got moving, turn both seats into a mini bed so nobody recognized and tried to talk to him. Does this prove him a liar, well yeah, maybe a little bit, certainly a sort of deceiver, although seemingly innocent enough. But the kind who'd stage a toxic ethanol cover-up to move his health care ambitions down field a few yards, hopefully to a touchdown after Hillary's victory in 2016?

Maybe not. But then again he might not be cheap. In fact he's likely pretty wealthy and was really playing hide and seek in coach so he wasn't confronted by insiders in business class playing the same game he was. Marge, whose son Marc married Chelsea Clinton on July 31, 2010, wrote a lengthy letter on March 18, 2010 published in the Washington Post begging Democrats to vote for Obamacare even if it meant winding up getting run out of DC like she was.

March 18, 2010 - Democrats: Vote your conscience on health care  
- by Marjorie Margolies

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/17/AR2010031701496.html>

Perhaps Hillary called her back in the game. Maybe that's why she was dressed to travel on a first class private jet on Amtrak, because she was an unplanned last ditch Hillary effort to find out what Zeke was doing for Trump by people not "in the know" about the consequences of ethanol use on Obamacare that forced brother Rahm to leave the White House to become mayor of Chicago. They knew he would be on that train, obviously in business class. Marge steered clear of him in the club lounge so she didn't scare him off. That explains might why she so strangely sat with us.

Zeke was however wise to her agenda with Democrats all over DC tracking him down to talk him out of working with the dastardly Donald Trump. Yes she's from Philadelphia where the train was heading. But she no way fit in with the rest of the people I the station, high fashion compared to dry cleaned workweek suits. It could all be coincidental and Zeke read it the way I am now. One way or another, Zeke didn't fit into coach class the same way she didn't fit into business class unless there's more to the story.



### “No, he can't read my poker face”

I suppose you see how very confusing it all is, or how I make it that way in order to relate it to my agenda. Here it was Wednesday night, March 29. The next day Trumpcare would sink or swim, ultimately sinking a couple days later. Zeke said in the Union Station lounge club how he had to get to Philly that night to be back to the White House the next morning. On the train he told me he didn't have the president's ear like it would do me no good talking to him about something I wanted relayed to Trump. He was also overheard in the lounge talking to Marge saying Trump needs to trust more people.

I didn't bother him after using the bathroom. His laying crumpled across two seats like that seemed so strange, such a stronghold defense that I figured I'd be better off trying again later. When the train arrived in Philadelphia, we started to decamp. As we stood up to get our things together, when he glanced my way and acknowledged me, I walked over and asked politely “One question, one word, you don't have to answer?”. It seemed a memorable enough question he'd remember it later if I wrote something about meeting him, yet so simple most people would react affirmatively without thinking.

He gestured with his eyes telling me it seemed like a fair enough proposal - 'what the hell, go ahead'. I think he realized my strategy just as the word “ethanol” came out of my mouth. That's when it seemed to dawn on him that I didn't care if he responded with words, I was rather more interested in his facial reaction.

He was putting on his poker face just as I said ethanol, which did distract him ever so slightly. I venture to guess if he followed through with his initial reaction, he'd have given me a “How the hell does he know about that?” look. But he didn't, he rather caught himself with great seeming poise and discipline before it was too late. By the end of the exercise he'd regrouped back to his poker face before I could read what he was holding. This is telling in itself, why not react honestly if there's nothing to hide? Why put on a mask when not incognito?

As he bleakly stared in wonderment about what I could possibly mean by this one word question “Ethanol?”, I asked “nothing huh?”. He shrugged and went back to collecting his belongings as if he had no clue what ethanol had to do with anything related to health care or Trump. It was like I had a mental disability he didn't want to catch. As he compartmentalized the thought of me like I wasn't still standing there, his way of telling me the conversation was over before it got started, he looked genuinely confused. So I told him to ask his brother how ethanol related to health care stating confidently “he knows, your brother knows all about it”. Then went back to my place in the exit line.

Oddly enough, when he came to the exit line a moment later, he asked if I meant ethanol “like in gasoline?” I nodded in agreement as he gave me a confused look like he still had no idea what it had to do with his brother or health care. This made me wonder if he was playing coy to distract from the small tell he'd shown

when trying to hide his poker face. It was pretty obvious why I asked him the question the way I had, especially after his giving it a moment's thought. He had no choice but assume I was looking for a facial reaction, and therefor likely saw it even though it was small.

He didn't ask what I was talking about, just verified he still had no clue how it related to Trump, his brother, or health care. I told him to search "Obama, ethanol, ozone, EPA, and CME (Chicago Mercantile Exchange)", then again telling him to ask his brother restating "he knows, he and Obama know all of it".

He exited the train quickly disappearing into the crowd to avoid further dialogue. This doesn't fit with what I've read him quoted saying when talking about transparency and the death panel issue, how he doesn't play head games like Republicans and right wingers when it comes to health care, he's straight up, as serious as they come. Guess that isn't as true as might be hoped, not on Amtrak in coach class, not when hiding out with deplorables from Marjorie Margolies stalking him as a favor to his sons mother in law, Hillary Clinton, no way right, who can blame him, who the hell am I for a person of his obvious stature to have to answer to?

## Conclusion

I guess it could have been an innocent sequence of fumbles on a train rather than his getting called out on being the mastermind behind keeping the American people sick in order to prevent Obamacare from working the way he designed it to until after the 2012 election. He could easily be a geeky puppet of his brother Rahm,,, but I doubt it. I've read how he often stays with his brother when in Chicago. I'm guessing he even has his own key. He's too smart to not be a player, ever master of the game.

He recently joined FOX News as a health care commentator. So it's not like he doesn't know how to juggle words without stumbling over half-truths or lies he and or somebody he works with are behind. It seems he functions brilliantly at everything he does, sometimes as a family unit with his brother or brothers in the high powered political arenas of multiple White House's while being at the center of the most controversial topic of the day, Obamacare. No way, this guy is a big dog, no way a puppy, the real deal, as fast and smart as they come.

Get this, is this hard to swallow or what? Their other brother, Ari Emanuel, is a Hollywood talent scout who was once Trump's agent. Ari met with Zeke and Trump in Trump Tower during the transition period after the election. Ari is alleged to be helping set up a bipartisan PAC (Political Actions Committee). He said in promoting/defending the move "No matter what side of the aisle you sit on, or where you live in the world, the call for meaningful and sustained civic engagement is louder than ever." A lot of people see PAC money as swamp water. Presumably so does Trump, or he did until after the Emanuel Brothers took a run at him

Outside of me (lol), Ezekiel Emanuel is always the smartest person in any room. His brother Ramn didn't get to be chief of staff under Obama, for that matter, the same is true for any presidential chief of staff, without being a master contriver. I'm guessing Obama might have been kept a safe distance from decisions that might lead to his someday needing plausible deniability, like my alleged ethanol scandal. Although that would have made it hard to tell Obama Rahm was resigning the White House to run for Mayor of Chicago without Obama wanting to know why he was being left behind in a strange town where he's undeservedly loved or hated by everyone. I wonder what it would be like to elect a president who grew up here where everyone undeservedly loves or hates everyone else so it wouldn't seem so foreign to them when they assume power?

It does appear on many other issues that there was a lot of sharing within the Obama administration where Obama was in the loop on issues he'd have been better off staying away from. This might explain why there was such overconfidence that Hillary would win, because she had to or they would all be lead away in handcuffs. Funny how some human beings can so easily assume the worst could never happen to them because they simply couldn't handle it if it did. Like if you sit in a criminal courtroom long enough, you begin to hear through the veil of many defendants defense how if they'd known they were

gonna get caught, they wouldn't have done it. What they mean is they're not real criminals who break the law because they're bad people, they're innocent, no so much of the crime but in body, soul and spirit, and therefore should be found innocent.

If so, that explains why they're trying to start a civil war to overturn the Constitution after Trump won, because of the littered trail of damning evidence they left behind for Hillary to clean up that Trump now controls. Then there's people like me they became masters at ignoring a long time ago, bottom feeding deplorables that Trump might listen to before he's been initiated into the Washington insiders club. That's why I dropped everything to write this book, because DC's cesspool of corruption doesn't take long to consume and digest its victims leaving not much more than a piece of shit in its wake.

I really gotta wonder about all this. Did Trump call the Emmanuel bothers for meetings during the transition period; or was it the other way around? He met with Ari at his golf course in Bedminster, N.J on November 20 where he trumpeted how Ari is "The King of Hollywood". This was just after he won the election, meaning surely he was very busy. So why meet with his Hollywood agent when he's obviously not going to be doing any reality TV for at least a few years?

A couple weeks later Salon.com published a lengthy highly informative interview with Ezekiel on December 4. Aside from it helping me make my case for how our health care was and is being dealt with at the top of the game,,,, ok, I have no health insurance. I'm a health nut who stays away from doctors whenever I can. My wife would be the same, she just can't help it, which is the only reason we were on that train even though Philadelphia is a really nice city.

What I'm trying to pry out of my fingertips before rambling any further is, if you have a personal interest in how the health care system is managed, especially as it relates to Obamacare, or what it appears soon will be what Obamacare once was, this is likely the best source of information you will ever find coming straight from the Architect himself, Dr. Death.

**DEC 3, 2016 - Obamacare architect Ezekiel Emanuel: Donald Trump has an opportunity "to do enormous good" — or to create "chaos"**

<http://www.salon.com/2016/12/03/obamacare-architect-ezekiel-emanuel-donald-trump-has-an-opportunity-to-do-enormous-good-or-to-create-chaos/#comments>

Obama's healthcare adviser says the ACA has been a success — and, believe it or not, Trump could make it better

There's too much juice here to paste twice, once in the above grayed frame to prove its source, the other here so I can elucidate what he's really saying. So this time I'll just do it here, save us both the effort of doing it twice.

“Obamacare made enormous advances toward solving the problem of how best to provide health care in this nation. It moved us forward a great deal as a society.” Great confidence in the wake of utter failure. Hmm, smart guy, wonder why, why not slither away and let Obama’s legacy go down the tubes by itself. Oh yeah, guess he’s right, that deep sucking noise we can all hear following Obama as he’s flushed out to health care sea is Zeke’s legacy going with him.

“Although this may seem counterintuitive, Trump is actually well positioned to make great improvements to the health care system.” Now we’re getting the picture, this is about Trump. Ok, we already knew that, move along.

“Trump actually has a tremendous opportunity to do enormous good for the nation.” Nice work, not everyday yard worms but store bought night crawlers, he really went all out, barred no expense to catch an ever illusive Trumpfish.

“I agree that its (Obamacare’s) overall reputation is poor. That is largely a problem of communications and branding.” I don’t think I even knew what branding was until Trump ran for president, maybe a little from The Apprentice and Shark Tank.

This was all said in under in his first hundred words of commentary where even the interviewer was caught off guard, “I’m very surprised to hear you say that. He (Trump) appears hell-bent on destroying your program.” We’re not so surprised, not me anyway, what else can he do but suck up to keep from getting sucked down, or rather flushed.

He (Zeke) went on and on glowingly praising the success of Obamacare, gloating about all the good they’d done while ignoring the glaring fly in the soup staring back at him. The interviewer finally asked what he knew everyone reading his article would wanted to know “What about overall costs? There is a widespread perception that Obamacare is just another expensive government giveaway by Democrats.” Well hell yeah Zeke, we can do all kinds of good if we got the money. Good is good, we all love good. However going broke is not good even if it’s to buy good things.

You didn’t have to get a PHD to figure that out bro. Like a bored kid in a grocery line whining wanting Mommy to buy everything the store puts there’s to inspire impulse purchases, ”can I get this,,, what about this,,, oh please please please you have to buy me this one, it’s the best thing ever and it only costa a \$189”. As much as she’d love to be able to give little Johnny everything his heart desires, she only makes so much money.

His answer isn’t worth repeating, he just went on and on about how Obamacare is actually cheaper ending with “Cost increases in the system are lower”. Ok dude, whatever you say, you know a lot more about these things than I do, or you should if you don’t, otherwise maybe I should be the one fishing for Trump’s ear.

When asked to “explain the fact that Obamacare has been so vilified and has

become so unpopular?”, of course he blames the GOP. He pretended to say it was Obama’s fault rather than his own, then flipped it back on Republicans. I got no problem with that, they do the same thing to Democrats, nobody in that city has the nads to take responsibility for their failures, swamp water politics as usual, nothing new to see here folks, move along.

However this is where the good doctor first brings up individual mandates. This is where if you can afford health insurance, you have to purchase it or pay a fine. Throughout the rest of the interview he goes on and on about how the only way to keep the medical system from collapsing and taking the rest of the economy with it is to raise fines on young people who are too healthy to need health insurance who opt to pay the fine because it’s cheaper. By raising the fine to the point it’s more advantageous to go ahead and buy insurance they don’t need, it will offset the costs to insurance companies required to take on new clients with preexisting conditions.

According to Zeke, the more healthy people paying for insurance allows Obamacare to pay for more sick people, which is what I’ve been saying all along, their health care model was designed to do all along. Less sick Americans with insurance lowers expenses to pay for those who don’t. Only my take on their plan was to do this by lowering pollution levels that cause grave illness rates to skyrocket. In this seeming new scenario, we keep making people sick at ever increasing rates while healthy young people pay the freight.

This not at all the same scenario or result as lowering pollution levels. We already gave it to young people Vaseline free by providing them non- defaultable loans for highly overpriced college diplomas from Wall Street owned “for profit universities” behind the promise of high paying jobs that don’t exist. What the hell, none of that is getting in the way if Dr. Death’s successful career, why not have them pay for the health care system as well? Oh yeah, what about jobs, there are none. Wait a second, Trump’s gonna fix the economy to bring back jobs. Ok, now I see the logic, only Hillary wasn’t going to bring back jobs, she wasn’t going to do anything but sit a vagina behind the desk in the Oval Office. So what was the plan if she won? Hmmm, guess we’ll never know.

After saying Republicans checked out of the process in order to let Obamacare fail, therefore putting politics ahead of the country, he says “Some Republicans have offered constructive suggestions for making various adjustments to Obamacare to improve it, and these suggestions are welcome and valued.” He then went on at great length explaining their ideas and why they won’t work. It’s highly informative for the health care uniformed, at least for me anyway. All I know is that if I stay healthy, I don’t have to go to the doctor, and therefore don’t have to pay for doing so. Might be simplistic for an ole health wiz like Zeke Emanuel, less illness translates to less medical expenses. That way we can leave recent college grads working part time at McDonalds alone so they can afford to take the bus to work. That way they’re not stuck at home in their parents basement answer repeating phone calls from college loan collectors stalking them for their loose change. But who am I to say.

In every case where he seeming respectfully lays out a Republican idea for health care reform, he comes back to “but” that doesn’t solve the preexisting condition problem. And the only way to solve it is to raise fines on the individual mandate to force young “healthy” citizens into paying for it through buying insurance they don’t need, also the ever rising fines when they don’t. I mean come on dude, does he know how that sounds. Does he really thinks if it comes from a scholarly guy like himself, it will resonate as normal instead of absurd. Because it makes me think having a doctorate, although requiring a great deal of effort, doesn’t mean a person who achieves this lofty goal has any common sense, they just know a lotta stuff, so we look to them for validation and leadership even though they’re pretty much clueless about how the real world works.

Is this really how the smartest of the smartest think? Do you know it was the smartest of the smartest who crashed Wall Street in 2008, rocket scientists bankers recruited to take us all to the bank; bankers with degrees in higher learning. And while I gotta give it to them for all the money they made, I still see them all as pretty stupid. Like how here we are, we got this planet and universe, hands, awesome eyes, huge brain, all this cool technology, OMG the things the human race could do, am I right? So what do the best and brightest come up with? - They ripped us off for all our money.

OK, let me put it another way, they ripped off all their own money because we are what give money value. Outside of us, it’s just paper. It’s like how in the 1980’s when the World Bank loaned money to third world countries to build economies so they weren’t so dependent on us doling out free money so they could survive, they’d rather one day become contributors themselves. With our knowing their corrupt leaders would steal whatever we lent them, the fact is the same banks doing the lending taught them how to steal it without getting caught by redepositing it back in their banks.

Next they milked poor countries for everything they could using debts owed on monies that never left their vaults. These debts were used as leverage to take their natural resources while making their population cheap labor slaves exploiting their own lands for export to the West. It’s like how if you hear about one Crip, Blood, MS 13, or Hells Angel, doing something bad, you associate it with their whole club even though they’re not all bad. They might all be badasses, but not all bad people.

Every group has bad people, except of course suits and ties. Indeed we can all point to bad guys in suits and ties, even the worst of the worst dawning stylish nooses around their neck before going to work everyday. But no matter how bad they are, most of us never reach a point where we associate their cult’s uniform with them all being bad like we do other groups. We rather very rarely say “a few bad apples doesn’t spoil the barrel” when referring them even though it does. I mean yeah, there’s still be some edible apples left after some go bad, but they’re covered in rotten apple slime from the others. so it’s not like anyone will

actually ever eat them unless it's all there is to eat,

That's what we've come to, eating rotten apples even though in our form of Democracy we can harvest a new crop every couple years. I think that's what the Trump elections signals, the fact that we're done with all that, no more dumpster diving for leaders, no more settling for scum bags running the world we already know are scum bags. How bout we start elected leaders who might not be scum bags? That's who Trump is, the guy we don't already know is covered in apple slime. I wish I could say better about him, but that's the best we can do until he proves otherwise. I wonder if that's why he wears red ties so much, to signify he's not rotten to the core?

I really hope so because Washington insiders aren't even evil. If they were evil or good, we'd have been exploring the universe as the United Federation of Planets or Klingons a few thousand years ago. The reason we're still not really even thinking about it is because we're lead by fools who don't deserve the title of good or evil, because one way or another, good or bad, at best they're still slime covered apples for playing roles in ours and their own demise. Good conquers evil. Evil conquers good. We on the other hand don't even conquer ourselves, we rather rot in the bottom of a barrel hoping everyone else rots with us so we don't feel as stupid as we actually are

At the end Death dude claims "Regardless of the marketing, packaging, publicity and optics, Trump actually does have a tremendous opportunity to break through the politics of Washington to make adjustments to the existing health care system that would truly benefit millions of ordinary Americans and achieve the goals of universal coverage, no preexisting disease exclusion, and affordability. The American people would then receive the improved health care system that they deserve." Indeed, on the backs of young healthy people without a word about ozone or ethanol, nothing about poisons in food or drinking water, nothing about actual health, just saving his health care plan from the bottomless toilet he, his brother Rahm, Hillary, and Obama, created for it.

To that I gotta ask myself why, like the last question where he's asked - *Despite your association with President Obama, if President-elect Trump calls, might you agree to help him?* Where he answers "I was raised to believe in the civic responsibility of serving our nation and I am always willing to help improve our health care system."? Does he really think Trump is going to fine the hell out of young people to pay for preexisting conditions. That's wasn't Zeke's original plan. It became their plan when ethanol turned out to be the worst ozone producer in the country.

I remember after this interview where pundits kept repeating what Zeke said about how trying to replace Obamacare with anything that left out paying for preexisting conditions with young people forced to buy insurance would cause the whole medical system to crash, so much so that a couple months later Dr. Death was on Trumps health care team pushing a proposal through congress that failed the day my wife got her first chemo treatment in Philadelphia.



That was when we also picked up a terrible flu, which hindsight makes me wonder if the gurgling cough I heard coming from a few seats in front of me, not a dry one but one you know spells “infected”, is this why he was so exhausted in the lounge at the train station back in DC? Was this why he was strewn across two seats in coach class? Did my wife and I pay dearly for my getting close enough to ask him that one word question about ethanol? I don’t know, but if so, whatever revenge he would like to exchange for my writing this book, I paid dearly for it already, worst illness of my life, complete hell to get over. My wife even had to go the hospital. Don’t you ever wonder about flues where they later show how it migrated around the world? So wait a second, it weren’t for sick people moving around giving it to others, it would stop dead in its tracks?

“Well yes, theoretically, but we can’t shut down a whole regions of the world wherever it breaks out.” Ummm, why the hell not, seems like something we could get pretty good at if we simply tried, like stopping littering, fines didn’t work, so why not ask people to simply stop, it’s called leadership. What about super viruses caused by overuse of antibiotics, I’ve been reading about them being just over the horizon since I was a kid’ now they’re here.

Is it unrealistic expect physicians to be more responsible with antibiotics? Or is all about sales of flue medications, street sweepers, and prescription medicines? I think it is, I really think so. If it’s not, at this point it’s time suits and ties need to prove it. But then in order to go there, we gotta get them to admit there’s question that need answering. Having lived around DC all my life, I’ve repeatedly found the truth behind solving real world problems is always a lot easier than getting our leaders to stop do everything assbackwards.

On December 7, Rahm Emanuel hand delivered a letter to Trump from himself and 17 other mayors asking him not to change Obama’s Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, an executive action that allows immigrants who arrived when children to be shielded from deportation.

On February 8, Ari announced he was setting up a bipartisan Political Action Committee (PAC) for Trump. A lot a people have questioned for years why Ari has anything to do with Trump, much less set up a PAC for him. This was because Trump so viciously attacked Obama over the birther issue when Rahm was Chief of Staff. It later became an issue because of the way he went after Obamacare during the election, which brother Zeke help put together. In spite of these seeming insurmountable and divisive political obstacles, Trump met with Zeke to discuss Obamacare reform on March 20.

When I look at the big picture, I see a complex, even diabolical conspiracy to keep poisoning the American people with ethanol even after the Obama administration learned it was causing high levels of deadly ozone throughout the country. With lower ozone levels critical to the success of Obamacare while the corn/ethanol vote was just as critical to Obama’s reelection in 2012, ethanol won out over our good health and Obamacare’s success. The plan to protect ethanol’s

future until 2012 and after was contingent on two critical factors, Rahm protecting ethanol as mayor of Chicago, and Hillary winning in 2016 to keep covered up what they'd done.

When she lost, the brothers came up with a plan to get Zeke inside the White House to influence Trump's decisions on Obamacare reform, hopefully steering him away from anything that might expose the true nature of what he, Rahm, and Obama had done and were doing.

First they sent in Trumps's friend Ari to clear an unsuspecting crack for Zeke slip through. Ari maybe even tried to get Trump to suggest, or make him think he had, that having Zeke on his team would be an asset for the future of health care. Trump probably agreed the way he does with everything, "oh yeah, your brother, very smart guy, so smart that guy, gotta love that guy, smartest guy in the country, I'll have me people get in touch with him", and forgot about it. So Rahm took at run at it, then Ari went back speaking a language Trump better understands, money, in this case, PAC money.

As of today, May 4 2017, Star Wars Day (May the 4rth be with you), Trump just supported a budget bill Democrats couldn't be happier about. Not sure if it means he's been turned, maybe just scratched or bite while the full blown walking dead disease hasn't set in yet. I'm pretty sure it won't matter if Surfing Amtrak with Dr. Death takes off, not to my agenda anyway. It will for the rest of them while Trump still has time to pull whatever feet he has in his mouth out and turn against the rest of them to drain the swamp as promised.

Either that or they'll finally do with me what they did with Chandra Levy, only this time without leaving any evidence behind. Kind of hard to do that with this book though, ahhh, maybe another war, this time on our own soil, maybe Kim Jug Um could take a shot at DC and miss to the South by just a few miles. Yeah, that would probably work.

Also today, as I finally had a successful upload of Surfing Amtrak with Dr. Death PDF print plate to my publisher's website, the House of Representatives passed a new Trumpcare bill. It's said to save the country over a trillion dollars. I doubt this is what Zeke was angling for.

It appears Trump didn't give up on health care after his own Republican Freedom Caucus blew the one Zeke put together out of the water. He rather doubled down to support a Democrat budget to let Republicans know he's a get-er-done kind of guy, if not with them, then with Democrats. Now it appears he might have the support needed to get Obamacare reform done.

I like the way this guy rolls, nothing gets in his way. And they say there's still plenty that needs to be done to fix Obamacare over the coming months and years. When I put it all together, I'm inspired with great deal of confidence that between this book and Trumps ability to shift lanes in order to get where he needs to go, I'll be breathing much easier in the near future.

That and I expect a great sucking will soon flow from a few miles north of me as the levies preventing swamp waters from escaping of our nation's capital will soon be torn down. Makes me wonder if they'll need to reopen Lorton Federal Penitentiary just up the street from my home to house them all. Now that would be pretty cool,,, dontcha think

## Trump Ethanol Campaign

Below is a copy of my ethanol comments used on ethanol articles and Facebook for the last so many months hoping to draw Trump's attention to on the ethanol issue? My hope was whoever is assigned to follow the issue for the administration would come across it and do the right thing. Now that hope has switched to them coming across 'Surfing Amtrak with Dr. Death; The Architect of Obamacare' -

*ethanol added to gasoline doesn't work,, ethanol is water based while gasoline is oil,, believe it or not, it's actually true that oil and water don't mix,, that's why ethanol has to go through the expensive process of becoming anhydrous, because there can't be any water content when added to gasoline or the two fuels will separate.. the problem with the logic there are many water sources that gasoline encounters from point of ethanol blending to the spark plugs of our engines,, and even if there's not enough to cause a phase separation of the ethanol from the gasoline where the ethanol sinks to the bottom of fuel tanks, even the smallest amount, such as atmospheric water vapor it encounters in engine combustion chambers, is enough to make it separate from gasoline as it all heats and becomes pressurizing before ignition,*

*like with regular 87 octane gasoline used in low compression engines, since ethanol is 113 octane, it's blending with 83 octane gasoline to provide a balance of 87,, however when separate before ignition, they become two fuels again, neither of which has an octane the engine can efficiently take advantage of even if it could choose one over the other,, in the end, there's a loss of power, which translates into lost mileage along with hotter engines that don't run the way they're designed to,,*

*the good news is much cheaper to produce hydrous ethanol, which is effectively moonshine when made from corn, is an awesome fuel by itself,, at 113 octane, it can run in very high compression engines, it can be produced for around \$.25 a gallon depending on price of oil, probably cheaper with profit incentivized competition rather than government regulations that date back to the Clean Air Act of 1990 and an additive called MTBE, another huge loser of the EPA,,*

*then there's the gasoline itself, when Obama discovered his pet issue ethanol was the biggest source ozone causing VOC's, he pulled back on his 2008 campaign promise to instruct the EPA to enforce stricter controls on volatile organic compounds (VOC's) or lose his ethanol supporters in the 2012 election,, this was bigly because he built Obamacare around the notion that less VOC's would mean lessening illness rates by such a wide margin that it would cause a collapse of the much over inflated medical care bubble,,*

*if Americans are unnecessarily made sick so medical costs always increase, and those trends are expected to continue, investments are made behind long term forecasts predicting greater rather than lesser need for health care,, Obama didn't want to crash the economy again, so he came up with Obamacare where,*

*as less people with health insurance needed medical treatment after his new clean air rules took effect, those empty slots could be filled by people who could not previously afford insurance, thus creating a profit buffer to stave collapse as markets slowly adjusted to new health trends,,*

*when he found out ethanol was the biggest source of the pollutants he wanted to reign in, he pulled back on new ozone attainment regulations, however the cat was already out of the bag with Obamacare,, so illness rates continued to go up at the same time the government and tax payers were forced to pick up the tab for Americans who should not be able to afford health care in an overburdened market,,*

*the point is that they later came up with a plan to fix it, not by stopping ethanol from being added to gasoline while allowing hydrous ethanol to create new markets of its own, but by removing so much sulfur from the gasoline that the resulting pollutants are no worse when ethanol's added to it,, it doesn't make ethanol and gasoline any more compatible, in fact worsens the efficiency of the resulting fuel, but it is less dangerous to human health,, this is not only a ridiculous solution when, rather than wasting corn and the ethanol made from it to cause lost mileage to gasoline, hydrous ethanol could be a source of a real domestic fuel that we sorely need,*

*there's also a way to make the old sulfur rich gasoline (and diesel) that provide upwards of 20% more mileage with 70% less emissions,, it effectively converts what otherwise would be harmful emissions and converts them to power (<http://www.visconusa.com/>),, and it costs no more to produce than regular gasoline, just few simple tweaks at the refinery,*

*the reason we don't do it is 1) rather than heading in this direction, the oil industry chose to foster an MTBE program though Enron and Bush 41 in the 1990's that failed miserably,, and 2) rather than doing away with the whole concept of oxygenates when MTBE use was forced to an end, they double down with ethanol, both of which counter the positive effects of refining more efficient less polluting gasoline and diesel fuels, something nobody seems to be interested in doing or even knowing about because there's too many big money elitists in control of our fuel markets who would lose out if we went in this new direction, which includes so called environmentalists, because actual clean air and water means there's no reason to pay them to solve the problem, that's the real problem in Washington, as long as problems grow worse, more money gets sent here to solve them,, if we however do our jobs around here, all the people who come here to live the high life will be forced to go back where they came from and get real jobs,, but hey, if done my way, there will at least be real jobs to go home to*

## 2008 and 2010 Campaigns

I ran for congress in 2010 here in Northern Virginia as a way to draw attention to issue discussed in this book. I produced a website with videos explaining the issues and solutions. I later used the transcripts from them for a book. The chapter on health care seems like a perfect match for the message I'm conveying here. It's followed by an outline from a video from 2008 promoting my idea for "The World's First Political Reality TV Game Show". The transcript from the video fills the remaining pages

### Health Care

Health care is a complex issue but only because it's been made to be that way. Any issue that can be simplified doesn't need big governments or corporations to manage for us. The key to good health is something we all want, like a roof over our heads, a kitchen, bathroom, nice bed to sleep in, clothes, TV, all the basics. Wanting good health is a given for all of us, even those who smoke, drink, over-eat, don't exercise, or have many of the other bad habits that we know aren't good for us. Keeping in good health isn't as easy for some of us as others. But I think it's safe to say that we all want good physical and mental health. We also want to be strong and good looking even if we don't try hard to get it. What we can't have in the way of perfect health, we want the best we can get.

This simple reality seems to have alluded our leaders and those who run the health care system. What we want is not necessarily good health care but good health. If we could have perfect health without health care, we wouldn't be trying to provide health care to everyone at the expense of our futures. I mean if there was no such thing as accidents on our roads and highways, we wouldn't entertain spending what we do on vehicle insurance? But that's not how health works. So caring for our health plays a big role in our lives and future. My plan for health care however attacks the issue from a totally different perspective. Ra-

ther than trying to find ways to pay for health care, I'm looking at what makes us sick.

When I was growing up, when health was debated, carcinogens were key to the overall conversation. Carcinogens are pollutants that cause cancer. As I got older, I heard about how they cause a lot of other illness as well. Cigarettes were at the center of the original debates. That discussion then bled over into talking about pollutants that cause the same kinds of problems that cigarettes smoke does. Then it came back to cigarettes and second hand smoke.

When I was young, everyone smoked and it was done everywhere. I started smoking with most of my friends at the age of 12 and 13. By age 14, it was allowed in front of many parents. In high school, we had smoking lounges where we all went between classes to smoke, even freshmen. Everywhere anyone went, even in grocery stores, the ground was littered with cigarette butts. Grocers even

used to have to hire someone whose primary responsibility was to go around with a dry mop and clean up cigarette butts. So pretty much everyone was addicted to cigarette smoke whether they smoked or not.

When second hand smoke was discovered to be bad for health, there were lawsuits against the tobacco industry while many Americans quit smoking. Then those who didn't were forced to smoke outside in most public places. Throughout this social learning process, pollutants that also have carcinogenic properties become the primary focus of most health and environmental debates. I think those discussions would still be going on today if it hadn't been for 401K investment plans where employers set up retirement funds for their employees through investing in the stock market.

It seemed the more we learned about carcinogens, the more lawsuits there were brought against big corporations who weren't careful enough with how they produce or market their products that expose us and the environment to dangerous chemicals. But since we wanted to be able to buy these products as cheaply as possible while it was their job to give us what we want, the solution was to make some of us sick along the way while we had the option of taking them to court if we got sick.

It seemed in the beginning that most of us remained healthy while the lawsuits weren't able to stop big profits from being made. Then once most of us were invested in making money off this process through 401K plans, suing big corporations became antisocial at the same time the word carcinogen was largely removed from our dialogue. So of course products have gotten more toxic while industries don't mind polluting more if they know it won't cost them anything. As would be expected, we now have a very sick society that desperately depends on a very expensive health care system to survive. But our health care system still doesn't give us what we want, good health. It's gotten very good at fixing the things pollutants cause. But it hasn't come up with a way that allows us to expose ourselves to pollutants and stay healthy. So good health evades most of us while those who have it never know when they are going to join the ranks of the critically ill.

This is why everyone needs to have a health care plan or they're at risk of falling through the cracks when they need health care they can't afford. But still the key to health care and good health is getting rid of what causes most illness, which is pollutants. This can be done in many ways not possible before because we have the technology, manpower, and financing ability to invest in upgrading our industries so they don't pollute the products we consume or environment anywhere along the production and consumption line. This is while also making them more efficient. However along with the financial success we and Wall Street have enjoyed with so many of us invested in turning corporate profits, there's been little will by bankers to lead when it comes to building a nontoxic society because it would require investing money over a long period of time before the kinds of profits they're accustomed to are seen again.

With average Americans being so heavily invested in the future of Wall Street, we are no longer the kind of consumers that used to keep them in check. So

they've gotten reckless in the way they manage our money and the levels of toxins they allow into the products we consume. Since they have enough money to buy off our elected officials, the government has become complicit in their abusing us for profits while the money that could have gone towards bettering our quality of life and health goes into the pockets of elected officials and governmental bureaucrats. So now the economy is broken and they have no incentive to fix it because it seems the worse things get for us, the better it gets for them. But there is a flaw in their overall game plan. It's a little complicated, but you understanding it will lead to strengthening the economy while changing the course of the health care back towards good health rather than bad health and big profits for health care providers.

In the same string of articles in the Washington Times in 1990 that discussed the additive to gasoline and diesel fuel that gives 20% more mileage with 70% less pollution that I discussed in the PIB energy video, there were also stories about further discussions that were had on Capitol Hill about what to do about pollution. This was after the oil companies turned down the opportunity to use polyisobutylene (PIB) to give us cleaner more efficient fuels.

The biggest pollution problem in those days was smog that hung over our metropolitan cities, like in Beijing China during the Olympics. Those grey brown hazes were a constant reminder to urban Americans that they breathed polluted air because it was like a cloud that never went away. Even on sunny days, many cities were dark and cloudy beneath the smoggy haze. So city dwellers complained about it because it made them worry about their health, or worse, made them deathly ill. That is the kind of landscape the debate over forcing the oil companies to use PIB grew out of. So even after PIB was scuttled under the red carpet that rolls up to our nation's capital building, concerns about smog continued. That's when a new solution was proposed that the oil companies had no problem with, an additive called MTBE. Since it had PIB in it, which almost everything made from crude oil has some form of this polymer in it, it was able to be sold to congress being as good as PIB, that is as long as lots of free money was passed around town.

The truth is however that MTBE causes worse pollution problems than the smog it gets rid of. It also causes a loss of mileage and pollutes groundwater. What it did do, before it was replaced with ethanol, was cause large emissions of formaldehyde. What everyone liked about it was that formaldehyde dissolves smog. So although it made air quality worse for human health and the environment, since the pollutants Americans were complaining about could no longer be seen, the problem was said to be solved. So all that was needed was for congress to pass a Clean Air Act that said this additive was good for air quality and instruct the EPA to require it be added to all gasoline. That's how politics works in a democracy, if our elected officials tell our government's agencies something is a duck even if it doesn't quack, wattle, or have webbed feet, then it's a duck.

Enron accomplished this feat passing out millions of dollars to elected officials in Washington and state capitols throughout the US while telling them how good



MTBE would be for the environment. This kept politicians from looking passed their wallets to find out if it really worked the way it was claimed to work. In 2006, MTBE use was ended because it polluted most of the nation's groundwater with deadly chemicals. In fact since many other countries followed our lead in using it, so has groundwater in just about every place you can imagine. Since they're still pretending it's good for air quality, ethanol has taken its place. Ethanol produces a similar emission to formaldehyde called acetaldehyde. It also dissolves smog caused by coal burning and diesel engines.

Acetaldehyde is what gives us hangovers after a drinking too much alcohol. It's also a carcinogen. When the changeover from MTBE to ethanol was announced, California took the EPA to court to prove that ethanol worsens air quality. Then the Bush administration stepped in and said that they were no longer requiring it to be added to gasoline for air quality, but rather to lessen our dependence on foreign oil. So the program rolled on without being challenged. The problem is dehydrated ethanol, which is moonshine distilled a few extra times, causes a bigger loss of mileage in most vehicles than it provides, meaning that over all, we've become more dependent on foreign oil as a result of using it. And that's without figuring in how much efforts goes into growing the corn and refining the ethanol, another process which costs more energy to produce than energy given back even if it gave the kind of mileage the government says it does. Politics being what it is with a lot of people making money off the status quo, the truth about how much of a waste ethanol is for the economy, environment, and health has a hard time making it outside the Capital Beltway where people getting hurt the worst by this totally irresponsible policy can see it for what it is.

To ethanol's credit, which I'll cover this aspect of it as a fuel in more depth in my ethanol related video, there is a proper way to use ethanol as a fuel that is cheaper, can be produced easier and quicker in higher amounts from the same existing infrastructure, and doesn't cause a loss of mileage. In fact it is so easy that, well, the truth is that's why they're doing it the way they are, because once you know how we should be doing it, little companies who don't need big investment capital from Wall Street will spring up all over the country taking energy profits away from the oil industry and Wall Street bankers.

This is just one example of how we can provide better health for ourselves without feeding the health care system more money and lives to practice making profits from. In every case I've investigated where we're being exposed to toxins that make us ill, I find that not only are less toxic ways to do it, it can be done cheaper while yielding higher profits for investors over the long term. This is while building a more stable society so when we retire and cash out our 401k accounts, we have a decent country to spend it in rather than flushing it all down the same toilet our economy is heading right now.

We can have a cleaner environment, good health, and a strong economy, we just have to stop focusing on money being the cure for all our problems and look at the problems themselves. Take for instance the health care system today. What do you think is going to happen if we begin to clean up our act so we and our children aren't exposed to so many deadly chemicals on a daily basis? That's right, we won't get as sick anymore.

Of course all of you have heard of the housing bubble by now, the one that burst taking the rest of the economy with it when it did. That happened because the housing market was bloated, it was overvalued. It was invested in for profits, not to give us places to live. What would you call a health care industry that's grown to gargantuan such proportions because we're poisoning ourselves with so many unnecessary pollutants? I call it another bubble ready to burst if we stopped abusing ethanol and start adding chemicals to gasoline that actually make fossil fuels burn cleaner.

If Americans were made homeless when the housing bubble burst, what will happen to sick people when the medical industry's bubble bursts? Right now I see a health care debate that has gone on for endless months while the EPA and FDA have actually been moving to get rid of some of the pollutants that make many of us ill. But I don't see any open discussions about a coming health care industry bubble bursting. This is not how business in this country should be done. The American people need all the cards put on the table so we can decide how we want to proceed. This is not the kind of country where we are told what our leaders want us to know and are not supposed to concern ourselves with what they don't tell us.

We're supposed to be a country whose citizens know what's going on and have a voice in what is done about it. Decisions aren't supposed to be made behind closed doors where we're then told half or untruths about what is going on. If you want these kinds of issues talked about publically so our leaders have less incentive to work against us while better allowing us use our wallets to deal with problems coming from Wall Street, all you have to do is let the other candidates in the House race for the 11th district of Virginia know that you want answers, all the answers, the way I give them to you. That will put them in a position to either agree or disagree with my position. If a lively debate can be had over these issues, it will lead to change.

The reason these stories have been kept from you or lied about is because if you knew about them, change would follow. That's the way I see it with every problem we face right now. If we knew how to solve them, we wouldn't need big government or big banks to solve them for us. So of course they don't want us to know how easy it could be to make things work right for us because it wouldn't support their privileged lifestyles in the fashion they've become accustomed too.

When I was a kid growing up, we didn't rely as much on bankers or elected officials to run our lives for us the way we do now. My father's generation looked to them even less and so one back through the ages. But we also littered the streets with cigarette butts everywhere we went while filling out lungs with poisons we knew were bad for us. We got rid of the cigarette butts but we've replaced them with toxic gasoline additives. That isn't a sign that our way of life doesn't work, it just means we still have work left to do perfecting it. I believe that if we survive where we've been, and where we are now, we can survive anything. Just think about how great things could be if we stopped working against ourselves.

That's the vision I have for our country, an America that can solve problems without causing more to take its place. If we can survive the way we do business now, think about how happy we could be if we simply knew the facts behind the

troubles we have and how they could be gone tomorrow with just a slight shift in how we deal with them. You don't have to vote for me to make this happen. It can happen long before November.

All you have to do is support my being taken seriously as a candidate even if you have no intention on voting for me. If you do that, it will force the truth out into the open where these problems will be solved so country and world can heal to become stronger as a result of it. That way by November, there will be no one else left to vote for. If it happens that way, I won't care if I'm elected or not because I just want things to work the way they ought to. If they did, I wouldn't be wasting my time trying to get into politics. I know, it's quite a dilemma. Make sure you stick around to see how it all works out because it's bound to be mighty interesting.



Although this book is about campaign 2010, my career in politics actually began leading up to the 2008 presidential election between Barack Obama and John McCain. It also included Joe Biden and Sarah Palin as nominees for vice president, all of which seemed to me to be a grim set of choices for the leaders of the free world. I figured no matter who won, it wasn't likely they were gonna address the issues actually causing this country to crumble. The reason why is twofold. If they were going to do anything about it, it would already have been done because they're all in positions with enough authority to get the job done.

You'll read later how solving the nation's problems only requires you, the American people, to know the real story behind why everything is falling apart, something they're all part of, which is the other reason they weren't likely to address any of it. So I came up with a video to promote an idea whose time I thought had come. I still think 2008 was the perfect time for the world's first political reality TV show. Even so, it's even more relevant today than just like the solutions I offered in my 2010 campaign for congress are.

Below is the transcript from the unrehearsed lecture for my Clandestine Candidate promotion video. It's still the strongest presentation I have for this idea. The title I came up with for the show came about because back then, like now, the issues presented throughout election cycles don't reflect what we ought to be paying the most attention to. I figured out a long time ago that it's very hard to break into the political process to present anything other than what the Democrat and Republican Party put on the table, which of course only consists of what they're divided about. The biggest problem with that equation is they're in agreement on the issues at the core of the nation's downfall, which means most Americans never hear a word about them. We rather wind up talking about abortion and gay marriage, or ideologies and who lives by a better set of principles when all they do is pretend to be who they say they are.

We hear a lot of talk about socialism versus capitalism and unions versus free enterprise, which are important issues, except when being used to mask issues of vital importance to the nation's survival. Then it becomes more about choosing how we want to be perceived in our last days before we're no more rather than fighting to survive to put the country back together. Liberals are more concerned with everyone being prim, and proper, like wearing clean underwear in case we get in an accident and have to go to the emergency room or undertaker than making sure highways are so safe there are no accidents. Conservatives are the same way except if they're drawers are covered in skid marks, Jesus forgives

them. So they can pretty much do whatever they want and call it freedom

That's what happens when you have a two party democracy and both parties step in the same pile,, of it. They cover for each other so we don't find out what's wrong until it's too late. That's what happened to the Soviet Union only they had a one party system, which really goes a long way to prove my point. When there are two parties divided over an issue, it will likely get resolved because they both scramble to tell us their side of the story looking for support for their solution too it. When they're both to blame, it's allowed to fester, out of sight and out of mind. I guess the twisted logic behind this behavior is that if they have to take a fall, they're taking the rest of us with them.

Central to this problem is their biggest donors being lobbyists who troll Washington looking for support for plans to undermine our future in exchange for personal financial gain. They give money to everyone on both sides of their particular issues. That's how you get things done in our nation's capital, make everyone happy so no one is willing to go against you. I guess if Washington lobbyists had the nation's best interests at heart, perhaps this would work. But then, as you will see later in the book, the best solutions don't need government to prop them up, the worst ones do so they have an unfair advantage of their competitors. So we get policies shoved down our throats by government that otherwise wouldn't have a chance competing in the market place while the solution we'd rather have get cheated out of their destiny.

It occurred to me that a political reality TV show would be a big hit even if it didn't attract any of the major party candidates, in fact it would probably be better if it didn't. The idea is to take regular folk who want change and give them the opportunity to show how their ideas work, not by talking about what they will do if elected, but by using the show and resources provided for challenges to see if they can actually make something happen. My thinking was that if I could get Hollywood interested in such a project, I would have an inside shot at being a candidate. If so, I could then use the TV show to force issues Democrats and Republicans are hiding out into the open where they would have to be addressed. In a sense, I was seeking to clandestinely undermine the system by forcing it to work. When the title Clandestine Candidate came to mind, it stuck like glue.

In hindsight, perhaps a different title might have drawn better attention to this concept. It unannounced too clearly that I have a personal agenda, which might have distracted from the overall concept. It's still a great idea as we approach 2012, which is whether I was a candidate on the show or not. I have no doubt it would be a big winner as a reality TV show. I even still like the name, and maybe you do to after I explained the rationale behind it. However something simpler might have gotten more mainstream attention

Promo Video Transcript –

“What is Clandestine Candidate? I'm a Clandestine Candidate. Clandestine Candidate itself is the first political reality TV show in the world,, it'll chose the next president of the United States. If I win, I'll be your next president. But that's not what we're here to talk about, we're not here to talk about me, we're here to talk about you and how you can participate in Clandestine Candidate, and what

Clandestine Candidate is all about.

The election process we're presented with today,, it's expensive. We spend billions and billions of dollars every 4 years, and that's just on our presidential campaigns, whatever government services support the whole system, media, gasoline, people running around, posters being plastered all over the country, negative ad campaigns on TV. We spend billions and billions of dollars and thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of man-hours to elect a man to go to the White House to solve problems that he promises he'll take care of that cost less to solve then the whole election process itself costs. And then once we spent all that money and sent that fella to the White House, he's got to answer to all the people who gave him that money. We don't really spend that money, I mean corporations make all the money off of us, the banks and the corporations do. It's all profits they made off of us but the president ain't answering to us.

Our representatives in Washington and our state capitals, they're not answering to us once they get elected, they're answering to the people that fund their elections. So what we get for leadership is people who owe favors to businessmen whose ideas don't work without the support of government. At Clandestine Candidate we're looking for people who can make things happen without the support of government before we give them a government to run.

The people who support our elected officials nowadays can't make their dreams of prosperity come true without government support,, without laws being passed to support what they want to do. What I'm asking is why don't they just take the money they spend on the election process to solve the problems the election is about. The way we do it now is once a candidate is elected, he or she has to fight to get laws passed to support the programs they promised they'd put in place, which costs billions more dollars. Then once they get their laws passed, they gotta set up programs and build agencies which takes years and years costing millions, even billions more dollars. In the end they set up programs that don't work or are irrelevant because the problems they were debating during the election campaign was years before that, it was something we were concerned about years before that we needed solved at that moment, we needed answers right then and there.

By the time they get their programs off the ground, we've already moved passed most of it. But they've still gotta build their institutions, they've still gotta spend their billions of dollars to get out there with programs that don't work trying solve problems that may not even exist anymore. So our government doesn't work. So I came up with an idea to make money producing an election process to solve the problems of the day as the election process unfolds. You see the unique thing about our form of government here in the United State, as supported by our Constitution and Bill of Rights, is that it protects our right as U.S. citizens to solve our own problems without government. We seem to have forgotten a great deal of that.

We've got government dipping in our pockets to solve our problem from every angle that could possibly be conceived, and none of it really works, not from my perspective, not the way I see the world. I see a world that could doing a whole

lot better, a whole lot easier, a whole lot cheaper, and making a whole lotta people a whole lot happier. But government is the primary reason that gets in the way of all that. The way I look at government and solving problems is that if you go back 5,000 years to the beginning of civilization, you'll find it's conceivable that all the problems in the world that society has ever had is the result of government. Then we hire government to solve the problems they created and their giving us more trouble, which is exactly what we ought to expect, exactly the reason why probably better than 50 percent of us don't vote, don't engage in the process, don't like talking about politics, people who read the sports page instead of the front page because it's just a big waste of time, it's just a whole lot of nonsense. We gotta pay a whole lot of money in taxes into a process that doesn't work, so we'd just rather not think or hear about it.

Well I say if I produce a reality TV show to choose the next president of the United States and have a bunch of people come on this show, and they go into an office building, and they live there for a month or two months competing against each other, and compete against the audience and producers, to prove their value to us, I'm gonna make money. I'm gonna make a profit producing a president rather than it costing billions and billions of dollars where who we get, we don't really know. We think we know them. They make us feel like we know them. But by the time they leave office, we wish we'd known them a whole lot better.

Since our government allows us to solve problems without them because the Constitution and Bill of Rights protects our right to solve them without government, we can make a reality TV show that's a whole lot more than about giving speeches, shaking hands, and kissing babies while talking and telling us what they're gonna do, how their gonna get up there and pass laws and create institutions that will one day come back and give us something worth all the trillions of dollars to hire these governments with to solve our problems.

What if we do more than just campaign on that TV show. This TV show is aimed at taking a candidate and giving him or her the opportunity to start changing the world right there on the show. I mean you gotta figure you're gonna have some huge ratings on a show like that because you're gonna have everybody watching. So if you gotta candidate who's able to lead, who's able to communicate and get a message across to people to inspire them to want to see change, then what does he or she have to go to the White House to then try get a city of bureaucrats to get behind them to pass a law to build an institution to force us to change something when we're all sitting right there wanting to get it done, what the heck, why can't we can get right out there and change it right there.

So I got an idea for a show where my candidates are gonna get out in the field, they're gonna operate, they're gonna create change, they're gonna create their own institutions, they're gonna come up with their own ideas and their own problems to solve. They're gonna get out there and prove their worth to us. We're not gonna elect someone who's a gamble on changing the world. We're gonna elected someone who's out there doing it. The person we want to put the most weight behind is the one who's already out there making a difference, and we're gonna make a profit doing it. That's basically what Clandestine Candidate is all about.

Who can vote, how do we vote on Clandestine Candidate?,, well Clandestine Candidate is a 24 hour a day show where contestants go into their new work environment, they live there, they sleep there, they eat there, they debate there, they live amongst each other. We watch then on Youtube, we watch them on live feed closed circuit TV,, and we regularly poll the audience on anything and everything about the candidate, about the issues, about anything that we want feedback on in order to feed it back to the American people, feed it back to our candidates. We're gonna poll on everything and everything is gonna be out in the open. We're gonna have experts to support the truth about whatever issues are being debated, and historians. We're gonna have people from the audience who are experts on everything that could possibly be debated. So the candidates, they're not just gonna be able to make promises based on a bunch of misinformation that the government has given to them, or they researched themselves, or think sounds good enough to get out there and sell us a bunch of ideas that got no foundation in reality in the first place.

So we're gonna get down to business. These contestants are gonna get out there and compete in a reality TV show that's about the real world, about facts, not about philosophies but about reality. Our candidates will be presented with challenges of all kinds of different sorts to prove themselves in all the different kinds of arenas like what they might encounter in the real world as president. The audience will vote on who will win those challenges. The winners of the challenges will get more funding than the other candidates from the show.

The funding will come from profits made by the show paid by the sponsors of the show. And the public will be able to donate money to their candidate. So let's say you gotta candidate out there that has an initiative that's working, that's changing something, that's making something happen out there in the world that's positive without the aid of government, without the aid of being president, without the aid of sitting in the Oval Office making phone calls and dirty back door deals selling out our future just to get something good done now and then so they can win reelection. And you wanna put some money behind it, or a big corporation wants to get behind it, well we'll have that all set up.

We're gonna take donations and it's not gonna be for campaigning, it's gonna be for making things happen, so the person who gets elected will have a proven track record that they put together in front of us that we've seen firsthand, that we've watch 24 hours a day for months on end. We know he or she ain't sneaking around in no bathrooms tapping his foot trying to have some kind of perverted clandestine meeting with somebody he don't know. We're gonna know about these people, we're gonna dig into their backgrounds, we're gonna interview their families, we're gonna monitor their lives, we're gonna bug their phones, we're gonna regulate how they live their lives. We're gonna create candidates run by and for the people, not a government that runs its people by and for itself.

Now once we elect somebody, our cameras will stick with them if he gets into the White House or if he doesn't get into the White House. If somebody else gets elected to the White House and our candidate doesn't, they can still keep doing their good work and our cameras can be right there to follow them along with providing funding and support of any kind. This will be a person with a voice, a



powerful voice, a show with a powerful voice. So if our Clandestine Candidate doesn't win the election, he or she still there to address all the issues. So anything that whoever does go to the Whiter House wants to bring up and sneak by us, we gotta whole new way of looking at reality, we gotta whole new way of digging down to the facts and getting the American people motivated.

This show isn't just going to be educational and political, it's gonna be fun, its gonna be entertaining, this is gonna be about real people. The candidates don't have to wear suits and ties, they don't have to speak perfect English, they don't have to be polite, they don't have to be over 18. They can be 12 years old. You could be from Ethiopia and don't speak English, all you have to do is create a video, put it on Youtube, let me know that you gotta Clandestine Candidate video that you want to entered into the contest, and I'll put a link to it in my "favorites" at (Youtube account closed). That way people can come to it and check out what you have to say. In addition to that, at ClandestineCandidate.com (no longer available ), I'll put a link to your video and webpage if you have one. If you have writing or information that you wanna make the public aware of, you can send it to me and I'll create you a page at ClandestineCandidate.com (no longer available) and post it there for.

I doesn't matter who you are,, if you gotta serious issue,, in fact it don't have to be serious,, it can be anything, it can be not serious, it can be something you think is serious that other people might not think is serious. I think it's all serious. I think individuals are what's important, that's where the future lies, that's where the answers for what we need to do will come from, from individuals, from simple people who learn to be complex, from complex people who are willing to address the future from a little bit simpler perspectives, although Clandestine Candidate is a lot more complex than the election process we're presented with now,

Clandestine Candidate is going to be an ongoing process. So we're going to always make sure we have interesting people on the show. We're gonna make sure the American people are there watching the show. We're going to have serious candidates, we're going to have not serious candidates, we're going to have funny candidates, and we're going to have serious candidates that are funny. And we're going to keep this process going so that all eyes are always on the political ball so we always know where the game is.

So if our candidate doesn't win the White House, we got a new way to keep an eye on who's in the White House, a new person to keep an eye on who's in the White House, kind of like a prince of America. And if our candidate does win the White House, our cameras will follow him or her through the process, and keep raising money, and keep supporting their initiatives without having to go to government. We'll pay their paycheck and give them what they need to make their initiatives come true,, and they'll already know who they answers to, they answer to their audience, they answer to the American people, they answer directly to the voters on everything on a daily basis, on minute by minute, moment to moment basis.

So what I need to make Clandestine Candidate a reality is some candidates. I need people who wanna participate on Youtube that I can put on TV during

prime time hours at a major network who the American people are gonna wanna hear from. I need contestants, and in order to get that, I need you to post your video on your Youtube pages, forward me the links too it, let me comment on them and post your links on ClandestineCandidate.com (no longer available). Then tell your friends about it. I need people to view the contestant's videos to find out where they're coming from and comment on their issues. Once we've drawn enough attention to what we're doing here, once this whole idea starts to grow and we attract the attention of a major network, we'll choose some candidates and get the ball rolling“