

Lehigh Valley Common Sense Herald

THE PUBLIC VOICE ON THE CUTTING EDGE OF THE FUTURE



May 5, 2014 *** Newsletter *** Vol. 2014 -1

A JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

An Associated Newsletter of the Lehigh Valley Council For Regional Livability, Inc, ---P.O. Box 1136, Allentown, Penna. 18105. Telephone # - (610) 434-1229
Publisher, Managing Editor and President ---Dennis L. Pearson ...



Alexander Shumilin is the director of the Center for the Analysis of Middle East Conflicts with the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies at the Russian Academy of Sciences

Russia has managed to divert attention from Syria

Twice in the last six months, Russia has managed to divert attention from what had previously been the central focus of international relations: the conflict

in Syria. The first time was in September, when Russia averted a U.S. military strike against Syrian forces by proposing that Syrian President Bashar Assad instead eliminate all of his country's chemical weapons. That effectively shifted the world's attention from the country's ongoing and bloody civil war to the goal of "depriving Damascus of its chemical weapons arsenal." It also bought Assad time to gather strength, receive additional fighters and weapons from Hezbollah and launch a large-scale offensive against insurgents across the country. The second diversion occurred when Russia's actions in Ukraine altered the global security picture and pushed the Syrian conflict into the background.

Now, global players are most concerned about the unexpected appearance of a "European front" in Ukraine, where NATO and Russian interests come into conflict and their military forces stand at only a short remove from each other. That situation is of far greater importance for the world than what is happening in distant Syria.

Although these conflicts might appear unrelated at first glance, they have emerged as a result of several common factors. These include the desire of Russian leaders to counteract the Tahrir Square and Maidan-style uprisings that have toppled legitimately elected leaders and to assert a "new role for Russia that the West cannot ignore," their geopolitical interest in maintaining Russia's presence at its Black Sea port in Sevastopol and its Mediterranean Sea port in Tartus, Syria, and the desire

to mobilize and consolidate President Vladimir Putin's electorate at home. Putin's foreign policy "success" in fending off a U.S. bombing of Syria might have won him a dozen or so popularity points with voters, but the annexation of Crimea unleashed a flood of patriotic fervor that, with the help of state-controlled media, boosted his ratings to record highs and effectively drowned out all voices of protest.

Two other factors connected with Russia's stance on Syria have also played an important role in its approach to Ukraine. First, Moscow positioned itself as a "peacekeeper" in Syria, helping the "legitimate regime fight Islamist terrorists" — a role for which Putin was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. The Kremlin then expanded on that idea by claiming a desire to "save the Russian-speaking citizens of Crimea" — and possibly those in southern and eastern Ukraine as well — from the "pro-fascist forces that illegally seized power in Kiev." Of course, the means Moscow employed in Ukraine differed somewhat from those it used in Syria.

Second, Russia has come to expect a relatively restrained reaction from the U.S. and the European Union in response to what Moscow calls its peacekeeping and humanitarian operations in Syria and Ukraine. The West ultimately came to understand — or reconcile itself with — Russia's attempt to neutralize the "fascist regime" of former Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili during the Russia-Georgia war of 2008. Why shouldn't

the West respond in a similar manner to the current situation in Ukraine?

The problem is that Russia went much further in Ukraine than it did in Georgia and especially in Syria: It annexed territory formally owned by another country. This is the first incident of its kind in the postwar period since World War II, with the minor exceptions of former Iraqi President Saddam Hussein's brief but unsuccessful annexation of Kuwait in 1990, and the independent states of Kosovo, Abkhazia and South Ossetia. The result is that a qualitatively different situation has developed concerning Ukraine, one that, even with any further escalation, promises to persist long into the future. And that means the effects of the Ukrainian crisis will largely determine the outcome of the Syrian crisis.

The U.S.-Russia confrontation over Syria and Ukraine can develop in one of two ways. First, the two parties reach a tentative agreement in which they pretend as if international organizations remain unaffected by recent events and whereby they continue appealing to the United Nations Security Council and its related bodies concerning the situation in Syria. The advantage to this approach is that both Washington and Moscow avoid further aggravating relations over Syria when they already have their hands full with Ukraine.

According to this scenario, both sides would refrain from taking any drastic steps and would turn a blind eye to such "minor violations" as the Assad regime delaying the removal of chemical weapons and permitting

the monitoring of their production and storage facilities. Leaders would work for a sort of "Geneva 3" agreement while the Syrian regime conducts so-called "elections" in which, not surprisingly, Bashar Assad would once again emerge triumphant. Moscow and Washington would offer different opinions about Assad's "re-election," announce that their positions on Syria have not changed and accept a continuation of the conflict there on the grounds that the Syrians are "working it out between themselves." This approach is a losing option for the administration of U.S. President Barack Obama because his opponents will point to it as a sign of U.S. weakness in international affairs — the very problem Obama's critics claim prompted Moscow to feel it could seize Crimea with impunity.

In the second scenario, Washington tries to "get even" with Russia for its actions in Ukraine by taking a more forceful political position on Syria. But for that to happen, Obama would have to hold Assad strictly accountable for violations of his obligation to destroy Syria's chemical weapons, for the use of excessive force against civilians and other infractions. A great deal will depend on whether Obama continues to regard the UN Security Council as the highest body and final arbiter in such cases, or if he concludes that it is now defunct by virtue of Russia's actions in Ukraine.

In any case, Assad will doubtless draw his own conclusions from events in Ukraine. For example, he might very well conclude that, given the current state of world affairs and the lack of confidence he can have

in any security guarantees offered by outside states, it would be reckless to give up all of his chemical weapons and would make more sense to hide a few from the eyes of international inspectors.

He might also draw another lesson from Ukraine — that the preservation of a state's territorial integrity is no longer sacred and the highest constitutional duty of the president. That would make the idea of splitting Syria into two or more states no longer seem as improbable as it once did. And who knows, perhaps partitioning is a solution for Syria as well.

Blast from the Past 1992 --- JOGGER ON THE LAM ---

**by Dennis L. Pearson of The Common Sense Herald
Copyright (c) 1992 by Dennis L. Pearson *** ALL RIGHTS RESERVED}**

The new guy in the White House come January 20, 1993 sure knows how to win friends and influence people. Seems that the homeless one, in discussing the national deficit recently, seems determined to tap some of the surplus resources in the Social Security Trust Fund for deficit reduction.

You say, that is nothing new as the previous Republican Administrations have included the resources of the Social Security Trust Fund in the budget to make the deficit appear smaller.. That is true, but the previous Republican Administrations at least had the good sense not to blame the deficit problem on people living longer. And, the Republicans could not really do anything about curtailing the Social Security entitlement, as the majority Democrats in Congress might complain.

In response to the new reality that the majority Democrats are in complete control of both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, I ask --- Will they complain much about any attempt by the new guy to make changes in the basic Social Security law? The answer is no if the Democratic Congress assumes the role of loyal troopers. The answer is subject to debate if the Democratic Congress assumes a mind of its own and fails to follow orders.

The problem with bus caravan Bill is that as Governor of Arkansas he must have spent a lot of his time watching television. And one of the T.V. shows he might have watched had the following theme: A futuristic society had decided that it would no longer be responsible for maintaining the health and extending the lives of its most aged citizens. Therefore, citizens at a certain age were required to turn themselves in for termination proceedings. But not all citizens cared much for this new order. Consequently, a few attempted to flee that society in pursuit of a rumored society which offered sanctuary to those about to be terminated. Ruthlessly, this futuristic society resisted any attempt of its citizens to flee. Therefore, it hired enforcers of the age law to relentlessly pursue any and all citizens who attempted to flee the new order. Ironically, one of the enforcers of the new order went on the lam when his time neared...

Interestingly, Homeless Bill desires the establishment of a national health care insurance system covering the entire United States. One would think that one purpose of a national health care system would be to encourage a more healthier society by providing health coverage at an affordable cost. However, a more healthier society might allow people to live longer; and didn't the homeless one just complain that the trend of people living longer is detrimental to the goal of long-term deficit reduction... Makes one wonder what the real intent of a National Health Insurance Program really would be.

We can't help but notice that Bill Clinton appears to be an avid jogger. However, the source for this interest is less clear. Therefore, let us propose a theory. Bill Clinton spends much time in cross-country jogging because he is in boot training for the day he must go on the lam himself to avoid submission to the authority of the population control enforcers. And secondary, avoid the tentacles of the body parts snatchers who may be tempted once organ donations are made mandatory from the dead to gain quickened access to healthy body organs for their sickly clients. After all, what is expected of or good for other people is not expected of or good for William Jefferson Blythe.

Despite our criticisms of Homeless Bill, we do realize that the potential for future year crisis in the Social Security Trust Fund is possible. This is because the corner-stone of the 1983 Social Security "fix", engineered by Congress and the Executive Branch of governments, rests on a foundation that the wage growth of workers would fund both current and future retirement benefits. Unfortunately, if the foundation is set in sand or loose soil, the whole facade may crumble... Here's hoping that the foundation is set on proper pilings

The 1983 Social Security Trust Fund changed the age that I personally can receive full social security benefits from 65 to 66. Homeless Bill is considering raising the age for me and others to 67.

Interestingly, Senator Daniel Moynihan (D-NY), odds on favorite to become chairman of the Senate Finance Committee now that Senator Lloyd Bentsen (D-

Texas) is set to move to the treasury department, argues that the Social Security Trust Fund masks the true extent of the deficit problem. Moynihan views the next three years as providing perhaps the last window of opportunity to properly address the deficit problem. To quote Moynihan: " If we don't deal with the deficit, the deficit will deal with us.

Homeless Bill's transition team remains undecided whether his economic plan should raise the deficit in the first year to help stimulate the economy or whether it should finance itself completely in the short term.

Moynihan, whom identified himself with the Clinton cause in 1992, knows that the Democratic Party's promise to end what they term Gridlock in Washington will put much pressure on the Congress to produce positive legislation for Homeless Bill's "New Covenant." However, Moynihan on tax matters historically appears to differ with Clinton's proposed program. This is because Clinton's program seeks to reinstate the very same investment tax credit that was eliminated in 1986 exchange for lower income tax rates; and Mr. Moynihan was a key player in the passage of that landmark legislation in 1986.

Clearly, if Homeless Bill decides to push his proposal to raise federal tax rates on the wealthiest households, pressure will be also be exerted to raise the tax rates for corporation's as well. And that will add fuel to the debate over the merits of Clinton's limited investment tax credit to subsidize the purchase of new business equipment. Moynihan, termed by the Wall Street Journal as a democratic ally of Wall street, (Wall Street Journal, December 11, 1992) doesn't hide his disfavor for the tax engineering implicit in Homeless Bill's cap on corporate deductions for executive compensation.

This expected move by the Clinton economic team being the motive in the decision of the President of the Walt Disney Company to sell off part of his stock received in lieu of compensation.

Interestingly, one of the first tasks of the incoming 103rd Congress is to finish the work of the outgoing 102nd Congress by preparing a 1993 tax bill for Homeless Bill's signature. This rare opportunity arising due to a presidential veto. President Bush on November 4, 1992, the day after the presidential election, vetoed the Congressional Tax Bill of 1992 for fiscal yearx1993. The 102nd Congress being as it had already completed its business and formally adjourned for good, forfeited its right to consider an override of the veto. With the veto standing, such items like universal IRA deductions, more taxpayers rights before the IRS, and the repeal of some "luxury taxes" also died. President Bush squarely places the blame for this on Congress. For Congress added a mishmash of tax issues to an urban aid bill which in the eyes of the administration already suffered from an inadequate number of "enterprise zones "in the first place.

PUBLIC SERVICES CORPORATION REVISITED

by Dennis L. Pearson of the Common Sense Herald

Copyright (c) 1992 by Dennis L. Pearson *** ALL RIGHTS RESERVED }

News Item : Jeffrey Skinner, the Chairman of the Lehigh County Board of Commissioners, has recently suggested that the County of Lehigh put its newly constructed Industrial Wastewater Pre-treatment Plant on the real estate market. Well, should Skinner's suggestion be carried out, below is a suggested advertisement.

FOR Sale- --- Lehigh County Wastewater Pretreatment Plant, 7676 Industrial Boulevard, Allentown, Pennsylvania (Upper Macungie Township)... Plant currently operated by County of Lehigh, Pennsylvania and James M. Montgomery Operational Services, Inc., A Public-Private Partnership... Average Plant Capacity is 5.75 MGD, 76,500 lb./day BOD, and 25,500 lb/day TSS... Peak plant capacity is 11.05 MGD, 107,700 lb./day BOD and 35,790 lb/day TSS... Waste Sources : Industrial --- Stroh Brewery - 70% , Kraft Food Products - 10%; Trucked --- Various - 10%; Municipal --- Upper Macungie Township - 10%... Plant performance: Influent-- 1,000 BOD (mg/l), 500 TSS (mg/l); Primary Effluent --- 900 BOD (mg/l), 200 TSS (mg/l); Final Effluent --- 25 BOD (mg/l), 25 TSS (mg/l)... Interested parties should make inquires to the Jeff Skinner Realty Company.

Meanwhile in the City of Allentown, interested parties should contact the Allentown City Council if interested in acquiring title to the Allentown Health Bureau, the Allentown Human Relations Bureau, emergency services and Allentown's interest

in 911... Indeed - the opportunity is now as City Council would like to downsize its financial liabilities.

But that is not all ...In Allentown, City Councilman Lee Gaumer has broached the subject of the sale of the following parks in the Allentown park system: Trexler Memorial Park, Lehigh Parkway, Cedar Beach and Jordan Park... No mention is made how this would affect Allentown's annual contribution from the Harry C. Trexler Trust which pays among other things the annual salary of Don Marushak, the bureau chief of the Allentown Parks Bureau. But the sale or transfer of these particular parks would benefit those who favor regionalization of the City's resources. And the sale of these particular parks would end Allentown's environmental control over construction activities concerning the highways of wastewater that run through one or all of these parks.

Former Allentown Mayor Frank Fischl and Lehigh County Executive David Bausch outlined in a March 12, 1980 letter to the Allentown/Lehigh County Greater Community Council the concept of a Public Services Corporation as it might apply to Lehigh County. Based on a French model for providing a multi-functional metropolitan public services and/or facilities delivery system, it would involve the establishment of a broadly chartered private, not for profit corporation. In France, these are called SEM's (Societe des Economies Mixe) and can provide for many services including mass transit, water and sewerage, land development, etc.

The corporation would be structured much like a private sector corporation. A governing board of directors would be comprised

of both public officials and private sector representatives. The board as envisioned by Fischl and Bausch would be comprised of the following:

1. The Mayor of the City of Allentown;
2. The County Executive of Lehigh County;
3. The Chairman of the Board of Commissioners of Lehigh County;
4. The President of Allentown City Council;
5. The Lehigh County Administrator;
6. The Allentown City Administrator (See Note Below);
7. - 10. The presidents or designates of the four major corporations headquartered in Lehigh County; Air Products and Chemicals; Bethlehem Steel; Mack Trucks, and Pennsylvania Power and Light Company;
11. The President or designee of the Allentown/Lehigh County Chamber of Commerce.

(Please Note --- Allentown at the present time has no office of City Administrator. Therefore should this plan be revisited it must be determined whether the Director of the Department of Administration and Finance or the Director of the Department of Community Development or the Director of the Department of Public Works or whether the City of Allentown Cabinet Director would be the individual to fill this slot.)

The above Board would hire a corporate president who would manage the affairs of the corporation and be responsible for its day-to-day operation. Customer Committees would be created to "guide and direct" the corporation. For example, in the area of sewerage, the committee might consist of signatory community

representatives, voting on a weighted- basis determined by the service area population, municipal flow qualities or other criteria.

As stated in the Sewerage Task Force Report- of the Allentown-Lehigh County Greater Community Council of November 1980 the provision of multijurisdictional public services by a private entity should increase the cost effectiveness of such services. And whatismore significant savings should result as efficiencies of scale are employed, i.e. central purchasing and cost sharing. But dissenters of the plan in 1980 stated that regional experience with existing authorities then operating proved otherwise

Individuals associated with the mission of the Allentown-Lehigh County Greater Community Council were: David K. Bausch, County Executive, County of Lehigh; Frank Fischl, Mayor, City of Allentown, Dexter F. Baker, President, Air Products & Chemicals(Co-Chairman); Robert K. Campbell, President, Pennsylvania Power & Light Company(Co-Chairman); A.W. Pelletier, Chairman of the Board, Mack Trucks, Inc.; Anna Rodale, proprietor, An Ar Book Shoppe; Fred J. Jaindal, President, Jaindl's Turkey Farm; Philip I.Berman, Chairmen of the Board, Hess's Inc.; Harold G. Fulmer, President, H.G.F. Management Corporation, William Albert, President, Allentown-Lehigh County Chamber of Commerce; J.Walton St. Clair Jr., President, First National Bank of Allentown; Howard Loar,General Manager, Western Electric Company; Lolly Siegel, Supervisor, Corporate Policy and Procedures, Mack Trucks, Inc.; and Carl J. Feichtel, President, Merchants National Bank.

Individuals identified as members of the GCC Sewerage Task Force included: Robert K. Campbell, PP&L, Chairman; William J. Graul, Allentown-Lehigh County Chamber of Commerce; Robert P. Daday, PP&L, and Steward H. Stabley, Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.

Individual identified as Members of the Project Team of the GCC included: Thomas J. Shaughnessy, PP&L, Project Coordinator; Charles E. Anderson, Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.; Raymond R. Carmon, Pennsylvania Economy League; Richard A. Muessig, Pennsylvania Economy League; and Denise A. Tobolla, CPA, PP&L.

Individuals identified as members of the Sewerage Task Force Advisory Committee included: From the City of Allentown --- William H. Hansell - Business Manager, Harry Bisco - Director of Operations, James G. Schultz - Community Development Director; From the Lehigh County Authority --- Raymond R. Snyder - General Manager, Aurel M. Arndt - Deputy Manager; From the County of Lehigh --- Robert W. Fulton - Director of Planning and Development, Terry B. Schutten - County Administrator; From the Lehigh/Northampton Planning Commission --- Michael N. Kaiser, Executive Director, Allen R. O'Dell - Chief Planner. }

Among the advantages listed for the public services corporation by the Sewerage Task Force Report was the assertion that the corporation would operate on a less political setting. That in theory, it would be independent from anybody in its operation and administration... After Board approval, traditional business plans could be implemented without ongoing intergovernmental

conflict on regional issues. The private entity could also deal more effectively with various personnel issues that must be addressed in a more limited way in a government.

Also, another advantage of the public services corporation suggested by the report would be its ability to expand into other more traditional services as the need arises.

Fischl and Bausch identified six areas, other than sewerage, where there is potential for joint services delivery: data processing, emergency communications, water supply and distribution, parks and recreation; specialized public safety services; and public works.

As stated by the report there was one apparent disadvantage in 1980. According to the Internal Revenue Code at the time, as interpreted by the Philadelphia Regional Office, bonds issued by a private not for profit corporation would not qualify for tax exemption. This would affect the ability of the corporation to directly issue bonds for capital additions or improvements.

To circumvent, this problem, two operational options were offered by the Sewerage Report in lieu of direct purchase of the sewerage system by the corporation.

1. The corporation would contract with the signatory communities for operation and maintenance of the system. Ownership would remain with the municipalities. Current indenture agreement or agreements would remain unchanged. But an apparent strength, central control, would be sacrificed.

2. After the creation of a regional authority to finance the "buyout" of the system, the operating function could be leased back to the corporation. The not for profit corporation would be little more than an operating authority.

In the end the GCC Sewerage Task Force Report made this analysis of the issue and recommendation in regard to the public services corporation: " The GCC see merit to the Public Services Corporation concept. A broadly charged delivery system is a dramatic and innovative idea for the Lehigh Valley and could serve as a model for other metropolitan areas. Considerate of the present conflict between the City and suburban community on sewerage and the recent failure to establish a countywide health bureau (all municipalities except Allentown voted against it), the GCC feels multifunctional regionalism cannot be achieved in the near future. An effective regional sewerage authority should be established before undertaking the public services corporation concept. A working regional sewerage program will help justify expanding into other services."

We ask --- are the recent pronouncements of City officials in regard to transferring some of their services to another entity and the pronouncement in regard to the Lehigh County Industrial Pretreatment Plant by Lehigh County Commissioner Jeff Skinner a form of revisiting the dormant idea of creating a French-styled public services corporation in the Lehigh Valley

Reference: }

Allentown-Lehigh County Greater Community Council, u-
Sewerage Task Force Report- - --"Analysis of the Issues and
Recommendations", November, 1980, pp. 1-5 - 1- 6.}

THE QUEST FOR HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY ==PART 1

By Dennis L. Pearson
Copyright (c) 2009 by Dennis L. Pearson

All Rights Reserved --- No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission from the author.

Preface

PAN-AMERICANISM - THE CONCEPT

Introduction

Latin America is in the broadest sense, the western hemisphere south of the United States. In a more restricted sense, Latin America comprises those countries of the Americas that developed from the colonies of Spain, Portugal, and France. The name Latin America was devised because these three countries used languages derived from Latin.

II. Colonization

Beginning with the voyages of Italian-Spanish explorer Christopher Columbus in the late 1400s and early 1500s, Europeans sailing from Spain and Portugal reached, conquered, and colonized large areas of South America and Central America, and North America as far as the present southern border of the United States. They developed a highly bureaucratic colonial system and imposed their language, culture, and institutions on the native inhabitants.

The Roman Catholic church converted the Native Americans to Hispanic Christian culture and acquired large land holdings, and its clergy assumed important positions as governmental, financial, and spiritual leaders.

Spanish and Portuguese conquerors and settlers were few in number but superior to the Native Americans in military skills and weaponry.

Native Americans also were decimated by diseases brought by the conquerors. The survivors became a servile class that worked the mines and plantations. The colonists also imported African slaves. By the end of the colonial period, people of mixed blood formed the majority in many Latin American colonies.

A tiny corps of royal officials governed the colonies in collaboration with the clergy, landholders, and merchants. These European and American-born (Creole) families and bureaucrats dominated the majority population and controlled a centralized mercantile system. In the 18th century Portugal and Spain instituted economic and governmental changes to increase production and revenues in the colonies. These changes contributed to dissatisfaction among the Creoles and the masses. By 1825 all of Latin America, except Cuba and Puerto Rico, had renounced

allegiance to Spain and Portugal and had achieved independence.

III. Liberal Republics and Dictatorships

Political turmoil and economic decline characterized the early years of most of the new nations. By the mid-19th century, conservative dictators dominated the region. Liberalism soon triumphed, however, and many countries instituted modernization programs. Power generally remained in the hands of a small national elite. The United States became the principal market for Latin American exports. In the 20th century the United States intervened frequently in the internal affairs of individual states.

Despite modernization, national economies remained dependent on the export of raw materials. Although a small middle class benefited from industrial growth, progress was limited for the vast majority of Latin Americans, many of whom moved to cities but did not find jobs. In the early 1960s trading associations aimed to improve the region's economy. By 1977, faced with meager results, most of the countries were disregarding the trade agreements. The rapid rise of external debt during the 1980s and the rampant inflation that has plagued several countries are key problems facing Latin America in the late 20th century.

Several political changes have also affected Latin America since the 1960s. Military dictatorships have generally given way to democratically elected governments, although these governments tend to support their own interests, or those of elite groups. Most investment is still directed to the growing urban centers, leaving rural zones underdeveloped. In several countries the desperation stemming from poverty, governmental neglect, corrupt politics, and unrealizable

progress has stimulated regional protest movements. A number of governments have turned to brutal repression to silence the voices of protest.

Venturing into the unknown future ---A future that may or may not come

Road to Hope, Change or Disappointment by Dennis L. Pearson

(Compiled from 2008 to 2014)

(c)2014 by Dennis L. Pearson All Rights Reserved --- No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission from the author.

Part 1

The 2010 G-20 Toronto Summit was the fourth meeting of the G-20 heads of government, in discussion of the global financial system and the world economy, which took place at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre in Toronto, Ontario, Canada during June 26–27, 2010. The summit was initially proposed to be held in the town of Huntsville, Ontario, where the concurrent 36th G8 summit was hosted, by Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper. The town was later deemed insufficient to provide hospitality for the large number of G-

20 delegates and journalists, thus the G-20 summit was later finalized to take place in Toronto. And with that decision, a scheduled interleague series between the Philadelphia Phillies of Major League Baseball's National League and the Toronto Blue Jays of the American League was transferred to Philadelphia with the Blue Jays still being the home team. That happened because the Canadian government in consultation with its national security and police agencies as well as Provincial Officials expected a high degree of protest and opposition to the summit and thought it better to send the rematch of the 1980 World Series participants to Philadelphia. As it happened, Police arrested at least 1,000 people through the course of the summit.

From late May until late June 2010, Dennis Kennethsson, by himself took a land route across the USA covering the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Without any problem he crossed the U.S Canadian border into British Columbia stopping in Vancouver before taking the British Columbia Ferry to Vancouver Island to see the fabulous Butchart Gardens, Victoria, the Provincial capital British Columbia and a historic lumber mill way up north near Port Alberni. In a fortnight he re-crossed the U.S-Canadian border in reverse to see the state of Washington's Grand Coulee Dam which had its flood gate wide open due to high water from tributaries to the north in Idaho, Montana and Canada.

Historically, the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River during the Great Depression not only facilitated the employment of thousands of people but also provided an abundant source of cheap energy for the Pacific Northwest with the added benefit of fueling a long era of economic prosperity in the region.

Kennethsson in undertaking this fabulous journey achieved his long time goal of crossing the U.S. by land taking a northern route through beautiful land ... Even in a motorized vehicle it was indeed a challenge to slowly circle around a snowy passage in the Big Horn Mountains to get down to a lovely Wyoming Valley lowland to see a dying cousin. He had already been to the 50 States of the union plus Puerto Rico and American Virgin Islands and the former American Canal Zone in Panama. But what was so special about this land

journey is that he followed the route of Lewis and Clarke as best as he could. He had traveled the USA not in a Conestoga wagon nor in a Chevrolet as touted by Dinah Shore in her television show that ran from 1956 to 1963 but in a Ford Focus whose fuel efficiency had served him so well. Ford, of course, unlike Chrysler and unlike GM did not accept government stimulus money as handed out by the Obama Administration.

As described in Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, Walter Mitty is a fictional character in James Thurber's short story "The Secret Life of Walter Mitty", first published in *The New Yorker* on March 18, 1939, and then in book form in *My World and Welcome to It* in 1942. It was made into a film in 1947, with a remake starring Ben Stiller scheduled for release in 2013.

Mitty is a meek, mild man with a vivid fantasy life: in a few dozen paragraphs he imagines himself a wartime pilot, an emergency-room surgeon, and a devil-may-care killer. The character's name has come into more general use to refer to an ineffectual dreamer. The most famous of Thurber's inept male protagonists, the character is considered "the archetype for dreamy, hapless, Thurber Man".

Although the story has humorous elements, there is a darker and more significant message underlying the text, leading to a more tragic interpretation of the Mitty character. Even in his heroic daydreams, Mitty does not triumph, several fantasies being interrupted before the final one sees Mitty dying bravely in front of a firing squad. In the brief snatches of reality that punctuate Mitty's fantasies the audience meets well-meaning but insensitive strangers who inadvertently rob Mitty of some of his remaining dignity

Nobody is attempting here to rob Dennis Kennethsson of his dignity or say he is ineffectual here, but a wee bit of Walter Mitty dreamlike fantasies emerge here for he carries inside himself the muse that this trip just described was also an informational gathering expedition for a possible Presidential Campaign in 2012 or 2016. Indeed Mr. Kennethsson has run for political office before, but he never formed a campaign committee, never solicited for campaign money, never

spent that much money and, of course he never won. Yet Mr. Kennethsson never went away.

The ultimate defeat is giving up and it is clear that Mr. Kennethsson has not attached the white flag of surrender to the flag pole. It was not that Mr. Kennethsson was not qualified. In fact, he was very knowledgeable about the political offices he sought. Unfortunately, for Kennethsson he was not the favorite of the power brokers that supported candidates already on the inside and who also supported candidates who wanted to be on the inside. Thus to these people, Dennis Kennethsson has no appearance, he is invisible, he may well have been a ghostly spirit; and as a well-known gadfly among the local media , Kennethsson had the liability of being a much too honest man who did not formulate opinions just to please those who held the power. Maybe that was the reason he was not appointed to an municipal political office when vacancies occurred despite the fact he was more familiar with pending issues then those who were appointed.

But the truth is when appointments to political office are to be made Mr. Kennethsson not being a member of the coalition, the in-club, the groupie gang if you will is not on the list. Therefore, when he does apply it is like he committed the misdemeanor of trespassing. It is like he does not belong that he must be some sort of an undocumented intruder which he certainly is not.

In May, 1804, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark set out on an amazing expedition across the Louisiana Territory on orders of U.S. President Thomas Jefferson to see what he had bought. It has been over 200 years since then, and the bicentennial of this historic journey has come and gone. These true American heroes faced unknown people, harsh conditions and unexplored lands to secure a place in history as two of the world's greatest explorers ... And importantly for the emerging United States, its land mass had been crossed from the Atlantic to the Pacific --- from sea to shining sea. But in this life, learning does not end with the last test, note taken or paper written in a formal classroom. Learning continues in one way or another throughout our lifetime. And with Dennis Kennethsson this is also so. With open eyes and ears he toured the U.S. Department of Energy's Fermi National Accelerator Lab and the Argonne National

Laboratory in Illinois and a Boeing Aircraft Company Assembly line in the State of Washington. In Wyoming he visited the Buffalo Bill Historical Museum and natural wonders of Yellowstone National Park. Academically, Dennis Kennethsson has received a M.A. in History and holds a teachers certificate in history and social Studies. In his academic career he has taken many classes for credit and reaped a good deal of knowledge. But we remind you again that knowledge and professional development is not packaged just in a course or elective a certain state wants you to take. Dennis Kennethsson found usable knowledge at the places mentioned above and also in a Museum in Nebraska... And this bit of useful information would serve him well both in a classroom and in his visit to Western Canada.

From First Across the Continent - Sir Alexander McKenzie by Barry Gough Seeking the Northwest Passage and the fabled link to Russia, Japan and Cathay, Alexander McKenzie drove himself and his men relentlessly, by canoe and portage across the uncharted rivers, valleys and mountains of North America, Mackenzie's 1789 journey to the Arctic Ocean and his arduous journey to the Pacific in 1793 predate the Lewis and Clark expedition. By the age of thirty-one, Alexander Mackenzie had become the first white man to cross North America from the northwestern hub of the interior trade, Lake Athabasca to the Pacific Ocean. He had opened the continent to trade and expedition. Historically U.S. President Thomas Jefferson felt the need to keep the Port of New Orleans open to American Commerce. Therefore, control of the Port by foreign nations who could impose an embargo on the passage of American goods through this port was a problem. So Jefferson welcomed the opportunity to negotiate with the French agents of the Emperor Napoleon the purchase of the Port of New Orleans. But Jefferson was shocked when the French negotiators included in the package a much bigger deal at a very good price. Constitutionally, Jefferson initially felt that he did not have the power to make this deal. Consequently, Americans should be grateful that Jefferson overcame his initial concerns and made a deal for the region for the following reason: Had he not done so, the continent would have not been opened to Americans for exploration and trade. Upon leaving the Grand Coulee Dam, Kennethsson again entered Canada in the mountainous area of Eastern British Columbia ... He had little trouble with Canadian border authorities except this time two agents talked to him instead of one. Prior to this trip

Kennethsson could say that he been in all ten Canadian Provinces but none of the Territories. But admittedly his presence in Saskatchewan and Manitoba was rather miniscule in nature. But this time Kennethsson crossed the Canadian national park mountain passes into Alberta , left the mountains for the prairie, making a stop in Calgary, Alberta, Medicine Hat, Alberta , Regina, Saskatchewan and Winnipeg, Manitoba before seeking re-entry to the United States. In Regina, Saskatchewan, Kennethsson attended a Presbyterian Church Service, and visited a Royal Canadian Mounted Police Depot taking advantage of an invitation to tour the Depot's training grounds for new Mounted Police recruits. As it occurred, at the border point between Manitoba, Canada and Minnesota, United States Kennethsson was greeted by a female custom agent and asked the normal questions including a request to see his passport ... Then he was turned over to another female agent who asked similar questions and asked him to give her the car keys to open the trunk ... After that she requested that he drive his car to a parking space between the cones near the building ... And then go inside the building ... Wherein he had to give up his car keys, wallet and empty his pockets ... They already had his passport In the building he had to sit on a long bench ... A group of three gentlemen who were there as their boat was being inspected told Kennethsson to join the club. But soon these guys were to go outside to speak to an agent. Inside the building, there was nothing to read and if Kennethsson was thirsty there was no water and of course there were no vending machines.... But what did that matter, given that everything was removed from Kennethsson, he had no money anyway. As it happened the female agent got into Kennethson's car and drove it away to be searched ... They did not tell him why it would be searched ... They did not allow him to stand by and watch them search his car. And no one could blame Kennethsson if he was a bit disturbed by this ... Obviously they did not have a warrant showing just cause to do this ... All Kennethsson knew was as a White 63 year old Male driving his own newly purchased vehicle with PA license plates he was perhaps profiled to be stopped or on the opposite side - stopped because he was not profiled ... But he was not an enemy of the state and he had the right to object to them for treating him as one ... He was using his private transportation not some public transportation as an airplane, bus or train. What's more, he was not about to undertake a suicide or Kamikaze attack on anyone. And certainly, he was not an agent of

some foreign organization or nation. The truth is he carried with him no firearms, no fire crackers, no fishing rods, no alcohol, no cigarettes and no illegal substances and drugs ... Indeed he had with him his required doses of diabetic medicine prescribed by his doctor.... He was not smuggling in any material either for later sale in the U.S. to avoid tariff charges ... He did not carry with him a large amount of money.... The fact is he relied mostly on credit cards on this trip, even though he knew that Canadian banks and American Credit Card companies would add a currency conversion fee to the bill, and cashing of a small supply of travelers checks for back up ... Starting with only \$10 of Canadian paper money and a few Canadian coins, he returned to the U.S with only a few Canadian coins. His expenditures in Canada was mostly for lodging, food , gasoline and one oil change ... He spent very little for merchandise bought in Canada in which in today's world may or may not have been made in Canada anyway. He carried with him almost 3 and 1/2 weeks of clothes which also included cold weather clothes if the weather would turn that way. And too, he carried with him the necessary utility items for fleshing oneself up. It can be supposed that the most dangerous possession for some considering today's political environment was the Bible he carried in his Society of Professional Journalists satchel he received in Indianapolis in 2010. The fact is, Christians in Michigan and Minnesota have been arrested for Christian witness on complaints launched by Islamists in those states ... The same Islamists seeking the application of the law of Sheria in their communities

Sheria law comes from a combination of sources including the Qur'an (the Muslim holy book), the *Hadith* (sayings and conduct of the prophet Muhammad) and *fatwa's* (the rulings of Islamic scholars).

Under Muslim Sheria law, the clothes you wear, the music you listen to, and the television you watch would all be censored. Behavior in public is legally restricted and controlled. And Sheria is the ideal social system for those that preach Radical Islam.

In Arabic, Sheria means "the clear, well-trodden path to water". Islamically, it is used to refer to the matters of religion that God has legislated for His servants. The linguistic meaning of Sheria reverberates in its technical usage: just as water is vital to human life,

so the clarity and uprightness of Sheria is the means of life for souls and minds. **But in reality Sheria is an intolerant system that threatens the Western ideals of "liberty and justice for all". Sheria views non-Muslims as second class citizens, sanctions inequality between men and women, prescribes cruel and unusual punishments for crimes, and promotes a restrictive business environment that strangles the freedoms of capitalism**

Sheria. It's often associated with the amputation of limbs, death by stoning, lashes and other medieval punishments. Because of this, it is often thought of as draconian; and many people in the West view Sheria as archaic and unfair social ideas that are imposed upon people who live in Sheria-controlled countries.

Yet many Muslims hold a different view. In the Islamic tradition Sheria is seen as something that nurtures humanity. They see the Sheria not in the light of something primitive but as something divinely revealed. In a society where social problems are endemic, Sheria frees humanity to realise its individual potential

For Muslims, life did not begin at birth, but a long time before that. Before even the creation of the first man. It began when God created the souls of everyone who would ever exist and asked them, "Am I not your Lord?" They all replied, "Yea."

God decreed for each soul a time on earth so that He might try them. Then, after the completion of their appointed terms, He would judge them and send them to their eternal destinations: either one of endless bliss, or one of everlasting grief.

This life, then, is a journey that presents to its wayfarers many paths. Only one of these paths is clear and straight. This path according to Muslims is the Sheria.

Sheria does not dominate the rule of law today in western society, but dangerous elements of Sheria are rapidly creeping into institutions across the western world. Sheria has infiltrated major western financial institutions that now run Sheria Finance or Islamic Banking Divisions. Sheria ideology has a very real influence on the creation of public school curriculums and the publication of textbooks in the United States. Radical Islamists promote the idea that Muslim

communities should be subject to their own separate law. Sheria is currently practiced in Saudi Arabia, Iran and Sudan, three countries which are prone to terrorist influence and funding. But according to Radical Islam, Sheria should not be confined only to Arab countries. In Europe in particular, due to rising Muslim populations, there is a growing radical movement pushing for the introduction of Sheria. The goal of Radical Islam is to undermine western society, by destroying individual rights and freedoms. Those promoting Sheria seek to institute laws that oppose the basic human rights observed within secular, liberal, and democratic western states. The threat of Sheria has even begun to strike in the United States. Today you can find closed communities of Radical Muslims across the United States promoting Radical Islamic ideology and living under localized versions Sheria. Furthermore, Radical Islam has infiltrated American Corrections Departments, as convicted criminals are being converted en masse to Islam, oftentimes by radical clergymen. Due to the rapid population growth of Radical Islam in Europe, Sheria is already becoming a reality within specific regions.

As some Conservatives say radical Islamists think that Sheria law should be applied, even in the United States

Thus the headline in a Breitbart Report of August 6, 2012 : Obama Administration Paves the Way for Sheria Law. The story was written by William Bigelow

Bigelow leads off : "The most terrifying danger Americans face from a second Barack Obama term isn't the economy, which is scary enough." Then continues: "The most harrowing prospect is the Obama Administration's passivity in the face of attempts to introduce aspects of Sheria law into our legal system. Now there is strong and open evidence of the Obama administration collaborating with Islamist activists to ensure the path toward Sheria law is accelerated."

In evidence Bigelow cites ; "Just last week, Thomas Perez, Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice (DOJ) Civil Rights Division, was asked this question by Trent Franks (R-AZ), a member of the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on the Constitution: "Will you tell us here today that this Administration's Department of

Justice will never entertain or advance a proposal that criminalizes speech against any religion?"

Perez refused to answer. *Four times.* "

An article in the Daily Caller of 10/ 21/2011 attributed to White House Correspondent Neil Munro provided background information for the above confrontation:

" Last October (2011), at George Washington University, there was a meeting between DOJ officials, including Perez, and Islamist advocates against free speech. Representatives from the Islamist side included Mohamed Magid, president of the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA). The ISNA was an unindicted co-conspirator in a Hamas terror funding trial in 2008, as well as functioning as a Muslim Brotherhood Front. The leader of the Islamist attack was Sahar Aziz, an Egyptian-born American lawyer and Fellow at the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding, a Muslim advocacy group based in Michigan. At the meeting, the Islamists lobbied for:

- 1. Cutbacks in U.S. anti-terror training**
- 2. Limits on the power of terrorism investigators**
- 3. Changes in agent training manuals**
- 4. A legal declaration that criticism of Islam in the United States should be considered racial discrimination**

Aziz said that the word "Muslim" has become "racialized" and, once American criticism of Islam was silenced, the effect would be to "take [federal] money away from local police departments and fusion centers who are spying on all of us."

And what was the response from Perez and the DOJ officials?

Nothing.

That's right: no objection, no defense of our first amendment right to free speech.

In response, , Kennethsson answers respectfully to the background information: : "You got to be kidding!"

The point clearly made by Tim Brown of the Freedom Outpost in an article dated August 7, 2012 that: "The Obama administration obviously care that homosexuals can spout off about Christianity. They must believe that Muslims are OK to mock, openly ridicule and attack Christians, but look out if it should come to speech against Islam and pointing out its errors or false prophet!

Concludes Kennethsson: "Barack Obama would be doing great damage to the Republic if he forsakes our Constitution for principles of Sheria."

2 Thessalonians:3 --- " Let no one in any way deceive you, for it will not come unless the apostasy comes first, and the man of lawlessness is revealed, the son of destruction.

One of his missions on this adventure was to interview an individual who had worked in the Lehigh Valley area who had moved to Akron Ohio ... Therefore as the official interviewer for a non-profit historical group he carried along with him the equipment necessary to do this oral interview ... Luckily he carried with him his own equipment because if Customs officials had decided to keep this stuff the non-profit group would be out of this equipment.... This is the inventory ... Cannon Video Camera, Tripod, Standard portable audio tape recorder and two digital audio recorders. He carried with him two lap-top computers as well- one for the internet and one to store the still and video pictures he took on his Olympic digital camera which somehow became defective so he acquired a backup in the Chicago area. And in addition, Kennethsson carried a journalistic flip video camera also and this piece of electronic equipment received plenty of use as well. As one can see he had much electronic equipment but there is nothing wrong with this ...More than an hour passed before Kennethsson's car, possessions and passport were returned to him.... Upon inspection he noted that a cooler which contained diet Ginger ale and diet Pennsylvania Dutch Birch beer had been removed from the trunk and placed in the back seat of his car ... He had purchased this soda at the Giant in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. And of course, we

believe that nothing is wrong with this. Additionally he had in his car two cases of this Diet Birch beer which had not yet been opened ... But after his visit to customs he did indeed open them and put them in the cooler... But upon inspection, what he found was that one of the cans had been slicedHe can't say that customs had used a knife to test the contents ... But the reader should use their own judgment.

Ironically, Kennethsson's return from Cuba a few years later went a lot smoother. The Immigration agents at the portal gate in Miami, Florida just let Kennethsson back in, never bothering to check his baggage for items that would be in violation of the Country's economic embargo against Cuba. But in reality, Kennethsson wasn't hiding anything which would have been a violation of the embargo, And what Kennethsson saw in Cuba was a country entrapped in its past. A country whose people accepted a lower standard of living, housing stock that needed to be refurbished and updated, and economic control which stifled the economy. The revolution that Castro brought to Cuba did produce gains in education and in health care at a great cost to the human spirit. Surely, Mr. Kennethsson thought that this was not the model that the U.S. should pursue as we move forward into the undefined future.

There are Americans who bestow the virtues of unregulated capitalism and there are Americans who would if they could remove what they term as blot on American culture from the face of the Earth. Can these forces ever achieve accommodation. Says Fred Kramer in his E-South Newsletter # 19, February 2012 which is associated with the Jesuit Social Research Institute of the College of Social Sciences of the Loyola University of New Orleans:, Pope John Paul II in his earliest writing of his papacy attempted to distance the Roman Catholic Church from the dominant political and economic schools of both east and west. He harshly criticized the underlying ideologies of both liberal capitalism and Marxist collectivism and the devastating evil and destructiveness of their interaction.

Then, in *Centensimus Annus* (1991), Kramer said that Pope John Paul reflected on both socialism and liberalism in light of the fall of the U.S.S.R. and the dominance of capitalism on the world stage. He contends that Pope Leo foresaw the negative political, social, and economic consequences of the social order proposed by socialism,

including its suppression of private property [no. 12 in text]. Socialism's flawed anthropology subordinates persons to socioeconomic mechanisms [13] and is rooted primarily in atheism [13] and class struggle [14]. "Real socialism" was embodied in the oppressive regimes which fell in 1989. Their fall, John Paul says, was due to violations of the rights of workers (private initiative, ownership of property, and economic freedom) [23], the inefficiency of the economic system as a consequence of violating human rights [24], and the spiritual void created by atheism [24].

That said about socialism and liberalism, Kramer writes that John Paul II then turned his attention to capitalism and looking at the efficiency of the free-market.

Can we say that with the apparent defeat or retreat of real socialism that capitalism is the only model of economic organization or is there another model more effective for the times? Dennis Kennethsson knew that Pope John Paul II did not regard capitalism as the only model of economic organization left for the world to follow. He believed that the Pope had suggested that there should be another way but his understanding rightly or wrongly is that the Pope did not directly define that other way.

Fact is, Pope John Paul II wrote in his 1991 *Centesimus Annus* epistle (No.35): "We have seen that it is unacceptable to say that the defeat of so-called "real socialism" leaves capitalism as the only model of economic organization.." The Pope maintaining that it was necessary to break down the barriers and monopolies which left so many countries on the margins of development and to provide all individuals and nations with the basic conditions which would enable them to share in development.

One may ask, should capitalism should be the goal of the countries still making efforts to rebuild their economy and society after the fall of the Soviet Union and real socialism? Kramer points to what John Paul II once again replied in his 1991 *Centesimus Annus but this time point 42*.

Pope John Paul II writes: "The answer is obviously complex. If by *capitalism* is meant an economic system which recognizes the

fundamental and positive role of business, the market, private property and the resulting responsibility for the means of production as well as free human creativity in the economic sector, then the answer is certainly in the affirmative even though it would perhaps be more appropriate to speak of a *business economy, market economy*, or simply *free economy*. But if by *capitalism* is meant a system in which freedom in the economic sector is not circumscribed within a strong juridical framework which places it at the service of human freedom in its totality and which sees it as a particular aspect of that freedom, the core of which is ethical and religious, then the reply is certainly negative.

Kennethsson sees the Pope as hedging his bets on this issue. Kennethsson visions the image of a see-saw in which the Pope wants a balance between what economic gain is achieved by the structural system and what safeguards there are against systematic abuse. The Pope certainly would not want the weight of the enterprises participating in the structural end of the see-saw to prevent the safeguards from ever touching the ground.

To understand better what the Pope said here, Kramer warns us that it would be important to read this statement in full. He said that "many commentators quoted it in part and out of context, even going so far as to reverse the two alternative "if" sentences to end with the affirmative. Then too, he dismissed claims of ringing praises of capitalism or the moral vision of a political economy such as the United were at a best a new form of theological spin control and at the worst a form of market idolatry when judged in the encyclical's full complexity.

Says Kramer, John Paul's position, which was consistent with Church tradition, has been to criticize both socialism and capitalism, even the "new capitalism.

According to Kramer, Catholic social doctrine is not a surrogate for capitalism. In fact, although decisively condemning "socialism," the church, since Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum*, has always distanced itself from capitalistic ideology, holding it responsible for grave social injustices (cf. *Rerum Novarum*, 2). In *Quadragesimo Anno* Pius XI, for his part, used clear and strong words to stigmatize the international

imperialism of money (*Quadragesimo Anno*, 109). And in a more recent magisterium, Pope John Paul II is quoted to have said that after the historical failure of communism, he did not hesitate to raise serious doubts on the validity of capitalism, if by this expression one means not simply the “market economy” but “a system in which freedom in the economic sector is not circumscribed within a strong juridical framework which places it at the service of human freedom in its totality” (*Centesimus Annus*, 42).

So in the end Kramer claims that Pope John Paul endorsed neither capitalism nor communism, nor did he propose some third way between the two or some economic model of its own. Kramer simply offered that according to the Pope the church's proper contribution is Catholic social teaching which, in the prophetic mode that, "recognizes the positive value of the market and of enterprise, but which at the same time points out that these need to be oriented toward the common good" [43]. The 1999 discussion by John Paul II of “neoliberalism” in *Ecclesia in America*[56] added further weight to the argument that Catholic social teaching even before Francis was profoundly critical of current market-driven societies and the injustices which they perpetuate

John Cassidy in his article "Pope Francis's Challenge To Global Capitalism" that appeared in the New Yorker of December 4, 2013 described a papal exhortation as an official statement issued by the Vatican that ranks below formal encyclicals which are used to state the Church's position on things like abortion and contraception, but above a regular letter to the faithful. So what does Cassidy believe Pope Francis was doing in his APOSTOLIC EXHORTATION EVANGELII GAUDIUM OF THE HOLY FATHER FRANCIS TO THE BISHOPS, CLERGY, CONSECRATED PERSONS AND THE LAY FAITHFUL ON THE PROCLAMATION OF THE GOSPEL, in short known as the Joy of the Gospel in English. Pope Francis, who succeeded the arch-conservative Pope Benedict XVI,(Cassidy's description not mine) according to Cassidy was simply laying down some themes for his tenure, and the Pope ranges well beyond economics. He writes primarily about the meaning of the Gospels, the challenges facing Roman Catholicism—including a section on “Temptations faced by pastoral workers”—and the need for a renewed missionary impulse in the Church. “The joy of the gospel

fills the hearts and lives of all who encounter Jesus,” According to Cassidy the Pope begins the exhortation with the following words;. “I wish to encourage the Christian faithful to embark upon a new chapter of evangelization marked by this joy, while pointing out new paths for the Church’s journey in years to come.”

Cassidy writes that like many Jesuits, the former Jorge Mario Bergoglio is a doctrinal traditionalist, who puts great stress on the language of the New Testament. But he also has a vision of the Church as an institution that acts for, and on behalf of, the dispossessed—a vision that owes a lot to Saint Francis of Assisi, the thirteenth-century Italian who renounced his inheritance to tend to the poor.

But Deuteronomy 15:11 states: "For there will never cease to be poor in the land. Therefore I command you, ‘You shall open wide your hand to your brother, to the needy and to the poor, in your land." And, we see from this sage advice that wisdom in regard the poor also comes from the Old Testament...

Within the American experience, even during a time of War, President Lyndon Johnson using public money opened up his hands to his fellow American citizens and residents, to the needy and to the poor of this land when he announced his well intended War on Poverty during his State of the Union address on January 8, 1964. This legislation was proposed by Johnson in response to a national poverty rate of around nineteen percent. The speech led the United States Congress to pass the Economic Opportunity Act, which established the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) to administer the local application of federal funds targeted against poverty.

As a part of the Great Society, Johnson believed in expanding the government's role in education and health care as poverty reduction strategies. These policies can also be seen as a continuation of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, which ran from 1933 to 1935, and the Four Freedoms of 1941.

The popularity of a war on poverty waned after the 1960s. Deregulation, growing criticism of the welfare state, and an ideological shift to reducing federal aid to impoverished people in the 1980s and 1990s culminated in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, which, as claimed President Bill Clinton, "ended welfare as we know it." Prof. Tony Judt, the late historian, said in reference to the earlier proposed title of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act that "a more Orwellian title would be hard to conceive" and attributed the decline in the popularity of the Great Society as a policy to its success, as fewer people feared hunger, sickness, and ignorance. Additionally, fewer people were concerned with ensuring a minimum standard for all citizens and social liberalism.

Nonetheless, the legacy of the War on Poverty policy initiative remains in the continued existence of such federal programs as Head Start, Volunteers in Service to America, TRIO, and Job Corps.

And Deuteronomy 15:11 reminds us : "For there will never cease to be poor in the land. Therefore I command you, 'You shall open wide your hand to your brother, to the needy and to the poor, in your land.'" And, we see from this sage advice that wisdom in regard the poor also comes from the Old Testament...

Cassidy confirms that the poor have long been with us, and Catholic priests and lay workers the world over have long made great exertions on their behalf. But he laments: "All too often, though, this charitable work has coexisted with a Church hierarchy that studiously avoided critiquing the political and economic system that generates poverty and inequality."

As reported in Luke 14:12-14, Jesus has said the following about people who invite guests to luncheons and dinners: " " When you give a luncheon or a dinner, do not invite your friends or brothers or your relatives or rich neighbors , otherwise they may also invite you in return and that will be your repayment....But when you give a reception invite the poor, the crippled , the lame , the blind ...And you

will be blessed, since they do not have the means to repay you; for you will be repaid at the resurrection of the righteous."

And so it happened that a movement did emerge from within the Roman Catholic Church, during the nineteen-sixties and nineteen-seventies, in the form of "liberation theology"—a doctrine that placed helping the poor and oppressed front and center, with some detractors saying it was tinged with Marxism. Cassidy maintains, the Vatican stamped down on it, with Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, who eventually became Pope Benedict XVI, playing a prominent role. . With Cassidy now saying that Pope Francis seems intent on revisiting this debate. In the part of the exhortation devoted to economic matters, which runs to about twenty pages, he resurrects, and appears to endorse, many of the themes of liberation theology.:

But Dennis Kennethsson reminds us that Pope Francis is a Jesuit ... That for a Jesuit especially from South America he is said to be Conservative ... But Kennethsson also reminds us that Jesuits in South America within recent times have not been considered Conservatives

In regard to Economics Pope Francis writes:

IN TODAY'S WORLD In our time humanity is experiencing a turning-point in its history, as we can see from the advances being made in so many fields. We can only praise the steps being taken to improve people's welfare in areas such as health care, education and communications. At the same time we have to remember that the majority of our contemporaries are barely living from day to day, with dire consequences. A number of diseases are spreading. The hearts of many people are gripped by fear and desperation, even in the so-called rich countries. The joy of living frequently fades, lack of respect for others and violence are on the rise, and inequality is increasingly evident. It is a struggle to live and, often, to live with precious little dignity. This epochal change has been set in motion by the enormous qualitative, quantitative, rapid and cumulative advances occurring in the sciences and in technology, and by their instant

application in different areas of nature and of life. We are in an age of knowledge and information, which has led to new and often anonymous kinds of power.

No to an economy of exclusion

53. Just as the commandment “Thou shalt not kill” sets a clear limit in order to safeguard the value of human life, today we also have to say “thou shalt not” to an economy of exclusion and inequality. Such an economy kills. How can it be that it is not a news item when an elderly homeless person dies of exposure, but it is news when the stock market loses two points? This is a case of exclusion. Can we continue to stand by when food is thrown away while people are starving? This is a case of inequality. Today everything comes under the laws of competition and the survival of the fittest, where the powerful feed upon the powerless. As a consequence, masses of people find themselves excluded and marginalized: without work, without possibilities, without any means of escape.

Human beings are themselves considered consumer goods to be used and then discarded. We have created a “throw away” culture which is now spreading. It is no longer simply about exploitation and oppression, but something new. Exclusion ultimately has to do with what it means to be a part of the society in which we live; those excluded are no longer society’s underside or its fringes or its disenfranchised – they are no longer even a part of it. The excluded are not the “exploited” but the outcast, the “leftovers”.

54. In this context, some people continue to defend trickle-down theories which assume that economic growth, encouraged by a free market, will inevitably succeed in bringing about greater justice and inclusiveness in the world. This opinion, which has never been confirmed by the facts, expresses a crude and naïve trust in the goodness of those wielding economic power and in the sacralized workings of the prevailing economic system. Meanwhile, the excluded are still waiting. To sustain a lifestyle which excludes others, or to sustain enthusiasm for that selfish ideal, a globalization of indifference has developed. Almost without being aware of it, we end up being incapable of feeling compassion at the outcry of the poor, weeping for other people’s pain, and feeling a need to help them, as

though all this were someone else's responsibility and not our own. The culture of prosperity deadens us; we are thrilled if the market offers us something new to purchase. In the meantime all those lives stunted for lack of opportunity seem a mere spectacle; they fail to move

To sum up . Pope Francis' recent description of unbridled capitalism as a "new tyranny" that is crushing the lives of people around the world through an "economy of exclusion and inequality" maybe hardly radical in the context of the social teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Nor is his condemnation of rampant consumerism an alien idea at the Vatican.

Wrote Francis in face of Conservative criticism: "We have created new idols,". "The worship of the ancient golden calf has returned in a new and ruthless guise in the idolatry of money and the dictatorship of an impersonal economy lacking a truly human purpose."

As one of the Commandments of God say: "You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is on the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. You shall not bow down to them or serve them; for I the LORD your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing steadfast love to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments."

Fact is, according to Cassidy, the core of the Pope's critique is moral and theological rather than economic, and that is what gives it its power. Referring once again to the idolatry of money, the Pope writes:

Behind this attitude lurks a rejection of Ethics and a rejection of God. Ethics has come to be viewed with a certain scornful derision. It is seen as counterproductive, too human, because it makes money and power relative. It is felt to be a threat, since it threatens the manipulation and debasement of the person. In effect, Ethics leads to

a God who calls for a committed response which is outside the categories of the marketplace.

What might that response be? Once again, the latest heir to St. Peter according to Cassidy doesn't hold back:

Money must serve, not rule! The Pope loves everyone, rich and poor alike, but he is obliged in the name of Christ to remind all that the rich must help, respect, and promote the poor. I exhort you to a generous solidarity and to the return of economics and finance to an ethical approach which favors human beings.

Jesus said this concerning a rich young ruler in

¹⁷ As Jesus started on his way, a man ran up to him and fell on his knees before him. "Good teacher," he asked, "what must I do to inherit eternal life?"

¹⁸ "Why do you call me good?" Jesus answered. "No one is good—except God alone. ¹⁹ You know the commandments: 'You shall not murder, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not give false testimony, you shall not defraud, honor your father and mother.'^[1]"

²⁰ "Teacher," he declared, "all these I have kept since I was a boy."

²¹ Jesus looked at him and loved him. "One thing you lack," he said. "Go, sell everything you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me."

²² At this the man's face fell. He went away sad, because he had great wealth.

²³ Jesus looked around and said to his disciples, "How hard it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of God!"

²⁴ The disciples were amazed at his words. But Jesus said again, "Children, how hard it is^[1] to enter the kingdom of God! ²⁵ It is easier

for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God

Is Jesus saying, money must serve not rule?

Then too... Out of the Bible should be cited this verse for reflection before we proceed on:

Romans 16: 17-18 ... Now I urge you Brethren, keep your eye on those who cause dissensions and hindrances contrary to the teachings you have learned and turn away from them ... For such men are slaves, not of our Lord Christ but of their own appetites and by their smooth and flattering speech they deceive the hearts of the unsuspecting.

In this verse, the Apostle Paul admonished early day Christians not to be deceived by those who talk a smooth line. And Kennethsson knows that our society is abuzz with smooth talkers from the left and the right, and that, our media is full of talking heads that raise the level of conflicting charges and counter charges daily to the utmost disgust and confusion of most Americans. Some say that while we may talk to each other the reality is that we don't listen to each other and as a result there has been no real solutions to our problems. Politically we can characterize everything that is happening as a tug of war. One side is pulling one way and the other is pulling the other way and the twain seldom meets in agreement.

The following is the beginning of the future: The speech that Barack Obama made before a Chicago throng in Grant Park the night the America media conferred upon him the American Presidency.... The night that some in derision or admiration said he became the anointed one....

Hello, Chicago:

If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible; who still wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time; who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer.

It's the answer told by lines that stretched around schools and

churches in numbers this nation has never seen; by people who waited three hours and four hours, many for the very first time in their lives, because they believed that this time must be different; that their voices could be that difference.

It's the answer spoken by young and old, rich and poor, Democrat and Republican, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, gay, straight, disabled and not disabled -- Americans who sent a message to the world that we have never been just a collection of individuals or a collection of Red States and Blue States: we are, and always will be, the United States of America!

It's the answer that -- that led those who have been told for so long by so many to be cynical, and fearful, and doubtful about what we can achieve to put their hands on the arc of history and bend it once more toward the hope of a better day.

It's been a long time coming, but tonight, because of what we did on this day, in this election, at this defining moment, change has come to America.

A little bit earlier this evening, I received an extraordinarily gracious call from Senator McCain. Senator McCain fought long and hard in this campaign, and he's fought even longer and harder for the country that he loves. He has endured sacrifices for America that most of us cannot begin to imagine. We are better off for the service rendered by this brave and selfless leader. I congratulate him; I congratulate Governor Palin for all that they've achieved, and I look forward to working with them to renew this nation's promise in the months ahead.

I want to thank my partner in this journey, a man who campaigned from his heart and spoke for the men and women he grew up with on the streets of Scranton and rode with on the train home to Delaware, the Vice President-elect of the United States, Joe Biden.

And I would not be standing here tonight without the unyielding support of my best friend for the last 16 years, the rock of our family, the love of my life, the nation's next First Lady: Michelle Obama. Sasha and Malia, I love you both more than you can imagine, and you

have earned the new puppy that's coming with us to the White House. And while she's no longer with us, I know my grandmother's watching, along with the family that made me who I am. I miss them tonight, and I know that my debt to them is beyond measure. To my sister Maya, my sister Alma, all my other brothers and sisters -- thank you so much for the support that you've given me. I am grateful to them.

And to my campaign manager, David Plouffe -- the unsung hero of this campaign, who built the best -- the best political campaign, I think, in the history of the United States of America. To my chief strategist David Axelrod -- whose been a partner with me every step of the way. To the best campaign team ever assembled in the history of politics -- you made this happen, and I am forever grateful for what you've sacrificed to get it done.

But above all, I will never forget who this victory truly belongs to. It belongs to you. It belongs to you. I was never the likeliest candidate for this office. We didn't start with much money or many endorsements. Our campaign was not hatched in the halls of Washington. It began in the backyards of Des Moines and the living rooms of Concord and the front porches of Charleston. It was built by working men and women who dug into what little savings they had to give 5 dollars and 10 dollars and 20 dollars to the cause. It grew strength from the young people who rejected the myth of their generation's apathy, who left their homes and their families for jobs that offered little pay and less sleep. It drew strength from the not-so-young people who braved the bitter cold and scorching heat to knock on doors of perfect strangers, and from the millions of Americans who volunteered and organized and proved that more than two centuries later a government of the people, by the people, and for the people has not perished from the Earth. This is your victory.

And I know you didn't do this just to win an election. And I know you didn't do it for me. You did it because you understand the enormity of the task that lies ahead. For even as we celebrate tonight, we know the challenges that tomorrow will bring are the greatest of our lifetime: two wars, a planet in peril, the worst financial crisis in a century. Even as we stand here tonight, we know there are brave Americans waking up in the deserts of Iraq and the mountains of

Afghanistan to risk their lives for us. There are mothers and fathers who will lie awake after the children fall asleep and wonder how they'll make the mortgage or pay their doctors' bills or save enough for their child's college education. There's new energy to harness, new jobs to be created, new schools to build, and threats to meet, alliances to repair.

The road ahead will be long. Our climb will be steep. We may not get there in one year or even in one term. But, America, I have never been more hopeful than I am tonight that we will get there. I promise you,

There will be setbacks and false starts. There are many who won't agree with every decision or policy I make as President. And we know the government can't solve every problem. But I will always be honest with you about the challenges we face. I will listen to you, especially when we disagree. And, above all, I will ask you to join in the work of remaking this nation, the only way it's been done in America for 221 years -- block by block, brick by brick, calloused hand by calloused hand. What began 21 months ago in the depths of winter cannot end on this autumn night.

This victory alone is not the change we seek. It is only the chance for us to make that change. And that cannot happen if we go back to the way things were. It can't happen without you, without a new spirit of service, a new spirit of sacrifice. So let us summon a new spirit of patriotism, of responsibility, where each of us resolves to pitch in and work harder and look after not only ourselves but each other. Let us remember that, if this financial crisis taught us anything, it's that we cannot have a thriving Wall Street while Main Street suffers. In this country, we rise or fall as one nation, as one people. Let's resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity that has poisoned our politics for so long.

Let's remember that it was a man from this state who first carried the banner of the Republican Party to the White House, a Party founded on the values of self-reliance and individual liberty and national unity. Those are values that we all share. And while the Democratic Party has won a great victory tonight, we do so with a measure of humility and determination to heal the divides that have held back our

progress. As Lincoln said to a nation far more divided than ours: "We are not enemies but friends...." "Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection."¹

And to those Americans who -- whose support I have yet to earn, I may not have won your vote tonight, but I hear your voices. I need your help. And I will be your President, too.

And to all those watching tonight from beyond our shores, from parliaments and palaces, to those who are huddled around radios in the forgotten corners of the world, our stories are singular, but our destiny is shared, and a new dawn of American leadership is at hand.

To those -- To those who would tear the world down: We will defeat you. To those who seek peace and security: We support you. And to all those who have wondered if America's beacon still burns as bright: Tonight we've proved once more that the true strength of our nation comes not from the might of our arms or the scale of our wealth, but from the enduring power of our ideals: democracy, liberty, opportunity, and unyielding hope.

That's the true genius of America: that America can change. Our union can be perfected. What we've already achieved gives us hope for what we can and must achieve tomorrow.

This election had many firsts and many stories that will be told for generations. But one that's on my mind tonight's about a woman who cast her ballot in Atlanta. She's a lot like the millions of others who stood in line to make their voice heard in this election except for one thing: Ann Nixon Cooper is 106 years old.

She was born just a generation past slavery; a time when there were no cars on the road or planes in the sky; when someone like her couldn't vote for two reasons: because she was a woman and because of the color of her skin.

And tonight, I think about all that she's seen throughout her century in America -- the heartache and the hope; the struggle and the progress; the times we were told that we can't, and the people who pressed on with that American creed: Yes we can.

At a time when women's voices were silenced and their hopes dismissed, she lived to see them stand up and speak out and reach for the ballot: Yes we can.

When there was despair in the dust bowl and depression across the land, she saw a nation conquer fear itself with a New Deal, new jobs, a new sense of common purpose: Yes we can.

When the bombs fell on our harbor and tyranny threatened the world, she was there to witness a generation rise to greatness and a democracy was saved: Yes we can.

She was there for the buses in Montgomery, the hoses in Birmingham, a bridge in Selma, and a preacher from Atlanta who told a people that "we shall overcome": Yes we can.

A man touched down on the moon, a wall came down in Berlin, a world was connected by our own science and imagination.

And this year, in this election, she touched her finger to a screen, and cast her vote, because after 106 years in America, through the best of times and the darkest of hours, she knows how America can change: Yes we can.

- **America, we have come so far. We have seen so much. But there is so much more to do. So tonight, let us ask ourselves -- if our children should live to see the next century; if my daughters should be so lucky to live as long as Ann Nixon Cooper, what change will they see? What progress will we have made?**

This is our chance to answer that call. This is our moment. This is our time, to put our people back to work and open doors of opportunity for our kids; to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace; to reclaim the American dream and reaffirm that fundamental truth, that, out of many, we are one; that while we breathe, we hope. And where we are met with cynicism and doubt and those who tell us that we can't, we will respond with that timeless creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes, we can.

Thank you.

God bless you.....And may God bless the United States of America.

Thus ended the last official speech by Obama in what was the 56th Presidential campaign of the Republic... And with that, the 57th presidential campaign of the Republic would begin almost immediately as the nation and the world journeyed on the meandering road to 2012 . A road which would see two conflicting narratives of the Barack Obama administration emerge.1) Was Obama a skillful political player and policy visionary—a chess master who always saw several moves ahead of his opponents ? Or 2) Was he politically clumsy and out of his comfort zone—a pawn overwhelmed by events, at the mercy of a second- rate staff and of the Republicans?

