

Democratic Capitalism_ Profit or Plunder_

Mon, Jun 26, 2023 10:32PM 45:46

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

democratic capitalism, abuses, today, progressive, americans, government, climate, vote, gilded age, american, border, claim, liberal elite, science, system, america, amendments, moral high ground, democrats, fact

SPEAKERS

Keith



Keith 00:00

We are pleased to provide this text from our podcast. As you know, the spoken word is often less formal and sometimes less precise than a written piece that may be carefully edited. I have also been known to sometimes jumble my words beyond recognition! Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns -- and thank you for supporting "As I SEA It!"
Keith DeGreen



Keith 00:07

Welcome to as I SEA it, I am Keith DeGreen. Today our broad topic is democratic capitalism, profit or plunder. Now in this episode, I hope to pull together, some of the comments I've made in previous episodes to sort of tie a ribbon around for now are well supported, and I hope thoughtful defense of democratic capitalism. Well, let's start by talking about those greedy bastards. You know, these days, the prevailing progressive view is that American democracy is hopelessly flawed. For example, they say, the deep anger of millions of Americans about the direction of our country and Americans like you and I, is proof that American democracy is not working and that there's a real risk. The nation will surrender the populist translation totalitarian ravings of good god forbid Donald Trump or other suspicious Magga types. Meanwhile, the prevailing view among the liberal elite, so often taught in schools these days, is that the history of capitalism is nothing more than the history of abuse and exploitation, that it is so replete with abuses that our economic system capitalism must be treated with the utmost suspicion and contempt. Why they say those dirty capitalists are just a bunch of greedy bastards that want to exploit blacks and women and transsexuals and your grandma and your dog, especially if your dog is a transsexual. Now, all these alleged shortcomings, of course, are proof in the minds of the liberal elite, that we'd all be a lot better off if well, if things were a bit more closely controlled by enlightened progressives, that would solve everything when you betcha. Power to the people well, power to certain people anyway. So their bottom line is that democratic capitalism is no better and may be worse than other demonstrably inferior political and economic systems around the world. I hate to confuse a well oiled set of biases with the facts. But that's exactly what we're going to do here today. You betcha. The recurring theme of

America's progressive pseudo intelligencia is that America's system of democratic capitalism is nothing special, a system that deserves only moral parity with other competing systems, just another system no better and perhaps worse than the rest. So today, I'll make the case that democratic capitalism not only works but works exceptionally well, and that it not only continues to enrich millions of people here in the US, but also billions of people around the globe. Of course, progressive spin doctors point to virtually any period of American history as proof that we are a flawed society, and they usually get it wrong. So today, in response to their revisionist history, we'll begin by discussing today's documented attempts to monopolize thought and speech by big tech, by the media and by our own government. Next, we'll discuss a period of American history known as the Gilded Age, that period of American history from about 1870 to around 1900. Because today's progressives use it as an example of how under capitalism, the rich, then as now, they claim got richer at everyone else's expense. They're wrong, and we'll prove it. We'll also discuss America's original sin slavery, because again, the left claims that our experience with that horrible institution discredits our entire system. And finally, we'll address just two of the serious threats faced by American democratic capitalism today, the cynical progressive socialist agenda regarding our southern border and their weaponization of climate science. Let's first talk about the monopolization of ideas. You know, as he left office, President Eisenhower warned of a military industrial complex. Today we face a Washington media big tech complex that routinely threatens our freedoms. As Americans, most of us tend to be troubled, not as much by big Tax profits, but by its ability indeed, its desire to suppress dissenting views in cooperation with the media, our own government as well. As an aside, let me offer this advice to our big tech government media censors. Look, if you actually want to defeat a bad idea, let it see the light of day. Instead of it being whispered from the shadows let it be shouted from the rooftops let all passionate but non violent ideas compete in the ultimate marketplace, the marketplace of people's minds. Great concepts will rise to the top foolish ideas will sink to the bottom. When you center dissenting views, oh, you know, like those crazy ideas such as, say, the allegation from those right wing extremists that the 2016 Russia hoax was not about Trump conspiring with Russia. But about Hillary Clinton. The Democrats and our own government deflecting attention from the classified server Hillary kept in her closet Crazy, huh? Are they're really stupid idea that yeah, maybe COVID did originate in a Wuhan lab. Or one more, the ridiculous assertion that the government and Twitter colluded to exclude Donald Trump and his supporters from that app. Well, you get the idea. Let ideas get out there, good ones will rise to the top. The bad ones will sink but let them compete. Anyway, here's the most important point. When you center dissenting views, you're not judging the idea you censor? No, you are judging the people who may see or hear that idea. You are expressing your contempt for those people, contempt for the ability of Americans to sort through the noise and make their own decisions. In short, you are showing your contempt for an essential cornerstone of our democracy, the common sense of the American people? Well, let's take a look at one period of American history just as an example, the so called Gilded Age from around 1870 until around 1900. Now, there's no doubt that many of the great industrialists and financiers of the day the so called robber barons such as JP Morgan Vanderbilt, Gould, Carnegie and others, pulled off breathtaking acts of market manipulation and political influence, many of which were entirely legal at the time, and some of which weren't. Incidentally, one quick sidebar story. There's also no doubt that it was a particularly profitable time to be an elected official, especially if you worked in say, Albany, New York, their legislators would sometimes vote against, say the proposed project of a specific railroad, but only after they sold its stock short, then after their vote to deny the project, the railroad stock would sink. Those same legislators would then collect their short selling profits and run to the stock exchange and repurchase the railroad stock at a deep discount, then guess what? They would return to the legislature and vote to approve that same railroads proposed project, which would of course, cause its stock to skyrocket in value. Not just nice work if you can find it. So absolutely. There

were abuses during the so called Gilded Age, not only by robber barons, there were also certainly labor abuses that range from violence against striking workers to dangerous working conditions. As an aside, ethical lapses are certainly alive and well, in our modern age. It was back in 1988. For example, when I ran for the United States Senate as Arizona's Republican candidate, my opponent was an incumbent who sat on the committee that determined the path of the largest public works irrigation project ever, the Arizona canal. Well, after he determined the path while sitting on the committee, the path of the canal, guess what he used a partnership to buy up land in the path of the canal after buying the land his partnership, then flipped it to the government at an inflated price. Again, nice work if you can, if you can get it done. Unfortunately, we did not get the details out in time to save my ill fated campaign.

K

Keith 09:56

Or perhaps you'd like to start at International Foundation and come All at all, I don't know, the Clinton Foundation. While you are a former president and your wife is currently Secretary of State, you then go around the world collecting massive speaking fees and donations from governments, to your foundation, all perfectly legal. Or, hey, who knows, maybe your dad is saying, I don't know, the Vice President of the United States. Suddenly, in the eyes of shady companies and governments, you become such an expert on everything that they pay you millions of dollars for your expertise, absolutely inspired in it. But back to those robber barons, as I'll demonstrate in a moment, the Gilded Age was in fact, a time of tremendous advances in incomes and standards of living across a broad spectrum of America. Despite the progressive near narrative, it was definitely not just about a few people making fortunes, while everyone else suffer. So before I make the point that abuses prevalent in the Gilded Age, and other abuses have been remedied through democratic capitalism, and again, acknowledging that there is still plenty of work to be done. I'd like to help set the historical record straight about that period. Now, here I draw heavily from an excellent opinion piece, recently published in The Wall Street Journal, and it was written by some people I really respect Phil Gramm and Amity Shlaes. Now, Miss shales SHLAES I believe I'm mispronouncing her name, and I approve I apologize. S. H. LAES. Ms. SHLAES is the author of the Great Society and the forgotten man, Mr. Graham is no slouch either. He's a respected economist and a former chairman of the United States Senate Banking Committee. Senator Graham is also co author of a great book called The Myth of American inequality. Now, I've mentioned that book in prior podcasts, and I do recommend it, remember, and this is important, alleged income inequality, industrial and labor abuse and all sorts of other real or imagined injustices comprise the sand upon which the progressive socialist church is built. It is their claim that today as during the late 1800s, the rich get richer and the poor get poor. But here's what Senator Graham and Miss SHLAES had to say about what the impact of the robber barons really was during the so called Gilded Age. In fact, they wrote and this is interesting. Between 1870 and 1900, America's inflation adjusted gross national product expanded by an unprecedented 233%. Though the population nearly doubled, real per capita GNP Gross National Product surged by 90%. Real wages of nonfarm employees grew by 53%. And life staples such as food, clothing and shelter became much more plentiful and much cheaper. Food prices plummeted by 174% and the cost of textiles, fuel and home furnishings fell by 70% 65% and 70%, respectively. The illiteracy rate fell by 46%, and life expectancy rose by 12 and a half percent, infant mortality declined by 17%. As American capitalism blossom, some got rich for sure, in 1892, there were 4050 millionaires, with less than 20%. Having inherited their wealth. The rest created their wealth, and in the process, reduced poverty expanded general societal prosperity, and made it possible for millions of immigrants looking for opportunity and freedom to find both. that mattered little to progressives who were so obsessed by the 4050 millionaires back then, that they turned a blind

eye to the 66 million Americans, whose economic well being improved faster than any people who had ever lived on earth ever. Had the Gilded Age suffered from monopolistic exploitation, the authors tell us as critics claim, output would have fallen and prices would have risen in the monopolized industries. But in a 1985 study, there's an economist by the name of Thomas de Lorenzo. He tested that hypothesis for steel, petroleum railroads and other industries accused of being monopolistic. That's easy for me to say monopolistic during the debate on the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 What he found is that output in those industries actually increased by an average of 175% from 1880 to 1897 times the growth rate of real GNP, on average prices in the ostensibly monopolized industries fell three times as fast as the consumer price index. So this myth of the Gilded Age, in turn produced Progressive Era regulations that proved to be an impediment to competition, as regulation became an instrument of cartelization. producing higher prices, poor services, and less innovation get this in fact, by the 1970s. The negative effect of these regulations was so obvious that even liberal Senator Ted Kennedy and liberal president Jimmy Carter led the deregulation of airlines trucking, railroads, energy and communications. The benefits of overturning excess Progressive Era regulations included more competition, greater efficiency, more innovation, stronger growth, setting the foundations of contemporary American competitiveness and prosperity. But the author's continued, proving that no bad idea ever dies. progressivism has been reborn without cries against billionaires and the tech industry as the new monopolistic trust that must be busted and regulated. Robert Reich, who served as President Clinton's labor secretary, has opined that, and I quote him, like the robber barons of the first Gilded Age, those of the second the tech giants have amassed fortunes because of their monopolies. Yet on both claims the case for 21st century progressivism is even weaker than it was during the Gilded Age spewing envy at the fortune 400 billionaires who get this. These fortune 400 billionaires who their combined after tax income would not have funded federal, state and local governments in 2024. Even one week, progressives denounce such people as Bill Gates, who has created hundreds of 1000s of jobs and enrich the lives of billions. Today, our retirement funds own far more of Microsoft that he founded than he does. Yeah, I'll admit the guy's a little wacky, but he changed the world for the better. Meanwhile, notwithstanding their attempted monopoly on thought and speech, today's Tech production, and prices show no signs of the modern tech industry being monopolized. In fact, many of their products are free, and the cost of search and text advertising that underwrites much of their revenues has fallen by more than 50% in the last decade. Progressive regulation for 80 years stifled competition, lowered efficiency and drove up prices. Now, Senator Graham and Mr. Glaze ask, is this an experiment we want to repeat? They continued in their editorial today's progressive rant, that income inequality is an excess is an existential threat is both unpersuasive and untrue. If we counted all transfer payments, such as food stamps and refundable tax credits as income to their recipients, and taxes paid as income loss to taxpayers, something the US Census Bureau doesn't do. We find that income inequality is lower today than it was in 1947. And I'll Harken you back again to that book that Senator Graham and two of his colleagues wrote called The Myth of American inequality a lot more detail on this issue in that book. Now, at its root, progressive ism is based on a myth and fueled by envy, the same caustic fort that has destroyed posterity and endangered freedom from the time of the ancient Greeks. So wrote Miss SHLAES and Senator Graham good for them. Now,

K

Keith 19:23

I returned to my earlier statement, I'm not nearly as concerned with how much money tech companies and their founders make God bless him. This is America, as I am concerned with their attempted monopoly on thought that must be fought. But like so many abuses before since and to come, Tech's attempts at thought monopoly, I'm confident will be overcome, as so

many other abuses have been overcome through the democratic process, overcome by reforms that help ensure our freedom and our right to ordered liberty. Considered since the days of those so called robber barons, America has enacted and redefined just for example, meaningful antitrust laws, meaningful investor protection laws, the creation of our social security system, tax deferred retirement plans, minimum wage and minimum age standards, occupational safety and health standards, product and food safety standards, equal employment legislation and much, much more.

K

Keith 20:36

Our detractors also claim that America is a hoax, because it was born of an original sin, slavery. But when they met in Philadelphia, our founding fathers knew that the question before them was not whether slavery would endure a while longer across the southern states. Many of them expressed the hope that the institution would die naturally because it was both cruel and inefficient. The question for our founders was not about whether some states allowed slavery. The Question two is whether we would have a United States at all. Here is the key. The miracle of America is not that our more perfect union was created by perfect men. No. The miracle of America is that our more perfect union was created by highly imperfect men. Men who through our founding documents, nevertheless laid the foundation for the 13th amendment that abolish slavery, the 14th amendment that gave citizenship to all people born in the United States, if they were subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, the 15th amendment that gave black Americans the right to vote and Oh, incidentally, the 19th amendment that gave women the right to vote. Incidentally, regarding the 13th 14th and 15th amendments. Those amendments were enacted during the Civil War, while nearly 180,000, freed black men distinguished themselves on the battlefield for the Union. Of the more than 320,000 Union troops who died in the Civil War, about 40,000 of them were black. The rest were white, fighting for the end of slavery. But those amendments 13th 14th and 15th amendments passed during the Civil War were very eminently and sometimes violently opposed by the few Democrats who have not left Congress to join the Confederacy. We have the Republican super majorities of the 37th and 38th congresses, to thank for those amendments, and especially three of their congressional leaders, fellows whose names you might not know but auto learn. Thaddeus Stevens, William Pitt, fez president, that's Fe S e n d n. And then wait. There's a great book on what those men went through to pass those amendments. The book is Congress at war by Fergus border, which, and I recommend it as Congress at war by Fergus border, which, yes, it took too many years for us to enforce those guarantees. Jim Crow laws enacted after the Civil War by Southern Democrats, deprived black Americans of the enjoyment of their rights for far too many years. But finally, President Truman ordered the integration of the military in 1948. Then in 1954, the Supreme Court eliminated the doctrine of separate but equal in education. Finally, Congress passed a series of civil rights laws in the 1960s, nearly 100 years after the passage of those amendments. Yes, democracy can be painfully so slow, but it does work. Democratic Capitalism ensures that it works. It ensures that we have the resources to make it work. But you guessed it, the progressive socialist crowd continues trying to convince black brown and other Americans that they are and remain victims of an inherently unfair system. And you know, those folks are often victims of a particularly unfair educational system, a particularly unfair educational system promoted and protected by progressive Democrats and the unions that own them. In my opinion, this is the greatest civil rights issue of our age. And its solution is school choice. Now, I've addressed this critical issue on prior podcasts and no no doubt will do so again. So is American democratic capitalism, about production or about plunder? I hope we've demonstrated what you already knew that the United States of America is the most productive nation on earth, precisely because we embrace and must protect democratic

capitalism. Unfortunately, as since its founding, our incredible system of democratic capitalism remains under assault, not just from foreign adversaries, but from within as well. Some people. Meanwhile, other people are very malicious in their intent regarding the existence of our country. Let's take just two examples of serious internal threats that we face. First, there's the border. First, who really has the moral high ground when it comes to our southern border? Now, in a previous podcast, I addressed what I call the south side of this issue, the economics of remittances and the pathetic job, so many Latin American countries do to provide democratic capitalism for their own people. If you haven't already, I invite you to join me for that podcast, as well at the green.com. But now, I want to focus on a profound human tragedy that continues to unfold due to our open border. You know, this is so important and so tragic. Liberals claim the moral high ground on this issue by saying, Oh, watch those poor migrants making the hazardous trip to the US to have a better life? How can we possibly turn them away? Where's our compassion? They ask? Well, here is our compassion with the 100,000 Americans who died last year, and the 120,000 Americans who will die this year alone from the horrible drugs that are flowing across our southern border. In fact, the left's position in favor of a porous border is not compassionate at all. It reflects the absolute lowest form of morality, literally trading American lives for future votes. What the Liberals are really saying is this, we can't get enough actual US citizens to vote for our policies. So we'll just import millions of new voters, give them tons of benefits paid for by you, and then undermine the integrity of our electoral system so that those people can vote in US elections for us. Folks, watch the videos of those that flood of humanity across our border. By and large, they are young, strong, healthy people, very few of them are carrying drugs. And we are not accusing them of being drug dealers. But but the drugs pour in alongside those people across our open border, brought here by genuine often vicious cartel criminals, criminals and drugs that take American lives. More statistics, 14,000 pounds of fentanyl were seized at the border this past fiscal year. And this is just the quantity that we intercepted. Deadly illegal drugs are pouring across our border. According to the Drug Enforcement Administration. Two milligrams of fentanyl is a lethal dose in most people. That works out to 227,000 potential deaths per pound of fentanyl. What does this mean to America? What does this mean to your family and your friends? Let me put it in perspective. Like some of you, I served in Vietnam, I was with the Marines. You know, the US had troops in that country for 20 years. 58,000 Americans died during the Vietnam War 58,000 over 20 years, terrible. But last year alone, more than 100,000 Americans, mostly young people died from drug overdoses right here in the United States, mainly from drugs laced with deadly synthetic fentanyl, and other deadly synthetic substances. Again this year, we expect to lose 120,000 Young Americans to illegal drugs that pour mainly across our southern border. Yes, in 2023 alone, we will lose twice as many Americans to heal illegal drugs from our porous border then died during the entire Vietnam War. Incidentally, that is about three times the number of Americans who died in the Korean War. Now we all know Remember the Vietnam War protests? Let me ask you. Where are the protests from the left over these drug deaths today? Where are the protests against the flood of illegal drugs and violent criminals pouring across our border? Where's the outrage at the American lives lost here at home every day? And what possible motivation could the administration and the liberal elite have to allow this travesty? Incredibly, their motive is obvious to win future elections, as they find more ways to allow illegals to vote

K

Keith 30:37

here in the US. The Democrats failure to protect every lawful vote, their push to expand ballot access to everyone, including non citizens in some jurisdictions, is not about civil rights. It is about trading American lives for political power. Is that the moral high ground? How utterly cynical must you be to sacrifice more than 100,000 Americans every year upon the altar of

your political ambitions? How absolutely unspeakably horrible. Oh, I know, the true cynic will argue that drug users are complicit in their own demise. But we know that most fentanyl fatalities occur among young people. Now, here's a news bulletin. Young people do dumb things. It's sort of their job. Oh, hey, dude, this is the really good stuff. Cool. That is why it is our job, even as we try to hammer some common sense into our kids, not just as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans and as parents and grandparents, to hold liberals and President Biden. And their elite friends personally accountable for failing to protect our border for failing to protect our young people. And for so cynically trading American lives for future votes, their body count continues to climb. That's why we must shout from the rooftops, we will never never trade the lives of our children for votes. And that, my friends, is the moral high ground. Now, there's another threat that threatens the fabric of democratic capitalism. In fact, it smacks of the special interest excesses that progressives claim they hate. It is a threat that has weaponized and misrepresented a legitimate but very complex science for the purpose of promoting a political agenda that is unrelated to the science itself. It is a threat that sees our own government create massive winners and losers in our economy in pursuit of an unproven causal relationship, a pursuit that commands each of us to become increasingly dependent on government regulated power supplies, and government mandated behavior. I speak of course of the weaponization of climate change. So let's tackle it tackle the issue of climate change. Now, raise your hand if you want to ruin our planet. I doubt too many people will have their hands up. I certainly don't. You know, back in 2007. During my first failed retirement, after I sold my first company, I bought a boat. It was a beautiful Nord hub and 55 foot full displacement trawler yacht. Incidentally, the convention is that boats over 50 feet are supposed to be called either ships or yachts. Anyway, with a small crew I piloted that boat that yacht across the Pacific Ocean as far as Thailand. We even broadcast a weekly radio show from the middle of the ocean, it was a blast. Now, I had hoped to take her around the world, but by the time we got to Bangkok, we were so far behind schedule. And so over budget that I double back to Hong Kong and with the help of the good people at Nord haven't sold the boat there to a nice family. Anyway, let me tell you, a 55 foot full displacement trawler may look very impressive when it's sitting at the dock, but put it out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, and it is an ant on an elephant's behind. Out there alone away from the works of man. I witnessed the absolute power and majesty of pure nature. And yet yes, it was not always pleasant for sure. Sometimes it was downright scary. And as we approach to the coast of, for example, the Philippines. I was sickened by the sight of manmade debris junk floating out as far as 50 miles from shore, along the Chinese coast and Vietnamese coast, it was just as bad. Yes, we are making a mess of the place. And yes, we need to clean up our app, but to allege that our pathetic human activities have the outsized consequence, that the climate crazies claim is just nonsense. It's not just me, that's talking. Courageous, eminent scientists are also finally speaking out. In 2021. Alone, the US spent a record \$755 billion on clean energy. And now with the incredibly misnamed inflation Reduction Act that the Democrats passed before they lost the house in 2022. trillions more will be funneled to favorite companies and industries. consultancy firm McKinsey says total global spending by governments, businesses and individuals on energy and land use systems will need to rise by an additional 3.5 trillion to 9.2 trillion per year, every year, if we are to have any chance of getting to net zero carbon emissions by 2050. That is a massive increase on today's level of investment, and is equivalent to half of global corporate profits, a quarter of world tax revenues and 7% of household spending. The report also states and I quote, The Net Zero transition will amount to a massive economic transportation transformation, you'll think yet there's no discernible evidence that the specific expenditures currently being made will have a significant impact on carbon emissions. There's no discernible evidence. But they sure are making a lot of people rich at your expense. Of course, in fact, some scientists speculate that planting a few billion trees, for example, could have the same effect, even a greater effect of reducing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere than

many of the expensive and mandatory lifestyle changes we're now being compelled to make. You know, a recent study published in the journal Science found that Earth's ecosystems could support 2.2 billion acres of forests 25% more forested area than we have now, by planting more than a half trillion trees, the authors say we could capture about 205 Giga tons of carbon. Now Giga ton is a billion metric metric tons. That would reduce atmospheric carbon by about 25%. And that's enough to negate about 20 years of human produced carbon emissions at the current rate, or about half of all carbon emitted by humans since 1960. Now that would buy the green energy industry time to develop much more efficient and cost effective energy saving technology. Oh, but God forbid, we should embrace the simplest solution first, no. Instead, the climate crazies in power have taken matters to the point of absurdity. For example, California is prohibiting installation of gas stoves in new homes. Instead, your cooking will depend on the reliability of the notoriously unreliable and expensive California power grid. Now, there's a case to be made against the indoor use of gas, especially in very small environments, especially in environments up in the northeast, let's say or across the northern plains, where during the winter, all the windows and doors are closed, but it's not a very strong case to be made at all. And it certainly doesn't justify these kinds of draconian measures being employed. Now in California, this is just nonsense. Look, none of us want to harm our wonderful planet, but I'll say it out loud. The left has inflated legitimate climate concerns to advance a socialist model of governance where once again, the well connected will profit. While the political elite exert even more influence over our lives. Their manipulation of data across major institutions, and their suppression of responsible dissenting views, if not lawfully criminal, at the very least, it is morally criminal. Here's what we know is happening. An entire generation has now been indoctrinated, not educated, indoctrinated, and now they incorrectly believed Climate Armageddon is inevitable unless mankind relinquishes individual freedom to the dictates of the state, a state claiming that only its effects and our compliance can save the planet. Their tool, climate models intended not to inform, but to persuade.

K

Keith 40:21

Now, for years, there have been detailed climate models that attempt to measure the impact of various social, economic, and political systems on the planet. That's fair enough. Not surprisingly, the model most supported by most so called climate science institutions, is a socialist model that favors wealth equality among nations at the expense of the two hallmarks of capitalism, individual initiative, and reward. Many previously reputable national and international science organizations have been co opted by people who selectively use present or even invent data to promote their political agenda. There's another wonderful and recent book out out there and it's called unsettled. That's the name of the book unsettle. It's written by a world class climate scientists, Dr. Stephen Coonan. Dr. Coonan was among many other things, the undersecretary of science in the US Department of Energy during the Obama administration. He has also chaired many international climate related scientific projects. In his book called unsettled, Dr. Koonin lays bare the statistical abuses and misrepresentations committed by even the world's most renowned scientific institutions. Dr. Coonan does not claim that we humans do not impact the environment. We certainly do. But he makes clear that the scientific community has abandoned its effort to objectively inform, and instead uses selected and often false data to persuade to support specific favorite industries and a specific social agenda. You know, I've long said that there are three climate movements, there is the science of climate that Presents Facts and findings engages, in fact based research and debate, and that acknowledges the limitations inherent in trying to incorporate the millions of variables involved with measuring climate. I support that, that science it's difficult work, but I support it. Second, though, there's the Politics of Climate that presents manipulates and if necessary,

invents facts to promote a political agenda. And third, there is the religion of climate that regards those who manipulate and misrepresent the data as high priests, and that regards challenges to them as pure heresy. For example, did you know this is incredible to me? That a few years ago, Chuck Schumer, and a few other Democrats literally tried to make it unlawful to use government funded studies to refute prevailing climate assumptions. I'm not kidding, seriously. Fortunately, their proposed legislation went nowhere. But how awful and frightening that they would seriously attempt to make scientific debate unlawful. Again, I encourage you to read Dr. Kuhns book, unsettled. By all means, let's have the debate. Let's find ways we can leave this planet a better and safer place. But let's demand that science served the truth and not someone's political agenda. Well, have we made our case, our topic today was democratic capitalism, production or plunder? I hope we've demonstrated what we already knew that we are the most productive nation on earth precisely because we embrace and must protect democratic capitalism. Yes, the winner is democratic capitalism. Yes, democratic capitalism may be corrupted from time to time, it may shift too far toward corporate greed or toward mob rule, or perhaps as now toward both extremes simultaneously, driven by big tech controlled social media. But the brilliance of our system is that with the active involvement of the American people, we have met past challenges and will rise to meet current and future challenges, because we have both the determination and the resources. I have said before, that freedom is not an etiology. It is the natural condition of humankind. Democracy is The wind upon which freedom flies. Capitalism is the nourishment upon which freedom feeds. Together with our help. They will take us, our children and all future American generations to heights well beyond our dreams. Feel free to weigh in with your own comments at DeGreen.com. Thanks for joining me today. I am Keith DeGreen, and this is as I SEA it!

K

Keith 45:31

We are pleased to provide this text from our podcast. As you know, the spoken word is often less formal and sometimes less precise than a written piece that may be carefully edited. I have also been known to sometimes jumble my words beyond recognition! Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns -- and thank you for supporting "As I SEA It!"
Keith DeGreen