



International Academy of Anti-Aging Medicine

Commentary

What would/could be your best approach to achieving life-long optimum health? As we see it, obviously, it would be to go beyond orthodox medicine's "Slam-Bang-one drug-for-every-disease" approach.

- a) Stay up-to-date and keep visiting this web-site here and also:
<http://www.EIToroEXPOSED.com/>
- b) Check out "Defining life-long optimum health," in the **HEALTH/MEDICINE** folder. Audio CD of Dr. Kuglers 40-minute presentation at the Orlando A4M Congress, April 7, 2011, is available at: www.prolibraries.com/a4m
- c) Read LifeExtension Magazine:
http://www.lef.org/magazine/mag2011/mag2011_05.htm
- d) Attend an Anti-Aging Medical Congress; for dates in major world cities check at:
<http://www.worldhealth.net/>
- e) Listen to a radio podcast interview with A4M President Dr. Ron Klatz. Many interesting topics. For Dr. Kugler's interview, heart recovery and anti-aging, click on July 4, 2010.
<http://www.worldhealth.net/secondopinion-alt>
- f) Lectures, recorded at anti-aging medical meetings, are available at:
<http://www.instatapes.com/>
<http://www.DigiVisionMedia.com>
<http://www.prolibraries.com/a4m>
- g) Find an alternative, anti-aging, physician for you.
<http://www.lef.org>
<http://www.worldhealth.net>

GM AIMING AT TITLE OF "WORLD'S BIGGEST LOSER"? - - Financially AND Environmentally?

It seems obvious that GM's taking a \$ 39 billion (Yes, BILLION) charge against earnings (11.7.07) - - setting the stage for a record-breaking quarterly loss - - demonstrates their totally brainless approach towards new product development.

As per major research institutions, including recent evaluations of energy data published by the Pasadena Institute of Technology, it is not only obvious, but also scientifically proven, that replacing gasoline-burning cars with alternative fuel vehicles (EVs, electrical vehicles) is the best and most effective way of reducing CO2 levels that are THE cause of global warming.

11 years ago GM, with the production of their EV-1, a car praised around the world as demonstrating GM's top engineering capacity, had a tremendous head-start in this new technology. Strangely enough - - with the weirdest excuses, accused of being under the "Knut" (the power stick) of the oil industry, lying and dishonesty - - GM took the EV-1 off the market and crushed remaining vehicles. If you are not familiar with this automotive blunder, reading up on the EV-1 (Environment Folder, at E-Books), and watching "Who Killed the Electrical Car?" (a Sony Pictures production) is an absolute must.

Had GM continued the development of the EV-1 eleven years ago, today they could have at least three variations – sports car, sedan, SUV – and GM would be praised as leaders in the alternative fuels automotive industry; billions of dollars profits would be rolling in, and people would look up to them - - - instead of down at them, with disgust.

Why is this so? This is soooooo \$\$\$\$-basic!

To probably everybody in the pro-environment movement, it is obvious that the oil industry will do anything to prevent the car industry from producing a car for which you can make your own fuel - - - charging an EV costs about \$ 3.00 per 100 miles, right out of the wall or (even less expensive) by simply installing an electricity-producing solar system on your house - - - as millions have already done; view our photovoltaic installation at the Environment Folder at E-Books.

Instead of such common-sense solutions, they are pushing for the "Hydrogen" car - - - to keep you coming to THEIR gas stations to buy just another, very dangerous, type of THEIR over-priced and environmentally incorrect "Gas"? (- - - while hydrogen burns clean, making it is extremely expensive, causing excessive pollution, and creating unwanted CO2). Read more at **ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT**.

ANTI-HIV DRUGS CAUSE LIVER, HEART AND KIDNEY DISEASES.

We recently reported that a landmark publication in THE LANCET found that anti-HIV drugs were ineffective in reducing the death rate from AIDS, and that people taking these (HAART, anti-retroviral) drugs for longer time periods (8 months or longer) actually had a higher death rate from AIDS. Scientists now know why this is so.

The anti-HIV drugs are not only ineffective against AIDS, but they actually affect immune functions and cause liver, heart and kidney diseases.

We are seeing here a true paradox in medicine; people diagnosed as HIV-positive are put on anti-viral drugs at costs of up to \$ 8,000 per month - - many of them with no insurance, selling everything they have, house, cars, investments - - to buy these drugs that do nothing good for

them, that actually kill them.

Berkeley Professor Peter Duesberg, renowned scientist, discoverer of onco-genes, formerly Max Planck Institute in Germany, asks: “Who is mass-murderer? The proponents of the HIV-hypothesis, prescribing inevitably fatal drugs? - - IAAM question added: The Pharmaceutical companies that refuse to acknowledge scientific facts, making billions in the process, indoctrinating doctors with questionable study results? - - The answers to these questions show that science must be free of politics!”

Do doctors, working in the field of AIDS research/treatment have no scientific pride, allowing themselves to be dominated by profit-influenced pseudo-science, allowing medicine to stoop down to be classified as truly SLOPPY and anti-health?

For answers, check out [HIV=AIDS? THINK AGAIN, on Home page](#). Here you can access key slides from a presentation by Berkeley prof. Peter Duesberg at the Kern Medical Center, Bakersfield, CA; with permission (2007).

Reader’s Digest, Nov. 2007: “The Vitamin HOAX, 10 not to take.”

(A, Beta Carotene, C, E, Folic acid, Niacin, Lycopene, Minerals Se, Zn, Fe).

What a collection of questionable pseudo-scientific nonsense! If you’d follow this advice, you would definitely increase your risk of disease. Ah! Maybe that was the purpose of this – half-truth, no, _ truth, even that would be too much – article of misinformation? Then you would – is that what they hoped for? – be paying more attention to the numerous multi-page advertisements by the drug companies(?) Has Reader’s Digest become a cheap – they are sending it to me for free – advertising, public-swaying tool for the drug and food industry? We see more and more of such – purposely misinforming(?) – articles in the print-media. Who is paying for this – definitely not honest science – campaign of El Toro Poo Poo? Why would Reader’s Digest editors allow themselves to publish such nonsense, risking to have their standing in the print-media to drop to sleazy back-alley levels?

SMALLPOX! UNPREPARED BEYOND BELIEF?

The CDC (Center for Disease Control) tells us that they are prepared; “if a smallpox outbreak/attack should occur, we’ll quickly rush the vaccine to the affected area.”

A theoretical, but definitely possible scenario:

If in possession of the smallpox virus, ten terrorists – 2 each in 5 different large cities – could infect 1,000 people/city within one or two days. Carrying the virus in many forms, totally inconspicuous, none would have to worry about detection if stopped by police for whatever reasons; relative to the 9/11 attacks, this would be a task much easier to execute by terrorists. If there is no accidental discovery of what had been done until rashes in infected people are diagnosed as smallpox (14-17 days), this would result in about 1,835,000 cases of smallpox and 550,000 deaths.

None of the stockpiled 280 million doses of smallpox vaccine would/could help any one of those victims.

If you feel unprotected, and would like to take the vaccine, our Government does not allow you to do so. If you are older, and had been vaccinated as a child, your immunity is gone.

DOES OUR GOVERNMENT - THE CDC - CALL THIS “PREPAREDNESS”?

Smallpox is an extremely serious disease; for a better understanding, please view pictures and disease details at: www.who.int/emc/diseases/smallpox/slideset.

Numbers are based on data published by MIT and Yale University Med. School.

***** For all the details, check SMALLPOX at TERRORISM*****

The # 1 Cause of Death in America.

Not cancer, not heart disease, but Medicine itself. Errors, accidents, wrong prescriptions, incorrectly followed procedures, and neglect in Hospitals causes about 1 million deaths At the Berwick Institute for Health Care Improvement in Cambridge they asked a simple question: Could a few modest changes to raise standards and reduce errors in hospitals stave off a large number of patient deaths? They developed a simple plan to achieve this goal. About 3,000 of the nation’s hospitals signed on.

Results: At the June 2006 Atlanta medical quality experts meeting the plan’s architect, Donald Berwick, triumphantly informed the audience that “an estimated 122,000 patient deaths had been avoided.”

Ref.: US News and World Report, p. 38, June 26, 2006.

That still leaves close to 900,000 patient-deaths.

This number agrees with the special report by Life Extension Magazine; the complete and detailed research paper is brought to you with permission by LE Reports.

[Click here](#) to view the complete LE Report, DEATH BY MEDICINE.

Guest Letter: From Senator Orrin G. Hatch, “The Case for Regenerative Medicine,” statement made at a press conference.



U.S. Senator Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah)

In the weeks ahead, the United States Senate will debate an issue that is of extreme importance to millions of Americans suffering from disease. The challenge before Congress is twofold. We must craft a law to make sure that human beings are not cloned. At the same time, we must not stand in the way of scientific advances that hold the promise of treatments and cures for literally millions of Americans.

At the outset, I just want to read one letter I received from my constituents—the parents of Cody Anderson in West Jordan, Utah. This sums it up far better than I can.

Dear Senator Hatch,

We would first like to thank you for carefully studying stem cell research and coming out in favor of it last year. We appreciate your taking the correct moral stand on this very important issue. We now need you to again lead the way on another important issue, the cloning of human cells for research to cure diseases such as diabetes. Let us share just a little of our story of why this is so important to our family.

I would first like to start by telling you how I became familiar with diabetes. My father was diabetic from the age of seven years old, and by the time I was four years old, he had lost his sight. He never saw my youngest brother. As we grew up, we always knew that our father was different, but we learned to live with the disease. We slowly watched more complications take shape because of the

disease. He eventually lost function of his kidneys and was on kidney dialysis for 10 years. He eventually lost his left leg below the knee, had two toes amputated from the right foot because of poor circulation, had a colostomy, had his left eye removed to relieve pain and pressure, and in total had 28 surgeries just to keep him alive, all because of the devastating effects of the diabetes. Finally on April 29, 1991, his heart just stopped, and he died at the age of 47. The cause of death: diabetes.

I am now married and have three children of my own, and my worst fears came true on June 9, 2000, when my youngest son, Cody, was diagnosed at the age of two with diabetes: the same disease that I had watched slowly take my father away from me at such a young age. Cody has to have his blood sugar tested at least six to 10 times daily. He is on an insulin pump and has to have his site changed three to four times a week. We have to know every bit of food that he eats and how many carbohydrates each bit has so we can figure the correct amount of insulin to give him. Every day is different, depending on his activities for the day. A growth spurt can throw everything off for days at a time. Something as simple as a cold can have devastating effects on his blood sugar. The stomach flu also is extremely difficult to deal with.

Not only does diabetes affect Cody's life but it affects the lives of our entire family. My husband and I have to work opposite schedules just because we don't have anyone close by who can watch Cody. Anytime Cody goes to a friend's house for play group, we need to be where they can reach us at all times, because they don't understand the simple basics of taking care of a diabetic child.

With your leadership on this issue, we can help people understand that cloning human tissue for research has nothing to do with making "carbon copies of people" or creating a life. It is about saving human lives and easing the suffering of children like Cody.

Sincerely,
The Anderson Family

As a father of six and a grandfather of 20, when I read that letter, it really tugged at my heartstrings. It pointed out so clearly the challenge before us: to help families like the Andersons without sanctioning human cloning, which is anathema to us all.

And so, I am pleased to join with my colleagues to announce agreement on legislation that we hope will do just that: prevent human beings from being cloned, but promote—with appropriate safeguards—the new science of regenerative medicine.

In addition to banning human cloning, our bill advances the field of regenerative medicine by explicitly authorizing—with appropriate safeguards—somatic cell nuclear transfer or nuclear transplantation, to potentially provide stem cells.

One of the goals of regenerative medicine is to learn how these undifferentiated stem cells develop into the over 200 specialized cells and tissues that comprise the human body. This knowledge could hold the key to understanding much about human health and disease and may yield new diagnostic tests and treatments to help all the Cody Andersons of the world.

This bill promises to help the 100 million Americans who are struggling with the day-to-day challenges of currently incurable diseases. We are talking about cancer, heart disease, diabetes, AIDS, Alzheimer's, ALS, Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis, and so many other diseases. We are talking about our grandmothers and grandfathers, our mothers and fathers, our children and our grandchildren. We are talking about the people with whom we live and worship, our friends in the neighborhood, and our colleagues at work.

Listen carefully to what leading experts in science believe. A group of 40 American Nobel Prize-winners have already written to Congress to ask us to support this research. I will also make available today copies of a few of the compelling letters I have received from Intel CEO Andy Grove and the director of the prestigious Huntsman Cancer Institute, Stephen Prescott.

I come to this issue with a strong pro-life, pro-family record. But I also strongly believe that a critical part of being pro-life is to support measures that help the living. At the core of my support for regenerative medicine research is my belief that human life requires and begins in a mother's nurturing womb.

As I considered the ethical appropriateness of nuclear transplantation in regenerative medicine research, two facts stood out: The egg, with its nucleus removed, is never fertilized with sperm; it's never implanted.

The absence of a fertilized egg coupled with a legal prohibition against implantation led me to conclude that this research can be conducted, with appropriate safeguards, in an ethically proper fashion.

Americans deserve the best treatments available. To ban human somatic cell nuclear transfer research would be a tragic mistake. It would force Americans to travel abroad to seek the latest treatments. It also would drive many of our young, talented scientists overseas. As we have done so often in biomedical research, it is in the interest of our nation to lead the way in this new field and to help set the ethical and moral standards for the rest of the world.

Regenerative medicine is pro-life and pro-family; it enhances, not diminishes, human life. If encouraged to flourish, it can improve the lives of millions of Americans and could lead to new scientific frontiers not now in sight. I urge my colleagues in the Senate and the American public to support this bill that opposes human cloning but promotes regenerative medicine using nuclear transplantation. Thank you.

Are we sleepwalking to the terrorists' drumbeat right into financial self-destruction?

by Hans J. Kugler, Ph.D.
1996 Candidate for US Congress
Updated June 2002

I grew up in a time when terrorism was first evolving. I was a NATO officer in the West German Air Force and a platoon leader at the Air Force Academy. Later, while studying biochemistry at the

School of Medicine at the University of Munich (with a minor in the University's International Politics Program), it became second nature for me to evaluate a problem logically and from a military point of view. This demanded that you "know your enemy, how he functions and how he plans to achieve his goals." This perspective has served me well in military (presently still glider to multi-engine rated), in civilian industry, as a scientist in the health and fitness field, reserve member in a local police department, and also as a 1996 candidate for the US Congress.

With over 40 years experience in applying logic to any situation, keeping up with international politics and with the enemies our country faces (especially terrorism) I am appalled, as so many others from police officers, pilots to businessmen, at the indecisiveness, confusion, and often outright incompetence of so many government branches, ranging from the FAA to INS, FBI, border protection, health preparedness, and more.

We have been at war for more than one year now, and already the actions by some key Washington "experts," prove that the resulting failures are due to a total lack of understanding of terrorism, or a lack of coordination with experts who DO understand terrorism. Obviously terrorized, their decisions are fear-based, demonstrating their inability to clearly evaluate priorities. Instead, those decision-making executives are falling into defensive lockstep - a paralysis of sorts - of doing the "right" thing. In reality, they are marching our nation to the drumbeat of the terrorists right into financial self-destruction.

We are at war, no question about it! Yet, there are politicians with apparently no logic, no understanding of what it means to be at war, and with whom the Sept. 11 reality didn't sink in yet. We have seen on Washington hearings how the FBI was in total disarray, and how all this could have been prevented, had they just used an ounce of logic. There are several areas where the same disarray, some even worse, and lack of logic still exists and leaves this country and it's people unprotected and at the greatest risk. Three - as I see it priority - examples:

1) **Airlines were the # 1 target during the 9-11 attacks.** How do we defend them? Many pilots want to carry guns; legislators don't allow them to do so. They say "leave protecting the flights to air marshals," but there are only very few; essentially 98% of flights fly unprotected. The day after 9-11 the airlines could have had all the protection they ever needed: from police officers, sheriffs, military personnel, and firefighters, they would have done it for a free airline ticket, or for minimum pay. BUT NO, "we don't trust them," or "you are too old," or "they could do more harm than good with a gun in an airplane." As of the latter argument, let me tell you from experience as a pilot (military and present), member of a reserve police unit, and hand-gun training officer in the Air Force: "They know zero what they are talking about! Anybody with a basic handgun training and experience could be brought up-to-par about special airplane conditions and fragmentation bullets (used in such an environment) in one 1-hour training session. ANYTHING would assure better airplane safety than the bureaucratic BS that is going on now." But don't let that scare you; because of the aviation and pilot's ingenuity to secure flights, I truly believe that flying nowadays IS the safest means of transportation. For more details about the PILOTS, GUNS & SAFETY OF FLYING issue, click on this topic below.

2) **Military history books, no matter by whom written, will confirm one major fact: If your country is being attacked, secure your borders.** The US borders are literally non-existent.

Incompetence at INS (Immigration and Naturalization Service) is setting all-time records: Months after the 9-11 attacks they approved visas for those terrorists, and just recently inspectors who monitor US ports of entry found out that they were working with a list from which INS had dropped 3,500 people identified as suspected criminals or potential terrorists. Thousands of shipping containers, each one big enough to hold a least 50 atomic bombs, come into the US every month, and only about 2% (2 out of 100) are checked. Our actual borders, especially along Mexico, are so porous that thousands of illegal immigrants get across every night, and drug-smuggling airplanes fly into our air space without being detected. Thousands of trucks coming across the Mexican border could carry anything; only about 1% (one in 100) are being checked, and NOT very thoroughly. North of us, Canada allows anybody - - from the most questionable countries, and without any background checks or permits for entry - - to come into their country. And you know how easy it is to enter the US from Canada.

3) **SMALLPOX, the greatest and most likely risk:** After the 9-11 attacks, data from the Department of Health can be summarized in these few words: Hot air, but no preparedness. Even though smallpox was considered the highest risk, vaccinations were out because the entire Government stockpile was only 14.5 million units. "If a smallpox outbreak happens, we'll rush the vaccine there. The vaccine is still effective if given right after exposure." Then a French pharmaceutical company informed us that they had 70 million units of smallpox vaccine, and a study by NIH demonstrated that - - but only to induce preventive immunity - - the 14.5 million doses could be diluted ten-fold, therefore being able to vaccinate 145 million people. At this time the Health Department changed it's tune and decided against preemptive vaccinations because there is a (1 in one million) risk of serious side effects. "How about giving it at least to health professionals or to people who wish to take it voluntarily?" Again, the government says NO. Look at the health department's decision in the light of the following facts: a) Vaccine given to people is only good up to 3 - 4 days after exposure. b) It would take several days for doctors to even recognize that there is a problem; first signs of smallpox exposure are flue-like. c) It would take another XY days to get the vaccine to the people. d) Older people who had been vaccinated many years ago have lost immunity. **END-EFFECT:** Millions of people would come down with smallpox. Compare the effects of smallpox (15 to 40% death rate) with the risk of vaccine (an estimated one death per million) there is hardly a question about choice. The risk could further be reduced by closely watching people who got vaccinated, and the risk for people who had previously been vaccinated would be close to zero.

WHAT IF IT WAS MY CHOICE, AS A HEALTH PROFESSIONAL, TO TAKE THE VACCINE AND POSSIBLE ASSOCIATED RISK, willing to pay for it? The Department of Health, headed (I'd prefer be-headed) by Dr. Tommy Thompson, still says: "No, you can't have it! WE decide what is good for you! My response, in total disgust over (as I see it) this unquestionable incompetence: "Who the H - - - is this G - - D - - Government that always tells ME what is good for me?" For more details: Click on "Smallpox and cyanide; two disasters waiting to happen."

FIRST A LOOK AT HOW TERRORISM WORKS AND WHAT THEY AIM TO ACHIEVE

a) Terrorisms' goal is to disrupt and cause damage, with a heavy emphasis on terrorizing; to the terrorists this is a big stage where they are aiming at impressing - terrorizing - YOU. **Emphasis: Terrorists consider themselves 100% successful if, with whatever they did, people got so frightened and terrorized that they do truly illogical things, are unable to see things in**

perspective, and thus do things that lead to economic self-destruction. Witness the damage to the infrastructure to our country that penetrated several levels of the business community in a matter of hours. "Count the devastation in terms of self-induced monetary damage: if the damage is tenfold that of the terrorist's investment, they succeed, if it's one hundred fold, they are heroes to the terrorist's cause," a British expert on terrorism told us when we learned about terrorism in officer's school. So, 1:100 means total success for the terrorists. Would you like to venture a guess what this ratio was for the 9-11 attacks? Hint: 1: 2,500,000.

b) **After an attack in one media terrorists quickly move to another.** While the response to an attack in one area, aviation for example, is to "never let this happen again," and to make things fool-proof, the results are over-reaction, not knowing when to stop, initiating actions that are truly ludicrous, actions that not only damage the entire aviation industry, but that also have devastating effects on other industries, like the aviation transportation industry, destroy thousands of related businesses like flight schools and general small aviation, spills over to damage other industries - hotel, tourism, etc., etc. - **in essence doing what the terrorists want us to do, namely self-destructing our infrastructure, which is business on every level and harming the entire economy.** Our FAA has done exactly that; maybe their failures are a reflection of the illogic of the entire department of transportation. I am not the only one who sees Norman Mineta (Transportation secretary) and John Magaw (Transportation Security Undersecretary), with their obvious lack of understanding of terrorism, unqualified for the job under war conditions, classifying their actions (slower than molasses) and decisions as truly illogical, putting our country at great risk.

While the people who don't know better perpetuate the process of ignorance-based self-destruction in one media, **terrorists have already moved into another.** Why would terrorists, lacking the manpower for a full frontal attack, risk a defeat in an area that has been fortified, and where everybody is paying attention? Especially if there are so many other unprotected targets of equal importance available everywhere? What if they explode a car bomb? Should we push this over-reaction to the point of absurdity by halting all travel by cars, vans and trucks? What if it turns out that one of those terrorists got a driver's license from a US driving school? Do we shut down all driving schools? What if they explode a car bomb at an airport parking facility? Do we start a national program to train parking lot marshals? Anybody not pushed into total hysteria by a terrorist act will recognize the ignorance of such (ill-)logic - - only certain "experts" in Washington don't appear to see it!

c) Following true principles of terrorism, **the next attack must be much bigger than the first, at least by a factor of 100.** If they planned it right, the second plan of attack (not necessarily including the actual weapon) must already be in place when the first one goes off. NOW, WHAT WOULD BE 100 TIMES BIGGER THAN THE SEPT. 11 DAMAGE? This, in essence, narrows it down to three possibilities: ca) **Nuclear, with a real atomic bomb (a dirty bomb would be far less effective), cb) Chemical, like Sarin, Tabun, or Cyanide, or cc) Biological.** Even though the biological preparedness programs (part of the Dept. of Health, headed by Tommy Thompson, MD) is considered by many a total disaster area (threat known for years, yet vaccination programs totally unprepared and insufficient), it is somewhat ruled out because of recent findings regarding smallpox (# 1 risk) vaccines and effectiveness. If the Anthrax attacks were the true second attack by the terrorists (which I doubt), they failed tremendously. That leaves us with nuclear and chemical. **NARROWING IT DOWN TO THESE TWO POSSIBILITIES AGAIN EMPHASIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF**

PROTECTING OUR BORDERS AND POINTS OF ENTRIES INTO OUR COUNTRY

(containers from all countries, and specifically trucks coming into the US from Mexico).

THE REAL COST OF TERRORISM!

Sure, America is a powerful and strong country. If we have to fight a war, we will carry its costs. Most of the cost is carried by individuals like you and me. Have you heard any complaints from any one of the thousands of business owners who had to report bankruptcy because of the 9-11 events? No, we just grind our teeth and accept this as part of the cost of freedom! **BUT WHAT IF MANY OF THOSE COSTS WERE NOT NECESSARY** and could have been prevented? What if true ignorance and incompetence - caused by a lack of understanding of terrorism - induced those additional humongous costs? What if those unnecessary, self-induced costs are too much for our country to carry, leading to the destruction of our entire economic infrastructure?

According to their own definition, what was the Terrorist's degree of success?

Remember: At a ratio of 1:10 (10 times as much damage as invested): success! At a ratio of 1: 100 (100 times damage as invested by terrorists): total success, heroes to the terrorist's cause.

Let's figure out the actual ratio, and what part of the damage caused was self-induced.

With the training cost figuring to be no more than a few hundred thousand dollars, and a loss of 18 terrorists' lives, the enemy achieved a major success in:

A. Causing a loss of lives as high as 3,000+.

B. Bringing to a halt and to the brink of financial disaster:

1. The commercial airline industry that also includes the lay-off of 200,000 plus airline employees.
2. The aviation transportation industry.
3. Civilian and small aircraft aviation, including thousands of flight schools.
4. The hotel and tourism industry in general.

C. Bringing to a complete halt:

1. One day - - extended in some areas - - the entire country, of which the total dollar amount alone is most likely close to the entire New York damage. But who cares! It's carried by the millions of businesses and by us, the taxpayers.

2. Numerous times, in many cities over the days following the initial attack with bomb scares that again disrupted lives, businesses, and cost lots of \$\$\$.

Compare the total investment and damage caused on both sides! Estimates suggest a total cost to our country in excess of \$ 240 billion for the first week. That does not include calling up the troops, or the drop (estimated \$500 billion) on the first day of the re-opening of the stock market. Then followed by a \$15 billion financial aid package for the aviation industry (not for the average guy, like

several thousand flight schools that went bankrupt), a \$70 billion aid package to stimulate the economy, \$ 100 billion to re-build New York, etc. Would you like to calculate the ratio of this terrorism investment versus payoff? Remember: at a 1:100 ratio, terrorists are celebrated as heroes of the cause.

The actual, Sept. 11-caused, ratio is about 1: 2,500,000 - - - mostly caused by our own FAA, in shutting down our country, thus initiating a chain reaction of self-destruction, making us dance to the tune of the terrorists. No wonder we see terrorists celebrating success around the world!

The table below gives a summary - many estimated, not very precise - of the damages and costs induced by the 9-11 attacks.

Looking at these data, it should be self-explanatory why there was - and still is - so much criticism regarding the FAA.

Michael Boyd, aviation security expert, expressed exactly my sentiment when he suggested that "the indecision at the FAA gave the terrorists what they wanted," and the former FAA security expert who quit the FAA in disgust asked that the FAA be taken away from the people who are now in charge. **One thing most critics of the FAA can agree on: namely that a change in the FAA leadership is an absolute must - - - but nothing is really happening. Incompetence must not be rewarded!!!!**

SUMMARY OF DAMAGE COSTS		
ST	TERRORISTS	USA
es	18	3000+
ining	\$ 250,000	
damage		\$ 80 billion
op in airline busi-		\$ 30 billion self-induced
s; not yet fully recov.		
s in aviation transportation		\$ 10 billion self-induced
ness		
l to Airline Industry		15 billion necessity self-indu
s hotel/tourism		\$ 12 billion self-induced
ustry		
ousands of businesses (includin		\$ 38 billion self-induced
nt schools) going out of busines		
ckage to stimulate economy		\$ 70 billion need self-inc
ajor airports losses Parking/long		\$ 30 billion self-induced
utting down entire Country for		\$ 110 billion self-induced
-Marshal project		\$ 4 billion
),000 airline employee layoffs		\$ 3 billion self-induced
T INCLUDED here are many truly needed expenditures, like the cost of the war in Afghani		

e Security, improving FBI, CIA, others. (Re-opening stock market drop \$ 500 billion)		
	Terrorists	US
esses:	250,000	00,000,000,000 or 25: 50,000,000 or 2.5: 5,000,000
1:2,500,000 This is 25,000 times more successful as Terrorists had hoped for. And we wonder if terrorists in Arab countries dance in the streets and celebrate success?		

I SUBMIT TO YOU ANOTHER SCENARIO FOR DEALING WITH TERRORISM:

"Show the world that we will not live in fear of the dark side," said Alan Croce during the September 16th Philadelphia Tribute Concert.

In a war would general McArthur or Patton have ducked down, and temporarily retreated from their positions just because somebody on the other side yelled "bomb scare?"

Did America shut down in response to the Pearl Harbor attack? NO! They rolled into action full steam! While the military response (commented on below) is of top caliber, something we can be truly proud of, the focus here is on the FAA, government bureaucracy, and pencil-pushing that puts our country at tremendous risk.

IF AT WAR: the top two rules:

EMERGENCY ORDERS: Decisions must be made instantaneous, not tomorrow; the history of being at war has demonstrate that point, and in many languages. There is no time for eternal discussions anywhere. From the President to the Governors can declare emergencies and issue TEMPORARY emergency orders.

Within this framework: Give major directives only: like to the airlines: Secure your flights and you can fly. To INS, the border guards and military: secure our borders and points of entry.

"LEARN HOW TERRORISM WORKS," must be a major directive to every decision-making individual: Know how he functions, what he is trying to achieve, his methods, counter-measures, what the enemy wants us to do (- - and do the opposite).

The best possible measures will evolve in such a way. Worried that something might go wrong in the meantime? That chance of problems is even higher if some bureaucrats take weeks to work out procedures.

Predict what the enemy wants you to do - - - AND DO THE OPPOSITE. He wants you to be scared, crawl in a hole, and tinkle in your pants. Tell him to go F- - Y- - - self! (which, for the person who doesn't understand letter abbreviations, means "Fear Yourself"). Go shopping. Spend some money! Go on a vacation! You get the best deals for Hawaii vacations right now. Volunteer your services! Even the president urges us: "stay cool, don't lose your nerves, go about your daily lives!" So what do our great leaders in Washington do in response to a - very minor - anthrax scare? They run and hide. The New York Post called them WIMPS! Right on!

Find out WHY THEY HATE US

If the situation is not as simple as "Good Guys, Bad Guys," we must initiate programs to defuse this "hate America" issue. The Muslim world is quite large, and the terrorists have the sympathy of many Arab countries. For an excellent summary article read "Why They Hate Us," in NEWSWEEK, Oct. 15, 2001.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE - and should be done in the future - to PREVENT THE continuation of the SELF-INDUCED FINANCIAL DESTRUCTION.

1) **Secure our borders and points of entry.** Involve the military to secure our borders. Tell those people to develop ways to thoroughly check containers and trucks that enter the country. Don't tell them HOW to do it, just tell them to DO IT!

2) **Keep the airlines flying.** Cancel only 10% of all flights to lighten the load and have a better overview. Tell the airlines to secure their flights - - actually let the pilots decide how to do this - - and get them back into the air. Immediately let pilots who have weapons experience carry guns. Numerous additional security measures, as outlined below, can quickly be initiated. Quickly bring life back to normal.

\$\$ Would have prevented a large part of the drop in airline business \$\$
\$ 27 billion

\$\$ Would have prevented most losses in hotel/tourism industry \$\$
\$ 9 billion

\$\$ Prevented the need for aid to airline industry \$\$
\$ 15 billion

\$\$ Prevented: most of the 300,000 airline layoff \$\$
\$ 2.5 billion

3) **Immediately, to protect flights (until air-marshals are available), use law-enforcement and military personnel.**

On the first day after the 9-11 attacks, they could have had all the protection they ever needed. From law enforcement and military personal - - AND AT THE FRACTION OF THE COST OF THE "Air Marshals" DINOSAUR THEY (still planning, absolute majority of flights still unprotected by air marshals) WANT TO INSTALL. This comes out of discussions with police officers, retired military, and firefighters. Many of them would do it for minimum expenses and/or for a free airline ticket.

Because I believe that the reader probably has more logic than some of those decision-making "geniuses" in Washington, the key points of The **Ill-logic of the "Air Marshals" program** is discussed under this heading at the end of this presentation.

The major, ABSOLUTE MAJOR reason why the terrorists were able to take over the four airliners on this disastrous Tuesday, was because previously hijackers wanted something that could be worked out. "Be nice to them, keep them calm and bring the airplane back on ground" was the major directive to the pilots. Now the rules have changed. We have seen what happened with the fourth airliner. Once people knew what the terrorists' goal was, they fought back. Sadly enough, it appears that the terrorists were already flying the plane, and flew it into the ground when they recognized that their take-over was being terminated by passengers who fought back. Now, that we know what terrorist aim to achieve, and applying the many possible counter-measures, I am sure that they wouldn't succeed. Actually, in my opinion (as military and civilian pilot, and member of a local reserve police unit) I believe that flying is the safest method of transportation.

4) **Keep transportation and small aviation flying.** The major worry was that terrorists might abduct something like a FEDEX or UPS airplane. This possibility is so remote - - because of the many precautions that can be taken - - it demonstrates again that people ignorant about how terrorism works, in addition to a lack of knowledge about flying, were making those far-reaching decisions that dragged us into a path of financial self-destruction.

\$\$ Would have prevented loss in aviation transportation business \$\$
Saved \$ 10 billion

\$\$ Would have prevented most bankruptcies of small businesses \$\$
Saved: \$ 35 billion

Fact: many of the FAA's rules that were supposed to make us feel safe made absolutely no sense, easily bypassed (as I demonstrated in actual flights), but they certainly contributed to stressing flight schools financially, driving many of them into bankruptcy.

5) Do NOT shut down the entire country in response to a terrorist act. Unless a threat that materialized is close to your location and requires action, don't send people home. What are you going to do there? Get more hysterical? Tinkle in your pants? What a waste of time! As a matter of fact, most people instead of being sent home would be happy to work an hour of overtime and donate the extra dollars to victims or to hunt down the aggressors.

\$\$ Prevent cost of shutting down the entire country \$\$
Saved \$ 110 billion

\$\$ 1) through 4) would also have prevented the need for economic aid package \$\$
Saved \$ 70 billion

6) **Do NOT respond to bomb scares.** Allow people - who wish to do so - to leave a building while the security check is done.

\$\$ Saved loss in productivity \$\$

But what I'd like to see in response to a scare is signs appearing in the windows - - the all American sign with the hand that has the middle-finger erect - - with "terrorist" written across the hand.

7) Evaluate the possibility of future threats; take into accounts terrorism principles.

A) Biological: That opens a whole new can of worms; it became clear that the US health department, headed by Dr. Tommy Thompson, is totally unprepared. Having known the possible threats, our vaccination programs were - and still are - a sham.

Anthrax: As I see it, there is something truly wrong with the anthrax attacks (really only scares). If those were real attacks, one would have to conclude that they were near total failures. But **terrorists are not stupid! Let's not underestimate them.** The anthrax attempts are either just aimed at rattling our cages, trying to scare and terrorizing us - - but most likely to take our attention away from other possible coming areas of attack. **Relative to other agents, anthrax is only minor.** Some of the anthrax data (weapons-grade anthrax from Iraq or stolen from insufficiently protected Russian weapons depots) suggest that another terrorist group is entering the picture (Iraq?). I think the same is true for the agricultural airplane scares (again Florida); a smokescreen to make us focus our attention in the wrong direction.

We all know what an unprepared mess that was. Nothing impressive about it.

Smallpox: One of the highest possible risks. **The unpreparedness and unwillingness to act logically, and in agreement with facts - - referred to by many as "incompetence that even surpasses the bungling in the FBI and INS,"** deserves special attention and is written up below, together with the cyanide scenario, under the heading of **"Smallpox and Cyanide: Two disasters waiting to happen."**

B) Nuclear: A regular atomic bomb, or "dirty" bomb.

A dirty bomb is a conventional explosives bomb with radioactive (waste) materials attached. It doesn't kill lots of people, but it spreads radioactive material to make affected areas a wasteland for some time to come; decontamination is possible, but difficult. It's really more of a p.i.t.a.(pain in the - --) bomb with a psychological effect. Naturally, the size (how much conventional explosive, and how much radioactive waste) also plays a role.

Nuclear atomic bomb: Potentially the biggest threat! Priorities would be to prevent the terrorists from bringing the bomb into the country, secure borders, check containers and trucks. 50,000 containers come into the US every day.

If you should learn that a nuclear bomb was exploded in your vicinity, would looking at the Homeland Security color chart tell you what to do? The key questions you should ask? Like am I downwind? How far away? Immediately what mineral supplement to take? (Iodide). How to secure your house? (Turn off any outside air intake, secure, tighten windows and doors).

Nuclear weapons: Even though at least 100 atomic bombs - some of them as small as a suitcase - are missing from the former USSR arsenal, the experts in this field appear to agree that the terrorists may not have one (at least not yet brought into the US) and that exploding an atomic weapon in a western country is not very likely. **However, data made public at the end of December - taken**

serious by Washington - suggested that terrorists had successfully dispatched two suitcase atomic bombs to the US (Ref.: TV interviews with Yosseff Bodansky, Bin Laden expert).

C) Chemical poisons: Sarin, Tabun, Cyanide, others.

The biological/chemical threat is very real! As reported in the Los Angeles Times on Sept. 16, 2001, Section A, page 25, U.S. reconnaissance satellites recently spotted numerous dead animals near one Bin Laden camp, suggesting that the testing of chemical weapons had already been accomplished. In an unprecedented move, normally only heard from alarmists, the CDC alerted health professionals to watch out for cases of smallpox, food poisoning, and deadly viruses like Ebola.

A little terrorist logic. Even though available data are sparse, I'd like to venture another prediction: **Any coming attack has a much higher probability to be with a chemical poison rather than biological** (I'll disclose my background information for this conclusion at a later date). Previously, from terrorist activities, I concluded that Florida (Miami), and in decreasing risk, Atlanta, San Diego and Boston were at a higher risk of being hit. Florida materialized; I still believe that Florida (most likely Miami) is at an elevated risk.

Trying to prevent a chemical poison attack: If it was up to me, I'd focus antiterrorist forces on trucks big enough to carry 2 tanks for liquids, chemical trucks or even smaller trucks (possibly even Vans) with 2 liquid containers. I'd equip law enforcement officers with simple chemical tests for checking transported liquids (while wearing breathing equipment or a gas mask) - - and having another officer standing by with a gun aimed at the driver. All law enforcement officers should be issued Atropine for self-injection (in case a poison attack with a toxin like Sarin should materialize.

If you have any questions about toxins/biological agents, go to <http://www.immed.org> by prof. Garth Nicolson, formerly Chairman of the MD Anderson Cancer Center in Houston, Texas, expert on Gulf War biological agents.

Cyanide poisoning: Terrorist's manuals contain how-to information for preparing and using cyanide poison. In May 2002, the theft of a truckload of 10 tons of sodium cyanide in Mexico made it clear how easily this could become a US reality. We have worked out the scenario and the details are presented further below under the same heading.

Face reality: This will be a long war. To win it we can't rely on the military and hired security forces alone. We must all play our part. Click on "Why this is everybody's war," by Dr. Tony Kern, Lt. Col, USAF (Ret.).