

# THE NEW TIMES

\$25 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

*"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" - John 8:31.*

VOL. 63, No. 3.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

MARCH 1999.

Australia and New Zealand edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

## THE TRAGEDY OF PAULINE HANSON

*by Eric D. Butler.*

As it is generally agreed that the leader of the One Nation Party, Pauline Hanson, is not a deep student of political literature, it is most unlikely that she has ever read *"The Tragedy of Human Effort"* by C.H. Douglas, the author of *Social Credit*. If Pauline Hanson had absorbed the wisdom of Douglas, she would never have started out on a project of trying to achieve her objectives through orthodox party politics. Douglas related how early in his career, he felt that by having made the discovery that there is a major flaw in the modern finance economic system, and that the very future of Civilisation was at risk unless constructive steps were taken to correct this flaw, all that was necessary was for him to bring his discoveries to the attention of prominent members of society, who would then take appropriate action.

But he soon discovered that those who might be expected to take action had a vested interest in exploiting a defective system that further centralises power. It was after his historic 1934 World Tour that Douglas returned to Great Britain to outline a political programme for action, which would unite people in making this democratic system work. The programme was outlined in what is known as the Bastin (Buchan) address. In essence, Douglas said that economic reforms were impossible unless the political system was reformed. Political democracy must precede economic democracy.

He specifically rejected the formation of Social Credit political parties. Douglas was reflecting the views of distinguished critics of the breakdown of the democratic system. Early this century two well-known members of the British House of Commons, Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton, resigned from the British Parliament in protest at the growing dictatorship of the party system. They wrote a little-known book, *The Party System*. They wrote "Votes and Elections and representatives and assemblies are not democratic government. They are at best machinery for carrying out democracy. Democracy is Government by the general will. Wherever, under whatever forms, such laws as the mass of the people desire are possible, and such laws as they dislike are rejected. There is democracy." Belloc and Chesterton concluded that the party system had killed democracy in Great Britain. Regeneration required that electors obtain effective control over the individual Member of Parliament

Following the First War, the former Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, wrote a sensational work, aptly described as *The New Despotism*. Lord Hewart outlined how bureaucratic dictatorship had replaced genuine democracy. After the Second World War the distinguished British jurist,

Professor G. Keeton, later Mr. Justice Keeton, wrote a sequel to *The New Despotism*, described as *The Passing of Parliament*. Keeton wrote *The History of modern political society*, which is in large measure the history of the struggle of the ordinary citizen to exercise some influence upon government, and of his

### OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

To defend the free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private.

To encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

repeated failures to achieve this modest ambition. Douglas grasped the reality of the situation, observing that it was quite sufficient for millions of people to accept the objectives of Social Credit, but a mechanism had to be developed to unite people to demand legitimate results from their elected representatives.

### **The electoral campaign**

This became known as The Electoral Campaign. We will be examining the concept in more detail and how it might be applied to the contemporary political and economic situation in coming issues of *The New Times*.

Pauline Hanson has successfully acted as a type of catalyst in Australian politics. But tens of thousands of votes for One Nation will, of themselves, change nothing. Wars are not won merely by recruiting troops. Those troops must engage in effective action. There is no more effective way to destabilise

## **BASIC FUND CAN AND MUST BE FILLED**

With only a minority of supporters contributing, the Basic Fund is only short of \$10,000. A few dollars from each of those who have not yet contributed will see another League success.

All donations to GPO Box 1052J, Melbourne 3001.

and demoralise troops than to divide them into warring political parties, which inevitably disintegrate, as witnessed by what has happened to One Nation. It is a major tragedy.

---

## **A DIVIDEND OF LEISURE**

*by Michael Lane, in "Triumph of the Past", May 1998.*

**"Triumph of the Past" is published by American Social Crediter Michael Lane, Associate Member, Catholic Press Association. "Triumph of the Past" may be obtained from P.O. Box 29535, Columbus, OH 43229 USA. We strongly recommend this high quality Social Credit publication.**

Let us begin by imagining one of the associations called nations. And let us imagine that it is a money-less economy in which the only product is corn. All businesses are farms, and all payments are in corn. The crop is harvested, most is paid out for eating, part is saved back for planting. The part paid out for eating is, from the point of view of the business, payroll and dividend. From the point of view of the individual, it is income.

Now suppose that every year, after corn for planting has been set aside and individuals paid as agreed, a surplus remains. What is to become of it? If it were a rare occurrence, you would rightly say that the surplus belongs to the owner of the farm, who took all the risks. And if he couldn't eat it all himself, he would have the right to part with it on whatever terms he pleased. But suppose it has become an enduring feature in the association, of which all are members by birth, an enduring legacy of the risks of past generations of farmers. It may now be said to be a product of the association itself. If the association is to serve all the individuals who compose it, such a surplus must be shared equally among all. There would not even be ground to skip over those who, for one reason or another, did not work. The infant, the octogenarian, the sick, and even the lazy are equally members by birth in the association. This is a dividend.

The owner of the farm takes risks and is entitled to ordinary profits. But the owners of the association (that is, everyone) may also be said to be taking a risk in the sense of their loyalty to the nation, and they are entitled to the profits that pertain to that association.

The first effect on the economy of such a proceeding will be general relief from want. People will be happier and healthier. A second effect will be that those who had plenty already will have extra. They can save it "for a rainy day" or part with it on terms.

Suppose, however, that the surplus is not shared out like this but retained as a *monopoly*. The farm owners, of course,

cannot consume it all. But as long as there is hunger, they may be able to use it as a carrot-and-stick to direct people's behaviour. (We are assuming that they are without scruples). As the pile gets bigger and bigger, it will become inconvenient, for the advantage of monopoly is in controlling a vital good that others lack, not in having a lot of it. If the pile gets too big, the farmers may be tempted to destroy it. They will then learn simply to produce less than they easily can, to produce only as big a surplus as they can get advantage from (regardless of the fact that there is still hunger). Indeed, using the surplus for blackmail depends precisely on keeping an edge on people's hunger.

But there are other possibilities. It will dawn on the farm owners that the world is a big place. If they could go outside the association of the nation, they could find other hungry people to direct. Even so, eventually, they will reach a limit. For outside the association of the nation are other nations also producing surpluses. And the farmer-owners find themselves in competition with other farmer-owners in other places. In this competition some will win, and some will lose. And the winners will take over not only hungry populations but also, alas, productive farms producing mountains and mountains of corn! Even the association that conquers the world will have to learn to produce less, though people are still hungry. They will produce as big a surplus as they can get advantage from and no more. For we are assuming they don't care about anyone but themselves.

Now let's return to the arrangement in which the surplus is shared out equally to all members of the association. The first effect will be general relief from want. The second effect will be that those who had plenty will have extra. A third effect will be this: over time, if the surplus itself increases, more and more people will have plenty and, with their dividend, extra. Hunger

will be more and more a thing of the past, and there will no longer even be any use for this extra. There will come a point when it becomes desirable to produce less.

This has important economic consequences. If, for example, ten percent of the annual harvest is extra and plenty is stored in case of emergency, the association can produce ten percent less. It can plant ten percent less seed and release ten percent of the labour force. Workers will either drop out voluntarily, having sufficient for their needs and preferring their leisure, or else negotiate shorter hours for the same pay.

All by means of the dividend. A consistent surplus is something produced by the association, not directly but by its very existence. And the more the association produces in this manner, the less individuals have to produce. The dividend is therefore a dividend of leisure.

What will people do with this leisure? Well, what would you do? I would turn *Triumph of the Past* into a weekly. Making things is man's natural vocation. Selling them is only an unpleasant necessity. With leisure, people would make what they wanted to, without constraints. They would make things to give joy to themselves and others, without the necessity of demanding a price. *Of such things there can be no superfluity.* Many would for the sheer pleasure of it make things that would serve to increase the capacity of production still further.

We looked at a money less economy first, because it contains all the essentials. Money is just a promise of things. The realities of production and consumption are simple. The only purpose of money is to facilitate these simple realities.

---

## WHATEVER HAPPENED TO INFORMED MEDICAL CHOICE?

**Phyllis Schlafly is a well-known and highly respected American conservative researcher and commentator. She issues "The Phyllis Schlafly Report" monthly, which may be obtained from Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002, USA. The following article is from the December 1999 issue of the Report, and is most appropriate at a time when Big Brother is attempting to enforce mass medication on people everywhere.**

Why are American infants and schoolchildren being forced to submit to hepatitis B vaccinations even though the French Health Ministry has suspended them in schools because of evidence they can cause neurological disorders or multiple sclerosis? (*New York Times* Oct. 7 1998). Has America become a nation where the government can force controversial medical procedures on children without allowing their parents informed choice? If you think such things only happen in Communist China, think again. Compulsory health treatment is on the march in the United States.

"Force" is not too strong a word. Across the country, newborn babies are being injected with hepatitis B vaccine only hours after birth (even when their mothers test negative for hepatitis B), and children are told they must present proof of having received three hepatitis B shots before they can be admitted to daycare, kindergarten, fifth grade or high school.

I first became interested in the hepatitis B vaccine when, in connection with the birth of two new grandchildren, I learned that hospitals are routinely injecting newborns with the vaccine during their first 24 hours of life. A series of inquiries produced no convincing medical reason or scientific evidence for this procedure. My new grandchildren were not at risk for hepatitis B, which

is primarily an adult disease transmitted through bodily fluids. Those most at risk are the highly promiscuous (heterosexual or homosexual), needle-sharing drug addicts, health care and custodial workers exposed to blood, and babies born to already-infected mothers.

According to a Centers for Disease Control (CDC) report, there were only 10,637 cases of hepatitis B in the United States in 1996, including only 279 cases in children under the age of 14. Hepatitis B is not fatal for most who contract it, and it is not epidemic except among high-risk groups.

For the problem of 279 children who have hepatitis B, millions of U.S. children are being forced to submit to vaccination consisting of three hepatitis B shots (at about \$40 each)! The government isn't just trying to vaccinate the people who are *at risk* for hepatitis B - that might "stigmatise" them. Instead, the CDC recommends that *all* babies be vaccinated at birth to be ready for risky activities a dozen years later. "Infants are considered the easiest to immunise," says Dr. Walter Orenstein, Director of CDC's Immunisation Program (*New York Times* July 30 1997).

**To win parental support for hepatitis B vaccinations, the vaccine police de-emphasise sex and drugs as risk factors, instead citing alleged**

**dangers from ear piercing and contact sports. A hepatitis B coordinator said, "We didn't want to have to battle people's moral philosophy over children's vaccinations and having parents tell us 'My sixth-grader doesn't have sex'." ("Lining Up for Hepatitis Shots," *New York Times*, July 30, 1997, p.B10)**

More than 24,000 reports of hospitalisation and injuries, including about 400 deaths, following hepatitis B vaccinations have been reported since 1990 to the U.S. government's Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System. There have been no controlled studies to evaluate these reports, there is no adequate proof of the vaccine's long-term safety, and little is known about the effect of vaccines on a newborn baby's immune system. One nationally respected vaccine developer has been repeatedly turned down by the National Institutes of Health for a research grant to study hepatitis B vaccine-related injuries (*Science* magazine, "A Shadow Falls on Hepatitis B Vaccination Effort," July 31, 1998, p.630).

### **VACCINES: THE KEY TO FEDERAL CONTROL**

It's been clear since 1993 that the Clinton Administration is steadily working toward federal control of the

entire health care industry, and a major feature of this control is to compile the health records of all Americans on a government database. The 1996 Kennedy-Kassebaum Act gave the Department of Health and Human Services the authority to establish "unique health care identifiers" so the government can identify and track our medical records. Thanks to Eagle Forum and other alert citizens, last year's Congress postponed this authority until Congress takes further action.

The Clinton Administration is using vaccines as the excuse to build a massive database of the health records of individual Americans. The bureaucrats expect vaccines to be non-controversial because of the remarkable success of the smallpox vaccine in completely eradicating that disease. Here is how the Clinton Administration's plan works.

The 1993 Comprehensive Childhood Immunisation Act, signed by President Clinton, gave the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) \$400 million to assist states to computerise state vaccine databases, or registries, to tag and track children's vaccinations.

The CDC uses carrot and stick to force the states to obey federal "recommendations". The CDC has the power to withhold money grants if state health officials don't show proof of designated vaccination rates, and the CDC has doled out hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars to reward state health departments for promoting mass vaccinations. States receive either \$50, \$75 or \$100 per child who is fully vaccinated with all federally recommended vaccines, including hepatitis B.

In 1995, HHS Secretary Donna Shalala gave the states the power to get access to newborn babies' Social Security numbers in order to put them on vaccine tracking databases. Now, the CDC is trying to link the state vaccine databases, or registries, into a de facto centralised database containing every child's medical records. Once in place, the national vaccine database can serve two important goals:

First, the database will enable the government to enforce mandatory vaccination of all children, thereby conditioning Americans to accept compulsory control of their individual

health care. Although American children entering kindergarten have a 97% to 98% immunisation rate for most prescribed vaccines. (Statement of Dr. Alan R. Hinman, Director of CDC's Center for Prevention Services, to the U.S. House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, Mar 7, 1990), government officials are determined to let no child escape.

The federally monitored vaccine database, which will have all children tagged from birth with an I.D. number, will serve as a gatekeeper to deny the child admission to daycare, kindergarten, school or college, or even access to medical care, without showing proof of all required vaccinations.

Second, once the vaccine database is in place, it will be easy to add *all* medical records. This will accomplish one of the major goals of the Clinton Administration's nationalised health care plan, and will be the key to government's ability to dictate the giving and rationing of health care.

Before any of this happens, it is vital to pass state privacy protections to forbid state officials from sharing personal health data with other states or the federal government. It's also important to keep the feds from preempting existing state privacy laws, which Congress tried to do last year in the so-called Patient Protection bill that fortunately did not pass.

## HOW ARE VACCINES MADE COMPULSORY?

Medicine used to have a grand tradition of according patients the right of informed choice before being given drugs or submitting to medical treatment, including the right to refuse unwanted medical procedures. The only vaccination required when I entered public school was for smallpox, and that's the only immunisation I ever had.

A national campaign to enforce mandatory vaccination laws started with the Jimmy Carter administration, and then was aggressively accelerated during the 1990s. Most states have now passed laws requiring children to be injected with about 33 doses of 9 or 10 different viral and bacterial vaccines, including three doses of hepatitis B vaccine, in order to enter public school. A New Jersey court recently upheld the right of a private school to deny admission to a student who objected to taking a vaccine.

When it comes to vaccines, instead of "choice", some states tolerate limited and hard-to-get "exemptions". Most states permit a *medical* exemption, but that must be signed by a doctor. All but two states permit a *religious* exemption, but that can be interpreted narrowly or broadly. Some 16 states permit a *philosophical* exemption, but that can be arbitrarily interpreted by state bureaucrats. There's a big difference between exercising free choice or having to plead with some government functionary to tolerate your exemption.

Where do these intrusive and expensive vaccine mandates originate, and how can they be enforced nationally since immunisation is a state, not a federal matter? The vaccine police have figured out how to override state authority (and even overrule pediatricians who might otherwise act in the interest of their patients). They have developed an intricate system of control outside the spotlight of public scrutiny and without accountability.

U.S. vaccine policy is set by a quasi-governmental group of mandatory vaccination promoters called the Advisory Committee on Immunisation Practices (ACIP), whose members are appointed by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). ACIP members can have financial ties to the drug corporations, which is a gross conflict of interest since the vaccine manufacturers' profits depend on laws that force vaccines on all children instead of just those at risk. One would think that ACIP's objective would be to promote the health of Americans or to provide information to aid informed choices by parents, but it's not. ACIP's stated purpose is "to increase the safe usage of vaccines."

After ACIP and CDC endorse a given vaccine, then state health officials move to make it mandatory for all children. Sometimes the state law designates a specific vaccine, and sometimes the state law delegates to the state bureaucracy the authority to add a new vaccine to the mandatory list. The unaccountable bureaucrats make regulations that follow CDC instructions and have the impact of law. The drug corporations are involved every step of the way in securing CDC endorsement of a vaccine and in lobbying legislators and bureaucrats to make its use compulsory.

The *New York Times* recently published a front-page report on how

the pharmaceutical corporations spent \$5.3 billion last year sending their representatives into doctors' offices and hospitals, with gifts and meals, to sweet-talk physicians into using their brand-name products. The *Times* headlined the news story: "Fever Pitch: Getting Doctors to Prescribe is Big Business." (Jan 11 1999). The *Times* explained "business is a big part of medicine now." Indeed it is. But of course, doctors have complete freedom to accept or reject the drug corporations' sales pitches.

It's time to hear the rest of the story about how politics is an even bigger part of medicine. With a \$5.3 billion marketing budget, the drug corporations can easily afford to lobby thousands of state legislators and federal and state bureaucrats to pass laws that force us to buy their products, particularly vaccines. It is the mandatory feature of vaccines that makes them so profitable for the industry. (How the Hepatitis B mandate was lobbied through the Ohio legislature, bypassing the proper committee, with no notice, study or debate, is described in "Hepatitis B vaccine for Ohio's kindergarteners unnecessary, *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Jan. 15, 1999)

Vaccines are designed to give us immunity from certain diseases, but the most interesting immunity is the drug corporations' immunity from any liability related to vaccine side effects, which Congress gave them by law in 1986. That, combined with coercive state laws, has made vaccines extremely profitable for the drug corporations.

Physicians who respect the traditional Hippocratic Oath have a duty to work for the well being of their patients (rather than the good of society or any other social goal). This presents a conflict with CDC vaccine policy, which is to promote public health.

The American Academy of Paediatrics (AAP) issues vaccination guidelines for paediatricians. In 1995, however, the AAP and other physician organisations agreed to endorse schedules determined by federal authorities. Some HMOs are requiring paediatricians to achieve a near-perfect vaccination rate of their patients as a condition of their HMO contract, and even be subject to on-site inspection of records to verify compliance.

It's time to have a free and open debate on the pros and cons of the policy considerations that go into laws that make the use of drugs compulsory. Better

yet, it's time to give all parents the right of informed choice about medical treatment for their healthy children.

### **VACCINES A MIRACLE OF MODERN MEDICINE?**

Smallpox has been virtually eliminated from the face of the earth, and polio is well on its way to the same fate. We don't hear much about diphtheria, whooping cough, or scarlet fever any more, and the cases of once common childhood diseases such as measles and mumps have dramatically decreased. Conventional wisdom credits vaccines for these remarkable changes. But there are many variables and unknowns in matters of disease and health. No vaccine was responsible for the dramatic decline of scarlet fever.

Vaccines are supposed to fool the body's immune system into producing antibodies to overcome viral and bacterial diseases in the same way that actually having the disease usually produces future immunity. Natural recovery from infectious diseases usually stimulates the immune system to produce a type of immunity that lasts a lifetime. Once a child has had chicken pox, for example, he will never get it again. However, vaccines provide only an artificial, temporary immunity. That's why booster doses of vaccines are often needed.

Vaccines contain either inactivated (killed) bacteria or viruses or they contain live viruses that have been attenuated (weakened). Sometimes, live-virus vaccines can cause the disease they are designed to prevent. The live-virus polio, measles and chickenpox vaccines can cause vaccine-strain infections of these diseases. Drug corporations grow the viruses and bacteria used to make vaccines in either chicken or pig embryonic cell cultures, monkey kidney cells, human embryonic lung cells, yeast cells, or other mediums. Chemicals such as formaldehyde are used to inactivate the viruses or bacteria. Vaccines also contain such additives as aluminium, thimerosal (mercury), gelatin and antibiotics.

It is not clear that the increased use of vaccines always promotes the health of individuals. No vaccine is 100% safe or effective. We hear persistent reports that some children, following vaccination, develop chronic health problems such as seizure disorders, asthma, persistent ear infections, learning disabilities, hyperactivity, autism, diabetes, arthritis,

or other autoimmune or neurological disorders. Virginia's Lieutenant Governor John Hager is in a wheelchair because he acquired polio from the vaccine given to his infant son.

Between 12,000 and 14,000 reports of hospitalisation, injuries and even deaths following vaccination are reported to the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System every year. The National Vaccine Injury Compensation Programme has already paid out \$925 million in claims for vaccine-caused injuries and deaths. Nobody knows the real total of adverse reactions following vaccinations because very few doctors report vaccine-associated health problems.

When we ask questions of the scientists who created the vaccines, the drug corporations that make and sell them, the public health officials who issue regulations, and the legislators who pass laws forcing every child to be vaccinated, the answers are unsatisfactory and disturbing. The more we ask questions, the more we find that the subject of vaccines is not all based on science - some of it is politics.

Many vaccines are required without publication of the risks and benefits. The vaccine establishment's attitude is that such information unduly alarms parents and, anyway, the government knows what's best for children.

### **NEW VACCINES ARE COMING FAST**

A new live virus varicella zoster (chickenpox) vaccine has recently come on the market. Chickenpox is highly contagious but is a mild disease for most children. More than 95% of all American children get chickenpox between the ages of 1 and 9, recover without complications, and have lifelong immunity. The movement to make the chickenpox vaccine compulsory for all children is moving rapidly. Maryland, Oregon, Washington, D.C., and Massachusetts have already used rule making authority to mandate use of the chickenpox vaccine, and legislation is pending in several other states. Radio and newspaper advertising for the chickenpox vaccine is designed to frighten parents about the disease.

In 1998, the Food and Drug Administration licensed a live rotavirus vaccine to block one cause of infant diarrhoea, even though the vaccine has been shown to be only 50% effective.

The principal selling point used by public health officials in mandating the new chickenpox and diarrhoea vaccines is not the health of the child, but that it will save working mothers money from wages lost if they have to stay home with a sick child. ("Cost-effectiveness Analysis of a Rotavirus Immunisation Program", *JAMA*, May 6, 1998, p. 1371, concludes that this factor accounts for ¾ of the alleged savings from the vaccine).

More than 200 vaccines for a variety of diseases are now under development by drug corporations and government scientists, and there is much talk among government officials about more mandates. A prominent vaccine policymaker has said that all 12-year-olds will be targeted for injection with an AIDS vaccine when it is put on the market.

### **CAN VACCINES BE WORSE THAN THE DISEASE?**

*The Economist*, in an article entitled "Plagued by Cures" (Nov. 22, 1997, p95), stated: "There is growing evidence that preventing diseases in infancy may be a mixed blessing. Can intervening in an illness sometimes be worse than doing nothing at all? . . . The first possible effect is the replacement of one disease by another. As the incidence of childhood infections has fallen, a number of chronic ailments, such as diabetes and asthma, have become more frequent. In parts of the world where childhood diseases are

still common, these chronic ailments are rare . . . Childhood infections do indeed seem to reduce the probability of chronic disease . . . an idea known as the 'hygiene hypothesis' . . . The second possible effect of intervening in a disease is that the intervention makes the disease worse in the long term, not better. A number of viral infections are more dangerous to an adult than an infant."

*Science News*, in an article entitled, "The Dark Side of Immunisation" (Nov. 22, 1997), reviewed several studies by New Zealand and by British researchers showing that vaccinated children have a higher incidence of asthma and diabetes than do unvaccinated children. The article notes that animal studies indicate that an absence of contact with naturally occurring viruses increases the risk of diabetes, and that research in humans suggests that some childhood infections may be advantageous in priming the child's immune system to fight off asthma.

A 1994 study suggested that the pertussis vaccination of infants may increase the risk of asthma five-fold during childhood. (Odent MR; Culpin E.E., Kimel T., "Pertussis vaccination and asthma: is there a link?" *JAMA*, 1994; 272; 591-592).

None of this provides conclusive proof, so we need basic science research and large clinical studies, conducted by independent, non-government, non-industry-financed scientists, on the side effects and long-term effects of vaccines

and of multiple vaccinations. But neither the government nor the drug corporations appears willing even to talk about this.

### **WHO SHOULD DECIDE A CHILD'S CARE?**

When it comes to balancing risks versus benefits, it's not always obvious how to weigh the risks. Parents, not government politicians or bureaucrats, should be balancing the risks and benefits of vaccines for their own children based on complete information.

State legislators and state and federal bureaucrats are seldom physicians or scientists. They get their information from other unaccountable bureaucracies such as the CDC and from the lobbyists for the drug corporations. Scientists and physicians aren't infallible. When I was growing up, tonsillectomies were routinely performed on children. I now am glad my family couldn't afford that unnecessary surgery.

Freedom in America should include allowing parents to make their own informed choice about injecting their babies with potentially dangerous vaccines. Parents should do their own research. Helpful information about vaccines is available from a non-government educational organisation: National Vaccine Information Centre (NVIC), 512 W. Maple Ave., Suite 206, Vienna VA 22180; 1-800-909-SHOT; fax: 703-938-5768; www.909shot.com.

---

## **CHRISTMAS SMILES IN ALASKA**

*by Neil McDonald*

**On opposite ends of the world, Alaska should envy Australia with no genuine problems on the surface. No shortage of anything, anywhere. The economic brakes are on - with just enough effort to keep shops filled but never overflowing. No scarcity - instead abundance. Brightly the sun shines on Australia.**

An invisible, unpayable national debt - now well over \$200 billion, strangled with interest charges.

Tomorrow's future is heavily mortgaged to pay for today. Is there an escape? Another country offering retreat from a path to ruin? Is there somewhere a nation with no national debt?

Search worldwide . . . perhaps Switzerland - less tangled with international agreements - is in the clear?

Wearing a blanket of snow, Alaska, 59th State of the U.S.A., poses an example we need to examine.

For more than ten years, every resident of Alaska has received an annual dividend - a genuine Christmas present. Royalties from oil have been placed into a Permanent Fund.

On 16 June 1995, the *Brisbane Courier Mail* reported: "Alaska makes its living by pulling riches from the ground Alaskans pay no income tax . . . 85 per cent of the budget comes from oil revenues."

Despite a harsh climate, Alaska is a modern State. Agriculture is modest. The entire population is less than

600,000.

Dividend cheques are to every resident. . . Average handout is \$A8, 600 . . . a lot of dollar "dough" to put glow on the snowballs.

Australia needs to take a closer look at Alaska and reject the debt trail of one-worlders.

There is dividend material mixed with the unlimited potential trio - mineral, industrial and pastoral.

A rebirth of dormant productive capacity would rival the dividend rewards enjoyed across Alaska from capital Juneau to more remote Anchorage.

Our political representatives need to awaken from the dreamtime to the reality that everything physically possible has a credit and not a debt component.

Wake up Australia - there's gold at the end of the rainbow. Needed are visionaries to replace the gaggle of party hacks squabbling over ways to further drain the passive Aussie taxpayer.

# MONEY IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

by Michael Joyce

From *The New Age* (London) of October 5th, 1933

The history of Greece up to the time of, say, Alexander the Great, has these two claims, among others, upon our interest: one, that here we can see things happening for the first time, in Europe at any rate; and two, that the principles involved are as vast as the scale on which they are applied is small. It seems likely, then, that Greek history will have something to teach us about money: the following sketch is elementary and non-controversial, and I hope it will inspire someone who is better equipped than I am to go into the question more deeply. My chief authorities are Plutarch's life of Solon, Mr. E.S.G. Robinson's article on money in that admirable book of reference, "A Companion to Greek Studies," Mr. A.E. Zimmern's "The Greek Commonwealth," and Bury's "History of Greece." I have quoted at some length to show that I have not twisted History to suit my own ideas.

It is generally agreed that money was first coined in Lydia, in Asia Minor, at the end of the eighth century, B.C., or the beginning of the seventh. The use of precious metals in commerce had long superseded crude barter and the reckoning of wealth in terms of cattle; but the seller had to check the weight and purity of the metal offered in exchange for his goods, until the Lydians saw how much time and trouble would be saved by stamping the bits of metal intended for circulation. "As Aristotle says, the stamp was to show that the weight was true and to dispense with the continual use of the balance." (Robinson). By the end of the seventh century the idea had spread to Greece, and during the next hundred years it reached Italy and Sicily. "Every city of importance wished to issue its own money (to do so was a sign of autonomy) and the resulting coins are a characteristically varied reflection of Hellenic life . . . At first the type was stamped on one side only of the coin, the obverse, while the other, the reverse, showed a sinking or incuse, the mark of the punch which drove the metal into the engraved die. In the later sixth and fifth centuries it became usual to engrave a design on the punch as well, and thus the coin reaches its final form. The earliest types were probably the badges of individuals, perhaps Lydian kings or tyrants of cities, or even mere private merchants...

"All Greek gold, electrum [an alloy of gold and silver] and silver coins are 'value' coins, that is, the nominal value of the coin coincides in theory with its value as mere metal. The earliest coins were of the denominations representing considerable purchasing power, but the growth of trade produced an increasing demand for small change; and coins in the same metals representing small fractions came more and more into use. The inconvenience of such tiny coins led to the introduction of larger bronze coins of the same or even lower values. These were 'token' coins, that is their face value was considerably greater than their value as mere metal, and their acceptance depended solely upon convenience backed by the authority of the State." (Robinson)

From which point it is not such a very far cry to the fourth century, B.C., when Demosthenes remarked that if you didn't know that credit was the most important factor in making money, there wasn't much you *did* know. The word I translate

as "credit" is  $\pi^{****}$ , which is used in the New Testament for Faith.

By all accounts the invention of Money gave almost as great an opportunity for the concentration of power as the growth of the modern credit system.

"For consider what the change means in the life of a peasant who is living from hand to mouth on his yearly harvests. He used to take his stuff to market and exchange it for the goods he needed - wool for the wife to spin, children's shoes for the winter, or tiles to mend the roof; or he would pay the smith and the joiner in kind for repairing his plough or his cart. But now most of them will not accept his corn and wine till he has turned it into money. How much is it worth? He has not the least idea: for it depends on factors outside his range and which he has no means of controlling. He takes what the middleman gives him; and the middleman makes a living on his commission. At the end of the first year he is alarmed to find he has not as much margin in hand as usual. When the inevitable lean year comes he has no margin at all. In fact, he cannot see his way to get through the winter without help. His only resource is to borrow." (Zimmern.)

The only people who have any money are the nobles, and he is forced to go to one of them and raise money on the land, which was his father's before him. The aristocratic moneylender "sets up an eyesore of a pillar, with letters on it, in full view of the house. He [the peasant] cannot read the letters, but he supposes they are to keep him in mind of his bargain." (Zimmern.) In short, as the great liberator, Solon, said, the black earth was enslaved.

Unless the farmer's luck changes he cannot repay the loan next year, and the money-lender takes the property in lieu of payment, leaving the former owner in possession as tenant, on condition that he pays one-sixth of the value of his produce as rent. And as Plutarch tells us, those who couldn't pay their sixth:

"were by the law delivered to their creditors, who kept them as bondmen and slaves in their houses, [or, of course, on the original farm] or else they sent them into strange countries to be sold: and many even for very poverty were forced to sell their own children (for there was no law to forbid this remedy) or else to forsake their city and country, for the extreme cruelty and hard dealings of these abominable usurers their creditors."

Those who have read their poets know what expatriation meant to the Greeks; Homer makes Athene say of her favourite, Odysseus, that "in his yearning to see it if were but the smoke leaping upwards from his own land, he longs for death." Zimmern suggests that similar sufferings are reflected in the complaints of Amos and Hosea; and there is certainly an aptness in Amos's imprecation on those who have "sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes." An interesting parallel might also be drawn between the reforms of Solon, which we are about to consider, and the liberation of bondmen and the return of land to its original owners in the Jubilee year, as laid down in Leviticus.

The growing jealousy between rich and poor all over Greece led to the establishment of "tyrannies," or dictatorships, as we should call them. The easiest way to become a dictator was to take up the people's cause against the nobles at the critical moment; and there is the famous case of the rising politician who rushed into the market-place one morning, covered with blood, and informed the populace that the nobles had shown their resentment of his popular sympathies by trying to assassinate him. The people were so touched that they voted him a bodyguard on the spot, and that was goodbye to their democratic hopes. But autocratic government was never congenial to the Greek, and the next period was that of the great lawgivers, of whom the greatest, probably, was Solon of Athens (born about 639 B.C.); at any rate we know more about him than any of the others. He is famous for his democratic reforms in the Constitution, which were far-reaching in their results; but here we are concerned with his handling of the economic crisis.

He was an aristocrat by birth, a moderate liberal by conviction; apparently he commanded the respect of both parties, and as everyone realised that revolution was imminent he was elected archon with extraordinary powers in the year 594 B.C. There is some obscurity as to the nature of his reforms, but apparently he decreed the complete cancellation of all mortgages on land, freed all the farmers who had been enslaved, and made it illegal to borrow money on the security of the borrower's person; his decree went down to history as the  $\pi$ .....\*\*, that is, the shaking off of burdens.

"Howbeit some write," says Plutarch, "that the poor were contented that the interest only for usury should be moderated, without taking away the whole debt: and that Solon called this easy and gentle discharge, Seisachtheia, with crying up the value of money. For he raised the pound of silver, being before but three score and thirteen drachms, full up to an hundred: so they which were to pay great sums of money, paid by tale as much as they ought, but with less number of pieces than the debt could have been paid when it was borrowed. And so the debtors gained much, and the creditors lost nothing. "Nevertheless the greater part of them which have written the same, say, that this crying up of money, was a general discharge of all debts, conditions, and covenants upon the same: whereto the very poems themselves which Solon wrote, do seem to agree. For he glorieth, and breaketh forth in his verses, that he had taken away all bawks and marks that separated men's lands through the country of Attica [I fancy this refers to the mortgage-pillars described above], and that now he had set at liberty, that which before was in bondage. And that of the citizens of Athens, which for lack of payment of their debts had been condemned for slaves to their creditors, he had brought many home out of strange countries, where they had been so long, that they had forgotten to speak their natural tongue, and other which remained at home in captivity, he had now set them all at good liberty." No doubt these reforms represented a compromise.

"For where," Plutarch tells us, "the mischief was tolerable, he did not straight pluck it up by the roots: neither did he so change the State as he might have done, lest if he should have

attempted to turn upside down the whole government, he might afterwards have never been able to settle and establish the same again. Therefore he only altered that, which he thought by reason he would persuade his citizens unto, or else by force he ought to compel them to accept, mingling as he said, sour with sweet, and force with justice. And herewith agreeth his answer that he made afterwards unto one that asked him, if he had made the best laws he could for the Athenians? Yea sure, saith he, such as they were to receive."

Like so many compromises, Solon's settlement was not altogether acceptable to either party, and there were still some awkward corners to be turned before Athens reached the height of her prosperity. But it seems to have been an honest and fairly effective attempt to return to the former state of peasant ownership. Later on, of course, Athens became more and more an industrial and trading centre, and by the fourth century at any rate - witness the activities of Pasion - something of a banking centre too. And of course the slave-population was much greater in the age of Pericles than in that of Solon, though the old idea that the greatness of Athens was based entirely on slavery is quite discredited; slaves and free labourers worked on the Parthenon side by side.

As her trade increased Athens became more and more dependent upon wheat imported from the area round the Black Sea; so much so that at the opening of the great war with Sparta Pericles succeeded in persuading the populace that so long as they could hold the famous Long Walls which connected the city of Athens with her harbours, it would pay them to let the Spartan armies ravage the rest of Attica, and get all their food by sea. It was Lysander's defeat of the Athenian navy at Aegospotomi in the Dardanelles, and the consequent loss of her most vital trade route, that led to the final surrender of the city to the Spartans.

In conclusion, I must quote a passage from Plutarch, which shows how little the sixth-century Greek had to learn from the modern financier.

"For [Solon] having framed an edict for clearing of all debts, and lacking only a little to grace it with words, and to give it some pretty preface, that otherwise was ready to be proclaimed: he opened himself somewhat to certain of his familiars whom I he trusted and told them how he would not meddle with lands and possessions, but would only clear and cut off all manner of debts. These men before the proclamation came out, went presently to the money-men, and borrowed great sums of money of them, and laid it straight out upon land. So when the proclamation came out, they kept the lands they had purchased, but restored not the money they had borrowed. This foul part of theirs made Solon very ill spoken of, and wrongfully blamed: as if he had not only suffered, but had been partaker of this wrong and injustice. Notwithstanding he cleared himself of this slanderous report, losing five talents by his own law. For it was well known that so much was due unto him, and he was the first that following his proclamation, did clearly release his debtors of the same."