

Regarding the EGR...To DELETE or not to DELETE... that is the question! (Part One)

It would not seem appropriate, at first glance, for anyone to openly tell another they should break the law, transgress a regulation or contravene a ruling. We are, by the way, law abiding citizens of a civilized nation, mature in mind and conscience. Our only hope is to supply our families with food and shelter and a means to prevail. However, what do real men do when laws restrict personal freedom and along with it their very hope to prevail?

Laws are intended to provide citizens the framework for personal freedom, security and the pursuit of prosperity. But what happens when the laws themselves inflict the abuse and fraud?

History has clearly shown that not all laws in society have been or will be just, fair practical or even moral. Consider these examples: slavery, prohibition (alcohol as illegal), women not being allowed to vote, and the British monopoly of Salt in India (see Mahatma Gandhi: Non-violent non-co-operation, protesting oppressive taxation and discrimination to achieve independence).

Are sound and moral people bound to obey the laws when they are based on fraud, deception, discrimination and abuse? Would we today be a part of the underground rail road? Helping runaway slaves seek freedom in the north? Was it not (or would it not) be our moral obligation to do so?

No sane citizen today would push for slavery or abolishing the female vote but I would dare say a robust debate could be found for prohibition, with strong arguments on both sides. One claiming personal freedom issues while the other showing the social degradation alcohol abuse fosters. Not all laws are as clear as slavery.

Hast to create or passion to continue laws are not always based on justice, equality or liberty. Like the British Monopoly of Salt or U.S. slavery laws, some had serious financial considerations. Who would pick the cotton? What would become of the British Treasury, of the impoverished southern States? Lawmakers (from the southern states or Britain) could hardly be considered unbiased in their arguments. There was big money and power to be made or lost.

A comparison is easily made to the so called "Climate change" anti-carbon legislations. These laws (originating between 1999 and 2001 at the height of global warming fears) are based on "climate science" a now steadily DECLINING source of true scientific data (see climate-gate and ClimateDepot.com).

Why would politicians, (and some scientists) contrived a climate crisis and facilitate harsh and extreme legislation?

At the heart of every injustice and fraud is money and power. There was big money in slavery and concentrated power in denying women the right to vote, climate change legislation is no different. One example is the "cap-n-trade" global carbon tax where (if passed) HUNDREDS of BILLIONS of dollars would be funneled through an exchange privately administered without public accountability (unfettered power and economic control).

Publicly the exchange would "save the world" by economically controlling it, quietly harvesting billions in "credits" for global control. The plan is based entirely on a crisis (or in this case perceived crisis) and requires the public's absolute "blind faith". It makes Bernie Madoff's fraud look like sandbox pocket change.

So, if a citizen understands and believes that a man made law was based on fraud and discrimination, are they morally bound to obey that law? Is it a law that must be observed? Is there a moral obligation that supersedes this anti-carbon legislation?

Canadian's are not anarchists, if anything we tend to be somewhat pacifistic. But what if an unjust, fraudulent based law restricts personal freedom and sabotages the very hope to feed our families?

My accounting firm works exclusively with operators. Since 2008 (inception of the EPA second wave) I have personally seen operators go bankrupt, insolvent, or set back by decades due to temporary repairs. I call them temporary because they kept re-occurring. These were NOT fly by night operators. They were NOT financially challenged. They were in the industry for decades. They had a history of strong financial success (some with several trucks) and several with a respectable net worth.

First there came the increase in monthly fuel costs (\$1000-\$1400), then the incessant downtime (luckily under warranty). Then warranty expired, team operators were hit first, then the singles.

Not many operators can overcome the average \$9-18,000 per year in needless maintenance costs (coupled with reduced margins). Some were able to trade off just before warranty expired while others got out of the industry, or sold the newer and "upgraded" to the older. A smart business move by the way.

These challenges are NOT small. They are NOT petty and they are NOT temporary! These challenges threaten the very fabric of our nations trucking families. It can easily be a financial death blow to any operator. Anyone who found themselves in this crisis can take comfort in the fact that they have been truly victimized. If you survived, consider yourself fortunate to have purchased a non-typical non-lemon.

Talking with and observing as many operators as I have, I must state that some seemed to miraculously overcome their maintenance and fuel challenges almost over-night. I'm of the Clintonian philosophy... don't ask... don't tell.

I believe operators have three primary choices: stick it out (if you can), leave the industry or stand against discrimination and fraudulently based legislation, for some that may mean deleting a fraud.

For all those who may participate in the "under ground highway" just remember. Without a complete understanding of the principles behind what you are doing simple "deleting" is lawlessness. However well educated, principle based "deleting" may be viewed as civil disobedience, which (by the way) may result in the same consequences as lawlessness.

Democracy provides us a civil means of waging war without physical conflict. Every election has its consequences, every politician his day of reckoning. If buffoons were elected, we must personally take responsibility for it. Democracy allows us the power to "elect the least offensive buffoon".