

Book Reviews

The Revolution: A Manifesto, by Ron Paul, 173 pp, hardcover, \$21, ISBN-10: 0-446-53751-9, New York, N.Y., Grand Central Publishing, 2008.

The Constitution is like the elephant at the tea party that everyone pretends not to notice.

The principles enshrined in the Constitution do not change.

Gold cannot be mined as cheaply as Federal Reserve notes can be printed.

Ron Paul

Dr. Ron Paul is an obstetrician and congressman from Texas who is known in Congress as “Dr. No” because of his adherence to his oath of office to support the U.S. Constitution.

In *Revolution* he exposes a wide spectrum of unconstitutional, tyrannical government programs that result from legislative and executive misdeeds, and shows that there is an alternative to our approaching national bankruptcy. Paul believes we should achieve our goals through reason and persuasion instead of through threats and coercion. He opposes the immoral system by which we use government to exploit our fellow citizens on behalf of our own selfish ends.

A silly, comic-book version of history—that big business is evil, monopolies hurt us, and the free market is wicked—is designed to make citizens terrified of the free market and to condition them to accept the ever-growing burdens that the political class imposes on the private sector. According to Frederick Bastiat in *The Law*, c. 1850, we can take three approaches to legal plunder:

- 1—The few plunder the many.
- 2—Everybody plunders everybody.
- 3—Nobody plunders anybody.

Hidden from the average American citizen are the huge economic successes of the past 50 years that have resulted from the extraordinary workings of the free market, the great engine of human well-being that everyone is taught to hate. Never before in history have so many people enjoyed such large rises in their standards of living. For example, between 1978 and 1998, poverty

in India fell from 51% to 26%, while in China it fell from 28% to 9%. “Extreme poverty” in the world fell from more than 80% in 1820 to 50% by 1950, and to 24% by 1992, all because of the market economy.

Creating more capital is the only way to increase everyone’s standard of living. Increasing the amount of capital per worker enables the worker to produce more with less cost. By levying taxes or restricting trade, government sabotages this critical process of wealth creation. Wealth creation is enhanced by free trade, but free trade does not require treaties between governments, such as NAFTA, that are 20,000 pages long. Free trade occurs in the *absence* of government intervention.

Central economic planning has long ago been discredited. Yet even as Americans claim devotion to the free market, we centrally plan our monetary system, the very heart of the economy. Paul exposes the immoral inflation created by the Federal Reserve, which redistributes wealth from the poor and middle classes to the politically well connected, through what are known as distribution, or Cantillon effects. Those who get the new money first—government contractors and big banks—benefit before prices have yet risen throughout the economy, while the average person loses economically. Since 1913, when the Federal Reserve Act was passed, the Fed’s inflation has increased the cost of a \$100 item to \$2,014 today.

For many years Paul has warned that foreign interventionism is of no benefit to American citizens, but instead is a threat to our liberties. Until the U.S. invasion in 2003, Iraq had never had a terrorist suicide attack in its entire history, Paul writes, referring to Robert A. Pape’s 2005 book *Dying to Win: the Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*. In Lebanon, between 1982 and 1986 there were 41 terrorist suicide attacks. After the U.S., France, and Israel withdrew from Lebanon, there were no more attacks.

Foreign interventionism is bankrupting us and making us less secure. Were it not for the neoconservatives, the false conservatives who led us into the Iraq mess, America would now be trillions of dollars richer, Iraqi society would not be in shambles, and thousands of Americans soldiers and countless Iraqis would still be alive.

Paul believes we need “a humble foreign policy, no nation building, and no policing the world.” We maintain 700 bases around the world and have kept troops in Korea, Europe, and Japan for more than five decades. We still keep 64,000 troops in Germany. Cutting back on this overseas empire could save hundreds of billions of dollars from the nearly \$1 trillion it costs us every year, and would allow us to transition out of our welfare-state programs of Social Security and Medicare, which are poised to consume the entire federal budget by 2040.

A decent society never accepts or justifies torture, which dehumanizes both torturer and victim, and rarely produces any reliable intelligence. In a dangerous threat of unchecked executive power, President Bush has claimed that he retains the power to engage in torture regardless of congressional statutes to the contrary. In the case of Jose Padilla, Bush abducted an American citizen on American soil, declared him an “enemy combatant” (a charge the accused cannot contest because it was rendered by the president in secret and is not reviewable), detained him indefinitely, denied him legal counsel, and subjected him to torture.

Executive power has expanded beyond the Constitution. An executive order is a command issued by the president that has not been passed by Congress. It is from his authority alone. It may be distributed without notice, and executed in stealth. Another little-known executive abuse involves the use of “presidential signing statements,” wherein the president announces his intention of not enforcing the provision in question. Here, as law professor Jonathan Turley notes, the president becomes “a government unto himself.”

Nowhere in the Constitution is government given the power to conscript citizens. The draft is a totalitarian institution based on the idea that the government owns you and can dispose of your life. As early as 1814, Daniel Webster described the military draft as an attempt to “extract slavery from substance of a free government.” Paul believes that young people are not raw material to be employed by the political class, and that their lives are not the playthings of government.

The income tax implies the same thing as the military draft: government owns you and allows you to keep a percentage of the fruits of your labor, as it chooses. This idea is not compatible with the principles of a free society. Paul believes we should abolish the income tax and replace it, not with a national sales tax, but with nothing. This would cut government revenue by about 40%, a level that existed way back in—1997. The economy would become so robust and dynamic that it would shatter all expectations.

An especially tragic federal program, in Paul's view, is the war on drugs, which is based on lies, bigotry, and ignorance. Over the past two decades more citizens have been imprisoned on drug offenses than for all violent crimes put together, while our civil liberties have been continually eroded. Nonetheless, the government has been unable even to keep drugs out of prisons, which are surrounded by armed guards.

The law cannot make a wicked person virtuous. As Thomas Sowell notes, "... we are not God ... we cannot ... save people who don't want to be saved, and [we should] take the profits out of drugs by decriminalizing them. That is what destroyed the bootleggers' gangs after Prohibition was repealed." Paul believes that drug abuse is a medical problem and that the federal government should get out of the picture and leave the issue to the states.

In 2004 a presidential initiative, the New Freedom Commission on Mental Health, recommended forced mental health screening for all American children, beginning in preschool. Some 2.5 million children already are being given psychotropic drugs. This number increased by 300% from 1991 through 1995, and by another 500% from 1995 to 2002. Parents have actually been threatened with child-abuse charges if they refuse to drug their children. Paul asks, "What kind of free people would turn their children's most intimate health matters over to government strangers?"

In most other industries, technology leads to lower prices. But not in medicine, where government-mandated price-fixing and managed care, such as Medicare and HMOs, have been forced upon us. Half a million Americans traveled overseas in 2005 to get high-quality, inexpensive health care (that costs 60% less than in the U.S.). Paul believes we can escape this government-imposed system through the growth of medical savings accounts.

In spite of the widespread government tyranny documented in *Revolution*, Paul believes that freedom is ours for the taking. The last line of defense in support of freedom and the Constitution consists of the people themselves. He suggests that we promote an us-vs.-them issue of *all* the people vs. the government, which loots and lies to us, threatens our liberties, and shreds our Constitution.

We are engaged in a great battle of ideas, and our choices could not be clearer. Economic freedom and personal liberty are not divisible, but Americans are economically illiterate. Paul agrees with Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises, who admonishes that no one can evade his personal responsibility to learn economics, which is the philosophy of human life and action that concerns everybody and everything. It is the "main and proper study" of every citizen, and the fate of every man is at stake.

Read *Revolution* and learn some economics. See whether you agree with Paul. Then join and support organizations that will promote your ideas. You might even consider writing in a freedom-supporting candidate, instead of voting for one of the collectivist candidates who will be listed on the ballot this November.

Jerome C. Arnett, Jr., M.D.
Helvetia, W.V.

If Democrats Had Any Brains, They'd Be Republicans, by Ann Coulter, 274 pp, hardback, \$24.95, ISBN: 978-0-307-35345-0, New York, N.Y., Crown Forum, 2007.

*"All liberals are the enemy."
"...[A]nimalkind has never developed a better mechanism for destroying civilization than liberalism."*

Ann Coulter

This is an outrageous (if you are a liberal) or a delightful (if you are a conservative) collection of Coulterisms that deal with many of the problems we face today because of our sick popular culture.

Ann Coulter is the #1 New York Times best-selling author of *Slander*, *Treason*, *How to Talk To A Liberal (If You Must)*, and *Godless*. Here in her own words are her unbiased observations on:

Liberals

On the seventh day, God rested and liberals schemed.

Liberalism is a mental defect. It's as if all the brain-damaged people in America got together and formed a voting bloc.

Liberals are clueless, amoral sexual degenerates, Communists, and pacifists.... They want mass infanticide, zero population growth, reduced standards of living, and vegetarianism. Most crucially, they want Americans to stop their infernal deodorant use.

By openly admitting to being philanderers, draft dodgers, liars, weasels, and cowards, liberals avoid ever being hypocrites.

Liberals don't read books—they don't read anything. That's why they're liberals. They watch TV, absorb the propaganda, and

vote on the basis of urges. Liberals have been wrong about everything in the last half-century.

Some liberals have become even too crazy for Texas to execute, which is a damn shame.

Liberals' idea of civil discourse is no conservatives talking. For liberals, changing words quickly metastasizes into changing facts. "Constitutional right" means "whatever liberals want." "...Free speech" means nothing but "shut up, we win." It's no wonder liberals' default argument is to throw food. When they win, they won. When we win, we cheated.

Historically, the best way to convert liberals is to have them move out of their parents' home, get a job, and start paying taxes.

Democrats

For more than fifty years, Democrats have harbored traitors, lost wars, lost continents to Communism, hobnobbed with the nation's enemies, counseled retreat and surrender.

The only important lesson from the Vietnam War is this: Democrats lose wars.

In the seventies and eighties, the Democratic Party decided to re-create itself by getting rid of all the normal people.

Just as Republicans have a social-conservative wing, a free-trade wing, and a neoconservative wing, the Democrats have a traitor wing.

This is a party that supports killing, lying, adultery, thievery, envy...and they're talking about evil?

Education

[Liberal students are] buffeted by a liberal media. They have liberal public school teachers. They go to college. They have liberal professors. They don't know how to argue. They can't put together a logical thought, whereas you could put a College Republican on TV right now and he can debate you ...

The only violence on college campuses these days occurs when people like David Horowitz and me show up to give a speech in defense of America. Then we need bomb-sniffing dogs and a lecture hall lined with armed police. But a Talibanist goes about his day at Yale unmolested.

Islam

Muslims are the only group who kill because they're angry [because] people have called them violent.

[Since liberals demand] that Americans...proclaim, "Islam is a religion of peace," Muslims might do their part by not killing people all the time.

Global Warming

In general, Hollywood actors don't know any facts—but they are 100 percent

committed! Crazy liberal obsessions like global warming take on a life of their own once some idiot celebrity takes up the cause.

It is not an accident that, today, the Left's single biggest cause is "global warming." This time, conservatives won't be able to prove them wrong for a thousand years.

Gun Control

Only one policy has ever been shown to deter mass murder: concealed-carry laws.

Mass murderers apparently can't read, since they are constantly shooting up "gun-free zones." With no armed citizen to stop them—because law-abiding citizens are obeying the "Gun-Free Zone" signs—murderers are able to kill unabated....

Joe McCarthy

Lost amid all the mandatory condemnations of Joe McCarthy's name—he gave anti-Communism a bad name, did a disservice to the cause, was an unnecessary distraction—the little detail about his being right always seems to get lost.

The principal result of being called a Soviet spy by McCarthy was you got to teach at Harvard.

Bill Clinton

I didn't particularly mind [Clinton's] policies, largely because he didn't have any—if you don't count felony obstruction of justice.

Hillary Clinton

Even when she's throwing lamps and cursing like a sailor, she's ethnically sensitive.

Who would you rather live under, me, or Hillary Clinton? I wouldn't tell you [that] you couldn't enjoy a little tobacco pleasure at a bar.

Michael Moore

If the death penalty doesn't deter murder, how come Michael Moore is still alive and I'm not on death row?

Read this book to see how liberals promote America's self-destruction.

Jerome C. Arnett, Jr., M.D.
Helvetia, W.Va.

Climate Confusion: How Global Warming Hysteria Leads to Bad Science, Pandering Politicians and Misguided Policies that Hurt the Poor, by Roy W. Spencer, 191 pp, hardback, \$21.95, ISBN-10: 1-59403-210-6, Encounter Books, 2008.

Most books whose theme is that climate change is caused by human emissions of carbon dioxide repeat dogma based on misleading temperature records and

misleading records of the carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere.¹ Most of the 100 or so books taking the opposite and more optimistic position concentrate on the science. Many address the motivations of climate alarmists in addition to the science. *Climate Confusion* has solid science on how weather operates, but most space is devoted to climate alarmist motivations, biases, and social networks.

Roy W. Spencer received his Ph.D. in meteorology in 1981, was co-developer of the original satellite method for measuring atmospheric temperatures from orbiting satellites, was a senior scientist for climate studies at NASA, and is a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama, Huntsville. He was careful to note that his research funding was from NASA, not Exxon Mobil, despite frequent accusations by climate alarmists. He also wrote that no fuel company has ever asked him for help.

This book was intended to be, and is humorous, with irony, ridicule, and sardonic cartoons. There is an index, but for the intended audience of educated nonscientists, no citations. A long, accurate explanation of how science works, how predictions often fail, and the severe limitations of computer models of climate, whose predictions have failed, is followed by the most detailed explanation of how weather works that I, not being a meteorologist, have ever seen.

Much of the book is quotable. From p 37: "We scientists can usually be divided into two main camps—male and female.... But in contrast to most humans, who must provide useful goods and services in their jobs in order to earn a living, the government-funded scientist's job is to spend your money.... This tends to make most scientists relatively clueless about basic economics."

Spencer explains that research on "global warming" appears to support a man-made cause because this is what the funding was intended to support, abetted by groupthink. He comments on the ballyhooed 2004 study that claimed that, of 928 abstracts of articles dealing with "climate change," none disputed the "scientific consensus" that recent global warming, presumably from 1978-1998,¹ could be attributed to humans. He then noted that he has a stack of such non-consensus papers in his office (p 44), as do I.

Following the chapter on weather is one on how global warming and cooling works, with due respect to water vapor as the main greenhouse gas and the source of Earth's thermostat by making more or fewer sunlight-reflecting clouds, and by moving heat around by precipitating and then evaporating, leading to warming and cooling respectively. Spencer's expla-

nations are very clear. Spencer discusses problems in the thermometric temperature record caused by increasing urbanization of weather stations (p 83).

Chapter 5, "The Scientists' Faith, the Environmentalists' Religion" goes further than any other writing I have seen on the lack of consensus on the causes of climate change. Predictions of warming made in the late 1980s were shown to have been exaggerated. "Some climate scientists act like they are doing something worthwhile for humanity by expressing alarm about global warming. Just like most environmentalists, they seem to think that risks should be reduced through more government regulation [based on unproven assumptions].... Several have said, in effect, 'Even if global warming isn't going to be a problem, reducing fossil fuel use is the right thing to do anyway'" (p 88).

The nonscientific decision to ban DDT use, resulting in the deaths of millions of Africans, is used a dozen times to show how "do-gooding" and political correctness kill people. On p 93 the intimidation of climate skeptics (who now prefer the term "climate realists") by climate alarmists was said to be dangerous. Ad hominem attacks on realists were said to accuse them of behavior as bad as genocide or tobacco promotion, while a major characteristic of alarmists was said to be their difficulty in addressing evidence.

Spencer then goes even further than Michael Crichton in showing how stubborn views, such as "evil" mankind causing global warming, are more characteristic of religion than science (pp 95-102). Spencer recounts an example of an alarmist calling for outlawing climate change denial (p 94). He cites pressure from Al Gore, the Royal Society of London, and the biases of the news journals *Science* and *Nature*. Rather than attacks, segregation, and ostracism, Spencer asks: "Why not put our [climate realist] claims in the spotlight and under the microscope, and show everyone the stupidity of our positions?"

The chapter "Economics 101" explains that everything has a cost and a risk. More wealth means more can be done to solve problems, and that capitalism and free enterprise generate the most wealth, even if it is unevenly distributed. The market system that allows the price of oil, for example, to rise, automatically causes individuals' demand to fall. Interference causes shortages, and Spencer gives the examples of California's fixing electricity prices, which led to blackouts in 2000. He notes that the EPA makes regulations with no regard to cost (p 120).

A chapter on the politics of climate change suggests that the federal government begin requesting climate research

proposals that fall into two equally funded groups: one to investigate climate destabilizing mechanisms (the alarmist view) and the other for climate stabilizing mechanisms (the realist view). Current peer review, Spencer says, is incestuous (p 127). Indirectly, he shows the continuing folly of having scientifically ignorant (or phobic) politicians, or their appointees, make policy decisions. He proposes that candidates for elective office should have had the experience of running a business.

Finally there are chapters on “dumb” global warming solutions and “less dumb” ones, even though Spencer wrote that there is no reason for climate panic. This includes the environmentalist and alarmist positions that *no* practical large-scale energy source is acceptable. And there is an excellent conclusion.

My only misgivings were Spencer’s failure to present either the carbon dioxide assays from 1812-1965 and the non-correlated global cooling from 1940-1978 and 1998-2008,¹ or the warming in the 19th century without much carbon dioxide from burning.² Also missing is the evidence that DDT was guiltless for thinning birds’ eggshells.³

But this book was written to persuade undecided nonscientists to see climate reality, for whom more facts may not be as helpful as the social commentary. I recommend the book, especially for your patients or schoolchildren who are terrified of “global warming” to the point of having nightmares.

Joel M. Kauffman, Ph.D.

Berwyn, Pa.

¹ Kauffman JM. Climate change reexamined. *J Sci Exploration* 2007;21:723-750.

² Robinson AB, Robinson NE, Soon W. Environmental effects of increased atmospheric carbon dioxide. *J Am Phys Surg* 2007; 12:79-90.

³ Edwards JG. DDT: a case study in scientific fraud. *J Am Phys Surg* 2004;9:83-88.

Medical Science Under Dictatorship, by Leo Alexander, M.D., 32 pp, paperback, \$7.35, ISBN-13: 978-0930429034, Bibliographic Press, 1996.

Dr. Alexander, who was chief U.S. medical consultant at the Nuremberg war crimes trials, originally published this report in the July 14, 1949, edition of the *New England Journal of Medicine*. Writing 4 years after the end of World War II, he examines the process by which the German medical profession willingly and without question collaborated with the Nazis.

He describes the “subtle shift in attitude” that led to the horrors of the

concentration camps “from small beginnings” that perverted the values of an entire society. Dr. Alexander “shows the consequences of disbelief in the sanctity of human life and the paramount importance of morality in politics.”

He writes, “Nazi propaganda was highly effective in perverting public opinion and conscience in a remarkably short time.... [I]n the medical profession [there was]... a rapid decline in standards of professional ethics. Medical science collaborated...in...the mass extermination of [the] chronically sick in the interest of saving ‘useless’ expenses to the community as a whole.”

Lay opinion was “propagandized by the motion pictures, one of which, entitled ‘I Accuse,’ deals entirely with euthanasia.”

Ideology was implanted in children using *Mathematics in the Service of National Political Education*, which included problems that distorted the costs of caring for and rehabilitating the chronically sick and crippled.

Dr. Karl Brandt headed the medical section directing the euthanasia program. Deciding which patients should be killed was based on brief questionnaires concerned mostly with how long the patient had been ill and how much his care had cost. Expert consultants, most of whom were professors of psychiatry in key universities, and who never saw the patients, decided who should die. Then, the “Charitable Foundation for Institutional Care” collected the cost of the killings from the relatives without telling them what the charge was for, and gave the family a death certificate with the cause of death falsified.

German youth, however, were not fooled. When they would see the buses with shades drawn haul the infirm to the gas chambers, they would call out, “They’re taking some more people to be gassed.”

“The technical arrangements, methods and training of the killer personnel were under the direction of a committee of physicians and other experts headed by Dr. Karl Brandt.” They found that Zyklon B cyanide gas was more effective than carbon monoxide.

Dr. Hallervorden, who received 500 brains from the killing centers, said: “Where they came from and how they came to [me] was really none of my business.”

Dr. Rascher introduced the term “terminal human experiments” to denote an experiment that resulted in the test person’s death. He developed the standard cyanide capsules. These experiments were designed to deal with political enemies.

Professor Karl Clausberg developed a method at Auschwitz by which he could sterilize 1,000 women in one day.

“The physician gradually became the de facto executioner, for the sake of convenience, informality, and relative secrecy. Even on German submarines it was the physician’s duty to execute the trouble-makers among the crew by lethal injections.”

Dr. Karl Gebhardt did heteroplastic transplantation experiments using whole limbs amputated from live prisoners—the prisoners deprived of a limb were killed by lethal injection.

Rascher, and others, were consciously and methodically manipulated by the SS by the age-old method used by criminal gangs—making those suspected of disloyalty clear themselves by participating in a crime that would definitely and irrevocably tie them to the organization. The SS called it *Blutkitt* (blood cement).

The subtle steps in changing physician ethics started with acceptance that “there is such a thing as a life not worthy of being lived.” The smallest step was the attitude toward sick persons who could not be rehabilitated.

Incredibly, the physicians of Holland saw through the bureaucratic message: “It is the duty of the doctor, through advice and effort, conscientiously and to his best ability, to assist as helper the person entrusted to his care in the maintenance, improvement and re-establishment of his vitality, physical efficiency and health. The accomplishment of this duty is a public task.”

Have we not been confronted with the question, “Is it worthwhile to do this or that for this type of patient?” Perhaps we see some of these same “small beginnings” today among Medicare directives and prior authorizations demanded by insurance companies, with the decisions made by “doctors” who have never examined the patient.

There is an eerie parallel between what Dr. Alexander wrote about Nazi Germany and what we see happening in the United States today. Indoctrination of students in public school systems, which have excluded both God and Bibles while promoting the preservation of “society’s limited resources”—at the expense of the individual and individual freedom.

The “standard” that some lives are unworthy of living is one we see increasingly applied to our most vulnerable people, either because they are consciousness impaired, or because of a “choice” made by others—more than 30 million times.

George R. Watson, D.O.

Park City, Kan.