

# **REVOLUTION NUMBER TEN**

A BLUEPRINT FOR THE NON-VIOLENT TRANSITION  
OF POWER  
AND DIRECTION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA

**By**  
**GEORGE BAILEY**

Copyright© 2001 by George Bailey

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the author.

ISBN 0-75962-130-6

1<sup>st</sup> Books rev. 7/19/01

*Revolution Number Ten*

**E Pluribus Unum**

*George Bailey*

This is not a hoax, a gimmick nor a play on words. It is my intention to inform you, to unite you and to guide you toward a socio-economic revolution. I have no doubt that there are those who would rename this book “The Man Who Would Be King”. Let me assure you that I would not. This book is born of a sense of frustration, not a thirst for power. For 30 years we have debated our course, but the solutions have never been made clear. I have come to believe that nothing can be fixed unless everything is fixed, and there within lies my goal. This is not a great literary work. My writing style is not all that I would wish it to be. I consider myself an inventor not a writer. Furthermore, my references are just as likely to be to movies and the lyrics of songs as to books or the standard platitudes of academia. The reason for this is simple. I am writing to “ALL” Americans; for I believe it is often the scholars of our time that hold us back. It is they who have invested their lives in the acquisition of knowledge and therefore it is they who must defend that knowledge as truth or face ridicule or even a life of privilege lost. After all, if you are vested as an “Expert”, you are not very likely to support an idea which casts you out of your position of privilege.

Robert Kennedy said “Some people see things as they are and ask why; I see things as they never were and ask why not.” It is safe to say that, I too, see things as they never were and I offer you a chance for change. This book is a holistic approach to the healing of our country. It attempts to deal with a very broad spectrum of our problems, how they interact and what must be done to improve the situation. For this reason the book is comprised of three parts. In part one I do my best to explain what I personally think has gone wrong and why. In part two, I offer up my solutions. In part three, I lay out the plans for transition and the terms for reconciliation. There are no chapter headings, subheadings, no titles. Were I to lay everything out in a table of contents, I’m sure that most people would begin with part three and then proceed to their personal area of significance in part two. That kind of self-centeredness is as much to blame as anything else for where we find ourselves today. I apologize for the length of the book. I wish I could have gotten my plan across on a matchbook cover. Never the less, if you intend to judge my work by excerpt, you will have to do it without my help. Instead, make this your book, with your notes and references: study it, contemplate it. I have worked alone, without benefit of an editor. My spelling has always been bad. I may have used some words inappropriately. I may have used some big words when they were uncalled for. Forgive me. I may have made mistakes of all manner and said things that I will regret in the future. But without a plan, there can be no change. Without a consensus of which plan to enact, there can be no change. If I have misquoted or in any way said anything, which is untrue about anyone, let me apologize here at the beginning; because this work is not about hurting but healing. It is not about falsehoods; it is about a search for the truth. It is not about me, it is about Us.

Let me say first that I am an American. I've always been, simply, an American and nothing else, although I'm not always proud of the things my country does. I grew up in a time when anything and everything was possible. The nation was full of hope and of itself. But as we grew up, my generation was finding that the nation was not perfect. Still, we believed that we had the tools to change things; to right wrongs and heal old wounds. Today I think most young people are of the opinion that the protests against the war in Vietnam were somehow championed by the press and accepted by the public. The truth is that they were often not even tolerated. There was a lot more "Love it or leave it" in the land than there was debate. Protesters found themselves at odds with parents, government and society at large. But we had been inspired by the work of Martin Luther King and the Kennedys. We knew what was wrong and we were determined to fix it. So, we put an end to the "Police Action" in Vietnam, we fought racial injustice and we fought social intolerance and we fought sexual inequality: and with each new fight we built organizations, with politically powerful leaders; and the politicians played up to the leaders of our organizations until the leaders of the organizations became politicians themselves. And in time, each new power hungry individual outside the political parties, found their own cause to champion and gained their own political clout, until we as a people became so fragmented as to be politically impotent. Our inner cities are war zones. Our water is unfit to drink. Our politicians and our judges are corrupted. The list goes on and on, and yet, nearly all of our elections in 1990 [when I began this book] seemed to focus on the issue of abortion to the exclusion of all else: an issue on which the country is evenly divided. Prior to 1990, congress voted itself a \$35,000 RAISE in salary over the furious objections of the whole country; then they publicly agreed not to discuss it in the 1990 elections and We took it. We voted in the same faces. We tell the world that we are a democratic society, but in fact, the government functions independently of the will of the people. Public reaction is merely pandered to. By 1994 the Democrats would be voted out of Congress and the new Republicans would move to make sweeping changes. But in the end, nothing would really change. In our furor to change the world in the 60's and 70's we handed out what little political power we had to watchdog groups that are self serving and fanatical.

Now I watch the occasional talk show and news program. I read the newspaper and listen to the same on the radio. They discuss this problem and that, in the same inflammatory way, over and over again; but their answers and proposals fall short. Why? It is, I believe, because the whole system has run amuck. It is like the story of the "Six blind men and the elephant", in which the six blind men go to investigate the nature of an elephant without benefit of any prier knowledge about the animal. The first blind man feels the elephant's side. "How smooth" he says, "An elephant is like a wall." The second feels the trunk. "How round, an elephant is like a snake." The third feels a tusk. "How sharp, an

*George Bailey*

elephant is like a spear.” The fourth feels a leg. “How tall, an elephant is like a tree.” The fifth feels an ear. “How wide, an elephant is like a fan.” The last feels the tail. “How thin, an elephant is like a rope.”

Contrary to what we were told in those heady days of my childhood, one person can make very little difference in the political arena. Even politicians, by their career oriented nature, render themselves ineffective. No: the only way I see to turn this nation around is with a bold stroke; with a revolution: or perhaps closer to the point, a revelation. We must galvanize ourselves together in a common purpose and demand change. But what changes? We must not sink so far as the Soviet Union did before “Perestroika”, only to stomp our feet and demand the impossible. We must embark upon this journey with a consensus of opinion and conviction, while the framework set forth by the founders of our country are still in tact; while we still have an economic base to build on; before our freedoms have disappeared for the sake of “Law and Order”.

How then to build a consensus? We are bombarded with information from all directions each day. Some of it is true but much of it is slanted and unreliable. Statistics can be interpreted in many ways, and the phrasing of a polling question can be calculated to elicit the desired response. Some of the “facts” I state here within may be incorrect. Just because I saw them on TV or in print or heard them on the radio, no longer means that they are true. But these things are inconsequential, for while the facts of a particular incident or circumstance may be veiled in misinformation, the broader truths of life can not be hidden from those who have heard the truth. They say that there is a mental process in which information is taken in, assimilated and digested. Then sometime later, subconsciously, a conclusion is reached. An answer is formed in the mind because of a subconscious need which demands that questions be reconciled before they can be set aside. Today this mechanism is strained more than ever. Information comes at us from the television and the radio, so fast that we dare not even speak amongst ourselves for fear of missing the next bit of information. But logic is like mathematics; hence the phrase, “It doesn’t add up”. The assimilation of these bits of information over time gives us our own world view. For many years I found myself changing sides on certain issues. With new information and new experience, I found that youthful ideology give way to reality and saw reality tempered by charity; and I hope, some small amount of wisdom. My opinions don’t change much any more. Instead, what I hear just continues to reinforce and confirm what I believe to be true. I believe that most of you have reached your own conclusions. My hope is that I can articulate my conclusions in a way that shows that most of us have arrived at that point of assimilation and our conclusions are much the same. At the same time, you may not have all of the facts. So by informing you, I hope to change some of your conclusions which are based on misinformation.

Only a fool would claim to have all the answers. For that reason I reserve the right to change my opinion. But for the purposes of this work there can be no alterations. So then, for the sake of my conscience, I offer up this book to you, The Americans. For the purposes of discussion and the formulation of a common consensus, I submit to you my view of the elephant as a whole. It is doubtful that anyone will agree with “all” I have to say. I ask only that you struggle to find agreement with me as hard as you struggle to criticize. I have no other agenda. For that reason, I will not give my name so that I do not become the issue. It is the state of the nation that is the issue, nothing else.

Over the years I have discussed many of the issues covered in this book with various people I have encountered in life’s travels and I have learned that most people seem to have a pretty good grasp of what it is that’s wrong with what everyone else is doing. But they have built up a set of defenses around how they contribute to the problem. Interestingly enough, it isn’t necessary for me to know much about a person prior to a conversation to know a lot about them when the conversation turns cold. It’s natural that people defend those things that they do to get along in society. And if I, as an individual, were to sit down with you and challenge your defenses, we would soon be at odds. It’s like walking up to someone and telling them they’re stupid or ugly. They’re probably insecure enough, that even if it isn’t true, they don’t want to be made to feel small. We have little choice about the looks God gave us or how smart we were born. And in this world we were born in to, we all have done things and made choices to get along and to get ahead. But this book is about changing our country and with it, the world. For that reason, it is going to be up to you to at least hear the things that challenge your self-perception. As the big picture becomes clearer it will be easier to let go of your defenses. If you are young, you will find it easier to be open minded. Try not to become too judgmental. We have to help each other to understand what is going on, so that we can take control of the situation. Again, let me apologize in advance for any discomfort I cause.

The story of the Kennedys and Martin Luther King Jr. is the story of William Wallace as told in “Brave Heart”. Many Presidents have galvanized the people together against a foreign aggressor, or against an economic problem: but only the Founding Fathers of this country, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy lead the people of this nation toward freedom. Social oppression in any form oppresses all men and all women. William Wallace galvanized a people together to rise up in violent revolt because violence was his only avenue. And while the movie “Brave Heart” celebrated the violence, the real lesson of the story of William Wallace is not the battles he won, nor even the opportunity he afforded the future King of Scotland to gather together his people to win their independence from the King; “Long Shanks”. The importance of the story of William Wallace is that his popularity and the power it would give him;

*George Bailey*

caused a situation in which his rival, “Long Shanks”, would be forced to bargain. Of course, if you know the story, you know that it is not in the nature of those who rule through politics to bargain with those who challenge the system but rather to make alliances with those who are willing to play along. William Wallace was betrayed by some of the very people he was trying to help to become free Scots because they feared that Wallace would fail, or because they saw their opportunity to increase their own lot at the expense of others. That is the real lesson of brave William.

Martin Luther King’s famous “I Have A Dream” speech says that, in his dream, all God’s children live together in a nation where they would not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their heart. He spoke of a nation where color was of no consequence. A decade later, the leaders of the Black community would be promoting the development of a Black subculture within our country. They would promote everything from Islam to Ebonics. It would begin with promoting an African heritage and move on to celebrate the violent subculture of the inner city. They would champion both special privileges and the Democratic Party. Those that could deliver the “Vote” would be raised up to prominence and economic security. There was no place in Martin Luther King’s dream for a people who were forced to speak a language that would insure that they remain down trodden. He could never have imagined that they would be convinced by their own leaders to adopt such a language on their own.

But it was not just the Black community who was separated from the Nation united by the Kennedys. We have all been bartered for and followed willingly. We pick a line to stand in and we defend the beliefs of those who stand in that line with us. We justify our motives with common rationalizations, and we never change lines for fear of losing our place or just because we do not wish to put forth the effort. It is a mentality borrowed from the “Spots Fan” who proclaims that this is “MY” team and I will champion it blindly because I derive self esteem from carrying its banner and wearing its “LOGO”. It is an excuse to shirk our responsibility as members of a free society or to hide our insecurities about our inability to live up to those responsibilities. I have come to call you together once more. But just as those in the Black community must reflect on what I have just said of those things they cling to, you must prepare to do battle with your rationalizations. You must be willing to step out of your line lone enough to look at where it leads.

When I was a young man, I took a job at a concrete company. They paid their drivers \$10.45 an hour, which was a good wage for the area in which they were and at that time. Because it was seasonal work, many of the drivers were laid off during the winter and as a result, many did not make it back for a second season. In fact, as I progressed into that summer season I came to realize that about 40% of the drivers seemed to be new. Because it was a non-union



company, all the new drivers started out at \$6.00 an hour. Virtually all of the competing concrete companies in the area had been run out of business. This company was allowed to operate in pretty much of a vacuum. The drivers who had been there a while believed that the reason all the other companies had gone under was because they had been union. They did not recognize the fact that their good wages were more than likely a direct result of the higher wages paid by those by gone, “union” competitors and they resisted any notion of unionizing, lest their company might go out of business as well. Of course, the notion was ridiculous, as they were the last man standing in that metropolitan area. No government agency had or would ever challenge their monopoly, so any wage increases would have been passed on to consumers without affecting the companies “Bottom Line”. Still, they made a good wage at \$10.45 an hour and they were the majority.

When I took the job I really couldn't afford to work seasonally for \$6.00 an hour; but the health plan was good and I was told that I would receive a ten-cent raise, every thirty days. When my first raise didn't show up and I inquired about it. I was told that I needed to ask for the raise each month in order to receive it. So I began asking for my raise each month. When my second raise was late, I inquired again. I was informed that raises were only submitted on the Monday following the end of the thirty-day period. As, thirty days from Monday will always fall on Wednesday, the following Monday will always be thirty five days away. This method of bookkeeping lowered the potential number of raises from twelve a year, to ten. New hires also had to face the reality they would be lucky to work more than eight or nine months a year. Company policy also dictated that when drivers who were laid off in the winter, returned to work in the spring, they would loss ten cents in wages to offset the company's expenses associated with their retraining. As it happen, the company had given an across the board wage increase of 5% that spring. Those who were at top wages had gone from just under \$10.00 an hour, to \$10.45. If there had been anyone returning at \$6.60, they would have lost 10 cents to, \$6.50. Additionally, while those at the top got around 50 cents an hour as a result of the 5% raise, those starting their second year would get 32 cents. It would therefore take them about seventy days to make up the difference with their monthly raises.

One day we were all setting around the break room waiting to be dispatched, and I began playing with the numbers. When I extrapolated that a 5% increase might come each year in the future, I determined that it could take as long as eight years to reach the top wage. When I shared my revelation with the twenty or so drivers in the room, I was amazed at the responses. Some of the established drivers actually became indignant at my suggestion that such an arrangement was unfair. One driver, who had made top wage in three years, insisted that I should work all winter in the shop, fixing trucks, the way he had. Of course, that was his

*George Bailey*

job and not available to me or the majority of the newcomers. He had been fortunate to be able to work year round in a seasonal profession. He had, in fact, been privileged; but the intimation that he had been, set him off. He would have fought with me physically, had I insisted that he admit that his circumstances were different than mine. Most of the older drivers simply shrugged it off as of no consequence. Most of the new drivers saw the writing on the wall. One of the older drivers took me to task. It was fair for him, he insisted, and therefore, fair for me. In fact, he was forever telling us that when he started, the top wage had been \$2.70 an hour. So I ask him what the beginning wage had been when he hired on. "\$2.40" he fired back. So I inquired of him if he hadn't told us in the past that "Top Scale Wage" had been \$2.70 when he started and he affirmed. I asked him if he got 10 cents a month in raises. He affirmed. I asked him if that had not allowed him to make scale in three months. He affirmed. I asked if we, the new guys, were getting the same deal he got. "Yes", he insisted, "Ten cents a month." Life is rarely fair. We all are forced to find a way to survive within systems that are not of our own making and sometimes we are not always proud of that fact. The guy who worked year round for the company I just spoke of, did not wrong his fellow workers by working year round. But when he defended the methods the company used to divide its work force into "Haves" and "Have Nots", he allowed his own feelings of guilt and his insecurities about his job and his own self esteem to be used by his employer to their own end. I would move on and start my own business. I would go on to meet many people who stood in many lines and who, like the old driver, would defend their line, their team, with the rationalizations promoted by those who pay people to stand in those lines. You, no doubt, stand in more than one line. They are lines of entitlement. I have come to challenge your rationalizations in the privacy of your own heart rather than in a break room in front of those who are "have nots" in order that you may have. Please, open your heart. Our problems, as I see them, are inter-related. So from time to time I may seem to ramble. There is also little doubt that I am long winded. Again, I apologize. But if you can wade through this entire work, I will share with you a means for change, and maybe, if you can find yourself aligned with me, a chance for some measure of peace of mind. One thing I can promise you is that if you will listen to all I have to say, you will never see the world in quite the same way again.

To begin with, I would like to speak to you about perception. For the purposes of this discussion we will look at two American Presidents, what they contributed and how they are perceived today. The first is one of the world's greatest advocates of the common man, and one of the greatest American patriots, Thomas Jefferson. In recent years, some historians have come to see aspects of Jefferson's life, as in conflict with what He has come to stand for. For example, in a documentary that aired on P.B.S., one historian claimed that, while Jefferson would state publicly that He no longer wished to be involved in

politics, that in fact He did want to be involved but that this denial was in keeping with a type of false modesty prevalent among politicians of the time. The truth is that Jefferson loved his farm and his agricultural pursuits. He redesigned his Monticello estate unceasingly until his death. His cup was full. What's more, the politicians of the day were patriotic public servants who were not getting rich in Washington like their counterparts today. Politics was not Jefferson's love but rather it took him away from the things he loved. This is almost certainly true of most of the leaders of the day. Were it not so, they never would have relinquished the power they had won, into the hands of the people, as they did in the Constitution of the United States. Another point on which Jefferson is chastised is his ownership of slaves: more importantly on the fact that he did not set them free even upon his death. At the same time, history records that he died broke and with his estate in disrepair. Again, it must be understood that he and his counterparts dedicated large portions of their most productive years to the service of their country. This kind of self sacrifice had to adversely affect his personal economic pursuits. So while Jefferson would champion the abolition of slavery long before it would come to pass, he would be bound by the same constraints as any other debtor. While he may have owned slaves, his creditors would never have allowed him to give away what was considered to be personal property while in their debt, not even, if, as it is claimed, he fathered some of them. These were the realities of the day and Jefferson can only be understood when that reality is the lens through which he is observed.

The second President to be discussed is Franklin Roosevelt. Raised as an aristocrat, Roosevelt has often been called a traitor to his class. He was the originator of the "Trickle Down Theory" of economics, which would be readopted by Reagan in the 1980's. To understand Roosevelt it is necessary to again look through the lens of his era. He would come to power during the "Great Depression". He would use government to do what the wealthy Capitalists were unable [or unwilling depending upon your perspective] to do; that is, to put people to work. If you are old enough to have known those who were of the working class in that time, you know that there were two camps of thought. For those 75% to 80% of the population who did not lose their job in the "Depression", Roosevelt was often seen as a left wing radical who grew government and paid wages to those at the bottom. They viewed those jobs as being invented and the people who got them as not always being as "hard working" as those who were under the whip of the private sector. If, on the other hand, you were one of those who's family was starving, you probably saw him as a Saint. Today, in the midst of an all powerful and intrusive government, which professes its ability to defend and protect us from the cradle to the grave, Roosevelt is the hero; the Founding Father of the type of systems that liberals champion. He is seen as the aristocrat who championed the right of the individual to be protected economically by society. But to truly understand Franklin

*George Bailey*

Roosevelt one must look at the old institution of slavery. Under the old system a slave owner could, in fact, rape, torture, even murder his or her slaves at his own discretion. Slaves were not even afforded the protection that animals enjoy under today's laws. Still, as a commercial property, it was in a slave owner's best interest to care for his possessions. Indeed, under the hypocrisy of the early American Church, it would have reflected badly to be openly abusive. With the end of the Civil War this would change. The institution of slavery would be replaced with the institution of "Share Cropping". Blacks, along with poor Whites, would now be "Free" to starve to death under the terms of the tenant agreement and the Land Lord would be held harmless by society. This, then, was the basis for "The Social Security Administration". It relieved the obligation of the Capitalists, who reaped the rewards of "Labor", from their obligation to see that labor did not starve to death on the streets owned by the citizens of the country [which included labor]. The wealthy, who roared in chauffeured limousines, past the starving and huddled masses standing in soup lines, owed their fortunes to Capitalism. And while Capitalism did not hold them accountable for the welfare of those who worked for them, the world [like the church of the old south] would expect them to be benevolent. More importantly, the Russian revolution had vividly demonstrated what could happen when a majority of the masses was disenfranchised. Add to all this that America, unlike Russia, was a democracy. It was a nation of supposedly FREE people, who could vote to improve their lot if organized by circumstance to do so. But rather than spend money from the pockets of the rich, as the old slave owners had done in order to provide for their servants, the rich would adopt the strategy of the Share Cropper. Social Security would be used to take care of those who were not taken care of by Capitalism without any expense to those who reaped the rewards of Capitalism; the rich and powerful Capitalists.

Like the tenant farmer who would be indentured by debt to the Landlord; now each new generation of labor would be indentured by the debt of the generation which proceeded it. It would be the children of the working class who would provide for the well being of those unable to produce enough for the Capitalists to justify their existence. As the members of a generation moved from the work place to infirmity, they would be cared for by the State, and the bill would be sent to the next generation and called a retirement contribution. With time the system would become part of the American fabric. It would be a coup of perception.

As I said, Roosevelt would also be the first American to introduce the "Trickle Down Theory" of economics. Simply stated, it says that, when the economy grinds to a halt, that the way to get it going again is by pumping government money into the pockets of the rich. In so doing, the rich will then feel free to invest that money and thereby create jobs, which will pay wages and

which will in turn start money circulating. I will explain the idiocy of such thinking later on in the book: but for now I would like to point out that Roosevelt was not the true originator of the Trickle Down theory. It's not widely known here in America, but in France, they call the crumbs that fall from a loaf of bread, "cake". It has been alleged that just prior to the French revolution, a certain Queen you have probably heard of, was informed that her subjects had no bread. She responded with the suggestion that the crumbs that trickled down from the bread of the aristocracy should be ample to their needs. Of course, to quote Marie Antoinette exactly, she replied, "Then let them eat cake." It cost her, her head.

So on the one hand, we have the great liberal and champion of the populist being slandered by today's left. At the same time, the protector of the great Capitalist Elite is seen as the hero of the same liberal thinkers. In the next few hundred pages I will challenge many of your perceptions. It is a fact of life that, while people can rationally discuss almost anything that does not directly affect them, they will bristle in defense of those things which reflect poorly on them. It is my job to help you to understand the world as it is, rather than how it has been presented to you. If I can do that and you can remain open minded, then it may be possible for you to put down your guard long enough to understand and support what must be done to straighten things out. So let us begin.

"In God we trust"; it was the premise on which our great nation was founded. The writers of the constitution prayed for God's guidance, not because they were on "C-Span", but because they believed: and they were inspired. They inscribed these same words on their legal tender, put the State beneath God in the "Pledge of Allegiance", and [I am told] placed his commandments on the walls of their highest court. We no longer trust in God. We trust instead in science. Our priests are the doctors of Medicine, Psychology, Physics, Chemistry and Economics. Our laws no longer reflect the "Ten Commandments". They have been twisted by "Precedent", into the laws of lawyers. The battle rages over evolution versus the Bible's teaching of creation. But let me ask you, what does it matter? Does either invalidate the existence of something greater than yourself in the universe? When your children first come to you with the question "Where do babies come from?", do you answer them in terms of sperm and zygote, chromosomes and genetics; or do you simply say they spring from the love of a man and a woman? And what is the Hebrew word for proton?

There was a movie made in the 1970's with Harrison Ford, called "The Blade Runner". In it, a genetically engineered man confronts his creator face to face and asks that his life span be lengthened. His creator replies that the forces of nature have been set in place from his conception and counsils him to accept his fate and "Revel" in the glory of what has been given him. The man then squeezes the life from his creator with his own bare hands. I don't think the movie did all that well at the box office. I never heard any critics acclaim it. The

*George Bailey*

search for God hasn't been a big theme in Hollywood. They don't make movies about things people aren't interested in. But they told us in the 60's that God is dead. For some of us perhaps: those who [like the character in *The Blade Runner*], turned away because they did not wish to hear the realities of this life. It's not the first time Americans have turned away.

“We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power, as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us! It behooves us, then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.”

-April 30, 1863

President Abraham Lincoln's Proclamation  
for a National Day of  
Fasting, Humiliation and Prayer

But God still lives within many of us. Whether you have faith or not, if you want to join this revolution you must concede one thing; the existence of good and evil. You may call them Christ and the Devil. If that offends your intellect, you may call it the “Force”. You may call it Yin and Yang, but you must concede that you serve one or the other. There are, in fact, Satanic groups in this country. Does it matter whether there is a Satan to hear them when they make their sacrifices to him? I think not. Either way the sadism they unleash ripples through our society. It makes parents fear for their children and distrust strangers. The leaders of these groups gain power whether they are ordained by Lucifer or just their own sick congregation. And if we can believe the stories we hear about such cults, it gets our children murdered either way.

The literary and film heroes of our time have been largely what the literary folks refer to as the “Absurd Hero”. That is, the guy or gal who does the wrong thing for some understandable reason. It has been a case study in the gray area between black and white. The legal term for it is the extenuating circumstance. “Yes he did rob the bank, but life and society have been rough on him and the system is corrupt anyway.” “Yes she was a ‘Porn Queen’ but she was only

looking for love and was taken advantage of”. “Yes he did murder someone, but his parents were abusive to his little brother and put too much pressure on him to succeed”. Empathy for these people is understandable, even positive. After all; we are, none of us, perfect. The problem is that the line between black and white has become so blurred that we no longer seem to know where to find it. That’s the beauty of the Bible. Regardless of your religious beliefs, the Bible “is” the wisdom of the ages. It allows empathy, but the lines do not change. The fact that we “Judge Not” doesn’t mean we should condone indiscretion. In fact this scripture, which is so often quoted, has been taken out of context. It actually says, “Judge not who shall enter the Kingdom of God, lest Ye be judged”. When one of us commits a cold-blooded murder, the rest of us are not wrong to judge him or her guilty of the crime. That is why we were given the law in the first place. Christ proclaimed that you stand with him or against him. Whether you have faith or not, you must reconcile yourself to this one fact. If you do not stand for good then you have surrendered yourself to the dark side. What “works” morally has been defined. Like the laws of nature, these laws are irrevocable, and while the Psychologists and the Lawyers redefine right and wrong,  $2+2$  still  $=4$ , and gravity is still inescapable on earth. What’s more, society is not static. We are constantly moving in one direction or the other. So if we are not moving toward the light, we are moving toward the darkness.

Now I think you already know these things to be true. But before I move on I want to share with you a few places where the line has disappeared that you may not have thought of. The next time you turn on your favorite country music station to avoid the Satanic influence of Rock and Roll, play this little game. Count how many times your favorite tunes use the word love, when what they are really talking about is having sex. Then ask yourself how many songs are about the pursuit of sex. After all, what you listen to is what you tell your children is important in your life. If the word love is substituted for the word sex long enough, the two become interchangeable. And if love is sex and sex is love, then loving one another takes on a whole new meaning. Another place we set a bad example is the state lottery systems. Now, we Americans are gamblers by nature. From emigrating here, to planting a crop or starting a business, it’s part of our heritage and what makes us the economic power that we are. But anyone who gambles what they can not afford to lose is breaking with prudence. Society says that gambling is a vice and corrupting. Yet, we have taught our children that, while it’s bad, it’s for a good cause. “It’s all that keeps our schools open.” “We can’t afford any extras for the family.”, but we buy lottery tickets. In quiet desperation we pray for luck and deliverance and each week we set ourselves up as losers, unworthy and hypocritical, right before our children’s eyes. When you stretch your insurance claim; when you use a racial slur; when you buy things from a “Flea Market” that you suspect are stolen; when you speed on the highway, when you pay somebody “Under The Table”: you demonstrate to your

*George Bailey*

children a contempt for society and its rules. When you switch on a day-time “soap opera” for what ever reason, your approval is not lost on your children. When the network flashes some lewd preview across the screen during family programming, your approval is implied to your children whether you approve or not. When the poster above the beer display shows a woman’s buttocks, rather than a smiling face, whether you buy the product or not, the implication is that women are merely meat and your approval is implied by shopping there. When you place a bet with a “Bookie” or even when a sports announcer quotes the odds on an event, the subtleties are not lost on your children. When a lawyer’s TV commercial shows some jerk sipping a mixed drink by a pool, telling you that the accident was his fault but his attorney at law still got him some outrageous court settlement, the fabric of our society is being ripped apart. When your child stands at your side at the cash register and stares at their eye level at the sexy magazine covers and shocking tabloid photos, their perception of the world is twisted. Let me leave you with this one last thought. The Soviet Union turned its collective back on religion nearly a century ago. In Moscow, they took a pole of young women in 1991: 70% of them said that they aspired to be prostitutes. Call me a prude, but how far behind can we be when so many of our “What’s going on in the entertainment world?” television shows focus on the exploits of nude models and promote it as “main steam”.

If we follow a strict interpretation of the definition of “Fraud”, which is “To intentionally mislead” then it could be said that the American people have dozens of frauds perpetrated against them daily. You can see an advertisement for a hamburger chain on television and walk into one of their franchises only to be told they are not participating. We find meat at the meat counter colored with red dye. You can listen to a telephone company advertisement on television while the disclaimers for the same advertisement are being visually displayed around different parts of the television screen. A radio station may advertise thirty minutes of commercial free music and then make constant interruptions with promotions which are, in fact, commercial advertisements promoting the radio station itself. Banks can send you a written promotion stating in simple English that you have been pre-approved for credit in order to solicit your credit information and then deny you credit, while negatively impacting your ability to get credit by making an inquiry at credit reporting agencies. They may even keep your credit information and sell it to a third party while failing to honor their initial pledge for which you were pre-approved. You can listen to a radio advertisement in plain and easy to understand language that is contradicted by the disclaimers at the end, which are hurled at you at undecipherable speeds. The news programs who hold themselves in such high esteem and who stand behind the first amendment of the constitution, profess their holly obligation to uphold the truth while advertising for their upcoming broadcasts with stories that are often far more about “hype” than substance. Even the Postal Service is not above



a little fraud when its advertisements compare its priority mail to its competitors by price and delivery speed, but fails to mention that the competitors have a money back guarantee. The Postal Service does not. Advertisers sell their products on television, giving one price for the item while “padding” the true cost with inflated shipping and handling charges. Or they may show you a price which is, in fact, an installment amount for a price many times the amount shown. Lending institutions advertise an interest rate and then add on all manner of charges, which are not reflected in the advertised interest rate.

I started working on this book nearly a decade ago. At the time I had no idea where it would lead me. I certainly never intended for it to be a book about religion. But I have discovered in the course of trying to find solutions for the problems we as a nation face, that the problems stem from a lack of morality. Now many of you probably take that to have a sexual connotation. But what I am talking about is moral fiber. Today when lawyers “argue” a case they are “nit picking” the law. If you can imagine the scene that coined that phrase, you can begin to understand that the focus of the activity obscures the object in question. They are so busy looking for the needle that they lose sight of the haystack. The churches of man are of the same mind set. While all the Christian religions believe in Christ and the Old Testament of the Bible, they “Nit Pick” over the issues, divide Christians and fight over power and turf. In fact, the Bible has been translated from ancient languages that make such “Nit Picking” a snare. It is a work that must be viewed as a whole. When the Apostles asked Jesus which of the commandments was the most important, He answered that they were all equally important and that they should all be honored; but the most important rule he said, was to treat others as you would wish to be treated. When we make an honest attempt to do that, then we begin to live “In the Way”. Moral fiber comes as a result of using God’s holy laws as guide posts, as we follow the paths of our lives, remembering always to treat each other as we would want to be treated. These are the rules which were employed in arriving at the solutions I have laid out here within. The answers are not intended to hurt but to heal. If they do hurt, it is because they are the truth. Do not reject the truth because it is painful. Instead, embrace it and begin to heal yourself.

For all the problems and shortcomings of our medical sciences, there is one branch that exceeds all others in sheer audacity. There is no other that has contributed more to the decline of mankind as a social animal. It is the practice of Psychology. These are the people who claim to read the minds of others. From lobotomies to drug therapy, they have championed their successes and hidden away their mistakes. We have given Psychiatry our ear in our courts and allowed its members to mark out and defend their own turf. We have been convinced that those who are incapable of understanding right from wrong should not be punished. In so doing, we have challenged the sick to come forward with proof of

*George Bailey*

the severity of their illness, that they might be granted help and recognition of their pain. And the sick have come forward with ever increasing frequency; each more demented than the last. Far more catastrophic than what Psychiatry has done to our legal system, is what it has done to the way in which we perceive ourselves. Since the inception of modern Psychology and Freudian theory, we have been taught that we are “base” in nature. While I’m not entirely sure that it’s what Freud was teaching; it has been widely interpreted as saying that we are driven by sex and sexual appetite: that all we do, all our goals, are ultimately a means to an end, and that end is sex. If this is true, then what motivates a child who knows nothing of sex? What motivates adults who have lost their ability to perform? Why are not prostitutes the happiest and most mentally and socially successful of all? It is because “SELF ESTEEM” is the true and “quintessential” element of mental health. The only relevance that sex has is that it is the ultimate physical expression of giving, one to another, and therefore feeds self esteem. Unfortunately, with the sexual revolution over the last quarter century, its value for building self esteem has declined. Ghetto kids, who become sexually active at age 12 or 13, find no self worth in the act. There is no fulfillment in a desperate social climate where sex is all around them. They find their self esteem through possessions, and they are so desperate for it, that they have sometimes killed for a pair of designer tennis shoes.

Another degrading myth fostered by Freudians is the Oedipus complex: the belief that, at one time or another, all boys have desired to have sex with their mothers. Boys stand at a cross roads when they become sexually aware. Girls do as well. Those who understand the difference between love for another and sex as an expression of love, have established a major mile stone in the development of mental health. Those who are unable to make the distinction show some degree of mental illness. Those men who do not understand the difference may very well wish to have sex with their mothers. They are very likely to be perverted in their love for all things, including their own children. Perhaps Freud himself never fully made the distinction. That would account for his view of humanity. And if this were true, how sad to think that western civilization has come to view itself through his eyes.

Still another form sex takes as a means of building self esteem is that of dominance: all be it twisted. Masochism, Gay and even lesbian sex, all contain varying degrees of dominance and submission woven into their fabric. To some extent, any variation beyond the “Missionary” style of heterosexuality is license given by one to another, in excess of mere sexual favor and is therefore of more value to self esteem, if that is one’s inclination. On the other hand, if your perspective is more puritanical, then these excesses diminish the value of such an event with regard to self esteem. Here again, the prostitute will, theoretically, perform any act you can afford and yet most men do not seek them out. The

reason is, of course, that there is no pride of conquest when one pays for sex. Therefore it has no value with respect to building self esteem except perhaps as it relates to domination, or as fantasy. Those Gay men, who are among the most promiscuous within their peer group, are more likely to suffer from low self esteem as a result of the degradation they inflict upon themselves. Psychology and the Gay community have both been trying to tell us that the reason for such negative self perceptions on the part of homosexuals are a result of society's stigmas placed on the act. I submit that it is their lack of self esteem which has caused them to push us to condone such activity so that we can free them from their guilt, [that and the political power enjoyed by their leaders]. When we begin to look at ourselves from this perspective of self esteem being the driving force, as opposed to sexual appetite, things become much simpler and much clearer. For instance, when a man or a woman physically abuse their spouse, it's usually because they themselves lack self esteem. The logic being that, "If I am of no value and you love me, then you must be of no value. Therefore, your love is of no value. What's more, you degrade me by offering your love to me, because it is of no value". A similar scenario may sometimes be true for parents who physically abuse their children. The driving force is self esteem, not sex.

For some, power is far more stimulating to their self esteem than sex. Henry Kissinger called power an aphrodisiac. And if sex is traded for power, then it is power, not sex, which is the most powerful driving force. For many, however, there is a far more powerful method of deriving self esteem. It is far more easily attainable than even sex. It is far more reliable than the struggle for power. It is something that many of us have moved away from as our schools preach to us the doctrines of psychology. If you haven't already guessed, I refer of course to the love of God.

So many of us raised in the age of science feel uneasy about that. It's almost as though we feel that the second we kneel in acceptance of His existence, someone will jump out from behind a curtain and yell— "Smile, your on Candid Camera!". Now I can almost hear you wincing as I write this, even if you believe in God. You may call him by a different name than I; but you've come this far so hear me out. You see; the mind has a safety valve. Because we have a need to deal with life in finite terms, it is necessary for things to be congruent: to fit. We also have to be able to justify our thoughts and actions in order to protect our self image; our self esteem. Because of this, we have a mechanism known as rationalization. It is far and away more powerful than sex. As Jeff Goldblum asked in "The Big Chill", "Have you ever tried to go a week without a good rationalization?" Rationalization allows us to do everything from take too much change from the clerk at the check out stand, to make war in Vietnam and still keep our sanity. It allows gangsters to kill and extort because the government does. It allows middle class Americans to declare a drug war on their own

*George Bailey*

people, while having a beer and a cigarette and placing an illegal bet on a ball game. It allows the government to send money and guns into El Salvador to wage war on an oppressed people in the name of preserving democracy. Rationalization is so necessary to the way our minds function, that those who can not put it to use, very often go insane. It may, in fact, be the most powerful force in the universe. That is of course unless you believe in something more powerful than yourself; in which case, rationalization is held in check. You see, it is the power of prayer, which balances our need to rationalize, with our need to seek the truth. We can lie to others, you can even lie to yourself, but if you believe, you can't lie to God. And because, at least in Christianity, confession and repentance lead to forgiveness, you can face the truth with God's help. The founders of this great nation were not perfect, but they embraced a simple truth; that all men are created equal. It was a truth born of the belief that God loved all men and gave His only Son for their sins, so that they [mankind] might be forgiven. Before you dismiss what they believed to be true, you must first be able to grasp the concept of infinity. That's right; infinity. Many eastern cultures devoted themselves to the contemplation of it. Albert Einstein came as close to realizing it as any western man; and yet, while history portrays him as a man without religious conviction, he remained convinced of the existence of an all-encompassing force, which he called God. But if you can not grasp, can not internalize, this concept of infinity: if your brain is not capable of thinking beyond the closed loop to which the rest of us are limited; then your science and your logic, can not refute the reality of one greater than the sum of all which is. So turn away from what you can never know and study instead upon what you can. Ask your self if there was more justice in the land when the laws were new and still based on the wisdom of the Bible and the Ten Commandments; or is there more justice with the laws of Precedent set down by men. Ask yourself if lying on your own deathbed, strapped to a machine and afraid to pass on, is this life; or is life better lived as a journey to its end? Ask yourself if you will spend your life's efforts in pursuit of reimbursement for life's trials, or will you "Revel in your time" with those blessings you have been given. I can not give you faith, but if you look around our land it can not be hard for you to see what the lack of it has done to our families and our country. I can not prove to you that Jesus was the son of God; but consider this: that one man could be so wise, so loving of all people, so uncompromising, so unwavering, so willing to die for what he lived, and so forgiving; was truly miraculous in and of itself. If science has made you too skeptical to believe in anything but these truths of his life, it should still enough for you to see the connection between mankind and divinity. It should be enough for you to grasp that we have the potential to be more than animals driven by sex. Regardless of whether or not this twisted view of humanity is true to Freudian theory, I think it was and perhaps still is, a widely held belief that that's what he was saying. The problem with, and I believe the result of, this

“Base” description of humankind is that it excuses obsession. It encourages us to drop inhibition to the lowest common denominator on the basis that it is inevitable. It is, of course, at the discretion of society to set limits; but who will draw the line? Is a thong bathing suit acceptable where nudity is not because someone’s bare buttocks is not over the line? If you say then that these are choices that belong to the individual, then will you accept naked couples foundling themselves in the street, on your street, on the hoods of their cars so long as there is no penetration? When Gay men, who meet in city parks, to perform their lewd acts in the bushes and the public rest rooms, tell you that your moral outrage has no place in a Free Society: will you accept what they say as the truth?

I have heard it said that young American males have so many hundred or so many thousand sexual impulses in a given day. I don’t dispute those findings at all. But I would argue that so much focus on sex is due to environmental stimulation rather than some inherent primeval lust. That is; so many of the things our eyes come in contact with, seem to be advertisements using sex as the “hook”. So many of the things we hear: the sexy voice, the provocative lyric; bring sex to mind. The sexual fantasy scene inundates our lives. Advertisements push young, immature girls into adult dress and makeup. Children dressed as women, seeing what looks like women in the mirror, are giving into peer pressure and into over stimulated young men and boys with unprecedented frequency.

I once told a friend of mine that I thought television advertisements should be censored. That is, for instance, when the seediest piece of the “Movie of the week” is used as a “promo”, that promo should not be aired during the 7:00 viewing time. The beer commercial that never shows the face that belongs to the curvaceous body that speaks to little boys and girls that women are physical forms rather than people, is another one that I think inappropriate. His response to me was one that I hear quite often. He said that they are public airways and as such, people are entitled to freedom of choice. “But what about my kids?” I asked him. He told me I should monitor what they watch, I told him “We do. But even if we are confident of the program, we can’t know what will be in the commercial”. He told me that there was always the option of kid’s videos. So I asked him, “What about my kids’ freedom of choice? What about a little freedom from the sex and violence for me and mine to offset your freedom to it”. He called me a Bolshevik.

As I see it, there is room in an open society for a great many things for which I have no use. But to be bombarded by it imposes on my rights to “Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness” every bit as much as denying it to the next guy, imposes on his. People are forever throwing up what the French do or what the Swedish do and what someone else does as being some kind of model for

*George Bailey*

Americans. It was a French diplomat, somewhere back around 1800, who, upon returning to France from America, remarked that the beauty of American liberty is that Americans, with all their freedom, don't feel the need to abuse it but rather show self restraint. The Bible uses the word "Modesty". When you and your mate are in the master bedroom and make love, ever mindful of every noise that might signal a child out of bed, you are showing modesty, not shame. Passion and sexuality are for adults, not children. If the vocabulary of sex is present today in the language of first grade school boys [which it is], then the line between love and sex is being blurred long before they are ready to understand the concept. An author I saw interviewed on TV had written that, due to the conflicting pressures from peers, and from society and the media; High School girls in large percentages now perform oral copulation on their boy friends in order to live up to sexual expectations, while retaining their virginity. This is twisted. We have been trying for decades to remove the "shame" of sex from our society. For the sake of couples together as man and wife, I believe it is a good thing. As for consenting adults, I am not qualified to say. The problem, as I see it, is that we have abandoned modesty. As I said, there is room in a free society for the more perverse. While I can not condone it, I can except it. But it belongs in the master bedroom and not on the hood of a car.

I am reminded of the pageant winner who lost her crown when it was discovered that she had posed nude at some time in her past. Rather than being apologetic, she lashed out that America should "wake up" and face the fact that these are not the dark ages. But her's is the story of the boxer who has taken money for fighting and then wishes to fight in the Olympics, back when the Olympics were still reserved for non-professionals. Her's is now the arena of the centerfold. Regardless of her beauty and talent, she has crossed the line. It gives me no pleasure to see her fall, but it was her choice. She may call herself a model, a dancer, and an actress to legitimize her past. Hollywood can make her a star in order to defend her right to express herself in whatever way she sees fit. But I can no longer hold her up as an example of what I want my daughters to aspire to. For that reason I can not support her; I can only give her my condolences. I feel that way about many of those who have chosen similar paths as well as those who have stepped much further away from what can be given the light of day.

I was talking with a young man not so many years ago, about a rather infamous brothel. This fellow had been there one time. He claimed it was in the capacity of a service technician. But, no matter. Never the less, the idea of young girls put in the position of selling them selves has always made me wince. I believe it's a feeling that most of us used to have in common. Look how often Hollywood has been able to make America fall in love with a poor girl delivered from prostitution into the arms of a decent man. Anyway, in our conversation, he

responded to my emotions with something very profound. He asked me if I hated my job. Not “Would I rather be rich?” or “Would I rather be doing something else?": but “Did I hate my job?”. I answered “No”. “Well, there you have it!” he said. You see; society labors under the assumption that all prostitutes are humiliated and all solicitors are morally bankrupt perverts. The fact is that within the population there are those among both genders who are perverse. The only difference is that it is women who are more likely to be paid for such perversion and men who are more likely to pay. I’m not saying that large percentages of prostitutes are not forced into it by drug addiction. That’s another good reason to legalize drugs. I’m not saying that young girls and boys aren’t forced into prostitution because they are run-a-ways; forced upon the streets and underground. That’s precisely why prostitution should be legalized. It should be taken off the streets and out of sight, into sanitary, regulated surroundings, where abuses are not so easily inflicted. There are lots of people who feel the need for such activity. It has always been so. Christ himself was tolerant of it. In order for society at large to become free “from” the evils of prostitution, it will be necessary for us to grant those so inclined, the freedom “to” indulge when so inclined. As with the drug wars, it is very often those who profit the most from such situations who yell the loudest when change is suggested. It is the lure of big easy money that brings many girls into the profession. When things are legal they are always less expensive and safer than when they were not. Since we can not legislate morality, it makes more sense to take the money out of immorality. But in the end we make our own choices and we alone must live with them.

If there is one group who personifies a lack, even a disdain, for modesty in their sexuality, it is the homosexual community. After all, coming out of the closet began as a plea for tolerance. In the case of men, there is simply no way to sexually gratify each other in the traditional sense. But gratification in any other way, even in heterosexual sex, is considered [by most of us anyway] to be a sex act. That is, “sex”, as opposed to what is today, commonly referred to as the act of making love: regardless of one’s inclinations for or against such activity. The very word “Gay” implies a festivity rather than a relationship. In fact, to state that one is “Gay”, is nothing more than a sexual statement. For example; if my wife and I were to rent an apartment, we would not feel compelled to inform the manager that we intended to have sex in our apartment; nor would they likely ask. If we intended to engage in mass orgies on the premises and informed the landlord of such an intention, that landlord would likely have the right to deny us the apartment. If individuals announce that they are “Gay”, it is they who have brought up the sexual issue and made it an issue. I do not profess, nor do I care to know, the workings of the homosexual community. I am certain that within the group there must be those who are monogamous and it is certain that they are productive in an economic sense. But among them are men who, we would learn in the early eighties, consistently engaged in sex acts with as many as a dozen or

*George Bailey*

more partners in a given day. When local government tried to shut down west coast bathhouses known for this sort of behavior, in order to slow the spread of the AIDS virus, they were unable to do so. Political and legal pressure was brought to bear by the homosexual community. This faction within the “Gay” community, regardless of the percentages, shares a great deal of the blame for the AIDS epidemic we now face. In view of the numbers of homosexuals infected with the virus, it is hard to view their community as being as monogamous as they have professed to be.

As for Lesbians, if they don’t have sexual intercourse, then they would not be lesbians, they would be friends. If they conduct such intercourse with penetration, regardless of the object used, then isn’t it simply a substitute penis? And if that is the case, then isn’t their sexual preference a rejection of men rather than a preference for women? I don’t know how one could argue to the contrary. Still, the same conditions apply; if they don’t bring it up, it need not be an issue. If they are compelled too bring it up, then they have abandoned modesty.

As for men who want to be women and women who want to be men, it seems to me that they, in most cases, simply reject what God or nature intended for them. All of these people speak of their “Sexual Orientation” as being different from those of mainstream society. In fact, it is precisely that, which at the heart of the conflict. They do not find themselves at odds with Christians because they love another of their own sex. After all, we all love people of our own sex. They are not at odds because they wish to share a lodging or even a life with someone of the same sex. They are at odds because their sexual behavior is at odds with what Christians, Jews and Muslims are taught. Love is not sexual. Sex is not love.

Regardless of all this, I do not hate the “Gay” community. I do not condone violence against its members. To the contrary, I condemn any form of violence: especially in connection with this book. America is, by and large, a tolerant place. When the “Gay” movement began, we tried very hard to find acceptance in our hearts. But like so many of today’s special interest groups, what they asked of us then, bares little resemblance to what they demand of us today. Very often, political pressure is used to force our leaders to make changes which are not the public will. The “Gay” movement has lost all sense of modesty. It screams its rights in front of my children. It forces it self into my home with equal rights legislation, asked for in good faith and then used to sue me for refusing to sanction the teaching of alternative life styles to my children in school; and with lawsuits to become Cub Scout troop leaders.

I can not imagine that any of my daughters would be able to live a normal life from adulthood to the grave without experiencing sex. But that does not alter my belief that they should not become prostitutes. It is not the sex but the circumstances surrounding it, which is the criterion by which such an act is



considered healthy or unhealthy, moral or immoral. Those who distort sex are at odds with what I am taught to be healthy and yet the “Gay” community would accuse me of being sick for not condoning their actions. They would label my disdain for their perversion as a “Phobia” and label me with the clinical sounding disorder of “Homophobic”. It is the double standard that denounces those who insult the so called minorities with hurtful and inappropriate words, while hurling back names like homophobic, cracker, gringo and even male chauvinist PIG. It is a continuation of the elitism which states that the death penalty must be imposed against “Cop Killers”, but not against society at large. It is special punishment for those who perpetrate crimes against Gays or minorities because they are called “Hate Crimes”: when all crimes of violence stem from hate. It is street gangs made up of minorities and even angry Gays, who commit violence which is somehow classified as free of hate. It is a reflection of a coalition mentality brought on by a Two Party system of government. It is equality for those more equal than others and it is very wrong and very dangerous.

I would not allow my daughter’s Brownie troop to be led on a camp-out by an unchaperoned man. So how can I be expected to do the same with my son and a man who’s sexual behavior I believe to be deviant? “Gays” have sued to come out of the closet in the military. But if they understood modesty, they would understand that “straight” men would be embarrassed to be naked in front of them. They say that they took showers with schoolmates and weren’t aroused. We have only their word for that, but no matter. If they profess their orientation, then I am now aware. It is now more embarrassing for me than if they were of the opposite sex. It now feels inhibiting and perverse to be exposed to their eyes. Is it only their feelings that are to be considered, or should mine count for something as well? The “Gay” community is fond of using the teachings of Christ to remind us to be tolerant, but it does not see the arrangement as reciprocal. If it did, I would not be called names like homophobic because I do not champion their cause. I would have a right to my opinion so long as I did not harm them or advocate that others harm them. If the “Gay” community is to live in harmony in this country, it needn’t go back into the closet, but it must remain in the master bedroom. America is the most generous nation I know of, but tolerance can not be legislated into society. Don’t try to justify yourself to me. Simply go your way quietly. But do not be counted among the radicals, simply because they are your fellows. Stand with all of us for what is fair for all of us. First you must decide if you wish to be counted as “Gay” or simply as human beings. But don’t try to impose your will on me nor recruit my children to your fold. You have targeted Christians who will not condone your activities, when in fact, the protections you enjoy stem from Christian tolerance. It doesn’t matter in the end if your differences are genetic, or psychological. It doesn’t matter if, as my cousin once said, you are simply hurt children, calling to your parents “Look how screwed up you made me!”, while trying to convince society that there is nothing wrong with

*George Bailey*

you. If you stand quietly, like will gather around you. If you continue to push, eventually society will begin to push back. If you dismantle Christianity in the hope that you will be exonerated, you may find yourself undefended in a violent society. If you demand special accommodation, you weaken the society which protects you. If you demand privilege, in time the pendulum will swing in the opposite direction and others will be given privilege over you.

You know, about 90% of whether people are good looking or not has very little to do with their genetic appearance. It has to do with the way they perceive themselves. Their smile, their eyes, their dress, their general demeanor, gives us an impression that transcends their structural characteristics. For most of us, how we look is simply an expression of how we feel about ourselves. We sense that about the people we meet even if we are not conscious of it. At the same time, much of what constitutes "Beauty" is simply symmetry. Symmetry is an indication of physical health, which we perceive as beauty. So when someone is blessed with symmetry and adds to that, an appearance that would seem to indicate good mental health, they have an exceptional combination. That's why the "Beautiful people" are given advantage in our society and why those unfortunate enough to be born with truly unpleasant features have to struggle so hard to find their place. When this special "license" we give to the beautiful is wasted, we feel let down some how. It's akin to seeing a lottery winner throw away those winnings on a craps table in Las Vegas. As children, we fantasize what it must be like to be in their place. We thrill to their conquests vicariously and tend to scorn them when they let us down. I believe this is the essence of our disdain for pornography. Those who champion its cause would have us believe that makes us prudish. Someone is forever bringing back that Gay advocate's movie "Victor, Victoria" in which "Gay" is cute, straight sex is bawdy and the transvestite you love is really the girl next door. In the movie, the well respected Robert Preston says something to the affect that shame was invented by people who have no fun, to stop others from having any. They would also have you believe that if you understand and embrace modesty, that you are in the minority. You are not.

I think a good example can be found in the short lived careers of many young Hollywood starlets. They burst on the screen, playing roles in which the character has no moral precepts, and yet the actresses are engaged by the public. That is, until the public sees that the starlets themselves do not understand the difference between acting the part and living the part. It is a subtlety lost to many young and beautiful people. I do not wish in any way to denigrate anyone. I'm not morally outraged. I liked them as well. I thought that they understood why their characters were not the heroines, and when they didn't, I was just as saddened by my own sense of loss as everyone else was. But they stepped away from that role of someone I could use as an example for my children. When you stand at a

convenience store check out counter and your eyes are drawn to the continuous and seemingly never ending flow of new young faces, posing scantily clad on the covers of “nudies” magazines, it is disheartening. The difference between the nude pictorial or painting as an art form and pornography is in the body language. The language these magazines speak is confined to four letter words. As I said before: for the vast majority of us, the choice of appearing attractive or unattractive is our own. You perceive instantly, by a person’s appearance, if they are at all like you, or if they make you feel uncomfortable. If they do make you feel uncomfortable, it is probably their intention to do so. That’s why they appear the way they do. When you tattoo “Born To Lose” on your arm, or slash a cross or a swastika on your forehead, you have made an irrevocable choice concerning how others will perceive you. It’s not like shaving your head as a defiant youth. That grows back. When you pose for smut you have made an irrevocable decision as well. It is trying to gain self worth, self esteem, through an act which is degrading. Things which are hard to attain are considered valuable. Conversely, things which are easily attained are of little value. This is true of our perception of people as well. It’s like the old joke about the guy who asks a girl if she’ll have sex with him for a million dollars. When she answers yes, he asks her if she’ll have sex with him for twenty dollars. “What do you think I am?” she answers indignantly. “We’ve already determined that,” he answers, “ Now we’re just quibbling over price.” I guess that’s why when I see a truly beautiful woman on one of those covers I am more adversely affected than when they look a little sleazy. It’s another lottery winner gone bust.

If I am anywhere near the target on all of this, I’m not secure in the fact that we as a people are retaining our grasp of the fine line between what is tolerable and what is unhealthy. When I was a young man, the lyrics “Rock and Roll” music were just as indecent as they are today. When “Louie Louie” snuck onto the airwaves we were ecstatic to think that such trash could be radio waved to us right under the noses of our parents and the “Establishment”. A decade before, a group of musicians had said that “the bird is a word” and got away with it. The difference is that, the people we respected, such as our parents, did not condone it. If they had stopped to consider what word “the bird” meant, the song would have been banned from the airwaves. Today, on TV, sex, not music, sells the music. Magazine covers that were once found only near men’s toilets and hidden under young boy’s mattresses are displayed at the eye level of children or even on billboards. Even our Presidents can disgrace themselves publicly and find support from the liberal press. If you are a young woman, or a young man for that matter, before you decide that it would be a kick to pose nude in such a magazine or that it might be a short cut to fame, remember: they are more often than not, the pictures of people who’s careers are in their death thralls. Often times they are the death thralls of careers that never even get off the ground. If you want success or stardom you’re going to have to work for it like the rest of us. Don’t

*George Bailey*

blame the rest of us for being prudes. Nobody respects those who sell out or take short cuts for very long, especially when their looks gave them a head start in the first place. If you feel the urge to go wild and do something irrevocable, get a tattoo: but get it where it doesn't show and make it your little secret. If you need to shock your friends and parents shave your head. But keep your options open. Keep your future in the future and not in your past. Revere yourself first and others will be able to revere you as well.

Just as smaller is better in government, I believe that the smaller the congregation the better. The excesses of the national church of the media are well documented. That is not to cast doubt on all ministries, but consider this. In the 1980's the idea of "Separation of church and State" laid out in the Constitution of the United States was twisted from protecting the church from the State, to protecting the State from the Church. In fact the Law was intended to be a sword that cut both ways. The "Inquisition" was cause to give the State protection, but just as profound was the need to keep the religious freedoms which had colonized the young American republic. Yet in court case after court case, God has been push into the closet. Satanic cults run unopposed, protected by freedom of religion, while "under God" and "so help you God" are disappearing from our oaths. Ask your self how often these church leaders, of whom I speak, urge you to write your congressman. How often has your TV evangelist given you information on where to write to preserve a place for faith? Now compare that to the number of times you have been asked to contribute money.

Jerry Falwell road high on the crest of Ronald Reagan's popularity, while his followers lost their economic future to the theory of trickle down economics. The last time I heard him speak he was still in favor of jailing tens, perhaps hundreds, of thousands of people who have lost their way to drugs. Is that in keeping with the forgiving nature of Christ and His teachings? Christ was put to death by a government unwilling to go against public opinion and a church afraid of losing power. If your church will not stand for what is right, then perhaps you should find another church.

There was a TV commercial that ran for Pepsi back in 1991. Two little boys sit on a bench. One has a Pepsi and one has a Coke. They tell the audience [their peers], that it doesn't matter how you dance. It's not the clothes you wear. It's not this material thing or that. It's not whether you drink Pepsi or Coke. Then a cute little girl comes and sits down beside the boy with a Pepsi. With a suggestive tug at his skateboard using her feet, she chooses him. Then the boy looks into the camera with wonderment and says, "Who knew?" In those two words it is implied that all those things do matter. It is unfortunately a truth in our society today. But should we allow this message to be targeted at our children? We have become a nation of "You are what you wear, what you eat, what you drive; and He who dies with the most toys wins". I don't have to elaborate on

the lust for power and greed aspects of day-time soap operas or their night time counter parts. You are well aware of the sex and violence on our televisions in the evening as well. The show "Twin Peaks" which achieved such notoriety in the early 90's went so far as to show the graphic and brutal murder of a young woman. Her demonically possessed uncle had killed many other women, among them his own daughter. The murder of the niece culminated with her face being smashed into and through the glass of a picture hanging on the wall. In another vein, "The Equalizer", "Miami Vice", and "Hawk"; were all basically cops and robbers shows. The "Equalizer" defended the helpless as did "Hawk". Miami Vice fought the drug war and exposed us in a sometimes very real way to the workings of the underworld and police corruption. As a matter of fact, as I recall, Miami Vice ended as a series with the heroes turning in their badges and fancy cars rather than go along with the corrupted police policy. In 1990, I heard a radio evangelist call for a "Boycott" of the sponsors of these three shows; The Equalizer, Hawk and Miami Vice. In spite of the fact that the violence in these shows was far from graphic and that the theme was always good over evil, he called for their demise. These three programs were not the best that television has had to offer. They did in fact promote violence. But they were far from the worst. I have yet to hear a call to boycott day or night-time soaps. There was no outcry from the "Moral Majority" about the Pepsi commercial: nor did Black leaders speak out, even though the three kids in the commercial were Black and it was the Black community who was being targeted. I heard no outcry from N.O.W. about the weekly savage beatings of women on Twin Peaks. It makes one wonder if this Evangelist didn't have some stake with a company competing with the sponsors of the shows I mentioned? What agenda would be served by such a boycott? Certainly not better programming. There is a great need for moral leadership, but have you seen any? Do they lead or do they follow? Do they contribute or do they only solicit contributions? Look to your leaders and make your own judgments. Where is their righteous indignation on the Mexican border issue? Are they silent because the majority of Mexicans are Catholic and the evangelists are not? Is it because they are too poor to contribute to their ministry? Or is it just that they can't vote? And if that is the case, does your minister want your soul to be saved, or does he want your political proxy?

On the related subject of abortion, I have no answers for you. But I do have some observations. I know that the situation as it stands is wrong. Pro-abortion factions have denied mandatory education of the realities of abortion because the truth is too ugly to stand the light of day. Yet I am not my brother's keeper: nor my sister's. Each of us, in our own circumstance, must face life on our own terms. I know a woman who was faced with such a choice a long time ago. She is a feminist and a woman's rights advocate as sure of her cause as any. Still, she chose to have her child, and because she thought she had no choice, she gave it up for adoption. Now, a quarter of a century later, she is alone with her career

*George Bailey*

choices. She visits us and, I am sure, anguishes over her loss when she looks into the faces of our children. But could she feel better if she had snuffed out the gift that she could not accept. I think not. She knows at least that her gift was not lost to her child. I think if she had it to do over again she would have kept the baby rather than to give it up or abort it. She would have taken her chances at finding a mate rather than a career; or struggled to make it on her own: but she has remained proud. She is fervent in her belief that women have a need for special interest rights. Never the less, in her heart I know that she would trade her pursuit of a career for a family, and when the day comes that she admits it to herself, I hope that she will share that knowledge with the young women who would follow in her footsteps. It can be said of drugs that they will ruin your life. They will take away all you have worked for and rob you of your chance for a future. Many of these same arguments are used to justify abortion. If that is the case, then I ask you: If we could cure drug addiction by aborting unborn babies, would we as a nation, support such a practice?

Morality has other enemies: among them, insecurity and greed. Is there anyone in America who considers the banker to be their friend? Not generally speaking. After all, if you want to borrow money, which is [historically anyway] the American way to achieve success, then the banker is likely to stand between you and success. I have often heard the complaint that bankers act as if it were their own money they are lending out. On the other hand, if it is your deposits that are being lent, that is exactly how you hope the banker will respond. The savings and loan bail out of the late 1980's was a good example of what can happen when things go wrong. There were plenty of sharks in the water in those years to be sure, and while some of them met with justice, most did not. Still, more than the nature of the people involved, the whole tragedy was largely a result of greed and fear in the market place. If you can remember as far back as 1977, you may recall the inflationary spiral we were in and the ramifications of the "Arab Oil Embargo" of 1973 which helped to trigger it. Americans could see that money left in the bank was losing value every year. The rate of inflation was a multiple of the best interest rates that banks and S&L's [Savings and Loan Institutions] were paying on deposits made to savings accounts. Like any other business, banks have to purchase materials and produce a product to make money. Their material is money. The amount of money they can raise and loan is contingent on the amount of money they can bring in through deposits. By around 1978, some S&L's were having to offer interest rates as high as 15% or 16% on long term certificates of deposit, in order to attract deposits. This meant that they had to charge as much as 20% or more for their "product", which is the service they provide and the money itself. During the Reagan years which followed, our economy was shrinking rapidly. Reagan bragged on our new growth industry, the service industry; but the real money found its way into speculative markets; while producers of goods dropped like flies or moved off

shore. In any business, once you produce the product, you must sell it before you make a profit. If it sits on the shelf too long, the interest on your borrowed money eats up that profit. If it sits too long, it eats you up as well. The same is true of financial institutions. The interest rates had, by now, dropped to below 15% on certificates of deposit; but they were still quit high because the Federal Reserve was pushing them up to curb inflation. Industry did not provide high enough returns to pay the high interest so they turned to housing. Housing had always been a “safe” bet. But bear in mind that, unlike a car dealer, for example, who gets his money at the point of sale and moves on, the quality of a bank’s investment may take years to insure that the market will not drop below the amount of the outstanding loan. Not only did they pursue home loans, but they began to push the concept of the home equity loan. Some even got involved in the development stage of speculative housing tracts.

But to understand what was truly going on, one has to look at the “Baby Boomers”; that largest ever generation to be raised in the U.S. Through the early 1970’s the last of that group were reaching young adulthood. Like any generation, it would be the period in their lives were they looked to settle down, accept some financial responsibility and raise some kids. The corner stone of such an endeavor has always been a house. The American dream of owning one’s own home was a mainstay of the American Mythology which had kept the working masses happily yoked to America’s industrial machine. Anyone who ever heard of Capitalism is familiar with the term “Supply and Demand”. With the arrival of the Boomers on the economic scene in the 1970’s, anyone in a position of authority should have been able to anticipate the kind of pent up “Demand” that would logically arrive along with them. But when the largest generation came into its own, something went wrong. As their demand was felt in the market place, it would have been logical to increase production to “Supply” that demand. The result would have been more jobs created. More wealth created. Instead, the initial onset of the demand caused prices to rise. The Federal Reserve would “Brand” it inflation. The cry would go out to kill the dreaded beast “Inflation”; and the club used to beat to death the aspirations of a generation would be the “Prime Interest Rate”. Rather than lowering interest in order to see more houses built, which would have increased supply, thereby dropping prices and reducing the speculation frenzy which dominated the era: the Fed. increased interest rates, which had the reverse affect. For the Boomers it was like the old story about the rigged card game: when asked why the people continued to go, the man replied, “We know it’s crooked, but it’s the only game in town”. Inflation ran wild. After all, what were they to do; put off starting a family? Well, in fact, most of them had started later in order to save and prepare for the future. Unfortunately, when the “whole” of a market reacts to the same stimuli, the market levels the field. In this case, that meant that the more they saved, the higher the bidding would go when they faced off to see who would get

*George Bailey*

the available housing. Because they had waited so long their biological limitations were becoming a factor. In the end, the bidding over limited housing would drive up prices, causing inflation to spiral upward. It became the psychology of the day; and the social mind set that ultimately caused the Savings and Loan crisis and the financial difficulties we face today. It was prevalent in the private sector and in the Government as well, and it led to our overwhelming national debt. It would continue into the 1980's. After all, Reagan kept telling us that we were doing great. We preferred lies to the truth. Once this philosophy was in place, it was a short step to "Buy now, pay later". If we couldn't afford a down payment on a car, car manufacturers would add it to the price of a new car and give it to us in the form of a rebate. The banks turned a blind eye to the practice and "VAULAH"; those who couldn't afford a new car could now afford a new car. The down payment simply became a formality circumvented. As the price of things began to climb, the whole process snow-balled. People strapped themselves to home mortgages they couldn't afford to make money on the climbing market. They bought second homes if they could, in order to cash in: often using "Home Equity" in their first home as the down payment. It was little more than a national pyramid scheme and when the breaking point was reached, the house of cards tumbled. The grunts in the cheap suits behind the desks at the bank, who made the "safe" bet rather than speculate on small business and innovation, were now the bad guys. But they had only been doing what they were told. As for the depositors, they had been greedy too. They never inquired what the difference was between the FSLIC [which insured deposits at the S & Ls] and the FDIC [the agency that insures deposits for banks] because they really didn't want to know. They just wanted the higher interest rate. It had not concerned them that high interest rates were dismantling American industry and sending it off shore or out of business altogether. Instead, We were told that our foreign trade competitors were to blame. But it was greed that drove us. So when the Savings and Loans went under, Congress covered those lost deposits with more National Debt because congress didn't want to offend those of us with enough money to have deposits. The debt, true to the psychology of the era, was borrowed then, to be paid off later. Later, meaning our children. Individual's deposits of as much as \$100,000 and in as many S&L's as that depositor had deposits, will be paid back by people who may be working for as little as minimum wage and who have no savings of their own.

This notion of saving Banks and their depositors would develop in other areas as well. FEMA, the federal emergency relief agency, would gain prominence and funding that would grow right on through the 1990's. Banks who would have gone under in decades past for lending money on housing in flood plains or in other undesirable locations, would be propped up at taxpayer expense. Rather than have homeowners walk away from mortgages on homes that were in ruin and uninsurable or under insured: the market forces which used



to protect communities from such unwise zoning practices would be thwarted. In many cases, individuals would be made low interest or no interest government loans to rebuild in order to protect bank equity. Individuals around the country who suffered losses in isolated incidents would flounder on their own; while concentrations of devastated individuals would be propped up by tax payers to rebuild in areas that were unsound in the first place. It was a coup in perception to enlist those who had built their homes on “Shifting Sands” to refinance in order to save mismanaged banks. Unfortunately, in the end, they ended up rebuilding back in the flood plane. It is true that FEMA has helped victims of hurricanes and tornadoes as well. But it only comes to the aid of communities, not individuals, and it is my belief that the common thread is not taxpayers, but bank solvency.

Another banking trend that blossomed over the last couple of decades or so is the “Loan Sharking” system know as the credit card. Rather than the loan made on the merits of the situation, it is an insurance pool. People with the proper profile are give uncollateralized credit and charged outrageous interest rates. The rates are high, presumably, because the percentage of defaults is high. But these losses are calculated into the formula so that those who pay off, are the ones who have to cover the losses incurred by defaults. It is a method which requires no interviewer expense and therefore, streamlines everything for the bank. The problem for consumers is the portrayal of the cards by government as an option. Because they are so prevalent, great percentages of many bank’s assets are wrapped up in them; making it difficult to get available monies in any other form. It’s the only game in town. If you are fortunate enough to pay off your balance at the end of every month you may avoid the interest for the short term altogether. Those who are unable to keep up with the debt are the ones who pick up the cost in the formula. The process also allows for a type of commercial extortion in which retailers are forced to pay the bank cards a fee when a purchase is made. Since the purchaser doesn’t incur the fee, there is little or no incentive not to use the card. Unfortunately, these costs to the retailer must ultimately be reflected in the cost of merchandise to “ALL” consumers: card users and non-card users alike. In 1991 congress tried to force banks to lower their interest rates. Wall Street reacted at the prospect. Congress turned away from another hard decision. By the end of the decade, credit card companies would be selling card holder’s accounts [their debt marker] to other card companies who had the right to raise the interest rate on a debt already incurred without the consent of the debtor. As the “squeeze” on the debtors increased more and more individuals and couples were filing bankruptcy in order to escape. As I edit this draft in 1998, congress is considering new legislation, not to curb the abuses of credit card companies, but to make it more difficult to file bankruptcy. In 1997 President Clinton would champion and win a tax exemption for the profit on homes sold by individuals for up to \$250,000: \$500,000 for

*George Bailey*

couples. One underlying reason would be to keep the profit from home sales from going to taxes when it was needed to cover excessive debt loads. People who had been given home equity loans for 100% or more of their home's value were among those going under. I was told, [second hand] that in 1997 it was reported that nearly one in six credit card holders in the San Francisco Bay Area were on the brink of default. I would not be at all surprised. In the end, those lost tax revenues, which will be used to keep banks solvent, would once again fall to the tax payers at large to make up, in order to save poorly managed banks.

Another of the driving forces in the 1980's was the mystique of the "Corporate Raider". Imagine a family business, run with an aging father at its head. He has ten sons. The eldest runs the business of making widgets. The father is overseer. All of the sons, who work outside the business, contribute all their savings to the capital assets of the business and each owns 10% of the stock in the widget business. The company pays the father a comfortable salary, and the eldest brother is paid a handsome wage to manage the business full time. The system works well. The business flourishes. They decide that they will diversify in case widgets should lose their demand. They will make wadgets as well. The plan is a success and they move on to develop a third product: wodgets. Wodgets initially lose money, but it is an up and coming commodity. So they support the loss with the profits from the other two. This keeps widgets, wadgets and wodgets available in the market place, and that's good for the country and its economy. It keeps people employed in the manufacture of these products, and that's good for the country and the economy. And it keeps the shares of stock in the company valuable and growing in value and that's as it should be. It also insures that, as widgets become obsolete the business will remain solid through its manufacture of wadgets and wodgets. Everyone in the family and the people they employ are happy; until one day the eldest son becomes greedy. It is his responsibility to assess the value of the stock. He reckons that if he can underestimate the value of the stock, and buy up some of his brothers holdings, he can get rich on their ignorance of the situation. So he says the stock is worth \$4.00 a share when in fact it's worth \$5.00 or maybe even \$6.00. In this way he is able to convince two of his brothers [who now fear that they might lose their investment altogether], that they should sell some of their stock; and he quietly buys up their shares.

Waiting in the wings, and unbeknown to the eldest, is the black sheep of the family, his cousin. Aware of what is going on, the black sheep strikes a deal with a seedy friend of his to raise money. The two of them will barrow money at an extremely high interest rate from an uninvolved party [Junk Bonds] and buy up 51% of the stock in the company. The plan is to dump the wadget factory and lay off all those employees. This will take away the company's long-range ability to capitalize on the wodget market, but the cousin and his friend will have no losses

to show against the profits of widgets and wadgets. They will also loot the employee's retirement fund. That will make the value of the stock soar to \$8.00 a share, doubling their money. Then they will sell those shares, take their money, and leave the company to stand or fall on the production of wadgets and the rapidly outdated widget. Then they will pay off their lenders and pocket the difference.

With the plan in place they move. Before the news of what's going on gets out, the cousin has bought up 30% of the company's stock. Afraid that he might lose control of the company, the eldest brother warns those who still own their stock not to sell to the cousin. At this point one of two things will happen. Either the cousin will win out and dismantle the company by convincing enough of the stock holding brothers to go along with his plan and double their money in the short term; or he will fail: defaulting on the loans his friend [the junk bond dealer] made. Either way his friend makes money by charging a commission on the sale of the bonds. Because the friend was a stockbroker who encouraged foolish investors to take long shots rather than an investor himself, he can't lose. Furthermore, if the investor was a banker or an S&L, or an insurance company trying to keep ahead of inflation in the 1980's market, it was the depositor or the policy holder who lost. This was inevitable in the atmosphere of the 1980's and one of the causes of the S&L collapse. Unfortunately, if the S&L made money on junk bonds, the profit went to the S&L. But if they went broke over the deal it was the depositor, and ultimately the taxpayer who lost.

Now when all this was going down, the father should have stepped in. [In the 80's that would have been Reagan] and said "Enough!" He should have punished the eldest son [with the criminal justice system for stock fraud]. He should have made the cousin sell back the stock for the same amount he paid and made him personally liable for the interest on the high interest junk bonds. And if he could show that the friend raising the money was aware of what was going on, he should have had the other son's [the criminal justice system] beat the tar out of him.

Even if the eldest son was honest about the worth of the stock, branching out into unproven, slow starting, new ventures like wodgets, leaves publicly owned businesses vulnerable to black sheep. During the 1980's, not only was our father silent, but American's made media heroes of those corporate assassins they called "Raiders" and I call black sheep. When such people spoke of trimming the dead weight off of corporations across the country, they were really selling out our pension funds, our buffer against hard times, and our future. We stood and cheered in admiration and celebrated our demise with another episode of "Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous".

Today it is estimated that of twenty some types of electronic components used in one particular piece of military equipment sent to crush Saddom Hussein

*George Bailey*

in the Gulf War, only eleven are manufactured in the U.S. These components were yesterday's wadgets. They are the wadgets of today. Most electronic patents are still filed by U.S. citizens. Yet, they are sold countries abroad, [notably the Japanese] because our banks, our stockbrokers and our institutions will not dare to look to the future. As we grapple to stand on each other's shoulders to keep above the water line, the tide is coming in and soon even those near the top will be submerged.

At the beginning of our national history, the coastal mountains of the northwest were rich with giant Redwoods. Awe inspiring and magnificent, they were a symbol of the grandeur of the land. Today, less than 5% remain. The rest have been carved up into lawn furniture and redwood decks left to rot in the sun and then be discarded. There was a timber company in northern California who functioned for generations as good steward to its redwood forest holdings. It owned the land it harvested. For each generation of trees felled there was one planted. Sons worked in the same forests as their fathers before them and families grew children to adulthood with security. In the 1980's, I saw a report which alleged that the company, the land and the redwoods were sold to a man who financed the takeover with high interest "Junk" bonds. It was said that he began to clear out entire sections of land, in double shifts, in order to repay the loans and [presumably] to make himself rich in the bargain. It was said that the employees begged him to allow them to buy him out in order to save the redwoods and their future and that he declined. As the clear cut soil began to erode and spoil the waters of the local streams, the citizens of California brought it to a stop through the use of the courts. As of 1991 they had been successful in halting the deforestation of the timber.

In that same time period, 1991, the news magazine "60 Minutes" did a short story on a man who was sentenced to three years in prison for violating the federal "Wet Lands" act. He had cleaned up a polluted dumping ground in a commercial area near a small creek. At his own expense, this area was reclaimed and part of it turned into a sanitary land-fill for a building site on which to expand his business. He had done all the required paper work to receive the proper permits from the local authorities but he alone was charged, fined and incarcerated for a crime against nature that was never committed. At the same time the federal government allowed the redwoods to fall without a whimper.

In 1996 the city and county of Los Angeles entered into an agreement to turn a significant amount of its "Wet Lands" along the LA coast into commercial property for the purpose of building a new movie production studio. In return, the studio would help to reclaim and make improvements to those adjoining "Wet Lands" that were left. Isn't this exactly what the man on "60 Minutes" did? Where is the outcry from the Hollywood environmental set who that forever bashing every industry but their own?

We do not need more laws. We need leaders who will honestly enforce the “intent” of the ones we already have in place. When the redwoods are gone, they will be gone for generations to come, if not forever. The only thing we will have to leave behind for future generations is toxic and nuclear waste.

American corporate business has been whipping boy since the “New Deal”. The government is unable to control corporate greed and lust for power in any meaningful way, and yet, at the same time, insists on crippling its ability to compete, by using great broad strokes of legislation and allowing unions to feed on it like parasites. Perhaps one of the most important things my stepfather ever told me about looking for work was to first ask myself, what special qualifications did I have. At the time, the answer was, pretty much, none. It’s true for most of us starting out. Still, after we are once trained by a company, we feel no debt. We feel no obligation for the investment made in us.

A famous Russian ice-skating team defected to the U.S. when I was very young. I was never able to understand why the Russians expected them to do any less, given the opportunity. I somehow thought that all those people trapped within the “Red Menace” would applaud their escape. But as I grew older and we, as a nation, began to see behind the fallen “Iron Curtain” it became clear, to me at least, that the skaters betrayed a debt. The Russian people were depleted of everything in order to fight an arms race with us that lasted half a century. Yet, they gave the best they had to offer to the training and life styles of their athletes and dancers and musicians. They were the Hollywood stars of the “People”. Their preferred economic status was given politically and with the consent of the people rather than by capitalistic market forces. But when they got a better offer, they took it.

In the mid 1970’s our country was entering the computer age. Many people found themselves being trained, at corporate expense, to operate the new computers. Many other corporations, rather than invest the time and money in training, simply offered higher salaries to those already trained by someone else. There were bidding wars going on. At the time I thought it an enviable position to be in. Many employees made the jump. Looking back, I can see now that it was the same type of situation that the Russian ice-skating team must have faced, [Although, for them it was a question of political, as well as, increased economic freedom]. No one seemed particularly put off with colleagues that made the switch. Company loyalty was not an issue. But ten years down the road, when companies began to shy away from middle-aged applicants because they were approaching retirement [a costly proposition for any employer with retirement benefits], people were outraged. Legislation was enacted.

A friend of mine owned a truck and trailer back in the early 1980’s when unions and unnecessary government regulation helped to drive the US steel industry under, [I say unnecessary lest you say I oppose environmental control;

*George Bailey*

some of which would fall under necessary]. He got dispatched to pick up a piece of machinery from a steel mill that was closing down in the northeast. When he arrived he was met by a man who had been a foreman at this union mill and now, as his last duty, he helped to load the liquidated machinery. The mill worker complained indignantly that the government had allowed the Japanese to run “his” company out of business. My friend asked “How much were they paying you as foreman?” “Thirty five dollars an hour.” the man replied. My friend, a Utah native, pointed to his one year old tractor-trailer outside at the loading dock. “I’ve got \$80,000.00 in those eighteen wheels and what’s sitting on them. The steel may very well have come from this mill. I pay for the fuel, the license, the tires, the insurance; and when I’m not driving it, I’m under it, working on it, keep’ in it up. When I’m not getting paid by the mile, my hourly rate is thirty five dollars an hour. What did you bring to work,” he concluded, “ your boots?” “No,” the foreman replied, “ the union made my employer furnish my boots.”

American business is not a bottomless pit of wealth. For thirty years after the destruction of Europe and Japan in World War Two, we skated ahead of the rest of the world with a head start. The best minds of the world flocked to our shores to escape tyranny and gave us our aerospace lead, our lead in physics and chemistry. Those days are gone. As we fall to the grip of this hoax of a drug war and Russia and Eastern Europe throw off their chains of oppression, we may very well pass them headed in opposite directions. “Special Interest” groups in Washington cry out that we are faceless, meaningless, masses to the members of the in corporate America. Yet, at the same time they accuse that corporate America discriminates against woman, minorities and the middle aged. Which is it? It is profit that drives corporations, not racism, sexism or social conscience. If they tend to pick good looking receptionists over less attractive receptionists it is for the same reason that America chooses its Hollywood starlets from the “beautiful” people rather than the “kind” people. If “White” women are chosen over “Black” women for the same receptionist position, it is most likely for that same image which they pander to, but do not control. If young, able, minority workers are turned away by people within the corporation, it is most likely an individual choice made by ignorant individuals, in intermediate positions of authority. It is the racist from “Mississippi Burning” who says “If I ain’t better than a Nigger, who am I better than?” Or it reflects a perception in corporate America that, in some cases, because of government involvement, such employees come with more baggage than others.

But what are we talking about here? From the “Gay” movement, to nude pictorials, TV evangelism, the S&L failures, Corporate Raiders, Unions and Corporate America; we are talking about a decline in America that goes hand in hand with and is a result of, a decline in morality. If we are to change it, we must first change ourselves, not put ourselves out of business with lawsuits. We must

employ every man and woman with the need to work, so that the small-minded need not fear for their job. We must free business, big and small, from the burdens imposed for political gain. We must allow them to compete with a world-wide economy before it is too late. We must give in order to receive. On the other side of the coin, business must be held accountable. The question is how. In the 1940's the city of LA had a mass transit rail system in place at the same time as the famous trolleys of San Francisco. It was bought up by a corporation and systematically dismantled. The rail cars were destroyed and, more importantly, the right of way was sold off and cannibalized in such a way as to eliminate it forever. In 1953 it was proven in court that the buyer, who was one of the Big Three automakers, intended the move to cause LA to buy their busses; which is what happened. There was a token fine imposed. No one went to jail.

Little has changed in corporate America in the last half a century. The Ford Pinto was said to have gone on the market in spite of the knowledge that it was a potential fireball. Three Mile Island Nuclear facility exposed its neighbors to radiation without sufficient warning. A major US chemical corporation killed thousands and irrevocably maimed thousands more in India when its plant exploded: presumably as the US flag flew in front of its door. You know the rest. Yet, those who make the decisions are rarely punished. Today, with laws on the books which call for the death penalty for drug dealers, the heads of the American tobacco companies seem to have been proven to be involved in a conspiracy which dates back decades. Now that evidence has surfaced that they may have attempted to addict major segments of our population, will they pay the price exacted against Colombians accused of similar crimes? Of course not. Instead, the Government will turn the evidence into an excuse to increase the tax burden on those addicts who it can now demonstrate were targeted for addiction. Government will assert that such revenue will be necessary to provide for the health care of these people. People who's need is said to be greater than the general public; when in fact, that segment of the population will probably die young. They will probably neither linger in death nor collect the social benefits associated with prolonged retirement. Those who conspired to addict them may or may not lose their jobs, but they will almost certainly avoid criminal prosecution. Given the fact that, all of us who became addicted to tobacco in the last half of this century, entered into smoking with the knowledge that it was addictive; the whole business was a non-issue. The Congress has always had the right to ban tobacco advertisement entirely, as a health menace. Law enforcement has always had the right to fine or even jail those who would sell tobacco produces to minors. Even the money, which is said to be earmarked for campaigns against smoking, will ultimately be used as a political "Slush" fund to reward radio and television stations who play along with the two political parties. Ad campaigns will be run by political insiders who pay kick backs as campaign

*George Bailey*

contributions or in the form of cheaper production costs for candidates on the inside at election time. In the end, the whole suit against tobacco was a sideshow, not to divide and conquer, but to divide and tax. Those who lied and became rich as the perpetrators of this decades old scam, may lose their jobs but kids will still be smoking cigarettes and people will still die of lung cancer, and the pace of our down hill spiral will quicken. Had it not been an industry in which those who purchase the Corporate product were addicted, such a suit would have seen the burden of the law suits paid by the stock holders. Had market forces determined price rather than addiction, such a settlement would probably have wiped out the industry all together. Those in charge, who caused the losses, who were immoral, would be insulated from real punishment in the same way Congress insulates itself from the kind of justice it reserves for the masses. As a result, Corporate America dares to do the wrong thing as a matter of course.

There was a time when I believed that the power of the purse was the way to make corporate America responsive. But suits against stockholders, who were probably not aware of what was going on, much less in control, is like cutting off the hand that pulled the trigger. It is only effective to the point that it can effect change in the attitude of the murderer. It is even less affective when we hack off the arm of the guy who put him in charge of the gun. The arm that we maim is the financial stability of the stockholder. In a society where corporate heads commands salaries of \$10,000,000 a year, it simply doesn't work. If they can show a profit, by whatever means, for even one year, why would they be afraid of being fired over a huge lawsuit. These suits have become something akin to winning the lottery. Like any lottery; for every million awarded a plaintiff, thousands of stockholders must lose money, and the house [the lawyers] always wins. We must go for the head: for the throat. We must demand of our legislators, stiff, mandatory sentences in the state and federal penitentiaries: not country clubs. And we must demand enforcement. Government [more to the point, politicians] plays a subservient role to corporations as a result of lobbies and campaign contributions. At the same time they make great demands on Corporate America for the sake of the popular vote. Both are detrimental. When government allows pollution standards to fall short, only to demand that health care benefits paid by employers be improved, it becomes another down hill spiral.

If we are to save our society, we must first begin by trying to understand what society is. Human society, more than any other, is based on the consent of the strong to protect all its members from internal threats as well as external threats. It is the protection from the internal, that most sets us apart from the wild beasts. For the wild beast, the rut and the competition for food and nurturing space are matters left largely to the power struggle. This, in spite of the fact that, the group may ban together to intervene against an external threat. What's more,



the farther human society moves away from the natural parameters of society in the wild, the more tentative that society becomes. For example, we are all well aware of how dangerous it can be to find ourselves stranded on a deserted stretch of highway or even an empty city street. Men suffer somewhat less from this anxiety because of a combination of factors. In a physical world they are, as a general group, better trained and better physically equipped to deal on natural terms: natural meaning, if you will, the “Law of the Jungle”. This factor also increases the likelihood that an aggressor, historically anyway, will be a man. In any case, simply being physically removed from the social setting can cause a break down in modern human society. Fair or not, that is a fact of life. There are those who believe that this base animal instinct tenancy resides only in the male portion of our society. It is true that power manifests itself in the physical form of violence more and more these days in our men against our women, but I believe it is directly linked [if not proportionate] to the lack of power, and lack of control, society allows these same men, to control their own lives. Please don’t accuse me of excusing such action. I do not. But consider that women in a business setting are capable of being every bit as ruthless as men. Consider that in a divorce court, a woman can be just as un-empathetic to the future of her spouse as a wife batterer is to the plight of his. The only difference is that, male aggression often takes a turn toward the physical and that is, I believe, largely a function of the fact that it is the only real power some of these men feel they have in our society.

I had occasion, in May of 1992 to watch Peter Jennings host a forum on rape and violence. Women sat on one side of a room and the men sat on the other. They began the show with an excerpt of a woman entertaining at a bachelor party. There was a debate as to who was in control at the bachelor gathering, the men or the entertainer. I got the impression that the women saw the men in control and that the men saw the erotic dancer in control. Both sides seemed to agree that “power” was the driving force at work in the situation. I find it interesting that the group of women could see a situation as one in which the men were in power. As the dancer danced, it was she who was the obvious source of the sexual tension in the room. Had the men truly been in power, some of them would very likely have turned the situation from a sexual overture to a sexual act. Therefore, it was the dancer who controlled the situation. It was she who set the parameters of conduct. The question was how long she could retain control. Like the lion tamer surrounded by too many lions, she pitted her mastery of the situation against the danger of it. As one of the women on the panel said, this is how fraternity rapes occur. Along those same lines, another woman on the panel reminded us that this kind of behavior on the part of the lions is why we keep lions caged in our society. Never the less, if a lion attacks a trainer, the lion is shot. But if more and more lions are having to be shot, eventually the owner of the circus must question the methods of the trainer.

*George Bailey*

Whenever there is a discussion like the one just mentioned, it is inevitable that the women are represented by experts in the field. Unfortunately, that, in and of itself, assures that those women asked to speak for all women, are those who bring the most baggage with them to the forum. That is, they are those most likely to deny that the “Women’s Movement” had a negative impact on our society. It was interesting to note that, for the most part, the men’s panel seemed to be looking for answers, understanding and even reconciliation; while the women demanded more empowerment and took on no responsibility. To the contrary, one young woman, who dealt with a crisis center, made a point of saying that women caught in a situation of rape should not feel any guilt what so ever: and I agree whole heartedly, so long as we are discussing individuals. But as a society, women share at least equally for the situation we find ourselves in. It is women who have changed women’s dress to be more provocative. It is largely women, who still do most of the family shopping and who decide whether or not to buy items sold with the persona of the sensuous woman. It is women who buy underwear from companies that show women in their underwear. Only one company dared to try it on television in the beginning. Their success caused he others to do the same. An individual caught peeking through a key hole, as a woman undressed, would be punished severely by the panel I just spoke of. Yet a camera doing the same on television commercial causes women to buy the product. A man caught looking up a woman’s dress would be a ruined man in most cases, but a TV camera placed at a low angle, brings women from across the dance floor to allow the folks at home a look up their dress. It was the apathy of middle of the road American woman, and the lust for power of the women’s movement leaders, that led to this. Feminists have promoted the absolute myth that women are as sexually driven as men. They have urged young women to abandon the role of homemaker and mother, and to strive for economic, political and sexual equality. Now we have a generation of young men who have come up separated from their absentee mothers, who, logically, grow up in the company of guys who had their own misconceptions about the role of sex in a relationship and in society. It is a small step of twisted logic to assume that women have rejected the role of homemaker for a ride in the fast lane and all that society tells us that implies. What’s more, women have fought to become one of the guys without understanding what that entails. The “guys” talk mostly about sports or cars, or computers, or other interests from the physical realm, and “getting laid”. So is it difficult to understand how young men with limited maternal guidance at home, could grow up without empathy? Is it hard to understand that 50% of teenage boys don’t see taking advantage of, or over powering, an intoxicated female, as rape? If a “guy” has candy and teases another guy with it, most guys will simply dislike him for the jerk he is. Those without self restraint will knock him down and take the candy and feel justified. Furthermore, a boy [or man] lacking the social graces necessary to be able to obtain his own [candy]: or more

importantly, one who believes that every one else is being given all the candy they want [i.e. the message on the television], is going to be much more angered and much more able to rationalize the violence, if he is denied.

One of the women on the program was a rape victim. She said that after the rape, the assailant paused to brush a bug off of her. Understandably, she said that she just wanted the creep gone. But it shows, in some small way at least, two dynamics of rape. The first is that, right or wrong, there is a difference in the mental faculties of an impassioned male prior to sex and immediately after sex has occurred. It can be base, even primeval. Even so, it does not excuse individuals who do not conduct themselves in accordance with the rules of society. On the other hand, it should not be dismissed or dealt with in a frivolous manner. While sex for women is largely mental, sex for men is largely physical and chemical. It is why most women can giggle and say that they have faked an orgasm and why men are so astonished to hear it. The second dynamic is that, hate and violence are very often the manifestation of a thwarted ability to show and attain love. Fifty years ago a man was judged by his work record, his family, his honor. Today, young men see themselves as having to be ultra economically successful and physically attractive in order to be sexually alluring. The ideals that women hold up to young men are not simple men. They are, for the most part, as mythical as the standards they hold up for themselves in the “Super Mom” or “Barbie” stereotypes. It is women who have set the agenda for today as much as anyone. It has been as unrealistic an approach to the forces of nature and society as stepping into a crosswalk in front of a speeding car. Yes, the “Law” gives you the right of way. But as evidenced by a society in decay, the laws of the physics will see you seriously injured in spite of your rights, and those who love you will suffer as well.

It was noted by one of the women on the panel that, in spite of increased violence against women, men are still the more likely targets of aggression. The women seemed angered by the fact that, even though that is the case, men didn't seem intimidated to the degree that women are. The fact is, that men tend to be resigned more to the realities of life. They are trained in their youth to face them as best they can. There are limits to the protection society can afford its members and men have always had to deal with that, for themselves and for those they love. It is the reason that men look each other in the eye when they meet and greet strangers with respect. It is the baggage that goes with being one of the guys. It is the price to be paid so long as people [men or women] rule over people. You do, as women, have the right to pursue sexual equality with men; to promote yourselves in all the ways you choose: be it intellectual, business person, artist, mother or even sex goddess. But in the midst of the sexually transmitted plague known as AIDS, where the risk to women seems to far out weigh the risks to men; who will suffer more through your liberation and who will you blame?

*George Bailey*

On the subject of the litigation of less violent matters: in 1991 I heard a newscaster announce a story about a recent court case in which a woman sued for sexual harassment. Her case revolved around nude photographs of a woman being displayed in her work place, which she found to be offensive. The reporter said that the judge in the case, instructed the jury to view the case through the woman's eyes, rather than through the man's. She won the case. So, fine. In many circumstances I find such pictures offensive too. I certainly object when I go to pick up my car from a garage with my young daughter and such pictures are plastered all over the place. At the same time, our much twisted "First Amendment" rights allow pure pornography to thrive. I'm not even going to get into what the stars of such films are asked to do by their "employers". Yet we see them promoting themselves and their work on all the tabloids and on tabloid TV. These women are not offended by such trash. To the contrary, they would have us believe that they are proud of it. The point here is that when these jurors looked through the eyes of a woman, they looked through the eyes of this particular woman, not the woman who was flaunting her stuff in the picture. It now becomes a law subject to the interpretation and discretion of any particular woman. Stop for a moment and try to imagine where we are heading through the eyes of a man. If you employ women and one of them dresses particularly special one day, do you, or your other employees dare to say, "You look nice today"? Presumably she wanted to look nice or she wouldn't have put forth the effort. But any statement made is subject to interpretation. So day after day someone is making small talk with this woman. She keeps a log of all the "questionable" comments made [as suggested by the news caster] and a year later she takes you to court with full documentation: things that co-workers never remember saying, or things taken totally out of context. Heaven forbid that someone on your staff was generally attracted to her and let his feelings be known.

As long as there are men and women, there will be an interaction of a sexual nature between them. My wife and I met on the job. Where else do most people meet if not at a social function or on the "bar" circuit. The way things are headed, I would not have dared to speak to her on a social level for fear of losing my job, or worse. As it stands today, the law requires that women be found to fill the quotas within the work place. Not just be allowed to compete for those jobs, but "found" to fill those positions. With this new trend, it allows that they now be permitted to subjectively analyze their situation, their peers and their supervisors; and sue on grounds of sexual harassment if they are dissatisfied. I think every little girl in grade school had a nasty little boy sitting behind her at one time or another: one that pinched and pulled her pigtails. The difference is that when you grow up, you have the right to get out of your chair and leave. You can even slap his face. In the real world, everyone faces choices. They are your choices and yours alone. I have watched grown men take verbal abuse and utter humiliation from superiors, for the sake of their family's income: insults that they would have

killed a man on the street for saying. If you find colleagues and superiors offensive or pushy, then leave, or take it like a man; like one of the guys. We've had to since society began. Those are the rules. I'm not saying you have to stand for ultimatums; "Sex or your job" is way over the line. But that's not sexual harassment, that's extortion. As for the rest, the federal government can not make it all better for you. You're going to have to face that. This whole business becomes especially irritating when we consider that the same group of women who would champion the right of women to be offended by such a picture, are the same women who would insist that straight soldiers must be forced to cohabitate with Gays.

It was also in 1991 that proponents pushed for passage of new job anti-discrimination legislation. Because of the resistance to what some called "Nothing more than a quota system" the democrats pushed for support from women who are included in the bill. The law was said to make it easier for those discriminated against, to sue employers. But in order to gain support from the right, some Democrats sought to put a limit of \$150,000 on suits involving women. It was minorities pitted against American employers, with a handout to women. And who will win? Lawyers of course. The new breed of what used to be "Ambulance Chasers" who claim to fight the good fight for the little guy, and now the minority or the woman; while keeping 40%, or 50% or even 60% for themselves.

The national news organization on which I saw the story about the new legislation, gave an example of a woman who claimed that her boss, a car dealership owner, had stood before her desk clad only in a towel and asked, "How do you think I'd look without the towel?" [or something to that effect]. Then, according to the woman, before she could answer, he exposed himself. It was a perfect example of how the Bill would be beneficial. He is, presumably, wealthy. He certainly deserves punishment. But would the law protect her if she were the employer and he were the employee? Of course not. If a man exposes himself to her on the street, is she somehow less offended, or has she simply been denied an opportunity to get a huge settlement for herself and her attorney? The man committed a crime punishable in criminal court. That's where it should be handled. You may say that she is now forced to leave her job, whereas, being accosted on the street by a stranger, her job is not affected. But what if it had been a physical threat that was not of a sexual nature. To say that any time a male and a female have a confrontation, it is of a sexual nature, is absurd. I have worked with women I have disliked on a personal level. If a male abuses his authority over a female simply because he dislikes her, there need be no sexual overtones. What if the dealership owner physically threatens another male employee? It's just more of the same old "Politically Corrected" double standard, in which women and minorities get to be more equal than the rest.

*George Bailey*

Suppose for a moment that you work for a company that employed a hundred people. Suppose that its owner employs four supervisors and one of them is less than even handed. Let's further suppose that it is a white male, since they are an easy target. The supervisor is a bigot and a sexist, but he is crafty. He is very careful not to let on in front of the owner what kind of a person he is. Now, the owner is no crusader and no saint; but he believes in live and let live. As long as the work gets done, he's pretty much invisible around the job. One day the "ass" of a supervisor reveals himself to be a sexist "Pig". Perhaps he pulls the same stunt as the dealership owner. If the woman takes these charges to the owner, he is supposed to act. But how? He is not a court of law. Any move he makes against this supervisor, based on evidence which is given outside the parameters of the courtroom, could find the supervisor suing for slander. It is an untenable situation. Suddenly the owner finds himself in court. If the woman's lawyer can show cause in the eyes of a jury, the business loses \$150,000 or more, depending on the final Democratic package. If she is a minority, it may cost millions if she can convince the harassment stemmed from a racist motivation. The lawyer makes money. The plaintiff makes money. And you may very well lose your job when the business is forced into bankruptcy. Just the cost of defending the accusation in court can wipe out a small business. And even if business could insure against such suits, those companies who did not discriminate intentionally would have to carry insurance just in case. That would mean that good companies, run by good people, would have to help foot the bill for bad ones who had claims: All of which weakens the company which provides your pay check. It also weakens business in general as business tries to compete in a global economy. It is the "lottery" mentality that threatens our entire social and economic system. Criminal indiscretion should bear criminal penalties. The idea that corporate America will end discrimination practices because of financial penalties, puts the burden on those who have the least control over the situation; the stock holder. It is wishful thinking. The costs are simply passed on. It's like suing the city of L.A. for police brutality. You only increase the burden on the taxpayer. One person and any number of lawyers get "well off" and the rest of us pay for something we had no part in and were probably appalled by. It is the perpetrator of the crime who should pay. I doubt this truth was wasted on the broadcasters of these stories. But they chose to "Spin", to slant, the stories in the direction they do because they portray themselves as the defender of the down trodden. Shame on them. Will they show the next court battle, when the system is further choked by a suit in which the plaintiff was called a "Bitch" or a "Mexican" in the anger of the moment? Will they take you on a tour of the "Witch Hunts" created across America where there are no witnesses to the event: where it is the disgruntled employee's word against that of the admittedly less than perfect employer; where greed, not justice, is the motive.

Find me a White Male who has worked a lifetime in any position, of any profession, who has not been humiliated by a “superior” at some point along the way and I will show you a very rare individual. It is the nature of power to cause people to be abusive. That doesn’t make it right or fair, but it is a reality of life. All too often we see our employers as our adversaries. The fact is, that in order to create a single job, for a single employee, business must “RISK” capital, time and effort to “PROVIDE” you a job. Business must expend much more money and energy than you may be aware of to comply with an ever increasing mass of city, county, state and federal regulations, just for the “CHANCE” to compete in the market place. In most cases it takes everything an owner has worked for, being laid on the line. If it is not individuals, then groups of individuals in the form of stockholders. You must ask yourself what it is you are expected to gamble in return. Probably nothing. Your wages are guaranteed. Your time must be compensated by law. If your employer fails, they may lose everything, but you simply move on if dissatisfied. Inconvenienced? Certainly. But the debts of your employer will not go against you. To be sure, in the 80’s, many abuses were perpetrated against employee retirement plans. Some instances were shameful. But each coin has two sides. Sometimes we begin to feel that the company is our own because we have given to it the best years of our life. But the fact is that we are paid for those years with every pay check. Those people who retired with good retirement plans, back when I was young, were the same people who were loyal to the companies they retired from. We employers and employees need to return to that relationship. If we are to have change, we will all have to give up something. It is simply the nature of things that you must give in order to receive. Anyone who makes promises to the contrary is lying. This old government of ours is not working properly and we can’t change it for the better if everyone is going to keep that part of the failed system which caters to them. So, let us begin to look at what you “think” you’re getting from the government, and what you’re really getting.

Long ago, the Federal government passed a law that got you time and a half for your overtime if you worked by the hour. It was designed to hold companies to eight hour shifts and forty hour work weeks, in big “round the clock” factories. The legacy is that, outside of “Mega” manufacturing, business was hamstrung. Machinery sits idle when it needn’t and overtime is hard to come by. Not only that, but, after taxes, we all know who gets the half, in time and a half.

Then there is unemployment insurance. Let’s call it what it is; too little, too late, with strings attached. For each dollar your employer pays in, a large percentage goes to bureaucrats behind the counter, doling it out. It has become a subsidy for seasonal workers, and it’s more paper work for your employer.

Workman’s compensation: tell me you don’t know someone who has abused it. And how good is an insurance policy that only covers you Forty hours a week?

*George Bailey*

With 90% of us living paycheck to paycheck, how can compensation of 60% or 70% or even 80% of your check get you by? Once again, it's too little too late, with strings attached. There is another far more serious problem with workman's compensation insurance today: that is, the new definition of "Stress" as a compensatory work injury. How can you argue that there is no injury? How can you prove recovery? There is a hidden agenda here for insurance companies and it is a windfall for lawyers.

The Welfare System conjures up all kinds of emotions. It hasn't worked, won't work, can't work. The most shameful legacy of the welfare system is the "Single Mother, "Head Of Household". I can remember the White Middle Class mind set that demanded that the father [or in some cases boy friend] not be living in a household where aid was received. It must be said that it was a valid concern. After all, we were locked in a terrifying, all consuming, "Cold War" with Russia to prevent the spread of Communism. How then could we let a man and a woman raise a family and be totally supported by the State, and without working? The feeling was that if you denied the father access to his family, he would make something of himself in order to reclaim his place. The problem was and is, a lack of opportunity: and as the generations passed, these men of often times, Black, welfare recipient families were considered unable and finally unworthy, even by their own. But this discussion belongs in our study of minority races and the women's movement. For the purposes of this part of the discussion, "The Self Perpetuating Growth of the Bureaucracy", I must take our discussion in another direction at this point.

I want to take a moment to discuss "Communism". Communism, Socialism, and Capitalism: These are economic terms that refer to economic systems. These different systems are all ways in which a People [a nation or a society] provide goods and services to the members of their group. Communism, as it is referred to in today's western societies, is a system in which everything belongs to the "State": the government. It is a system based on Marxism. It was conceived by Carl Marx and oddly enough, it was originally called Socialism. Still, today and for the purposes of our discussion it is now referred to as Communism. In this "Communitic" system the theory holds that everything belongs to the people, that the people control the government and therefore the bureaucracies within the government decide where to invest the resources, who will work, and who will receive the goods and services.

Capitalism, in its purest form, says that the market place determines everything. Resources are allocated by "Supply and Demand" and those who can afford the resources get them. Shortages of resources drives up the price of those resources. The work is done by those who can show a profit because they are the ones who can afford the resources. Profit goes to those who produce the profit.



What we today call Socialism is the Bastard child of the other two systems. It allows the very strong to operate independently of government. The government then “milks” most of the profit from those who create it and then redistributes goods and services through governmental bureaucracies.

Totally independent of these “Economic” systems are the forms of government: the systems by which people are “Governed”. The original form being of course the Monarch: the King and Queen or Chieftain. Now this system is not so bad under King Arthur, but on the other hand, there was Marie Antoinette. The second form of government sprang from the abuses of the monarchies; and that’s what we loosely refer to today as Democracy: government of the people, by the people and for the people. Lastly, is the form of bureaucratic dictatorship that appeared in the beginning of the twentieth century. It called itself a “Socialist Republic” in Russia: but our politicians and press gave it another name; an “Economic” name; they called it “Communism”. Now at the end of the twentieth century, time has proven what we Americans knew from the beginning. You work harder for yourself than you do for others and government is, by nature, too self serving and corrupt to run a business. The significance of all this is the “Catch Word” “Communism”. In that single word was embodied all the fears of political and religious oppression, secret police and loss of individual ownership. But let’s compare the crumbling United Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia and the failed Red Chinese systems, to ours. The communist party member is not any relative to the political party member of the U.S., or is he? The communist party was the only game in town. Membership was the only way to secure a bureaucratic job. But in Communism, all jobs are bureaucratic. The importance of this is that, as I said, in a communistic system, the bureaucracy distributes the wealth. This means that when the waiting list for an apartment becomes 10 to 20 years long [which it now does over there] the bureaucrats are the first in line. The higher up in the government one is, the further up the list they move. The rest live four and five families to an apartment. Now let’s mirror that image over here at home. Here it is possible to find housing in abundance because demand fuels the supply. Moreover, the greed and graft of the savings and loan’s of the 80’s had even left us with a surplus in some parts of the country. However, the inflation which resulted, left many homeless. In fact it is possible for both parents to work a full time job at minimum wage and still be forced to live on the street in some cities. Our government employees however, [our bureaucracy] receive inflationary wage increases regardless of economic consequences for the rest of us. Thus, housing is affordable and therefore available to them. Do you begin to see the similarity? Another parallel is our tax system which gives tax breaks to special interest for political reasons rather than economic ones. Example: oil and nuclear over wind and solar. Or how about political protection? “60 Minutes” exposed a story of a Texan who bred carnivorous bugs which held in check, weevil bugs, that devastated stored grain.

*George Bailey*

The Environmental Protection Agency or The Federal Drug Administration or some other “Protector of the Public Good Agency”, was misused to shut him down. You and I both know it was done to protect pesticide producers. That is bureaucracy versus the “Free Market” determining allocation of funds. Now, I could go on and on, but you already know enough of these stories to get the point. And the point is, while crime and the fight against it, chips away at our social freedom, governmental growth strangles us economically and politically. If Perestroika were to succeed, we may very well “Sail past the Soviets, headed in opposite directions”, I believe was the quote.

Before we move on from this discussion of economic systems, it is important to note that, while Capitalism is the most productive; it is no more inherently humane or socially conscious than any other. Labor must be protected from unsafe working conditions and starvation wages. The environment must be protected from plunder and pollution. Advertising must be kept honest and unfair monopolies must not be allowed to form. People do fall through the cracks in a Capitalistic System. Goals and demands for goods and services change; and when they do, supply must be allowed to fall. That means people losing jobs and maybe having to change the jobs they do. Government should be there to break their fall, but “not” to hold them up. More importantly, it should not prop up the outmoded industry. It should also be noted that when the laws of a nation are not adhered to, Capitalism can actually become a centrifuge which eliminates the honest from among the competition. For example, when a truck driver exceeds the speed limit, they enjoy an economic advantage over their competitors which is in direct proportion to the amount by which they exceed the speed limit. Many of us tend to empathize with the driver who is trying to get somewhere: but that is the nature of the job at hand. If we, as a society, look the other way, then we force those who compete with the speeding driver, to speed as well. These are the realities of the economic engine known as Capitalism. Like any form of power, these “Economic Truths” must be held in check with laws that govern the use of that power, so that members of society are protected.

Now let’s get back to the subject of what your really getting out of government on the subject of education. It may well be that we should fund education out of the defense budget. After all, can there be a more direct link between ourselves and our future, than the children? If there is one institution in this country which epitomizes our relationship with government, it is our schools. Many of the kids come to school with nothing. No home life, no respect, no social graces, no incentive, no hope, no love, no sleep, no food in their stomach. We dump them on teachers, 30 or more at a time. We bog the teachers down with hours of State and Federal paperwork and demand them to teach. “More money” the government cries to the public. “More paperwork” it cries to the teachers. Now, with less and less to work with, some suggest that we should push hard to

keep up with the Japanese curriculum. Well, the fact is that after the stress of 12 years in Japanese schools, the Japanese college student has already been hired by a corporation and goes on a four year drunk in college. The result is an education equivalent to ours at the end of college. Year round school is another new theme, but it is often simply a smoke screen for the working parents who have dumped their kids on the system. Summer vacation wasn't some farm harvest ritual as some would have you believe. The crops grow unattended through July and August except for the weeding. Harvest doesn't come until September and October. Summer is a time of body and soul. It is a reward for a years work. To take it away is simply punishment; punishment for not being as smart as the Japanese are perceived to be. Punishment for being a burden on your parents and society. Government can not give your kids those things that can come only from you. And what may be even more important, if we are to take back our nation from the grips of bureaucracy, it can't take away from your children, those things that you have taught. The most important lesson of a dictatorship, be it the Soviet Socialist Republic, the Red Chinese or even Nazi Germany, is what happens when the youth of a nation are given over to the government to be indoctrinated into the mold cast by "The State". At the same time teachers unions have worked unceasingly to weed out the young enthusiastic teachers so they don't make waves for the ones who stopped teaching years ago but refuse to retire. Through the mid 1990's there would be an onslaught of "Socially Responsible", public service announcements, featuring celebrities who lavished praise on teachers. They spoke of teachers contributions and how just one good teacher can make a profound difference in a kid's life. I couldn't agree more; but I would add that the same can be true of one bad or unfair teacher. The unions, who have placed themselves between our kid's and what is best for them, in order to further the demands of teachers, are at the heart of many of the problems we find ourselves unable to deal with. We find teachers ready to innovate. We find teachers ready to connect every assignment to a computer. We find teachers making every assignment an art project or a cluster of color coordinated folders. We find teachers who lavish on homework. We even find teachers who show movie videos in class. But we don't see that many teachers in the business of teaching.

Perhaps the most dismal failure of our government is in the area of the judicial system. Remember that governmental power is allocated from the top. And since nearly everyone at the top is a lawyer, it is easy to see how the fox got left guarding the hen house. There is very little about the corruption of the system that you don't already know if you live in America. Lawyers make the laws, and money buys the lawyers. The constitution guarantees a speedy trial but we are denied. Criminals revolve through the system, paying lawyers with money that came from illegal activities but no lawyers are sanctioned for being unethical. This revolving door has given rise to a new sub-system, which functions much like the welfare system. It creates jobs and paperwork [which creates more jobs].

*George Bailey*

Except that these jobs go to law enforcement, lawyers, judges, corrections and administrators. This also includes the fat building and maintenance contracts awarded for the prisons in the game of "Pork Barrel Politics". The recipients of this system are the habitual criminals.

I saw a talk show on which ex-convicts sat on a stage and were confronted by victims of crime. One woman among the "Cons" was asked why it was that she thought these people in the audience were so mad at her. She was at a loss to understand it. From her point of view, she had paid for her crime. From her perspective, these people confronting her just didn't understand the game. "I steal, I get caught, I do my time and we're even." There was no consideration of right and wrong. It is simply "The Game". "The 'Man's' Game". Like a license to steal, it is good until you get caught. The price of renewal depends upon such considerations as previous convictions, ability to offer something through plea bargaining, and the luck of the draw on judge and lawyer. It is the same cycle she has known all her life. It is the cycle of the people she travels through life with. It is a permanent place, which produces a permanent need in the system and all the things that implies. It is her line. You need only turn on your TV to find some special report on inmates being released early. It amounts to nothing short of a threat from the judicial system "Give us more money and power or we will unleash these people on you."

At the very top of the judicial system sits the "Supreme Court". This is the same court that determined that in order to preserve the rights of inmates, they must have adequate accommodations, as well as exercise and under crowded sleeping conditions. But if they were, in fact, concerned with prisoner's "Rights" under the constitution, Rape and murder would not be a way of life behind bars. After all, a prison, where personal freedom and access can be controlled, should be a safer place than the streets, regardless of the population. It therefore becomes self evident that drug abuse and rape and murder, go on within prisons by design in order to control the population. So I ask you, would you rather be locked up and do sit ups in your cell; or would you rather be free to be thrown defenseless into an armed, drugged, hostile and dominating prison population. Ask yourself, if the Supreme Court decides what cases it will hear, why, in all these years, has it never heard a case in which an inmate sued the state or federal government for violating their rights under the constitution for crimes committed against them such as I have described. It is government spending that feeds these court decisions, not compassion. Who sells all these color TV's to prisons? From what "Pork Barrel" does the money flow to build these prisons. To get an idea of how the correctional money tree bears its fruit, you need to watch an old Robert Redford movie called "Brubaker". It is a case study on how to move money from the pocket of the taxpayer, through the system and into the hand of the rich and influential. Convict labor has, of late, found a new renaissance in the form of

telephone solicitation and the like. We have even seen the reemergence of the old “Chain Gang”. It is cheap labor subsidized with tax dollars. It competes with business in the private sector. It is a commodity to be traded for political favor, kick-backs and whatever the cleaver official can dream up. As taxpayers we are easily swayed to believe that inmates should help pay their own way. The problem is that absolute power corrupts absolutely. That is, an inmate with limited rights [if any] is nothing short of a slave. We fought a great civil war, in part, to settle that question. We look down our noses at China for such practices. But, more importantly, when there is a profit in the prison system for those who control the prison, there is the incentive to find new ways to put more and more of us in prison. With the proliferation of new facilities I think it very likely that is already happening. Today, America’s total prison population exceeds the populations of five different American States. In order to preserve our own freedom, we must take the profit out of the system. Facilities should be clean and secure. They should afford safety to the public and the inmate. Medical attention should be adequate. Food should be nutritious, clothing comfortable. But the founding fathers could not have considered air conditioning a standard for humane treatment. Television could not have been a necessity in their eyes. Inmates should not be arming themselves against the world in weight room. Cooking and cleaning for themselves should be the limit of their labor. Farm products, or any other kind of products for that matter, are only an invitation to graft and should be eliminated. No ex-con from the inner city is going to use the skills he learned on the prison work farm once he gets out. It is not my intention to ban televisions for prisoners. It is my intention to change the way the system works. It is also important to note that as you read this, there are presently corporations contracting with various State governments to provide prisons and staffs. These are prisons, with the right to hold Americans as prisoners, that are owned and operated by private corporations. Do you have any idea how perilous our position as citizens becomes when the rules of Capitalism become the driving forces in our penal system? It is a practice which should be outlawed. Later on in this book I will outline my ideas for a better penal system. But for now let us back up and look at the part of the judicial system which effects us most directly; Law Enforcement.

I believe that 99% of all the people who pursue a career in Law Enforcement start out as good, caring, honest people. I think, that while it may be to a lesser degree, they also bring with them a good racial attitude. These lofty qualities fade fast on the mean streets of this nation. Law has little or nothing to do with justice anymore. You know it, I know it, the criminals know it and the Cops know it. Still, there they are, trying to do the right thing; until finally one day they silently throw up their arms and give in. It is true that the revolving door of the system is largely to blame. But the biggest problem is one that we as a nation have refused to face up to. You should know to what I refer. It’s the supposed Drug war. They

*George Bailey*

call it a “Drug Problem”, but if we as a nation of free people are to save ourselves, then “We” must begin to see it for what it is. It is a symptom. If you grew up in this country in the “60’s” and “70’s” and never so much as took a “Hit” on a “Joint” [puffed on a marijuana cigarette] then you are probably in the minority. In those days, way back when, when I smoked “The Weed”, it seemed that everyone was smoking it. All over middle class America, we were “Lighting Up”. The significance of this stroll down memory lane is the mind set of the time. Despite the fact that President Nixon was fighting a drug war to eradicate “Pot” crops in Mexico: despite the fact that some poor slob was serving a “Life Sentence” somewhere in Texas for possession of a “Roach”, [a marijuana cigarette butt]: despite all the indignation of our elders, we felt no sense of immorality. We were hurting no one. We were every bit as justified to break the law as the members of The Boston Tea Party were to throw the King’s tea into Boston Harbor. If you want to know who profits from “The War On Drugs” you must simply listen to who promotes it the loudest. The only other driving force for such a stand is blind ignorance. We learned these lessons during “Prohibition”. It was the mind-set of middle class Americans who frequented “Speak Easys”, the mind-set of the “60’s” Hippies and the mind-set of “Street Kids” today. The laws being broken are oppressive and Man Made. They are not the laws of God or even right and wrong. In reality, they do not even truly reflect the will of the “People”. They do however account for between 40% and 80% of our prison population. And as we have already discussed, prisons are “Big Business”. If I make \$20,000.00 a year and purchase an \$800,000.00 house, before too long the IRS will have me up on Tax Evasion charges. So look to the inner city. Do you see the billions of dollars in yearly drug profits reflected in their lifestyle? A million dollars in cash is relatively worthless in America today. You can’t put it in the bank, or spend it on anything of consequence until you have shown how you made it and paid the taxes on it. Tax evasion is how they brought down Al Capone. It’s true that the “Street Dealers” make thousands of dollars a day, but it all goes “Up Their Nose”. They spend it to support their own habit or addiction. It travels up the ladder and into the system. Moreover the profits from drugs are relatively small when compared with the profits from money laundering. That takes Organization. It takes cooperation from banks. I ask you, how many bankers have you seen “Busted”, let alone convicted, on your nightly news program? It takes law enforcement at the top, turning a “Blind Eye”, and hamstringing their own forces. It takes Criminal Justice being subverted by politicians to cover their own tracks. We invaded Panama, a sovereign country, to bring down the drug dealer Manuel Noriega. Records were seized, people died. What ever happened to him? Was he the entire organization? Did he personally distribute the drugs and collect the money? During Prohibition the FBI fought “Boot Leggers” across the country, but it was J. Edger Hoover’s policy not to acknowledge the existence of “Organized Crime”. He feared that

even his own hand picked, “All American” patriots could not withstand the temptation of Mafia bribe money. Now we all saw “The Godfather”. We all understand the supposed “Code” of the “Families”. We know in our hearts the type of element who runs gambling in America. It is unreasonable to assume that anyone other than them controlled the drug traffic in America. That is, until the emergence of the “Drug Cartels”. These people are ruthless. They fear no one. They will kill your family. They simply don’t play by the rules that have been in place since Prohibition financed Organized Crime: and once the reputed head of the most infamous drug cartel in South America was shoot dead, We never heard of the Cartels again. But the Drugs and the Drug War remains.

In other words, your grand, self righteous Drug War may very well be a war to protect the status quo, whoever that has ultimately become. And whoever it is, one thing is for certain: they are well insulated. It keeps prices high and uses all the resources of our government to keep our own underworld on top. It keeps addicted prostitutes in line. It’s just a darned good policy for an organization that needs a lot of cash flow to stay in business. It keeps alcohol and tobacco, [two heavily taxed drugs] as the only game in town and it keeps the population from growing a little tax-free pot on their window sill. It also allows the CIA to convert money to drugs, to guns, to power and influence: as they did in Cambodia and Laos during the Vietnam War; the same tricks that were purportedly used in “Iran Contra”. The inner city kid can’t see the immorality of it, any more than the pot smokers of my generation could. Within his world he is simply an entrepreneur in the only game in town. He is not part of our “Great Society”. There is no place for him in that world. It offers him a minimum wage job that won’t pay the rent. They protect their small tribal turf with the same commitment of the soldiers who fought in the Gulf War. They market their product of the street with all the enthusiasm of an Anheiser Bush or a Phillip Morris. If I sound like some Bleeding Heart for those people, well I’m really not. I don’t like “Macho” in any neighborhood or in foreign affairs of State. I don’t like graffiti and fear. I don’t like it that inner city cops are “Shell Shocked” after ten years of duty today and perhaps five years somewhere down the road. I don’t like “Crack Babies” laid at my doorstep. I don’t like the loss of my liberties that the drug war advocates have perpetrated on me. I don’t like crooked cops getting rich while honest ones are frustrated or killed or both. I don’t like lazy cops using extortion to do shoddy police work, using the rationalization that theirs is a noble cause and it doesn’t matter anyway because the system is a revolving door. I don’t like South American citizens being murdered by drug lords or brow beaten and staved by their own government for my sake. I don’t like the whole stinking hypocrisy of it. I don’t like the “fact” that if government decides to retaliate against me for this work, that the most likely avenue for such retaliation is to “trump up” drug charges against me, and convict me for something I have not

*George Bailey*

done. I don't like the fact that the Supreme Court will allow it because my rights have been suspended under an act of "war". McCarthy would be proud.

In mid March of 1991, A.B.C.'s Prime Time Live aired two stories of particular relevance. The first was on the LA Police Chief whose officers were video taped in the act of brutally beating a man after apprehending him in a high-speed chase. Fourteen cops were present at the beating and not one lifted a finger to stop it. You should know the Rodney King story and how it led to the LA riots. The incident put Police Chief Darrell Gates into the limelight and during that time he was quoted as saying that "casual drug users should be taken out and shot". The fact is that, that kind of force is exactly how China brought an end to its own invasion by opium, some one hundred years ago. Are we prepared to do that? Will you turn over all of your guns to Government if it threatens you with more violence in the street? Will you trust this police department or the department it might become? If your police department funds itself, pays its payroll, pays its health and retirement benefits by selling confiscated homes, boats and cars, and with confiscated cash, do you believe that your complaints will be heard and your calls for help answered; or will they be too busy looking for the drug dealers and their money? Will they "Bust" small dealers or cultivate them? For that matter, if an officer of the law "Plants" drugs in your home or on your property, how will you prove it isn't yours? How will you get a good lawyer, or even come up with bail, if some rival at work sets you up and the police impound all your assets? [Under the RICO laws government may seize all of your assets without a trial and it will be necessary for you to raise 10% of the amount seized and put it up as bond before you will be allowed a trial to prove your innocence. FACT. You need not be tried nor imprisoned. You simply loss all of your possessions.] In fact, by the end of the 1990's, a motel manager somewhere in this country would be told by the local police that there was too much drug activity going on in the motel complex he managed. He was told that he should install more surveillance equipment and hire more security personnel. When the motel manager's response to the problem did not meet with police approval the local police called in Federal Drug Task force personnel, who seized the motel. So then, it can be demonstrated even today, that the police can fail to do their duty, place the burden of that duty onto the private sector and seize the property of citizens who fail to do the job the police are paid to perform. The spoils can then be legally divided between the Federal and local law enforcement. This is law enforcement for profit. By 1999 this type of government shake down would find its way down to the city level were Mayors would thumb their noses at our constitutional protection from illegal seizure, by confiscating the automobiles of drunk drivers without a day in court.

The second story that aired that night was about some very poor Americans who were people struggling to make it on minimum wage in El Pas Texas.



According to the report, some one hundred and fifty “Sweat Shops” in the area systematically failed to pay some four thousand people their wages. No one disputes that they deserve the money. The Sweat Shops haven’t gone out of business. They simply don’t pay the meager minimum wage that they owe to these people. People who have worked in conditions very similar to those we heard about in grade school, during our studies of the Industrial Revolution. The report concluded that a complaint filed with the Texas State agency in charge of such matters, would not process the complaint [that is even look into it] for at least four to five years, due partly to administrative cut backs [which is probably just another way of saying, “We want more money for ourselves and more underlings to do the work, or we will not do anything at all]. When they interviewed the prosecuting attorney in El Pas he said it wasn’t his problem. It fell under the jurisdiction of the State Labor Commission and he wasn’t going to pursue it. Now this is a case of four thousand people trying to do the right thing. Four thousand people, [U.S. citizens] being robbed. Unfortunately, the Federal Government, the State Government, the Local government, the Courts and the Police are all looking for the big “Bust” and their own cut. I hate to keep beating this dead horse but there is one other facet of this mess that I would like to address. It is the “White Collar” occasional user that the police chief spoke of. These people used cocaine socially at the beginning of the decade. They may find another drug before the decade is out. But they get involved for totally different reasons than Street Kids. For most I would guess the lure to be nothing more than prestige. It’s driving the B.M.W. or the Mercedes. It’s paying a hundred and fifty dollars for a pair of designer tennis shoes. It’ whipping out their American Express card and leaving a big tip. It’s how the “Brass Ring Chasers” show each other how naughty they can be. If cocaine were being given away for free on street corners these people would go back to champagne.

I am reminded of a story about a woman and her son. The son loved to play at the video arcade: so much so, that when he ran out of money he began stealing money from his mother’s purse to support his lack of self restraint. The mother naturally took the problem to the press. “Ban the arcade machines” she cried, “My son steals from me, a poor woman, to support his habit”. This lady’s problem was, in my view, that she had raised a thief. If his passion changes to stealing cars and driving at speeds that will endanger him, will she demand an ordinance against cars? Will you give her your support? Main steam drug abuse is a “SYMPTOM” of a society that has given up. Hope, opportunity and education are the only effective weapons in this fight. Self destruction has many tools. Eliminating drugs won’t save lost souls. Some way to relieve the tension and heighten the spirit exists in almost all cultures. The drug war is just one more lie that we parade in front of our children and the rest of the world. It is hypocrisy to have drugs illegal when so many use them. And it is as much a plague on the fiber of Law Enforcement as it is on those addicted.

*George Bailey*

Getting back to the ways of government, I'd like to elaborate on the expression "Pork Barrel Politics" just in case your not familiar with the term. It is, arguably, the most wasteful aspect of Government and yet it is a game loved by all politicians. It is also considered to be totally ethical. A good example was an amendment attached to a congressional bill by a powerful Senator from West Virginia. Here's how it works. A bill [that is a proposed law] is coming through congress. Hopefully it is a good law, but it needn't be. This particular bill has almost but not quite enough support to pass in the Senate and become law. So here sits the Senator. He is an established "Senior" Senator with a lot of influence. "Influence?" you ask. Well, that means he is owed a lot of favors and sits on enough powerful [large budget] committees to trade a lot of favors. So the sponsors of this bill in question come the Senator. He tells them what he wants and how many votes he can swing their way in return. What he wants is an amendment [an addition] to the bill, which has nothing to do with the bill itself. As it turns out, the FBI finger print center is in need of alterations: new technology, more space, etc. They're going to build a whole new facility. Where to build it? West Virginia of course. Simply put, if the Senate will agree to move the new FBI Center to West Virginia, the senator will use his influence to get the bill passed into law. Now West Virginia has its piece of "Pork" from the nation's "Barrel". Never mind that it raises the total cost of the FBI project to \$185 million dollars. Never mind that Federal tax payers will have to pick up the tab for relocating thousands of FBI personnel to West Virginia: buy their homes at market value if they can't sell them themselves. We're not talking about renting them a U-Haul and Uncle Sam springing for it, but rather reimbursement for moving companies. When they interviewed the Senator he said simply that it had to be built somewhere. Well, why not Washington D.C.? That's where the old building was. Why spend the extra money? He didn't address the issue. This bill should have passed or fallen on its own merit. If it was a good bill for the people of this country, then how could he vote it down? If it were a bad bill, how could he support it? The people of West Virginia won't hold it against their Senator; they will simply scream bloody murder when the next Senator takes home his piece of "Pork". Congress is full of Robin Hoods. The problem is that they don't steal for you, they steal from you. We have two tools to shrink this seemingly unavoidable problem. The first is called the Presidential Line Item Veto. With it, President Bush could have vetoed the amendment and let the original bill pass into law. The Senator from West Virginia would have needed a majority in the Senate to over ride the President. What's more, if President Bush allowed the amendment to pass, he would have been accountable to the nation at large, not just West Virginia. This is crucial if we ever hope to limit Government waste. The second tool at our disposal is election reform and we will discuss that in greater detail later in the book. By 1998 We would have a law allowing for a "Line Item Veto", but it would be struck down by the Supreme Court on the basis

that congress could not give away its power. If you have ever dealt with a Federal Agency you know that We are regulated daily by regulations written by bureaucrats. These are the laws that govern our everyday lives and the Supreme Court has never had a problem with that. In this same way, mandatory sentences, set by Congress, for drug trafficking have stripped Judges of their oversight in the sentencing phase of a trial and infringed on the powers of the Judicial Branch. It is yet another example of the political nature of the Supreme Court and its Justices. They are sworn to defend the Constitution, given lifetime terms in order to keep them insulated from politics, and yet they still do not see.

Before we move on from the Pork Barrel, let us examine the “Power of the Purse” and how it effected the nursing home issue in California. In 1991 the new governor Wilson locked horns with the Feds on the issue of paperwork. In the ever increasing Socialist role of the Federal Government, we are taxed to pay for Social Security under the guise of a retirement program as opposed to a tax. The Government collects money from taxpayers and their employers, then squanders and outrageous percentage of that money on Federal Personnel who administer the money to the States. In return the Federal Government requires reciprocal paperwork to be fed [sent] back to the Federal Government. This particular paperwork presumably protects institutionalized people from being restrained, either physically or through the use of drugs, as I understood it. This is where Wilson got into it with the Federal paper shufflers. He claimed that in order to get the \$1 billion dollars that California receives, California must spend one quarter of that amount [\$250 million] to fill out the paper work. So there lies the paper trail. For every dollar collected, perhaps as little as 40 cents reaches the rest homes once all the bureaucrats, at all levels, have fed off of it. What’s worse is that paperwork can’t protect these people. The purpose of paperwork is to create new bureaucratic jobs for the Pork Barrel. For each group of paper shufflers there is a supervisor. For each group of supervisors there is a department head. For every group of department heads we have very well paid and very politically loyal administrators who wield their power and influence for whom ever put them there? Whose appropriations will get through? Whose will get held up? From who will purchases be made? To whom will campaign contributions be made? Who within the prevailing “Party” will get jobs for themselves or their friends and family, or their political “Cronies” within the agency?

Okay, that’s politics you say. That’s how the game is played. But can you afford to have these people playing with your money and still take care of your family? Only if you are on the receiving end. The people of West Virginia will profit for many decades to come from the Senator’s “Slight of Hand”, but in the end we all lose. During the time frame that Mr. Wilson referred to, I knew of a woman who was in a nursing home. She was sedated into “Never-Never Land” for days at a time. They woke her up to feed her and then put her back to sleep,

*George Bailey*

perhaps in her own excrement. It wasn't until her daughter became her "Watch Dog" that it ended. But there are no watch dogs for many elderly, separated by time and space from family. For what it costs California to fill out the Federal paperwork [\$250 million] we could put a thousand agents in the field to safeguard our elderly. We could give them a badge with the power of a local health inspector and have them traverse the country demanding instantaneous access to patients and their records. We could back them up with fines and more importantly, jail sentences for administrators and staff and we would see our institutionalized people protected. We could pay them each \$100,000.00 a year, give them \$50,000.00 a year for expenses and still fund the national program for 60% of what California alone now spends. Always remember that Government acts as a broker with your tax dollar. That is, it charges you a percentage to handle your money. Like the "House" in a Las Vegas poker game, if you put your hands out for a \$1.00 "Pot", there must be more than a dollar in the pot. If Government is the "House" you will have to have upwards of \$1.65 and all the folks at the table will pay. But it is the middle class who will pay the most.

So how did Government get so big, so powerful, so wasteful? Probably the easiest way to understand is to look at the U.S. Postal Service. It was originally implemented by Benjamin Franklin in the infancy of the country. It was Nation Government at its very best. It tied the States together in a way that only the Federal government could. It provided an advantage for commerce and served American citizens both personally and professionally, and most important, equally. One hundred and seventy five years later, when I was a boy growing up, no one doubted the integrity or the devotion of its employees. Nor did we have any misconceptions about the Government's willingness to pursue and convict anyone misusing the agency. No kid on my block even dared mess with a mailbox and my parents had the confidence to order by mail because the full weight of "Mail Fraud" laws stood behind each purchase. For all this the price of a post card was still one "red cent". Central to the success of the Postal Service was the old distrust for Government and the Postal Employee's work ethic, which compensated for that distrust. We were all familiar with the inscription above the door of one eastern Post Office which read something like "Neither Rain Nor Snow Nor Sleet Nor Dark of Night Shall Stay These Noble Carriers From Their Appointed Rounds". It wasn't the law. It was like a Hippocratic oath for Postal workers and they tried to live up to it. They took pride in their work. But the Postal Service, like the rest of Government in general, fell prey to the Pork Barrel. It was one of the first large scale attempts to subsidize and subvert the free market system at taxpayer expense. The method was called "The Bulk Rate". It gave special rates to those insidious, forest eating, land fill filling, mountains of trash that fill your mail box, called "Junk Mail". It skewed our economy by giving rise to thousands of small printing shops across the country that produced "Fliers" for local retailers. It propped them up economically

against existing news papers who used to do the same advertisement; as did local radio and TV. It gave a greater market to paper mills, which inflated the cost of such paper for other paper product users. If these waves of junk mail spurred the economy enough to justify their use without the bulk rate, then the free market system would have used them. Unfortunately they perform no function which hadn't been adequately performed before. So in the end the bulk rate undermined the junk mail's competition. At the same time, taxpayer dollars propped up the useless junk mail. It's impossible for me to say if this was done to enhance the US paper industry. But I am certain that it did enhance another US industry. In the end, the subsidy for junk mail manifest itself in the need for more and more Postal workers to be furnished with a vehicle in order to perform their deliveries. Much like the prison system, the political power which can be wielded with the procurement of tens of thousands of vehicles is incredible. Now nearly half a century later, the Post "Person" comes once a day instead of twice. They stop at each mailbox instead of only those who had personal or professional mail, so that they may deliver the Junk. When you consider that losing a check or a bill in the mail may very well cause unbelievable hardship in certain circumstances, it becomes obvious just how important it is when Mail Service is sub-standard. They receive the best health care. Their jobs are absolutely guaranteed. They retire early compared to the general population and yet with an average income within the Postal Service of \$42,000.00 in 1990, we hear that they are stressed out. Meanwhile, the Justice Department has been off playing at the Drug War, and Mail Fraud has become the rule rather than the exception. You may get a flier from the Postmaster telling you to watch out for fraud, but you're not likely to be protected by anyone other than yourself. Over the last decade and a half, with the success of the overnight delivery, the Postal Service is using its advantage to compete with private enterprise. Today the US Postal Service is no longer an agency of the Federal Government. It is protected as a monopoly. Its operations are, by in large, mandated by the Government. As I understand it, it is a corporation that Government set up in the hopes of selling to the private sector. But because its workers have the pay and privileges of Government workers by law, it has been unable to sell itself to the private sector. It shows a profit each year by raising the price of a stamp without regard to the realities that the private sector would have to consider without a monopoly. Therefore, without the Government privilege of monopoly, a private takeover would fail; just as a private takeover of any Government agency would fail without the ability to raise taxes and fees without limit by legal mandate. When you send a letter, a bill, or a birthday card through the mail you are subsidizing all of the Pork I have just described. The system that was set up by Benjamin Franklin to serve the "People" has been perverted into a system which feeds off of the People in order to serve those to whom Government owes favors and gives privilege.

*George Bailey*

This growth of Government can also be traced to the bond between government and the generation which parented the Baby Boomers: a bond which developed out of the “New Deal” and then the winning of the second World War. This generation began to see Government in a different light. A generation before, when those who could remember a time before the introduction of an “Income Tax”, prior to World War One, came to retirement age; they would have to be sold on the idea of Social Security. A generation before, it had been necessary for the Government to run long and aggressive ad campaigns in order to get the first Social Security recipients to sign up for benefits. They were truly a free, proud and independent people. But the tide was turning. People began to see Government as a source for the cure of the inequities of life. Society was turning away from its religious heritage of faith in God and embracing the promise of science and the scientific community. And what better organization to administer the “New Gospel” than the Federal Government? With the change in public perception, the dreaded “Revenuer” [tax collector] became the divine provider, and the members of Government began to see themselves as benefactors rather than public servants. As they doled out our money to us, they began to see us as the servants and always with our hands out. It is also safe to say that those who preserved this country by winning WWII, felt that Government owed them a debt.

The clouds, charcoal gray and heavy with the promise of renewal, drifted silently over the ridge. Through the timber’s canopy jutted the spiny remains of the oldest tree in the forest and from this pinnacle could be seen the track of the showers as they moved along the valley floor below. Wet, cool and soothing, the edge of the shower crept up the slope, laying heavy the greenery with the essence of life; filling the boughs of the ancient stand. With a “CRACK” the calm was shattered and the thunder rattled the land. But the forest was not afraid, for the oldest tree had snatched the lightning bolt from the sky: and in the ceremony of renewal had exploded with the energy of the heavens and laid down along the ridge. It had gone home to the earth. In its ceremonial cremation it had lit the sacred fires that turn dead pine needles into nourishment and bring fertility to the seeds that lay there within, as only fire can. And the fire crept out, low, seeking the dead and decayed as it walked down from the ridge. And the cool air from the valley blew up against it, holding its pace, until at the end of its march at the base of the slope, it came upon a steam running full with the gift from above.

Forgive me my attempt at prose, but the time has come to discuss another Federal Government agency that has forgotten who is working for whom. It is our Forest Service. When President Teddy Roosevelt put into place our first “National Park” he gave it the name “Yellow Stone”. Since that time there have been a proliferation of National Parks across the country. It was a sound policy, a good policy: to preserve forever some of our wilderness. At the time there was no

concept of the scarred national landscape across the privately owned holding we live with today. There was little or no understanding that the Parks would someday be nearly all that remained of our ecological systems. Unbeknownst to us, the balance, even within the parks themselves has been altered: perhaps irrevocably. As I see it, the problem began the way that all Government problems began. First by allowing the forest service to be in the business of gathering revenue from the forest. Secondly, by allowing the resources of Government [the forest products] to be used to subsidize politically favored groups. These two practices have sounded the death knell for “Old Grow” forest in the west. In addition, the “Fish Cops”, as some of the locals call them, and the other Forest Service personnel have come to view themselves, not as Public Servants, but as landlords. Land Lords whose income is derived by charging admission to their holdings and from the sale of their assets. If you are to look for our national parks of the future, you need only go to Scotland. There you may walk undisturbed by creatures of the woods, through millions of acres of sterile tree stands. The diversity of the wilderness is gone. Hundreds of species of trees are no more. The shrubs and flowers and creatures that were the Scottish record of evolution are vanished.

I began this section with a little insert I call “The Gift of Fire”. The Native Americans understood it and I am told they walked the ridges in the fall setting fires with the coming rains. The cattlemen that followed lit fires on their way down from the summer pastures. For fifty years the US Forest Service has pursued a course of action that has stored fuel on the forest floor. Immature forests are susceptible to the heat created by the fuel and the fire is carried to the “Canopy” using those same immature trees as a wick. Once in the canopy, it “Crowns”, creating the infernos so common place today. A single storm may develop as many as a thousand lightning bolts. Yet, in the Old Growth stands, the trees may be over 500 years old. Redwoods live over a thousand years. When a tree dies of old age it will create a hole in the canopy. That hole will be high enough above the forest floor that the light allowed to enter will be concentrated at the center of the hole. The replacement trees will cluster near that center. Finally, one will win out. But all the time that the new trees grow and compete, they will be kept away from the base of the old trees by the symbiotic action of the collective of trees, which is the forest itself. By controlling the light that shines on the forest floor, old trees protect themselves from the fire that juvenile trees are susceptible to. Tampering with the forest ecology exceeds our ability of control. The variations on deforestation practiced by the Forest Service for the purpose of replacing slow growth varieties with “pulp” producers is another dangerous game. In the end the only way to save our forests and their ecosystems is to remove management from the political arena. After all, the environmental movement must bear as much responsibility for the high fuel situation as the Forest Service must for the practice of clear cutting. As long as economics are

*George Bailey*

involved in decision making there will be conflict. As long as politics are involved, look for the same. In part two of this book I will outline a long term solution to the National Forest question, but it should be noted that in recent years the Park Service has embarked upon a path of land acquisition. If you look at any forest map you are likely to see small parcels of land patch-worked into the parks. They are old privately owned homesteads and the like. They are also coveted by the Forest [and/or Park] Service. In some cases the Government has put a covenant on the property that ownership of the land may not pass to anyone outside the family with the exception of the Government. In some cases they have been even more blatant. "You sell to the Government or the Government will seize the property." In Yosemite a long-term lease [99 years I think] was dissolved by the Park Service after fire destroyed the home which was on the property. In 1991, in Washington State, a kid's organization lost the structures on their property to fire and the Forest service tried [and I believe succeeded] in forcing the sale of the lake front property to the Forest Service. The people accused the Forest Service of arson. In the early 1980's, the head of the Department of the Interior under Reagan, boasted that he had raised more money through the sale of the oil rights on public lands than anyone gone before him. What he failed to tell the American people was that he achieved this tremendous dollar figure at rates as low as \$1.00 per acre for a lease that would last for ninety nine years: which is, in effect, for ever; given the world's known oil reserves.

Another area in which our government has failed us is in foreign relations. I have tried to refrain from conspiracy theories in the book. They are, by their very nature, impossible to prove. But regardless of the intentions of men, it must be observed that, to some extent at least, we Americans have been involved in a conspiracy of the heart. Since the "Battle Of The Bulge" in WWII, the Middle East has been a focal point of military apprehension. The politics of the region today are a reflection of British colonial influence as much as they are of religious heritage. American industry, and in particular the US Auto Manufacturers, have been unwilling to pursue alternate transportation modes or even fuels. And We Americans, who were raised on the American Dream which included a car or two in the garage, have been unwilling to adjust. Banking interests, business interests and personal interests, have left us far too dependent upon oil. It has caused past Leadership in Washington to "Prop Up" vile dictators like the Shah of Iran: a Tyrant who would turn his armies on his own people. We were, at the time, involved in a cold war with Russia. The Communist lure was the promise that all the wealth of a nation should be divided among its people if those people would seize it from those who ruled over them. Even though Communism was never true to its promises, it was a hard threat to fend off with a despotic leader as your alternative. In the end the Shah would fall to a fanatic group of religious fundamentalists rather than Communism. We would respond by building up arms in Iraq. Those arms would be turned on any decedents



among the Iraqi people. Eventually, they would be turned upon their neighbors; drawing us into the Gulf War. In the end those same arms would be turned back upon their own people.

These are the policies we used in the Middle East. We used similar ones in Central and South America. The results were often similar as well. The forces that have shaped our oil policy and with it our foreign policy in the Middle East are complex and dynamic. What's more, any speculation on my part as to what our Government has pulled, may not only be detrimental but it is unnecessary to our purpose. What is necessary is that we change the way in which we deal with Foreign Affairs. The way in which we perceive ourselves, is at odds with how we are perceived around the world. To understand why we can look to The Philippines. The people of the Philippines were our allies in WWII. They considered themselves our friends. They allowed us to build military bases on their sovereign soil. Back here in the States we would hear how much it was costing us to maintain such bases. When the people of the Philippines told us to get out, we would be reminded by our press of how much we had spent to build these bases. But our Government and our press would not tell us about Marcos [the dictator we held in place] and the way he robbed from his country, until it was too late. Through all those years that America enjoyed the access of the Philippines, we never invested in them. In truth, the money that it cost us to maintain the base probably went, by in large, to US contractors. The wages paid to the military that weren't saved or sent back home to the US, probably went mostly to bars, prostitutes and even drugs. During the same time frame the Japanese were putting Filipinos to work in manufacturing. Their pay scale was horribly low. But it brought jobs into the community where we had brought bars. It fostered opportunity into the community where we fostered prostitution and drugs. At the end of WWII the Japanese were the hated enemy of the Filipino People and we were their dear friends. Today the Japanese are their employer and benefactor and we have been ejected. In the end, it was the US military's intention to bring nuclear devices into the Philippines that caused them to eject us. I would hear that, not from the American press, but from a Filipino American, who claimed that, aside from that issue, Filipinos had no quarrel with us. So why would We allow our military to push?

For the money and blood that we spent in South East Asia We could have maintained a "Peace Corp" unlike the world has ever imagined. We could have [and still can] given our young men and women for God and Country and got them back better for the experience. We could have built a home for every Vietnamese citizen for what We spent to annihilate a generation. But we didn't. Our Foreign Policy has been and continues to be, characterized by a lack of Moral Courage and Decency. We may be the most powerful nation on earth but

*George Bailey*

We could have gotten here much more easily with a carrot than with a stick, and We would then be as Great as We are powerful.

Of all of our failed Foreign Policies, perhaps none is more hypocritical than our relationship with Mexico. It glares in the face of anyone with a shred of moral conscience. The illegal immigrants from Mexico and the other countries of the “Americas” are a paradox not wasted on anyone with eyes to see. The farmers complain that Americans won’t bring in the crops for what they can afford to pay. Is that true? No. In truth, Americans, for the most part, are not willing to bring in the crops for what farmers are “WILLING” to pay. This is a capitalistic issue and as Americans schooled in Capitalism, you should know the answer. If the cost of labor pushes the cost of the product too high then demand falls. Therefore, if the price of those goods being sold rises beyond what people are willing to pay, then there is no demand. In Capitalism, if the price of a head of lettuce rises to \$10.00, those who want lettuce bad enough or who have so much money that \$10.00 means nothing to them, will buy the lettuce. If, on the other hand, demand for lettuce is not great enough to justify its “TRUE” cost in the market place, then lettuce can not justify its place in the “FREE MARKET SYSTEM” of “CAPITALISM”. Therefore, any attempt by Government to intervene in the decisions of the market place “MUST” be construed as a “SUBSIDY”. Therefore, the Illegal Alien problem is little more than a Farm Subsidy.

It wasn’t all that long ago that there was a program which allowed Mexicans to cross the border with work permits. American critics charged that the Mexican Government wasn’t even handed in handing out the permits. Would those critics call our open boarder policy even handed? Let’s step back here for a moment and look at what’s really going on. Who benefits from the Illegal Alien “Program” as it exists today? First and foremost of course the farmers and the sweat shop owners, and the owners of the poultry industry and the meat packing industry in the mid-west. And lets make a distinction here: we’re not talking about farmer Jones on 40 acres. We’re talking about the reincarnation of the southern plantation owner before the Civil War. We’re talking about meat packers who employ 500 people. The difference is that the plantation owner had an interest and a responsibility in his slaves because he owned them. Illegals can die at the border all day long and it costs these peoples nothing. In stead the costs are reflected in our School systems, the health system, the Welfare system. They are reflected in poverty and despair: in gang wars and street violence. The costs extend to the bloated budget of a corrupted border patrol. The costs include bus lines that return Illegal back across the border. The costs are in the moral fiber of a nation who has turned its back on injustice. These people, who would gamble everything, even to their lives and the lives of their families, for the chance to better their prospects for the future, are a kindred spirit to the American pioneers.

They are the maids, day workers and the child care providers for that segment of our middle class who has learned to rationalize its own hypocrisy. They are the ones who sleep in the canyons and defecate behind your housing developments because they have no other place. They are the ones who will be dragged off by the INS just before payday. They are the one's who will be prayed upon at the border by the "Coyotes" who have taken their money to smuggle them in. They are the ones found gutted by those who suspect that they carry balloons filled with drugs in their stomach and the ones found abandoned and dead from suffocation in the trunks of cars. They are the fertile soil which bears the "Grapes Of Wrath".

Perhaps the group who is cruelest of all to the Illegal is those who claim to speak for them. Down in San Diego County, in the city of Chula Vista, they know the problems well. On any given night, Illegals pass like an army through the back yards and under the bedroom windows of tax paying US citizens, who fear that somewhere in the volume lies a thief or a murderer. They fill the canyons around San Diego with groups so large that the Sheriff's department dare not enter at night. In response, back in the early 1990's, some people gathered together to form a group they called "Light Up The Border." They were not a violent reactionary group. I myself listened to several interviews with one of their spokesman. They didn't harass anybody. They would simply go park on a hill which overlooked a known crossing point and at dusk they turned on their car's head lights in the direction of the border. Once a month they met. As their numbers grew, so did the publicity. Their stated agenda was simply that some National "Light" be shed on the issue: open up some discussion on an increasing problem. That was when the self proclaimed spokes-people for the Illegals showed up. They marched up and down the road in front of the headlights carrying a Mexican flag on American soil. A nationally syndicated news program sent a crew down to see what was going on. They portrayed "light Up the Border" as persecutors of the down trodden and the dialogue ended before it began. You might ask why those who claimed to speak for Illegal would be so inflamed at the prospect of an open discussion. In such a desperate situation, why not some dialogue? Unfortunately, the leaders of this group, like the leaders of all politically fractionated groups in America, draw their power from the unresolved problems of society. If those problems are resolved they will lose that power. If there is a solution found there will be no political favors for those who give lip service to the groups they sell out and hold in check. Like the so called "Noblemen" who sold out William Wallace, they serve "Long Shanks" and his agenda. Anyone who would argue that these Illegal are not good people is at odds with the facts. For all the abuse they suffer, the oppression that they endure, they still don't rob or kill Americans to any significant extent. They gamble their own lives for a chance. They work for low wages that they know they may be

*George Bailey*

cheated out of. But it's the only chance they have, so they take it. We Americans suffer as well and for what?

Suppose, for example, that a motivated Illegal farm worker can harvest 300 heads of lettuce in an hour. If he is paid only \$2.00 an hour in cash, the cost added to a head of lettuce is 1 cent. Now if an American worker, getting \$10.00 per hour plus the \$5.00 an hour it costs legitimate employers to hire people [we'll discuss that later]: and that same lazy American only picked 150 heads of lettuce [that's one head every 24 seconds]; it will increase the cost to 10 cents a head. So if you pay 75 cents for a head of lettuce where you live, your liable to see as much as a 50% increase in the cost of that lettuce as it passes through the system to you, doubling at each step. It is doubtful that your family spends much more than \$40.00 per month on such labor intensive farm produce. So let's balance that 50% increase [\$20.00] to what we are losing to what the status quo is costing us as society. We lose millions in uncollected Social Security taxes that "Illegals" do not pay. We lose millions in county health care spent on "Illegals". We spend millions on "Illegals" who had their babies within our borders and are as such entitled to benefits as the legal guardians of native born, US citizens. We spend millions on educational systems that must be bilingual in order to accommodate both "Illegals" and those given amnesty under Reagan. We spend billions on a "Make Believe" system of immigration; not to mention the strain all this puts on law enforcement. When I first wrote this, the federal Government, in a game of Pork Barrel Politics, was preparing to build a concrete trench across our southern border in San Diego County, Ca. It was ironic that so soon after the fall of the "Berlin Wall" that We in America were preparing to build the "San Diego Trench". It would not stop the flow of Illegals. Today they are still outside the law and unable to go to the police for protection. They are still run down like dogs on the freeway trying to get north. So much blood, and all of it on our hands.

So now we have come to that agency of Government which has become the most perverted of all. It is the enforcer of the American tax "Code", and it is truly written in code. Our Founding Fathers joined the thirteen colonies together for the purpose of National Defense and Commerce. Their purpose was not to redistribute the wealth of the States or their citizens. Nor was it to manipulate the economy in some Socialistic fashion. The sheer volume of what has become the US Tax Code is unconscionable. No member of Congress has the time, let alone the will, even to read it. It is the spring from which the Pork Barrel flows and all Americans know it to be cruel and unfair. What you may not know is just how cancerous it has become. It is widely held that the US has a significantly lower tax rate than the rest of the world. At the surface that may be true. But the fact is that, what they take out of your check is closer to half of the total taxes you pay. Consider first of all that we have virtually no social programs for those of us who

work for a living. So if We are to compare ourselves with, say, Canada; who has nationalized health care, you must now factor into your tax bill, both your Social Security and health insurance benefits [if you have any]. Now bear in mind that the amount you see deducted from your check for Social Security and Medicare is only half the amount the Government collected in your name. It's a little slight of hand they do. They have your employer match the amount you are "Forced" to contribute. But remember, in Capitalism, that amount which an employee costs an employer is the true cost of that employee. So what is allocated to you as an expense is your true wage, regardless of creative book keeping by the Government. These same economic truths apply to health insurance, employment insurance, Workman's Compensation insurance, and whatever other creative devices your State and local Governments employ to separate you from your earnings. Even without including Health Insurance, it costs an employer between \$13.00 and \$15.00 an hour [depending on the State you work in and the type of work you do] to pay you \$10.00 an hour on your pay stub. What that means is that before they begin to make all the deductions you see on your check, you have already paid 20% to 30% taxes on what you really made in terms of what you cost your employer per hour. Just to add insult to injury, the 15.5% that you and your employer pay jointly to Social Security [and Medicare], isn't charged on income over \$53,000.00. That was the amount in 1990. So that those who earn salaries equivalent to that of Congressmen [who gave themselves a raise to well over \$100,000.00 that year] only paid on half of their earnings. This ceiling would continue to increase through the 1990's, but it would always remain at about one half of what congressmen paid themselves, thus keeping the rate at about one half of that of the ordinary tax payer for the peers of congress. No Social Security is paid on earnings from interest or from earnings on stocks or leases. It is a benefit given to the rich, that they not have to help with the retirement of those who made them rich. It is a privilege they share with Congress, for Congress, like other government workers, does not contribute to the fund at all. Divide and conquer: it is an old axiom and one not lost on the taxman. Non-smokers love to see Smokers taxed without mercy. Non-drinkers love to see drinkers taxed far beyond excess. This is especially true if the money is to be used for something that is used by all. Something for nothing: it's the original scam. For a long time We all paid a "Federal Excise Tax" on new tires. We were told that it was to raise money to maintain our highways. With all the taxes We paid it seemed that there should already be enough to do the job. The tax was bothersome and unpopular. Government's answer was to drop the tax on the public at large. However, it was retained on a small faction: the Trucking Industry. It was a Governmental "Coup". They could repeal a tax from the public at large, while at the same time, collecting more taxes from the public at large. Confused? You shouldn't be. In a Capitalistic system, the rate charged will rise or fall within an industry to allow for expenses and profit. Since all things are

*George Bailey*

equal [theoretically] in the market place, you can increase any cost [including taxes] evenly among competitors without damage to the industry. In short, when the cost of diesel fuel went from 50 cents a gallon, to over \$1.00 a gallon, back in the 1970's; it didn't put an end to the trucking industry. It merely raised the production costs on nearly every thing in the country; because nearly all things are shipped by truck at some point. This meant that by focusing on the trucking industry, Government could tax goods traveling to market indirectly. If you buy a loaf of bread in the store, you as a consumer, bear the cost of tire taxes, fuel taxes, highway taxes, licensing taxes, and State Port of Entry "Border" taxes [which, by the way, are unconstitutional], as your bread moves from grain field, to storage facility, to mill, to baker and finally to grocer. It is then sold to you without sales tax added in most States because taxes on food are considered immoral. When you get your phone bill next month, take a look and you will find that you've been taxed. Check your utility bill and you will find that you have been taxed for your lights and for your heat as well: even your water in some cases. We are taxed from every quarter, on and below the surface. When We demanded cuts in deficit spending George Bush's 1991 tax package included a large one. It was the money used for Postal Service retirement. He simply made the Service responsible for its own retirement and in turn the Postal Service began escalating the price of Postage stamps to offset the new expense. We are no longer a nation of villagers who can hand deliver our bills where needed. In that sense, the postage stamp is merely another tax we pay to sponsor a Government subsidized monopoly. Each time Government invents a new method of tax, it must hire new bureaucrats to collect the tax. In some cases, such as taxes on diesel fuel, the government makes the refiners of the fuel add either red or green dye to the fuel; this in order to distinguish between tax exempt [off road] fuel and taxed fuel. So in the end, a needless and significant cost to users is incurred simply to help government gather this almost subliminal tax on fuel. Currently, We as a nation try to "Watch Dog" our taxes by fighting to protect our own interests. But Government, in one form or another, is in session twelve months a year devising new strategies to separate you from your money because more money is the easiest way for them to solve the complex problems we face. Unfortunately, We, as a nation, are bankrupt. No politician is going to admit that. But, when you consider the interest rate We pay on the National Debt, the Taxes We pay and the fact that each person in the country owes over \$12,000.00 individually on the debt [families owe: Husband + Wife + dependents x \$12,000.00] in addition to their own personal debt: no bankruptcy court in the country would deny you your right to accept defeat and start over, if they could. The much praised "Prop 13" in California said, in affect, that "Regardless of increased costs to government, regardless of what the "system" has provided for Me and Mine in the past, regardless of the benefits I as a Home Owner will receive due to the inflated value of My home: that I intend to ban together with

my fellow property owners to decrease my tax burden. It meant that those who owned property had used their political clout to escape taxation. The problem was that they did not address Government spending. To the contrary, they insisted that those services that they were provided by government remain in tack. The result was, of course, that in order for politicians to keep their jobs, they had to devise new taxes. Unfortunately, the shift in the tax burden would fall to those who could not afford a home. At the same time, the cost of collecting the new taxes would be passed on to all Californians, ultimately raising taxes across the board. Of course, because property value in California has always been so dynamic, the net affect for many homeowners was to see a gain in equity in their property and increased Government services at the expense of the lower middle class. Today, this mind-set of self-enhancement through political manipulation is associated with Californians who have left the State to develop new pyramid schemes throughout the West. These are the same people who President Clinton spoke to in the 1996 campaign when he said he intended to allow individuals to sell a home worth up to \$250,000.00 [\$500,000.00 for married couples] without being liable for income tax on the increased value of the home [As opposed to the ones who were on the verge of credit card bankruptcy], I am speaking now of the older, more solvent, home owners who were able to stay ahead of the curve by dodging high interest rates and being in on the ground floor of speculation in the market place. They already owned their homes back when "Prop 13" became law. Now they will avoid "Capital Gains Taxes" as well. But this isn't just Californians. Many hot spots around the country found people cashing in. That includes many Eastern politicians. As wide spread and perverse as the burden of taxation is on this country, it is not the rules of tax gathering that make up the volume of tax law. The bulk of tax statutes are concerned with other clever ways in which congress allows special interest to escape taxation. It amounts to nothing short of repayment of bribery. I'm not going to elaborate too much here. You would have to have been raised in cave not to have heard some of the outrageous tax breaks and deductions written into the law in recent years. It is not that Congress doesn't think you hear about such laws. They just don't care.

Even Social Security can be used as a subsidy. Out in California, were the cost of housing is too high for those who work at the minimum wage to ever afford a home of their own; there is a group of individuals who work as security guards for the construction industry. Many of these particular individuals are US citizens, who immigrated here from the Pacific Rim. These are mostly male security guards who live in small mobile trailers on various construction sights to protect the property of contractors and builders as the buildings go up. Some of the men were within ten or fifteen years of retirement age. They send their money home to loved ones in the Pacific with no hope of ever being able to afford a home in the US, to which they might immigrate their family. They live solitary lives, in a frugal existence, which keeps the cost of Security Protection

*George Bailey*

low. But until the time of their retirement, nearly all their money is sent back home and out of our economy. When they retire, many of them will go back to their Mother Land, where they will collect Social Security benefits for the rest of their lives; [and perhaps long after their death]. So in the end, the nation as a whole, subsidizes the California construction industry with Social Security benefits, which are the carrot held out to people who are held down by an unfair labor system. This scenario is replayed over and over in a thousand slightly varied ways across the country.

Please understand that We have no right to feel animosity toward those who play the game that our government has set up. They are allowed to enter the country, but never allowed to participate in a meaningful way. They are held in limbo with the promise of a future at retirement. It is a future which will be paid for by those who still make up our work force when those who profited from the inequity have retired along with the fleeing immigrants. It will not do for us to say that they may not leave and collect their due. We would never insist that our parents or our selves be bound to these shores at retirement. That flies in the face of freedom. It is a Berlin Wall for retirees. It is simply the price paid by a country that has lost its compassion for its own.

As a side note, in talking to one of these guards, I would learn that when thieves are caught on these construction sights, it had been his experience that they are most likely the same Hispanics who worked on those same jobs during the day. So then it can be argued that the rationalizations which these thieves use, spring from the inequities which they find from working along side well paid construction workers, while they themselves receive minimum wage. In an attempt to survive in a corrupt and consumer-oriented economy, they use those rationalizations to allow them to steal from the places they are most familiar with and justified against. The true cost of their wages will be born by the Immigration Service [the I.N.S.] and in the guards wages and the Social Security benefits of those guards: all of which will ultimately be picked up by the taxpayer, now and in the future.

The last function of our tax system is to steer the economy in the desired direction. It presumes that the so-called "Experts" can understand and predict the forces of the market place. It is a practice totally out of place in a capitalistic economy. Put aside the fact that corruption and self-serving interests subvert any such plans. The American economy is like the Old Growth Forest. Because society's diverse needs, a diversity of goods and services has evolved naturally. It is what makes Capitalism superior to the "Tree Farm" approach of Communism. Only those items of enough economic importance to support interest on a National level will find resources in Communism. Similarly, when the economy is manipulated by tax incentives, the shrubs and smaller trees of the economic forest are trampled under in an attempt to exploit the bigger trees. When the



Government manipulates grain prices, We end up subsidizing farmers to keep the inefficient ones in business. When Homeowners get a tax break for interest on home mortgages, it gives a tax break to those who can afford a home, at the expense of those who can not. When two income families get a tax break for childcare, taxes must be raised on families who struggle to keep a parent at home with the kids. When oil companies get tax breaks to drill new wells it props them up unfairly against wind generated power. All these are obvious. But many tax breaks affect us in subliminal ways, with much more corrupting results.

Subsidies are the other edge of the “Economic Manipulation” sword. Grants and awards are given outright and as such are subject to much more public scrutiny. They have a place in a society which strives to achieve as much as We do. Monies for research and development in medicine and technology are needed I believe. But Government should be accountable, don’t you think? For years the Government has subsidized the Tobacco Industry at one end while taxing it heavily at the other. There are however, many ways in which the Government subsidizes “Pet” interests that you may not have considered. Before any county government will issue a building permit to anyone anywhere, they will have to show a plan to accommodate their sewage. Either a sewer or a septic tank: something to protect your fellow citizens from the contamination of the waste you produce must be part of your plan. Reasonable? The Nuclear Industry has been allowed to create ton after ton of nuclear waste without ever addressing the problem of waste disposal. Forget Three Mile Island. Forget Chernobyl. Forget all the fears of you have of terrorism, human error and natural disaster. Never mind that periodically, millions of gallons of radio active water will inevitably be released in emergencies, or plumes of radioactive gas may be released over head from time to time without your knowledge. Forget the lessons of Hanford: that even when you can prove you’ve been killed by contamination, it won’t be acknowledged until after your dead; so that you can bear the financial burden of dying, alone. Forget all that and consider only that, every ounce of radioactive material We wrap up, in whatever material, and bury in the ground, will one day have to be dealt with again by future generations. Their resources will have to squandered on this perpetual clean up of deteriorating containers. It will not come out of the profits of utility companies that have long since been spent. Nor will there be money for the health problems created. In other words, We are subsidizing the Nuclear Industry with the health and financial well being of “ALL” future generations to come. Bush doesn’t care, he’ll be dead. Clinton doesn’t care, he’ll be provided for. But what amount should you and I add to the cost of a kilowatt of power produced with nuclear power to offset the cost when it is balanced against the high cost of alternatives.

As I mentioned earlier in this book, it has been demonstrated that carnivorous bugs control weevil infestations in stored grain in a way superior to pesticides.

*George Bailey*

Superior because there is no pesticide residue left behind and superior because weevils are not only eradicated, but they are not likely to develop an immunity to being devoured. There also exists a breed of Chinese ducks that will waddle through a field, limiting their intake to the sprouts of weeds. They eat only the weeds and leave droppings as they go. I first watched a special on these wonderful birds well over two decades ago. Yet neither one of these proven pesticide and herbicide/fertilizer ideas has caught on. Why? Because today's farmers are not gamblers. It's true that they risk a great deal each spring when they plant and they take chances on the whether in the fall: harvest early, harvest late. But on a level playing field, Farmer against Farmer, you will find few who are willing to innovate. They work by the book: The seed grower's book, the pesticide book, the herbicide book, the government program book. Those ecologically sensitive farmers in Texas who used the weevil eating bugs, found their grain seized by a Government "Quarantine" of sorts. It was months before they were allowed to sell their grain. It got the message across in short order that the Government intended pesticides to be the only game in town. Go to any farming community in the country. Their water is tainted with the chemical run off from the fields. Go to their rest homes. Their old are riddles with cancers. But unless Government shows them a "Level Playing Field" on which to make a transition to a more natural system of farming, they will be unwilling to gamble "The Farm" in the direction of change. Once again We are subsidizing chemical producers with our health and our medical dollars. Industrial polluters benefit as well. How can We compare the cost of grain by the bushel, when with that bushel We must factor in the lives of our families. Which paper is less expensive? The one that costs \$20.00 a ream or the one that forces you to purchase bottled water because the tap water is tainted? Will We let companies dump mercury in your river to save 100 jobs or 10,000 jobs, if it then passes down stream to be ingested by the next town and the next. How do We back charge industry up stream for the cost of our water purification and the other ramifications of their act? Or do We simply continue to pay the cost ourselves? How many lost fishing jobs shall We surrender to jobs in the logging, cattle and farming industries? Now that We can no longer eat shell fish; against who's balance sheet shall We enter it? When you reach under your sink and pull out a aerosol cans and chemical cleansers, is the cost to you being reflected in the amount you paid in the store? When you buy something wrapped in plastic, is the cost of the disposal of that plastic being reflected in the cost of your purchase? If paper is renewable and burnable as fuel, how can poly-styrene compete except that it is subsidized by the costs listed as disposal fees. As landfills grow larger and further from cities, plastics manufacturers endeavor to recycle only 20% to 30% of their product: not because We don't return it, but because it must be mixed with 70% or 80% virgin material to make it recyclable. This simply slows down the problem until We can die and dump it, literally, on the next generation.

With enough glass being discarded each day to fill a skyscraper, it makes more sense to return to the reusable bottle system or to develop a whole new system. But here again, landfills are subsidizing the cost of throw-aways. Aluminum cans are probably our greatest success story. Yet with an inadequate redemption value, far too many are thrown away. The problems are complex. They are complicated further by a leadership that will not make the hard choices.

At the same time, when Government took the lead out of paint: We didn't like it when the cost of paint went up. We wouldn't stand for inferior quality. Any politician who would have dared to stand and demand that we face facts would have been swept away. I believe it has to do with the promises science made to the America of my youth. We were told that we had harnessed the atom. With the discovery of penicillin and a polio vaccine, we seemed to be on the verge of wiping out disease. Chemistry and technology would feed the world and fly us to the stars. They were all half truths. We may indeed have a harness on the atom but we don't control the direction it pulls us. With every advance made in medicine, it becomes more difficult to afford care and nature continues to provide us with new diseases here to fore unknown. As we just discussed, the costs of the new farming technologies included contamination of our ground water and the death of our ecosystems. In a capitalistic economy the government has to resist the impulse to medal. On the other hand it has to act to see that the esthetics of life are factored into the equation when determining the "Bottom Line". What we have today is, government operating in reverse: subsidizing special interest and subverting the quality of our lives and our environment. Never was this more evident than during the Reagan years.

There is an old saying that a fool and his money are soon parted. I believe it is true. It is also true of working folks in America. Just making ends meet takes all our money. We have had little discretionary money to spend since the early 70's. Economists have sat and theorized on why savings percentages have dropped, but we all know why. Everyone trying to get into a home in the 70's and 80's was aware that saving for your future was a losing battle. If you waited to buy a home, the price rose faster than your savings. The phrase "better buy now, it's the only way to keep up with inflation" was the mind-set of the era. So any money that went into our lower and middle classes was instantly infused back into the economy. In the face of this, Reagan promised that if we lavished wealth upon the upper class that they would allow it to "trickle down to us". Because the rich were withholding their new wealth from economic investment and opting to invest in land speculation or simply lending it out at inflated interest rates, rather than long term investment; or by throwing it away on "lifestyles of the rich and Famous", we were losing jobs and income. Since we were no longer taxing the rich, government had to borrow more. To put it in to human terms; Reagan had run up a huge bill on our "US express" credit card. He

*George Bailey*

didn't use the money to build modern factories or infrastructures that were energy efficient or less polluting or could better compete in the market place. He (We) used the money to fill the pockets of people who never intended to reinvest, and what money did circulate within the economy was used to buy ourselves a bunch of new toys which came with that familiar sticker, "made in Japan" or Germany or somewhere in the Pacific Rim. Unable to pay this bill on the credit card, Reagan began to take "cash advances" to pay the monthly bills. As the balance grew and foreign lenders saw there was nothing being paid on the principle, Reagan appeased them with raw materials and the Federal Reserve appeased them with higher interest rates. We watched as old growth forests within our national parks were cut away and shipped as logs to sea going Japanese lumber mills and sold back to us as finished product or stockpiled at the bottom of Japanese bays. We escorted oil tankers through the dangerous Persian Gulf waters at no charge, even when their destination was a trade competitor. At the beginning of his term, Ronald Reagan had a national debt of one trillion dollars. By 1990 it had tripled. Once again; in human terms, Reagan borrowed "8" thousand dollars for every man, woman, and child in America. When the U.S Treasury offered bonds for sale on the market in 1991 it paid between 7 and 7.9 percent per year in interest. At that 7% rate we are faced with an \$840.00 a year interest payment per person. During the eight years that Reagan was in office we paid him around a million dollars total, in salary. After the end of his term he traveled to Japan. They paid him two million dollars for a single speaking engagement. He wouldn't discuss it much when he was interviewed: and his wife was indignant about the question. I guess in the end you get what you pay for.

Like most people, I consider myself an ecologist, an environmentalist. In fact I doubt there are very many of us who would consider themselves anti-environmentalist. Even the timber men of the northwest, who hate environmentalists, aren't anti-environment: their more anti-telling us how to do things. But the truth is I am a consumer. I was raised and taught to be a consumer. There is, built into my psyche, a connection between my car and my freedom; between my happiness and my industrial possessions. In California where high income and public sentiment have led to strict environmental legislation and enforcement, it is now unlawful for a car wash to allow people to wash their car engines unless elaborate and expensive filtration devices are in place, [in some jurisdictions any way]. Note: it is the responsibility of the car wash owner to monitor the problem. There is no law or penalty for consumers who wash oil off their engines. At the same time, if you go into an old asphalt parking lot in your neighborhood, in each parking space, just below where the engines sits, you can see black deposits from the leaking motors and transmissions. With each rain the run off from the parking lots and the deteriorating black top highways themselves, finds its way into our water and our soil. With the same misguided leadership that allowed LA's rail transit lines to be

dismantled, we have built a nation of suburbs that demand we have individual transportation. It is what we wanted. It is what we have. So be it. But do we improve our lot when we designate each old filling station sight, each junk yard sight, and each mechanic's shop a hazardous waste sight: and "truck" the contaminated soil off to another "Hazardous Waste Sight"? And how can we hold the guy who owns the car wash accountable for what people wash off their cars. Should we hold the government of California responsible for oil leaked on to the state's highways. It serves no purpose to pave our country from one end to the other with asphalt and then classify that asphalt as toxic waste when we pull it up: not unless you own stock in a chemical waste dump [A dump which gets thousands of dollars per truck load for disposing of all those things it can get classified as "Hazardous Waste"]. There are food grade (non toxic) lubricants. But, for what ever reason, the used oil in an internal combustion engine, becomes toxic, and there is nothing to be done about it. At the same time, there is now a non-toxic anti-freeze on the market, but the toxic ones are still allowed to be sold. The earth, as we are learning more and more, is itself alive. In some places the great tectonic plates overlap; pushing the old crust back from whence it sprang, eons ago. In the center of the ocean, lava boils up to the bottom of the sea to fill the void that is created on the other side of the globe. It is the cycle of renewal but it is far to slow to accommodate the infestation of industrialized man. The water my father drank as a child from the ground waters of Iowa was once clear. Now you can't even get your car clean with it. The filters of the earth in the Midwest are choked with the residues of industrialized farming; the waters tainted by the concentration of feed-lot run off. Once again the problem must be addressed at its source. Capitalism will find an alternative but not as long as synthetic fertilizer and pesticides control the market and meat producers are allowed to over concentrate feeding operations without proper ecological measures. Nor will these problems be addressed so long as they are a "Smoke Screen" for those who profit from the disposal of all those things they are able to get Government to classify as "Hazardous". Human waste is a problem in every city in the world because it is dealt with in a linear fashion rather than a circular one. That is to say that the nutrients gathered in the form of food are used by us, turned to waste, chemically treated and regarded as waste. Since they move along the line to a dead end they must be replaced artificially at the beginning of the line. This process inherently leads to a accumulation of waste at one end and depletion at the other. The chain is dealt with by adding chemicals at both ends of the line. Circular ecosystems have been put in place in this country. A documentary on PBS has shown how marshes and wetlands can be built to decompose human waste naturally while eliminating the need for chemicals at the end of the chain. Many small localities already use such systems. Done on a giant scale it could be possible to build and then drain such areas in a revolving

*George Bailey*

fashion so as to allow for farm soil renewal contributing to the elimination of the need for chemicals at the beginning of the chain.

Another politically and greed motivated waste material is our garbage. It too is a linear system. We spend untold amounts of health care dollars to deal with what is termed "Hazardous" blood products and by-products. According to the network news magazine "Expose" it is an operation run, [at least in one instance], by the mob and the waste is illegally placed, of course, straight into the local landfill anyway. But what does it matter in the end. At some point in every month, every woman in America contributes blood waste to her local landfill: unless she has passed menopause. It's a scam.

It makes no sense to expend fuel for trucking or barges or rail to export from a metropolitan area, what should be fuel for that area. It makes no sense to import electricity to a metropolitan area when that energy could be, at least in part, generated by burning that refuse. If we have the technical expertise to build nuclear power plants then we can find a way to incinerate our trash in a safe and productive manner. If we need legislation to control the packaging we allow in order to make it work, then so be it. If we need to spend large amounts to "scrub" the air before discharging it then so be it: better that than a nuclear discharge. If we need to douse it with fuel to make it burn, then so be it: better that than to burn fuel to deliver trash to the dead end of a chain. Recycle all the metal by bringing it to a central location and smelting it out of the trash with the same heat that fires your city's generators. Save the time and energy wasted separating and transporting aluminum cans. Incinerate those things which are finding their way to our environment and if the residue of the fire can not be dealt with, fuse it within the glass from the furnace and carry that off to your hazardous outpost. Separate those things from the garbage that can't be incinerated and send the bill to the manufacturers of those products. We can do these things if we can find the spirit that once took us to the moon. And when we have done it, we can export our knowledge to our benefit without nuclear proliferation: without fear and without shame. An American Indian I once heard speak, said, that the earth will live on regardless of what we do, the question is, he said, will we?

In trying to define those things which has brought us as a nation to the cross roads of today, there is perhaps no single thing that molded my generation more than Vietnam. To those of you to young to remember, I strongly urge you to seek out a PBS documentary on the Berkeley Campus in the 60's. It is an insightful look at the times and frustrations which ultimately fractionated the country. It aired in 1991 and I believe it was titled "Berkeley Freedom of Speech; the Vietnam War".

Of all the subjects I have bandied about, there is one that evokes more passion on both sides than all the rest; it is war. Through out the ages, it seems that each generation must face its own. The war of my youth was never even

officially declared. It was classified a police action. It was of course Vietnam. There were a whole spectrum of sides to be on: perhaps as many as there were Americans. For, while war is the essence of the mob, it is also very personal. For the purposes of this “look back” I have divided us in to ten groups. They are often over lapping, and still after a third of a century, often at conflict.

They are:

- #1. The Volunteers
- #2. The Flag Wavers
- #3. The Draftees
- #4. The Volunteers In Lieu Of The Draft
- #5. The College Exempt
- #6. The Draft Dodgers
- #7. The Protestors
- #8. The lottery Winners
- #9. Those on the fence
- #10. The Spitters

To my mind, six of these groups were actually paired mirror images of each other; although the image we see in retrospective looks do not portray it that way. The first group I mentioned was the first group to witness a war that John Wayne had never mentioned in his tribute movie to “The green Beret” and the first to die. They were the volunteers. Among them were the career soldiers and aviators; some of whom would be taken captive and tortured by a vile enemy from another culture. Some would be the young guys out of high school looking to become men. You would think that having gone to school with veterans and working with them over the last 20 [now thirty] years since the war ended, I would have heard lots of stories about Vietnam. But it wasn’t a war that Veterans shared. It wasn’t until the late 80’s that I had a conversation with a truck driver bellied up to a bar beside me, that I got a glimpse that was real and beyond what Hollywood had to share. He told me a story of a group of young men of which he was one. They were motoring up a river in a gunboat. He was there in the capacity of an armed observer in the very early 60’s. They began taking heavy rifle fire from a rice field they were approaching, and as they returned fire they saw a woman and a young boy running along the Delta in the line of fire. They couldn’t shoot back without hitting them. So they held their fire despite the incoming. A young lieutenant in the boat with them, stood up, frantically motioning for the woman and the boy to drop down. It must have seemed like an eternity suspended there

*George Bailey*

in time, but they held their fire, in spite the danger. These were truly All Americans; defenders of freedom and good. But then, suddenly and without warning, the boy revealed a rifle from somewhere unseen and let go a burst that blew the chest out of that brave and caring young lieutenant. The gunboat returned fire; and as the bullets raked across the body of the boy and on to the woman, she exploded. She had explosives concealed under her jacket and she had literally been blown to bits when she was hit. That's the kind of a war Vietnam was. It was not just the legions of uniformed men from the north that General Westmoreland led us to believe. It was, as often as not, the rice farmers in the field by day, that our soldiers fought by night. It was the "people" we were fighting. From the perspective of the Vietnamese in sympathy with the north, it would have been as if the Russians had invaded Illinois. This truth, as well, was kept from us; and, as well, was brought to light on a PBS documentary on "Ho Chi Mien". It seems the French and the Japanese had both held Vietnam as a colonial possession. They had each exported the whole of the rice products from Vietnam for profit, for years: leaving its inhabitants to starve amidst their own bounty. When Ho Chi Mien taught his people to steal the grain and asked Us in the west for assistance in his struggle for independence, we declined. We Americans declined so as not to offend the French. When he went to Russia he found help and he gave birth to the revolution long before we entered into it. The country became split. In the south it was anti-communists; in the north anti-starvation. We backed the Anti-communists when France retreated in humiliation because John Kennedy was afraid of appearing soft in the eyes of the Kremlin. The result was an army of young Americans who had to face a challenge that no tactical advantage could have over come. They had to make a choice between survival and fighting a war in which armed woman and children were among the enemy. Many of those who survived the battlefield never recovered from the mental torment. By 1990 it was calculated that more combat soldiers who served in Vietnam died by their own hand at home, then died in the field over there. That's over 50,000 people.

This was a war we sent our well-intentioned, brave and unwitting young men to fight. It was the hoax perpetrated on us by a government unable to affect change in a positive way. It was a government supported by another group we called "Flag wavers". It would not be fair or true to tell you that the flag wavers were war mongers as some "did" accuse them of being. They were, by in large, those who had lived through World War II and its fear. They felt that Communism had been stopped in Korea and could be stopped in Vietnam. The problem was and is and always will be with Flag Wavers: their paradoxical view of freedom and democracy. As an example; remember, as I explained earlier in this book, our fear of Russia and of "Communism" had very little to do with the economic theory of communal possession. It had been the Robber Barons of the early twentieth century who feared Communism [then called Socialism], and



gave into unions to defuse its spread. It was the American press that had associated the dictatorships of the Russian and Chinese models of Communism, with the economic term, "Communism", and made Americans willing to believe in the "Domino Theory", [The idea that each country which falls to Communism causes the next to fall]. But ironically, at the same time that Linden Johnson was increasing the military budget in Vietnam, he was promoting the "Great Society" at home. The "Great Society", if you are too young to remember, was a socialist system of welfare and big government that strangles us today. At the same time, unions, the American counter part to Communism, were as strong as they were ever to be in America. It was dictatorship and echoes of Fascism that scared the "Veterans of Foreign Wars" "The Elks" "The American Legion" "The daughters of the Revolution" "The Rotary" "The John Birch Society" "The Church" and on and on. So it would happen that as Johnson instituted "Socialistic" reforms here at home, we would set out to fight Communism a half a world away. Yet, when the children of America protested; when they made use of their constitutional right to question government, they were told to "Love it or leave it".

Another perplexing notion of patriotic America was that people who would not stand up; and who had coined the phrase "You can't fight city hall" out of their frustration with government: would send their own sons off to fight. More than that, they often times encouraged it; even expected it or demanded it. These were the same people who never even bothered to vote; not even for President: sighting the futility of wasting their time trying to change a system that over taxed them and was over bearing and unresponsive to their needs. Those same people would wave "Johnny" good bye, confident that the government they had told Johnny was so corrupt, was somehow doing the right thing and with good cause.

There is a sad and tragic link between World War II and Vietnam; it is poverty. There is no doubt that Hitler was a mad man. The very mention of his name evokes terrible images for anyone who lived in his time or grew up in his wake. The fact that he was able to come to power at all, was largely a result of a proud people facing ruin as a result of the way Europe punished Germany after its defeat in World War I. In the midst of a world wide depression it was German flag waving taken to its most perverted extreme, that sent Germany to war. I have heard it said that before the rise of the "Third Reich" the inflation rate in Germany had become so great that people were paid at noon and again at quitting time each day because Germany's currency would depreciate by the hour. Ask yourself how your neighbors would react in that situation. Ask yourself if our leaders could project our fear our frustration and our hate upon a single entity such as the "Jew". Could we, for example, be persuaded to kill a hundred thousand soldiers and fifteen thousand civilians including women and children, if

*George Bailey*

our economy was threatened by a loss in oil imports by a nation like Iraq? But I am off track. The point is, we could have built a whole new nation in Vietnam. With brick and mortar we could have built new cities, and filled their shops with American goods and food for what we spent to desecrate it with Napalm and Agent Orange. We could have been the leaders we were told we were in our books and in our movies. We could have been the brothers and sisters to the world we professed to be. In retrospect, because Russia's leaders are as corrupt and ruthless as are all the other leaders of the world, including our own; it may indeed, have been necessary to run the arms race over the last fifty years. But our aggression only prolonged the struggle. In the end, every country that Communism overtook would become another weight around the Kremlin's neck. Communism was doomed from its inception because it offers no incentive for productivity. Its rewards are given politically for gamesmanship, which produces nothing, so that the more people you include in the Communist system the more you must provide for. If you want to see the proof of that, you need not look to Russia, you can look around you right here in America.

The draftees were the real tragedy of Vietnam. If the only war you can remember is the one in the Gulf then you have no idea what truly caused the turmoil of the 60's. If you were male and 18 you stood a very good chance of being plucked from polite society and dropped off into a rice field in South East Asia whether you wanted to go or not. You weren't even given the privilege to vote before age 21 until 1972. By the late 60's enough of us had heard enough the stories to be scared as well as morally outraged, but at the time Nancy Reagan wasn't in politics and we weren't allowed to "just say no". If you got into minor trouble with the law you went to Vietnam. If you didn't go to college you went to Vietnam. You didn't get paid up front: you just went. It was illegal to be male and 18 and not have your draft card on your person. The young men (barely old enough to be called men) were disproportionately black and or poor. Exemptions went out to sons of politicians and the wealthy, while the rest were threatened with prison and pressured from friends and family, relatives and community. For a time, being married was a sanctuary. When the demands for new "recruits" became too great and too many young men got married to stay out of the draft, it no longer worked. Many had a child to get one up on the ladder; then children. They were trying to stall until they got out of that age group the military loved so well, the young malleable minds of 18 to 20 and then 21, 22, 23, and so on: whatever the quota demanded. Guys tried doctors excuses; prayed for slight disabilities, family hardships and soul surviving son exemptions. They even began to falsely portray themselves as "homosexual", until the army no longer bought that excuse. Oddly enough, if you have ever heard of Arlow Guthrie's song "Alice's Restaurant" you know that the only truly safe way to stay home was to be perceived as immoral. In the end, most of them, with their backs against the wall, bit their lip and went in for their tour of duty: one year. But for

many, if not most, it would take up their whole life: if not in death, then in living with the memory.

There were three ways to dodge the reaper that many young men used to their advantage. The first was the only option for many who could not afford to go to college or didn't have the grades for it. It was to enlist into one of the other services: the navy, the air force, or the national guard. There were no guarantees. In the navy you could still end up in a gunboat headed up river like sitting ducks, or in the Marines: but many naval personnel had a good chance of staying relatively safe at sea. Most of the noted POW's were "Fly boys". But the bulk of the Air Force personnel does not fly. Those guys would be at the airfields, which would at least keep you out of patrols into the jungle. The national guard or "Week end warriors" as they were called, had to serve a 6 or 7 year hitch: but it was only one weekend a month and a couple of weeks every six months. More importantly, they never left "State Side". It was a popular alternative and not easy to get. That's one of the reasons that all those who remained in the Guard and took the extra income and education benefits through the 1980's were caught so off guard when the Guard was called up after a dormancy of nearly a century to serve over seas in the Gulf War.

The second alternative, if you could raise the money and make the grades, was the college exemption. As long as you could keep your grade point up and pay the tuition, you could apply for and receive, a temporary exemption from a military service for up to four or five years. After that, your draft status reverted from 2S to 1A and you took your chances in the draft pool. The problem with the college exemption was you had to have been on track for college from early on, in order to get accepted. In many ways the draftees, the volunteers to the navy, air force, and national guard and the college exempt were all of the same fabric. They were struggling to do the right thing as they saw it. They were working within the system and watching it happen all around them. They were simply dealt different hands. These were all acceptable courses of action within the scope of the 60's, and up until the war ended in 1973. Unfortunately, and unfairly, as I said before, it was the Black and probably Hispanic and definitely the poor, who were most often dealt the worst cards.

To my mind the mirror image of the volunteers who fought in Vietnam were those who chose to challenge the system. Those who risked imprisonment and those who went to prison out of their own resolve against the war; showed the same kind of commitment, conviction and courage as those who blindly served. To say goodbye to one's family and country and to be shunned by both, for the sake of one's convictions, is every bit as admirable as to take up arms for a war you don't understand or believe in. To be sure, there must have been some who left out of fear of death in war, or imprisonment at home. Only they themselves can see into their hearts. But many also served the draft out of fear of persecution

*George Bailey*

from the society and from families that prodded them into going. Those who chose to go to Canada had no way of knowing or [ given the mood of the country when they left] even hoping, that the Carter administration would allow them amnesty. While those who went off to serve their tour expected it to be over in a year, one way or the other, those who left their country, committed to a tour for life.

The protestors that eventually changed the course of history and forced an end to the war were, by in large, college students. Among them were those who would possibly have to later make a choice to be drafted or to dodge the draft. But there were also those among them who had returned from the war and attended college. To say that students only protested out of fear of having to go themselves is not only untrue, it is also to miss completely what the protests were all about. To say that when Abby Hoffman wrapped himself in the American flag, he desecrated it, is to fail to understand the meaning of democracy. The government of the United States, locked in a mortal conflict of fear, paranoia, blind ambition and ignorance; had made a decision to send boys and young men denied of even the right to vote, off to die in a war that was never declared, and was from it inception, immoral. The government and the military lied about their motives, their intentions, their abilities, their methods and their results. It has been suggested that there were communist infiltrators within the factions that protested, sent to disrupt us in our war in Vietnam. That is almost certainly true. But the real struggle of the time was for liberty here at home. When the young people of this land learned the truth of what the war in Vietnam was, they spoke out; and when they spoke they were set upon by every one, from all sides. Abby Hoffman was probably more showman than saint, but when We saw him drape the flag around his shoulders we knew we had the Constitution on our side to shield us. And We knew that We had the blessing of the Founding Fathers to speak. It was our flag too. It was and is, our shield. The right of decent was the promise of the revolution in 1776. To deny us our voice was the unpatriotic thing to do. And when we heard of the death of those at Kent State, who marched for the voices of "We the People" to be heard, and when we heard that they fell at the hands of our own soldiers, on our own soil, we knew that it was the Government that was our enemy, not the rice farmers of Vietnam. We knew it was a fight against ignorance and blind national pride. The school books do not tell the story of Vietnam. They are purchased by the State. It is a lesson they would like us to forget long enough that they might rewrite history. With the "War in the Gulf", it would seem that we have remembered what happens when we fight a war half heartedly or turn our backs on those who serve. But we have not yet conquered our urge to rally around the flag. If anyone should tell you that the protest movement was motivated solely by fear of being called up, remember this. In 1969 the first draft lottery was held. Yes a lottery. In response to the growing awareness that local draft boards were less than even handed in

choosing who should go and who should be granted grace; the Federal Government devised the draft lottery. All young men born before 1951 drew their number in 1969, and with each passing year, a new lottery was held for those coming of age. Your birth date determined your number and those with the lowest numbers went first. With 365 days in a year, everything below 150 was a possible ticket to Vietnam. Depending upon the demand, you needed well over 200 to feel safe. So just imagine that fully half of all the eligible young men were being used up. On the other hand nearly half were relatively certain that would not have to go. In spite of that, the lottery did not defuse the anti-war sentiment. Instead the protests continued to grow: not because they were all afraid for themselves, but because the war was a lie. Long Shanks had tried and failed in an attempt to divide and conquer. A small, but committed, segment of society fought the lies until the country as a whole began to see the truth. After nearly two full terms of lies, Nixon was finally caught in the one that we could prove: it was called "Watergate". Threatened with the certainty of impeachment We forced him to resign in disgrace; the only American president ever to do so. History gives him credit for getting us out of Vietnam. But he had no choice. Unlike the guys at the concrete company I spoke of at the beginning of this book, the majority of young people, who were safe from the draft, stood for what was right. Like the majority of Whites who had supported civil rights even though they were not Black, and were not given their due by historians, we were just for justice sake.

I mentioned those who sat on the fence. I think anyone who had lived through those times was torn to some degree, but to say that one merely watched passively would probably be a mistake. But most Americans were not faced with the prospect of having to go themselves. For most it would be a relative, a friend, a son, who would go in their stead. Many of those who watched as the War drug on and the Anti-War Movement grew, would eventually be swayed to abandon our war effort. Once they were, Nixon would be forced to act. There are those who still say that, had We had the resolve to win the War in the first place, We could have. They are probably right. The lesson of Vietnam should therefore be that an unjust war should never be waged to begin with; not that we should slaughter anyone that our President points our army at.

The last group I could think of, deserves to be last. While historical documentaries focus on them unceasingly, they were a very small percentage of those involved. Unfortunately, despite their small numbers, they had a devastating effect on the way we remember Vietnam. They were the mirrored image of the fervent, the most self righteous, of the Flag Wavers; juxtaposed. I call them the Spitters. There were a lot of reasons that men returning from Vietnam didn't find a brass band waiting. Once the war got rolling, soldiers were coming home in small numbers all 365 days of the year, to cities scattered across

*George Bailey*

the nation. Add to that the mixed bag of emotions around about the war and the impossibility of keeping any kind of sincerity of emotion up over five thousand days of homecomings, and you have a formula for not doing the job right. It was just that kind of a war. It was an assembly line that put young boys in, one at a time, and chucked the living and the dead out the other end. The only place where a large congregation of newly Veteranized Americans could be found was at the airports, when they flew back to the main land to catch connecting flights for home. And there, waiting for them, were the Spitters. Young men and women, who cursed at them and jeered. They called them baby killers, and literally spit at them. It was inexcusable. Back home here, with the nightly news bringing fresh footage of the war into our homes every evening, we were all aware that things were different over there than they had been portrayed in the WW II movies we grew up watching. We had heard of the My Lai Massacre [pronounced Me Lie] and felt the shame of it. But the shame belonged to those who stayed home and sent others to do the fighting, not to the soldiers coming off the planes. Even more poignant was the fact that so many of the hecklers were women who would never know the pressures that had sent so many of these men off to war. I offer no defense for the Spitters. If they are still around, they were careful to keep silent when the troops returned from the gulf, but they should be remembered in perspective: not as the embodiment of the protest movement, but as radicals, twisted indignant by their frustration and ignorance. Like the "Rednecks" of the time, who shaved the heads of "long hairs" with bare, rusty, razor blades; they had no excuse and no place in a democracy. If your only reference to war is that in the Persian Gulf, then you must not use it as a gauge by which to remember Vietnam. Some of its veterans refer to it as "The Nam" as if it were a thing. In many ways it was. Unlike the Gulf War, which had men of all ages, men with maturity and experience to draw on for leadership: Vietnam was fought by very young men. Unlike the Gulf, where those called upon had obligated themselves to serve with payment in advance, Vietnam shanghaied most of its participants. In the Gulf, we led the way and called the shots. In Vietnam we soiled our hands, by dealing with corrupt South Vietnamese, many of whom were little more than feudal war lords. Some of them ended up being set up in business in the states after the war; while many of the real patriots in South Vietnam were left to the "killing fields" like the Kurds of Iraq. The war in Iraq, with its great and swift victory, will undoubtedly create a whole new generation of Flag Wavers. We will forget that there is still no democracy in Kuwait or Saudi Arabia. We will forget the oil spill. We will forget Saddam Hussein's reprisals on his Kurdish, Sheit and other citizens. We will forget his sabotage in the oil fields and never contemplate what might have happened had we given Iraq a nuclear power plant when we courted Iraq to subvert Iran because of our failed policy in Iran, so many years ago. It will not be reminded that, unlike those

drafted into Vietnam, the men and women sent off to the Gulf had hired on for the job.

It is possible that, if left unchecked in Kuwait, Hussein may have moved on Saudi Arabia. With success there, the Middle East may have fallen to him like “Dominos”. Perhaps Bush stopped a “Would be Hitler” in time. Fortunately, he is stayed for the short run. We, along with our allies in the Gulf War, were justified to go after the “Tyrant” that George Bush convinced us to fight. The way he treats his own people, the way he treated the Kurds and the Sheits [and the Iranians for that matter] and the way in which he still plots against the world: all of these things justify a war against Saddam Hussein and his government. But Bush was never sanctioned by those in the Middle East to wage such a war. He had sanction only to remove Iraqi troops from the oil fields of Kuwait. That was why Bush’s initial battle cry was about oil and jobs. It is why we refused him. The War In The Gulf was a resounding triumph for our military. It put our faith back into our ability to unite as a nation. It was an opportunity for our military leaders to show us that they deserve our trust. But when the dust settled, it seems that our political leadership had missed the lessons of Vietnam all together. Because the target of the war was the oil fields rather than the government of Saddam Hussein, the very Kurds that Bush incited to rise up in the north were either killed or driven out as we looked on helplessly. In 1996 they still lived in a refugee camp that we support. They are still under attack from both the country they fled to and the country they fled from. Saddam Hussein’s main force of his best soldiers escaped the war untouched; and to this day prop up that same government which sent troops into Kuwait. Today there is growing concern that the biological, nerve gas, and nuclear weapons which Saddam Hussein either had or was developing, are still in his position. Despite the great job done by our military in the Gulf War: as some one put it “We managed to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory”.

If we intent to govern ourselves in a democratic manner, then we must educate ourselves with respect to the consequences. We must not be led into another Vietnam. More importantly, our children must be educated to be weary of such involvement. In Jan. of 1996, PBS aired a “Front Line” documentary on the Gulf War. It should be mandatory viewing for anyone wanting to graduate high school in America. If the citizens of the United States are to sanction armed aggression by their military, then they must understand the implications. The song goes “ Ain’t gonna study war no more,” but if we are to wage it, we must study and understand “ALL” the consequences.

In closing let me say that, many good people died in Vietnam. The Gulf War would claim good people as well. Their memory will be dangled in front of us whenever Government tries to get our blood up. For those who came back, We as a nation are in your debt. It is a debt that in some ways We can never repay. At

*George Bailey*

the same time, and with the most sincere humility, let me add that, the revolution I will unveil to you, is a revolution unique. It addresses all the needs of all the people. So please, remember that when you promote your cause in a world of finite resource that it is at a cost to others. Remember also that what you fought for was equality for all, not special privilege for yourself. And finally, remember that not all of us asked you to go. In fact some of us did not agree that you should go. Some of us pleaded with you not to go. But we were shouted down.

Poor Archie Bunker. If you don't remember him, he was the white, middle classed, middle aged guy from "All In The Family"; a television show from the early 1970's. My friends and I never missed a chance to watch Archie's young hippie son-in-law rake Archie over the coals with the help of Archie's own daughter: and Archie deserved it all. Each week we saw his racist, anti-Semitic, greedy, self centered, self serving ways, get him into trouble. He loved his nation blindly to bolster his own self esteem. In the midst of an unjust, unpopular war, he believed what he wanted to believe, [what he needed to believe] and closed his eyes to the reality of a country that was living a lie. But it must be said that Archie Bunker did the best that he could. The fact is that everybody wants to believe in something, and he was gullible enough to be able to believe. All Archie ever really wanted was to be loved and respected, and to have some sort of economic security. Remember, he was born of the great depression and molded by the fear and uncertainty of World War Two. He was not well educated. So every week when his son-in-law, the "MEAT HEAD", challenged the beliefs that Archie had grown up with, Archie would suffer the humiliation: and deservedly so. Each week, this embodiment of the White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, [WASP] power structure, made concession after concession to minorities and to his children; accepting the guilt and opening the door to change. Yet, all the while, his son-in-law lived in his home and ate from his table. His daughter and his wife received his love in the best way he was able to give it. Turns out that Archie was more ignorant than cruel, more insecure than greedy, and more human than all-powerful. It's nearly thirty years later now. The face has changed, but if you look hard, you can see that Archie is still getting cheap shots taken at him. He's the simpleton in the commercial being straightened out by the bright, articulate woman. He's the fat guy that the hard bodies in the diet commercial laugh at. Twenty five years age, he was a caricature of all American fathers. Today I would hope he has gone the way of the dinosaurs. I guess what I'm trying to say is that it was very easy to ask concessions of White, middle class, male, population that seemed to have it all. Many of these concessions needed to be made and many still remain. But, it is important to remember, that all the special interests who have gained ground in the last three decades, have done it with the support of many Whites and with the consent of the majority. The White majority, or any majority, will always have to be shown the way. They will always have to be prodded. It's human nature, not White nature, to



resist change. But the fact is, that changes made over the last three decades, be they right or wrong, were made out of a common will to do the right thing. Poor old Archie Bunker would give you the shirt off his back if he thought it was the right thing to do. But he is, after all, a product of his environment, and human. If he were standing on the shore and saw you drowning, he would throw you a rope. But, what seems to have been forgotten is that if you drag him down into the water, and try walking out by standing on his shoulders, he will panic and save himself. Now, I know that there are those who say that Archie should be the one in the water and they should be the one entrusted to throw the rope: maybe. I say that they had better get past the debating and start swimming and all the Archies of this country had better pull hard on the rope: the tide is going out.

The fathers of the 1950's and 60's, in their bid for economic freedom and security, reaped the benefits of the single strongest economy the world has ever known. They took care of their own first, through unfair union practices and good old boy networks. But this is not a uniquely White technique. You can find the same kind of discrimination occurring along bloodlines and political lines in Mexico where there are few Whites. These are problems that must be addressed as ethical problems, not just racial problems. When a successful Black man or woman, uses their influence to give a position to an unqualified minority applicant, they serve our society no better than any other bigot. I wish these problems did not exist. I wish that the generations that went before had set aside their prejudices, so that these problems were all behind us. Then these leaders that use our discontent, to steer us to their ends, would shout to deaf ears. Then, perhaps my generation of middle class males would not have rejected so much of what our fathers did right, along with what our fathers did wrong. Perhaps we would not have cheered as our sisters lost all sense of who they were. No matter what you say about Archie Bunker, whether you see him as an object of pity or of scorn, you must concede that he was a provider for his family. And no matter if you view his wife as a good and giving homemaker or an idiot, who subjected herself to his abuse; you must concede that together they provided an atmosphere of love and security for their child: a child who grew up with a sense of self worth and social conscience. Can our generation say the same?

Archie felt a strong conviction for the American union worker. But, in fact, he was far removed from the founders of the labor movement. The union struggle in America had its roots in a lot of different "Trade" groups, but one of the first major strikes came in the coal mines of Pennsylvania. It was a system of enslavement through economics that brought those brave men together. The owners of the coal mines owned the "Company Store" as well and they sold the food on credit. The company, in most cases, controlled the local police, and government, and had the ear of the governor. If you worked for the company, you were entrapped. You would always be in debt to the company. The company

*George Bailey*

would force you to enlist your sons, as young as age four, to the struggle for existence, through economic manipulation: and if you should voice decent, you and yours would be on the street; at which point the law would deal with you harshly for your indebtedness and make an example of you for others. It was a long, bitter and sometimes bloody struggle that brought dignity to those men and their families. In the beginning, the Pennsylvania miners were of European decent, and while today's minority groups like to think of White Americans as a group which is organized to keep minorities down, these miners came from countries which had an age old mistrust for each other. They spoke different languages and came from different cultures. The mine owners, who had cornered the market on anthracite coal, were well aware of that mistrust and they used it to manipulate one group of Whites against another. According to a dramatization I watch on [once again] PBS; before the union movement prevailed in the mines, it included not only WASP miners; but also the Black Americans and Italian emigrants who were brought in as strike breakers. There was no public outcry for these desperate souls, who squandered their lives away in cold, wet, dust filled caves, that fueled our nation's industrial revolution. There was no empathy from rural America, for those emigrants who suffered in the factories and the sweatshops of the big cities. The majority of Americans lived on the farm. Like the drivers at the concrete company, who had made it to the full wage, they were more concerned about their own problems and how they would get by. They probably felt that anyone simple minded enough to put up with those conditions, deserved what they got. After all, if you farmed a small piece of ground, you could get by on your own wits. It probably never occurred to the vast majority that the knowledge and the opportunity they took for granted was out of the grasp of those locked in the system. As for those stuck in the cities, more immigrants from other backgrounds meant more competition for jobs. The more immigrants the Industrialists could bring to this country, the less they would have to pay a labor force divided and trying to survive. When Henry Ford invented the assembly line, he changed the face of the industrial revolution forever. He "one-upped" the rest of the world and overcame the "Good Old Boys" in the automotive industry that had previously kept him from success. But the demands put upon workers by the assembly line were horrendous. From the dawn of civilization men had worked to the beat of their heart. Now it would be the tireless machine that would set the pace. In those days, a ten or twelve hour workday was commonplace; sixteen was not uncommon. Saturday was a part of the normal workweek. By contrast, life in early agrarian societies saw people working a six hour day most of the year. But in industrial America, people were simply used up and discarded. Yet, Henry was a man of the working class. It is said that one day he received a letter from the wife of one of his workers, in which she told him that she feared for her husband's life: the beat of the machine was too fast and the day too long. Because of his amazing success he found

himself in a position from which he could begin another revolution: he championed the eight hour work day. Without reducing the weekly earnings of his workers, he shortened their workday to eight hours in a grand act of benevolence that would in time, spread across the country. On the other side of the world, in 1917, the Bolsheviks came to power in a Revolution that over threw the Monarchy in Russia. It was a hateful and bloody ordeal; reminiscent of the French revolution in which Marie Antoinette lost her head. The Czar of Russia fared about the same. Over here in America we still professed to be the land with cities paved in gold. We still sold hopeful immigrants fairy tales of rags to riches, to draw them to America to feed our machines. But we had an aristocracy of our own. They ruled not by divinity but by wealth and power. They were the Carnegie and the Rockefellers, the Hursts and the Morgans: and they were nervous. Pittsburgh, Detroit, New York and the other big industrial cities of the country were teeming with the “Huddled Masses” that the Statue Of Liberty had beckoned “Come”. Those masses lived and died for industry; and they were intrigued by this new “Communism”. Unlike Henry Ford, the wealthy of America showed little benevolence toward the people who did the labor. When unions had asked for an eight hour day at the turn of the century, they had been broken. The twelve hour day, six or seven days a week would stand. But Ford was benevolent like a fox. He would be the first to understand that by putting money in the pockets of his workers, he would enable them to purchase his cars; and that would ultimately put money back in his pocket. Unlike the “Trickle Down Theory” of Roosevelt and Reagan which polarized all the money toward the top, enslaving the masses, Ford put it in circulation. Because of that, and because of the revolution in Russia, the union movement in America would later flower. Unlike the Bolsheviks of Russia, the unions were not the Government. They did not nationalize [seize ownership of] the companies that had abused them. Instead, they limited a company’s ability to choose employees from outside those who were presently employed; or those the union provided. Since no business can operate without labor, it did, in affect “seize” the companies and hand them over to the employees. It then became a question of doing business with the unions or not doing business at all. The whole idea of unions was, more than likely, perceived by the majority of rural America [at the time a national majority] as communist in nature. And in the truest sense it was. The only major difference being that, it was communally controlled by the union members, rather than the state; which was the case in Russia. That and of coarse, the fact that ownership still remained in the hands of the original owner. It was this fact that caused the union movement to be tolerated, but “Control” was seized by the unions. When union workers marched on Henry Ford’s plant, hired thugs shot some of them. History records that Henry Ford was both removed from that decision and appalled by it. Given his concern for his workers it’s likely that he was. But never the less, his company was in affect seized along with all the

*George Bailey*

others that “organized”. There was a need for the birth of the unions in this country. Safety and human dignity in the work place were sorely lacking before their introduction. But like all institutions of man, they have been irreparably corrupted with time. They are political voting blocks manipulated by self-servers. They are trust funds misused by gangsters. They are strike makers used to extort business and have been as far back as Frank Nitty using the “Projectionist Guild” to extort theater chains, and the Mafia using trucking to extort nearly every one in the fifties and sixties. Their leaders are the “Nobles” who serve “Long Shanks”. Their members are the sons and the nephews of the “Good Old Boy” network and pass on membership to the union as a right of birth. If a union serves its constituents well, then it is its constituents who should prop it up. However, in government contracts, wages to be paid by the contractor are specified in the terms of that contract. Under an act voted in by congress years ago, known as “The Davis Bacon Act”, a “Prevailing” wage was established. These “Prevailing Wages” are not only as high as union wages, but must also pay cash values equal to union benefits and other union gratuities normally paid by employers of union workers. All this causes non union employers to pay an equal amount in labor costs to that of the union employer. If this were not so, contractors using union employees could not compete in the bidding. It works out great for the non union employee on the government contract job because he or she enjoys union wages plus the additional 20% to 40% in cash to compensate for what would be the union’s cut. It works out great for the union, because they are able to compete in the bidding. In fact, in 1996 some unions were caught falsifying union pay scales in order to raise the “Davis Bacon” schedules; thereby thwarting non-union competition by inflating non-union bids. It works out great for the politicians because the unions give him or her support and the voters are none the wiser. But it is hell on the taxpayer who foots the bill, for the “PORK BARREL” government projects that may or may not have been needed in the first place: and at inflated rates. This is especially true when you consider that by the end of the 1990’s many members of the “Operating Engineers” union would be able to retire with pensions as high as \$35,000 to \$70,000 per year. These are pensions drawn from monies collected, in many cases, from an extorted public.

I once had a union man relate to me a story about a truck driver friend of his, who was an hour out of his trucking terminal, when he had a tail light burn out on his truck. He called into the terminal to have a mechanic come out and replace it. You see, with the bulb burned out it was illegal for him to proceed at night. Furthermore, it was against union rules for him to replace the bulb himself, as he was not a mechanic. The moral of the story I was told, was that thanks to the union rules both men’s jobs were protected. The mechanic got in his eight hours that day, and so did the driver. Now that’s great if your operating in a vacuum; or if your a communist state in which it is more important that everyone have a job than it is that they produce something for their pay. The problem is that, while

the driver slept in his truck waiting for the mechanic, the company he worked for was being driven out of business and he and the mechanic were both put out of work. The foreign shipping company, that left an hour behind him, had their driver fix his own bulb. He made his deliveries on schedule and for less money and took away all of the union driver's accounts. Now that union driver marches in Washington and cries on the news about how his government doesn't protect him from the real world. Of course European and Pacific Rim companies do not operate shipping companies within our borders, but Canadian and Mexican companies do. What's more, foreign companies do compete with us in a global market. If the shipping companies used by our manufacturers are protected from having to compete, then all our manufacturers suffer the cost of that inefficiency. We compete as a nation or we fail to compete as a nation. The commercial says "Look for the union label." I say, if you choose to support the 5% to 10% elitist workers in the nation that belong to unions, that is certainly your prerogative. And if those workers wish to spend their money to support their union, then so be it. But when our tax money is used to support an organization that claims the best jobs for them and theirs, then I say wait a minute. This is especially true when government organizations or legal monopolies such as utilities, or protected industries such as airlines, are allowed to become unionized.

Not too long ago I heard a devoted union man complaining that the government was extending unemployment benefits to farm workers left unemployed for six months, as a result of a devastating freeze that ruined citrus crops. "Those people are literally starving" I told him. He replied that, "Anyone that would work for four dollars a hour deserves what he gets!"

So I guess it has come full circle. Now that the wages are protected for those in the city, either through unions or "Prevailing Wages", it is those who make their living tending and gathering the crops who will carry the burden: and those in the city who will turn their back. If you are inclined to believe in reincarnation, perhaps it is those same people on top once more. As for me, I believe that people need to feel good about themselves; and when they are faced with a system that is corrupt in nature; and that they are powerless to change, they simply turn away and rationalize their own position as best they can. Like I said, if I were to challenge some union workers belief systems like this, in person, they would have taken a swing at me by now. But look at the facts folks. California has been the recipient of Long Shank's benevolence because it is a large electoral vote. Here is just one example of how it works.

Back in the mid west they are forced to put salt on their highways and bridges in the winter, to keep the roads open. The severity of the weather conditions and the addition of the salt to those conditions, causes their roadways to deteriorate rapidly. It is just a fact of life. The taxpayers have to bear the cost of rebuilding roads and bridges, and while the federal government does

*George Bailey*

contribute some of the taxpayer's money back to the problem, it is matching funds at best.

At the same time, when northern California had its major earthquake back around 1990, the federal government rushed in to pump in money to rebuild. Ten years later the construction industry would still be strong in the San Francisco Bay Area; due, in no small part, to that infusion of Federal money. That Federal money would come from California taxpayers, but it would also come from workers in the mid west. Workers who made around \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year as welders on assembly lines; and a lot less in most other jobs. Workers who must rebuild their deteriorating roads constantly and without emergency assistance money from the federal government. The fact that unions are propped up by politicians, should tell the tale for you.

I do not say these things to place blame or to cause hard feelings. Those who work the union jobs and defend the union line are just trying to get along in a world which they did not make. But it should also be remembered that if someone tries to work on a job, when a union has told its membership that it should be a union job: those people, who come to try to make a living in a world which they did not create, will be called "Scabs". They will be portrayed as less than human so that the truth can be rationalized away and hate and violence can rule the day.

American labor unions were the original special interest group. As the union members came to covet their jobs, and began to see those jobs as belonging to them and their children, the unions themselves fell to decay. The promise of a true organized labor force is to protect "ALL" the workers of the land from unfair, unsafe and inequitable labor practices. But the unions fell far short of their obligations. They organized to control by faction. They protect the "STATUS QUO". They wield their political clout, not to the benefit of the American worker, but to the benefit of their selected few, at the expense of the whole. In return, government contracts protect union employees, and in the bargain, cause government contract prices to be inflated. That causes higher taxes, which places a greater burden on those already excluded from union protection. Similar forces manifest themselves in governmental, utility and protected industry unions as well. The dues and fees and interest paid on monies handled by the union for its member's sake, are monies that a frightened and self centered union membership, pays through extortion. Memberships no longer control their unions, but concede power and a percentage of the "Take" in order to stay ahead of the pack. Today, in America, some unions have sunk so low as to have two wage packages for their membership in order to perpetuate inflated wage rates for tenured members at the expense of new members. These are not trainee programs; but separate scales based on having been in the group before the new deal was made. Simply put, some union members have sold out there own brotherhood to maintain their

own standard of living in the face of new economic realities. It may seem hypocritical, but, in truth, that has always been the union way.

As long as politics is a career job in America we will continue to have these schizophrenic leaders talking from both sides of their mouth. How many times have you heard it said that the Republicans or the Democrats are trying to decide what their “Platform” will be? I mean, do you really think they want their finger on the pulse of the people, or are they just trying to figure out what it is you want to hear? Damn the pulse of the people! We need leaders who will stand up for what they believe is right. Then if we vote for them we can be sure that they are committed. We need Presidents who, unlike Reagan, will tell the truth and make us face it, unpopular or not. You don’t get that from career politicians. They offer no vision. Instead, you get coalitions. You get government by faction. All of the special interest groups, into which we have divided ourselves, bid for a voice in government. The candidate picks his allies, pays them lip service, gives their leaders special consideration and then does whatever he or she wants once in office. Abraham Lincoln once entered this country into a bloody civil war on the premise that a house divided against itself, can not long endure. Today we are no longer Americans: we are Black, White, Asian, Native American, Hispanic, Women, Right to life, Pro-choice, Timber, Environmentalist, union, Moral-majority, Gay, Homeless, Elderly, Veterans, Disabled, Democrat, Republican, Independent and on and on and on.

I’m going to move away from my views on government for a while and focus instead on our countries ethnic groups. John F. Kennedy said, “Ask not, what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country”. This sentiment is more relevant than ever today. The popular press, in its obsession to sell news print and air time have tried to drag down the memory of this man and his brother. Or maybe it’s just their way of promoting our decline in morality, to hold the actions of other men, in other times, to the scrutiny of today’s standards. These same people suggest that Kennedy did not rush in to promote “Civil Rights” for Blacks in the south. In reality the same can be said of Lincoln. And I’m sure that the fact that George Washington owned slaves was not lost on the anti-abolitionist press of the Civil War. The point here is that the achievements of these men came at the crossroads. Washington and the others could have written a constitution which read “All men of European decent are created equal”. As for Lincoln and Kennedy, it was the fact that they were leaders that made people face into the wind and force an end to what was unjustifiable. They led us to do the right thing in spite of ourselves, and in their wake, we as a nation grew closer to the promise of democracy. Had either of them run for office on a platform which indorsed what they would ultimately accomplish, they would never have been elected. People fail to see that a President has very little power other than the power to lead, and they lead our nation to good or to ill. Great Presidents use

*George Bailey*

the office as a “Bully Pulpit” after they are elected and risk their lives to change the world for the betterment of mankind as a whole.

So where “is” Black America today? Some reports estimate that between 50% and 80% of Black Americans have reached the middle class. If that was true, in the hard economic times of the early 1990’s there is good reason to be optimistic. Is that reason for complacency? Of course not. No race within this country emulated or tried to imitate mainstream America like Black America. They took our religions and our culture because slavery had stripped them of their own. But beyond that, they strived even to imitate the physical appearance of white America in an attempt to fit in. It was, and is, truly the basest of human impulses, displayed by America at large that caused them to be rejected. There was probably a lot of guilt involved too. It was government’s feeble attempts to rectify this injustice that give birth to the kind of Federal monster that drags us down today. Had we, at any time since the Civil War, included them into our society, we could have avoided nearly all of our social problems today. The lessons we could have learned as a society would have made us the people we professed to the world to be; but we didn’t. We didn’t even come close. By the time the government put affirmative action into place in the 60’s the battle had been lost; the opportunity missed. We had failed to do the right thing. The Blacks of the nation were bitter, hurt and lacking in self esteem. They stopped trying to be like mainstream America. They saw themselves once again as Africans. But they were not Africans anymore than a Mexican is Spanish. They were, and are, a people unique to the new world. Their lineage was crossed with White slave owners like those of the American “Indians” [natives] was crossed with the Spanish to make the Mexican gene-pool of today: They are mixed in the same way that White American heritage is woven from all the nations of Europe, as well as with all those who joined for love, or need, in the “New World” along a path as long as the history of this nation [including Blacks]. The bonds of “Family” that saw Black America into the twentieth century were as European in nature as African. They were strong bonds forged of a memory of slavery, and forced separation. They carried their people through a century of oppression running from “Abolition” to the “Civil Rights Movement”. The strength of their conviction in the Church, led them to equality by law. When “Affirmative Action” was put in place, I had a discussion with a painting contractor on the subject. Like his father before him, he was a union contractor. There was, and is, an apprentice program in the Painter’s Union. An apprentice makes less money than a “Journeyman” painter because he knows less and works slower than a “Journeyman”. “It’s unfair” the contractor protested, “one in four of my journeymen painters has to be Black, but there aren’t any Black journeyman painters out there. So how am I supposed to hire some guy off the street and pay him journeyman wages while I teach him?” He was frustrated at the prospect. So, I asked him how many Blacks he had hired on during his years as a contractor.



He had trained none. So, I asked him how many his father had trained as union painters during his days a union contractor. Again, the answer was none. They had brought this upon themselves it seems. Neither he nor his contemporaries, or his father's generation had made the effort. Now the price would have to be paid to set things right. Ultimately, it would be the consumer who would pay the price for the training, in the form of higher contract bids, and it would be the young "White" males of my generation who would lose their opportunity to participate. After all, none of the established "White" journeyman painters were going to quit to make the numbers right. Many of their sons would become union members as well. So those young White males who's' fathers were not part of the "good old boys", would never make the team. Those few open slots that weren't spoken for by family lines within the union, would go to women and minorities. Therefore, as in other facets of the work force, "The sins of the Father would be visited upon the son". It would be Archie Bunker's indignant son in law who would pay the price in unions, government jobs and in many other facets of the economy. But, we as a Nation, had decided to right the wrong and pay the price. So what went wrong? Well, it's true that there was resistance and animosity within the employment community. That paint contractor I mentioned ultimately stopped hiring any employees at all: not just because of affirmative action, but because of workman's compensation insurance, unemployment insurance and seemingly endless government regulations. But the stumbling block that ultimately drug the "Quota System" down, was the bitterness felt in the Black community. That hurt that went so deep, that rejection that had so embittered, was to become as big a problem as bigotry itself. It was to be known as "Tokenism". The "Token" Blacks, who filled the newly created positions, only to put in their time, without regard to productivity, began to drag us down. Am I saying that affirmative action didn't work? No. Am I saying that all Blacks were and are "Token Blacks"? Absolutely not! For those Blacks who applied themselves and found employers willing to work with them, things did change. Things have changed, in some respects; sometimes more than Black activist would like to admit. It is evidenced in a much larger Black "middle", even "upper" class. When once it took affirmative action to get one in ten people in TV commercials to be Black, we now have entirely Black casts on TV programs, showing our children the way it could and should be. But I am saying that some people are lazy: Black or White. I'm saying that quota systems invite abuse. I'm saying that it is very easy to justify a bad attitude by pointing to inequalities, past and present. I am saying that I doubt that anyone can rattle off all of the public figures of our society today, who are Black. And I am saying that Blacks have been unwilling to criticize their own and have instead made excuses for them, to the detriment of affirmative action. I am saying that Martin Luther King Jr. had a dream that all men and women would arrive at the promise land together and that many of America's Black community have abandoned that dream and chosen instead to

*George Bailey*

pursue a path of "Separate But Equal": maybe even a little more equal. I am talking about rationalization.

If government can take any credit for helping to raise the social and economic status of Black America, it is overshadowed by the way the welfare system has destroyed the Black family unit of the lower class. The welfare system implemented its own "Catch Twenty Two" on the Black American Male. Look around you today and you can find, literally, millions of families floundering on the edge. Then, as now, it has been necessary for them to seek government assistance. You may dispute the reasons, but you can not refute the fact that a disproportionate number of them are Black. With the emergence of the "Welfare Society" the Black "Man" was pushed away from his family. With Dad in the house, Mom couldn't collect the welfare check. Now Mom had become the "Bread Winner", not because she had a job in any traditional sense, but she did truly provide the paycheck and it came from welfare. Without a role model, how could young Black males aspire to any goal? They were well aware that their fathers were not the "Bill Cosbys" of the world. Not only did they have no place in the work force; they now had no place in the family. They could see their fathers from the windows of the "Projects". They were the guys on the street corners hanging out; they were the drunks and the junkies being carted off by the law or sleeping in the alley. The only men from "Their" world that draw the attention of the ladies are the ones with the "Bank-roll" and the "Nose Candy". Middle America, no matter what color, is abhorred by the immoral, self destructive strain that has developed out of this subculture. The young Black male's hate for the female dominated society that rejects them, is reflected in the violent apparition that has been called "The music of the inner city culture". Whether these souls can be saved is a matter for theologians to debate. Whether they will continue to be produced from the same mold is a matter for society [that's you and that's me], not government to decide. In 1990 Arizona lost an estimated two million dollars due to a boycott put in place against the "Sun Bowl". The citizens of Arizona were labeled as bigots because they refused to adopt Martin Luther King's birthday as a holiday. The truth is, that, they rejected adding yet another paid government holiday, not Martin Luther King. Bureaucrats did not offer a paid holiday to be given up in its place. But Black community leaders raised "hell" over the rejection. Black Americans pay taxes too. Middle class Blacks, along with the rest of the middle class, pay a larger percentage of tax on their income than the rich. Were they being well served? You know full well who was being served: government; who could show false concern, while giving themselves a day off; and Black leaders who could raise money for the cause and get their faces on the TV and the front page. I have eluded to films over and over again, because we are largely a nation of movie goers rather than book readers. Movies, from "Guess who's coming to diner", to "Mississippi Burning" and "Driving Miss Daisy" are extremely valuable in

making White America take a good hard look at what is really in our hearts. The facts that these film's names are recognizable demonstrates that good will is present in America at large. But there is another film which is, perhaps, more important to the struggle of Black Americans: its name was "Lean on Me". Like "Driving Miss Daisy" it starred Morgan Freedman. It shows in a somewhat over simplified way the form and function of today's activist in politics. More importantly it shows what must be done for the sake of the children. When you go to government for solutions you must always fail, because in doing so, you tell the children that they are powerless to help themselves. This is true for all people of all races of all time, and for all time. When recruits join the army they must pass basic training. It's a right of passage, and well known as a trying and difficult time. Yet, nearly everyone who applies themselves, is able to pass muster. This is in the design. No one becomes a master of hand-to-hand combat in six weeks, but soldiers emerge from boot camp with the confidence to go into battle. A high school education is something that virtually all kids are capable of achieving. But, we stand on the sidelines, making excuses for them and teaching them to blame the system. Don't tell them that they can't succeed. Don't fill their heads with the rationalizations of the line know as the down trodden. Tell them that if they truly try, they can not fail. Don't send them into the world without the confidence to compete. There are those who would rewrite history for the sake of young Black kid's self esteem. But children do not look to history for their sense of self worth; they look to their community. There are those who belittle the contributions of Whites, to the Black cause, but that only makes young Black kids feel more ostracized. There are those who promote the sub-culture of the inner city, but that only keeps young Black kids chasing the wrong dreams and rationalizing their failures. As I said earlier, it has been suggested that as many as 80% of Black Americans have found their way out of poverty. This may be no more than wishful thinking, but consider this; if the majority of Black America is middle class, when Blacks allow their leaders to portray them as unsuccessful, they themselves perpetuate the myth that Blacks can't measure up. They fuel racism, by contributing to bigoted beliefs of Black inferiority. Most importantly: there will always be those at the bottom. They must be helped and protected. But if they turn their back on society they must not be given the right to become abusive because they are Black.

There was another movie made in the 90's that dealt with race and bigotry. In it, two White males raped and attempted to murder a young Black girl. The father of the child, killed the two men on the courthouse steps and was put on trial for murder. As his defense, the defense lawyer would ask the jury to close their eyes and imagine the atrocity. Step by horrible step, he described what had happened to the child. At the end of the exercise he would ask the jurors to imagine that the little girl he described had been White. Of course the exercise allowed the Southern jury to empathize and the man was acquitted. But I must ask you to

*George Bailey*

back up a moment. In the story, the father had killed the men before the trial was over. Whether they would be found guilty and truly punished for their crime was still not certain. This father had also contacted his defense lawyer in advance of the murders to make sure he would have a White lawyer to defend him. He would, during the course of the trial, raise money for his defense by extorting it out of a self serving Black organization who had intended to use him to promote their cause. In the end, he had planned the murders carefully and with premeditation. He had manipulated his lawyer to defend him and members of the Black community to pay the bill. He would be acquitted and the movie would proclaim that justice had been served. But I must ask you, "What if that father had been White?" What if the two men murdered had been Black? When we as a society take the responsibility for the shortcomings of individuals on our shoulders, on the grounds that society was unfair to them, then we as a nation can not survive. Today it is asserted that Black jurors are acquitting Blacks of crimes simply because they are Black. If I must elaborate on that issue then We are already lost.

If any individual or group would advocate that all Blacks be marked in such a way that both their political views and the neighborhood they grew up in, could be identified immediately [even over the phone], there would be an upheaval. And yet, today we find individuals who can not speak intelligible English, being held up as role models to inner city kids. I had a telephone conversation with a woman who worked in a Government office in Washington DC. I could not understand her. She had obviously grown up in the ghetto. Because the government has no mandate to perform any of the tasks it taxes us in order to provide, she will have no problem keeping her job. But she will not likely find a job in the private sector, nor be productive in Government. She will be repelled from interviews long before she gets her chance to show what she is capable of doing. Her self esteem will be challenged every time she opens her mouth outside the mean streets where she grew up. If she is forced to learn to speak like those she works with in order to advance, it will be at the risk of offending those she left behind in the ghetto. If the pendulum swings against "Tokenism" she will have lost her chance so as not to offend. It should always be remembered that those who find fame in our society are chosen from a sea of illegible candidates. It is not Black America who runs the selection process. Nor is it mainstream, White America. It is the rich and powerful. The "Glitter Machine" does not glitter because the famous people appear on it. It is the fact that they appear on it, that makes them famous. Those selected for fame, are selected by the same people who buy the elections and promote their agenda on television and in the press. So then, Black America must ask itself, what is gained by convincing Black America to segregate itself with language and culture and by whom? Why would a people who fought so hard for so long to be part of the culture now abandon that "Dream"?

One of the big social campaigns that sprang up over and over again in the last half of this century was urban renewal. Million after million flowed from the Federal government to inner cities for the supposed purpose of helping Black communities improve their lot. In 1996 there was a, so called, "Festival" in Oregon. It brought together a group of people who saw themselves as hold outs from the hippie days of the sixties. They brought with them their younger disciples and an attitude of antisocial behavior, which included the rationalization that it was alright to steal from the Imperialist establishment. In fact, there were so many of these people who set upon the local grocery chain store, that the store had to close its doors until the throng left town. If you go down to the inner city you will find wire mesh and chains on all the stores. Building nice, new, buildings will not attract business to a war zone, where thieves are the norm; whether they are White hippies or Black ghetto dwellers. It then becomes a question as to whether the inner city Blacks are forced into the ghetto or whether they create the ghetto when they are present. The answer is pretty obvious if you are not concerned with being politically correct. If a group of people who have income, be that income from jobs or from welfare checks: live together in a community which is safe, and in which business is not the target of theft and vandalism, you will be hard pressed to keep business out. Look to Sun City Arizona, where Social Security sends the checks and you will find no war zone. The purpose of Urban Renewal programs was two fold. The first was to put a good face on a bad problem. A problem that a government, which does not guaranty a future for those who try, can not deal with. The second was to allow individuals "in the know" to buy bad property cheap and sell it high: Long Shanks. He will always foster that sense of betrayal, that inner city Black's feel toward those Blacks who try to rise out of the inner city. Not betrayal that some were left behind, but betrayal that most got out. It is the Black America of the middle class which breaths life into the rationalizations that inner city Blacks use to justify an attitude which makes them victims of the system. It is up to Black leaders and more importantly, the Black community at large, to tell it like it is; and whether you want to hear it or not, you Black men must now face the fact that Black women have already been given the go ahead to leave you behind. In the late 1990's, "Oprah" would promote a movie for television that would promote the idea that it is finally acceptable for Black women to choose a "White" male partner if a suitable Black man can not be found. As our Socialist system raises Black women up to economic independence through affirmative action, they are now free to consider their social and economic peers, along with their racial ones, as mates.

Finally; on the subject of Black youth in America, there is a movement under way on many of our university campuses to write into the school rules, a provision. This new standard would make the use of such hateful words as "Nigger" an offence punishable by expulsion. It is a word that has no place in our

*George Bailey*

culture, other than in a retrospective context. It is a word that cries out “Look at me. I am a bigot; and I am too insensitive and too ignorant to feel ashamed of it”. But I have heard Blacks use the word as well, as if to say, “IT is my word. I can savor its pain and ridicule it as only a word, which can not hurt me. But you ‘Whitey’, you dare not use it. You are not my kind, my fellow”. This too, is racism. This too, is bigotry. So, will Black activists demand the expulsion of Blacks for the use of this word or “Whitey”? And if we judge that this word be erased from our memory, then what of the word “boy”? I was about to end the previous paragraph by saying “Call a spade a spade”; a saying which is completely appropriate in any context which does not include Blacks. So should we then say that it is the way in which the word is used in a sentence. Who among us will determine what was in your heart when you referred to your class mate as being a “Jew”, or perhaps “Gay”: because it is a short and certain step to outlawing such offensive words as “faggot” and “Kike”. The list can only grow. And if government is asked to make it the “Law of the land”, it will almost certainly oblige with all the words suggested: because the more people who can be put outside the law, the fewer there are protected by it. There will always be hurtful words and people eager to use them. It is a lesson of life, and college is as good a place to face it as any, and the very best of environments for turning such behavior around.

Native Americans: for over a hundred years they have been lost, waiting for an apology from the American public; a public that they refer to as White. It was an apology that didn’t begin until Hollywood movie writers began to reveal an American history which our government schools did not provide. Our image of them, and indeed, their image of themselves, seems to be one of long haired horsemen, living as one with the land. But long hair was world fashion at the time. Our founding fathers all had pony tails; “Custer” had shoulder length hair: and horses never existed on this continent until the Spanish landed in the south in the sixteenth century. It’s as though Native Americans have been treading water for the last century, unable to go back, and unwilling to move on. If I seem to lack compassion, it’s not intentional. I can hear the music of “Gary Owen” in the movie “Little Big Man” in my head: and in my mind’s eye I can see the way it must have been. I am ashamed before God that any man could do what was done to Native Americans because I am a man, and because it is the way of mankind. In 1891, at a place called “Wounded Knee”, some three hundred Native Americans were, more or less, murdered by the US Cavalry. Members of the regiment were given the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is almost certain, to my mind, that the medals were given out to mask the truth: to reinforce the notion that it had been a battle waged against a dangerous foe, rather than the slaughter of innocents. This is how governments through the ages have covered their tracks and how democracies do what they deem necessary without making its people feel responsible or invoking their condemnation. It’s how we were

convinced that we should fight the communist threat in Vietnam. It's how we put the people of Columbia in a cross fire between drug lords and government forces, because we can't face our drug problem. It's how President Clinton could continue the practice while telling those who grow tobacco here at home that they have done nothing wrong; while He was going after those who sell the tobacco. It's how we end up supporting sadistic, crooked, dictators like Marcos in the Philippines: ones like the Shaw of Iran and even Saddam Hussein in Iraq, to control world power. A hundred years from now Americans [including Native Americans] can look back in horror at what has been done around the world in their name and feel the same sense of guilt we now feel with regard to the native peoples of America. Or like one Native American spokesmen, they can rewrite history and claim that Native Americans never fought amongst themselves. They can sigh that because their language had no word for warrior, that no warriors existed. And being politically correct, We will not raise the issue that there was no need of the word, as the word man was synonymous with the words brave and warrior. But what will it accomplished? Has a century of mourning made the Native American peoples whole once more, or just more bitter? Those who were lost so long ago were pushed out of their land by people who had been forced out of theirs, in Europe. Those were the wrongs suffered and committed by our ancestors. They can not be righted. They are in the past. If we look back upon the Native American experience with an open mind it is not hard to imagine the political workings of the time. It is not hard to imagine an eastern press that suppressed news of atrocities committed against "Indians", while at the same time, playing up the most insignificant retaliation from the Native American quarter. Nor is it hard to imagine a military, answerable to the American people, broadcasting untruths of the unsavory deeds committed in the remoteness of the American west. But, to be fair, we must remember that the land barons who controlled the range lands of the country's "Manifest Destiny" were not so much "White" as they were powerful. That is to say, that they used the law, the government and in particular, the military, to rout White "Squatters" in much the same way as they did the Native Americans. The railroads, in a successful attempt to inhabit the territories it either owned or controlled, pitted the races against each other by bringing settlers west. Settlers were sold a rational of ignorance, fear and entitlement in the eastern press. "Go west young man" they were told. These immigrants were being exploited by the power brokers of the East and baited by the promised chance in the West. They were exonerated by the church and manipulated by the government and the press. It was the fact that it is man's nature to fear and reject that which is different, that was exploited to bring about the demise of the Native Americans. It was power and government, rather than the "White" man. It was time and history, rather than Christopher Columbus. In that sense, it was inevitable.

*George Bailey*

Jefferson had anticipated that it would take one hundred generations to move the country to the Pacific. In his agrarian utopia, people were freed by the land that they owned. The Native American culture would be fused with the European/American culture over time: evolving. His dream and the vision of his contemporaries would be laid to waste by the emergence of Capitalism, as it manifest itself in the industrial revolution. If you look for answers in a religious context, it may have been in preparation for the rise of the unholy powers that would spring to life four hundred years to the future in the Third Reich: or perhaps a counter balance to the birth of atheism in Russia. Regardless of historical significance in relationship to the workings of the universe, it is historical fact. It is also in the past. Through the 60's and 70's America wrestled with a great deal of guilt over the truth of what happened to Native Americans. However, I think we missed the connection that the demise of the "Indian" nations was due to our allowing ourselves to be manipulated by government: a government we have an obligation to oversee. To say that the "White Man" stole the lands that belonged to the Native Americans is inaccurate. As I said before, it was the rich and the powerful that ended up with the land: just as the rich and powerful had owned the land in the countries from which the immigrants had come. The fact that they were White did have great bearing on who would be gainfully employed in the exploitation of their holdings, but even the "Homestead Act" was a way to get people to make "product" from small pieces of undeveloped land, to feed the railroad and shipping industries; not to free the masses. I apologize if my message here is illusive. But I think it can be seen if you try. I know that the history of Native Americans is as varied as the land itself. The circumstances which played on the demise of the many nations, which were the native peoples of this land, can not all be understood in the context of the western tribes. But the common thread of power is forever present. We are, all of us, exploited by the powers that be. I own no land. I was born a White male. But the only thing given me by this country as a birth right, was some small measure of opportunity. Yet, that is the greatest thing that one can hope for from a society. I feel it in my heart that men and women, of this generation at least, are prepared to afford Native Americans the same opportunities. Take them. When the horse and the iron weapons and tools of Europe were introduced on the American continent, its natives of the plains took them to their own. They did not sit teary eyed around the campfires of their forefathers and grieve for the days of stone tools and seasonal marches. Instead they became world renowned horsemen. When adversity threatened them, they put aside centuries of bloodshed between tribes to join together. Though most of them died in spite of their efforts, those who perished did so unbeaten. Over a century later the welfare state of the "Indian" nations has defeated Native Americans in a way that would have shamed those proud warriors. I ask you to honor their past. Be true to your heritage and join with all Americans in brotherhood, Red tribe and White tribe,



Black, Yellow and Brown. Help us to fight ignorance and bigotry from every quarter. Help us to master democracy for all men, in the spirit of the horsemen. Help us to learn to govern ourselves in a way that teaches the world that the rich and the powerful may not pit us against each other. Allow your children to bury the dead without offending the living. Most importantly, allow them to know God. And while I will surely offend, I must state with all humility, that if God exists, then surely He is all-powerful. If the god to whom your ancestors prayed could not deliver you, then you must ask why. I know that it will always sound presumptuous of those who profess that theirs, is the one true God. I know that those who delivered the word of God to the New World were often as imperfect and self serving as those who profess to spread the Gospel today. It is not the people who God has sent to you, it is the Word. It was the gift shared at first Thanks Giving, before power and Government seized control. It is the reward for your suffering. Take it.

The word Hispanic, as I understand it, has come to mean anyone tracing their heritage back to include Spain. I suppose, on its face, that is a step forward. That is, as all the factions of the White race are lumped together as of European decent; now all the peoples who have come here to our country from the south, and perhaps Puerto Rico, are now Hispanic. I would hope that this is part of the evolutionary process of the “Melting Pot”, distancing each individual group from their prospective countries of origin: in so doing, moving them in the direction of thinking of themselves as Americans. But we must reckon with the fact that the reasons for emigration for Hispanics are as diverse as they have been for Europeans. Many Mexican Americans have been here as long as Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California have been territories of the United States. They were annexed as war reparation; first from Santa Anna in the Texas war of independence and then as a result of the War With Mexico. In fact, many of the patriots who fought for the independence of Texas and California were pioneers from Mexico who felt no connection to the Mexican Government. Many of these people were abused by the new US political and economic power structures. Many lost their land without “Equal protection under the law”. Bitter feelings after the war, surely helped the greedy “rationalize” such actions to themselves and their countrymen. Yet these “Hispanic” Americans learned the language of their new nation, sent their children off to war to defend this country and gave themselves to the melting pot. The same can be said of those who legally immigrated here in the years that followed. But somehow it seems that many Americans lump them together with those who come here illegally, and those who would resist the notion of “One country, one language”. During the Reagan administration, millions of illegal aliens were allowed to become American citizens on the basis of having been within the country for a specified number of years. Unable to either collect their taxes or eject them, and complicated by the fact that their children [born in the US] were citizens and thereby eligible for

*George Bailey*

welfare; we simply allowed them amnesty. I am bitter about this. But I don't begrudge the immigrants. I hold the government responsible. These people came here to better themselves. The government allowed them in; invited them in; with the laughable enforcement of laws pertaining to the employment of illegal immigrants. Many of these people given amnesty had relatives who were legal citizens and who helped them evade the revolving illegal labor system. The legacy of this oppressive and immoral illegal labor system is a subculture within the Hispanic community, which is uneducated, ostracized and [because they can no longer be threaten with deportation] unwilling to work in the forced labor system. Instead, some of them turn to the government welfare system or crime. Children who don't know the English language place a heavy burden on schools and therefore classmates. Some of these factors have been modified from the time I first wrote this passage, but we still struggle with the aftermath. I can not speak to the heritage of Puerto Ricans of the east, as I am not from the east. I apologize for that. But I do know that we can not resolve the problems of the inner cities until we address the "Illegal Alien" issue. Until we bring down this government sponsored, illegal labor system and find it in our hearts to include Hispanics in the social and economic community, we will not be the America of legend. On the other side, as long as false pride kindles Hispanic anger, there will be no progress. When a group of English speaking Hispanics makes a point of speaking Spanish in the presence of a non-Spanish speaking American, it is not only reverse discrimination, it is not only rude, it is threatening. It breeds fear. Prejudice has no greater ally than fear. It is the bigot's champion. When Hispanic leaders press America to become a bilingual nation rather than pressing Hispanics to learn English, turn your back on them. They intend to oppress you to their own end. They hold you down with your pride, so you will look to them for power. They serve "Long Shanks". Become Americans and we will fight to share power together. Do not speak Spanish in your home and send your children to public schools to learn English during those hours when what they should be learning is what they will need to know in order to get their piece of the American dream. If you do, then it is you, not America, who holds your children down. It is you who enslave them and fail them. It is you who must defend your children from those forces within your own community that would enslave them. If your brother were a child molester, you would not allow him to molest your children because he was your brother. So if your brother is a gangster, how is it that you would let him promote gangs to your children? If he were to give them candy until he rotted their teeth would you not stop him? So how can you allow him to rot their brain with the rationalizations of hate and violence? You would not drink while you were pregnant; nor do drugs that would harm your fetus: don't procrastinate with regard to learning English. Don't tolerate gangs. Take control of your life. You are not as alone as you have been told.

Another long standing minority in this country is the Oriental, now called Asian, community. The Chinese, paid their right of passage into this nation in the abominable labor gangs that built the railroad lines to the west, and died in company owned gold and silver mines. The Japanese homesteaded the barren desert valleys of California, made them bloom and had them stolen away during their imprisonment in their own homeland, here, in the US, during World War II. When I think of the way these good people have been treated I feel ashamed for my country. It makes me both angry and melancholy at the same time. I wonder if they do not sometimes get tired of all the attention focused on Blacks. It is human nature to categorize. It is necessary to survival to recognize the differences between those things which are good and healthy and safe, from those that are not. It is an unfortunate side affect that we allow our natural defense mechanisms to interfere with our assessment of one another. Perhaps if we could look into one another's souls we could get past the appearances of the bodies. If history is a guide, then we as a nation will always demand a right of passage. For better or for worse, until enough of an immigrant culture has been stirred into the melting pot to make it seem familiar, there will be resistance. If we have an example of how to overcome prejudice and survive bigotry, it is certainly the Asian community to which I just referred. Their strong family units stayed in tact despite all the hardships imposed upon them. They did not turn to government, but to themselves and their own community. "Social Services" could not deny their children fathers the way they came to in the Black community. They pushed their children to become educated: taught them discipline and self respect. Go to San Francisco. Get on the public transit system, or have lunch in a Bay Area community: and when you see young, well kept and polite people, that look as though they might have just come over to vacation from Japan or China or the Philippines, set near them. Take a moment to eves drop just a little. You will hear English. Not some ghetto version of English, which lets you know that they set themselves apart: Not broken English that is a second language: Not even England's English: what you will here is American English. The English spoken on the nation's network news programs. The language, intonations and inflections that are unique to one nation on earth and spoken by one group of people: "Americans". When you here it you will know that these people do not demand equality; as do some others. They "command" it. They deserve it. And they put the burden on the rest of the nation to recognize them not only as equals, but as brothers and sisters. They do not call to their youth to languish in the past but rather they push them toward the future. Even the renowned China Town of San Francisco is only a facade for a culture which is far more American than Chinese. Theirs is a bright future if they can remain patient. Today the Governor of the State of Washington is of Asian descent, not because he is in the majority by race but because he is in the majority on the issues. These are truly great days. At the same time, there has been a flood of

*George Bailey*

Asian immigrants in the last couple of decades and it must be said that those things for which I have just given praise, are not necessarily traits which continue to be universal. For example, as the numbers of Asian immigrants has increased, the amount of autonomy has increased as well. "China Town" in San Francisco, had been a American version of Chinese Architecture, conceived of to keep the local political power structure from perpetrating a land grab upon the local Chinese community. But, at its heart, China Town, and those who were a part of it, were American. Today, the influx of emigrants, has allowed many subcultures to spring up in which no English is spoken at all. This is true of Asian communities as well. Whether government is intent on dividing us or whether it is just an unfortunate side affect of trying to make up for uneven immigration practices of the past; the outcome is the same. We, the "melting pot" of America, are being polarized into factions. It is understandable that the first generation of an immigrant family will speak poor English, buy from merchants who share a common heritage and contribute new ideas to the culture we call American. But when the circle is closed and remains closed, it is racist. That is the lesson of a democracy. That is the truth which was embraced by those who died in the Civil War. It is the truth which was reaffirmed by those who marched and those who died and the who suffered public scorn and economic loss in the Civil Rights movement. And I would argue, that it is a lesson that "White" America has attempted to live up to in both of those struggles.

When I was a child, we had an alley out back that led up the hill to a convenience store a couple of blocks away. It was the 1955 equivalent of today's convenience store except that it was owned by a family, not a "chain". As with any such store, you pay more for the convenience. Today we accept that without question, but in 1955 the "Super Market" was a new concept. More importantly, people without an understanding of the cost of doing business, don't immediately grasp why prices must, of necessity, be inflated in a convenience store. What's more, they are not likely to care to know. So when my mother forgot something at the "Super Market", she would send me up the street for the milk or the loaf of bread, or whatever. She would send to the "Jew" store.

Some time in the last decade of the twentieth century, my seventy some year old uncle is sitting with a group of in-laws at a dinner engagement, when he uses the phrase, "He Jewed them down". As if that weren't bad enough, one of them was Jewish. Within the generation of my parents it is not impossible to hear a reference to Blacks as "Colored". It is even possible to hear the "N" word sneak out from between wrinkled lips. But it is not something condoned by my generation, nor defended much by theirs. Still, there is a distinction here that should be made. It is quite delicate, so keep your mind and your ears open.

There have always been Christians within the Jewish race. There have never, to my understanding, been any Christians within the Jewish religion, once Christ

died on the cross. The Gospel, which preaches universal brotherhood, is outside the realm of the Jewish religious context. I'm not saying that the Ten Commandments don't convey and nurture brotherhood; they do. What I am saying, is that the Jewish community is, by its own desire, a community "apart". Within the scope of that community there is a trait, a practice, which is NOT confined to the Jewish community. This characteristic practice is based on the idea that money brought into the community must not leave the community. It is implemented by giving better deals to those within your sphere of influence, than those outside it. The result, in the real world, is that; a business which enjoys a captive customer base, [Jews buying from Jews first] is free to deal or not deal with those outside that system. This "Leverage", while practiced in many forms, by many groups: is well understood within the Jewish community. In fact, they are so freely associated with the practice of using such leverage, that the verb "To Jew" found its way into Americana, along with "Scotch" and "Dutch". Scotch meant to be so frugal; so cheap, as to buy nothing that wasn't a bargain. When "Scotch Tape" came on the scene, everyone understood what was implied and no one was accused of being out of line. To go "Dutch" implies that you're too cheap to pay your date's way, or too independent to have your way paid. Yet, you could hear the expression on the nightly news and think nothing of it. Are you getting this? When my ill advised uncle said he "Jewed someone down", he was referring to a character trait associated with the Jewish People. I don't know if the people who owned the convenience store of my youth were Jews. They didn't speak Yiddish or broken English. My mother was referring to the inflated prices. She felt that they had her over a barrel and were taking advantage of the situation. Was it a trait that does not apply? I don't think so. I think it does indeed apply. Was it an undesirable trait? Absolutely? Insider Trading, Restriction of Trade, Trust, Monopoly; these are all legal terms to prevent that sort of thing. This kind of system within a system is like the "Good Old Boy" network. Women's groups promote it among women. Blacks promote it among Blacks. Asian Americans have long used the practice. So what is this curious mix? It is rationalization. We denounce the "Good Old Boys" network openly because it is associated with White males even though, in fact, it is the wealthy, or in cases such as unions, it is the friends and relatives of members. That denunciation is politically correct. At the same time, minorities and women can promote the practice for themselves and be seen as in the right. As for the Jewish community: they, like the Scotch and the Dutch, so embodied the characteristic trait that, for a time, the trait itself bore their name. They still refuse to understand what God sent Jesus down to instruct. In a land that professes to struggle for freedom, equality and brotherhood, they still can find justification [rationalization] for their separatism within the walls of their synagogues. But it is currently politically incorrect and socially unacceptable to associate their name with such practices. Oddly enough, I have even heard a television Character, who is

*George Bailey*

supposed to be Jewish, sight that his apprehension about meeting his girl friend family stems from his belief that they will blame him for the death of Christ. In fact, any Christian should know, that had the Jews not allowed the “ROMANS” to crucify Jesus, no Gentile could ever have been saved. Therefore, if this individual of Jewish heritage finds himself ostracized by an individual who is not Jewish; either that person has no understanding of Christianity and should therefore not care about Christ, or they are non-Christian who uses that excuse to dislike those who they associated with the Verb “To Jew”. For, to be a Christian, one must explain to those that do not understand, what it is that the Gospel is teaching. And while they may find themselves frustrated by those who will not see, if they are to be Christians, it is their Cross to Bear that they are to be as tolerant as possible; even in the face of their own disapproval.

I will not move from this thought without saying what I have said before in this book: finding fault with something within the Jewish community or the Jewish religion is in no way to be construed as cause to discriminate against them. It has been my intention to find fault within our society where ever it exists. As it turns out, that included just about every one and everything in our society. The objective of this work is to call people together, not to divide them. Don’t accuse me of anything I have not done. Please!!!

Along these same lines of thought, I have a friend whose wife is Hispanic. She works with a Black woman who lives in Oakland Ca., in a section of town that is not safe. The husband of the Black woman generally has no steady job. Because my friend’s wife is Latino, and therefore one of the down-trodden masses, the woman feels free to expound on the philosophy of the ghetto. Not too long ago the woman confided to my friend’s wife that she was worried for the safety of her children in the neighborhood in which they live. My friend’s wife asked why she and her husband don’t move to a safer neighborhood. The woman told her that she believed that all neighborhoods in America are that bad. She has decided not to leave the “Hood” in Oakland. Her husband, as I understand it, gets by on what he can scam, and blames “Whitey” for his situation.

This is the profile of one minority subculture within our country today. It is Blacks who are killing Blacks within the ghettos of Oakland California. Still, because of the pressures to protect self-esteem, it is Middle Class Whites upon whom this need for a scapegoat is projected. This rationalization is so strong that the woman I have just described, sees the whole world as being as violent as her own, in order to divest her guilt. And why would she have guilt you ask? She must protect the image she holds of her husband or she has chosen poorly for herself and her children. Either the world is to blame for all of his problems, or he is just another racist who uses his own set of rationalizations to justify his failures. She has chosen to see the world as a place in which she and all those around her are helpless to make things better and therefore not responsible. She

and her man are free to hate and to fail. Just as the Jewish community is free to discriminate in business but incapable of being bigoted by virtue of their status; the Black community of the ghetto is free to hate, steal from, or even kill on the basis of race, without being racist. That is, of course, unless the victim is Jewish, which brings other considerations into play. Most importantly though, all minority kids; be they minority by virtue of religion or race or even gender, are being taught the art of rationalization at home, in the media and at school. They are not being taught to seek the truth. They are not being taught how to protect their self-esteem through the power of prayer and forgiveness. Instead, they are becoming the masters of self-denial. They are gaining the ability to refrain from thought which is contradictory to the "Agenda" and the expertise to rationalize those things which can not be explained within what is "Politically Correct". This is the formula for Facets Italy. This is the blueprint for Hitler's Germany. Perhaps it is the "New World Order".

I would say to all those minorities and factions which have sprung up along political, racial, and ethnic and gender lines; that you can not point to Archie Bunker, who has done the best he knows how, to live up to the promise of America and Democracy; while you foster circles within the circle and cultures within the culture. If it is not wrong for the Asian Community to form subcultures and closed loop economies; then it is not wrong for Blacks to promote the same thing within their communities: and in fact, that is what is currently being promoted. And if it is fair for Asians and Blacks and Hispanics and Women; then it should surely not be a bad thing for Jews or Hindus. And if it is fair and correct that all these peoples be allowed to work together to support their own groups, then surely it must be fare for the "Good Old Boys" to exempt anyone who is not "WHITE" and "MALE" from theirs. But, what we have learned as a nation, over the last two hundred and twenty five years of our youth, as a Nation; One Nation, Under God, Indivisible, With Liberty And Justice For All; is that, it is wrong. So I must now challenge you to be as good Americans as those you have for so long chastised. Equality through brotherhood is our goal. It must be.

I had occasion to work with a young man back in the early 90's: he was about twenty, and White. Our situation allowed us five-minute chats, without interruption, three or four times a day. I tried to get a feeling from him about just what it was his friends and he were thinking: how they viewed the world and the times. I shared with him some of the opinions I have shared with you in this book. Then one day, quite out of the blue, he said that he hated Blacks, [he didn't call them Blacks]. He began by saying that they were more difficult to get along with than "Mexicans": that "Mexicans" had always been portrayed on television as being hard working. His example, of all people, was the gardener on "Father Knows Best". I guess he had caught a rerun. I told him that it had been my

*George Bailey*

personal experience that it was easier for me to get to know Blacks. Maybe it's because part of my youth was spent in a predominantly Black middle class neighborhood. Maybe because all the Blacks I meet speak English. Then he sighted the "Black Panthers". Now, he was much too young to know what they were all about; so I reckoned that there must be some outside influence involved in his thinking. He sighted a particularly distressing murder which had been perpetrated by a couple of Black men: and when he asked me if I wasn't offended by the murders. I answered that, yes, I was indeed offended, but because they were murderers, not because they were Blacks. I asked him if he was afraid of Blacks. He answered "No. I have a lot of 'White' friends". It was at that moment that I realized that he was one of America's new breed of Nazis. His "White" friends were probably "Skin Heads". It was a chilling thought. Up to that moment I had seen some promise for the future in our talks. He had been interested in discussing virtually every thing that came up during our conversations. He had considered many of the problems facing us today. He had some ideas of his own and he was open to new ones. But on this issue concerning the Black race, his mind had shut down. He was reacting to his fear over his intellect. He was just plain scared. We're all scared. Why shouldn't we be? The country is coming apart at the seams for all the reasons I've spoken of and more. The good, honest, hardworking Blacks, who are stuck in the inner city with those murderers and rapists and muggers and drug dealers, are scared too. The same is true of all poor and middle-income families of all colors, including Whites. And that fear is spreading. But we can not react to fear over intellect. Before, I told you about the difference between Communism the Economic System and Communism the "Red Menace". There is another word that used to get used a lot when I was growing up. The word is "Fascism". It refers to a political ideology that was shared by Hitler's Germans and the Italians under Mussolini. The Germans of pre-World War Germany were in many ways like Americans today. Their economic problems had seen the emergence of a society in moral decay. In the 1970's the movie "Cabaret" would glorify the type of moral decline from which the most radical of Germans would build a consensus of hatred. In Italy, Mussolini would gather up legions of angry youths and incarcerate the members of the "Black Hand" [or Italian Mafia, which gave rise to our own Mafia] that controlled the country through lawlessness. It would be the conquering Americans who would ultimately reinstate the old "Black Hand" and leave post war Italy to suffer the problem anew. The problem with the Fascist was not that they disapproved of lawlessness and a loss of morality. It was that they were so self-righteous, that they became far more intolerant, far more lawless and immoral than those they had gone after. Intolerance and violence, self-righteousness and injustice: these were the traits that characterized Fascism. Today We speak of being "Politically Correct". This is a minor manifestation of Fascism. Are We being pushed in that direction? Are Gays given a voice and



political power over us just to insight our anger? Are the races pitted against each other to some predictable end by those who will seize power when We have given up all our rights to become Politically Correct? I have no idea. But I do fear where We are heading.

It has always amazed me that people think of themselves in terms of the country they came from, rather than as Americans. The fact is that, nearly everyone who came to this country had been rejected by their homeland. Some of my lineage traces back to people who were sent to Ireland from England in a religiously motivated folly that gave birth to the Irish Republican Army. They were booted out of there, in time to come over here, to fight in the revolution. The pilgrims came here to escape religious persecution; many of the first English were sent here as punishment; the Blacks were often times sold into slavery by rival Africans or even their own kings. The Chinese, Japanese and all those who hail from the Pacific Rim, as well as Europeans and South Americans; all left for America because they found themselves at the very bottom of their “Mother” or “Father” land’s socio-economic ladder. “Their people” were oppressing them either politically, religiously or economically. As for the Native Americans: from the round faced peoples of the north, to the bandy little peoples of the southwest: racism existed in American long before the White man set foot on shore. Had it not been there for the French and the English to exploit, this country may never have come to be. In Hawaii, the fair skinned men were adored. The prejudice had to be learned. It is not true to the Polynesian heritage. Had it not been for slavery and the European ideology of conquest over the land, America may have looked a great deal more like those days at “Woodstock”: people and peoples banded together against the storm; basking in their freedom in harmony and tolerance. But it didn’t happen that way. There’s no use worrying about the past. We need rather to deal with the present.

“Women; can’t live with them, can’t live without them”. It’s an old, old joke; but for Americans, more than perhaps any other culture in history [save maybe that lot Down Under], the prospect of living without them was feared the most. It was men, for the most part, who carved a niche into this country that a White “Lady” could be asked to share. A native American wife; while subservient and perhaps better prepared for the conditions of frontier living, could only bear children who would be looked down upon by both races. As unfortunate and feeble minded as that is, it was still the case. So as the rigors of child bearing and primitive living conditions took their toll on the limited White female population, White women were elevated to a prized static. Now I can hear you saying that the term “prized” somehow denoted ownership. Well, it does in the sense that two people joined together in marriage do belong to each other in our culture. It’s true that a double standard on sexual activity existed openly. But then the facts of the time were that infidelity on the part of the wife could leave a man supporting

*George Bailey*

someone else's offspring. The reverse was not necessarily true. Equally important to the thinking of the day was the fact that women who were still in their childbearing years, who were at risk of complication involving childbirth, had no birth control measures at their disposal other than abstinence. This too reinforced the notion that men's extramarital affairs could be rationalized. It was also true, and relevant, that women of the day were often more devoted to God than men. It's the nature of powerless people to be more religious. The balance present in a home of that kind was the empathy one learns for others when the one you love most in the world [your mother] is one of the powerless. Yet to say that women were powerless within the home flies in the face of reality. It was what made them better, warmer and more forgiving; and more worthy of society's protection than men. This reverence for women [which I suspect finds its roots in European Chivalry] was carried into the twentieth century. With the appearance of the "Suffragette" movement, American males gave into the wishes of American women at large. It did not happen over night. But it must be remembered that even many of the women of the day resisted the involvement of women in the voting place. They saw politics as corrupt and corrupting. They saw woman as a counter balance to the forces around them, not as a competing force. There were no women beaten or shot in the street during their fight for equality. Over time and with a little kicking and screaming on the part of men: and a few women martyrs jailed and on hunger strikes, man gave in to the woman's right to vote. "And well they should" you say. Well yes, of course, by today's standards. But it should be noted that it was White women who got the vote. The organization of women's suffrage turned its back on its Black, allied, women in order to get the votes they needed. It was the first political act performed by the politically organized women of America. Just as the female opponents of suffrage had feared, it had showed no more virtue than the male politics of the day. The corruption of politics had corrupted the women who engaged in them.

No culture valued the rights of woman more than the America of that time, at that time. But it was men who did the fighting and the dying in war, and therefore it was thought that men should elect those who declared war. It was World War II that changed women in America into the cast we see today. With men off fighting in Europe and the Pacific, women were doing the work at home. Much more importantly, getting the paychecks. It was that financial independence that was changing American women. After the war, when the men came home and the women went back to being mothers and homemakers: things were never quite the same as they had been a generation or two before. On the one hand, the life of the housewife was being transformed by such things as washing machines, dryers, permanent press cloths, gas and electric ranges and ovens, electric mixers and dishwashers. Compared to her grandmother, who may not have even had indoor plumbing; life was good. Meanwhile, over this same half century that

liberated women from the drudgery of their home; this same mechanical revolution was still grinding men down. At the turn of the twentieth century, man worked to the speed of the river and the horse. By 1950 the assembly line was a tradition. It ate people up and spit them out. So, while women [with or without children] were finding themselves with more and more spare time, poor Jack was becoming a worn out, dull boy. Now “Jack” was very insecure in the 1950’s. He had been raised in the “Great Depression”, and greeted manhood in the face of WWII. He wanted stability. His wife was less and less satisfied with so much spare time and saving for the future. She no longer had the “fear of flying” in the work place, thanks to WWII. Perhaps even more crucial was the fact that in the doomsday atmosphere of WWII, and with the advent of better contraceptive measures [the condom] readily available, there had been a marked change in sexual morays. It should be noted that the double standard, which had sprung, at least in part, from a lack of contraception was eroding. Free now to get a job and change sexual partners, women in the 50’s pushed for divorce rights in the courts and in the church. Money-grubbing lawyers were eager to accommodate and the church caved in. All this dissatisfaction with middle class roles was being subliminally piped into the psyche of the “Baby Boom” generation; setting the stage for upheaval in the 60’s. It may very well have been the emergence of “Twiggy” that marked the beginning of the new “Women’s Movement” in America. In her wake the “Classic” nude sculptures and paintings of centuries past become outdated. The warm, solid, robust image was being replaced with a racier, more streamline model, built for speed. It was a skinny little model named Twiggy who personified the shift. Motherhood and stability had been fine-tuned to the art of bridge clubs and soap operas in the eyes of middle class girls. With the same sort of miss guided adolescent fervor that young Middle American men were using to reject their father’s values, young women were turning their backs on motherhood. Homemaking was no way to right the wrongs of the world. Only by finding their place in the system could they affect the kind of changes necessary. When the fledgling “Women’s Movement” insisted on equal pay for equal work, the whole country seemed to be in favor of it. We had seen great strides made in equal rights for minorities and we were eager to right this wrong as well. The emancipation of women was a strange and wonderful thing for a generation of young men who, up to then, had to promise love and marriage for sexual favor. One needed only to show respect in order to be granted privilege [providing there was mutual attraction]. On the other hand, speaking negatively of “Liberation” was social and political suicide. I don’t think we had any idea how far a field the “leaders” of the movement would take us. I remember a study that was done some time in the mid 60’s that alleged that if you followed an average American house wife around for a year and then hired professionals to do the tasks that she had done, that it would cost roughly as much as a middle class house. It has always bothered me that the growing “liberation” movement

*George Bailey*

of the time used this study to illustrate the value and capability of women in the home, while at the same time baiting those same women to devalue the profession of homemaker. They somehow convinced them that competition with men would be more fulfilling than partnership with them.

According to “Webster’s” dictionary, the term “Careerist” means “a person interested chiefly in his own professional ambitions to the neglect of other things”. I think it’s interesting that the generation of the baby boom who had rejected their fathers, for putting job and material wealth above family, were now embracing those same qualities in their wives. It would not be fair to place blame exclusively on women. All the men of our generation, who had thought it so easy to equal the achievements of their fathers, were now finding it difficult to measure up. The glut of new labor from the baby boom, in a stagnant economy, was taking wages down. Interest rates and inflation were on the increase. Many men encouraged or even insisted that their wives go out and earn a paycheck. Riding the crest of all this, as with any “movement”, were the leaders of the “Feminists”. The magazine publishers, the speechmakers, the organizational heads and the book writers, were getting rich and powerful promising anything women wanted to hear. Interestingly enough, that same 1950’s edition of Webster’s dictionary that I used to find the definition of careerist, didn’t even list career as a word. It was a notion thought up and promoted by the Feminist movement in a time when people simply had jobs. Advertising jumped on the bandwagon as well. Women still did most of the shopping and as they came into their own financially, banks and automobile manufacturers catered to the Feminist fantasy as well. Government followed suit with more and more legislation. Lawyers found new opportunities to raid corporate America in feminist litigation. The problem was and is, that it is all unrealistic. It was and still is, a sham. Fire departments, police forces and contractors and manufacturers, unable to find qualified women for positions within their organizations, had to lower standards. A one-man fireman’s ladder was simply renamed a “two man ladder”. A one hundred-pound lifting minimum capability was now a fifty-pound minimum lifting capability. Weight and height requirements were lowered and as the standards were lowered for woman, they had to be lowered for men as well. White males were now losing jobs to women in the same way they had lost them to Black men. The difference was that the minority positions based on race, had a good chance of training unqualified Blacks, Hispanics and others to be qualified. Qualifying women meant finding a larger breed of women. The sad part is that, primary income fathers were losing their jobs to secondary income mothers or young women with no family at all.

With the right of self-determination comes responsibility. Yet, if a married woman becomes pregnant, the Feminist would argue that it is her choice alone whether or not to have the child. They say that society must allow her an abortion

on demand, regardless of her husband's wishes. They say that if a single woman becomes pregnant, she may enjoy the same prerogatives but she may make the male liable for her choice to keep the child and exclude him from participation in that choice: even if he would like to take custody of the child she does not want.

If the women of this country feel that returning motherhood to its former position of stature is to take a step backward, then let me remind you of what you have lost. When I was a young man we were involved in an insane war in Vietnam. The culture that we engaged in battle had no special regard for the lives of their women and children. To the contrary, the life of a woman in Asia had, and still has, less value than a man's. In China, where couples are allowed only one child, we now have learned that many girl babies were drowned by their own parents; or were abandoned to state run orphanages, where they were bound and left to starve to death, by their "Care" workers. The awful truth of the war was that young American men had to learn to kill women and perhaps even children to defend their own lives. It is something that we were never able to reconcile as a nation and the cause of much anguish for our veterans. It drove a wedge between our people and made us all a little less humane than we had been before. We sent women to war in the "Gulf", and while they performed admirably, it marked the death of Chivalry in America. You can't remain on a pedestal in a party gown when you make your living in army boots. In the early 90's, marketing analysts were saying that in order to reach women in the 90's they had to represent them as what they were not because no one seemed to know what they wanted to be. Men are having the same kind of identity problems with regard to what women want them to be. There's an older movie you may remember by the name of "The Electric Horseman". It starred Jane Fonda and Robert Redford. Redford plays a washed up rodeo star who lost his wife to being a great cowboy but a poor husband. He steals an expensive horse that, like himself, is having any purpose there might be in his life, squandered for the sake of an image on a breakfast food cereal box. In his attempt to free the horse and himself from the lie they are living, he becomes a hero; a champion larger than life. This is due almost entirely to the efforts of a sharp, gutsy reporter played by Fonda. As this world class journalist follows him on his quest, they come to love and respect each other. But in the end, when his crusade has ended, and he becomes simply a humble man; it becomes obvious that a lasting relationship between the two has no chance. She is, in fact, autonomous. Without his exploits to feed the career that is her life, he has nothing to offer. The women's groups, that emerged from the inequalities still present in the 1960's, gave up on the idea of equality long ago. It is autonomy that they seek. Is that what you women of America want? The Orientals have a sign they call the "Yin Yang". It represents the fact that all things in nature are equally and appositely opposed; good and bad, love and hate, up and down, hot and cold. Yet, in the unity of their opposition there is a wholeness, a oneness. As with all things in nature and the

*George Bailey*

heavens, their bond is circular, complete and never ending. The relationship between man and woman is such a bond. Sheltered from the forces of the outside world, women of centuries past were able to hold out the light to each new generation. Men forced to survive in the real world were seduced by the darker side of life such as war, greed, the lust for power and all the temptations of the market place. The promise of the fulfillment of Man's potential to love himself, the world around him and the people in it; lay within the home with the Mothers of the world. But motherhood, Womanhood, was a drudgery of cooking, cleaning, spinning, mending; leaving care and nursing to wait its turn. With the modernization of American households, the opportunity had come to for mothers to lavish themselves upon their children. Unfortunately the mothers of the forties and fifties were caught unprepared. The training they received as children was a legacy from those days of plane life and hard work. The schools concentrated on home making rather than child development. They were still good mothers to be sure. June Cleavers and Donna Reeds did exist regardless of what the cynics say. They just weren't quite as "perky". But in the 60's and in the decades since, there was a feeling that the world was coming apart. The stereotypical bridge games and days of the country club seemed so flippant as to turn young women away from the role of housewife. The hypocrisy of not being allowed to smoke Marijuana while middle class American mothers were being given powerful prescription drugs to help them cope with the stresses of every day life, only added to the disenchantment. But few through history have made any lasting or significant change on the world. When the women of America flooded into the work place, the greatest changes they caused were in themselves. They did however have a devastating affect on physical standards, expensive accommodation and lower individual income by virtue of a glut in labor. The result has been a giant step backward for the children who, once again wait their turn behind the chores of daily life. Imagine the army of open minds that could have been fostered had the children been the focus of all that revolutionary fervor. Imagine the democracy and the free market system we would live in if children had been read to, talked with and educated to be consumers of goods rather than "Name" brands and images; and voters for issues rather than rhetoric and "Sound Bite". You can not pass legislation to put a Mother in a home, but you can create it to remove them. Today we stand at a crossroads. The women of the press and those who fear their reprisals, would have us build another institution to their ambition. They would promise us a PhD psychologist for every three children in day care if only we would force government to provide it. It is a pipe dream. It is an economic impossibility. And in the pursuit of it, the cost will cause those few mothers and fathers, who have gone without in order to provide a home life for their kids, to leave their home for the work force as well. It will take monies from the elderly, it will take monies from education and it will still not fill the void. Only a Parent can love their child to the degree required. It

is not a job for a PhD. Children understand and appreciate the effort above the result. When children are small they will believe that Mommy must work in order to make ends meet; but as they grow, they begin to weigh the possessions against what they have been denied. Look around you and see if your scales balance.

Not all women abandoned the role of housewife in order to pursue “career”. The deterioration of the American economy has plagued us since the early 70’s and caused many to seek work in order to help their husbands. In fact, many men in this country refused or were unable to carry the weight alone. At the end of WWII, Europe and Japan Lay in ruin. Their factories were destroyed. Their infrastructure obliterated. The Soviet Union had become a closed society. At the same time we held a surplus. Many government installations were simply given over to private enterprise. The whole world was rebuilding and we were poised to fill the demand. We were way out in front. With each new demand made by workers and government, we simply passed the cost on to the vanquished. Life was good and easy. Every middle class American family could afford a new car, a house, presents at Christmas and two weeks vacation by car. We grew to believe it was a birth right. But as those other parts of the world began to recover, it became more and more difficult to measure up to the standards and milestones of the generation before. We asked too much and when we failed, we enlisted our wives to pull with us.

Not everyone wants to raise children. I have a great deal of respect for those who know that about themselves. They should not be expected to bear the weight of those who feel that children are necessary in order that they might “have it all”. Make your choice and make your own sacrifices. At the same time the education of the next generation is of important to all of us, as they hold the future. It is into their hands that we must ultimately entrust ourselves in our old age. To see that they do not go hungry or without medical attention is demanded of all of us by basic humanity. But the day to day care and nurturing and guidance necessary to raise up health happy human beings is the soul responsibility of the parents. If you are not prepared to commit to that responsibility, then refrain from bringing them into the world or at least give them into the care of someone who is willing and happy to provide for them. If, on the other hand, you are ready; then choose a mate for the sake of your family. Spend more time research your spouse than you would a house or a car. Find someone as committed as yourself and commit to each other. When my wife and I first married we both worked. Her money was hers. Mine was mine. We each contributed from our own accounts. It was a difficult bridge for her to cross: giving up her financial independence for the sake of our future as a family. In some families it is the wife who handles the finances. In some it is the husband. Without a partnership in finance, how can there be a partnership in life. To be

*George Bailey*

“ONE” takes trust on one side and accountability on the other. Would you begin a family with a man that you knew would abuse your children? Then why would you begin a life with one who would deprive them of their mother in order to find financial security? And should he fail to provide for you in the manner that you think you deserve, be content that he does his best. Praise his efforts and gauge his results by the children you have made a home for together. Find your sense of pride in your family and he will find his in you. I ask the women of America to listen to their hearts rather than the leaders of the women’s movement. Ask yourself if the women in congress represent the people, or do they only represent women: and if so, is that all women, or just working women.

In 1991 “Sixty Minutes” aired a program concerning badly run abortion clinics where a woman became a “vegetable” as a result of the operation. The clinic remained open in spite of multiple irregularities. In fact, there were only eleven states that regulated abortion clinics at all. When they interviewed a spokes-woman for a women’s organization [a pro-choice organization], she admitted that they were not only aware of this woman’s story, but were anxious to keep from becoming a well known story, because news of it might work against their cause. If you have an unwanted pregnancy before age twenty, or even age twenty two; you will be free of your child rearing responsibilities by age forty: and as I have learned with its passing, forty is not the end of your life. To have a child simply inhibits a young woman’s ability to have a career. Women do not die for lack of a career. Unfortunately, many babies do, in their mother’s pursuit of one. It is true that caring for a baby without the benefit of a husband is a hardship for both mother and child. The leaders of the women’s movement would have us set aside jobs and aid for women who find themselves alone as head of a household. They sight their concern for the family. But if it is the family we endeavor to protect, why don’t these defenders of the family push to insure jobs for men who head families on their own? If they are so pro-family, why not protection for married heads of households as well? Because it would be unfair. Because we choose our path in life. “You pays your money and you takes you chances”. We do not insure good paying jobs by virtue of family size because it would simply encourage big families. When we use the argument that special accommodation must be made for “Single women, Heads of household”, we encourage single women to remain single heads of household. Why then are we surprised to see young inner city women becoming pregnant and going on welfare when having a baby gets them their own apartment free of their mother’s rules: and their very own welfare check. I believe in fair pay, safe working conditions and freedom of choice as to when you leave: equal opportunity based on ability. When I was young and my hair was past my shoulders, I insisted that my employer take me as I was. When minorities fail to conform out of defiance they do the same thing. With all the rhetoric of equality between the sexes, I never heard a cry for a law that punished for discrimination on the basis of the



length of men's hair: and with good reason. If you want to be part of a team, you must be a team player. Long hair on men signified defiance at the time. When minorities use anti-discrimination laws to enable them to hold jobs in defiance, they simply fuel prejudice, and hurt their own. The same is true of women. And don't look to government for the truth about the performance of women in the work place. To speak the truth is political suicide, and it doesn't serve the government's agenda. Government is more than willing to take over the role of guardian to your children. It will build great bureaucracies to the task. In 1991 the women of Russia gave birth upon an assembly line of the state. They are drugged into an altered state, given a seven inch appeazotomy, injected with drugs to induce contractions and if the baby should hesitate, its mother's ribs will be contracted, until broken if need be, to evict the "States" newest comrade. It may be up to a week before she sees the child again. Bonding is not necessary when men, women and children are all Comrades." Let the system nurture them".

When the Gulf War was over in 1991 General Schwarzkopf was interviewed by Barbara Walters; One of America's best known Women journalist. She asked him how the women in our armed forces did in the war. He answered that they preformed admirably. I'm sure they did, on the high tech playing field. He also mentioned that one drove a truck. Five years later America would see an interview with a female pilot that was shot down and subsequently molested. It must be said that her attitude was remarkably circumvent. But Schwarzkopf sidestepped the fact that the Kuwait Theater was not a battle of soldiers on foot. He resisted mentioning that, at his height and weight, that it would be unrealistic to assume that his physical equal existed any were in the female ranks of the combined armed forces. He skimmed passed the fact that, with water at a premium in the desert, many females were allowed to keep their hair long enough to put into a ponytail. I'm sure that the general was sincerely grateful for the job women did in the gulf. I'm equally sure that he was smart enough to keep any dissenting ideas he had to himself. If he had not, he might have spoken to the rumor that something like 70% or 80% of the nurses on one of the Gulf War's medical ships came home pregnant. He might have conjectured on what it might be like to spend a couple of weeks in a foxhole, pinned down in the desert with a woman as she came into her cycle. Or better yet, he might have asked the mothers of America, who they would prefer to stand at their son's side after the missiles had flown and the bullets had fired and the bayoneted were fixed for the final stand against a fanatical foe that wasn't so easily defeated. If women are going to be allowed equal standing with men in the armed forces, will we insist on abortion to remedy pregnancy during their tour of duty or will women be allowed this avenue of escape from the realities of military duty? And if, God help us, we face an aggressor like the Axis powers of W.W.II somewhere in the future; will you call women to service through the draft along with men? Will they be among the "grunts" who are sacrificed to the front lines, or will they be

*George Bailey*

“separate but equal”? Since the Gulf War, We have been involved in political actions in Bosnia, Somalia and Haiti. All three have been examples of “Urban Warfare”. Such conflicts do not lend themselves to the “Push Button” tactics of the War in the Gulf. It is unreasonable and unfair to deny males in the military, equal access to those areas of military duty in which females are able to excel; in order to accommodate females in those areas where they can compete.

In 1996, there was some talk about the possibility that “Affirmative Action” had out lived its usefulness. One of the programs I saw that tried to show the women’s point of view on this issue showed a young Black mother as their example of why we need Affirmative Action laws. This Black mother was somewhere in her mid, to late, twenties; as near as I could tell. Her two sons I guessed to be around eight and ten years of age [maybe younger]. The woman said that she was stretched to the breaking point. She worked a job, which she got, presumably, through an Affirmative Action program. She was going to school at night, which left her exhausted, [and that schooling, presumably came to her through another Affirmative action program]. She also alluded to the fact that without further assistance she would not be able to provide care for her children, so I assume that some other Affirmative action program provides day care for her children; who just happen to be boys.

So where have we invested our efforts with regard to this example, that “Affirmative Action” has held up in its own defense? Are we providing a home, which includes a family setting for these two young boys? Indeed not. In fact, if we fail to provide a dwelling for them in an upper middle class neighborhood, they are more than likely to find the family love and protection they NEED, in a neighborhood gang because when Mom isn’t working, she’s at school. Will the education we are supplying for free to this woman, at the expense of tax payers the same age as this women; taxpayers who might also wish higher education but have chosen a more constructive path: Will this mother’s education help her children? No. It only takes her away from them during those years when they need her most. By the time she graduates they will be teenagers. Their interests will be outside the home. It will be too late to teach them right from wrong if their mother was unable to get the message across. It will be too late to build their self-esteem and their self worth when their mother has chosen to try to improve her’s at the expense of theirs.

So when we have finished; when we have paid her way; we will have to show for our investment, a working woman, in a well paying job, with good benefits. By the time she is thirty five her children will be gone. Regardless of whether or not she ever marries, she is not likely to have more children. For thirty more years she will hold that good job [very likely in the government] at the elevated rank she has achieved with the help of money paid by taxpayers who did the right thing and now can not compete with her in the work place, just as

they could not compete with her for opportunities at higher education. Because her sons can not become pregnant and there by rise through the same avenues, they are likely to fail. The forces against their success are, in no small way, the result of the systems that separated them from their mother and yet; because they have the need to love their mother, it is likely to be “Whitey” upon whom they project their anger and hatred. Their mother will likely become an Affirmative Action advocate as well. No one in her circle will question the rationalizations within the system. It is the method by which they retain their mental health. She will no doubt contribute to the feminist movement both monetarily and as an example of how the system is working. But is it?

I watched a television story in which a woman, who was identified as having a PhD, had a discussion with the journalist about advertising to the sexes. She claimed that men were only capable of assimilating a limited amount of information and therefore, commercials aimed at men tended to be more “Meat and Potatoes”. “Just the facts Mam.” Then they showed a couple of truck commercials. The implication was that men were, well, stupid. She said that if you want to sell to women, you must give them lots and lots of information. She said that, women have evolved to assimilate it through eons of dealing with kids and other never ending stimuli. Then she showed a commercial in which a watercolor image of a young woman danced and pranced uninhibited against a white paper background. She informed us that the commercial had been a great success and that its message was empowerment. Now, I feel I can tell you with certainty that its message was totally subjective. That was precisely why the woman with the PhD saw it as empowerment. In fact, if I may be so bold, I would suggest to you that the reason commercials such as this one do so well, is that they give women enough stimuli to choose from, so that they can make up their own fantasy. This, then, is at the core of the difference between men and women. While men want to know only what they need to know in order to make informed decision, women sometimes prefer to see the world emotionally.

“In the future, I will be the Vice President in charge of a day care center for a bio-research firm which develops food supplements from cactus. My husband will teach hearing impaired children to play a special type of piano at a very prestigious university. In the evenings we will walk down to this very exclusive little town and brows through very trendy shops which contain antique, high tech equipment, that I know all about and I will leave a message for my sister on her computer using my high tech wireless phone. The message will be a birthday reminder that I am still younger than her.” This is a close approximation of a precursor to an actual radio commercial, which ran in a major metropolitan city in 1998. Who do you think was paying for the ad and what were they selling? They were selling a fantasy. Why would a business need a Vice President [or for that matter a President] for its day care? Why would a company make food

*George Bailey*

supplements from cactus, when cactuses are among the world's slowest growing plants? The answer is they wouldn't. It just sounds high tech and trendy and exciting, like having a husband who is so smart and socially conscious that he teaches the deaf to play piano at this really neeto school. And walking down to an exclusive and therefore expensive store, where you have to be smart just to appreciate what it is they are selling; sounds like something that would be neeto too. Maybe in the future I could be that smart. And when I am, I'll call my big sister up; the one who always got to do everything ahead of me, and remind her that, now that I have arrived and become so really smart and everything, that all she is, is older than me.

In fact, the ad was run by Pacific Bell. They were promoting their new PCS service, which is the wireless phone with which the girl narrating the story would leave the message for her sister. But the precursor was not selling the PCS or the service. It was selling the fantasy. It was creating a need within young women's psyches that they could begin their journey toward that place in the future by purchasing a wireless phone. More importantly, they were implanting the notion that until that wireless phone was in her position, she will not have arrived. This is not new. Auto makers have been selling both sexes the American Dream for years. But the men are trapped by it whether they buy the idea or not, if the women they seek to impress are only impressed by "Bright and Shiny". The problem is in the expectation. In the late nineteen forties and early nineteen fifties, the wealthiest generation in the history of the world was just starting out. They were the parents of the Baby Boomers. But they came from humble beginnings. While they enjoyed numerous economic advantages over the generations to come, it was rare to find a second car in a household. So many of the things which we take to be the barest of necessities, would have been luxury items to that generation. The idea that a family could not get along without a television would have seemed outrageously frivolous. From travel, to all that junk under your kitchen sink; from fast food to computers, garbage disposals, even air conditioning; people weren't consumers in the sense that we have become. In order to consume in the manner we have been convinced we should, we have chased a vision that has been planted in our psyche. Women have found their way into the work place in order to fulfill a superficial need and those who have pushed them in that direction have been as unrealistic as that radio commercial. The importance of this is, that it is power which we are talking about: economic and political power. The last three decades have been marked by an emotional response to real issues. We have seen a new type of double standard. We have witnessed the birth of Political Correctness at the expense of the truth. We have seen women take advantage at the expense of their brothers, their fathers and their sons. There can be no healing in this country so long as women pit themselves against men.

In the current political climate, women who want to become married mothers, have three avenues of pursuit. If you look around you very hard, you can see a lot of young single women who have just started out. Many of them have new cars. But I doubt very seriously that many of them are busy saving a “dowry”: that old world bank roll that helped young couples get started. As a result, when they choose a mate they will have to choose from one of three avenues. First of all, they can marry someone who can support them at the standard to which they have become accustomed as a working woman, with no family expenses. In order to do that, they will have to find someone who is relatively well off. As most of the wealthiest 10% of the nation are those over 65, their options are severely limited. The second option is to keep their job at the expense of their family in order to be able to drive that new car and buy that “Fast” food, and all those other things like the wireless phone that their psyche demands. The last option is to devote herself to her family. But that one will call for some real sacrifices. Sacrifices that wouldn’t have been nearly as dear in the generation that flowered in the 1950’s. Why? Because the young women I speak of today have reserved a special place for themselves in the work force for those years before [and in some cases after] marriage; and the advantages that it will afford them are given at the expense of the men. I am not saying that women should not be able to support themselves. Nor am I insinuating that they should work for nothing. Remember, it was equal pay for equal work that we agreed to. But we have built a society devoted to the notion that women should be pushed to the front of the line. It is as simple as the law of Supply and Demand. If we as a nation strive to have equal numbers of men and women in the work force and always in comparable positions [which means comparable pay] then those women who remain home with their children for any amount of their childhood, constitute a shortage of women in the work place. When we enact legislation to mandate such equality in numbers, we devalue the male portion of the work force by virtue of a glut. Let me restate that for you. If women are allowed, by law, to come and go as they please within the work force; and it is mandated that women will retain an equal number of jobs at equivalent levels of pay, power and prestige: then those women who are off somewhere fulfilling themselves outside the work force, will constitute a shortage in the female half of the mandated work force equation. It will be a constant and chronic shortage that will manifest itself in a glut in the male half of the equation; which will also be constant and chronic. Therefore, separate but equal will always be more equal for women, and those who wish to be Home Makers will suffer the economic realities of Feminism. If women want to be able to be autonomous as a result of political clout, then these will be the options for those women who wish to become mothers. Ultimately, no matter which option you as an individual choose, all American families with children will pay the price of the autonomy enjoyed by single women. It is a

*George Bailey*

selfish way to design a culture which exists, at its core, to protect the family unit and it is the children who ultimately pay the price.

When the Chinese began the “Cultural Revolution” their leader Chairman Mao, told them that they should go out and make steel. By making steel, they were told, they could lift their country out of poverty and propel themselves forward into modern times. So the people set about to burn everything they could find to fire the forges that they had built. And they melted down their pots and pans and tools and relics, using all the wood they had: even to their furniture. But they did not make steel because that is not how steel is made and so they were left with nothing. And they were told by their chairman to grow crops, bountiful, such as had never been seen before: and in order to please their leader they lied about their accomplishments; each town more than the next. And when they lied about how much they had grown, the government took more than it should as its share, and in the end, the people starved by the millions.

When a male interviewer finally got the guts to ask one of the spokeswomen for the one of the Organizations For Women some tough questions in the mid 90’s, it came down to this. He asked: If it is necessary to equip every woman in America with an electric jack hammer in order for there to be equality in the work place, must we pay the price of all those jack hammers. The reply was “Yes”. The next question, which he did not ask, is, “What if the women can’t lift the electric jack hammers?” Just as Communism was able to survive until the stored wealth of the Russias was depleted, Feminism will be able to perpetuate the myth that it can create steel here at home until we finally become economically impotent. When asked how women are performing in the army and in construction, the military, police and fire departments: and how well they are competing in the free market system when given preference for Small Business Loans, we will be told of the bumper crops they are harvesting.

I have no doubt that what I have just said of the women’s movement will be construed as demeaning of women. But that is not my intention. I do not teach or make the claim, that women are inferior. What I do insist, however, is that they are different. Just as the left side of our brain is designed to deal with certain aspects of life while the right side is designed to deal with entirely different aspects, I believe that women are better suited to deal with certain aspects of life than men are. Conversely, men [as a general group] are better equipped to deal with certain aspects than are women. When a person’s brain is damaged, the other side of the brain can often learn to do the task once performed by the damaged tissue. But even if the task is performed equally as well as it once was, what is gained by expending the energy to teach one side of the brain, if the only purpose is to gratify the learning side, at the expense of the an undamaged side, left to atrophy. It is like making it the law that all scissors be made left handed. In the real world, left handed people are every bit as capable of using scissors as

right handed people. But because more people are right handed, the market place dictates that right handed scissors are readily available, while left handed people must seek out left handed scissors. They may even have to pay more for them. This, then, is a model for all of us in the work place; including women. If there is a price of accommodation, that price must be paid by the person accommodated. Otherwise, you have insisted that all scissors must be made for the left handed without regard for market realities.

On a similar note: all the diamond mines of the world were once owned by one group of individuals. As other mines were developed in other parts of the world, these same individuals continued to successfully control the availability of diamonds through various means, which included buying out their competition. Diamonds, as most of us know, are the hardest things around. Their industrial uses make them a valuable commodity; but it is their value as a gemstone which is truly noteworthy. Back in the 1950's, there was an advertising campaign of immense proportion. It targeted women by putting diamonds on the rich and famous. It put diamonds on Holly Wood stars in movies and created a mystique that would become part of the American Fabric. A new form, called a diamond engagement ring, would develop, and it would become a prerequisite to any proposal of marriage. The simple gold band, which had been the symbol of the union of two people from centuries past, would be replaced with the diamond wedding band. By the end of the century the diamond industry would actually be setting the value of an acceptable offering at a rate equal to two months wages. Of course the irony of all this would be that the value of that band and its diamonds would have to be assessed by an expert. In fact, it is all but impossible for most of us to tell the difference between a fine diamond and a piece of glass. Moreover, if the world's diamond reserve were ever to be released into the market place, the superficial rarity of the, so-called, gem stones, would disappear in the glut. Even more astounding is the fact that most men are aware of this fact and still; most women feel slighted if the man is unwilling to participate in the charade. The end result is that, money which should be allocated to the future solvency of the endeavor we call marriage, is squandered for the sake of pride and fantasy, in the face of economic reality. This flight of fancy is mirrored in the Feminist movement. Men are forced to play along as part of the courtship ritual. It is the "Beau Guest", {the gallant gesture} like spending money on flowers that cost a great deal but wither in a short time, leaving nothing of substance behind. These are gestures, and they have their place in courtship. There is an old John Wayne movie in which Moreen O'Hara plays the part of a young bride, who insists that Wayne's character fight her brother for her dowry. Wayne's character is forced to fight for his wife's honor but in the end they burn the money together, to spite her brother and as a gesture of their love and mutual respect. There is a need for gallant gestures in a society from time to time; but we have been burning money for far too long. The Feminist movement has convinced us

*George Bailey*

to place our economy in a vase and speaks to us of how beautiful it looks. But it is a system cut off at the roots, and while it may still look like an economy in bloom, it is dying. In 1992, at the infancy of the Clinton administration, Hillary Clinton would be given, what I seem to recall as, in excess of a million dollars, with which to come up with a health care plan for the nation. A few months later the money would not only be gone, but I seem to recall there were questions as to whether or not it could be accounted for. No health care plan would ever emerge. In 1999, the left wing of the liberal press would begin to promote the idea of Ms. Clinton as a possible candidate for president in 2000. They would go on to promote her as a future candidate for Congress, from the state of New York.

I would like to say in closing this segment that, I grew up in a time which preceded the sexual revolution. There were those in my high school who did have sex, but it was uncommon for girls to be promiscuous. Those girls who were lured into sexual activity were most often those who were in love with their sexual partner and, more importantly, were told by their lover that, He too, was in love. Sometimes, those who wanted a girl's favor, lied. Sometimes it worked. Those of us who couldn't bring ourselves to lie, waited for the sexual revolution. There are still those who are willing to tell women what they want to hear to get their favor. But until Women can come to understand that it is those who won't lie to them who are the good guys, we will all be at the mercy of those who lie for personal gain. There is an old saying, "A place for everything and everything in its place". Those of my generation rebelled against being pigeon holed. I fear that we misunderstood that there is stature and fulfillment in all places. Finding your own place and reveling in it, is the best life has to offer. I do not attempt to "put" you in your place; rather I urge you to take your place. We need you for balance, for hope and for the future.

I would, at this time, like to turn away from those things which divide us, and toward those things which we all face together. To begin with, let us have a look at the criminal justice system. And again I would like to refer to a movie. This one aired on HBO [Home Box Office, a cable network], and it was called "Criminal Justice". An overload on the system in the form too many cases, has ushered in the era of the "Plea Bargain". It is a system that ultimately serves no one except the guilty. For the victim of the crime there is no justice. For the innocent accused, it is a burden too great to ask anyone to bear. We all know and understand the game our legal system has become. Both sides; defense and prosecution, withhold evidence and twist the truth. In this particular story, it was the word of female victim against an accused male. His mother is the accused only alibi and it becomes painfully obvious that because of the violent nature of the crime and her love for her son, that her testimony will be discounted, and he will be convicted. There is no corroborating evidence what so ever, to link him to the crime; but how can the jury discount eyewitness testimony? I have heard it



said that we all have a double, somewhere. This may or may not be true. There is also the question of lighting and eyesight. Add to that, hysteria and the natural tendency for our eye to be focused on the weapon and away from the perpetrator's face. New and compelling research has all but proven that eyewitness identification is all but worthless. It may even be that the witness is simply lying. With all these things at work, this trial could go either way. Now we bring in the Plea Bargain. When your life hangs in the balance, would you give up two or three years of your life behind bars against twenty or thirty on the flip of a coin? If you were a career criminal you would be glad to. Three years translates to six months "real time" these days. If you're familiar with prison life, you might not like it, but it surely holds no terror for you. The most moving part of the whole plot was an "angle" I had never contemplated up until I saw the movie. If you are innocent and you choose to plead guilty, you may not only have to do the time, but you may have to stand up in open court and confess to a crime that you did not commit. You can't just say, "OK, I except the sentence". You may have to spell out each detail and call it your own. If this is truly the case, you would be forced to bear false witness against yourself in order to comply. Not only will you be faced with the decision to plea bargain or not: should you refuse the offer of the court, you now run the risk of somehow "challenging" the court, should you refuse its offer and ask for your constitutional right to trial. Once you have decided to face reality, pass on the "Sucker" bet and "Cop a Plea"; you are now either the perpetrator of the crime or a liar. The next time someone goes through the "Perp" file and you resemble the assailant, your "record" could conceivably put you back in the same spot you "copped the plea" to get out of. The fact is that, the resources are not available for police to follow through or double check with further investigations. The courts feel forced to plea bargain in order to keep the wheels turning. Finally, today it can be said that most of the people being tried in our revolving criminal justice system are guilty. To change the system we must find the resources to do the job correctly. We must put an end to the plea bargaining system. It is short term and short sighted. Short sentenced, plea bargain convictions, put habitual criminals right back into the system and right back out on the street. Lastly, our ill-fated war on those stupid enough to do drugs, is dragging us down. We must make our peace before there is no justice at all in the land.

In the winter of 1999 I sat at my mother's house one afternoon while my stepfather browsed through the local court docket listed in the local paper. Of the thirty-five cases which were before one of the local judges, twenty were about drugs and ten were about alcohol. Another judge had seven cases before him. Six were drug related and one was alcohol related. We will deal with drugs in a meaningful way within this book. We will also change the capitalistic methods being used within government and the courts to raise revenue. In so doing, the incentives to drag people into court for driving after having a drink, will be

*George Bailey*

removed and replaced with an obligation to keep unsafe drivers off the road. As a result of these two changes, there will be time to search for the truth in those few cases that remain before judges. But we will need more changes than these.

The idea of an advocate; someone to speak on your behalf, has always been part of all social structure throughout history. A man or woman, who can find no one to stand up for them, is not very likely to be heard. This “social” truth is what gives credence to the old adage that “Any man who defends himself in court, has a fool for a lawyer”. It is an unfortunate truth, but it legitimizes the need for a lawyer to present the case for his or her client, without letting personal bias interfere. That was the intent of those very wise men that wrote our constitution. They had come from a place in time where people stood before judgment looking guilty from the accusation. They understood that even fair minded magistrates had only their personal experiences to draw upon, and by which, to judge. So they adopted a “jury of one’s peers”, to broaden and deepen understanding. They counseled these twelve “Tried and true” to “deliberate”: to discuss, share, empathize and ponder; and finally to judge. They placed a magistrate in charge to see that fairness and order was maintained. They conceived of a higher court that might review the workings of local jurisdictions because “Good old boys” exist in all times, among all races and among all cultures. And to insure that the decisions reached in the lower courts were in keeping with the “Law of the Land” [the constitution], they put in place a “Supreme Court”: and on its walls they wrote the “Ten Commandments”. They wrote those ten laws given to Moses by God “All Mighty”, so that they would not forget the source of “Supreme” justice. Like the little plaque that hangs in our kitchen that reads, “Rule # 1, Mom is always right. Rule # 2, when in doubt, refer to rule # 1”; it was there to remind them of the laws that do not change with precedent. It was a good system, a fair system, a revolutionary system; and we as a nation put our faith in it. We laid down our swords and beat them into plowshares. We learned to litigate rather than duel or feud. It took time; but we were a nation of laws not of men. It offered protection for the weak from the strong and we embraced it as a nation. You may remember the movie “True Grit” which epitomized the changing of the guard as the last remnants of the old west succumbed to the litigators: where the rough and ready Rooster Codburn watches as the J. Noble Dagetts of the world seize power. And as we relinquished more and more of our power to the J. [not so noble] Dagetts, they became the men who would be king. Their role in the courtroom as advocate, declined in favor of gamesmanship. With each “Precedent” set in the courts they moved further and further from the issues of right versus wrong. They lost sight of the link between an “Adversarial” process and morality, and made it a competition, which did not care so much about the truth, but only about the score. They, and the courts, which are of their making, never referred back to rule #1. Instead they devised end sweeps around it. Their role was perverted from presenting their client’s situation and point of view, to

technical manipulation and trickery. Their aim is not to find justice but to win what they have made into a game. When a judge directs a jury on a point of law, he is doing just that: directing them. At the same time; when people must be directed in order to understand the law, it means that either the law is not based on what is right and wrong or that the jury does not know right from wrong. It is one of the fundamental problems that tears at our society. What we used to instinctively feel as being right and wrong has become so blurred in our courts that, with each generation the lines become more unclear. It's why God fearing Middle American kids could smoke pot in the 60's without feeling any guilt. It was illegal but not immoral. It is why today, thieves and even murderers walk free. It may be immoral but it can be technically legal. It is hypocrisy and a mockery. When a nation of people is governed by laws that they neither understand nor embrace, it is anarchy. When a trial takes more than a week to present, it makes it economically impossible for the "Peers" of an average citizen to be present. You know and I know that working class Americans shrink from jury duty. If they don't resist because a long trial would bankrupt them, they resist because they know they will be instructed to judge on a point of law, rather than right and wrong. To add insult to injury, if it is a criminal case, the sentence will be shortened do to lack of prison space, should they find the defendant guilty. If it is a case of civil litigation, any damages they award are likely to be appealed or overturned in another court. If the poor soul is innocent, nobody will believe it anyway.

At the other end of the spectrum we find juries who convict to "Send a Message". In their frustration to change the system, they take their anger out on the individuals they are there to judge. Lawyers have made a revolving door of our criminal system. As a result, nearly every one they deal with is guilty. It is a hell they have created for themselves, but it has had its effect on all of us. We are predisposed to believe that if you're in the system, you're probably supposed to be there, just by the law of averages.

In the realm of civil litigation, it has become a contest based on greed and fine print. It is a game we have sponsored. It is our greed, as much as anyone's, that has put us were we are today. Ambulance chasers only put the gun in our hand; we are the ones who pull the trigger. Lawyers go after those with the ability to pay regardless of their culpability, and we cheer them on. Everyone hates the "Shyster" lawyer until their day in court arrives. Then they go looking for the sharpest one they can find. We thrill to the exploits of the "Perry Masons" of the legal profession, as they out maneuver the "Lieutenant Trags", until it was "our daughter" that was hurt, or "our bank account" that was lost. In the sixties, when this marathon drug war began, the innocent and the guilty alike, were being harassed by "Storm Trooper" FBI agents and we rallied behind the "Civil Liberties Union". "Normal" {The National Organization For The Repeal of

*George Bailey*

Marijuana Laws] was founded and we resolved to fight fire with fire. We would protect our right to privacy with “Loop holes”. We would challenge domination by the state through the courts. We would gain political power and change the world. All we really did was to subvert the law. We made its web more intricate and at the same time, even less defined. We challenged the masters at their game and we were defeated. We changed nothing. The law has become so far removed from us, “The People”, that we dare not even die without consulting council. A properly written Will can entitle a cat to an immense fortune. But to write in your own hand, that you “Will” what you leave behind to “Able”, can not stand against “Cain” and his attorney; or even the State itself for that matter. And in this adversarial game that lawyers play across the land: how can it be permitted that information which may show innocence or tend to disprove guilt, be withheld by the police or the prosecution. It happens routinely. When we see it in the movies it is the defense who uncovers the “Key” piece of evidence and saves the day. But in the real world, the prosecuting attorney has an entire police force at his or her disposal to gather information. They show their badges and people give answers. However, a citizen, represented by one lawyer, is generally confined to the limits of his or her own knowledge. Here again, that is enough if you are guilty. The guilty already know all the pertinent facts of the case. They were there. But if you are not guilty, you probable know very little, if anything, about the crime.

There is a branch of medicine, which has built for itself a place of prominence [dominance] in our society, through the use of the legal system. Its members have professed the ability to look inside the souls of individuals. The lawyers in our courts have taken advantage of their boosts. It is, of course, the fields of Psychology and Sociology. The great institution of Psychology, which had, by the early twentieth century, taken the lobotomy to an art form, performed in seconds, unceremoniously and with a knitting needle: this institution presumes to tell us who’s reality is acceptable and who’s is not. Sociologists claim the right to remove our children from us without evidence or trial. They have the right to slander us, “Black List” us, destroy us, institutionalize us; with out fear of repercussion. They may allow the proven murderer to be judged innocent, and absolve them of their crime.

It was 9:30 in the evening when the Smiths got home. Nine year old Billy had gotten his second wind and whirled around the living room with his arms outstretched, screaming in muffled tones that mimicked the sound of an airplane. Six year old Susie collapsed in her miniature rocking chair near the door. Dad was dragging stuff in from the car as Mom repeated herself for the third time from the kitchen. “Billy. Up stairs and take your bath. Tomorrow is a school day”. “Billy, do what your mother says.” Dad said in a voice that was low and firm as he entered the door. Billy raised his flaps, turned his rudder and flew

upstairs without a change in pitch from his engine. A moment later the sound of running water echoed down the hallway. "Susie honey," Mom softly called as she emerged from the kitchen, drying her hands on a towel. "Let's go up and get you ready for bed." "No!" came the snarling reply. "I don't want to get ready for bed! School is stupid."

"I still have lunches to make and cloths to fold," Mom answered in calm and soothing tones, "and it's way passed your bedtime."

Dad turned from his stowing of the gear into the closet, to see Susan setting face down; her angry dark eyes staring up from the corners at her mother. "What's the matter honey?" he inquired consolingly.

"School is stupid. And I don't want to go to bed."

"Look at you. You can't hardly keep your eyes open." he replied.

"Come on up with me and we'll jump into the shower together." Mom baited.

"No! School's stupid and your stupid too. And I'm not going to Bed."

"OK Sue, that's enough." Dad interrupted firmly.

This time she stuck her tongue out in defiance.

"OK," he responded "You go up to Mom's bath and rinse off in her tub, alone, now."

She crossed her arms and slammed them against her waist, brought her knees together and sat firm.

"If I have to tell you again, you'll be grounded from playing out side tomorrow." he affirmed.

Once again her tongue jutted out.

"OK, your grounded." he confirmed. "Now if I have to tell you again, you get a spanking."

Still she did not move. Dad stood there. She sat there: until finally he made a step forward in her direction and she bolted toward the stairs. With a great sweep of his left arm he drew her up, screaming.

"No Daddy no, I'm going." she pleaded.

"Too late." he replied solemnly. And with the snap of his wrist, a hand the size of her whole bottom, flicked its fingers against the right cheek of her buttocks. Then he released her and she fled up the stairs towards Mommy's bathroom screaming, "I hate you. I hate you Dad and Mom."

Mom and Dad just looked at each other with chagrin and shook their heads. A moment later she stood at the top of the stairs calling. "Mom. You said you'd take a shower with me."

"No Sue," Dad called back, "you had your chance".

*George Bailey*

“Dad.” she pleaded; reconciliatory for the moment.

“I’m sorry. You made your choice.”

“Mom, please.” she begged in an attempt at an end run.

“I can’t honey. You should have listened to Dad.”

“Well Dad’s stupid.”

“Sue, that’s enough.” Mom answered in a tone that had suddenly gone stern.

“Well, will you help me rinse off?” she replied, sensing the change in attitude.

Mom looked at Dad for confirmation of her decision and he nodded his approval.

“OK honey, I’ll be right up.”

Thirty minutes later Billy and Susie were tucked in. Billy got a hug and a kiss from Mom and Dad. Sue got a huge and a kiss from both as well and returned them as if nothing had happened. “I love You”-s were passed around and Dad headed down stairs as Mom played “Twenty Questions” at the doorway, before turning out the light and closing the door.

We live in an imperfect world where kids are sometimes too tired to reason with and time gets too short. This Mom and Dad went through reason, discussion, enticement, threat of punishment, punishment, corporal punishment and finally compromise in that little story. Yet there are those who have the power to take away our children, who would tell us that we must “never” use physical force. I actually heard one psychologist refer to the act of looking down on your children and raising your voice, as child “abuse”. Since I was taller than my children when I was on my knees, I suppose I should have laid down at their feet when addressing them. And when they grew up to have no respect for authority and wound up in trouble with the law, She could have come and absolved them of their crimes because I failed to teach them right from wrong. Children, by nature, test. That was the reason Billy ignored his Mother’s repeated commands and responded without incident to his father’s. He had tested in the past. He knew the rules and the consequences. Mother would not act until she had taken the time to stop what she was doing and moved to him physically to confront him. If, on the other hand, father had to relocate in order to assert himself, it would all ready be too late to avoid punishment. The important thing is to be consistent and even-tempered. These are lessons that Susie is still learning. It is important that she be grounded the following day, so that she understand that such threats are not made lightly and that she will be held accountable. Had Dad reached out and slapped Susie’s face, or reached out and kicked at her as she ran by “That” would have been abuse. If he had hit her over and over in anger, even though it was on the butt, it would have been out of line.

But he didn't. She was tired and in the mood to test the system. She found that the system works consistently in accordance with her input. This story raises some question as to whether or not Susie might be having a problem in school. Her parents should be attentive to that. They might bring it up while tucking her in. But problems in life are not an excuse for improper behavior. That is the best we can teach our children; [and coincidentally, what we must strive for in our laws]. Barring unlimited time and resources it is the only way. Even given unlimited resources, what is to be gained from raising children who are not made to recognize any form of authority? If reason is the only tool we are allowed to use as parents, how does one enforce even as much as a grounding? There is a place for reasoning. There is a point when the time for reasoning has passed. So let us suppose that we give up everything that we are able, to develop a childcare system in which time and expertise are plentiful. Susie now spends her day in a clinical setting with her time shared between rest, play and the counseling of her PhD psychologist [whom she shares with only two other children]. She is fresh and alert, harsh words are never spoken, and when she "goats", probing for the edges of her boundaries, she finds there are none. When she is placed in a chair she simply rises; when she is asked to return she heads for the door. Diversion and pandering fill her day through which she is the focal point of all around her. Even if this sounds like a good system to you, which of society's PhD's do you think will go to work in your local daycare? Will it be the "A" students or the "D" students? Will they have the patience of "Job" or will they too, resort to some sort of physical punishment when all the nurturing ways fail or just become too tedious. Who's going to care about your baby, your child, the way that you do? Nobody. Not if you're any kind of parent at all. Not anybody.

It is not the parent who spansks their child who is being abusive, it is the parent who does not teach them right from wrong. Today, mothers may pierce the ears of their young boys, dress them like pirates, or bikers, in gang colors and expose them to Gangster Rap music with impunity; but "that" is child abuse. Watching soap operas with your child in the room is child abuse. Allowing adults to speak profanely in front of your children is child abuse. "Spare the rod and spoil the child" seems ridged and out of place in the polite culture we aspire to today. Still, the meaning of the message is clear. Violence begets violence; but discipline, dispensed with love, is essential to human development in a social setting. To deny it, is to lock up a child's concept of the real world in a closet and leave it in the dark. It is a paradox that we as a nation have come to accept a system in which those who Lord over us may threaten us for punishing those we love in traditional ways: while at the same time, these same systems of Government foster the belief that once grown, a person in trouble with society deserves what they get: even if what they get is sodomized or murdered while in the custody of those same systems.

*George Bailey*

I know that, that little story I just told about the Smiths was not the best ever written. I may even be wrong about how it should have been dealt with. But that is the point. As human parents, we will, all of us make mistakes. It will not do to have outsiders second-guess us. I doubt that there has ever been a parent who does not regret decisions they have made, or actions they have taken. But that is all the more reason to fear how outsiders would handle our situation if given oversight. In the spring of 1999, I watched an under cover report done on a prominent national mental health care chain. The Federal Government allocates \$1,000.00 dollars per day to the care and maintenance of persons placed in these institutions. According to the report the staffs are made up of mostly untrained and minimally paid individuals who are instructed to write reports which foster the idea that there is little or no improvement in the individual patients. The visits that patients receive from resident doctors were calculated in minutes per week, not hours. People were being warehoused in order to fill the facilities and their families were powerless to free them. This is the pool of talent and the mentality of the systems that will evolve to administer government run daycare. It is a myth fostered by those who would rise to provide the service, that there is someone as qualified as you to raise your baby, your child. Even if we as a nation were to allocate one tenth of that \$1,000.00 amount each day to the maintenance of a child's day care we would be bankrupt. While, in today's mental health care system, all that \$1,000.00 buys us for those who truly do need a PhD Psychologist, is paper work and minimally paid attendants.

There are three reasons why Psychology fails to live up to its own boasts so miserably. The first was depicted by Jack Nickleson in a movie, based on the book, "One Flew Over The Coos Nest". It is the fact that, when someone is predisposed to believe something, they are likely to hear only that which confirms that belief. The second, portrayed in the Barbara Striesand movie "Nuts", is that, once assigned a working definition of your illness, your "care" may be at odds with the integrity and stature of your doctor. Lastly, it assumes that because a person is able to understand and commit to memory the terminology of psychology and sociology, that he or she has the intellect to understand the workings of a mind that may be far and away superior to their own. It is, from within, that a mental disorder originates, and it is from within that a cure must come. I fear that it is rare that a drug can make it all better: be it on the street or in an institution, mostly there are only sedatives. Sociologists and Psychologists align themselves with pharmaceutical companies in an attempt to proclaim a cure. The very best that any "therapist" can hope to achieve is to become a friend to a troubled mind. A hand, out reached, without vested interest or a hidden agenda; a confessor; a sounding board off which to hear and to come to terms with that which is feared.



Yes, there are good Psychologists and there are good Sociologists. And yes they do help people sometimes. But because there is no definitive way to insure that the Doctors of these professions are correct in their assessment, how do we monitor them? And if they can not be monitored, how can we entrust them with power over people's lives to the degree that we have?

Yes, there are medications that improve the lives of some of these individuals. But with our Surgeon General telling us that he believes 20% of our population to be in need of help, how can we fight a drug war while administering mind altering drugs to 20% of the population.

So now we come to what I see as a triad. In many ways it is the head of the elephant. It has had a great deal to do with the direction we have taken as a nation and the road we are on. It consists of three elements that, like veined plants planted close together, have grown snarled. They are Medicine, the Civil Courts and Insurance. Let us begin with insurance. Try to imagine this country's beginnings had insurance entered the picture. The Queen of Spain and her government underwrote Columbus in 1492. But imagine the hurtles faced by the Pilgrims. The founders of James Town could not have found an insurance carrier to cover their losses in the wilderness. Wagon trains leading the way west could not have obtained business liability insurance coverage against Indian attacks, or bad weather such as the "Donner Party" encountered. These people built a great nation based on faith. Faith in God and faith in themselves. I think it was Paul Harvey who told the story of one of the first life insurance salesmen, who sold numerous policies among the members of the Seventh Cavalry. You may recall that, that was Custer's outfit. It was the dawn of a new way of thinking. The idea that we could collectively protect each other from life's tragedies. At the same time, it was a move away from faith and the idea that you must play the hand that you are dealt. Because people were honorable and proud, insurance worked for a long time. Because it was communal in nature and in spirit, it was looked on as something akin to charity outside the realm of church. It branched out into all areas of life: home, health, auto, business and on and on. With time and success it became a very large and wealthy member of the business community. With the change in perception that came with the advent of "Social Security", things changed for insurance as well. Like Social Security, insurance was no longer regarded as a form of charity. It was something you had paid for and had a right to receive compensation from. Because the insurance companies were now "fat", if you [the policyholder] were lucky enough "not" to have a claim, you were somehow being cheated out of the money you paid in. This missed the original concept of insurance completely; but it was a concept not lost on lawyers of Civil Litigation. The idea that insurance companies were a bottomless pit of wealth, gained prominence, and public opinion now held no contempt for the "Robin Hood" approach to monetary gain in this way. The floodgates opened wide.

*George Bailey*

Under the right circumstances you too could win a piece of the new jackpot being offered in the new lottery called insurance. Terms like “Pain and Suffering” were added to our national vocabulary. It no longer mattered that the guilty be punished, nearly so much as that you make them pay. But in fact, it was his insurer being made to pay. In the end it would be all the others insured by the insurance company that would be made to pay. And, as for not wanting to play their silly game? By now legislators had made having insurance the law in many cases. A home mortgage could not be obtained without insurance on the home. Companies may not hire employees without accident insurance for them. Now many employers are being forced to provide health insurance for employees. As a result, courts are jammed, insurance is high and the lawyers are laughing all the way to the bank with the lion’s share of your insurance dollar. This chain of events would have collapsed the insurance industry in its infancy. But insurance had come of age. Banks wouldn’t lend without it, cars couldn’t be driven without it. On a social level people are told they shouldn’t die without it. The great wealth and influence insurance now wielded gave it the ear of the government and allowed it to survive. It moved from charity to necessity and then entitlement; and as such, demanded the response of government. Many good things have resulted: fire codes, structural integrity and other standards of all kinds, in all fields, have been greatly improved due, in no small part, to insurance companies demands to decrease liability exposure. But how far can we let them take us. Shall we fence off every scenic overlook, every body of water, every non-engineered setting. Will we strap ourselves into cars and dawn helmets because it’s statistically safer? With the possible depletion of the “O Zone” shall we be mandated our hours in the sun; or will we stand up and say that, to some degree at least, we want to take our own chances with life. After all, isn’t your life? When you hear the rhetoric about insurance premium increases being the result of increased lawsuits and higher settlements remember what I have said. But you must also remember that insurance is a rigged game. It’s true that insurance companies are regulated and must submit their rates to the State for approval. At the same time they can determine their losses statistically. Their profit is calculated in with a great deal of certainty. It is also a “function” of the amount of money they handle. That is to say, that if they make 10% net on their gross income, then they will make more handling a billion dollars than they will handling a million dollars. It’s true that their expenses will increase, but this is greatly over shadowed by the increased social and political power one gains from an increase in cash flow. What’s more: an increased size in settlements does not constitute an increase in workload, or for that matter, expense. Larger settlements therefore may actually translate into a larger “fee” attached to a settlement in the form of the insurance company’s standard percentage. In other words, they feed on our despair. The more you fear, the more power they have. One other note on the difference between the “Communal” fund, insurance began as and what a

“Big Business’ it has become, is the fact that, the price of such things as “Business Liability Insurance” rise and fall with the market. In a good economy they will be far less competitive than in a poor one. The philosophy that price be determined by what ever the market will bear, has no place in a protected industry. If an insured’s premiums are based on the “Gross” business done by that insured, exposure is reflected in that “Gross” business, and has no relevance to expanding or declining insurance markets.

Another result of insurance on our lives is apathy. Consider that the average person invests the net earnings of probably a year of his or her life into their car. It is the largest investment we are ever likely to make outside of a house [discounting children]. At the same time: stealing a car has become a minor offense. They used to hang horse thieves. Without the benefit of insurance, something like, every twenty seconds, an American would find themselves paying off a three to five year balance on a car they no longer had in their position. Who do you think would be at the top of our most wanted list then: Drug dealers, or “Chop Shop” dealers? Drug importers or stolen car exporters? The fact is that we still pay. And added to the expense are the operating costs and the profits of insurance companies. It’s just that we share the burden collectively. With all their political clout you would think that they could inspire Law Enforcement to make a greater effort: or even band together to wipe the problem out on their own; like the railroads did using the “Pinkerton” agency to stop train robberies in the old days. But here again, the more money they handle, the more powerful they become and the profit is built in. Despite all their power, influence and ability to pass on their expenses, many insurance companies still seemed to be bordering on collapse at the end of the 1980’s. One of the key ingredients to the insurance formula was investment. The money that Custer’s men put into the fund was invested. Making money with the money allowed for more money to be paid out in claims than was collected in premiums, while still making a profit. Unfortunately in the 1970’s and 80’s, insurance companies found themselves in the same situation as the S& Ls [Savings and Loans]: They all went looking for the fast buck and no good investments were made. One thing is for certain; rates went up to compensate for industry mistakes.

Consider now the industry of medicine. I say industry because that is what it has become. Up until the nineteenth century, healing was done with herbs and faith. Faith in magic, faith in their healer’s wisdom or faith in Divinity; but never the less, faith. With the birth of the “Scientific Method” Western Medicine had begun to view the human body as a machine, in the dawning of the age of machines. They began to learn to separate the spirit of the individual from its container. Since the beginning of time, men have cleaved up other men and women. Some cultures are known to have performed crude surgeries as far back as recorded history goes; even brain surgery. But with the advent of the Scientific

*George Bailey*

Method, things began to change. With this trend we began to lose the concept of our body as a temple. Rather, it became a mass of tissues. It is, after all, a prerequisite of modern medicine to be able to cut on a human body without repulsion. Few would argue that these principles of science have improved the quality of life in the world. But the transference of our faith from the Divine, to our Doctor's and on to "Science", has been devastating. Even if you are unable to see yourself as less than the "Most Significant Force In The Universe", to hand yourself over to the gropings of science is a grievous error. For if the problems we face are like the "Elephant", the mysteries of life and the universe are like a dragon with a thousand heads, all different and yet interacting. What is represented as scientific fact, is almost always conjecture. What is "practiced" in one generation, is very often out of date in another. In the middle of the Twentieth century we witnessed the discovery of penicillin and a vaccine for polio. New technologies of all sorts promised new hope and we put our "faith" in science and in the government that sponsored it. We perceived super human qualities and gave super human status to those in the medical and the scientific community; and they accepted our trust and admiration without humility. Today it has become apparent that we allocated far too much faith to their systems. We are fifteen years into the epidemic of AIDS and they have no vaccine and no antidote. We are riddled with cancers, and they speak of success rates that reflect an extra five years of life if we submit to their radiations and disfigurements. The pharmaceutical companies feed upon us. Longer life spans often translate into mindless elderly people, warehoused in lifeless, uncaring institutions; or on extravagant and expensive machinery. As much as 90% of our health care dollars goes toward confronting our death thralls, while the little that remains is allocated to maintenance and prevention. [And that is in terms of monies spent 'after' insurance has taken its cut]. Hospitals compete among themselves with ever more expensive gadgetry that helps relatively small percentages of the population. As a result the cost of minimal health care is pushed out of reach for more and more of the general population. It means tests run for no other reason than to use the equipment and to "bill" for it. Here again, it has been left to insurance to police the situation and has resulted in the fact that many tests, that should in fact be performed, are being denied. At the same time, lawyers and the threat of law suits have left doctors afraid to reject any test that might be even remotely significant. Probably the most frightening thing about what we have come to expect, is medicine's scientific view of us as little more than a living cadaver. I remember, during the Vietnam War, I often heard it said that "those people", [the native peoples of South East Asia] didn't view life with the same reverence that we in the west did. People told stories of "booby trapped" children sent in to kill American service men and themselves in the bargain. I suppose the same could be said of South African and South American "Gorilla" fighters who recruited six and seven year olds, persuaded by a choice between servitude or

death. Yet this was a reflection, not of the people of Southeast Asia or South Africa or America, but of the forces in control. Humanity does not exist in “all” the people of “any” nation, and sometimes those who lack any sense of humanity, seize power. The photo images of Vietnamese men and women running, wounded, in danger, clutching their children in their arms; still remain fixed in my mind. Those pictures from the nightly news attested to their reverence for life. But I fear that we are losing ours. Today American doctors fight to conceal their own HIV test results. For the life of me, with so many people affected, I can’t understand why someone who took the Hippocratic oath and is HIV positive, doesn’t just use their practice to serve those that are HIV positive. Today, some in the medical community lobby for the right to conduct “Fetal Cell Research”, and the lines are in need of being drawn. If there is no moral issue involved in using the tissue of aborted fetuses, in order to develop cures for the living, if tissue is simply tissue, then what was the compelling question of the film “Soilent Green”: in which a starving world cannibalized its dead? Doctors question why more people don’t become organ donors. I think we instinctively fear where this road is leading. Set aside the fact that doctors speak indignantly of our inability to give away the remains of our loved ones, while they affix horrific price tags to the talents they supply in the same operation. More terrifying, is what happen when the dollar and change your body used to be worth after death, becomes thousands of dollars in commercial parts. You say that we can count on government to over see the acquisition and fair distribution? On what historical set of facts do you base your claim? Or shall we adopt the philosophy that as long as the “parts” come from outside the US we just don’t want to know how they were obtained. Will we live in fear of our medical history revealing that we are a “match” with someone of political or financial power? Will we be allowed to auction off parts of ourselves or of our loved ones? These are questions that science can not answer. The words, right and wrong, moral and immoral, are not even in the scientific vocabulary. Like the “Gorillas” who enlist children to war, this element within the scientific [medical] community seeks to control the value that we put on life in this county. They seek the power to determine who will live and die. They must not be allowed to operate unchecked and without “Moral” supervision.

Allow me another tangent here. In the late 1980’s a new being was introduced to the planet. It was genetically engineered, and when placed on strawberries, it enabled the plants to withstand colder temperatures without freezing. As I recall, it was either a bacteria or a virus, but the coverage it received was so small that I confess, I can not say for certain. It was placed into the environment in the presents of a single protester. Under laboratory conditions, it showed no threat to the environment. Now that it is part of the ecosystem, only time will tell. Like the promise of nuclear power, it is only a matter of time before this technology falls into the hands of those who would

*George Bailey*

dive into the darkness out of political and or financial pressure. We would not think of injecting an unknown chemical into a single human being, but we have allowed an altered genetic structure to be injected into the ecosystem of the planet. No matter how benign this particular organism turns out to be, the risks to the future are incalculable compared to the benefits.

Getting back to the medical profession; now that I have maligned it, allow me to speak on its behalf. Paul Newman made a very emotional movie, some time ago, which demonstrated the lack of integrity within the legal system. But while it was politically correct for its day, I believe it missed the Moral “point” of the battle between law and medicine. It was called “The Verdict”. In the movie a young woman becomes a “vegetable” as a result of a doctor’s incompetence. Then “He” [the doctor] tried to cover it up. He was a doctor with acknowledged credentials. There was no malice in his actions. Still, once the lawyers got involved everything got quite vicious. The hospital tried to settle out of court but the lawyer for the family of the lost patient, declined the offer. He sought retribution for the cover up. In the movie he was seeking retribution for what the legal system had done to him [the lawyer] personally. In real life it would more likely have been in pursuit of the money. When the sister [the guardian of the patient] learned the offer of money had been refused, she was furious with the lawyer. By the end of the intrigue, this same lawyer was exonerated by winning an outrageous settlement. Unfortunately, in the real world, since the doctor and the hospital were the defendants, they would have been able to appeal; and the evidence that the first jury heard would have been legally suppressed from the second trial. This would have left the sister and her family without any help at all to care for her indigent sister. They might have been left with their lawyer’s fees however. So let’s go back to that movie for a moment and see who the real victims of that story were. Let’s begin by looking at the players. There was of course the patient who lost what constituted her life. But nothing could be done to improve her situation: least of all in a court of law. There was the attorney for the plaintiffs [those suing], played by Paul Newman. He was a victim of the corrupt legal system’s “Good Old Boy” network. There was the sister of the patient and her family. Ironically they were the victims of their own lawyer’s vendetta against the establishment. For, as we discussed, they were offered a settlement that would have allowed them to care for the indigent sister and get on with their lives. The problem was that their lawyer wanted someone to “pay” for the injustices of the system as he saw them. There was the Lawyer’s girl friend, who was another victim of the good old boys. She sold out and fell from grace in spite of the fact that she had tried to come clean. There was the old Black doctor: witness for the plaintiffs, who was humiliated by the law “machine” that defended the hospital. In another scenario, that “Machine” might have been the lawyers for the insurance company of the hospital or the doctor. There was the nurse who gave up on the profession she felt born to, out of her moral convection

and pressure from the doctor. And lastly, there was the doctor himself. As I recall, story line never dealt with the doctor's guilt in connection with his medical mistake. It dealt instead with his guilt with regard to his covering it up. Had he taken on too much work on that terrible day? Had he taken on too much out of greed or arrogance or out of the urgent needs of the patient? We were never told. The girl had entrusted her life to the doctor and he had failed her. As much as we and doctors themselves like to believe otherwise, they are fallible. We have a "Good old boy network" in place within the medical profession as well; and, like lawyers, they are unlikely to turn on each other. We entrust oversight to insurance companies. This practice presumes that bad doctors will be weeded out by lawsuits: that large settlements against them will make them unable to obtain "Malpractice" insurance, thus putting them out of business. But it simply doesn't work. The costs are simply passed on throughout the medical profession. This in turn raises health care costs and insurance companies pass the expense on to the public. Suppose for the moment that the same thing had happened in the real world. Suppose, however, that he had simply come out of the operating room and admitted his mistake to the sister waiting outside. Do you think that, given today's ambulance chasing element, that the sister and her husband would have been content to see the girl, [the victim], cared for? Or would they take that confession into court and strip this accomplished physician of his ability to practice medicine, while getting rich in the bargain. Would the lawyers for the hospital and the insurance carrier be any less ruthless? If they represented you, would you want them to be? And if you were the plaintiff [the one suing], would you want your lawyer to be any less ruthless? Not, if you were looking to get rich off your sister's misfortune. And if that were your goal, do you deserve the empathy of society or its scorn? Doctors have been forced to become businessmen by insurance companies and by the cost of their education. Like other small businesses, they are entitled to a return on their investment. The years they study are years without income. Upon their entrance into "Practice" they have start up expenses, office expenses, insurance, equipment, and very often, a large debt from their education to service. Like the rest of us, they have had to pay higher and higher interest on that debt as well, over the years.

In 1991 there was a court case which involved an uninsured woman who was about to have a baby, and an emergency room doctor. Not only was she in labor, but her blood pressure was high: dangerously high. The doctor sent her on to another hospital, [Presumably a county hospital with indigent funding], but she gave birth to her child in route. The doctor was subsequently sued or discharged and it was left to the courts. The doctor's response to his nurse at the time of the incident was that, he would help this woman when the hospital took over payment of his malpractice insurance. This may seem cold on the surface, but bear with me. Imagine for a moment that you are in business. let's say that you are a cement contractor and a customer comes to you in need of a driveway. But

*George Bailey*

his property leading to his house is nearly vertical. There is no time to alter the pitch of the land, and you have serious doubts as to whether or not the driveway will stay in place or simply slide down the hill with the first rain. There are no disclaimers you can have signed to insure you won't be sued if this happens. On top of everything else, he now informs you that he can't pay you. So you pass on the job. The risks are too great, and the rewards too small. But the next week he returns with a court order demanding that the work performed. Now a driveway and a life are two entirely different things; and an emergency situation demands special consideration. But the ground rules are the same. For the average person on the street, emergencies are rare. But doctors, working in hospital emergency rooms, face them all day long. So because health care has passed beyond the grasp of more and more of us, does that mean that we should be able to force ourselves onto physicians who face financial problems of their own? Should they be forced to hire lawyers to defend themselves and lose time from work to answer challenges from people they have helped for free? Our health care system has become a muddle of, insurance companies, greed and statistical inhumanity. Doctors have been turned into businessmen, either by greed or by force; and lawyers have made a travesty of justice out of their arrogance and [once again] greed. In a perfect world the services of the lawyer played by Mr. Newman would never have been needed. The doctor would have been able to admit to his mistake and submit to the judgment of society. A doctor with a good record should be forgiven the occasional error so long as the circumstances justify forgiveness. If, on the other hand, he feared retribution in the form of losing his license to practice or even criminal charges; and he covered up his actions, the nurse should have been able to turn him in with the full support of the medical profession. Without the need for the services of the plaintiff's lawyers, you eliminate the need for the high-powered law firm defending the hospital, the lengthy trial, and the paid witnesses. With that, we then become able to deal with the problem at hand; that is the health care needs of the patient. If you recall, in the movie, the original offer that was turned down, took care of that. Had the patient left behind a husband and children, then compensation to help them get on with their lives would, theoretically, be in order as well. However, the idea that making them wealthy, to spite the doctor, will ease their anguish, is neither responsible nor economically realistic.

I'd like to close "Part One" with a strange little movie called "Joe Verses The Volcano". I thought from the previews that it was a trite comedy on a stupid subject. I happened to see it by accident. It's about a decent guy. Nobody special. Nobody going anywhere. He had no high opinion of himself, but he had the ability to listen without being judgmental. He had the decency not to take advantage of people when able. Despite his own loneliness and lack of purpose, he was able to consider the needs and feelings of others and give of himself. He was even willing to give his life for the sake of others. Because of this, he was of



course, used: used by society and by the church. In this case, it was a rich financier and a strange little South Pacific tribal religion. The great churches of our time give very little to us it seems; certainly not stability. They rise and fall on the crest of what is politically popular at the time. Women and Gays protest and the lines are redrawn. Mormons are forbidden to participate in polygamy despite its prevalence in the bible, while same sex marriages have found acceptance within some mainstream religions. That same church has been accused of discrimination against Blacks. I am no theologian, I can not say what is God's will with any absolute certainty. But I know that His Will does not change with ours. What was right or wrong, "is" right or wrong. So then, how can we look to our churches for answers when they cater to our will? I was raised to believe in Christian charity. That means giving of the heart as well as of the purse. When I listen to the figureheads of today's religions, their emphasis is either on money, or on increasing the size of their congregation. When they do that, I fear that they often lose sight of the fact that it is Christ's Church and Christ's congregation. When Joe [of Joe vs. the Volcano] reached the end of his journey he found love: the love of a woman and more importantly, his love for God. He sacrificed himself for the sake of people he didn't even know. They sacrificed him in their stead. His sacrifice was acknowledged and theirs was rejected: they were rejected. When you sit in church and use words like Us and Them, you miss the very essence of what it is that Christianity has to offer. The word should be We. We children of God, have his love for the asking. The Jew, the Hindu, the Buddhists and the Muslim are our brothers whether they see it or not. We must show them the path by example. Yet, we who worship the same God through Christ, separate even ourselves into sects. This is the vanity of our churches. The national news aired a story on Israel, a nation where twelve percent of the population is Muslim. It seems that the Muslims voted with the Hebrews on some issue contrary to their own beliefs. Why? According to the report it was because the law included a provision for reduced taxes on the Muslim Church. Much has been made of the wealth of the Catholic Church. The same can be said of the Mormon Church and the Television ministries. I think that wealth has had a devastatingly bad affect on our society's ability to believe in the Church of Christ. After all, how can we as individuals, have faith that the Lord will provide, when our churches feel the need to hedge their bet with investments in land and business? It makes them vulnerable to attack by anyone who would challenge the word of the Bible through their actions. The church should be a sanctuary of strength and stability. When a church calls on us to judge others, it is often times "Throwing the First Stone". When a church divides, then it is not the house of God. When a church votes its purse rather than its conscience, then it loses its way. Much of what I have written up to this point consists of those things that my generation already knows about. You may disagree with my interpretation of the past. I'm probably even wrong about some of what I have said. Still, I have

*George Bailey*

added much more to this first “leg” of the book than I would have needed, had it not been directed so much at the younger Americans that I hope will take this work to heart enough to spread the word. To those young people let me say that We live in a time of great promise. Not only due to technology but also due to the simple fact that we have the word of God at our fingertips. Now I know that doesn’t sound so incredible, but it truly is. For centuries the word of God came to average people like you and me through the church. The Catholic Church gave its sermons in Latin when my wife worshipped there as a child. In generations now past, it resisted letting the Bible be in the possession of the common man. It was Martin Luther, the name sake of the Lutheran Church who first translated the text into German so that it could be read by the common man and woman. It was less than five hundred years ago that Martin Luther’s predecessor, William Tyndale, was burned at the stake for his, the first translation of the Bible into English. Today the Gideons and others have been so successful at filling the world with the Word of the Lord that we forget that a century and a half ago it would have been among a family’s most cherished possessions. That may seem like a long time to you if you are young, but it is a short span in the progression of the history of mankind. As it turns out, it is just about enough time to get the Word out around the globe. Today the church still places itself between its congregation and their God when they take their confessions. I will have more to say about the world’s religions later on. But for now it is important for you to understand that today in America, there is nothing to bar you from a direct relationship with God. If you could find the time to read this in order to try and save your country; then surely there is time for you to try and save your very “self”.

I have a friend, who like most of my generation, believed that knowing and understanding the right and wrong taught to us by our parents, would be enough for her to teach her children right from wrong. But when a nation such as ours forgets that the laws We have, were given to us, rather than something We came up with on our own [as many of the scientific view profess]: the laws become susceptible to the political whims of each generation. This book is not about a religious revolution. But it is based on right and wrong. It is based on what is fair for everyone. But just as importantly, it is not a free ride. It does not make every body but “YOU” pay all the taxes. It does not allocate all of the countries resources to “YOU”. It does not hold “ANYONE” blameless. It does not leave “ANYBODY” alone. So READ THE BIBLE for your self. Find a member of the “Church” to help you with the words and passages that you don’t understand. Even join their church if you feel you want to. But listen to the word of God from the Old Testament. Understand the road that mankind has traveled and why. Then, in the New Testament, you will come to understand that the “NEW COVENANT” is with any of us that care to sign on. And you will come to understand that when the newscasters tell you that the “Christians” in Bosnia

have murdered their neighbors; that they might just as well have referred to them as the “Newscasters” of Bosnia. For, they are no more Christian than they are Newscasters, as evidenced by their actions. You will come to understand that it is Christianity, which is the source of the idea of Democracy. I have explained to you how people protect their place in their line. You can look around and see that our Democratic forum is in this state of affairs because people can not discuss our problems without threatening someone’s line. It was the notion that we should consider what is best for all concerned, which gave rise to democratic thought and it was Christianity which gave rise to that notion.

So what then is the fulfillment of science and industrial technology? As automation and technical advances produce more and in so doing consume more; what is the ultimate goal we strive for? In our utopia will we all cruise endlessly down endless stretches of pavement that lead to still more endless stretches of pavement? Will we set in houses filled with electronic hardware, that entertain us, while hand servants from the “Third World” stand in attendance. Is the “Good Life” simply lying around amongst our positions and feeding ourselves and our fantasies; punctuated only by short trips to the latest weight reduction machine. Or will we even find a pill to eliminate that unpleasantness. Is it nothing more than an endless, mindless orgy of consumption, sex and audio-visual pacification that we aspire to? Without restraint, without thought, without simple inward reflection; there is no peace. We have become slaves to our positions and our desires. We retreat from self reflection and self-examination by filling the void with the companionship of a TV or a radio left on in the other room. We are pacified with eating and drinking and smoking. We are alone amidst family members, all focused on the make believe lives of the people on the “tube”. A philosopher who’s book I once read and who’s name I have unfortunately forgotten; said that in order for mankind to reach its full potential, man must first achieve “Freedom From” the toils of life in order to find the “Freedom To” reflect upon himself. In our lifetime “Freedom To” has been replaced with a new philosophy: “He who dies with the most toys wins”. We have become a nation of obsessive-compulsives. It is not something that can be legislated away. It is a challenge that must be faced alone, each of us in his or her own way. But if we can not, then we can have no other meaningful changes. When asked which of the Ten Commandments was the most important, Jesus answered that they are all equally important, but above all else, we should love our neighbor as we love our self. In losing sight of that, We, the citizens of these United States, have been divided and conquered. Therefore, the problems We face can not be solved scientifically, but rather they must be addressed with moral direction. In part two I have done my best to follow that path.

In closing part one, let me say that, it is not necessary that you agree with what I have said up to this point, for you to find solutions to our problems in part

*George Bailey*

two. I am sorry if I ruffled your feathers thus far. As I said in the beginning, I may be wrong about some of the things I have said. Over the course of compiling this book, many things have been edited. Some, more than once. But if you have been good enough to read this far, then you surely owe it to yourself to have a look at the elephant. So let us begin.

The house that our forefathers build here in America has been ignored and neglected. Its foundations have been allowed to erode away. A self-serving, corrupted government has shored it up at points that pacify those who pay the most and those who cry the loudest, until we have come to a point at which it resembles a pole house. To remove any pole is to bring the house down. At the same time, all the lumber available is being used and termites abound. If we stand idly by and wait for the house to collapse, many of us will be crushed beneath it. And for all the shortcomings of our electorate and our citizens, I can think of no other body of people who would govern us with more generosity and compassion than ourselves. For that matter; while I am ashamed that we are often heavy handed around the world, I can think of no other peoples who could be significantly less corrupted by such power. Our only alternative then, is to save our house. To stand together and gather up the stones that were once the foundation of our land and return them to the pattern laid out in the constitution. To do that, the poles will have to be removed: all the poles.

What I proposed is a complete system that takes care of everyone. It also costs everyone. It is like the elephant. If, as you read, you see holes in the plan: that's good. That means your thinking. You're paying attention. What you must remember is that many things must change. I have dealt with as many of our problems as I could; but as a whole, rather than piece meal. If you judge it without looking it over from one end to the other, you risk of being blind to its design. Many of its parts may be unpleasant, even offensive, but if you love liberty and still maintain compassion for your fellow man, and woman, I think you will find this elephant to be a strong, kind, maybe even, a handsome animal.

In order to meet those basic guarantees of the "Declaration of Independence" ["Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness"], people "must" be able to own a home, feed themselves and get basic medical attention in return for their labors. These guarantees were not laid out as such in the Constitution but they are the principles for which our first revolution was fought. The only reason they weren't laid out as such is probably that any American should "Hold These Truths To Be Self Evident". Yet this self-evidence has eluded government, [including the Supreme Court] since the beginning of the industrial revolution. What's more, every attempt must be made to create jobs through Capitalism [not bureaucratic growth], to enable those who desire a job to find one. No man, who is free to starve to death, owes any allegiance to his country. No man is free who is over taxed, over regulated, over litigated or oppressed as an employee or an

employer. The book “Walden Two”, contemplated a society in which each job within the community was assigned a value according to its desirability and degree of difficulty, as opposed to its social status. This point system allowed an individual to fulfill their obligation to the collective by choosing any combination of jobs they wished, in order to acquire the needed point total. They could choose distasteful jobs for more points or less challenging chores for fewer points. It was a fairy tale answer to a simple problem in Utopia. In Capitalism, it is the skill involved, coupled with the rewards of the field of endeavor, more than the desirability of the work, which determines compensation. Of course “Privilege” will inevitably play a large role in who among us excels. For that matter, “Luck” is very often the quintessential element. These elements are all that is necessary in order for the economics of capitalism to function as the medium in which compensation for work performed is determined. That is to say, that, these are the forces that are at play in determining wages and compensation paid to employees in the market place today. But in order to build a society upon a capitalistic driven economy, it is necessary to put in place a base wage. This was the function of the “Minimum Wage”. Unfortunately, it was and remains a political sham. In order for a minimum wage to be adequate enough to produce autonomy and self-esteem, it must be sufficient to maintain a mortgage, a modest household and family expenses and sufficient medical attention. If it does not, the temptation to give up and simply let the system take care of you is often overwhelming. It also becomes a wellspring of rationalization for those who would rather live outside the law. It has become more profitable for many to play the Welfare game, than to work for a living. To this end, a minimum wage should be a function of the cost of local housing, rather than a political gift. To arrive at a cost for local housing, you must first understand the Mean, the Median and the Mode. They are all methods of averaging. By finding the value of each, for housing in your county and in those counties which connect with yours; and then averaging those three values in each applicable county to find the mean and then averaging the county values as well using the mean once again: you can find a usable, unbiased value for housing in your area. By dealing with mortgage rates [which we will discuss later] you can arrive at a monthly mortgage rate from which a minimum wage can be derived. Let’s move on now. We will return to this later on. Remember that it will be necessary not to prejudge. After all, it is obvious that such a plan is going to raise the minimum wage considerably. Furthermore, it is prudent to ask how we can afford such increases in bad or even, good times. The simple truth is that concessions will have to be made.

The first of these concessions is unemployment insurance. Anyone who has had to apply for it knows that it is not only demeaning but it is too little, too late. The idea that one is obligated to pay into an insurance fund and then made to jump through hoops in order to collect benefits, is intolerable. Not only are benefits limited and short term, but the money lost to the resulting bureaucracy

*George Bailey*

makes it an unnecessary burden on the economy. It has also subverted capitalism, in that, seasonal jobs which used to have to pay higher wages in order to attract workers, simply dumps those same workers on the unemployment system in the off season. Some of this is offset by contributions made by those employers, but some of it is ultimately paid by employers who keep their employees working year round. Regardless of the original intent of unemployment insurance, it has become a method to keep money flowing in the direction of local retailers and area banks during periods of economic setback. Rather than being a safety net, it is a burden for those who are forced to have “Contributions” made into its fund from monies which employers have allocated to their labor. It should be replaced with a system of voluntary “Job Splitting”. It should be federally funded [to bring federal money into distressed areas], and locally administered, since they can most accurately assess the need. By compiling a list of those who are looking for work and comparing it the number of job openings in the area, the number of “Job Splitting Incentives” to be offered can be arrived at. In return for filling a job opening with two “half day” employees, an employer would be reimbursed for twenty five percent of wages paid for those two positions; on a quarterly bases. [It is important that it not be offered as a tax credit as you will see later]. It is also important that it be limited to “Base Wage” jobs to prevent abuse in the job market. In order to sign on a new “Compensated Pair”, employees looking for work and employers looking for workers would call the local employment office and make a request. Preference should be given to employers with the smallest percentage of “Compensated Employees” in their work force. The “Term”, or length, of their compensation agreement should not exceed six months. At the end of that period the employer would have to reapply. There are many advantages to this “Job Splitting” type approach. First of all, and perhaps most important, is that it addresses the fact that people are different. It is about time that we recognize that not all people work or even play well together. It serves neither the employer nor the employee to work at a job with people you don’t like. If the bottom rung of the ladder will sustain the average family, and at least half that wage is assured to everyone willing to work, without interruption, employees would be free to find an agreeable group to work with even if they fail to find work in the field of their choice; without fear of jeopardizing their possessions or their families well being. This is “TRUE” freedom. By the same token, employers should not be forced to keep malcontents in their employ. Nor should it be necessary to prove a person unproductive in order to fire them or let them go. As in “Walden Two”, the bottom-rung guaranty may very well see Capitalism push previously menial paying jobs, into jobs which exceed minimum wage by virtue of their distasteful nature. After all, why would someone work a thankless stressful job, or do distasteful work any longer than it takes them to find a better job, if monetary incentives exceeding minimum wage were not offered. In the end, a minimum wage that one can not survive on, enslaves us all.

It forces us into a situation where we can't afford to quit or speak out, in a job that maintains us. A six month Job Splitting term would also serve as trial period for employers to evaluate their employees and an opportunity for those employees to demonstrate their abilities. With a six month split position in place, employers could move employees from half days to full days and refill that "split" position with another person off the street; since the designation they receive from the government is to provide a split position, not a particular individual. I expect a lot of criticism from those so called labor groups, minorities and feminists, over the idea that employers should be able to fire individuals who simply don't work out. Furthermore, I fully expect that there will be employers who are abusive. But those kinds of employers are doomed in the economic battleground of the New World economy. Those who choose their work force by any other criteria than ability are destined to fail. Those who are blatant can still be helped along toward that end through "Boycott" and negative press. But far more important than putting these people out of business and therefore power, is the fact that, for those who rise in an unregulated system, there is success that can not be denied. A false accusation of advancement by quota will carry no weight. Inroads have been made with the help of Civil Rights laws. The potentials of all races have been proven and the myths of racial superiority have been exposed. The resurgence of racism in America is not about old myths. It is about hard times. It is about government and Special Interests pitting us against each other to insure their own survival. I believe that we should all work. More importantly, I believe we should all be able to survive on what we work for. If wages are fair, then bad safety standards will not be tolerated by employees that have somewhere else to go. If employees choose to work at "hazardous" jobs, despite increased risk in order to receive increased wages; then employers should not be held accountable in the civil courts. If injuries incurred and those dangers were known by the employer and withheld from the employee, it is a matter for the criminal courts. And finally, those who reveal the truth when employers do the wrong thing [the Whistle Blowers] will have a place in the American work force assured for them. These options and safeguards will do more to further the cause of the American worker than all the unions and government regulations of the past thirty years combined. It will do more for the productivity of business than all the Reagan tax cuts. And it will be fair to all concerned.

Concession number two is "Workman's Compensation Insurance". Like unemployment insurance it is too little, too late, in many cases. It is a medical plan which protects only the breadwinner and then only at work. It is not likely to save your mortgage or protect your family and its cost can range as high as 38% of your gross wages paid out over and above the gross wages paid to you by your employer. Just as with unemployment insurance, it comes from those funds figured into your employers labor costs. And just as with unemployment insurance, you may not take those cash values as wages but instead you as an

*George Bailey*

employee are forced to participate, no matter how failed the system becomes. This kind of expense costs jobs in a big way. It bars competition by denying individuals the right to hire employees short term or without advanced notice. Fraudulent claims have risen to epidemic proportions. Today, in California, where mental stress has become a covered illness, lawyers advertise on television for clients, inciting people to abuse the system. How can we defend against a claim of stress? It is an impossibility. The incidents of Vietnamese American immigrants defrauding the system with the coaching of government paid translators is just one of the enterprising new ideas that has come about. It is a continuation of the notion that insurance is a free ride or an entitlement, rather than a governmental form of charity. It is far more fair and equitable to address the medical needs of the work force along with those of the general population [we will get to that later]. It is far more sensible to pay a worker an equitable wage and have them save for a rainy day. For those who are unable or incapable of that, there are other means, which we will discuss later as well. As for those suffering from stress, if it is not serious enough to incapacitate them all together, a “Bottom Rung” sabbatical [in perhaps the company’s janitorial staff] can both relieve their “Job Stress” and provide them with enough to cover an average mortgage, once a fair minimum wage is in place.

The third concession is one of the great political “Hot Potatoes” of our time. It can not be eliminated as can Unemployment and Workman’s Compensation, but it must be so dramatically altered as to be unrecognizable. It is Social Security. Social Security, like the FDIC and the FSLIC, was a myth perpetrated on the American public from its inception. It was designed along the lines of the old pyramid game. In order for it to work, it is necessary that the population continue to increase into infinity. Even then, it was necessary for the longevity of the population to remain constant [that means population had to keep dying at the average age of 65 to 70], which it hasn’t. The unfortunate truth is, that some projections indicate that, in the year 2010 there will be as many people over 65 as there will be people under 65. If AIDS is not stopped, those numbers could be significantly altered in a negative direction, as it is our youth who will be most greatly affected by the disease. The sad truth is that, just as with the Savings and Loan scandals of the 80’s, the money is gone. Despite the fact that the largest generation in American history paid into the fund all their lives, no money was ever set aside or invested by the government. Instead they robbed it to pay for other programs. In place of the money they left “I Owe You’s” in the form of US Bonds. Those bonds are guaranteed by taxpayers who coincidentally owe the \$5 [now \$6] trillion in the form of the National Debt. There is no cash. There is no private investment. Now, some part of the national debt is made up of those monies owed to cover the bonds, which We hold in Social Security. So in effect, We the taxpayers owe ourselves our retirement money. What that means is that as soon as We pay ourselves off, We can retire. Whatever monies are in the fund



are borrowed. It represents a small amount in the Country's credit column against a tremendous debit in the form of the National Debt. So, perhaps the greatest travesty is that We are being charged interest against that Social Security debt which We owe ourselves in order to perpetuate the hoax. It is true that those who are now eligible for Social Security Benefits have paid into the fund all of their lives, [which was not the case a generation ago]. But our government has squandered it away. That is the reality of the situation. As a result the elderly now compete with children for government monies and since kids have no vote, the elderly currently receive four dollars for each one allocated to children. I do "not", for a second, propose that we abandon our elderly. They are our fathers, our mothers, aunts and uncles, our teachers our mentors and our neighbors. I do, however, ask that they not rationalize their position. When your savings are stolen, you are left at the mercy of your friends and family. But if you approach the problem from a position of humility, rather than pride and entitlement, all manner of things are possible. As with Workman's Compensation, the health needs of all Americans must be dealt with: including the elderly. I will elaborate on this book's approach to health care later. My ideas for a new tax structure will go a long way toward helping those on limited income. That too, I will offer up later. But a flat Social Security check, based only on monies paid into a bankrupt system over a lifetime, can no longer be considered acceptable. Many of those who receive Social Security receive it based upon what they paid in, rather than on need. To that end, I would dismantle the Social Security system. Because of the stigma attached to the word Welfare, I refrain from offering it as an alternative. Rather I suggest that we call it what it is, "Retirement Aid". It should be administered by the federal government according to need and need alone. It should be funded by taxes raised through income on "ALL" wages, not just the first \$50,000 or \$70,000, [or whatever half of Congress' current wage happens to be]. It should be drawn out of the general fund and "NOT" out of a "Sacred" political fund, and employers should not have to carry the burden of matching contributions.

It is a childish notion, that because a person reaches the age of retirement without accumulating enough wealth to see them through, that they have somehow failed, or not contributed significantly to their society. On the contrary, it is often those who have worked the hardest and the longest, under a cruel form of "Feudal" Capitalism, who have the least to put aside. It is equally childish to assume that the generations who follow will be able face the challenges of the future without making some drastic changes. This makes it particularly difficult, because the older we get, the more we fear change. But You, the elderly, must believe; and you should know in your hearts, that We would not abandon you. Conversely, Your future is only as secure as ours is. What's more, as I edit this work nearly a decade from when I first wrote this passage, it has come to pass that the retirement age is already in the process of being raised to 67. It will, of

*George Bailey*

necessity, be raised just out of reach of the vast majority of my generation until enough of us have died to facilitate the care of the few that remain. The longer you who have already retired are able to continue under the old system, the fewer of your children will be able to retire at all. Consider that before you close your hearts.

The fourth concession is, currently, only a budding bureaucracy. It threatens, however, to rival Social Security and Health Care in its magnitude. It is Government managed or Government mandated Daycare. My father was once asked if he considered children to be a responsibility or a privilege. He saw them as the former, I see them as the later. But either way, responsibility or privilege, it is yours and yours alone. For too long we have twisted our society to accommodate the poor choices of an unfortunate minority. Children need a parent in the home far more than they need the home. And it makes no difference to me, or I suspect to them, which parent it is. Daycare is a dead end street. Today our schools are full of sick grammar school kids, who should be home in bed. The repercussions of these burdens upon education are felt right through high school. Teachers are unable to teach; children are unable to learn. As a result, entire classrooms remain exposed to illness all year long and succumb all too often. Kindergartens deal with children who are not ready for school but who are dumped on the system for the sake of a second income. Not only do those children suffer, but the entire class has to deal with disruptive behavior from little ones left to feel abandoned and not mature enough for the classroom. For those fortunate enough to hold their marriage together, a “Bottom Rung” minimum wage, or “Base Wage”, such as I have described, would insure your ability to survive on one income. It’s true that life will not be as luxurious as it might otherwise be, but it will be, ultimately, more fulfilling. Even if you fail to see it that way, please remember that, in the end, it was your choice to have sex and therefore children: not Society’s. As for that growing and quite vocal group known as the single working parent, it is a difficult question. I suspect that the overwhelming majority of you who are not hoping to find a new partner soon, are those same women who preferred the independence of making demands upon Society and the Courts, to the demands of a less than perfect marriage. Never the less, regardless of the percentages, there are those who have made a correct decision to leave, and those who were simply left: both men and women. And regardless of my personal opinion, or your circumstance, the needs of the children are still very real. To that end, I suggest that the employers of qualifying single heads of households, be able to apply for a 20% Government reimbursement for jobs ranging from four to six, or even seven, hours a day and tailored to school schedules. This too, would have to apply only to bottom rung wages to prevent abuse. And it may very well take 30% or more in order to interest employers. It may even be that smaller percentages would be enough. Only the “Market Place” can answer that. But with a strong WIC program [a

children's food program already in existence] and other food subsidies, both of which will be discussed later under Welfare reform, you will be able to provide a home, a future and an example for your children. It won't be easy. Summers will provide even greater challenges. Church and community youth groups, if organized, can and do provide a great deal of help toward this end. In those cases where schedules don't work out and organizations are not available, or in the case of pre-school age children; we will have to return to the safety net of an altered welfare system. The important thing is that single parents not be used as a political pawn to further the cause of Employer Financed Daycare [ or government financed: since in the end it is the same thing]. If we are to compete in an ever competitive world, we must, all of us, begin to understand that it is we as individuals who must pay for our choices: not government and not our employers. If we don't, we may all end up fighting over nothing at all. More importantly, if you are not the kind of person who would try to be there for your own child, what makes you think you deserve help from society?

Concession number five is overtime wages. If you've ever worked much of it, you already know that most of the half in time and a half goes to Uncle Sam anyway. If you watch the synopsis on economic recovery featured on the evening news, you see that, as manufacturers get increased orders, they begin to work more overtime. The same factors are at work in a healthy economy when companies are on the verge of expansion. Before they spend the money and effort to hire and train new personnel, and invest in new equipment; they will "test the water" so to speak. They will wait to see if the increase in orders is a trend or a fluke. If it is a fluke, work will taper off. The company will likely not receive much increase in profits, since a competitive company can not absorb the additional 50% increase in labor costs during those overtime hours and still show much of a profit for those particular hours of production. The employees will make a little bit more per hour and then slide back in to a forty or so hour week. So the machinery at work will be a little closer to worn out and you will have traded some of your free time for a few extra bucks. The government, on the other hand will have done quite well. If it turns out to be a trend, the employer will bring in new people, absorb the cost of training and get out from underneath the burden of time and a half wages. This is the beauty of the time and a half law: that it uses market dynamics to keep employers from running existing employees into the ground, rather than expanding capacity and work force. The only problem is that time and a half is such a burden to the employer that it makes it difficult to earn expansion Monies. For these reasons I think it is important to safeguard an "Overtime" increase in wages. But I think it should be reduced to Time and one third. If we enact the tax structure I will outline later, employees will get as much in "take home pay" out of the overtime increase as they used to, maybe more. The employer will still be "checked" against excessive overtime in an economically sound way. But at the same time, they will be given more

*George Bailey*

flexibility in the market place; and the Government will get its fair share, rather than a windfall: and that's what this revolution is largely about. A "Market Driven Wage System", that is, one in which wages are based on a comparison between "Bottom Rung Earnings" versus such things as: job difficulty, job stress, job security, the social status related to the work, job integrity, personal satisfaction, educational requirements, distance to work from home, rigidity of company policies and job safety; is, in theory anyway, a kind of renaissance in the work place. It fulfills the promise of the earliest beginnings of "Unions" in America. It is, in affect, a union of all the workers in our land. It is non-preferential and incorruptible. It provides individual protection and freedoms, without "Dues", political agenda or the power to extort. It does, however, demand that you ask your self "What special qualities and or abilities do I possess?" "Do my job skills justify my wage, or do I have only my union card as leverage?" I have worked with many union workers over the years. I believe many of them to be good skilled workers. I also believe many others of them to be free loaders. I further believe many of them to be great rationalizers. If you belong to a union, I now call upon you to put your money where you mouth is and stand with us as members of the union of the fifty states. Just as a free market system can not function in the presents of "Price Fixing" and "Monopoly"; a market driven wage can not function in the face of union wage fixing and political favor. For that reason, concession number six must be the Unions themselves. I propose that they all be disbanded. Their retirement funds should be dispersed without tax to their memberships. There after, the practice of union organization should be outlawed for a period of no more and no less than Fifty years. This includes all forms of job protection, from unions, to teacher tenure, and government job protection. Now before you union guys and gals decide that this is the end of the line for you as a revolutionary, I ask you not to prejudge the Elephant. First, look at your non-union counterparts and see what they're earning. Note that they're making this wage with the minimum wage at today's levels. If you'll stay open minded long enough to finish this book, you will find that the economic advantages afforded you after the revolution will probably surpass those you had at a higher pay scale, under the old system. Furthermore, as skilled labor, you may very well maintain the same wage. The savings to your employer in Workman's Compensation, Unemployment insurance, Social Security, Union Benefits, and others we have not yet discussed, was never on your pay stub anyway.

The next three concessions have to do with what you, as an employee, will bring to the market place. The first of these, [concession number seven], is your education. If we are to maintain competitive in the world market, we must educate our work force. More importantly, they must be willing to educate themselves. To give students the kinds of incentives necessary, we will need to make certain guarantees. The best way to do that is with a "Base Wage" system.

But in return it should demand that you bring a high school diploma, or the equivalent thereof, into the work place with you. To this end, it should be established that once a “Bottom Rung Wage Figure” is computed for your area, that amount, here after to be referred to as “X”, should be multiplied by .8 [or 80%], to find the minimum wage for those without a high school diploma or the equivalent there of. In other words, without a diploma, you will work for 20% less than bottom-rung wages. The incentives for education now become tangible; especially for those kids in the inner city who see themselves as stuck at the bottom rung. But if a decent minimum wage and the dignity derived from it are virtually guaranteed; then there is hope. It also becomes much harder to rationalize giving up or turning to crime. There is, however a danger in linking a diploma or the equivalent to a base wage. Schools under pressure from students and parents may begin to hand out diplomas without regard to standards. Government under pressure from business may press for insurmountable standards to hold down wages. To that end, all high school diplomas across our land should be subject to the successful completion of a “Standardized National Test”. Just as important, the test should be a composite. We have learned from IQ testing that regional and environmental differences can greatly effect test results without demonstrating IQ. For that reason, the test questions should be randomly selected, by computer or other method of chance, from a pool of 100,000 questions, and transmitted to the testing place, at the time the test is to be administered. This process of selection and transmission should be handled by a federal agency assigned exclusively to the task of test formulation, transmission and integrity. The questions should follow an SAT format. The test questions themselves should be submitted by “Practicing” teachers at the high school level. Two thousand questions, consisting of :math, English, science, political science, history, relatively current events, philosophy, economics, finance and the U.S. Constitution, should be submitted from each state of the union by individual teachers. Questions should be updated every five years at a state convention at which each area of academia gathers into its own group. The number of questions per teacher should be a function of an equal distribution between public school teachers in all facets of high school academics. As I said before, it is important that the system not become perverted by any outside force. It serves no purpose to have a test so easy as to be meaningless or so difficult as to be insurmountable. There will undoubtedly be a great deal of duplication in the questions. Random sampling will negate some of this. As for the rest, if a question shows up more often, it was probably of greater importance and likely to be worded somewhat differently anyway. The test itself should consist of 500 questions with no time constraints under eight hours. In fact, eight hours may not even be long enough for those with reading disabilities. It should be given the significance that it deserves. Subversion, in any form, should be considered a felony and dealt with accordingly.

*George Bailey*

Concession number eight is as simple as learning to speak the Country's language. Over the last ten or twenty years it has become politically correct to turn a blind eye to the fact that this is an English speaking country. Hispanics have argued [with much success] that they deserve special treatment. Considering the way that most Mexican Americans who were granted amnesty under the Reagan administration were brought into the country, they were probably justified. But as you will see later in this book, those days will be behind us after the revolution. The privilege of becoming an American citizen has always been tied to the learning of the language. Since a fledgling United States of America chose between English and German as a National language and German speaking Americans abandoned their spoken heritage for the sake of their country, it has been a right of passage. It was fair and indispensable in bringing together all the cultural backgrounds which make our American culture so rich and diverse. Look to Canada and its French and English speaking people, divided within their own borders. Some of them have pushed so hard to split their country that such a referendum was voted on in the winter of 95-96. But we know well enough from our own history what can come of that. It may very well be the intention of some in the Hispanic leadership to use such tactics to reclaim the southwest for Mexico. I don't see it happening; but even if it did, it wouldn't serve those American citizens very well regardless of their heritage. The point here is that in order for us to live together as a nation we must be able to communicate. Nor can we have safety in the work place without communication. Our children must attend the same classes, in the same schools, and share the same hopes and visions. The protection of Spanish as an alternate language in this country is an affront to every non-English speaking immigrant nationality who ever joined in the American dream. That includes Mexican Americans who learned English. It costs us in education, in government printing costs, in government administrative interpretation cost, and in the market place. But because the system is so entrenched it is easier and fairer across the board, to use a carrot to deal with the problem rather than a stick. To that end, concession number Eight, [like concession number seven, education], makes "Bottom Rung" "X" wages contingent upon being able to speak the American version of the English language. The penalty for not speaking our language, as with education, is a 20% reduction in the value of "X". Another way of looking at it is to say that a 33% increase in wages may be realized by anyone who does not have a high school diploma, or the equivalent there of, if they learn to speak English. [Note: as the official language of America, English is the only language in which the "Standardized National Test" will be offered]. Whether or not you are fluent in a language is, of course, a very subjective judgment. Once a person is accredited it will no longer pose a problem to any individual, as we will discuss later. But a federal set of fair standards is so simple to set up that I think it can be entrusted even to our congress. None the less, if you fail to bring both English speaking

skills and a high school diploma [or the equivalent thereof] to the work place, you will lose 40% of “X” as your personal minimum wage.

Concession number nine has to do with age. It is unfair and inaccurate to try to equate maturity to any specific age. Some of us never do grow up. Some of us had to learn to run households when we were still children. Never the less, from an employer’s point of view, age is the best measure of both maturity and experience. For that reason, concession number nine is a way to give younger employees a chance to get some “practice” work experience, not to penalize them. It is difficult to set an age. As I said, it is a terrible criterion for setting wages. None the less, in order to give school aged kids a leg up, kids who end up in the work force early will be penalized. Even if not by this concession, by virtue of competition with those allowed to work for less. Never the less, employees under the age of eighteen will make an additional concession of 20% of “X”. At the other end of the spectrum, those over age 65 should be allowed to make the same concession in order to make them selves more employable, should they so choose. Remember, in a system of Capitalism, all wages are negotiable. That is; no one can be locked into a lower wage. A seventeen-year-old, without a diploma, and without the ability to speak English, is only guarantied 40% of “X” in their area. But you may demand whatever wage you can get. We are simply making adjustments to the minimum [dead bottom] wages that employers may pay. Lastly, under the age concession, full time college students should be able to apply for but not be forced into, a 20% of “X” concession. This, again, to make them selves more employable.

The purpose of any Union is to protect the jobs its membership. Ours is no different. In order to safeguard our right to work, and to stem the flow of illegal workers into this country, we must set in place a better form of proving one’s right to work. With the end of Social Security, our old Social Security numbers would now simply be our “Employment Number”. Before we proceed beyond this point, it is important to focus for a moment upon our rights to privacy.

There was a time, before the computer age, when people could live pretty much anonymously. You could send off for your Social Security card when you got old enough to get a job and other than that, government pretty much left you alone until tax time. You got your footprint taken at birth and your family was probably the only one concerned with it. Even if you got finger printed for reasons of security on the job, or had a beef with the local constabulary: unless you made the FBI’s most wanted list, it just didn’t matter much. But things have changed. Today computers are able to read and match fingerprints: even pictures of your face. The sheer time and labor it once took to compare our footprints and fingerprints once protected us from what many of us viewed as “Big Brother”. To a great extent, that is no longer true. In the 1970’s many pamphlets circulated, warning of a future time when we would all be assigned a number. And this

*George Bailey*

number would be printed on our hand or under the skin on our forehead in such a way as to enable scanners to determine our identity. It stemmed from the book of "Revelation" in the Bible, which is "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show to his servants what must soon take place; and he made it known by sending his angel to his servant John, who bore witness to the word of God and to the testimony of Jesus Christ, even to all that he saw."

In the book of Revelation we are told of the end times, when Satan and his followers are finally put down; and about a beast which is often referred to as the "Anti-Christ". In Revelations 13:15 through 13:18 we are told "and it was allowed to give breath to the image of the beast so that the image of the beast should even speak, and to cause those who would not worship the image of the beast to be slain. Also it causes all, both small and great, both rich and poor, both free and slave, to be marked on the right hand or on the forehead, so that no one can buy or sell unless he has the mark, that is, the name of the beast or the number of his name. This calls for wisdom: let him who has understanding reckon the number of the beast, for it is a human number, its number is six hundred and sixty-six."

The meaning of prophecies does indeed call for wisdom: wisdom which I do not have. It is worrisome to think that the Social Security number we all got as youths, and now get for our children in order to get a tax right off, has somehow put the "Mark" of the beast on our "Right Hand" with which most of us sign our signature, or our "Forehead" with which we think. For who could argue that in America today, one can neither buy nor sell many things without a Social Security number. For myself, I am careful about literal interpretations of the Bible. But even more importantly, I try never to test God.

So: in order for us as a nation to have control over who will be allowed access to the benefits I will lay out throughout this book, it becomes imperative that we have a quick and incorruptible system of identification of the "Citizens" of this country. The only way to accomplish this is to assign each of us a number [our old Social Security number] and match it to one of our fingerprints. However, so as not to tempt the "Revelation To John" let us take the print from the left hand or even the foot if one so prefers. In that way no forgery can be made. And should this nation still exist at that point in time when people are barred from buying or selling altogether; those safeguards which are laid out herein will see that those who refuse to worship or refuse the "mark" will still eat. Those who own their homes will not have them taken away for taxes. And those with no roof will find one.

I have prefaced this next part of our reform with this discussion because, regardless of who it is behind such a registration, it is serious business. On the other hand it is foolish to protect our selves from such an obvious act of suppression while willingly giving up all our civil liberties. You must also



remember that “Revelation” tells us that God’s people will have a number as well, and that what we do here in America does not constitute putting a mark on all the people of the world. Still, once the system is functional and able to readily read prints, individuals will be able to drop their employment number all together if they so choose. But I would caution you to remember that even your name is stored in computers under a binary code, which in effect is a number. It therefore behooves all of us who are concerned about being numbered, to strive to make ours the number of God and not of the Beast.

To understand what freedom is, you must look back to those Blacks who were emancipated after the civil war, only to find themselves trapped in the “Share Cropper’s” system of the Old South. Their profits were manipulated to keep them down. Their land was not their own. The same Whites who had once claimed ownership of them, still raped their women, still beat and murdered them, and belittled them, and ruled them; all with impunity. In fact: now that they no longer had a cash stake in them, Blacks became expendable and a target for Whites who never would have dared to “damage” the property of the wealthy. None of us can be truly independent in an industrialized nation. We need each other too much. What freedoms we have, are contingent upon individual and national economic strength and the protection of our civil liberties [Not to be confused with the Civil Liberties Union]. Anonymity is not freedom. In fact, we could argue that people had much more freedom in rural America a hundred years ago, when everyone knew everyone, and their families; than we do today. If you are pulled over by police, you must show identification. If you have nothing to hide [and the police don’t have some other agenda] you don’t need anonymity. Freedom comes in the form of not being pulled over at all, unless you have committed a crime. Anonymity is, on the other hand, probably the greatest single factor contributing to today’s crime, and moral decay, and just plain bad manners. Can you imagine people cutting in front of you in a grocery store check out line the way they cut you off on the highway in their cars? Of course not. They would have to face you. Anonymity will not save us from tyranny. To the contrary, it is the anonymous who are most likely to fall pray to it. With those principles firmly in place in our minds and in our hearts, we can dare to make this one concession with respect to our privacy.

In order to insure that the work force in America be confined to Americans and those legally allowed the privilege of working within our borders, we must have an iron clad way to prove our right to work. To that end, I propose a “National Data Bank”, which uses a single fingerprint [or toe print] and a personal photograph. To be employed, an employer would simply send a “Facsimile” [Fax] of one’s print, [or a computer image] off to the government processing bank. The processing center would then verify the match of that print to your full name and your employment number [if you retain it]. After

*George Bailey*

verification they would fax back your file photo, which your employer could use for visual comparison. Then your employer could file the photo and information in their records and you could go to work. The process shouldn't take more than ten minutes. In this one simple step, illegal workers are cut out of employment and a great deal of the incentive for illegal entry into the country would be eliminated. Of course flight from persecution or prosecution at home, and the bearing of children within the US to gain citizenship for those children, and free medical care for aliens, will still have to be dealt with. But with this system in place your employer now has proof that they had every reason to believe that they are not hiring an illegal alien. Even those who used to come here to hide from the police back home, will be less inclined to do so with no way to make a living. With such a system in place we could lower southern boarder security to the same levels as those in use in the north. Furthermore, we could put in place "extremely" stiff penalties for hiring "Illegals" and make the charges stick. I propose an "X" x 40 x 26 dollar fine for each Illegal employee and a minimum of three months in the county jail for knowingly hiring illegals. If schemes are hatched to defraud the system [and they probably will be], I propose a mandatory ten year sentence for perverting the system for those involved; other than the would be employee. As for the employee, it is better left up to the courts to hear the individual circumstances.

Remember, even today, no one may be legally hired to work without a valid Social Security number. In the future, if we preserve our liberty, people will still get a job and go to work and worry about filling out the required paperwork later. But if people are gathered up by the Immigrations Service from a place of employment, then those who hired them had better have the required paperwork from the new system on file or all those involved with the employment of illegals will be down in front of a jury of their peers, and that jury will assess whether it was a mishap or a subversion of our laws.

Once any of the criteria for employee qualification [education, language and age] have been met; they would be permanent. If people are allowed to give up a higher classification, employers would soon attempt to wait employees out, until they willingly dropped their wage. There may be those who will temporarily refrain from "up scaling" their "X" coefficient value. Someone who has learned English that does not wish to lose their job may not take the test. But once a better job has come along they will eventually step up, and from there, there is no turning back. Besides, with job splitting rather than unemployment insurance, there is no reason, other than fear of the unknown, to delay.

Regardless of what ever agreements the workers of our land reach with their employers, regardless of the success of their collaboration together: no one on either side of the bargaining table can ever hope to prosper if Government taxes their earnings away. Somewhere along the line taxes became a matter of how

much Government will allow us to keep, as opposed to how much we would give Government. By the same token, it is difficult to think of all the bureaucracies we deal with throughout our lives as being “Servants” to the public, by any stretch of the imagination. As we discussed in the first part of this book, we have allowed it to happen to us out of complacency and a sense that we were somehow owed something. Government has always been ever eager to foster such thought because it makes us more and more dependent. As a result Government becomes, of course, more and more powerful. At the core, is this sense of entitlement. It stems from our loss of faith in God and our lack of understanding that all things come to us through “Grace”. They are gifts for which we are indebted and for which we should give thanks. They are not entitlements. More importantly, because we have become so self-centered, we have been divided and conquered. The middle class clamors to tax the rich. The rich spend to prevent it. Individuals complain that corporate America pays too little and corporations pay out fortunes to experts in the field of “Loop Hole” taxation. We have: luxury taxes, sin taxes, property taxes, communications taxes, transportation taxes, utility taxes, sales taxes, taxes on taxes, even death taxes. We have legislators who spend their entire work schedule doing little else than devising new ways to part us from, not only our earnings, but even more tragically, from those things we have been able to accumulate. If we repeal all forms of taxes mentioned above, along with those posing as licenses, sir charges, fees and whatever; right down to parking meters and toll booths: you would see your true buying power double. Taxes are so integrated into every thing we touch, at every turn, that if we threw out all of them, all the market forces used to compute the cost of any product or service would have to be adjusted. It is a cat and mouse game to mask just how much we really pay. Furthermore, even if we defeat any number of taxes, others will be devised to take their place. The Federal Income Tax was created in the twentieth century to fund a war. It never went away. It was increased to pay for Roosevelt’s “New Deal”. Finally, it was used to support Linden Johnson’s version of “The Great Society”. Some argue that it is illegal. Some have even tried not to pay it. Before all this, import and export taxes and fees, financed a far less imposing national bureaucracy. But only a military defeat by a foreign power or an act of God could return us to such an impotent force in the world in the foreseeable future. We Americans have come to see ourselves as a force in the world. It is in our national psyche. And as I said before, if some one is going to dominate, I can think of no better candidate than the US. As a result, until a “TRUE” world order emerges, we will have to support a large and powerful federal bureaucracy. We will have to pay taxes. But we should know how much we are paying and we should decide how much we will pay, and we must stand together to that end.

There is only one fair way to raise taxes; that is a flat tax. In the 1992 elections Jerry Brown tried to lay out his version of a flat tax. He was so buried

*George Bailey*

by opposing politicians, big money and the press, that I have yet to hear how a “Value Added Tax” would work. The television networks, the paper “Press” and the radio networks, are owned by the rich. They have to be. They simply cost too much for the average person to buy. For that reason they are biased. A major alarm sounded on the notion of a value-added tax, [that is some sort of federal sales tax on goods and whatever else]. We were told that such a tax would be passed onto the consumer. Of course it would. All taxes are. It isn’t a sinister plot. Taxes are part of the expense of doing business. They will always, by necessity, be figured into the equation.  $\text{Gross profit} - \text{expenses} = \text{net profit}$ . If there is no net profit, there is no business. Ronald Reagan suggested that corporations be tax exempt altogether, since it is all reflected in the cost of goods to consumers anyway. It wasn’t until the money comes out of the corporation into the private hands of stockholders, managers and workers, that he suggested we tax it. In that way, corporations reinvesting profits back into the corporation would build faster. Considering that foreign corporations do business here without paying hardly any taxes by subverting the tax system, it probably would have gone a long way toward the “level playing field” that every one is clamoring for now. But businesses, which are not incorporated, have to compete with corporations. So, in the end, not taxing any money that is being “left to ride” [so to speak], in the market place, may actually discriminate in the favor of those most able to pay.

Because taxes placed on goods and services at point of sale are reflected in the cost of those goods and services; the more money you spend, the more sales taxes you pay. This was the thinking behind the creation of the sales tax. In theory it squeezed the rich. But because the poor and middle classes spend nearly all of their income to survive, all their money is subject to sales tax. The rich, on the other hand, can save large percentages of their income, which remain untaxed in terms of sales taxes, as it gathers interest or return on investment. The same dynamics are at work when business is taxed and passes it on as increases reflected in the cost of their goods and services. That is, if 100% of one’s wages go out to bills, goods and services; then the tax load on business is born in greater percentages by that person than by one who spends less than 100% of their earnings. At the same time, the burden on business [especially small business] to cope with the US Tax Code, is unforgivable. The work hours, the money, and the time spent on collection and enforcement is catastrophic. They take their toll physically, economically and emotionally. With all this in mind; consider this; in 1992 the Federal Government spent one and a half trillion dollars a year. That represented 25% of our nation’s GNP [gross national product]. As defined by Spencer’s “Contemporary Economics”, GNP, is the “Total Market Value” of all “Final goods and services produced by an economy during a year”. Our GNP was around six trillion dollars. Federal revenues come from roughly the following:

Personal income tax-44%,  
Social Insurance-37%,  
Corporate income tax-9%,  
Excise taxes-4%.  
and Other taxes 6%.

What I propose is a flat federal tax of approximately 10% on gross: period. That is 10%, paid by individuals on their gross earnings and 10% paid by business on their gross receipts from all goods and services. The point of a true “Flat Tax” system in America is as much to simplify the tax code as it is to equally distribute the burden. To that end: individuals, business and corporations must bear the burden equally, based on gross revenue, or the same old games will continue. Remember that all business currently pays some form of tax, and if they don’t, they’ve perverted the system. It is the way in which the tax is assessed that has crippled our country economically. Purchases made and course of action taken for tax code consideration over market force consideration has hamstrung US business in the world market. For example: when I was a young man I could go to an auto parts store and find almost anything I needed on the shelf, warehoused in the store. Today it is often necessary to wait and have that item delivered from a main warehouse. The reasons for this were inflated interest rates, which made warehousing “In House” more expensive and, more importantly, a tax code which considered inventory as taxable. The end result has been that, to escape taxes on merchandise on the shelf, retailers wait to stock many items until the customer is standing at the counter looking for the part. This causes a parts lag; the backlash of which has been felt in virtually all American industries: and it has made every type of small repair business less efficient. In the field of machinery, the depreciation codes have caused a situation in where, after depreciating 100% of the purchase value of a piece of equipment, the owner must pay tax on 100% of the sale price received on that equipment. This may put his or her entire year’s earnings in a higher tax bracket. While it might be fair to tax depreciated equipment in this manner, the effect is as follows: such equipment is often bought at a juncture which is tax timely rather than “business need” timely in order to simulate the forward progression of a business rather than the feeling of a move backward at tax time. A few years down the road the business is still struggling with the debt and using the depreciation to keep above water at tax time: depreciation that is more or less a subsidy paid by taxpayers because taxes have been avoided by that business. By the time the equipment is paid off, it is depreciated out. Selling the used equipment produces little or no income when tax ramifications are factored in. So the incentive to sell is gone. The final result is that used, often unneeded equipment, is not recirculated to the market place. Instead it sets out back where it gets used occasionally if at all, and that translates into waste. In an economic vacuum, that would be good for

*George Bailey*

manufacturers of machinery. But in a global economy it is suicide for this country. Even more detrimental to business is the fact that once the depreciation of a piece of equipment is begun, it must continue to be depreciated even in years of loss. Because of this, business must sometimes pay taxes on money collected in the sale of equipment when the depreciation of that equipment did not even improve the business' tax situation.

Here is the quintessential test for when a business should spend money. Long ago, an entertainer won a court case with the IRS, arguing that he should be able to deduct the cost of his diamond studded clothing and accessories, from his taxes. He claimed that they were essential to his act and therefore a valid business expense. With a flat tax on gross earnings this becomes a point of non-contention. With a flat tax system, if the entertainer [Liberace] truly believed that this was truly the case, he would have continued to invest his business capital in that way, without regard to what the government thought. Conversely, if it was a sham, in order to be able to depreciate his diamond collection, then he would have abandoned them in favor of rhinestones. A flat tax offers business a free hand to invest in the directions it [not the government] deems the best avenue. That is Capitalism; and whether you are willing to except the truth of it or not, what we have today, because of the structure of our tax laws, is closer to the economic system of Communism as explained in the first part of this book. If the government wishes to steer our economic "Ship of State" then let it offer cash subsidies, to entice, rather than tax subsidies, that enslave. If government's ideas have merit, business will be interested. If they have none, government will find no takers. With the 1992 budget at \$1.5 trillion, you can see that 10% of the GNP will fall short. It will only raise six hundred billion dollars, or about 40% of the 1992 budget. But if we collect 10% of "ALL" goods and services at all levels [including used goods] that percentage will increase substantially. Even at that rate however we may raise less than current tax rates. Why? Because taxes are paid by individuals: nearly all taxes. If we will only understand that Social Security [including Medicaid and Medicare] is a tax [Social Insurance 37%], paid, half by us from our pay checks, and half by our employers from "Contributions"; we will begin to understand that individuals pay 81% of the federal tax burden in the US. Corporate America pays next to nothing. That includes foreign corporations who do business here but show all the profit in third world {tax haven} countries. By including the sale of used goods into the tax code and making corporations contribute their fair share We may very well be able to lower that 10% figure. Never the less, that same tax percentage would be assessed on the gross sale value of used merchandise, regardless of profit or loss on the sale. Now this tax system will have some inequities. There will be some scenarios where it may seem unfair. But if we allow exemptions, it will be the politically strong and the wealthy, who decide what is inequitable and we will soon find ourselves right back in the legal quagmire of taxation we face today. So

if today's system is no good, why support a system which may be, admittedly less than perfect? Because the rules are out there in the open, plain for all to see. If 10% is too high to reach the amount of revenue laid out later in this book, then government is better equipped than I to analyze what percentage it will take to carry our budget through the year. If the Government tells you that the percentage will be much higher, you must remember that it is you, the taxpayer, paying it all, as it stands right now. If Government raises the percentage to equal today's budget, then at the very least, you will finally be able to see how much you have been paying. You won't have to pay more. It will just be one payment in the form of an income tax, instead of countless fees, licenses, tolls and taxes. But it is the ONLY tax we will pay. We will pay nothing other than a flat tax on gross income at the SAME rate at which business is taxed. That's right, GROSS EARNINGS, NO DEDUCTIONS. After all, why should a homeowner right off home mortgage interest when the poor own no home? Why should a business that does not borrow money, subsidize those who do, by allowing them to deduct their interest payment? Why should the wealthy "write off" the expense of luxury cars and extravagant lunches, when the "Brown Bagging Commuter" can take none because they don't own a business. Why should the sale of a home be sacred from tax when many can not afford a home? And who benefits more from the exclusion, those who sell a \$100,000.00 home or those who sell a \$1,000,000,000.00 home? How you allocate your money is up to you. But 10% belongs to the "Kitty". If you want fairness, you must yourself, be fair. In the 1996 elections, the media [run for and owned by the rich] have thrown up the home mortgage as a "Sacred Cow" in an attempt to turn Americans away from Steven Forbs' Flat tax. But think about this for a moment. If you make payments on a \$100,000 house, with a mortgage rate of 9%, your going to write off, at most, \$7,200.00 a year on your taxes. So how much will a rich person, paying a 9% rate on a \$1,000,000 home write off? About 10 times what you do. What's more, a married couple, filing jointly, would get a \$5,600 standard deduction on their 1998 taxes. Which means that while they got an extra \$1,600 "Write off", [ $\$5,600 + \$1,600 = \$7,200$ ] by being able to write off their mortgage interest, the guy with the big mortgage bested them about forty fold. You see, every time you try to be unfair to the little guy below you, you help the guy above you be unfair to you. It's what Christ was telling you.

I will cover distribution further down the road. For now it is enough to say that this is the way that we will be assessed. No other taxes, no other fees, no other licenses: no other way may Government, any Government [state, county, city, district, none of them], raise money for the purpose of Government or related expenses. This includes the courts, the police, the fire department, military, regulatory \*\*\* etc. No other taxes. In those cases where fines are needed to detour improper behavior, from toxic spills to parking tickets: that money will be distributed as laid out later in the book. No property taxes:

*George Bailey*

because taxing property that makes no money, steals land and property from those who can't pay the tax. Conversely, land and real property that generate revenue will be taxed on gross, regardless of profit, at the same rate as wages. Money that changes hands would be taxed at the same rate as wages, in any form other than an interest bearing loan. And as you might have guessed, that would include stocks. After all, you are purchasing a portion of a company. Of course the ramifications of this will be enormous. The same is true of the bond market. But I will address these issues later on. The elephant has many parts and you will have to be patient.

It is a hard tax. But it is the only way to administer any tax fairly. It will have social implications as far reaching as its economic ones. For example; if you buy a home you will pay no taxes on it as long as you own it [although the seller will pay the tax rate on the gross sale price]. The Government will not be allowed to punish you financially for your accomplishments. That is to say, as long as you live in it, it will cost you nothing in taxes. A possession once purchased is your property, not an excuse for government to tax you. But when you sell something, anything, a percentage will belong to the Government, whether you sell it at a profit or a loss. If you sell it after sixty days or sixty years, THE PERCENTAGE goes to the Government. Any Realtor would expect their 6% regardless of profit or loss. Your fellow taxpayers will insist on the same. Now I realize that it is local government that assesses property tax and the federal government which will receive the tax at sale. But State, and local taxes, as well as disbursement, will be covered later. Bear with me.

One major social consequence is that speculation in many forms [including real estate] will cease to be profitable. At the very least it will become more risky. People would tend to move less. They would be more likely to rent if they don't intend to put down roots. Old people will be able to keep their homes, on a much smaller income. A lot of you will wonder why it is, that if you pay THE PERCENTAGE on a middle income, the rich only pay the same percentage on a huge income. It is the kind of jealous thinking that lead to this tax mess that we find ourselves in today. We should rejoice that people are still able to do well in this country through innovation and skill. If they did it corruptly, then jail, not taxation is the answer. Ask most people if a 50% or 70% tax on lottery winnings is appropriate and they'll say "no", because it's the only way they see themselves as becoming rich. But who deserves to keep 90% more; some one who made Capitalism work for all of us, or someone who gambled a dollar? We are far from done with respect to giving the middle and lower classes a better chance through our revolution. There are still many ways in which you will benefit. But the American dream must exist in order for Capitalism to thrive, and if you take it away for the wealthy, then it is gone for you and yours as well. As complicated as the effects of the flat tax are on a single product as it moves from raw material



to retail sale; it is child's play compared to trying to assess the ramifications of all the Government fees, taxes, regulations and licenses on business and the products they make. In each case where money is raised, someone has to be paid to collect the money as well as to implement the program it funds. If you make Government, at all levels, fund itself from a general fund; we will see an implosion in Government employees. Paper shufflers from Alaska to Florida will be out of a job, out of our pockets and out of our hair. The incentive for Government will be a tight ship that regulates efficiently and only when necessary: because it will be coming out of the Government's "Kitty", not our pocket. At the state level, the department of motor vehicles will be asking you to make your plates last as long as you can; and please stay away until you register another car. Cops will be patrolling the highways for trouble instead of filling ticket books, in an end of the month rush. At the city level, the building appraiser will be looking for a job in the private sector. At the federal level, congressmen [once we get through with the new election rules], will have little to do except what they're supposed to be doing. And the IRS will have a simple set of rules that both we and they can understand SUCCINCTLY. We will see dramatic shifts in some items. Food, especially processed food, may cost more. Taxes will effect it and so will a fair minimum wage. But you will have 90% of your paycheck: maybe more, depending upon what the statisticians work out as the necessary percentage of tax. But remember when the yelling starts, to use a little common sense. If those who stand to lose the most by a fair system, tell you that a 10% tax on business GROSS will bankrupt business then the percentage I have come up with should be adjusted downward to a point were we only generate the amount of tax laid out later in this book. That figure represents no increase over the 1992 budget. Therefore, even if the burden of tax does shift slightly from consumer to business [which I seriously doubt], consumers will have more cash after taxes with which to offset any raise in prices. You should be able to see that. Don't let them make you believe otherwise. Your home [and if you work, we'll give you the opportunity to get a home] will be tax-free. The important thing to remember is that "Capitalism" and the "Free Market" system can absorb the shock. If it is administered across the board so that it affects all competitors equally, they can all adjust. You must remember too, that, land held for speculation will be less of a temptation. And land that produces will pay taxes, while idle land or property will not be taken away. Conversely, it should not be subsidized to stand idle. Those endeavors which are favorably skewed by the new tax system will enjoy temporary "wind falls" until competition forces equitable adjustments. Conversely, those affected negatively will have to raise prices. There will also be those who "Cry Wolf". But the free market is a much truer and steadier hand than the Government so long as unfair monopolies and price fixing conspiracies are not tolerated.

*George Bailey*

There is an additional measure which must be taken in order to assure that money stays in the system: working. Idle money, “Rat Holed” by the wealthy, helped to lead to the “Great Depression”. The one in the 1920’s that is. It led to many of the tax laws and probate laws that we suffer with today. The first step is to lower the amount of savings insured by the government [the FDIC], to two year’s wages; or roughly 4,000 hours multiplied by the value of “X”= total. Not per account, but per individual. In that way, money will find its way into the market place where rates of return offset the risk. This is true especially if we address the banking interest rate: which we will.

A tax system this flat will cause major changes. As I indicated, businesses that operate on a large volume, small mark up; will experience significant increases. But you must remember that their competition will face exactly the same increases. The flat tax also has a multiplying [snow balling] effect on goods as they pass through the market place. It represents a huge shift in the values of this country. It puts a home and a secure future for each and every citizen above the race for self esteem through the acquisition of market goods. Remember there are two factors that won’t change. First: theoretically, all business pays up to 30% or so, taxes on their net income currently. A shift from 30% “net” to 10% “Gross” will not be a 10% in “Gross” shift. Secondly: if no taxes were paid at all, the cost will still be absorbed so long as it is levied evenly among all the players. One of the clearest examples of this is the motel industry. In order to tax “Out of Towners” many cities and states put a 10% of the “Gross” tax right on your motel bill. That’s today. Yet the motel industry has not ceased to exist in those cities and states. It is simply passed on to the consumer. So for the motel industry, a 10% flat tax limitation should actually see rates go down, since 10% will cover their enter tax liability. Trucking and related freight costs may actually drop as well, once taxes, fees, and permits aimed at their industry are removed. And while there may be, short-term windfall profits, competition between movers of freight will cause rates to be lowered. The biggest danger associated with taxing the business sector in this way, or in any meaningful way, is that foreign competitors in collusion with their own Governments, gain an upper hand. While a flat tax on all finished products sold in the US, evens the field somewhat, it doesn’t work completely. For example: while foreign auto makers avoid taxation here by showing all their expenses abroad and none of their profit here, they will now pay 10% on their sale price here. This constitutes a dramatic improvement over today’s tax laws. But the raw materials, manufacturing and labor costs of each step in production done off shore, will still be taxed by a different system than that of the US, if they are taxed at all. To deal with this problem it will be necessary for the government to do its job for a change.

By studying the tax laws of countries “allowed” to do business in this land of ours, it can be assessed how much those goods would have been taxed had they

been produced in this country. That figure should be the measure of an import tax. In that way the more a foreign Government props up a segment of competition against us the more import tax it will pay. What's more, all monies collected in the form of this import tax will be used to prop up our exports. For example, if a dollar is raised from imports in the field of auto manufacturing, then that dollar should be divided among auto manufacturers according to their exports to foreign countries.

To elaborate: let us say that General Motors assesses that it can sell 10 cars over seas in the third quarter of this year at \$100 a car. It further calculates that its market share of the American exports is 40% of all exports from the US. Now let's say that estimated third quarter import taxes, which will be distributed in the forth quarter for cars sold abroad in the third quarter, amount to \$125. Furthermore, GM [General Motors] projects that if they drop the price of their car by \$5, to \$95, they can sell another 2.5 cars; giving them 50% of the US export market in that field. [If 10 cars = 40% of the export market, 12.5 cars = 50% of the market]. That entitles them to \$62.50 of the import tax money raised, to offset subsidized competition. It also offsets the \$5 deduction they used to increase sales abroad. [  $\$5 \times 12.5 \text{ cars} = \$62.50$  ]. Using this kind of, off set, import tax system has two advantages. It protects viable, competitive companies in this country from tax subsidized industries abroad. Secondly it protects consumers from being taxed on imports that are less expensive by virtue of better production techniques for the sake of protecting antiquated producers at home. By stipulating that government may not assess import taxes for the purpose of protecting US manufactures in ways other than those listed here and later in this book, we can do much to create a fair trade climate. It is the level playing field that industry says it wants, without protectionism. It is important to emphasize that import taxes should off set only unfair practices abroad. Too often import taxes penalize consumers at home to protect US industries that have demonstrated an inability or an unwillingness to compete. In those cases where foreign governments directly subsidize their producers in order to gain a spot in the market place, US exporting companies that do business in any world market, should be able to petition our government for such taxes to be imposed by simply filling out a one page form; showing their total production, their American production and their exports from the US. US companies that produce products outside the US and sell products within the US would be subject to similar import taxes. In addition, they would only be eligible to receive disbursement as a percentage of their US production. This would make the incentive to move production to the third world less attractive. Example: Suppose that GM, Chrysler and Ford are still the only US auto manufacturers. They all manufacture one half of their merchandise out side the country. They are taxed equally on imports into this country and disbursements between them are equal as well. GM gets one half of what Ford and Chrysler were taxed. Ford gets one half of what

*George Bailey*

GM and Chrysler were taxed and Chrysler gets one half of what GM and Ford were taxed. If the import tax levels the playing field for merchandise bought in the US, then the disbursement money is a subsidy for exports. This subsidy offsets any advantage that a US manufacturer [who actually produces their product in Mexico] might have over a US manufacturer [who builds their product here at home], in the same way it does against a Japanese automaker who is propped up by their Government. If Ford should, at some point, move its organization home to the US [100%], it would lose less money by manufacturing in the US because it pays no import tax on cars sold in the US. In addition, GM and Chrysler now find themselves subsidizing Ford exports abroad. Admittedly, for those companies who gather parts and materials from around the world and assemble and distribute them in still others, it will take formulas reminiscent of the old tax laws to work things out. But they were able to muster that kind of energy and resource to avoid taxes and fill out required paperwork when they were paying under the old system. They can manage the same now if it is necessary in order to “level the Field” and keep jobs at home. If it becomes too big a problem, they can either forfeit the dispersal monies to those up to the effort or move the jobs back home. But we are speaking of “BIG BUSINESS” here and they have the resources. It is the small business who employs 60% of our labor force. And that is who has the greatest gain under the proposals made thus far. For those who manufacture and assemble here at home, the formula is simple: their exports divided by total US exports in their category x [multiplied by] import taxes gathered in their category. In cases where inequitable labor practices and lowered environmental standards cause an un-level playing field, it will be necessary to impose two separate import taxes on those goods: to be distributed in a similar manner. By assessing an equivalent to the “X” wage for foreign competitors which reflects the cost of their housing in their countries, We can assess a competitive standard for import taxes. In that way Governments who do not work to allow for the well being of their workers will subsidize our industry when they market their goods here in the US. By assessing the cost of a given country to conform to some sort of Environmental Standard We can affix an import tax in a similar way. Such an effort should not compare our housing to theirs. If We error in our assessment, it should be in their favor. But if We tell foreign competitors that the price they pay for not doing the right thing by their own people is that they subsidize our industries, We have a foreign policy for human rights with economic teeth. At the same time, it rewards them for improving the lot of their own. This is the Christian approach. It is just. But such advantages as these should NEVER be given to business in the form of a tax break. That is the kind of thinking that lead us to where we are today. Remember, we are, far and away, the “Jewel”. The United States of America is the market place that the whole world dreams of entering. We still have the economic power to make the players play fair, if only we will play fair as well. If Japan sees that taxing its people and

not its business, gives them no advantage in the market place, but rather gives us an advantage abroad, they will cease to play that game. After all, we made the rules; and currently they are only playing them to their best advantage in the way that “WE” taught them. If Europe sees that subsidizing key industries gains them no advantage here and contributes to our advantage abroad, through redistribution of import taxes, they will less likely to subsidize. What’s more, the more countries that see it working for us, the more that will adopt it. That is how a truly LEVEL field can be achieved: through the checks and balances of a truly open and equal market. Ross Perot suggested in his 1992 bid for President, that we needed to use Governmental subsidies in the same way that Europe and Japan have. I suggest to you that such actions would simply start a new, world wide, cold war of an economic nature. Let us instead attempt to defuse government intervention in business, in all countries, beyond the scope of the US as referee.

There have been those throughout America’s history who have suggested that We should adopt an isolationist approach to the world. As a beacon of Democracy and Human Rights, We have little choice but to engage the world. At the same time, it would be better if We closed our borders than contribute to the economic well being of “Governments” [not nations] such as China’s. In an effort to “Capitalize” on the economic rise of China, our Government has turned its back on those who are imprisoned there, for the sake of trade and the money it promises. In the end, if We do business with any country that “Crushes” political decent and/or religious freedom, then We not only prolong the struggle of those who are oppressed by it, but We raise up an economic power which is at odds with all that We profess to be. It would be better for us as a people to experience an economic decline of a magnitude greater than the Great Depression, than for us to cease to be a “Beacon Of Hope”. God will honor and protect those who do the right thing. And He will surely put asunder those who fail to do so.

As I have done so many times in this book, I want for a moment to take off on another tangent. As we watched the Gulf War unfold in our living rooms, on our TVs it became abundantly clear that our forces were overwhelming because all their facets worked together. The ground troops prevailed because the Air Force had held Iraq’s head down. The Air Force dominated because supply gathered all the necessary components together. The Navy had the enemy cut off and under fire. It occurred to me that if all countries held only one element or component; be it ground troops, Air Force, tanks, missiles or fighting ships: it would be impossible for one country to wage war against another without the kind of coalitions of countries we saw in the Gulf. Of coarse this will never come to pass. Given our superiority at this place in time we would be the last to want to attempt such a trusting venture. In a similar vein: a report issued in around 1991, which I mentioned before, stated that several of most critical electronic components, used in our defense are no longer made anywhere in the US. We can

*George Bailey*

only get them in Japan. At first I saw this as unnerving. It is certainly not a matter to be taken lightly. But on the other side of the coin, it is perhaps the hope and the promise of truly global economy. Imagine for a moment that, with time, as each industrialized nation becomes so specialized at what they do best, that no one country, or even a small collective of countries, can build all the components necessary to make modern war. No spare parts for any aggressor. Even today, when Boeing Aircraft builds a plane, parts come from all over the world. More importantly, and more probably, as more and more businesses outside the defense industry make allies and alliances, the risk of war diminishes. After all, it is Governments that make war, not citizens. And if a foreign country constitutes a large portion of your economic well being, you are much less likely to bomb it. We are currently losing some industry to what we once called the third world. Textiles, an industry that helped to build this country and made England an Empire, are moving to those countries trying to catch up. But we need not fear. Not if we are willing to work, and to change. No other country in history has been as innovative as we Americans and therein lies our strength. More importantly, we, the descendants of the industrial revolution, have another milestone to pass if we are to help lead the world into the future. It is a lesson we ourselves have not yet fully realized. But it is part of the riff that lies between the Japanese and their understanding of us. The Japanese industrial economy is based on a fledgling democracy that was set up by the US army of occupation under Mac Arthur. It mirrored our own, and it really only began after the end of WWII. Theirs is a culture steeped in tradition. Like our grandparents and parents, the work ethic and the pride associated with it and derived from it; are the focal points of their self-esteem. In the 60's, the youth of this country of ours challenged that notion but never resolved it. In time, as they work themselves to death, the Japanese will challenge it too. It is, I believe, the evolutionary process of Capitalism. The problem is that we have never come to a consensus as to what to replace it with. That, more than anything, is the challenge of the Twenty First Century. We must recognize that work should be performed to the best of one's ability, but that it should be a means to an end, not an end in and of itself. You see, the pyramid system of growth and expansion which has always been the answer to economic stability, can no longer be sustained. As technological advances eliminate more and more jobs, an increasing population also competes for dwindling resources. Job Splitting will, I hope, help us through the transition that must come if we are to survive. As more and more jobs are taken over by automation, more and more people will be disenfranchised. It serves no purpose in the end if the 10% of the population that controls the wealth of this country, produces products through automation without producing jobs to distribute money, so that those products can be purchased. Job splitting, along with an "X" based wage, is a way to transition into that vision of the future. The ultimate goal of a Government in a capitalistic nation, should be: the total number of man

hours of work available within the country, divided by the total labor force, multiplied by “X” [the minimum wage], plus a fair and healthy profit for investment and innovation, equals the value of the goods and services available. This formula should include those who work for salary. The idea is that, as automation reduces labor required, wages must rise and workday must decrease to insure that money circulates to the bottom to create demand for the goods and services produced. This is the only mechanism by which a true Capitalistic system can evolve. Without money in circulation the economy collapses. Unless Government seizes money and redistributes it, the results of automation and ingenuity must ultimately find all the money at the top without a way for those at the bottom to contribute and thereby participate. The short form of that would be, that We Americans, as a labor force, divide up what work there is to be done and our share makes us a decent living. The amount of that work will ultimately be decided by how many goods we feel we need, so long as resources are available.

If I have one thing of value to offer in this book, I hope that it is this: our attention should be focused on our people and our children. We need to raise a generation of children who are far more self content and far less materialistic than ourselves. A race, one race, a human race, that would know how to be content with time on their hands. For “time” [Freedom From and Freedom To], is the promise of the new industrial era. That includes time to observe Government and fulfill the promise of Self Government: not through a meddling mob but as an informed Republic. But how many of us today could function with too much time on our hands? How many men and women find life meaningless after retirement? How many young people get into trouble with too much of it? It is the philosophical question that needs to be asked over and over again until we arrive at enough solutions to fill the void. The only alternative is the traditional one of destruction: to tear it all down and start over again with the survivors. The first step toward filling the void is the family. The most important thing we can ever produce as a nation is a population of well educated, happy, healthy children. Before we concern ourselves with filling a house with things, we must concern ourselves with filling it with love. For those who do not know how, we must put our efforts toward teaching them, not punishing them. It is, after all, something that must be learned. If that is our focus the rest of our problems will take care of themselves. If that is our focus, we will see it done because that is America’s promise; to succeed.

Getting back to taxes: the best way to put an end to “Big Brother” is to take away his money. Washington’s greatest power lies in the power of the “Purse”. Any time the federal government places into effect new legislation, they withhold funds to cities and states until they comply with those regulations. Conversely, the most accountable public servant in the land is the Mayor. In most cities and all small towns, he or she is just not that hard to find. To that end, if we want to

*George Bailey*

return power to the people, we have to return the power of the purse to local government where ever possible. Unfortunately, because some parts of the country are so much poorer than others, a more even distribution is sometimes called for. Before I can elaborate on what will receive funding and how it should be distributed, we first lay out what the new government programs will look like. So for now, let me restate that what I propose is a flat federal tax of roughly 10% on gross earnings; coupled with flat state and local taxes based on gross earnings as well. In cases where your money is earned in a different place from where you live, it should be split between the two: be it city and city or state and state. It is my guess that an additional 5% in gross taxes with the distribution worked out among the state and local factions would be ample. What I propose as a starting point is somewhere around 2% for state with the remaining 3% of gross split between city and county governments to be worked out by the state and local governments. It is essential that we take the long view with a tax structure. For example, I know most of you are afraid of a 15% gross tax on the sale of our homes. But consider that a home is an investment for the long term. If we view it in that way, the absence of a property tax will far offset the 15% in around fifteen years [as most people currently pay around 1% per year]. Also, as we have seen through the 1980's and 90's, even the price of a home can decline in an unstable economy: sometimes a great deal more than 15%. Such a tax can be avoided by simply staying put. It threatens speculators far more than homeowners; which is likely to reduce the cost of buying your home by as much as 15% or more. It also curbs what I see as a trend, in large corporations. Corporations have begun moving into areas where housing costs are lower so wages are lower. Typically, they ask the local governments for tax breaks. In the end, it is the population of the city and county who pay for the expense of expansion. Increased property values associated with such expansion only benefit those who are leaving or speculating on property. Property tax levee rates seldom fall, which means increased revenue [as a result of increased property values] for local governments, who always find a way to spend the money: which means increased taxes for those who stay. In 1998, Nebraska would be asked to change its State Labor Laws in order to attract a large manufacturer. Often as not, as soon as the tax shelters are gone, so are corporations and the inflationary effects of their presents lingers on: leaving behind a glut of new, expensive mortgages and no jobs. Stability within the family is the key to stability within the nation. Communities that have a good reliable work force will attract business, and business that stays in those areas will have a consistent work pool to draw from. In this way the new tax code has a stabilizing affect on the economics of a community. Concerning the 15% figure, I want to reemphasize that it is a "guesstimate". In fact some cities may have higher or lower percentages than others. The same is true of states. The important thing to remember is that they will have to remain competitive with other cities and states or they will see an



exodus of taxpayers and the loss of tax base. A city with a low tax rate will not necessarily keep a good work force if it has no parks, no libraries, bad roads or high crime. Nor will people embrace a city with too many poorly run services and a high tax rate. Without a work force, business will move to find one. In this way, taxes versus quality of life provided for those tax dollars will have to be in balance. Because a flat income based tax is the only legal way for any Government, at any level, [city, county, state, federal] to raise money, We can compare apples to apples. The result will be cities competing to be better for less. Cities that fail, will see property value fall until it is low enough to attract industry with cheaper property and lower wages by virtue of a falling "X" value. The fall of property value is bad for property owners; which puts the wealthy in the position of trying to balance their need for a cheap work force against the assessed value of the property they hold. Cities will no longer be able to absolve industry of its tax obligation in order to bring in work for a few at the expense of the whole. If they want to raise taxes for all and pay a subsidy to a new industry to attract jobs, the amount of payment will be open and above board for all to see.

As long as there are no exemption and no differences in tax rates for business and individuals, then the scales will balance. More importantly, we as taxpayers can see once and for all, just what it is we are paying and compare it to what it is we're getting, and those who tax will have an incentive to keep their rates low. As long as government is forced to subsidize directly, rather than through tax breaks and tax law, we will have the check stubs to monitor who we are subsidizing and that is the key to fair distribution of government money. I know also, that the same old clamor of "Let those who use the service, pay for the service" will be heard again and again. But unless we resist division, we will fall back into the same burdensome, unfair ways of the past. No one is an island they say. That is true of government services as well. We all use some but not all. The important thing to remember is that they are necessary in the broad scheme or they should be eliminated.

There is another change necessary to tax reform. It has to do with the tax-exempt status of churches. Such exemptions should remain for monies and properties donated to the church; but it should not apply to investments made by the church. From bingo games to land speculation, the church has no right to ask for any exemptions when it enters into worldly endeavors. I believe in the sanctity of the church as being sacred, but if a church wishes to compete in the market place it must play by the rules.

Once a tax rate is assessed, those taxes will become due and payable within thirty working days of receipt of monies. In other words, thirty working days from the time you receive any income, or at the time of deposit [as banks will take such deposits for free as a condition of Deposit insurance] you will owe that percentage of tax to the government. In this way government will not need to

*George Bailey*

borrow money for working capital, but rather will work off the monies projected; and as they come in. One last note on taxes: As I said earlier on, it may be necessary that a flat tax be greater than 10% at the federal level, or it may not need be nearly that much. Either way, the importance of a single flat tax is that it is in the open and for all to see and share equally. I believe that many of us pay “ALL” our taxes in spite of our feeling that they are unfair. I also feel that nearly all of us know someone who doesn’t. Cheating on one’s taxes is not something that people seem to be ashamed of. It should be. If taxes are assessed fairly and evenly, I don’t think that we will feel bad about paying our share, nor will we be tolerant of those who do not.

Once we have set in place a fair minimum wage and a fair tax at the expense of many of our government programs born of the “Great Society”, it will be necessary to put in place a safety net. The first piece of such a safety net will be, simply, government food. The “commodities” type approach used prior to the introduction of “Food Stamps” simply handed out government packaged food to those who qualified. Now, I have heard it said, that they intend to do away with food stamps in favor of a credit card approach. This is an attempt to stem the flow of food stamps into the “Black Market” which thrives at the expense of the young mouths the program was supposed to feed. Regardless of how a “Hand Out” food system, which is based on “Qualification”, is administered; four things will still remain the same. It will cost as much to administer the program as it does to feed the poor. Secondly, it will be defrauded and corrupted. Thirdly, those who qualify will most likely eat more and better foods than those who struggle to make it on their own paycheck. Lastly, people in need will be turned away because they don’t fit rigid government guidelines. Hillary Clinton seemed to suggest that we could somehow feed the children of this country without the parents having access to the system. It is unworkable unless you remove the children from their homes. It is more political hype, with as much hope of success as her health care plan. The only fair and virtually incorruptible way to administer such a program is: First, to make those items available, as modest in nature as possible, while still being nutritious; and secondly, to make them available to everyone. Yes, everyone. A basic diet of beans, rice, bread and vegetables, is not what recipients of welfare have come to expect. It is, however, what many elderly and working folk alike, are forced to survive on. It should also be remembered that if one is able to work, and work is virtually guaranteed to be available, such a modest hand out is all, if not more, than a humble person would expect. As I said before, for the sake of children, the WIC program should still be left in place to provide milk, cheese and other essentials which are not part of the program as a whole. But for those of us who simply need help until we get back on our feet, an essential diet is generous enough. This is especially true when these benefits can not be refused you by some bureaucrat because you have no address or no need, in their opinion. To set such a plan in place, we must first

have a way to identify the food as Government issue. I had considered outlining a plan for making it blue. All of it “blue”. After all, one should feel a little “blue” if they are unable to provide for themselves. As to the effects of long term ingestion of “blue” food coloring, this is not intended for long term use. It is a short-term safety net. Still, my wife considered it inhumane; and if that were to be the consensus, then it was a plan best abandoned. Humanity is, after all, what this revolution is all about. For that reason, I think it best that these goods be identified by their packaging. To that end, it would be necessary to come up with a new can of an oval shape. It would be less skewed than a sardine can but still obviously out of round, even though it could be as tall as a regular can. That shape should be held for the purpose of government food distribution only, and no one else allowed to duplicate it. As for bread, it should be given an unmistakable “Blue” rapping of its own, but because it is perishable, it poses a much lesser threat to “black market” abuses. Three obstacles must be dealt with. Namely-purchase, processing and distribution. I will elaborate in that order.

Obviously, we are talking about a lot of commodities. In order to prevent the growth of monolithic farm corporations which can control and subvert the market; and to give small farmers an opportunity to compete without paying a broker: it will be necessary to set up some guide lines. Government should buy those commodities which have been designated as the ones to be made available through the program, with as little advanced lead time as possible to prevent the emergence of fat storage contracts [although they could be purchased as “futures”]. Commodities should be offered to the government at a bid price in increments small enough to include the smallest of commercial growers. For example, the amount of pinto beans in an allotment should be the equivalent of a poor yield on 20 acres of ground. If Pinto beans are in short supply and therefore expensive, they should not be purchased in that year; but rather those commodities which are a bargain should be used. For each bid period [perhaps every six months], growers should submit a price per allotment, in a sealed bid. They should be US farmers. Upon opening the bids, the government should fill its orders for the period with the least expensive first. At that point at which a bid level exceeds, in quantity, the orders to be filled; one lot from “EACH” successful bidder shall be taken: then another from “EACH” until a surplus is reached. To elaborate: assume that John, Mary and Bob all put in bids for \$1,000 per allotment. John offered 100 lots, Mary offered 150 lots and Bob offered 200 lots. Because the government was looking to acquire 500 lots, they took all of John and Mary and Bob’s lots and then moved on to Mike, Steve, Ed and June, who had submitted bids at \$1,002 per lot. Mike had offered 100 lots, Steve 50 and June 500: Ed only offered “1”. Because the government needed 500 lots to begin with, it still requires 50 additional lots. As a result, the government would buy 1 allotment from each of the growers in that \$1,002 bracket; resulting in an overall purchase of 4 allotments by the government. It then purchases 17 lots

*George Bailey*

from the three remaining participants in the category to end up with 51 lots. Had there been 200 growers in that last \$1,002 bracket, the government would have been forced to buy 200 single allotments, leaving the government with a larger surplus. But in this way the smaller producer is assured some piece of the action. You may have also noted that I made reference to growers only, as the ones doing the bidding. That is because it is unlikely that brokers and traders and speculators will be able to compete in the bidding due to the flat gross tax they would have to pay if they purchased the commodity for resale. In this way the smaller producer has more leverage for some piece of the action. It may have been that Steve, [who offered 50 lots at \$1,000] offered another 1,000 lots at \$1,003 dollars per lot and is actually one of the largest producers in the market place. It is important that allotment size reflect at least 15 to 20 acres and not just a summer garden. The consequences of dealing in increments smaller than that amount would be counter productive.

Also, after watching chemical companies control the market place for the last half century, it is appropriate that we give farmers both the opportunity and the incentive to get off the starting block in the field of the environment. To that end, commodities offered for bid which can show that they have been raised without synthetic herbicides should receive an additional 10% over their bid price. Commodities produced without benefit of inorganic pesticides should receive additional 10% over bid price. Lastly, food grown without benefit of non-organic fertilizer should be given an additional 10% over their bid price. This kind of monetary incentive will spur growth in new technologies in the face of chemical manufacturer's lobby effects. And should a time come when nearly all growers grow food in this manner, then the 30% increase will be negated on the even, capitalistic playing field by falling bid prices. It is important to note that the same quality standards must apply to crops grown organically that are used to grade crops grown with benefit of chemicals. Just as importantly, they must be fair standards that do not skew in favor of chemically assisted farm practices. Example: the amount of bugs found in stored grain should be calculated after sifting the grain, not before, since predator bugs, added to eat grain-eating bugs, can be removed in normal processing. It is an example of plain old dirty tricks to count them in before processing and should not be tolerated. Likewise; major producers in any given market should be limited in their participation within this program to a percentage of participation which does not allow them to subvert its intent. At the same time, they should not be barred from participation.

As for packaging and processing, it should be handled in much the same way. Processors and packagers can request a copy of orders needed to be filled and location of those goods to be processed so that the shipping costs can be calculated into their bid. Allotments should be large enough to facilitate meaningful labor opportunity for a small firm and bids should be taken and

awarded in the same manner as described for the acquisition of the commodities. Most canaries and bakeries have their “Trademark” product, which reflects their best effort, their advertising dollars and their highest prices. In most cases they feature the finest ingredients. They also have a non-premium label. In some cases the only difference between two is the name and the advertising money spent to promote that name. Nearly all grocery “chains” feature a non-name brand, reduced priced, line. This is true of bakeries as well. The only marked difference is that this will be a government label.

As for distribution, here again the same bid rules apply. The cost of shelf space taken up by a limited assortment of Government issued commodities will be limited as well. The market place will determine the cost of that shelf space on a cost versus “Business Attracted” or even “Business lost” ratio. From there, bids will be taken on distribution as well. It may very well be that businesses will find it necessary to provide the service for free in order to attract program users into their store. It is also possible that the kind of people such a program attracts cause a whole new enterprise system to spring up if current retailers would rather not elicit the presence of those seeking commodities. It depends to a great extent on who would take them, if commodities were there for the taking. It is my hope that those who feel themselves needy or in temporary need, would. Since that field should be narrowed to a great extent by the availability of jobs and a “Base” [X] Wage, I foresee few problems. If on the other hand, given the opportunity, large numbers of our society begin to simply “Drop Out”, then I suppose that we will have to face the fact that not all people strive for the same things. It is still the best way to deal with the problem. It is of the utmost importance that we remember that a republic, or any democratic institution, does not function well on an empty stomach. As long as we are assured of the basic need of sustenance, we can retain our will to be free. It is the most fundamental obligation of any government to insure that none of its people go hungry and yet the, so called, “Safety Nets” that we spend billions to prop up, fail with horrifying regularity. This is basic. This is the “Ace in the Hole” for a free people to remain free. To protect the integrity of this program, the amount of food taken by those using “Blue Food” should not exceed a week’s provision [a month’s in rural localities] and that’s the only limit. There is no reason for a black market to spring up for goods which any American can receive for free. The only temptation is a large scale attempt to subvert the system through exports, animal feed, or repackaging. To that end, the Federal Government shall form a 100 person task force empowered to safeguard the system within these United States with the budget and prestige adequate to the task. It is the purpose of the unique oval packaging to leave a trail and the punishment for defrauding or corrupting this most basic guaranty should be a minimum of twenty years imprisonment. Lest the policing force become drunk with power, I would like to interject that, if Grandma throws her left overs to the chickens, that should not constitute a defamation of the

*George Bailey*

program. But should buried caches of empty bean cans be found out behind the shed at the pig farm, I think the shoe fits. If a mission feeds people from a soup kitchen with government food, it should probably be on record as a distribution point. But a restaurant that serves prepared government food for profit has crossed the line. DON'T MESS WITH BLUE FOOD! In deciding what should be offered in the way of commodities I am afraid that I am no nutritionist. But it is essential that those things offered are the most basic. It is equally important that their selection not become a political football. Beans, rice and corn are easily prepared and inexpensive. Rolled oats, bread and perhaps, powdered milk should also be available: But not much more than that. Remember that we are talking of "pure" sustenance. If your only claim to need is a temporary stretch of bad luck, then these things will see you through. If your problem is permanent, then there will still be other programs around to augment your situation. If a small fixed income has prompted you to use commodities, then your basic needs are assured and all that remains for you to buy is the better things in life as best you can afford. It is my best attempt at fairness to both sides: those giving and those receiving.

Imagine for a moment that you had your big toe shot off. How would you feel knowing that you would be impaired for the rest of your life? Depending upon the circumstances, maybe pretty good. That wound and many others like it, was what was coined "A Million Dollar Wound" in wars past. It meant going home with pride, knowing you had fulfilled your duty without getting killed or having to stay another day in the field. It is that distorted sense of the world that has, in many ways, taken medicine to the state it is in today. The idea that if a doctor screws up without killing you, that you may have won the "jack pot"; has become a common notion. If doctors have become the bad guys it is because we have pruned them in that direction. We have caused them to invest most of their young adulthood in an education that put them deep into debt. In return we have promised them riches, and then begrudged them the fruits of their labor. We have put our faith in them, rather than in God, [or fate if that is your persuasion] and then blamed them for life's inequities. If we are to have good, reasonable medical care in this country, we must be realistic in our promises and in our expectations. We can not save everyone and it benefits us not, to save the few heart wrenching difficult cases at the expense of simple medical care for the masses. To the extent that we can do both, we should. We must. But we must also deal within our means. To address the problem we need first to make peace with our doctors. To do that, we need to turn away from our system of regulation by Civil Malpractice Suits in favor of license suspension and revocation; and in those rare cases where it is warranted, criminal prosecution. If we have a medical system which takes care of all the people, regardless of their ability to pay, then a large law suit, [to be split with a lawyer] to care for the patient, is not necessary. If you think that raising the cost of medical care to all of us will somehow insure better medical

care, you are mistaken. If you think that money will compensate for the loss of a loved one, then you are wrong as well. If a doctor has put forth the effort to become a doctor, then that effort is held in balance against the mistakes that he or she might make. If the mistakes are serious enough or frequent enough, then that investment of time should be held forfeit. And while it can not offset the loss or the injustice, it is fair and it should be enough; unless, as I said, criminal prosecution is in order. After all, a drunken locomotive engineer is going to prison if people lose their lives as a result of his or her incompetence. Shouldn't a doctor who risks patient's lives unnecessarily be equally culpable? How will increases in your medical costs, alter their behavior? It would be nice, if after such a shattering experience as losing a loved one, all your monetary problems could be washed away. But we have tried that system and it has proven to be at the expense of basic health care for an ever-increasing segment of the population at large. More importantly, as I have learn from first hand experience, the "Pay Offs" are not as advertised. The money does not always flow the way that lawyers would like you to believe, and what is made available often goes to the lawyers. If you or a loved one, loses the ability to perform as you once did, due to a doctor's error; it should be a function of the doctors in your area to determine if that error should constitute the loss of that doctor's right to practice. And if the doctors don't police each other, then it should be dealt with by the courts, as we will discuss. Complaints should be filed with a nation data bank and compared for frequency to determine cause for investigation. If gross negligence [not incompetence] is the cause, then criminal charges should be filed. But as for restitution, until your mental faculties are impaired or you have lost nearly all mobility, you are still able to contribute to society and reap the rewards of your contribution. Be compensated with a fair minimum wage, a government that is willing to help you, and medical costs that are covered by the system. It should also be, as it should with any American who is willing to put forth the effort to become educated, that the education of doctors should be given freely. Yes freely; to anyone who would aspire to it. And I will have much more to say about that under education.

Another key component to straightening out our medical system is hospitals. They should be owned and managed by the government. As much as I hate to say it, I believe that it has become necessary. So long as doctors who use the facilities remain independent watchdogs, we have safe guards. But the private hospital is a system that has failed to work in the market place. The main reason being, that it is not a service about which one has the choice to do without. In addition, because of the way in which health care rates are established, there has been too much duplication as a result of competition. For example, each time a branch of medicine at one hospital purchases a new [and sometimes over rated] piece of equipment, the hospital across town feels compelled to buy one as well. The result is a need to drum up business to offset the cost in a market place that

*George Bailey*

does not have that much business. This causes pressure for unnecessary testing from the hospitals and blind-eyed competency reviews of incompetent doctors because of their ability to bring in patents for testing dollars. In order for Capitalism to function, it requires a knowledgeable consumer. In the realm of health, we are not only in the dark as consumers, but we are desperate to take any precaution suggested to us. The backlash of all this is of course, mounds of insurance paper work [both governmental and private] to insure that the care given was necessary and prudent before paying the bill. If the hospital system is operated by the federal government, with its doors open to any doctor qualified to practice, then doctors can monitor the hospital and hospitals can monitor the doctors. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, doctors can monitor doctors without fear of retribution from hospital administrators. Remember that most doctors strive to be good doctors and don't like bad doctors. Duplication of equipment within a region can be held to a minimum and costs can be held down since the hospital facility is free to the public. When monies are allocated, they should be ear marked for operations and maintenance. In addition, 10% of that amount should be allocated to procurement of new equipment and/or renovation. The choice of what new equipment to purchase should be the decision of the doctors in that region, regardless of their affiliation with that particular hospital. The purpose of that kind of measure is simply to keep one small group of doctors from taking over any given hospital's direction. If it is the right move for the hospital, there will be a consensus; if it not it will be thwarted. Area hospitals in larger metropolitan areas should each find their own area of expertise. Specialization locally; duplication on a regional bases only. If we separate doctors from hospital staff, we can better stop the politics of medicine. If all doctors, with a patient in need, have access to hospital care and services, we all benefit. It is a common practice for private practitioners to set up their private practices near a hospital to facilitate making their rounds in the morning and evening. That shouldn't change. And as we relieve the paper burden of the health care system, more GPs will be able to stay in the community at large. With decreased costs due to the end of malpractice claims, prices should once again fall to within reason, to where simple office visit costs can be born, out of pocket, by a work force with a guaranteed minimum wage. This in turn will relieve over crowding in emergency rooms by allowing every one access to affordable GP care. When I say affordable; if malpractice insurance were no more, if insurance paper work were no more, and if college debt were no more, It is reasonable to assume that a GP [General Practitioner] in a nice office building, could see patients for the equivalent of as little as one or two hour's minimum wage earnings. There will still be private sector hospitals to be sure. They will probably have become very elite and specialized to compete. That is good. They can carry on the work of discovery and prove the promise of new technologies before we allocate too many resources to them. It is necessary work and if our



general medical costs and more common illness can be addressed through federally run hospitals, then perhaps all Americans can afford a catastrophic health care plan from the private insurance sector. In that way, it would allow all of us access to those services which we can not address in government run hospitals.

Beyond the scope of doctors as watchdogs: in order to insure the quality in a government run hospital, it is imperative that those doctors and their families be obligated to use those hospitals they practice in for themselves, for illnesses which those facilities are designed to deal with. In addition, all government officials and government workers from the city to the federal level, and their families; must likewise, be obligated to use federal hospital facilities in their immediate region, for illnesses which they have the expertise to deal with. The parameters of health care that hospitals should be adequate to address were outlined in a 1992 plan proposed in Oregon. I propose that it be adopted as a starting point. This is not a punishment for doctors and Government workers. On the contrary, it should insure that all federally run hospital facilities are more than adequate; and if they aren't, it will be "front page" news. It is not unreasonable that the people who pay for everyone's services, expect to get care as good as those who are most directly responsible for its operation.

The subject of pharmaceuticals is as difficult as they come. Without the enticement of windfall profits from patented drugs, there will be little progress made in the field. On the other hand, it seems unreasonable that publicly funded research should be allowed to be patented in the private sector; if that is indeed what is happening. It is hard to understand the justification for some of the costs. For example, in 1996, the regiment of drugs used in AIDS therapy could run as high as \$80,000 a year. None the less, we must remember that pharmaceutical companies must pay stock holders, just as auto manufacturers do. If your child was dying of a disease so rare, that finding a cure was economically unfeasible, would you not give up all that you own, and more, to find a cure. So when a drug company comes up with a cure of its own volition, would you then begrudge them all you have, because they have developed it in time to save your child's life? It is a problem best meted out on Capital Hill, I'm afraid. But as for those drugs that can be purchased under a generic label, no one is in a better position to buy them at a reduced rate than the US Government. The question of the corner drug store and its convenience as well as its right to survive in this new environment, also comes into play. For now I think it best that those drugs necessary to the performance of the hospital be purchased by and used in the hospital. In the same way, In House, Government owned and operated Pharmacies should deal with the prescription needs of those in Class I and II Welfare and Class III and IV Retirement Aid recipients [we'll get to them in a bit]. It may be that qualifying elderly would access their prescription needs

*George Bailey*

through these Pharmacies as well. Beyond that, for now anyway, we should refrain from an assault on the pharmaceutical industry: from research to retail distribution. But it will be clear by our actions in the health care industry that the pharmaceutical industry had better get its house in order or be swept away as well.

Let me say that this is one of the most difficult problems I have attempted to deal with. It is obvious that administrative, laboratory, nursing and maintenance staffs will become members of the Federal bureaucracy. Adding to that bureaucracy is the very last thing I wanted to do. But remember, as the paper work involved with the Federal and State Governments and Private sector Insurance is diminished, we will be trading many paper shuffling jobs for medically trained personnel. In this way We can stop the Capitalistic effects of having segments of Society competing for care. The “Grab Bag” approach of subsidizing care for the poor, the elderly, the veteran, the illegal alien and the government worker, [and even the Union worker] at the expense of the American taxpayer and their families, is a shameful approach. What We need is a system that provides care for all of us, equitably. To do that, we have to address this beast called entitlement.

I have an old friend who is well into his seventies. He is a veteran, so that he is eligible for veteran’s benefits as well as Medicare. A few years back, he needed some medical care. As it happened, the Federal Government had raised the amount that the elderly had to contribute as a co-payment with Medicare, at about the same time that he needed care. So, rather than go down to the local hospital and contribute the increased amount, he dug in his heels and called the Veteran’s administration. They flew him down to San Diego and back, at taxpayer’s expense, so that he could avoid the increased payment at the local hospital, by going to the Veteran’s hospital. You can defend his position if you want to. Like the rest of us, he used the system, which he did not design, to get by in the best way he knew how. But a system such as this does not serve the country as a whole. More importantly, he abused the system in order to get even with a government that he felt had treated him unfairly in the past. Many of us try to get even with government in similar ways. The problem is that it is taxpayers, not government, who bear the burden of our vengeance. Government is not punished. In fact, it is able to use such actions to grow and to further burden those of us who pay the cost of society.

There is currently a sweeping move on, to put the county’s health care in the control of American insurance companies. The growth of HMO’s [Health Maintenance Organizations] is a continuation in the direction that hospitals have been going for the last twenty five years. Sick people and their families make poor consumers. Capitalism is not a compassionate economic system. Corporations owe it to their stockholders to make a profit. The management and

paperwork costs, which are the baggage that drag along behind insurance driven enterprises, add expenses that are none productive toward the end of health care. If we, the people, own the mammogram machine and the X-ray machine and the MRI machine, and the dialysis machine, it costs us very little to perform the needed tests and procedures. If we, the people, buy only enough machines to perform the tests needed, in quantities that allow for “PROMPT” treatment, then we have less waste in duplication. If lab technicians are part of the government’s program and are educated with the same financial advantages I referred to before: if they are paid well and subject to dismissal like everyone else; and prosecuted for criminal neglect but held harmless from malpractice: if they are monitored by doctors who are not at the mercy of the system, we will have accurate tests when needed. Furthermore, it will be physicians who decide when they are needed, not accountants. With nurses on the hospital staff and subject to the scrutiny of physicians and physicians scrutinized by hospital management and nurses, we have a checks and balance system we have never enjoyed before. The “Medical Staff” of a hospital should be recruited by the “Hospital Administrator” who is a Federal Employee and who functions in much the same way as a City Manager. The Hospital Administrator would be answerable to a three member board: one member coming from the Federal Hospital Bureaucracy, one from local Government, and one Doctor voted in by fellow Doctors in the area. The hospital may very well have its books audited by the General Accounting Office of the Federal Government, but procurement will be left to the Board and the Administrator to delegate. While the Federal bureaucracy involved in health care may organize the purchase of bulk generic pharmaceuticals and equipment; hospitals and their Boards will remain independent and not bound to participation. Doctors will bill the patients themselves and the Board will work with hospital staff doctors to set rates. Interns will be part of the nursing staff, paid by the hospital. Economics will ultimately decide whether a hospital will need to augment Staff Doctors salaries. But the practice of paying doctors to bring their patients to a given hospital will find no necessity in our new system.

We have come to a time in our history where anyone who shows up at a hospital emergency room can not be refused admittance. I fear that changing that policy would not be helpful in the long run. To curb those who go to hospitals for non-emergencies we will make sure that the doctor’s fees for emergency room physicians is substantially higher than area GP office visit rates. Since the machinery of health care, and the hospital’s General Staffs are now free; and with the old welfare system defunct: individuals will be responsible for paying their on doctor bills [including Staff Doctors]. Changes in drug policies will stem the flow of much of the “Addict” traffic to the Emergency Room. Aliens, who have abused our good intentions, will no longer be a burden on our health care for two reasons. The first is that the time has come that citizenship, as a birth right in this country, no longer works with open borders and the freedom of travel that

*George Bailey*

airlines afford today. The rules must be changed to state that at least one of the parents must be a US citizen. Secondly, when foreigners use our hospitals and leave without making payment the Federal {US} Government will bill that person's homeland on behalf of the health care provider, reimburse that provider, and if necessary collect import taxes across the board on products from that country to cover the costs.

I can not end my thoughts on health care in America with out pointing out that the toughest questions are still ahead of us. What life and what constitutes it; when is it over; when has it begun. Can we trust corporate medicine to do the right thing? There are already those who have begun to engage in stealing organs. Just how they fit into the system is not yet clear. But with medical records on computers, and blood type and perhaps even DNA information available, We are all at risk. If the Government, in cooperation with the Medical Profession, can not monitor the situation with 100% accuracy, then it is better that transplants be banned altogether than to allow a single thief to prosper or a single individual to be robbed. Similarly, because we have allowed a fetus to be destroyed, is it then nothing more than grist for the research mill? I will not answer these questions for you, although I have answers for myself. Would I be King and proclaim myself divine, then I would tell you that abortion shall not be. But to be King is not my intention. Divinity is not in my nature. I am simply a guy with a plan to offer and in the end you are the one who will have to live with your choices. So how can I impose mine on you? Tolerance in the face of disapproval: It is what America should be. It is the best of what Christianity teaches. That in spite of disapproval, and in spite of letting that disapproval be known: that love and acceptance, brotherhood and Christian fellowship are still offered. While I am on this subject I am going to slide into my next topic. I will begin with a quote from a song by Don Henley taken slightly out of context. It is an idea that relates to so many of our social ills today, from race problems, to straitening out our age-old police corruption and our next subject; the drug war. It goes like this:

I been try' in to get down,  
to the heart of the matter,  
but my feelin's get mixed,  
and my thoughts seem to scatter,  
but I think it's about,  
forgiveness,  
forgiveness,  
even if,  
even if,  
you don't love me any more.

I was part of the “Drug Culture” in the late 60’s and early 70’s. I don’t tell you this because I am particularly proud of it. Then again, I am not ashamed of it. I certainly don’t advocate it. It was another time. We were looking for change and like all explorers, we took off in many wrong directions in our search. Like the factionalism, caused by the special interest groups, the drug culture resulted in dividing us as a people. The drug culture sprang also from a disdain for lies and hypocrisy. If you go back and listen to the music of the time, you’ll understand that many of the drugs being used were in the medicine cabinets of America’s homes. The only difference was that Mom and Dad had a prescription and the permission of their doctor. The army was handing out doses of hallucinogenic drugs to unsuspecting enlisted men. “Magic Mushrooms” an “Peyote” were part of the Native American culture and religion. “Uppers” and “Downers” were common prescriptions. Marijuana was professed to be the first step on the road to hard drugs; and it’s true that it was for most. The insane paradox of the whole drug propaganda was that “Pot” [marijuana], was and still is, touted as a horrible and devastatingly dangerous drug. Consequently, when you saw all your friends smoking it with no ill effect, you subsequently tried it yourself. Then, realizing that what you had been told by all those in authority was a lie, there was no reason to believe any of what they said about all the other drugs out there. In the end the members of the drug culture learned what would hurt them and how bad, by watching those around them. It is, after all, how kids learn everything that they can’t talk to their parents about. More importantly, their parents and those in authority lost the confidence of the kids. “Do as I say and not as I do” never worked and never will. The amazing thing about the drug war [to me at least] is that after all these years and all the people who have gotten in and out of “Pot”; that the lies still persist. There has never been a documented case of an overdose of marijuana. This, even though they say that the THC levels [marijuana’s active ingredient] in today’s “Pot” are at multiples of the levels they were in my time. Even if there are side affects; even if someone, somewhere has died; “Pot” is far less dangerous than alcohol. It is a sad irony, that after all the years the CIA had dealt [that is buying and selling for profit and influence] in “HARD” drugs; that when an “EX” “Head” of the organization became president, he {George Bush} declared a “War” on drugs as his first order of business. Go to a coffee shop in the early morning and watch the Caffeine and Nicotine Junkies reach equilibrium. Stop by a weight loss clinic and witness the struggle with obsessive compulsion. Drop into your local tavern five week nights in a row and count the faces that show up more than once. We are weak beings. We are frail entities. Some over play. Some over work. Some hide from life and some hide from death. So why have we chosen these people to brutalize: these “Drugies”? How is it that we can watch recovering drug addicts on “Oprah” and “Donahue” and applaud, teary eyed, and at the same time feel good when the five o’clock news parades the pictures of those picked up [the day before they hit rock

*George Bailey*

bottom and went for help], as they are carted off to jail. A dozen years or so ago, I was told by the father of a ten year old boy that, the generation of that time was lost. He said that drugs had wiped them out and they should be forfeited; given up, he said, for the sake of the next generation. Now his son's time has come. I don't know if his son has become involved in drugs, but I know that his generation suffers from their effects just as much as the one before. I wonder sometimes if that father is now ready to give up on this generation as well. Would he throw them into our prisons and onto our streets, to be used by those who feed on the lost and the helpless? I wonder how many more generations we are willing to sacrifice after thirty years. In WWII, the country was appalled when a story broke claiming that General Patten had struck a "shell shocked" soldier. The soldier refused to go back to the fight and Patten humiliated him for what Patten saw as cowardice. Today most of those who are the victims of both the drugs and the drug wars, are people who come from situations of lost hope. They come from the "War Zones" of the inner city. It is not the "Wall Street" "Coke Head" who goes to jail. Those people go someplace to be rehabilitated. The ones punished are not the ones who make the billions of dollars. Like I said; it's about forgiveness. It's about education, a minimum wage and job security that gives hope. It's about kids growing up to see that the workers lead happy productive lives and the drugies waste theirs. It's about opportunity, truth, choice, reality and "forgiveness; even if you don't love them anymore" because they have given up.

You know, I wrote that passage near the beginning of this decade, and while I still believe it to be true, I can tell you that the rules have changed. The drug war that was first perpetrated on the inhabitants of the inner city has become a club used to bring liberty to its knees. You may not agree with what I propose. You may not believe that what I say is true. But if you would support the continuation of the Drug War, then you need to watch a "Front Line" documentary which aired on P.B.S. in 1999, entitled "Snitch". If you ever heard of the threats to humanity depicted in George Orwell's book "1984", this documentary will help you to understand that, with the drug war, Orwell's prophecies have been fulfilled. You may not care enough about your fellow man to do the right thing by him or her, but if you care for Liberty or for your own future, you had better wake up.

So what do we change? First of all, if you want to hurt the drug dealers, put them out of business and out of our misery; you decriminalize drugs. Opium caused China to sleep for a hundred years. But we are not China. A minimum wage of consequence gives us opportunity. The class system that took away the hope of the Chinese people and takes away the hopes of so many drug users in America is one of the things we are addressing. There will still be lost souls, but not lost generations. More importantly, the lost souls will get help, not

prosecution. They won't be forced into theft or prostitution. They won't be coerced to "roll over" on the next guy up the ladder, because that is very often a choice between penal penalties and death [Besides, those who roll generally go down the ladder which is the nature of the pyramid, and in the end an insulator for those at the top]. They won't be forced into bearing false witness to escape prison.

To change the system, marijuana should be legalized for adults and the penalties for selling it or giving it to minors should be the same as those for alcohol. The THC levels should be regulated in the same way that alcohol levels are in liquor, [peaking somewhere mid way between what was around in the 60's and 1990]. Distributors should be prohibited from advertising in the same way that tobacco should become regulated. Alcohol too, should be added to that list; and all should be pushed back further. There is no need to allow any of these substances to advertise. It is an absurdity that the items in question have all been either illegal or under suit by the government and yet they can claim the constitutional right to advertise. It is, after all, one thing to allow something and quite another to allow it to be aggressively promoted. For that matter, every thing that comes to us in a natural state, from marijuana to coca leaves, should be sold over the counter to adults, and kept out of the reach of children. They are all the products of nature and in some cultures, the gifts of, and conduit to, God. It is not our place in a free society to make such decisions for adults. Some doctors now recommend a glass of wine a day. In the days of prohibition that would have been illegal. Now a battle rages over State's rights and a doctor's right to prescribe marijuana as medicine. It is my personal opinion that "pot" would make a much better sleep aid than the synthetic remedies allowed to advertise on television today; and a far superior relaxant to an alcoholic drink after work. But these are personal choices and that is the point. We have no right to impose our personal beliefs on other members of our society. Furthermore, all things good in moderation can be harmful if overindulged in; from fatty foods, to television, to jogging. The point is to keep these things out of the hands of children. With the profit gone out of drugs and penalties enforced, the balances are reversed 180 degrees. In the case of "Hard Core" drugs and those which are addictive enough to cause criminal behavior in order to feed the addiction, it should still be illegal to sell them. However, it should not be illegal to use them or to have them in your possession. The reason for this is simple. It puts those who would make it their goal to get others hooked, out on a limb, while relieving the foolish of the need to hide from help. It also keeps the price of illegal street drugs high. Now, with a riff in place between the user and what used to be the "Pusher", there is no more "Underground" drug culture. It has been taught to the American public that children get involved with drugs through contact with "Pushers". Millions of our tax dollars have been spent to conger up an image in our mind of an older, "Street Wise" figure, who gives out drugs for free in order to get our children

*George Bailey*

“Hooked”. It is a fallacy fostered by those who control drug traffic and perpetuated by those in Government who are either totally naive or some how involved. When a 6 year old comes in contact with drugs it will not be a gift from a sinister older kid on the playground. It will not be given them by their parent, even if the parent is an addict. It will be given them by a peer or a sibling who is sharing it with them because they think it is fun or cool, just like they share cigarettes. They will share it with the new kid the way their older sibling or peer shared it with them. It will move down the age ladder, jumping a year or two up or down or across. It will begin as experimentation but end up in compulsive or addictive behavior. Then, as we have seen, as the age of addiction within a community moves down the scale, the age of introduction will move down as well. They used to say that marijuana use was the first step on the road to hard drugs. The rebuttal used to be that all junkies could also be said to have been raised on milk. The truth of the matter is that it was neither the introduction to milk or marijuana that lead to harder drugs. It was the introduction to the “Underground”: that place where people are outside the law rather than protected by it. It is the place where kids learn that they have been lied to about marijuana and step out of mainstream society to test the rest of what they have been taught. If we can break the “underground” then we can break the link between drug addicts and children. In addition, with the price of drugs kept high, an addict who becomes more and more incapacitated and therefore less able to come up with the money for an addiction that continues to grow, will begin to look for a way out. If we allow them to acknowledge a dependency on a drug, and have that dependency verified through a blood test, an addict could be registered as such. Upon registration the addict could go to any “Qualified” distribution point and get a quality controlled amount of the specific drug to which they are addicted, in an amount great enough to meet their need [to bring on a “High”]. The cost of the drug, the syringe, or other paraphernalia would be born by the government; and all of the items would be used before they left the premises. To that end, pharmacies or clinics who participated, would more than likely set up a room in the back [probably with a back entrance]. If their drug of choice incapacitates them, then a government facility, with a government staff, should function as a place much like an opium den of years past. If they can be moved to another place to help defer cost then fine. If they can be persuaded to an alternative drug that allows them to get back into society, then great. But the point of this program should be that those who use it, find it to be the “Path of Least Resistance”. It is better to allow a junky to lie down and waste their life away using drugs administered by a health care professional, than to have them do it to themselves in an alley. It is better that we allow them to waste their lives than to force them into a situation were their lives are used to further the causes of drug dealers and pimps. It is better that we allocate the money to do this from our war on drugs than to pay the price of babies born to junkies who are doomed and who



we will very likely care for all their long lives. We will also have to insure that “ALL” that person’s drug needs are met by the distribution point in order to keep them from dropping in when it is inconvenient to buy on the street. But that goal should be secondary to being the Path of Least Resistance. In addition, we must not set up independent health care networks who have a stake in having an endless supply of junkies to fill their wards. If area pharmacies can not be found to as distribution points, then government clinics will have to be allocated money. The criterion should be a flat rate to distribute the free government drugs, arrived at by bid; not a percentage of volume business. If this sounds cold to you, your right, it is. But it is far less cruel than the lives our present system forces upon these people. At least if they decide they would like to turn around before they die, they will be free to do so. Our current system would give them life in prison without parole. And if you tell me that, that is only for the sake of protecting the children, then I say your approach has been proven a failure there as well. What’s more, this has some distinct advantages. The methadone programs don’t draw a crowd because it isn’t the drug of choice and it comes with too many strings. Theft and prostitution would no longer be forced on those down and out. In order for the addict to be registered, they would have to consent to taking a birth control pharmaceutical along with their drug and in that way we could be far more certain of controlling pregnancy in drug addicts. And don’t say that would be unconstitutional when courts now criminally prosecute junkies who become pregnant. We could revoke the driving privileges of those deemed a threat. Most important of all, most of the street supplies would simply dry up. The “Underground Drug Culture” would collapse. The link between the Pusher and the children would be removed from the street corner. The local junkies would not be in possession of drugs or need to sell them to get their own. Instead many of them would be able to hold down jobs and pay taxes with the rest of us. After all, once addicted, the addict will give up the right to drive and the temporary ability to bear children, long before they will lose all of their possessions or resort to criminal activity. The first time they are hurting and pressure is placed on them, they will run to a government program so long as those are the only strings attached. That being the case, the street market will atrophy. The guy at the corner will lose his customer and more importantly, his need to sell drugs, because he too, can go to the program. Once the connection at the street level is gone, drug use will decline radically. Less and less will be available due to lack of profit, versus danger of prosecution. More importantly, those who are ready to turn around won’t have to fight the system to do so. It is imperative that the laws regarding administration of such a program place no other restrictions [including time of day] on the system. Given governments past history concerning the drug wars, I feel that all too often, addicts are routed back to the street to feed the machine that pays the graft. It should not continue. If they choose to die there is little we can do but to cry for them. But it is a sin the way

*George Bailey*

we allow them to be prayed on, out of our own fear and self-righteousness. What's more, if we spent one tenth of the money on drug treatment that we spend on the drug war, there would be a place for them to go when they are ready. This program must also extend to those under age. As sad as it is, they will be the first to flee an oppressive institution and the first to fall pray to those who lay in wait. If we spend another one tenth of the money now paid out in the drug war, we could have homes for run away kids: enough to take care of all of them. We could stop much of the corruption in our police forces. We could remove the mystique that glamorizes life "Underground" and outside the law. We could change the way we feel about each other. It is "the heart of the matter. Forgiveness".

If you oppose what I have just outlined then I will tell you this. We have had thirty years of the coarse we are now on. You may not point to the drug war and say that it will change anything. The facts of thirty years will prove beyond a doubt that you are wrong. Therefore, if you point to this approach and say that it is inhuman, then you champion the inhumanity of the drug war. We have no right to victimize those who use drugs any more than we have a right to victimize gambling addicts or the obese. Drug addiction is a decease that kills, just as cancer kills. When people are dying of cancer we allow them "hard" drugs in order to ease their pain. But if police catch people dying of the decease we call drug abuse, rather than ministering to their pain we through them in prison. No one can be cured who is not ready to be cured. You do not have the option of saying that those who use drugs must stop using drugs. You have only the option to persecute or forgive. And if you would say that you care not about then fate of drug users; that you wish only to protect the children from becoming the next to become addicted, then you insure a link between the drugs and children. It is your own inhumanity which will be visited upon your children. I urge you to forgive.

One last postscript: when I talk to people I meet about decriminalization of some drugs and legalization of others, one of the things I very often hear is "Yea, at least then we could tax it." But remember, like all other taxes, the sin tax was a "Tax the other guy" idea. A very self-righteous one at that. We should not embark down any such roads again. The government can function on what it is given to function with.

Along the same lines of sin and forgiveness, lies what has been called "The world's oldest profession". I must admit to having no personal experience in the area; but you can't grow up in America without having some understanding of the players and their games. It's not that I'm perfect, it's just that the idea of buying sexual favor never appealed to my self esteem, and yet, such activity has its place throughout all cultures, throughout all time. As the father of three daughters, it is among my greatest fears that they could grow up with so little self

worth that they would prostitute themselves in any form, from marriage for money, to sex, or lewd pictorials, or even promiscuity. But since there has always been and will always be those on both sides of the business, ready to do business; it is better to control where it will be done and with what age group, than to have it every where despite half hearted efforts to stop it. It is like a hand full of mud: the tighter you squeeze, the less control over it you have. To that end, I would like for you to find a place for such activity. A “RED LIGHT DISTRICT”, if you will. It should not be allowed to advertise by any means what so ever, other than word of mouth. It should not be able to be anything but discreet in its operation. The girls [or guys] should be registered [at no charge] to make sure they are of age and show proof of frequent health examinations. They should be issued a license and their names kept confidential, so as to get them registered. Beyond that, if a person is caught buying or selling sexual favor without the seller having a proper license, the consequences to both should be substantial. After all, if we allow such activity within certain rules, and the rules are fair, then damn those who push. The benefits of such a set of rules include: getting prostitutes off the street, stopping bad cops from shaking down those unfortunate enough or just plain sad enough, to be involved in the first place; protecting kids from being recruited or forced into the unsavory business; and at the same time, allowing an outlet for those who feel the need of such services, what ever their reason may be. Prostitutes should be able to expect protection from the police rather than being abused by them. They should not have to rely on a “Pimp” for protection. It is also important that the need for such a license should not become the new way in which dishonest officials and cops, “blackmail” prostitutes into acts against their will. It is extortion. It is a felony perpetrated against a business person, regardless of your thoughts on their enterprise and it should be prosecuted as just that.

I had the privilege of having a conversation with an elderly gentleman who had moved to a small town in Nevada in the early 1940’s. Prostitution was legal in the state and the town had its own brothel. He was a family man, so he never used the service. Still, he told me, all the adults knew where the brothel was located. All the adults knew who the women were when they met them on the street. He said that the town’s people accepted their presents and in return they acted in the very best manner when in public. If there was a problem with a drunk or a “Hitter” at the establishment, the sheriff was called and the dispute was handled like any other “drunk and disorderly” or “assault”. The house had no special markings. And while the older kids probably knew what was going on; there was nothing to see. If this worked in a small town of one or two thousand, it can work anywhere.

As a side note, in the world we are creating, it is difficult to imagine that within the Brothel there could be such thing as rape. There is assault. There is

*George Bailey*

theft. But the word rape has implications of defilement and violation, which exceed the elements of humiliation and dominance present in assault. I do not say this to insight or condone such actions. It should be the function of a judge to see that those who perpetrate violence of any kind on any one, should be held accountable. What I am saying is that those who diminish the stature and significance of sex within a society by selling sex as a commodity, strain their right to ask that a theft of that commodity be given the weight of the charge of rape.

Another important component of the formula for success was revealed in something else the man told me. He said that the ladies of the house contributed a lot of money to the school on one occasion. It was their contribution to the children and community of which they felt a part. Still, and of the utmost importance, they contributed the money anonymously. Now of course the adults in the community were to find out. As he related it to me, the community was grateful as well. But the important thing here is that these women did not seek to elevate their place of business in stature within the community. They did not try in any way to promote their occupation or even themselves in the eyes of the children. This is the only way that such a relationship will work: With mutual understanding and respect and modesty. It is, once again, about disagreeing with an action and letting your feelings be known, while still holding out a helping hand. And what else is it about? You know. "Forgiveness. It is important to note that the brothel in the small town was legal in Nevada because the rules of the state say that population centers such as Las Vegas may not have Brothels. Flying in the face of this hypocrisy is about thirty pages of yellow pages ads in the local Las Vegas phone book. It is difficult to look for anything in the Las Vegas Yellow Pages without noticing the page after page of pictures of attractive women who are obviously soliciting. If you walk outside your motel room you will find vending machines selling advertisements for more of the same. Now that Las Vegas promotes itself as a family fun center and a family community, it is obvious what else it is promoting to the young. Whether that is their intention or not, the acceptance of such advertising infers endorsement. Because the pendulum has swung so far in the direction of moral decline, there are those who say that there is nothing wrong with such activity. I was watching a group of strippers defend themselves on a talk show and my oldest daughter was watching with me. The women said that they kept from their children what they did for a living but that they felt no guilt, nor should they. Even at fifteen, my daughter picked up on the obvious fact that they felt it morally incorrect or they would not have felt the need to hide it from their children. If We were to decriminalize bank robbery tomorrow, you would still know that it was wrong to rob banks of other people's money. These women knew what they were doing was wrong too and for the same reason. They tell themselves it is OK because were else are they going to make that kind of money. This is rationalization. The same money could

be made by robbing banks. Immorality is the quick road to a fast buck. Always has been. So you tell me that morality means nothing and that over time prostitution would find its way into the Main Stream if We would but let it. But this is another rationalization. In truth, sex, marriage, children, and family are all threads in the fabric which bounds men and women together. Yes prostitution has a function in society for those who fail to realize the full potential of society. But when prostitution becomes an accepted alternate course, then the thread of sexual "Intercourse" [meaning a dialogue between two loving human beings] has been lost and the fabric of society unravels. You can call it immorality, or you can call it cause and affect. It does not matter. What matters is that you understand its consequences. A place for everything, and everything in its place: Acceptance in the face of disapproval; Modesty and what else? You know. Forgiveness.

While we are here we might just as well deal with the last of the three greatest vices in America. Of all the three, the hypocrisy surrounding the "Institution" of gambling is by far the greatest. You can get "Odds" on television, radio and the printed news. You can witness advertising to gambling "Meccas" everywhere. It is practiced by the "State" by the "Church", by "Scouting" and by schools, in the form of raffles. It can be found in all places. It is available to all people, in person or by phone: and yet it is professed to be sinful and antisocial. It is the poorest of our society who squander their dollars, or tens of dollars, on a chance that God or fate will smile on them just once. The profile of the addict is one who would gamble their safety and even their life. Tragically, if they were to win, they are just as likely to let it all ride one more time because it's the thrill of the wager that "Trips their Trigger", not the money. Somehow, they seem to need proof that they are luckier: or perhaps they are just testing God's love. In the end, anyone who gambles more than they can afford to lose is a fool. It is conceded by the Gambling industry that one in twenty people has the inclination to become a gambling addict. If each of those people has a mother and a father, one living grandparent, one sibling, one aunt, one uncle, a spouse and two children; then for each potential gambling addict there is a potential to directly affect an additional nine people's lives. This translates into 50% of society at large.

To gamble beyond simple diversion is a sad commentary on your state of hope and self esteem. Never the less, it happens every day in this country and around the world: always has and probably always will. The parallels to drug addiction are so clear that it is an incredible irony that we have a drug war being waged by State Governments who are involved as gambling houses in the form of State lotteries; and yet, there we are. There is little we can do other than to counsel those who have a problem and yet I don't believe that the state has any business being involved in the role of the "gambling house". It's the effect that it has on the kids that is most troubling. In California, for example, to listen to the state lottery ads, a child would have to believe that their educational prospects are

*George Bailey*

tied to practice. And yet it seems, that for every dollar the lottery contributes to education, a dollar and a half of the state monies are taken out of the education fund. Regardless of all this, gambling should be legalized. People have the right to a game of chance, or to wager on a race. But as with other things best left to adults, it should have its own place and be kept there. There is no need to advertise the practice in front of the children. Nor is it reasonable to allow advertisers to promote the idea that gambling is an adult pastime, so that they will gamble in order to appear adult. There is no need to allow such practices to be glamorized. It should be illegal for them to advertise, just as it is with cigarettes, drugs, alcohol and prostitution. As long as the odds of winning are given in a truthful and clear fashion, and the percentage to be taken by the house is disclosed; then anyone should be able to make or take a bet. Any place "Zoned" for such activity, should be able to house the paraphernalia of such activity. If the state, or the fed, or the city, want to get involved beyond that, let them do it out of their own pocket, because we have taken away their right to charge fees to regulate what ever it is they decide to regulate. In Iowa, the old laws used to say that if the house took no fees or percentages, that gambling could be allowed. Bars could have poker games among patrons so long as that bar did not profit directly from the gambling. It should remain up to the State and Counties as to whether or not to continue these exemptions. The five major gains made by society as a result of such an approach are: One, an end to hypocrisy. There should be no more Government sponsored gambling. Two; the end to the hype and advertising that entices so many to gamble. Three; a dent in the system of the chosen few who monopolize the institutions and use them to further their other illegal activities. Fourth; to cut off another source of extortion and bribery for police forces. Fifth, to keep gambling out of the path of those addicted, as they travel through their daily lives. For that reason, these gambling establishments shall not exist on the Internet or be able to take bets over the phone.

One of the old rules about dealing with sins in our society which always bothered me had to do with liquor licenses. Many counties around the country only allow so many licenses in an area based on population. As a result these liquor licenses become a monopoly on a population. These same licenses are even sold from business to business. It is nothing more than a "Fix". It stands in violation of US Constitutional law. In some states such as Iowa, one used to have to buy liquor from a state owned and operated store. But in a capitalistic system, the mechanisms necessary to protect against the proliferation of unwanted drinking establishments is built into the system. If there are not enough patrons around to support any given number of businesses, the number of businesses will fall. More importantly, the businesses which remain will be selected by those in the market place [the patrons] not by the legislature. This is the way such choices should be made and this should be the law. The same criteria should be used with

regard to brothels and gambling establishments. Without such competition, only the “Most” corrupted of the field are likely to control the market place. To that end, when zoning is enacted, space for competition must be made available in great enough quantities to allow for all the competition.

If we deal with “HOPE” through a guaranteed means of making a living, and getting a home; we are in a much better position to deal with the vices of alcohol, drugs, gambling and prostitution. If we deal with vice in a realistic way, we are in a better position to deal with the problems of police corruption and aggression. One of John Wayne’s most acclaimed movies came long before “True Grit”. It was called the searchers. In the movie, the local men took off after a band of marauding Indians. Miles out, and with their horses worn out, they realized that while they had been off chasing the Indians; the Indians had circled back, killing, plundering and kidnapping those left behind. That is the state of police forces in big cities across the country. The drug wars have usurped all of the resources available. Why? First of all, because that’s where the money is: money that police departments get to share with Federal enforcement. Secondly, because that’s where the action and excitement is. It is a situation that is drawing a lot of the wrong kind of people into the vocation. They are Cowboys, adrenalin junkies, thrill seekers. Their posture is aggressive not defensive. They see themselves as being of more value than the general public and therefore members of the general public are expendable in their eyes. It is a very dangerous trend. I do not mean that this represents a majority; yet. But it is a very real threat to all of us. Just the same; it is important to remember that police are generally what we as a society want them to be. After all, the main component of any law enforcement person’s profile is the desire to be respected and admired. Not everyone, including myself, is willing to put themselves into a war zone situation for a paycheck and the hope of a pension. For that alone, they should be commended, respected and supported. Not unlike a loaded gun, a strong police force can be pointed in any direction, and used for good or ill. If we pull our police forces up out of the cesspool we send them out to live in today, We and they will be better for the effort. By removing the policing of “Sin” from their job, we eliminate a lot of gray area they are forced to deal with; not to mention much of the crime that springs from trying to survive or succeed in the Drug World.

Case in point; around 1990, L.A. was reporting that an average of three to five bank robberies a day. Most were directly associated with drug addicts or gangs. So by defusing the drug war We significantly impact bank robbery. Equally important is the need to give them a legal system that works and a penal system that is not a joke. We will deal with those further on. The last and possibly the most important thing that has to be addressed in law enforcement is corruption. With the repeal of “Sin Laws” per say, from the books, organized crime and elements like them will find it much rougher going. They will be

*George Bailey*

forced back into extortion and “muscling in” to monopolize the “Sin” business. With a ban on unions and bargaining organizations, extortion will be much more difficult to do with subtlety. As long as the “System” and society are corrupted and hypocritical, all the elements of rationalization that allow criminals to justify their acts, are in place; and organized crime of all manner will thrive. The state of our country’s sense of decency is largely to blame for the new factions springing up from all quarters of the population. If we are to see an end or even a decline in such activity, we must “all” play by the rules. In order for that to happen the rules must be fair. More importantly, the police have to play by the rules. The problem is that “The Fix” has been in for so long that many cops have long since been bought and paid for. If you are familiar with the story of a certain New York City cop by the name of Serpico, you probably have some insight to the problem. Even good cops must operate within the established system or else they constitute a threat to those who decide to play along with corruption. Consequently, in some cities anyway, you’re a little dirty or you’re dead. The best they can do is to try to protect the public within the rules that have been in place for so long. But remember, this is a revolution. We can change or do anything we agree upon. If We insist, then it is so, so long as we have a consensus of opinion. Therefore, I propose an amnesty for police. Forgiveness of their trespasses so long as they cease and desist. This is by no means a give away. Cops “on the take” know it and those who pay them know it. You and I can not free officers from the debt they owe criminal elements for bribe money. Cops will have to face the challenges with the help of other cops. What we can do is to free them from prosecution or loss of their job if they come clean. We can not overlook murder. For those the line has been crossed. They will not be allowed to continue on as police officers, but as hard as it is to say it, they must be able to apply for amnesty from prosecution. There are probably many acts which should be considered inexcusable; but if we do not give, we will not receive. If you want to see what it takes to truly mend a nation you will have to look to South Africa and their example of forgiveness. It will not be easy. But I ask you, is it not better to know and to have that person exposed, than to see no change and never know at all?

If we allow police administrators to lay down the rules of surrender, they will manipulate them so as to maintain the status quo and preserve the old graft institution. Neither can we set some far off date and inspire a mad rush to cash in before the deadline. Now there is no way for me to gauge the will of the average law enforcement person, to correct any wrongs he or she may have done. There is no chart to measure how long they are willing or able to fight without guaranty that he or she will be forgiven. Nor should it really be expected. In stead, as of July 4th, 2000, any member of law enforcement who wishes to apply for amnesty under the revolution should take only those illegal monies necessary to sustain the illusion that they are not a threat. Those monies should be cataloged and held



in a secure place or converted into real property [cars, boats, housing, even stocks and bonds] until the day comes to step forward. At that time it will constitute, not only proof of their willingness to start again, but evidence against those who paid. If such a plan has any hope of success at all, it must include amnesty for criminals as well. To that end; evidence which is brought to light in the amnesty process shall be inadmissible unless it can be demonstrated that those to whom the police owed the debt, will not forgive them the debt. In other words, the criminals must release the police from their bond or face prosecution on police charges made by officers who will be held harmless. In this way, those who make a living in crime will have to face their own rationalizations. Amnesty testimony will expose the framework of the criminal endeavor. If such activity continues it will be pursued by law enforcement. But officers will not be allowed to testify in criminal proceedings concerning laws broken and forgiven under the Amnesty Act except as a historical perspective, if those individuals are later charged in crimes which happened after the amnesty. It is the only way to stop the threat to criminals and allow police to exit from a criminal situation alive. Testimony should also include information about individuals who were denied a fair trial as a result of police misconduct. If police are sincere, they will begin when you hear of the revolution; but the cut off date, is July 4th, 2000. If there is no revolution, no second chance, then the money and guilt will be theirs to keep. But now they have a powerful weapon: perhaps the most powerful of all. It is the truth. The truth that we have the choice to make a difference. And if we choose to do nothing it is because we are part of the problem. If their comrades say to them that there is no way out, then they will know their comrades for what they are, rather than the victims of the system they tell themselves they are. And if they say to themselves that it can not be changed, then they will know of themselves that they did not really want to change. If on the other hand they do, and their fellows do, then just imagine the change. We need you back. We want you back, on our streets and in our neighborhoods, not off chasing marauders. And should criminals take this opportunity to go straight, would you be offended? Christianity teaches us to give a second chance. If they remain criminals, they will be caught and punished. If they cease to be criminals, We are free of their criminal acts and God will judge them in due time. Either way, We will have cleaned up our police forces. The one thing I fear most is that violence should erupt in any form as a result of this work. Therefore, if a murder is made after the news of this book is out, that murder shall have to be assessed under a different set of rules. Those involved in the amnesty process will have to review the circumstances of such cases to see if officers attempted to use amnesty in order to settle old scores. If that is the case, it should be considered a breach of trust and amnesty should not apply.

We Americans have an inherent distaste and distrust of those who wear their religion on their sleeve. To totally turn away from life in any way, religion

*George Bailey*

included, somehow misses the message of all forms of “The Word”, and I think we feel it intuitively. For that reason I have tried my best to shy away from basing this composition on a religious dissertation. But at this point it is impossible to continue without focusing on God again. There are two sets of rules that govern life. The first are the physical rules. They are self evident. While we don’t understand them all, we continue to gain insight into them. But even before “Newton” and “Galileo”, people knew what we all learn of the world as children. In trying to teach computer animated robots to do such simple tasks as cross a crowded room or to stack building blocks, we have discovered what a marvelously gifted thing we are. It is a gift shared by all living creatures. The result of all creatures to be able to learn, to deal within the physical laws of the universe, and to use this knowledge to survive, is nature itself. “Survival of the fittest” is the cumulative result of nature at work. These rules are not in question. Regardless of what we do, the physical laws will not bend to our desire. The second set of rules are those which we do not have in common with the other creatures of the planet. They are the laws of Moses and the elaborations on those laws laid out in the bible. And while those laws vary to some slight degree from religion to religion, they are largely universal. They are as firmly based in logic as the laws of nature are in physics. Now, one could argue that these works from the different cultures were simply the works and writings of men: but I find that very difficult to believe. We have dedicated countless resources in this country to search for a set of fair laws. We have offered up some of our best minds to the effort and look at where it has brought us. On the other hand, to satisfy those who view mankind as the greatest power in the universe, if all the ancient cultures arrived at basically the same conclusions and ideology; that, in and of itself, validates the grandness of the Bible’s logic. There is no civilization in history which has not understood that there must be a God. But The one true God has revealed himself to only those people and nations which he wished, at the time that he wished; and by that the scientific cynic has been snared.

There is a term that police and Psychologists use to describe a person who does not know right from wrong. They are called sociopaths. It is a fairly rare thing and yet, how can that be, when so few of us are versed in the law. For that matter, even lawyers only know their particular area of expertise. You already know the answer. It is that the laws handed down to mankind are as hard and steadfast and irrefutable, as the laws of nature we were equipped to learn on our own. It may also be the mind’s universal capacity to think logically that enables us to interpret and judge new situations, much like learning to stack building blocks. Or it may just be that, as the judge in “Bonfire of the Vanities” put it “It’s what your grandmother taught you”. Either way, from the dull of wit to the brilliant, we all share the capacity to understand it. Still, it is necessary to teach these rules to the young. Today there are those who would have you believe that mankind has some how “evolved” to understand right from wrong. If that were

the case then we would have to assume the Nazis, the Red Guard, the Bosnian Serbs and any other group that turned against the weak to do atrocities; to be genetic throw backs to another age. Some would even have to suspect the genetic credentials of lawyers in general.

But, the truth is that, the right and wrong We refer to in our daily lives is the right and wrong given to us by God in the Bible. Without the stability of the Bible, you end up with what is known today as “politically correct”. The Founding Fathers knew this. In fact to our detriment, they thought these rules to be so obvious that they did not elaborate on them nearly enough for posterity’s sake. They put them on the walls of the Supreme Court, they paid homage to their author on their currency, they put themselves beneath “Him” in their pledge to their flag. But the connection between God’s laws and laws of the land have been badly strained, if not severed. If you ask a recovering alcoholic what the first step to recovery is and they are likely to tell you that it is a belief in something greater than yourself. Because we have cataloged some of the marvelous works of nature we have dared to think of ourselves as capable of controlling it. As we get a good look inside the old USSR, and its nuclear nightmare we get glimpse at the cost of such abstinence. Likewise, we stopped referring back to the rules of right and wrong and referred instead to our rules of “Precedent”. As a result, we lost our way in the prosecution of criminals. We presumed to judge them; and when we did, we had to deal with the backlash of our own guilt. Like the alcoholic, if we want to turn the criminal justice system around, we must believe in a power greater than ourselves. The way to put that into action is to simply put an end to the practice of using Precedent to govern law.

It is a radical thought, but consider: what do you think George Washington would have thought if you were to go back and tell him that in the future, people wouldn’t know the laws or how to interpret them. What if you told him that, if you were accused of a crime you would have to consult with a professional in the field to find out if you are innocent or guilty? What would he say to the idea that the professional would have to consult with ever growing volumes of books to see for sure: and even then, they could only render you an “Opinion”. How could you make him understand, that even if you are guilty, no one will know if it is wrong or if it is permissible until a Judge has ruled. Do you think old George would find that notion “Radical”, or even “believable”? We have come to a point where we are all outside some law or some municipal code regardless of how hard we try. We have dealt with one great form of anxiety by reducing the tax code to the amount received, multiplied by a percentage. Let us now reduce some of the rest. Mr. Washington sat in on months of debate with some very wise and earnest men. They came up with a simple solution. They called it a “Trial by a jury of one’s peers”. They had called on God for his help at the beginning of

*George Bailey*

these sessions without embarrassment, and I believe that they came to believe in the old adage that “Given a level playing field, truth will always triumph over evil”. In essence: that is to say, that “logic” will prevail. If we are going to return to that kind of justice, we must set a few ground rules: The first, a level playing field. In Washington’s day people knew their neighbors. That old anonymity business didn’t play much of a role. Today it’s highly unlikely that any acceptable juror in a big city is going to be acquainted with the defendant or the victim. Because of this, every thing remotely relevant, must be acceptable as evidence. From a person’s history, to their dress and appearance at the time of the crime; regardless of how such information was obtained. Because the perpetrator of the crime was wronged, it does not exonerate them from the crime. Two wrongs do not make a right according to the old logic. Instead, the safeguards in the system must be enforced against those who would “purposely” break the law to gather that information. If, for example, an illegal wire tap is used to convict a criminal, and the execution of the criminal’s punishment is made contingent on the person who made the tape serving a term of six months in jail for a felony invasion of privacy; things would change. If no one took responsibility for the tape, it would be thrown out as unsubstantiated because no one took responsibility or stood up for its validity. So you say that we lose the evidence in this way. I say that we lose it today because it was obtained illegally. And you reply that it should be admitted because it is proof of guilt. And I reply that I agree but that it came to exist because a crime was committed by the one who made it and if We do not insist that all crimes are punished, then only the powerless will be punished for crimes. If We do not protect our privacy then We will forfeit it for the sake of making it easy to convict each crime. But Christians know that all crimes are accounted for in the end. In a Christian society it is only important that criminal behavior is not repeated. Those who offend repeatedly will be convicted soon enough.

If it was the police, over zealous or overbearing, who did the taping, the punishment would be three months to perhaps a year suspension; without pay. In that way, in a crime against the state, the prosecution would have to weigh the factors of proceeding or not. But in those cases where the family of the victims are involved, there would be pressure to see justice done on both counts. Remember, in our zeal to bring back a system that can convict the guilty, it is imperative that we not give up our civil liberties. This is especially true given the new sophistication of surveillance equipment. Invasion of privacy, through illegal search and seizure should constitute a similar Three month to one year suspension [without pay]: as should harassment and brow beating of suspects [unless that harassment took on a criminal nature in which case it should carry criminal consequences]. It is not my intent that police be punished for making mistakes. But it should be the intention of all police departments that the law not be broken as a matter of routine by those who are paid to enforce it. Citizens of

this country have the right to protection from such practices, but not on a technical bases. It should instead be a measure of the intent, not the overstepping of technical rules. In this way, bad cops will simply fade away, rather than going on with business as usual, while known criminals walk on technicalities.

It is equally imperative that we not create a situation where innocents are convicted. Unfortunately, because of the “Revolving Door” policies of the past and present, the percentages weigh heavy that if you are accused you are guilty. It’s in the mood of the citizens of the country. Thirty some years ago when “Perry Mason” ruled the airwaves, people liked his legal trickery, that got acquittals for the unfortunate and innocent accused. Today the TV series “Law and Order” uses dirty tricks to convict the otherwise, unconvictable, villain. But we can not have dirty tricks on either side, if there is to be a level playing field on which the truth may be served. There must be an end to jury instruction by judges other than to explain what is procedural. If the law must be interpreted, then either the law is not based on right and wrong or the jury is sociopathic. There must not be suppression of evidence by the police or the prosecution because it might hurt the conviction. It is more important that an innocent man go free than a guilty one be convicted. All those of you who call yourselves Christians have to come to grips with this. If they did the crime and they go free, they will either be caught again and eventually taken out of society, or they will never commit another crime. If they never commit another crime, you are safe from them and it has not become your burden to punish them. God will deal with it. After all, if our hope is that prison will detour such behavior, what could be better than having it never happen again without having to put them away? The only difference is retribution and “Vengeance is Mine” sayeth the lord. So do you want a world where We live by the Gospel or do you wish to perpetuate this cesspool We have created? We will work on the prison system as well; and that will help a great deal as far as repeat offenders. But a repeat offender will be back around sooner or later, so that a fair penal system [that is fair to the public] and a fair judicial process, will get them soon enough.

More and more we hear about frustrated police and prosecutors suppressing evidence that would prove a defendant’s innocence: Maybe because they know them to be dirty for other things they can’t convict on, or maybe it’s a needed scapegoat: maybe it’s political or personal: none of these reasons justify such actions. To stop it, we must make it an offense, “Punishable In Kind”. In other words, if someone goes to prison for a year and the police withheld proof of their innocence, or the prosecution did, or both did, then all those involved will serve the same time. “Refer back to the rules”. If the crime was punishable by death, and the person was executed, they should be punished in kind. If the person is saved, they should get time served. As I said earlier in this book, a lawyer’s job is to plead the case of the defendant and the plaintiff; or the defendant and the

*George Bailey*

prosecution. It is not their purpose to decide between right and wrong. That is the job of the twelve "Tried and True". It is not the job of the Judge to determine what evidence will be heard. He is there to keep order and pass sentence. But lawyers and Judges have presumed to tamper with the laws handed down and our system of law lays as wasted as "Chernobyl". On a level field there is no room for the "Miranda" laws. If the truth comes out then justice can not be better served. "Miranda" should be abolished. There should be an abolition of "Plea Bargaining". The ways in which the practice has perverted our legal system, are too vast to discuss here. But most important of all of its short comings is that it buys "False Witness", and we can not be a party to it. Secondly, the punishment should fit the crime committed. And the crime committed should be the one tried. If lawyers want to use cases of Precedent to show a jury the logic that brought another jury to their conclusion in a similar case, then fine. But it should not be used to usurp the power of those twelve gathered together to the task. The idea that the Supreme Court is too Supreme to sit over individual cases as a general rule has taken the right and wrong out of the law. In 1997 I could have sworn that I heard a newscaster announce that the "Supreme Court" had ruled that a judge could now sentence someone who was acquitted by a jury. They have made a puppet show of our right to a jury trial. It was intended that the person on trial be allowed a "Change of Venue" to remove them from a prejudiced jury. It was further intended that a State Supreme Court oversee that justice is not lost to regional and colloquial prejudice. Failing that, the Supreme Court of these United States was to be a safety net of last resort. They were sworn to protect us against laws which violated our constitutional rights. And yet the IRS is allowed to seize property and imprison citizens who are denied the protection of presumption of innocence. The same principles have been applied in the RICO laws in which citizens face the burden of proving their innocence after being forced to put up a bond to get their day in court. As a result, now even mayors of cities feel that they have the right to seize property without due process under the law.

Unfortunately, as judges and lawyers seized power from jurors, they were forced into a position wherein they were not supposed to bother the Supreme Court with decisions that the "Supreme" Court had already ruled on. This then is the basis for "Precedential [not to be confused with Presidential] Law" and the ever growing law libraries of the American Judicial system. It should be done away with. It shall be given over to the jury to hear the evidence and arrive at a discussion of guilt or innocence. After the trial, it shall fall to the jury to "Critique" whether or not the lawyers have gone too far a field and the lawyers should be sanctioned by the "Bar" if they use this power to destroy individual's reputations needlessly; according to the opinion of the jury. If the prosecution asks for a decision of guilt, it can be decided by the jury what that guilt is. Thereby, if the prosecution asks for a decision as to whether 1st degree murder was committed, the jury may find the accused innocent of first degree but still

find Man Slaughter the proper description of the crime without exonerating the accused of all guilt. It is the jury's trial. The Lawyers serve to educate, the judge to referee and sentence: Period.

I heard a news commentator speak concerning a judge's competency for the Supreme Court. He sighted the judge's one hundred and sum "decisions" on the State Supreme Court in which he had never been overturned by the higher Supreme Court. What does that mean? What it means is that he had never come into conflict with any of the past Supreme Court decisions. The term "Brief" refers to a document submitted to a court by an attorney. The Brief includes a list of past decisions made by the Supreme Court or, sometimes, just other judges, which the Lawyer feels are pertinent to the case. Such a decision, once made, is in fact, the law. By studying what decisions have been reached in trials past, the judge hopes to avoid letting anything happen in the trial, which might cause a higher court to "Overturn" [change] the outcome of the trial he [or she] is presiding over. For instance, "Miranda" laws refer to a case in which a guy named Miranda gave the police evidence against himself that a lawyer would have advised him not to give. The resulting "Miranda" decision by the Supreme Court caused police to give anyone under arrest his "Rights", which are, as most of us now know from TV, the warning that they have the right to remain silent, the right to an attorney, etc. Therefore, the logic goes that if a person was not given his or her lawful warning [Mirandized] and they then give the police evidence of a self incriminating nature, that evidence should not be used, because the high court will say the Miranda law [precedent] has been broken and therefore the case must be retried. From a public standpoint, this is expensive. The Taxpayer must now pay for a second trial. It is also considered an affront to the Justice System [the State and Federal Supreme Courts]. But for the judge, it is a black mark from his [or her] peers and the system in which they are trying to function. When the Constitution was written in the beginning of our Nation's history, there were no Precedents. The courts looked to the new Constitution and the Ten Commandments and the laws of the Nation at the Federal, and State and local levels, as a guide. They did their best to find the truth and left the decision of guilt or innocence to the jury. The judge presided to maintain order and to pronounce sentence. In those times the higher courts previewed cases brought to their attention as "Unjust" and ruled accordingly. Like "Miranda", each decision then became a Precedent. Even rulings made by Judges, that were not overturned by the High Courts, became Precedent. Each Precedent became a beacon to warn judges off the rocky shores of injustice. Unfortunately, after 200 years, We have so many beacons that We are blinded by their lights. We are unable to let a jury seek the truth for fear that a case will be overturned. If what I thought I heard is true, then by 1997 the Supreme Court would allow, by Precedent, that judges could sentence even those found not guilty by a jury of their peers because, by

*George Bailey*

the Court's own admission, juries could no longer make competent decisions based on evidence presented during a trial.

The rift between what was justice and what We have now, lies in the idea that a decision once made by the Supreme Court is to be applied to all cases. To repeal the rules of Precedent, is not to abandon the legal system, but rather it is to return to the first trial ever held in a United States Court of Law. It is to wipe the slate clean of Precedent as it is used today. What is the truth and what is not, is the mission of the jury to discern. Punishing Police who break the law is the way to stop such law breaking practices. Attorneys who are unscrupulous in their prosecution do not serve a judicial system which seeks truth above all else; even if the accused is guilty. If We look at the criminals of today's society We can see by their "Rap" sheets [their history of crime] that society is not served by a system which finds easy convictions and then releases criminals again and again. Without the laws of Precedent it will be necessary for the High Courts to be diligent with regard to injustice as opposed to legality. It shall be the obligation of the Court to press charges against those who violate civil rights in order to gain evidence, rather than overturn a finding of guilty when the finding was just. If a ruling [a Precedent] from the past has relevance in a case, the lawyer may surely share it with the jury. But there is no other way to fix this problem, which can only get worse over time, than to abandon it.

I know this sounds scary. But remember; We are returning to the first trial held in an American Court, not throwing out the system altogether. By instituting a preamble to laws which state their "Intent", a jury is then in a position to decide on issues of innocence or guilt, based on right and wrong rather than on legality. We will discuss the Preamble in greater detail under our discussion of the civil courts. For those laws which do not have a preamble: for the period We are in transition, the judge shall make it his [or her] duty to state the intent of the law in their judgment, for the jury. This is the only instruction in which the judge should be involved outside of court procedures. They should not be instructing in ways that subvert justice in order to adhere to the letter of the law. If We drop the adversarial approach of defense versus prosecution, in favor of a cards on the table approach; if We allow juries to decide on the basis of intent of the law as opposed to the letter; if We allow juries the power to weigh the circumstances and determine the degree of guilt; if We allow the jury to hear the evidence: they will arrive at the truth if they wish to. If they do not, then a Higher Court should be obliged to overturn the case on the basis that the truth was not served: not that the rules of the game were broken. And if the rules of the game were broken, then it should be a question for a Grand Jury and the Higher Court to decide if punishment is in order. And it should fall to a diligent press to give oversight to the entire process. Being able to convict anyone who does wrong, puts us all at risk in a society which pushes to make everything a crime in order to convict



criminals within the framework of a corrupted system. There will surely be an upheaval in the short run. The revolving door will be slamming shut. The more people We can help in the short run, the fewer We will have to lock up for the long run. But if We do not address our legal dilemma now, the Precedents will only accumulate. We will only become less and less a nation of juries and more a Nation of servants to the Pomp and Circumstance of a trial system which seeks not to offend the High Court.

One last note. The Law calls for a trial by a jury of one's peers. This is an impossibility in a system which is willing to provide legal council at tax payer expense but relegates jury selection to those few who can afford to miss work. At the same time; it is unreasonable to demand that people suffer economic loss in order to accommodate a jury system. To that end, with the revolution it shall be the law that those who are asked to serve on jury duty shall be compensated at a rate which is a fair assessment of their earnings outside the courtroom, up to twice the value of X. If they make more than that, they can probably afford some time off.

It should also come to pass that if enough juries acquit those accused of breaking a law, when in fact they did break the law, then it should fall to a vote of the people whether or not the law should stand. In this way, a cross section of American citizens, drawn together to make a decision of what is right and what is wrong, may find that it is law makers who are wrong. Therefore, if a law is challenged in this way, the prosecution may ask a higher court for a second trial. Regardless of the courts decision to grant such a trial, it shall go record that the jury of the first trial "Found in Defiance" of the law. If the law is a local law and the jury Found in Defiance, then the question of whether or not the law should be repealed should be added to the ballet in the next local elections. If it is a State law and juries in two or more counties Find in Defiance, then the law should be questioned on the ballet in the next State elections. And should it be a Federal Law, challenged by Defiant Jurors in two or more States of the union, then it too shall come to a vote on the next national ballet.

By making these changes which I have outlined, it then becomes the mission of the Supreme Court to over see rather than over Lord. We also return some direct oversight powers to juries who are drawn from a cross section of our citizenry. In a Republic, were all power is relinquished to a few at the top, it is imperative that some avenue of oversight remain near the bottom. This is our country. Whether it will remain so, depends upon our diligence and our worthiness. But if We are indeed worthy, then the power over who shall be punished and who shall not be punished by society should be based on right and wrong and not on legality. And those who determine what is right and wrong should be of the masses not of the bureaucracy. If We are not worthy, then there can be no justice in any system We devise.

*George Bailey*

The defense by reason of insanity has no place in a building where men and women sit in judgment. Ours is a decision of guilt or innocence based on the act committed. It is not a determination of damnation or forgiveness. We have all looked on in amazement, to witness the never ending filings of documentation that accompany each death penalty case in our land. Appeals extend the length of the process by decades. They run the cost into the millions. I don't believe that any of us would deny legal counsel to an accused in this day and age. But it becomes painfully obvious that these legal maneuvers are just that: maneuvers. Their purpose is either to line the lawyers' pockets or to detour our will to pursue such a sentence, or both. Without the technicalities of law, there will be far less to appeal against. Never the less, whether the death penalty is a sin committed against an individual by the members of society, is dependent not upon the act, but upon the purpose of the act. If vengeance is your purpose, then you eat yourself up with hate. If protecting society is your aim, then the sin is not yours. After all, to turn a person dangerous enough to deserve the death penalty, loose on a prison population, is no kindness to those stuck in prison. In fact, if We are to live in the way taught by Jesus, then We must consider the plight of the other inmates as much, if not more, than someone who has chosen to kill. So, from a religious standpoint, if you protect the convicted murderer, you do it at the expense of the other inmates. If you place yourself in their shoes, as Christ taught, you might be less inclined to save those who kill. If you say that prison should be a living Hell for all those who are sent away, then you have abandoned Christianity and your arguments of what is moral concerning Capital Punishment are without foundation. And if you say that God and religion are of no consequence, but that only mankind's state of evolution is cause enough to abolish the death penalty, then you speak of survival of the fittest, in which case morality is of no consequence and those who have not "Evolved" past the point of being able to murder are "Unfit", and as such are not entitled to survive.

But if we are to have Capital Punishment, then let us give up the gimmickry and gadgetry, that has made such a sad spectacle of a task we should not savor. The gas chamber and the electric chair are, I believe, cruel and unusual, as well as vengeful. We surely owe it to any human who's life we end, the same consideration as a pet dog. We have stood idly by as a nation and had our law and our order taken away from us. If we want justice it can only come from those laws handed down to us. Whether you believe, as I do, that they came from the entity that Judeo-Christians refer to in this country as God or that they are the work of men of such great wisdom as the world has not seen before or since, makes no difference. What is important for the sake of our legal system is that you validate their worth.

"Judge not lest you be judged" is often taken out of context. In fact the Bible says, "Judge not who will enter the kingdom of heaven, lest ye be judged".

“Vengeance is mine” sayeth the Lord . But we have been given the law in order that we can judge. The concept of Capital Punishment was to “send them to judgment”. It is not for us to judge them innocent by reason of insanity. It is not for us to make excuses based on the way life has treated them. It is up to us to judge them by the laws. Laws that are fair, and punishments that are fair. If we return to the ideology that it is better to let 99 guilty men go than to convict one who is innocent, we will still see the criminals in our society put away with the prison reforms I am about to outline. It is in the nature of being a criminal to continue until caught and then start again. If on the other hand, a crime is committed and the perpetrator is not caught but never commits another crime; society will be served just as well as if that perpetrator were put away. The important thing which should be known in the heart of all Christians is that, whether that person is caught or not, they will eventually be judged. Likewise, when circumstance and a “fair” conviction lead to the death penalty, no one [not other prison inmates, not society, not the taxpayer, who’s money is needed elsewhere] is served by thwarting that effort. Again, as Christians, we know that death is not the end but a call to judgment. Were I asked, I would say that carbon Monoxide is a silent killer that takes lives accidentally each year. It puts them to sleep without pain. It is appropriate that if We are to take a life, that We should do so in a way that is painless and without revenge or spectacle. But if we are to take a life, we must be certain beyond all doubt, not just reasonable doubt. It has become painfully clear that juries can be misled by over zealous prosecutors. Expert witnesses may be far from expert. Even “Eye Witnesses” are suspect not only by motive but by human error. Whenever an innocent is convicted of any crime, the books are closed on the investigation of that crime. Therefore, bad police work and poor prosecution, not only cause the innocent be punished, but allow the guilty to go free. All of these points make it imperative that no one be executed if their is doubt of any kind, not just reasonable doubt.

It serves no purpose to concern our selves with laws, law enforcement or a meaningful judicial system, if the result of their combined effort is freedom due to early parole by reason of good behavior or over crowding. With the changes outlined with regard to drugs, the prison population will shrink dramatically. More importantly, with a fair minimum wage in place, even someone with a criminal record has a way to make a meaningful future for them selves upon release. Furthermore, to insure a fair chance for those released, parole shall be outlawed and replaced with early release. When a person’s chances to re-enter society are as severely limited as our new system will be, prisoners need to be prepared, well motivated, and freed from the external forces which may impede their success. In a far system it also becomes much more difficult to rationalize ones failures, as the fault of society. Despite these positive aspects of the revolution, I dare to say that there will still be criminals and others who cross the line. Now, were this revolution to be a blood letting, we could sound a death

*George Bailey*

knell for many of the enemies of the State. After all, the FBI is aware of the names and addresses of the once estimated 5,000 Mafia members. They know most of the members of organizations from Russia, Asia, Columbia, Cuba, Haiti, and on and on. We could round them up into a football stadium and mow them down like any normal revolutionary would do. But this revolution is not about bloodshed. When you have bloodshed, the best leaders are the ones with the most hate in their hearts, and they ultimately start the process all over again. They simply have new people [their people] in the old positions. No, this revolution is about what? You remember. "Forgiveness". As I said before, just as the wicked sheriff of Nottingham justified the actions of Robin Hood, the deep seated corruption in law enforcement and government, allowed "SOME" of the immigrants of these countries to rationalize their own behavior: each in their own time. As we clean the soot from the windows of our glass house we will take that away from them. As we forgive those who are prayed on; [the drug addicts, the gambling addicts and the prostitutes], and allow them back, at least to the fringes of our society, we will cut off the flow of money to organized crime. For the ones that will not change, I do not envy even those at the top. They live in a world of fear, deceit and hatred. It is a world that they make for themselves. They tell each other that the violence they do is "Business" to mask the truth that they have made themselves repugnant. It is an attempt to distance themselves from the acts they commit. It is a rationalization; a lie, even to themselves. Even when they use their power and money to enter into legitimate business, they corrupt it with price fixing, monopoly and extortion. With the revolution they will be exposed for what they are in the light of opportunity for all, thwarted for the privilege of the few. As their rationalizations fail them, hopefully, some will find their way to what is right. Never the less, some will persist. If we want real change in America, we the public, must stop buying into their rationalization. We must step out of that line. We must disassociate ourselves from them in every way possible. Still, with law enforcement freed from their grip, and the energy diverted from the drug war and once again focused on them, many of them will be off to prison. When they go, there will be many others in the penal system as well. Some just as hard. Some that only made a single mistake.

We are all somewhat familiar with the penal system in America. It is a place where rape of one man by another and murder, are commonplace. It is a place where, [while we throw stones at China for doing the same thing], people are worked for slave wages. Of course, here, we are told that we are affording them the opportunity to work, while China forces them: as if there is a difference. We know that if you are influential, your prison will be safe and comfortable. We know that if you are feared you will retain power within the prison walls. We know that if you are young you will be hardened. If you are naive you will be rudely awakened. If you are unschooled in crime you will be educated. If you want cosmetic or dental work done it may very well be done. But if you are sick,

you may possibly die at the hands of an incompetent, or worse. It is a place where men build their bodies, to become strong enough to survive, and tattoo them, to show they have what it takes and to pledge their allegiance to the group that protects them. It is a place where those in charge allow drugs and violence, in order to separate and control the population: and because, as one researcher claimed, the guards are often drug addicts as well. It is a place where those who refuse to fight become the subjected to sexual perversion. It is a place where those who seek the asylum of solitary must endure such things as urine in their food, in retaliation. It is a breeding ground for fear and aggression and hate. We are told that this is the way to control a prison population. But just as so many things handled by government, the method used to perform the task is geared toward making the task easier for those performing it, at the expense of the results. Habitual inmates find themselves in prison because violence and dominance rule their lives inside and out of prison. In order to break the cycle it is necessary for us to show them that there truly is an alternative rather than reinforcing the old behavior.

The first step to a meaningful penal system is to establish that the rights of inmates should be very limited. It requires no amendment to the constitution. A realistic interpretation of the original document is all we need. A small private cell, free of interaction with other inmates, violates no prisoner's rights. To the contrary, the freedom of other inmates [who are by definition criminals] to approach and harm an inmate is what is unconstitutional. It is immoral as well. We have turned our backs on these people with the belief that they deserve what they get. And we as a society have reaped what we have sown. If the Justices of the Supreme Court can not see that, then they should be asked to resign.

The second step, is to mandate that no product shall come from the labors of inmates performed in cooperation with the penal institution. That is, if an inmate rights a book, paints a painting, designs a computer chip; then that money is theirs and theirs alone [unless they are profiting from the their crimes; such as stories about their exploits, in which case those monies should go to the families of the victims]. But such things as farms and tele-marketing operations, where the labor can be profited upon by those in league with the penal system, should be banned. Prison food should be the same issue as described as that which is free to US citizens [Blue Food]. Prison inmates should be allowed to prepare food for the prison population and the prison personnel. They should be able to do the prison's janitorial and laundry duties; and that is all. The fact that prisons are riddled with drug use and addictions is a situation that infuriates in the face of our "Drug War". As on the street, it is the way in which the weak are manipulated by the strong of the criminal world. The penal system is obviously no better if this is allowed to prevail. The only meaningful way to separate the weak from the strong is to separate them to different facilities, with different

*George Bailey*

methods of operation. What I propose is a Three tier system. It should apply to both, individual State's systems as well as the Federal system. The first tier would be for those convicted and incarcerated as an adult, for the first time, of any crime other than murder. It should be on the order of a minimum-security facility. It should be manned with guards who have never been guards at any other facility before. There should limited interaction between inmates, high intensity counseling, and education. There should be no early release given until the inmate has earned a high school diploma or the equivalent thereof, and learned to speak English unless it can be demonstrated that the prisoner is incapable by reason of a substandard IQ. There should be every attempt within reason to allow for contact between family and friends. But we do not need to feel obligated to carpeted, air conditioned rooms. The "First Tier" penal system should be our opportunity to see if we, as a society, have done something wrong that we can right. Even if it wasn't society at fault, it is our last effort to help these people turn themselves around. We should make it an honest one.

The second tear of the penal system should be separate institutions, in separate localities, with separate management. It should be for those sent away for the second time, those sent away for murder the first time and those who prove to be totally incorrigible in "First Tier". [It should be a threat for those in first tear, but not a step taken against first tier inmates for anything but the most serious offenses. For example, a fist fight should not send someone down the path of no return. A knife attack should. And, just as in the court system, if an inmate is "Framed" by guards, then the guards should do time.]. In "Second Tier" there should be no interaction between inmates unless supervised and then, only in groups of ten or less. The emphasis on improvement should shift to self-help. Outside contact should be allowed; but limited and supervised. No early release without a diploma or the equivalent thereof, unless it can be demonstrated that they are unable to achieve such a goal. While the emphasis is on self-help, it should be understood that those who seek help should find it. If we change our goals for our police from busting the unfortunates of society to the pursuit of thieves and muggers: if we muster our resources to go after the little criminals before they become seasoned criminals: if our court systems are about finding the truth and not plea bargaining away the work of law enforcement; it is far more likely that offenders will end up in our prisons before their "Rap Sheet" has developed. If we fail at that point to turn them around, then they become a burden on us for the rest of their lives. It is a challenge worthy of our best effort. Should they fail to come around they will ultimately end up in third tear. This, then is the reason for separate facilities, with separate personnel and separate management. We do not want, nor can we tolerate, a situation in which one tier is in the business of "stocking" the next with inmates.

In some cities, they make a habit of releasing inmates from jail at midnight. Individuals with no means and few prospects are dumped back onto the streets and into society, given an insult by the very system we engage to turn their behavior around. When a person is freed, it is an indication that We, as a society, have no claim against them. With that in mind, I would ask you to consider that you, as a member of this society, would not tolerate such treatment. If what We hope for is that they become productive members of society, then We must demonstrate our sincerity. Dumping someone on the mean streets of a city at midnight, with no money and no were to go, is not the way to accomplish our goals.

Third tier is for those who will not be coming back into society: Those who have been through all the levels and couldn't break with bad ways. At this point we must assume that the dye is cast. For their own protection from those around them, they should be given a single, bright, clean cell, with a toilet and shower, a TV, a radio, [both with headphones only] a desk, a bed, access to books and meals through the door. If they don't choose to come out, they shouldn't have to. If they choose to, they should have some access to a place to walk around or sit with others, but that's it; we owe them nothing more. There is no need for conjugal visits. There is no need to allow them to "physically" interact with the outside world in any way. Those who wish to be free from the general population should be kept in a separate wing. Their food and the janitorial needs of that wing should be taken care of by prison staff, not inmates. In short, the criminal element that ran their lives on the outside should be barred from controlling their lives on the inside. Third tier prison should not be viewed as a place of punishment. It should be a "holding" zone, a place of exile, wherein society keeps those who can not be trusted in society. They are beyond the help of punishment. The time has come for them to wait out their lives and prepare for "Judgment". For any inmate in any prison, there should always be the possibility of a Governor's or a Presidential pardon: and Governors should be open to reviewing individual cases to see if Third Tier was warranted. But those who have reached third tier, justifiably, have demonstrated an inability to live among us. While it is important to preserve their rights, it is equally, if not more, important to preserve ours. If they have made it to the third tier, it is for "Life". There is a movement on across this country to institute what is called "Three strikes, and your out". It is the idea that, if one is a repeat offender, that upon your third trip "Up the River" you will receive life without parole. In this day of violence and repeat offenses it is certainly justifiable. The problem is, as I see it, that because nothing can be done soon enough in a criminal's career to get them turned around in society today; the first "Strike" almost insures a third strike. The three tier system I have just outlined is about holding out our hand to those heading down the wrong path. It's about holding out a minimum wage that insures that if they try, there will be a way for them to succeed in society, even

*George Bailey*

after prison. It's about what? You know. And it must apply to those who have wronged us even if we won't let them walk among us. It's about "Forgiveness: even if you don't love them anymore".

For the purposes of transition, those who had a penal system history, should be given a shot at second tear incarceration; depending upon their past crimes. It should be up to the jury to decide if those whose criminal past, dating from before the revolution, should be allowed one last chance at self improvement, or be "Banished" from society. The inconsistencies of today's legal codes and systems, have created a breed of people who see the law as a game. That must end. For those who can not understand, the game is over. For those who have the capacity for change, we should hold out one last olive branch. In the case of juveniles, the lines grow more vague each day. Children killing children is something I am sorry I have lived to witness. It has been said that right is learned from wrong by age five, and yet, the "Right" that some of these children have learned is the "Right" of our current legal system. Namely, that until you are old enough to be tried as an adult, anything, even murder, is permissible. I have heard it said that if a wolf cub does not show the proper signs of conformity, that members of the pack will simply snuff out its life. We are not a pack of wolves and yet, something needs to be done; not only for the sake of society, but for those children in trouble with the law, who might be rehabilitated, but are thrown in with the mad dogs. For that reason, juveniles who commit murder [and are not sentenced to death] should go to First Tear facilities rather than a juvenile institution. It is not a matter that should be erased from their record upon adulthood. It is far too final an outcome for the victim. As for the others, there should be no effort spared in, not only turning them around, but in preparing them for freedom. I saw a documentary in which "Rival" gangs had to be separated in institutions. They banded together in their groups and barred their teeth at each other as if they were still on the street. I suggest that, instead, the members of rival gangs be placed in paired cells with members from other gangs. It should be made clear that a murder performed within juvenile institutions would result in a transfer to a third tier facility or even the death penalty. It is a step that should not be taken lightly or even on the first day. But it should be a prerequisite to release. In other words, force them to live together in a controlled environment so that they can learn to accept others on the street. Separate them from the gangs that are their substitute family, their source of self esteem and security, and force them to move outside the world that has brought them into the institution in the first place. For those of them that believe they are too tough to change, or to take advantage of what the juvenile penal system "Must" offer, then the first tear of the adult system is waiting. If it is their choice to prevent the salvaging of their comrades, then they belong up the ladder; and with the record that goes with it. If they come around in "Juvy" then they should have their slate sealed for as long as they are clean. In the case of repeat incarcerations of a



juvenile, it should be up to the jury to decide if the individual is better served with another chance at the Juvenile system or a First Tear adult facility. If there is no jury involved, it should fall to the judge. On the other side of the coin, even a juvenile should have the right to a trial by a jury of adults. Two final notes on the penal system. First: our attempt at turning kids around must not be half hearted. We should fund the system well; and more importantly, we must have places for "ALL" children to go for long term help and guidance. That includes "Runaways" who have not broken the law. It is perhaps the greatest disgrace of our country that children fleeing from troubled homes, can not be assured a safe haven. It is a task, not only for our government, but also for our churches and our citizens. For every dime spent here, we save tens if not hundreds of dollars down the road and more importantly, we salvage a human being. These kids will be a part of this country, for good or ill, long after I am gone. Those who seek to help them should show them compassion but not coddle. They must be led not driven, they must be loved and that love should not be perverted with sex. Secondly: with a system laid out as I have, it is unfair and un-American to have other facilities set aside for the privileged. All prisons, state and federal, should conform to the same standards, no more, no less. Furthermore, the inmates within a facility should represent a cross section of criminals, not an elitist group. Such an arrangement would constitute a "Conspiracy" by all those involved. Nothing has torn at the fabric of our national psyche more than the knowledge that, a person who steals food to feed their family, will receive harsher treatment than one who steals millions to feed their greed. It is the very kind of thing that helps the criminal mind rationalize its own behavior. There is also a current trend toward privatizing prisons. This practice can come to no good. Capitalism is far too ruthless to use on people stripped of their civil rights. Therefore, it shall be illegal for government to use private, non-government penal systems.

Before we move away from the criminal court and the penal system, I would like to focus for just a moment on political prisoners. What is a political prisoner? Well we all know the answer in terms of those held outside this country. They are those who are imprisoned because they pose a political threat to a given government and those within it. We, in this country, get very indignant about political prisoners held in other countries. Yet, if you look closely, you will see that they exist here as well. One example, in my opinion, is "Leona Helmsly". Her crime was that she relied on professionals to do her taxes. With a billion, or two, dollars invested in real estate, it's hard to fathom the amount of paperwork that must be involved in her tax return: Expenses, depreciations, well; you know. Anyway, in the end, she under paid by one percent. That's all "1%". Her husband was on his last legs. They have no heirs. Their entire fortune was to go to charity. Yet the IRS contended that she lied to save paying taxes. But no one was charged with collusion or conspiracy to defraud; in spite of tax preparer's requirements to put their names on the tax forms they fill out. No,

*George Bailey*

Mrs. Helmsley was a person that America loved to hate. It made her the perfect target for the IRS. Kind of a Marie Antoinette for the 90's. And it made her the type of political prisoner that we have here at home. She was an example. She took some of the heat off of congress at tax time by letting us vent on the rich who don't pay. And the 1.2 million dollars she didn't pay was far to great a figure for us to empathize with. But think back to your 1990 return and see what your prospects are for a prison term. If you paid Uncle Sam less than \$10,000 that year, you fit Leona's criminal profile if you made an error of one hundred dollars. At \$5,000, your mistake need only be fifty dollars. Mrs. Helmsley could have easily paid the tax and the penalties and the interest, but the IRS went for the throat to set an example: even though there is a good argument that the gathering of such taxes is unconstitutional. And that was the point wasn't it. I mean, when the entertainer, Willie Nelson, fell behind on his taxes, due to poor advice from those supposedly in the know, he was allowed to stay out of jail as a kind of indentured servant to the IRS; promoting their terror and still able to pay on his debt. Kind of ironic that the one who could pay went to jail don't you think? If, with all her money, Mrs. Helmsley did, in fact, defraud the government to escape paying 1.2 million when she was worth billions, then she needed clinical help not prison, and if it was a mistake then she was truly a political prisoner.

I feel we had another political prisoner put away at the beginning of that decade. He was a man perceived to have many rough edges when it came to the social graces between the genders; and yet, he was sought after as a prize by many of the ladies. Mike Tyson had the bad sense to become involved in a questionable sexual affair. The only two present at the alleged crime were he and the girl who accused him of rape. He had been chastised for his attitude and style before. He had admitted on television to being less than perfect. She was a young, and we are told, naive pageant participant. On the other hand, entering such a pageant shows a desire for success in a realm classified by feminists as sexist and degrading. She claimed that, once in his room he set upon her. He claims that everything was fine until he refused to escort her down the stairs after they were done. Tyson's story would lend to the theory that she was willing to have sex if it were to lead to the "Brass Ring". But in being told, more or less to, to find her own way out, she then felt degraded and "raped" in that sense. On the other hand, it would be easy enough for Tyson and his lawyer to conjure up just such a story. It's really the kind of thing that could go either way from what we heard in the media. That's why we entrust a jury to make the decision. They were there and they heard the evidence. Right? Well, as it turns out, that's not exactly right. If you watched Ed Bradley's "Street Stories" on the subject, you were told that the woman said, on the stand, that she and Tyson hadn't been doing any kissing or heavy petting [as we used to say] in the limousine, before they got out to go up to his room. But Mr. Bradley produced an eye witness that told us [those

viewing Street Stories] that she saw them in the limo, doing just that, just before they went up. She was no surprise witness. She had been known to the defense. But she was denied as a witness, during the trial. Denied by the judge, on the grounds that it didn't improve Tyson's defense to have her testify. This is what we were told. Now you've got to wonder in a case where one person's word contradicts the other's, how a third person, suggesting that the witness for the prosecution perjured herself on the stand, doesn't help the defendant's case. That is, until you watch the eleven o'clock news directly after Ed Bradley's Street Stories, and hear the inevitable analysis of the Tyson interview, by the women who claim to represent Rape victims. As I sat listening to the familiar phrases, "That is typical behavior"; "typical attitude"; "Typical answer — of a rapist personality"; I was waiting for the interviewer to ask what they thought about the statements of the woman witness: but the question never came. I began to feel that these women were not analyzing anything but rather, they were rationalizing their own prejudices, their own hate. The interviewer, it seemed, wasn't about to question it and risk being turned on by them or the viewing audience. You've got to wonder if that isn't where the judge's decision not to allow the witness to testify came from. Imagine what might have happened to the judge's career if he [or she; I don't know] had allowed the trial to end with Tyson set free and the girl put in jail for perjury. That is exactly why judges should not be allowed to make determinations on what will or will not be heard. It makes justice subject to politics and it just should not be.

I want to close here by saying that I still don't know what really happened between Mike Tyson and that girl. I doubt anyone will ever know for sure. As with Clarence Thomas and Anita Hill, I suspect it is possible that either story is true. For that matter, both could be telling the truth from their own perspective. What I do not understand, and what shakes me to the core, is that while most people I talked to didn't seem to be positive either way; all the women I heard interviewed, those who profess to speak for all women, were so very sure in each case that the men were lying.

No single institution in this land has been more detrimental to the economy of our nation than the "Civil Court". It has given insurance companies a straggle hold on all of us: in business as well as personally. The technical maneuvering that plagues Criminal Law is at its peak in the Civil Court. For that reason, "Law By Precedent" should be repealed from here as well along with all other forms of the judicial process. It has simply become too twisted and too far a field. This problem can only intensify as new decisions are made. If the laws are to be for the people, as promised in the constitution, they must be understood by the people. In addition, the gimmickry of legal documents and contracts must be understandable by the person affected in order to be of any true value or validity.

*George Bailey*

It is the “Intent” of any pact or covenant, that should be its essences; not its technical formulation.

It was to be paid over time; no money down, based on income from the machine, and my friend would be able to walk away from the deal if it became unprofitable or if he so chose. I said that I wanted it to be fair to both of us. I stood to make more than the machine was worth by selling it outright, and he stood to gain an opportunity to get into business for himself without risk. The machine was not new and therefore might require occasional repairs, so those expenses would be deducted from the money it made and we would split the rest as it came in. Mine would be applied toward the purchase price, and his was his. The lawyer told me that his [the lawyer’s] only obligation was to me. That fairness to my friend, while not out of the question, was the obligation of his own lawyer. It is an understandable premise in a system where everyone is trying to cover themselves from lawsuits and legal loopholes. But it distorts the concept of entering into an agreement in good faith. In the end, regardless of precautions, the person with the trickiest lawyer circumvents any agreement. To put an end to this practice of deceit, I propose “The Law of Intent”. It should exist as a preamble to any legal document, or be allowed to stand on its own in such cases as a “Last Will and Testament”. It should be implemented with the use of what we will call a “Statement of Intent”. Simply put: it is a statement of the intent of the function of the legal document. The legal document should lay out the specifics of the agreement; such as power structure and the dispersement of capital. The “Intent” should state in plain language what both sides expect from the agreement. When the “Statement of Intent” comes in conflict with the details of the document, the Intent shall prevail. Here’s an example. In the case concerning the piece of machinery I spoke of, Let’s say that my lawyer draws up a contract so that all the terms I mentioned are sighted. Then as a precaution, he adds that I too can withdraw at any time, taking the machine back. Now that’s not an unreasonable idea. If I have agreed to have the machine fixed whenever it breaks and my friend abuses the machine, my share may never come. Furthermore, he could enter into an agreement with a third party, whereby the machine never shows a profit. But he and his other partner do quite well using my machine in a joint venture and showing all of the profit in the joint venture with the third party. To protect me from being sent the bills for the parts and labor without a right of refusal, my lawyer adds to the contract, my right to handle and disperse the income made by my friend, so that I don’t end up liable for bills if my friend turns on me and keeps the money. What’s more I need a way to insure that his other friend isn’t doing the fixing of the machine and padding the bill. I explain to my friend why my lawyer has added these precautions; he decides to do the deal and begin his own business. Now he can get his own attorney to discuss the pitfalls of the contract; but in the end, this is an opportunity to be in business for himself without investment of capital. He

doesn't have any capital. So if my lawyer is firm [which he will be] it's this or nothing. So, we embark on this venture together. He drums up business for the machine. He works that machine twelve hours a day for two months. He keeps the machine running by working on it himself. He survives on his savings for personal expenses and uses up all of it until, finally the first receipts start coming in. They come in to me of course. It turns out that I am not a friend at all. As a matter of fact I do this sort of thing for a living. You see, the machinery was nearly worn out to begin with. He knew it and I knew it. He thought we would be taking from the profits to keep it going until I had my money. He would make a decent wage and when the machinery passed on to him, he would reinvest the share I'd been getting, back into upgrading the machine. In that way, he could continue to make a decent living as he built his business. But, in the end I simply repossessed the machine, which was my right. I then took it down to a dealer and had it rebuilt top to bottom. It cost nearly all the cash receipts he had worked for, for those two months. What was left I kept for payment for the time I spent in handling the repossession and coordinating the repairs [that was just something we threw into the contract at the last minute to protect me from spending too much of my business time helping "him" out]. I sell the machine for top dollar. I take the profit, buy another worn out machine, pocket the difference and I make a new friend. The outcome hardly matches the intent does it? And while "I" could never do such a thing, it happens all the time. The truth is that I would have needed these protections. My friend, while a great partying buddy, may not have had the drive to go to work on his own. In that case he makes no money with the machine, and I can't sell it because we have a contract. Or he handles the money, and because he's never been in business before, he squanders his and ends up living off my half. I could sue but he has nothing. It is possible that I might be sued for such an act as the trap I have just described. But I have just left this fellow penniless. What's more, there is a one year statute of limitations in many states. The point of all this is, that, covering or attempting to cover every contingency, must ultimately put someone in the "Cat Bird Seat". Some one must prevail. The purpose of a Statement of Intent is to demonstrate what was to be considered fair by both parties. Within the contract the lawyers can lay out the plans of contingency. It is their business to understand the pitfalls of circumstance. But when the technicalities of operation are abused, the offended party should have a powerful means of recourse. In this way, a jury need not be schooled on the meaning of the laws of lawyers and the court. With a "Statement Of Intent", if I keep all the money, this other guy can set a DA [District attorney] after me for fraud or on theft charges. Judges, without the right to rule on what will or will not be omitted, or the need to instruct juries on their obligation to serve the laws of the land over the laws of right and wrong, will be freed to some extent, from political pressure and barred to some extent, from the judges personal prejudices and biases. Lawyers who abuse this right to inquire without

*George Bailey*

restraint into the personal lives of people who are giving testimony or being cross examined, should be subject to peer punishment within the legal community and even [I hate to say it] civil litigation, after a trial is over. We do not need a system which intimidates with smear tactics any more than we need one that hides the truth. The criteria for whether or not a question or evidence is justified should be predicated on whether or not it leads to the truth.

In 1996, a celebrity was sued by a book publisher for failing to deliver an acceptable manuscript. It seems that the publisher gave over a million dollars to this person, who in return, agreed to write a book: in fact two books, for a total sum of four million dollars. What was turned into the publisher was unacceptable. It wasn't just bad, it was said to be too bad to use. It was considered so bad that even the celebrity's name recognition could not sell it. When the publisher tried to sue to get its money back, they found that the lawyer they had paid to look over the contract on their behalf, had failed them. As it turned out, the contract had been negotiated on behalf of the celebrity by a legendary lawyer, who was by this time deceased. It was reported that this lawyer had managed to exclude from the contract a clause known as "Satisfaction" clause [I hope I'm correct on that term]. The result was that, as one person put it, the celebrity could have handed in a phone book and fulfilled their obligation. The manuscript was not subject to the publishers being satisfied with it. In the end the possibility existed that the celebrity might sue the publisher for taking the celebrity to court to try and get their money back. This illustrates as well as anything I could show, how out of focus our legal system has become. We are bound by the forces of the legal system to seek out lawyers in order to be protected by the law. Yet those same lawyers have no obligation to us to perform. Just to add insult to injury, we are obligated to pay them for their services no matter how miserably they fail us. It would be laughable were it not so tragic. The days of doing business on a handshake are probably gone forever. But a written testament as to what you have agreed upon would do more to that end than what we have today. In the same way that we have done away with the adversarial roles of lawyers in criminal trials, it should be done away with in civil courts as well. The role of lawyers should move from "Fanner of the Flames" to arbitrator. It should be the goal of lawyers for both sides to introduce reason and fairness into a dispute and keep it from reaching the courts in the first place. No doubt, that the lawyer I referred to as counsel for the celebrity, will be the subject of much admiration among his peers in the legal system. But what he accomplished stands in direct opposition to what we are taught is right in the Bible. The celebrity had to be aware of what the publisher thought they had agreed to. Surely a jury that looked to what is commonly accepted as "Justice" would have made her return the money without any further penalty, had they not been instructed in "The Law". Today, while Doctors give up their profession in the face of rising Malpractice insurance costs and claims; lawyers, who spend

their time causing problems rather than working them out; have raised those same malpractice rates ever higher. Some make millions in contingency fees. Some charge \$250 an hour or more. If we eliminate the system of law by “Precedent”, we will accomplish two major changes. The first is to cause the State and Federal Supreme Courts to review more cases for unfairness, which was their job from the beginning. That is, they were to safeguard the constitution by making sure that laws written by legislators were constitutional: and to oversee the process to insure that citizens were not “Railroaded” by the powerful and the influential. That is why the terms of Federal Justices are for life. The Supreme Court should be an active body that protects the constitution on a daily basis; not some institution of the dead that nit picks over judgments made on decisions made on other decisions. Why else would it be possible to overturn decisions made a century before. So, you may ask, doesn’t that lead to changing laws with trendy values? It very well might. In fact the founders of our nation anticipated just that. It’s why they placed the Ten Commandments on the chamber wall. “If you have trouble with rule number two, refer back to rule number one”.

The second and equally profound change will be that energy will be spent on arbitrating rather than searching through law libraries for old decisions. In the old system it was always those who could keep the parties involved at odds, who stood to make the most money. If one’s lawyer fails to move things along under the new system, the lawyer might find them self replaced by an arbitrator from outside the legal profession. A lawyer or an arbitrator, who fails to resolve the issue and ends up in court, should regard such an outcome as an imposition on the taxpayer. Yes, we as Americans are entitled to our day in court. But if you refuse to listen to reason, if your goal is not to resolve the problem but instead to create a problem for those you drag into court; if you use the law as a club to bully those you desire power over or for vengeance sake, then you are subverting the process and you should be admonished by the court. If you are suing everyone associated with the case in order to find “Deep Pockets” rather than justice, you deserve nothing. There are those who advocate a “Loser Pays” form of law in which, the one who loses is liable for the lawyer’s fees from both sides. It is more of the same old stuff where lawyers get paid either way. The only way to protect the little guy and at the same time protect all of us [big, small, corporate and individual] is to return the trial into the hands of the jury. The only way to accomplish that is to return the laws to what is understood within our country to be basically right and wrong rather than technically right and technically wrong. And the only way to do that is to make lawyers advocates for their clients rather than the interpreters of the law.

A binding legal contract, based on a “Statement of Intent”, gives all of us access to legal protection without involving a lawyer in the process. For example, in the matter of one’s “Will” [Last Will and Testament] Most of us have heard

*George Bailey*

the horror stories of Probate Court. Lawyers advertise that without a properly drawn Will, those things we hope to pass on may very well be eaten up by lawyers in the process of distribution. We are caught in the middle; paying lawyers up front in the hope that we will not have lawyers feed on our remains. The only purpose for the intricacies of probate law is to circumvent the intentions of the dead. Relatives and governments who are dissatisfied with the dispersal intended, have manipulated the process to point of it being a sham. Regardless of what any court has said, a person has a right to disperse their possessions any way they see fit and in their own words. The laws which plead for children who have ostracized themselves from parents has not stopped large inheritance benefits from being passed to pet care. Along the same lines, who will vouch for another's sanity. It is a far gap between being incompetent and not knowing what you want. Losing one's ability to make sound judgments, doesn't necessarily impede their desire. There will always be those who would befriend the old to gather up their inheritance. The old legal process has never stopped that. It has only contested the results. But if the elderly are left alone and lonely by those who feel entitled, then who really deserves what is left over: them or the one who filled the void. By the time the lawyers get through, only they, the lawyers, end up with anything anyway. We come into this world with nothing; we leave it with nothing, but it should be our right to state who will get what we leave behind by simply putting our wishes to paper and having it witnessed and notarized. There will be those who claim that what I suggest is unworkable: that without the laws of Precedent, our courts will bog down and fail to resolve anything. I would say to you that, that is exactly the state of our judicial system today and that the reason is precisely the laws of Precedent. The lawyers of this country have presumed that they are better equipped to determine right from wrong, fair from unfair, than the people of our land. The result is a system that arrives at decisions like the one of the celebrity and the publisher. Will justice ever miss its mark if pursued as I have outlined? Of course it will. Juries are only as good as the people on them. Will the Supreme court fail to safeguard the Constitutional Rights of the accused? Our courts are only as good as the people we appoint to the bench. But, you must ask yourself, is the system we have today going to get better or worse with time; and do the protections of the Constitution apply to you, or must you buy them from a lawyer?

We must also do away with Lawyer Client Privilege when it covers up an illegal act. It is a centrifuge, which removes honorable men and women from the profession and makes criminals of those who must keep a pact with a criminal in order to honor the "letter" of an immoral law. Lawyers should be obliged to retain Trade Secrets or even personal secrets. But they should not be bound by law to conceal knowledge of a criminal act. Nor should they be shielded from their obligation to tell the truth.



Lastly, we will have an end to class action suits as they are pursued today. It is unreasonable and unproductive to the economy at large, that lawyers be allowed to use marketing principles to line their pockets. In establishing a “truth” for one individual, a lawyer has not demonstrated his or her right to collect a fee from every other person in the world to whom that truth applies. Under the old “Adversarial” system which we are abandoning, one could make the argument that in order to wage war with Goliath, David had a right to the unrequested proxy of all the injured parties. But even that argument is tainted by the way lawyers have lined their pockets at corporate expense, when it is stockholders and consumers who pay. It is more of the lottery mentality that has become the staple diet of a failed judicial system. With the revolution, we will overturn the class action suits and their awards, made against tobacco companies. Not because we like tobacco companies, but because it is those addicted who pay the price of the lawyers and their suits. Were this book about retribution, we would see those heads of the tobacco companies, who lied before congress, in front of the whole country, and said that they didn’t believe their products to be addictive; off to jail. But if we were to be vindictive, we would surely drag our president Clinton from office for a similar offence. So this revolution is about a new start. It is about a world in which those who do the work are compensated fairly, but where professionals are paid as professionals not entrepreneurs: and stockholders and addicts do not pay the cost of the corruption of individuals in positions of power and trust. That is what Criminal Justice is for. Therefore, after the revolution we will prohibit the number of clients for which a lawyer may sue, to the number who have hired him or her. We will acknowledge the good intentions of the Ralph Naders of the past. But we will abandon their attempts at equity through the bankrupting of our economy and replace it with the criminal punishment of those who make the decisions that knowing hurt individuals and groups of individuals. We will acknowledge openly that nicotine is an addictive carcinogenic and say that those who are adults and who wish to use tobacco, shall have “The Right Of Self Determination”. We shall specify that that “RIGHT” extends from the use of naturally occurring drugs, to the use [or non-use] of automobile seat belts and motorcycle helmets and even to the right to die. We will further stipulate that, with this right goes ones own responsibility and a waiver of our right to recourse, when the dangers are understood or should have been understood. We will state that tobacco, in its naturally occurring state, without the addition of the, up to 500 additional additives, has a place for those unfortunate enough to feel the need for it. But in its current form it is guaranteed no such protection.

With respect to legislation and regulation at all levels: by initiating the Law of Intent, law makers and regulators would have to attach a “Preamble” to each new law passed or regulation enacted. If the content of the law was in conflict with or failed to result in, the establishment of the intent of the law, it would be

*George Bailey*

null and void in that particular instance. We are entitled to a name on the law as well: The one who wrote it; and someone to go to, to get it to work in the real world. A good example of this would be the legislation known as RICO, which was made law under the pretence that it would suspend our rights under the constitution in order to give law enforcement a tool against organized crime. It was then perverted to be used by anyone in the possession of drugs. This act of confiscation in lieu of a trial has now found its way down to the local level in the form of mayors confiscating the cars of drunk drivers. Today they confiscate the cars if the driver owns them. In the future it will undoubtedly take borrowed cars as well. With the revolution, RICO will be abolished as the illegal search and seizure that it has been from its inception. But without a preamble and without the elimination of the laws of Precedent, our laws will always be twisted to serve power over justice. It is better that “The Mob” [Organized Crime] function as it always has than for our legal system to prevail at the cost of it becoming as overbearing as the “Mob”. Good people suffer under oppression, whether it is from criminals or from government. It is better that we support a government that is impotent and fair, than one that is corrupt and all powerful. In the end, organized criminals can not exist in a culture unless members of that culture support them. This is a reality that no suspension of our Civil Rights can overcome. Therefore, let us protect our rights and work to instill morality in our culture, for any other course is fruitless and folly.

Furthermore, if it is a regulation, we need an elected official’s signature on each regulation. In this way we can hope that our interests are being overseen. Example: because commercial truck and semi-trailers sit so high in relationship to passenger cars; cars that crash into the rear of such vehicles very often end up underneath the semi, often leading to the death of the occupants of the car in a particularly gruesome way. No body likes it. Everyone wishes it didn’t happen. Unfortunately, there are engineering constraints which make it difficult to do much about it on existing vehicles. The rear axles must move around on the truck, so you can’t build much on them to keep cars out. Trailers are built in a myriad of designs in order to meet with an un-uniform weight distribution code that changes in nearly every state. They also are very often built using specifications that are strong as a unit, but do not lend themselves to being retro-fitted by tacking great massive car catchers on the back of them. Never the less, a Congressman or bureaucrat from somewhere, with a vision to change the world, decided to solve this age old problem through legislation rather than on the drawing board. A law was passed that commercial trucks [by the way, combines or other slow moving “Farm” equipment like wagons, that ends up on the road, were not included] should have some means of stopping a car attached to the rear of the vehicle no less than so many inches from the ground, so many inches from either side and so many inches from the absolute furthest rear point on the vehicle. Because there was no structural specification attached to the law,

anything that couldn't be kicked off with a policeman's foot met the criteria. Pieces of steel with no more strength than the windshield frame on a convertible appeared on trailers and trucks across the country. Dump trucks immediately got an exemption because such a device would be in the way of dumping the load. So in the end, the intent of the author to improve safety was not met. Had he or she taken the time to research what they were doing they would have found that out before all the millions of dollars were spent to tack worthless car catchers onto millions of trucks and trailer: before the dump truckers had to waste their time getting an exemption; before your trucking rates went up again due, not to market forces, but legislation; and before the legislator put on their campaign speech how they made the roads safer. A preamble to this legislation or regulation would have invalidated the text of the law. Someone fighting such a citation might well have had a jury "Find in Defiance". In the same way it would eliminate loopholes that appear in other legislation. It would force Congress to make clear their intent or see their laws made invalid. Lastly, it would leave the door open to innovation, by allowing the private sector to deviate from the regulation, so long as the intent is achieved to the satisfaction of the government. At the same time, when an unworkable regulation first hits the scene, taxpayers would have an elected official to go to, to explain the problems with the bureaucratic regulations, if an elected official had to "Sign Off" on regulations.

It is also worth noting that this would give some recourse to small businesses who are trying to compete with large businesses, but who are hamstrung by "Sweeping" legislation. For example; when you get into your car in the morning before work and start it up, you know if something has changed. You are attentive to new sounds and you discern differences in the way your car handles. However, if you were to get a "Loaner" car from your garage you would be hard pressed to identify whether or not that car was in need of repair unless you looked under the hood and checked the tires, etc. These same factors come to play within the trucking industry. A large corporate fleet will assign a driver to any truck in its fleet. A driver who is unfamiliar with a specific truck should be obliged to give that truck a thorough inspection before he or she takes it out on the road, for safety sake. In fact, back in the late 1980's, that is what government mandated for all trucking companies. But the broad stroke of the legislation demanded that even those who drive the same truck day after day, perform an inspection, which would realistically take at least a half an hour a day. No one in the industry, big or small, complies to the letter. It can't be enforced against the big companies if it isn't enforced against the smaller companies, and the smaller companies view the letter of the law as ridiculous in the face of their economic realities. In fact, because big companies enjoy many economic advantages over small companies, such as; purchase power and better name recognition: big companies could afford to pay for a true inspection and still compete. What's more, such inspections are a reasonable standard when trucks are not paired to

*George Bailey*

drivers. For the small company however, these inspections are often redundant in the face of a driver's familiarity with their truck through its day to day maintenance. These are the economic forces which allow for competition between big companies and small; and when broad and sweeping legislation says that just because it waddles it must be a duck, we skew competition in favor of big business to the detriment of our economy.

It should be acknowledged that there are plenty of drivers who don't understand the danger they pose to themselves and those around them when they don't maintain their equipment. There are those who don't care either. There are also employers who assign trucks but won't fix problems in a responsible manner and drivers who are afraid to lose their job. The "X" wage will improve driver participation in policing this and other safety problems in all work places. But paperwork will never make trucks safer. Criminal prosecution will. "Stuff Happens" and when it does, we should know if it was an accident or an accident waiting to happen. We should have accountability. But we should have a place to go in Government where we can explain our side to those who regulate and we should be heard. More importantly, we should not let government use its power to prop up big business over small business.

In the end, new trailers would be designed to incorporate lowered rear bumpers and that would ultimately save lives. It was a change that we as a society could afford. But the sad truth is that people will die in accidents. The fact that we can statistically predict it, does not mean that we can always afford to prevent it. It is important therefore, that when demands are made against industry for safety sake, that they be demands that give us our money's worth.

The "Law Of Intent" should also be directed at fraud; including false advertising. We have a "Right" to be able to believe what we hear and read in our media. It is essential in a consumer driven economy, that information not be misleading, if we are to make informed judgments. Everything from car ads with disclaimers, rattled off at the speed of sound: to promotional spots, for your local news program, have abused our trust. It is a simple law. Not hard to understand. If a random sample of people hear or read your claim, and interpret a different meaning than what you offer, then you have broken the law. If a sign says "Rooms for "19.95 and up" at the motel, and you pull off the highway and invest your time and effort to check in, then you should be able to expect that there is a room available for that price. You should not be informed that, that rate applies to the elderly; or that, that rate applies to only two of the rooms in the motel and they are occupied. If a news caster tempts you with a story that there is word on something of interest to you, and you invest your time by staying up to hear that news, it should not be some insignificant quip, designed to lure you along; or held back to the end of the program, unless you are told it will be at the end. If a burger chain advertises a 99-cent sandwich in huge letters on their window, then

they had better make sure that, that “deal” was clear before you invested your time parking and walking in, or going through the drive through. Likewise, if a “Chain” advertises nation wide, the “Deal” had better be available at “ALL: those merchants who display the “Logo” of that “Chain”: without exception. If you are standing at the counter when they point out the disclaimer to you that says you must buy fries and a drink along with the sandwich in order to get that 99-cent price, or when they say that they are not participating in the advertised promotion, then they are at fault. They have infringed upon your rights and broken the “Law Of Intent” as it applies to false advertising. If a car dealer advertises a car at a set price, they had better make clear how many they have at that price, so that you understand fully that you have little chance of getting there before it is gone. If you are offered a deal in large print, all the disclaimers and charges had better be in large print as well. There will be a lot of cries over such a law. But advertisers know full well the dirty games they play. I have gone to merchants who are sold out of a special promotion and who have continued to run the ads for days after the fact. It can not be tolerated any longer. It lends to the notion that anything is fair and everything is corrupt in business. It is bad for our children, it is unfair to us and we have taken it long enough. But this should be a criminal charge: not another reason to drag people into civil court. It should be a charge brought against those doing the advertising. Despite all the people that are drug into civil court each year, the “tabloids” managed to function with impunity. I will speak to the press further on, but at this point I feel it is important to include this note: Nowhere in the Constitution does it allow lies to be printed with impunity. Here again, the very idea that “Freedom of the Press” could be interpreted as exclusive from “Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness”, was probably incomprehensible to the nation’s founders in a nation “Under God”. The courtroom games that the tabloids lawyers have played with the freedom of the press is a mockery of our law and our right to the truth. Oddly enough, it is our inability to prove intent that allows these “Low Lifes” to function. The burden of proof falls on the injured party, to show that the “Rag” intended to print falsehoods. Never the less, if a picture of a three headed Martian appears on the cover of a magazine which proclaims that such a thing exists then a three headed Martian had better indeed exist. We will deal with such people when we get to journalism. For now it is important to understand that a better United States of America begins with fairness, honesty and forgiveness: and an end to hypocrisy. As for fraud charges, it should be a matter of setting a random sample of twelve average people down in a courtroom and letting them interpret what the ad seemed to offer, and gauging that against what was offered. People are not fooled for long and they are capable of seeing when someone is pulling something [if they are paying attention]. The point is that we shouldn’t have to be on guard against claims made by advertisers. If you receive something in the mail that says you are pre-approved, it should not be your obligation to read through

*George Bailey*

all the fine print included in the document to see if somewhere in the literature it says they really don't mean what they obviously said. More importantly, when a charge is filed, the District Attorney's Office should consider such crimes as serious. Juries should, of course, use common sense and not find honest mistakes to be felonies or even misdemeanors. But failing to honor what my generation was taught as the "Golden Rule" "Thou Shall Not Tell A Lie", is as much a factor in the erosion of our culture as any other single component.

It would be my hope that in the future, when people come into conflict with others, be it other individuals or groups of individuals, that they could have those conflicts mediated by a legal system which seeks the truth and does its best to arbitrate. A country which is in a constant state of conflict as a result of a system which is slow and unfair, is being poorly served. When a dispute arises it should be that those involved have access to a "Jury Of The Day" so to speak, which sits to hear both sides of disputes in much the same way as a small claims court does today. These jurors would "sit" for one day only and hear disputes that could be laid out in one day or less. Questions such as, "Does this advertisement say what is truly being offered?" are questions best resolved quickly and without legal maneuvering. One's day in court will always be better served if an advocate speaks on your behalf; but fairness should not be contingent on ones ability to dig through the legal archives, nor to prepare beyond the gathering of the true facts. Justice that is not timely is not justice. We are told that in the Constitution and yet We are denied. When two people who have a dispute, agree to work within the framework of our legal system rather than become aggressive against one another, then they should have ready access to a referee, an arbitrator, to tell them who is right and who is wrong and if both are some of each. It should not be left to fester or consume their lives. It should be settled so that they can move on. That is why we give the respect that we associate with our fathers to our Judges. This idea of a Jury of the Day would be more democratic than a regular court. It would find in favor or against with a 8 to 4 vote or better. Juries which are not agreed by at least 8 to 4 shall submit to the Judge's decision.

Like a sitting Grand Jury, a Jury of the Day would be on duty to decide if the advertisement you received in mail that offered you one thing in the large print and then changed that meaning in the small print had committed fraud. If an advertisement offered you 50% off, but did not tell you what the base price was, then 50% off means nothing. It is misleading and it is fraud. If you are baited into taking an offer that is packaged like a special offer but is actually you every day offer, that is fraud and the Jury of the Day would charge those involved with the promotion and hand over an indictment to the local prosecutor, not hand over a large cash settlement to you. We will also have an end to the sales gimmick of "Won't be under sold". In a capitalistic economy, where the main considerations of a purchase are quality, quantity and price; the practice of guaranteeing to meet

a competitor's price allows merchants to sidestep the rules of engagement. It is a type of fraud that says that I may advertise the lowest price, but it will be up to consumers to catch me or they may pay a higher price. It is not the concern of the consumer that the seller may not be aware of a lower price when the claim of lowest price is made. That claim is the responsibility of the seller to uphold. Therefore, it should not be made unless the seller can be assured that they can not, in FACT, be undersold. Let advertisers be held to a standard of the TRUTH. Let them state their best price and compete in a truthful manure or be charged with fraud by a Jury of the Day. When you call your telephone company because you have a question or a problem and the recording says that "Due to higher than normal call volumes you may have twenty minute wait for an agent", it is depressing. But when, over the course of months, you never fail to hear the same recording over and over again, that company is telling customers that this poor service is not normal when in fact it is the norm. That is fraud, and the Jury of the Day should be able to clear that up for you in the time it takes you to tell them the story and they pass it on to the local prosecutor to investigate. In a land where justice and accountability can not be "Stone Walled" with laws and lawyers, this recording would never be played. That telephone company would simply refrain from making such false statements. Consumers would not have to be on guard against fraud because when it appeared, people would get in trouble: and the people in trouble would not only be the one who approved the fraud, but those who "Knowingly" participated in it. Even more importantly, it would be the Jury of the Day who would decide if they should have "Known" or probably did know. It is simple accountability. That is what the laws are supposed to defend. Without that principle in place, laws are a sham and a mockery. In addition, the "Rebate", which has become the newest gimmick, will have to revise its rules as well. If you buy a product that comes with a rebate, it will be up to the retailer of that product to fill out the necessary forms for you and give you a receipt stating that you are entitled to that rebate. That same retailer will have to make a record of that transaction and pursue your money for you. In this way, you will have an advocate if the rebate is not honored in the allotted time. There is just no other way to police a practice which has become a sales promotion that is often subverted by design. The retailers use such rebates as advertising gimmicks, they are therefore, participants, who are accountable.

After the Revolution: down at the Court House, or the various offices of the City, State and County Governments, it has become the law that if a taxpayer has a complaint against a government employee, that taxpayer can register that complaint with the government employee's superior. When enough complaints are registered, those complaints will be forwarded to the Jury of the Day. That Jury will decide if the complaints warrant a hearing, and if they do, then a Jury of the Day, sitting sometime in the near future, will hear the complaints of those who wish to come testify, or have their complaints read allowed, and the

*George Bailey*

government employee can either answer the complaints themselves or have an advocate [lawyer] speak on their behalf. We have a right, as taxpayers, to expect to be treated with courtesy and respect by those we employ. We have a right to have an avenue of recourse, which is removed from the in-house politics and the “Wagons in a Circle” mentality of government workers, monitoring government workers. If we are to live under laws for the sake of society, then those who administer those laws must be accountable to the public through some other means than the fox guarding the hen house. A Jury of the Day is a reasonable forum for such recourse. If it finds against a government worker, they may be admonished by the Judge or their job held forfeit by a unanimous vote by the jury. The Jury of the day will sit on as many days as a need arises. It will function in between the Small Claims Court and regular Court, in that it will tend to use the Judge as advocate and examiner for both sides in much the same way as Small Claims Court. What’s more, it will tend to function more like a Grand Jury. But rather than the or District Attorney asking the Jury of indict someone, the Jury of the Day will function as a way to insist that the District Attorney’s office indict on behalf of citizens. Just as I spoke earlier of all those in Texas who were being denied protection under the law for their pay checks, a Jury of the Day would safeguard that citizens have a right to insist that criminal charges be brought to bear rather than being left with civil litigation as their only recourse. If police use extortion, if frauds are perpetrated, if Judges are corrupted, if lies are printed: when wrongs are committed and our Judicial System is unwilling or unable to act, the Jury of the Day will become the citizen’s advocate for justice.

Before moving on, there is a side bar that might as well be dealt with here. It is unreasonable that government employees to use answering machines rather than to have someone answer the phone. One can make the argument that it costs money to have someone around to answer the phone all the time. But we are paying for these services. In the real word, a Government employee, whose work load is dictated by their peers, and who is allowed to “Screen” their calls with an answering machine, is not accountable to the public. When an answering machine is used, there is no one to monitor how much time a worker spends away from their desk. There will always be lag time in any job. This is an invitation to leave one’s post until enough work has accumulated to attack it in a manner which is most productive for the worker in question. But it is the taxpayer, who is often forced to deal with this same government worker, and who is thwarted and left to make his or her business wait for the bureaucrat to make themselves available. It is more of the idea that Government is somehow an equal partner to free enterprise, when in fact it is a stone around the neck of free enterprise. You will never see a answering machine employed in place of a live person in a service oriented industry that wishes to attract customers: not if that consumer has somewhere else to go. It is the fact that citizens have nowhere else to go, that gives government workers this feeling that they are still in business



because they serve. But “Manning” the phone is part of the job description and an answering machine does not fulfill their obligation.

In the first part of this book, I elaborated on the legal, moral and economic costs of medical malpractice suits in America today. We have tried unsuccessfully to monitor the quality and integrity of our doctors through the use of inflated or denied malpractice insurance. It is a failed proposition. The power and prestige of the “American Medical Association” has not been used to safeguard the quality and integrity of the medical profession. Doctors who are aware of incompetence within their ranks are forced to play alone or get out. Insurance rates sore, reflected in everything from rising office visit costs, to single surgical procedures that cost tens of thousands of dollars. It must fall to those who presume to accredit doctors in this country to bear the responsibility of watchdog. If we have a complaint against a doctor, it should be filed in criminal court if so warranted, or with the accrediting body or both. The accrediting body should bear the burden of taking away the licenses of those who should not be in practice. Just as importantly, it should not be a Governmental institution.

As it stands today, doctors are certified by various Boards: hence the term “Board Certified”. Additionally, they are licensed to practice by the state in which they practice. The problem is that any group of people can set up a board and begin accrediting doctors. Furthermore, a doctor who has lost their license in one state may well be licensed in another. Therefore, in order to promote true and meaningful oversight within the medical profession it shall become the responsibility of the various disciplines of medicine to accredit those within their field. That is to say, that, those who would generally be associated with the American Medical Association shall form a body to accredit doctors and their sphere of accreditation shall encompass all the fifty states. Those who practice Chiropractic will form their own national board, as will Acupuncture, or any other group who professes to heal. These accrediting bodies will be member supported and run democratically much like a corporation in which each individual owns one share of stock. The organization will accept responsibility for accreditation and bear responsibility for restitution; and its members shall bear the cost and that cost shall be born evenly across the board. That is to say, that, as we presume that all doctors are competent, all doctors will pay the same rate as a percentage of their gross billings. In this way, if they close ranks to protect incompetents, they all bear the burden. There will have to be some sort of Federal Government recognition and accreditation of the organization, but it should be non constraining so long as it is not a sham set up solely for the purpose of restitution, or to avoid the same. The advantage of this is that we can not sue an insurance company for selling insurance to a known incompetent, but we can sue the Accrediting Body for allowing them to practice in the face of growing evidence of abuse: and that alone should be the bases for recourse. If

*George Bailey*

criteria are established that clearly define how many complaints, and of what nature, constitute what form of action by the [ Let's say the A.M.A.: the American Medical Association], they will be held harmless so long as they stay within those guidelines. With a direct stake in the ramifications that could result from an internal investigation, doctors will be less likely to cover up for each other, especially within the hospital system I have outlined. At the same time, such an organization will be better qualified to look at facts rather than be driven by emotion or economics. In return, we must relinquish the right to sue individual doctors for anything beyond the care of the injured parties. That amount will be lowered substantially by the changes in hospital care as outlined earlier in this book. There will always be mistakes made and we will have to forgive them. If they are within the parameters of acceptable medical mishaps such as described in the movie "The Verdict", doctors should be able to accept responsibility and turn in claim to their accrediting body, just like you would except responsibility for a traffic accident and turn it into your insurance company.

This may cause new procedures and new ideas to suffer much more constraint than the old system. In order to innovate, doctors may have to do battle with the accrediting body. The Government agency that acknowledges that body of accreditation should be an advocate for Doctors who find themselves fighting against a constraining system. Even the Jury of the Day should be an avenue. But, in the end it is morality and a sense of fairness that is needed to make this, or any system, work. This arrangement will tend to the needs of those abused by doctors. The rest of the health care network personnel will be monitored by doctors and disciplined by the board of directors and the Hospital administrator. But the idea of suits for such things as pain and suffering are too abstract. Pain and suffering are a part of life. To try to minimize their affects was an unworkable idea from its inception. To lose a loved one to a fatal disease or an act of God, is not the same as losing them to the incompetence of a doctor; or for that matter, the negligence of a drunk driver, or even a nurse. A loss due to human error will be far more likely to elicit elements of hate and vengeance. But if you seek vengeance through lawsuit, you only take money from your neighbors when you sue an insurance company. If it is a corporation you are suing, it is the stockholders you are going after, not the board of directors. As for hate, no amount of money can relieve it. It's about what? You know, Forgiveness. As I keep reminding you, the criminal court still has jurisdiction when warranted. We must also see to it that the physical needs of those injured are paid for by the insurance companies of those who inflict the injury; such as in cases of drunk drivers; if they have insurance. In the case of doctors who make mistakes, it should be the Body of Accreditation who pays. If it is determined that some other health care provider was at fault, and that individual worked for the Federal Health Care System, it shall fall to the Government System to cover

the cost of care. The idea is to get away from the need of insurance. But if we retain it; for example, in the form of automobile liability insurance, I propose it work like this.

When someone wins a million dollars in a lottery, the State pays out only a percentage of the prize money. The money they do pay is put into a fund that pays an annuity, such as \$50,000 a year for Twenty years. As a result of paying of lottery winnings in this way, the State puts out far less than a million dollars. By selling the annuity to some entity who will use the money and pay the annuity, the State puts up a percentage of that money, which makes interest over twenty years, while paying out the \$50,000 a year to the winner of the lottery. So let's assume that I am hit by a drunk driver. My wife and three girls are left without a provider, and I am left brain dead. After the revolution, my medical costs will fall to the Federally funded hospital institutions. Those that aren't, such as my doctor bills, should be born by the driver's insurance company. I know many of you will say that the driver, not you the taxpayer, should bear the cost of all the medical expenses. But you have been confused by the system. It is his insurance, if he has any, that will pay; and those costs are born by the same people who pay the taxes, only with a profit for having the insurance company handle the money, figured in. You see, I am one of you and you are one of us. That's what makes us countrymen. His insurance should however, keep my family from suffering the loss of my income: even if I am the homemaker, whose job will now have to be hired out. As for the loss of me, how do you presume that they could be compensated for that? To protect them economically, a taxable annuity should be set up to provide them with an income comparable to the one I provided. It should be a minimum of a wage based on "X", [the new minimum wage]. Furthermore, it should continue until the children have graduated school [up to five years of college], or for ten years total; which ever is greater: or until my wife remarries. If I am single it should be used to pay my creditors and those I took care of. If I cared for no one, no annuity is needed once my bills are paid. This is fair to those in need as well as those who pay. Suppose that I had died instead of a heart attack? I would have left them with nothing that they will not still receive, with the exception of my life insurance. As for the life insurance: if I am in a coma or pronounced brain dead, then my premium payments on the policy should cease and my beneficiary should be able to collect when I die, or when the income I have just described runs out. We can not stop the injustices of life by throwing money at them. When we try, we only perpetrate injustice on those whose money we have taken and wasted in the effort. Without having to deal with suits for pain and suffering, or mistakes which did not severely incapacitate, doctors will be able to admit their mistakes in much the same way as you would in a traffic accident that was your fault. The accrediting body would be responsible only so far as setting up an annuity that would cover expenses and maintenance in much the same way as your own insurance carrier

*George Bailey*

would if you were at fault in an accident that only involved you. Punishment, if in order, would be a function of the Body of Accreditation and or the Criminal Courts: and because all those who are accredited by that body, must contribute in an equal percentage [which is multiplied by their gross income much like the tax system], members who cost other members too much, will be weeded out when warranted. Remember, unlike insurers; not only will they be weeded out because they are costing annuities, but because if the accrediting body does not monitor its own, it can be sued as well. If I were incapacitated, then an annuity such as the one described for the drunk driver scenario is in order, unless it could be shown that the doctor's record demonstrated that they should not be practicing and yet they were still accredited. In that case, the body of accreditation would find itself fending off an old style litigation suit.

With questions of euthanasia still unresolved, it is difficult to project into the future. Regardless, it should be left up to my wife [I would hope], to decide if my "Plug" should be pulled: and if the tables are turned it should be I who decides. We can not allow a situation where insurance companies apply political pressure to have plugs pulled to end payments. At the same time, we dare not make the help to families left behind, contingent on the death or survival of the victim. That's the best we can do. After all' who's to say that I wouldn't have slipped in the bathtub the day after my accident? But if these rules are in place, my family will be provided for as long as I am around. Should she remarry, then I have been replaced. But paying a man or a woman a huge settlement for the loss of a spouse, in no way insures their economic security over the long haul. It does, however, allow lawyers and insurance companies a death grip on our country. If life were fair, we would not grow to infirmity, but rather we would just "Check Out" when our measure was used up. Children would all be perfect and wise, loved and protected. No one would ever be hurt or hungry; and if money could make these things so, then there would be a lot more to go around. Regardless of your own beliefs concerning the meaning of life, if we are to survive as a nation, we must resign ourselves to being content with what life gives us. If we could change life, things would be getting better instead of worse; for we have seen more change in the last 50 years, than in the preceding 1,950. The answer lies in accepting our fate. Seeing justice done for those that deserve punishment and assistance for the victim and their families in moving on through the transition. If we apply this kind of honest logic to the courts and to our lives, we will see change. If we persist in trying to compensate monetarily for life's hardships, we will continue to decline.

Before ending this segment on accreditation, I need to address the problem of spheres of influence. The discipline of Chiropractic has long struggled to find a place in the shadow of Main Stream [AMA] medicine. I can personally vouch for it's worth. Never the less, it is the nature of power, greed and even misguided

concern, that causes the established of any profession to use their influence to hold down other disciplines and belief systems. It is the over riding obligation of the Federal Body which has oversight on the issue of Accrediting Bodies, that new and unfamiliar forms of healing be judged by scientific and statistical means, rather than by the prejudices of Professionals from other fields. Furthermore, it is the promise of the Jury of the Day that when such political processes manifest themselves in the destruction of those who do good work, in order to preserve the Status Quo, those who do good work will have an avenue of recourse, if not protection.

In order to deal with the problems associated with Insurance in this country, it will be necessary to enact some sweeping changes here as well. To begin with, with the revolution it shall be that insurance companies shall bid to supply coverage in a given area. For example, with auto insurance, if you have a valid driver's license, you will be entitled to an insurance rate which is the same as any other person with a valid driver's license in your coverage area. That amount will be determined by such factors as how large the awards are in your local courts for settlements against claims, and how bad your drivers are. In this way, regions in which it is felt that insurance companies should be made to pay for life's inequities, will pay higher premiums. Areas that are fair will pay fair rates. At the same time, insurance companies who claim that high court settlements have driven up costs will be forced to bid for your territory against other insurance companies. In this way, if your area is not the bad risk the insurance company claims, they [the insurance company] will be under bid by their competitors.

This constitutes a new approach to bad drivers as well. Like the old system of malpractice, the old system of auto insurance supposed that poor drivers would be driven out of their cars by higher rates. It didn't work. After all, do you want the drivers in your area to be safe and responsible, or do you just want them to be charged more for endangering you and your loved ones. When the decision of whether or not someone should be allowed to drive is based on their ability to pay, it discriminates to the detriment of those at the lower end of the economic spectrum. Whether or not you are a danger to others has nothing to do with your economic status. It is that factor of danger which each of us imposes on others around us, when we sit behind the wheel of a car, which is the only consideration which is valid when assessing right to drive. Therefore, in order for insurance to be fair it will become necessary for law enforcement to concern itself with seeing to it that all those who drive in a manner which is not at that mainstream level of competence, are barred from driving. In this way, the automobile liability insurance rates for your area will be an unbiased report card on the quality of your areas drivers: both how well they are trained and how well the police remove bad drivers from the mix. It will also be a reflection of how your government manages traffic and road conditions. There will be those who say

*George Bailey*

that the young should pay more, but I have tried to explain to you that insurance is a pool. What's more, I would remind you that we were all young once and I can assure you that I am in a better position to pay now than I was then. It then becomes a question of whether young drivers should pay because they are young, or because they are bad due to inexperience, or because they are dangerous as a result of incompetence or recklessness. In such cases as the first two scenarios, we owe it to the young to support them if we intend to ask them to support us at some time in the future. If it is because they are incapable, then it is their responsibility to seek help or refrain from driving. If they are too immature or reckless to be on the roads then they should be bared, not pay more for the privilege of endangering others.

As for comprehensive coverage against such things as theft: again; a police force, which does not see auto theft as a big enough problem to worry about, will be graded by the insurers who bid [or don't bid] for their area. In the new system, areas which do not remove dangerous drivers from their midst will pay higher premiums. Police who do not do their job will have to explain those rate increases to tax payers. Given that citations, which used to gather revenue, are now rendered useless by the new tax laws, police will have ample opportunity to focus in this more productive direction. Of course, coverage other than liability will vary depending upon such factors as type of auto and the cost of services in the area in which you live; but the purpose of insurance is to band society together for the purposes of averaging risk among its members, not to pick out those who have minimal risk in order to glean profits.

As for health insurance, it will be of a far more catastrophic nature than it was prior to the revolution. But just as with auto insurance, it shall be bid for regionally. The cost of such coverage shall be the same for anyone within that regardless of pre-existing conditions. Different coverage may be offered at different rates, but those coverages will be determined by the region before the bids are taken and will be available to all who desire to sign up within the region at the same price per person. As to region size, it should be no smaller than a county and no larger than a state. Beyond that it should be up to State and local officials to determine what is best for their constituents.

As for the question of pre-existing medical conditions, there is no easy answer. It is not fair to those who pay insurance premiums all their life, to have those who do not, begin to pay only when a need it discovered. Still, on the other side of the coin, those who do not invest in medical insurance within the new system will face the expense of one time medical events alone. But these same non-contributors also have a mediating effect on insurance rates because, as we have witnessed in our medical "Industry" today, as larger segments of the population are given a "Blank Check" with regard to their coverage, the cost of that care is "Bid Up" in the system of Capitalistic Medicine. In addition, if we do

not allow those with pre-existing conditions to purchase coverage for that condition, people will find themselves unable to relocate out of the coverage area they were in at the time of the first appearance of their particular medical problem. Because there is no perfect answer to the question, we must error on the side of coverage for those with pre-existing medical conditions: but there must be limitations. For example, if a couple sets out to have a baby, they would expect either to purchase insurance or bear the cost of the delivery out of pocket. If there are complications and the baby has to be taken with a caesarian section, then it is likely that all of the following pregnancies will come to the same conclusion. If they are allowed to purchase insurance after the first pregnancy the odds of how often that scenario will “play out” [will occur] within a given population, can be figured in. If their baby is born prematurely, it is not necessarily the case that the next one will be and they will either get insurance or risk the expense out of pocket again the next time. If they get the insurance and their next child has no complications, they now contribute but do not take, thereby negating some of their negative impact. Remember, because the hospital equipment and staff are paid for by taxpayers as a whole in the new system, a premature baby cost only a small fraction of what it used to. But the third scenario is one in which an uninsured comes down with AIDS, or some other catastrophic illness which will up set the balance, so that; if allowed health care after the fact, those who purchased health care in advance of illness would bear the cost of all our ills. The end result would be that no one would buy insurance until they had a claim. That would, in fact, nullify insurance by having only those using health care insurance, pay for health care insurance. To deal responsibly with this complex issue, it will be up to the electorate of our “Republican” FORM of government [not to be confused with the Republican Party]; to make some decisions with regard to what insurance companies must cover as pre-existing. Those who can not be allowed coverage after the fact [like the AIDS example] will fall to the Federal Health System, and the Federal Government will absorb the cost of their medical expenses through the Federal Health Care System. This balance between States and the Federal Government is the lynch pin of the new health insurance system. By States pushing to have the Federal Health Care System pay for the expense of those illnesses which threaten State’s private health Care Insurance across the country, States will be advocates for those who will unfairly burden the insurance industry; which would cause rates to rise or stop individuals from participating in health care coverage plans. It may appear that we are bailing out those who have not purchased catastrophic health insurance, but what we have really done is to band together and use the collecting power of the Internal Revenue Service to insure that every one contributes as best they can, in the form of taxes, to support the medical expenses of those who have suffered a catastrophic illness; and in doing so, we arrive at a system which is compassionate and fair. But there must be limits. We can not say that the

*George Bailey*

resources of the country can all be allocated to medicine so that we can attempt to save every soul, using every measure conceivable. Compassion is the key, and some times compassion comes in the form of letting God's will be done. The point at which a pre-existing illness will become a burden upon the Federal System will be determined by a balance between the needs of the States and the Federal System. But the point at which we will say that the Federal System has done all it can is a matter which I can not define for you. It is a question that needs to be evaluated and re-evaluated from time to time. It is a moral issue that needs a moral leadership to determine, because an immoral leadership will say no to no one at the cost of denying everyone what is just.

As an example, in a recent court decision, a High Court has ruled that an Iowa school system must provide a full time nurse, for a student who must have full time care and wants to go to public school. So often, the broadcasters of radio and television report the news in such an inflammatory way that one can not be sure of the true circumstances surrounding the case. So for discussion sake, let us speak in general terms rather than address this case. The "Heart of the Matter" it seems to me, is in the goal. If a child has realistic hopes of becoming a productive and self-sustaining individual within a society, then there is every reason to attempt to keep them in the "Main Stream". But if the goal is only to try and normalize a life that can never hope to be Main Stream in any sense, it is an unfair burden on society. It is a situation in which there is no attempt at compromise and the charity, which is given by society, is used as the club of Entitlement. So long as the student can participate without being disruptive, they have a right to the education. If they need special accommodation in transportation, then some degree of latitude is needed. But there must be some balance. Suppose that a situation such as the press described were to happen. Society would be better served if the parent, who sued the school system, was paid an "X" wage by the state or even Federal Health Care System, to take care of their child. In that way, the parent could deliver the child to school and attend to the child's needs all day. In that way, the special bus and driver are eliminated. The expensive Health Care Professional is replaced with an involved, "Base wage" worker and everyone contributes. If your rebuttal is that this child needs full time care, twenty four hours a day and the parent can not handle the burden all day and all night, then we must currently be supporting that family as well as paying for the Health Care Provider. In such a scenario, this child is better off in an institutional setting. It then falls to the parent to spend time within that setting. And that setting is where education should be given. It is the same set of circumstances that came to bear with a young mother who gave birth to a premature baby while on welfare. The baby was never to be healthy or perhaps even conscience. But because of a misguided sense of protection and a blank check from courts, paid for by society at large, the baby was kept alive to suffer. Individuals will always want to do every thing possible for their children. If they



did not, they would not be good parents. It therefore falls to Society to set limits which are fair; not only to protect Society, but to relieve parents of the sense that there was more they could or should have done. A government which grows itself will always vote to incorporate more tasks to its list of duties. In cases where the courts act as advocates for such growth, legislators must change the laws or juries must be used to “Find in Contempt”.

This approach constitutes a reversal in our approach to Government and Medicine, in which, we have abandoned the Socialistic approach of government toward business and its Capitalist approach to Medicine; for the Capitalistic approach of government toward business and the Socialistic approach to Medicine. It fulfills the basic purpose of society, which is to protect its members by constricting the involvement of Capitalism in areas which call for humanity.

As for business insurance, We need to make sure that government is ever mindful of those who do not fit the mold. It is, after all, those who do not fit the old molds that build the new molds. Each geographical area of bid should have someone within that state or county government who is something of an “Ombudsman” for the insured within that area. What’s more, these Ombudsmen should be in the business of helping to find a fair rate for those who do not do things just like every body else. For example, if you are a farmer who has a grain truck, you can probably get a rate which takes into consideration that you don’t operate the truck every day. That’s because there are a lot of farmers out there who use their truck pretty much the same way you do. As a result, you fit into a neat little place in the system and your exposure has been calculated accordingly. But what if you’re a wood worker in a remote location who makes hand crafted goods? In the course of a year you make a truck load of goods and once a month you take them to the fair in a far away major city. Because of the system we have now, it is almost certain that you will either rent a truck which comes with its own insurance or you will pay the same premium on your own truck as someone who uses their truck every day. If We, as a Capitalistic society, are going to insist that everyone insure against our misfortune, then We have to make insurance accommodate business rather than the other way around, or suffer the consequences in a global marketplace. Besides that, it’s just the right thing to do.

Finally, we also need to abandon the idea that a car or a truck is different from any other piece of property when it is not in motion. If someone trips over your sidewalk and sues you, then shame on them and any jury that gives them money. But if they do, your homeowner’s policy will protect you. By the same token, if someone trips over your car when it is parked and sues you, it is still just a piece of property which you own, no different than a sidewalk. It doesn’t matter if it is parked on your driveway or the street, or in storage down the block or across the country. A car or any other vehicle which is not set in motion, by design, is just a thing one owns, like any other. To say that something is an

*George Bailey*

“Attractive Nuisance” which beckons people near to do themselves harm, is to say that every tree which entices boys to climb it should be cut down. Nor is it fair that a person who owns more cars than they can drive at one time should have to insure them all at the same rate as the family next door who has one car that never rests. To be sure, the person with one car can lend one of his cars out. But in the end, a group of people who have an Ombudsman to speak for them to the insurer of their area and who deal fairly with that insurer will emerge with fair insurance coverage at a fair price. A community that is just with those who end up in court with unresolved claims, and does not punish insurance companies for life’s inequities, will emerge from that process with fair insurance coverage as well. Those who do not, will not.

The next subject of discussion is that of “Patent Law”. Of all our tools used in fighting for a strong position within a world economy, there is none more powerful, yet unguarded. It is the nature of both capitalism and the “Melting Pot” to inspire creativity. It is our monumental strength. But far too little is done to insure compliance globally. Most nations have some sort of Pact or agreement to deal with patents: both ours and theirs. Unfortunately to file a patent in this country does not provide coverage world wide. It is expensive enough to file here. But the costs sky rocket as you multiply them by all the countries of importance. I would urge Washington to seek an international form of patenting, reduced to a one shot deal. But whether that occurs or not, it is imperative that we see patents protected far better than they have been both here and abroad. For example, let’s say you own the rights to a patent in the US, on a successful product. You applied for and were granted patents in other countries. Then one day you travel to a foreign country and you see an unlicensed copy of your product. You discover that a third world producer has flooded the market overseas with an idea they stole from you. So you sue. What happens is that the company you sue, folds. All the money they made, they paid to themselves in salaries and wages knowing this day would come. So there is nothing left in the company for you to recover. Or each time you locate the manufacturer they disappear like a specter just out of reach. To end such practices, we need to demand that nations who want to do business with us, honor patent agreements. If they will not, American companies should be able to sue the offending companies here in a US court with or without the offending party present. If the US company is found to be entitled to compensation, then an import tax should be imposed against exporters from that offending country on items headed to the US, until the amount of compensation is collected. It is not difficult for the governments of offenders to either recover the money or exact judgment for such offenses, but it is an insurmountable task for alien business interests. Remember, we are still the jeweled crown of the market place. If the rules I suggest were unfair, it would be presumptuous, but if we honor such an agreement in kind, there is no reason for them to be disgruntled. After all, those advances made as a

result of investment gathered together due to patent protection, improves the lives of people all over the world. It is unreasonable, even ungrateful, of foreign governments to allow their business to usurp those things which we have developed, leaving our economy to absorb the cost of the development on its own. It is quite true that the US has taken advantage of weaker nations. The same can be said about any nation in the position of power. But to our credit, no other nation has rebuilt and included in its market place, nations it has vanquished, especially not when those country were the aggressor: and certainly not the way that the US has with Germany and Japan. The wealth and peace the world enjoys today are due, in no small part, to that unique vision. This book tries to promote the continuation of that vision. But it must always be remembered that we deserve to be met half way. I have done a great deal to find fault with my country here within, but I would be remiss if I failed to point out that those who make concessions from a position of strength are more worthy of our admiration than those who demand concessions from a position of weakness.

Another critical factor in protecting inventor's rights in this country is that patent infringement should be considered theft, pure and simple. Therefore, inventors should have the right to press charges against an infringer with federal prosecutors. It is difficult enough these days to come up with the capital it takes to secure a patent. It is unreasonable that once in one's possession, that patent is worthless unless one has the capital to defend it in a civil court. It is a common conception that a patent is of little or no value in this or any other country these days unless one has the money to defend it against thieves in court. This is not altogether unfounded, since it is up to he who has been infringed upon to sue for compensation. Furthermore, when a judgment is found in favor of the offended party, it may only be in the form of a small royalty or percentage.

When We as a nation, allow the powerful to profit from doing the wrong thing, We all suffer. This truth is even more profound in a Capitalistic economy. When "Goliath" defeats "David" in the market place it is the consumer who loses. If someone steals your patent they are a thief. Thieves should be put in jail where they can not steal. Those stolen from should be given back what was stolen from them, not some small percentage of what was stolen from them. When these consequences are known to be the result of patent infringement, then and only then, will innovators be able to find the funding necessary to innovate to the betterment of all. This truth has not been lost on those who hold copyrights. To the contrary, because it is the powerful who do the marketing of copyrighted material, it is often they who end up owning the copyrights. As a result, in recent years, landmark legislation has been passed to safeguard the possessions of the wealthy and powerful. At the same time, in the area of Utility Patents, the cost of manufacturing and marketing new ideas, prevents many new products from getting off the ground. In many cases, the success of such innovations could

*George Bailey*

challenge the existing power structure. It is for that reason that Congress has abandoned the innovators of our time. If I were to write a “Hit” song each and every month, I would not be able to unseat those who control the music industry. The amount of material that they can draw from is unlimited and they have an organization in place which some say is a monopoly. Congress has moved to safeguard their copyright “rights”. If, on the other hand, I invent a new device that makes an electric motor more powerful and more economical, I can challenge an existing industry. That is, unless that industry is allowed to steal my idea and use it until I can force them to stop with a lawsuit. Of course, the legal system being what it is, I will be beaten, even if I come away with some royalties. In the end, in both scenarios, the Copyright and the Patent laws, as currently enforced, defend the powerful.

Will this new approach to Patent protection cause any problems? Absolutely. It is almost certain that corruption will follow the money. People who wish to stop competition will almost certainly threaten people with jail instead of lawsuits when no infringement has occurred. The Federal Prosecutors will be unleashed on the innocent to protect the guilty. But that is what the checks and balances of the legal system are for. It is also why it is imperative that we demand morality in government.

If we need a way to better police our doctors, we are desperate for a way to police our lawyers. With the revolution, I expect a drastic reduction in their numbers. From tax law to probate, we will need far fewer if the law is returned to the jury and the people. Still, we will need them. The problem is that, as long as lawyers conduct the law, it will require a lawyer to weed out a lawyer. What I propose is that an individual be able to take their complaint to a District Attorney and file suit against that lawyer’s right to practice law, not just in that jurisdiction, but anywhere in this country. It should be at the discretion of that D.A. to take the case before a jury [perhaps a Grand Jury]. But the D.A. should be obligated to place the grievance on a national file. That file should be reviewed before making a decision on whether or not to move for a trial. To prevent situations where local DAs fail to perform, or where the prosecutor is overzealous or corrupt, there should be a Federal agency that will oversee the process. When a complaint is filed with the DA, that prosecutor will be obliged to forward the grievance to the “National Attorney’s File Board”. In return, your complaint will be acknowledged to you by the File Board. In this way there will be some accountability of lawyers beyond local parameters. It should be that this Federal Board is powerless to sanction lawyers on its own, so that it will not become a political tool: but rather, it shall be obliged to bring to the attention of local, setting, Grand Juries; those lawyers who have demonstrated what seems to be a abnormally large group of critics or an abnormally bad accusation. It shall

then fall to the Grand Jury to decide if a Federal Board shall ban that person from practicing law in these United States.

If we are to live within all the laws of our nation, then the laws must, first of all, reflect the realistic interpretation of our values, as in the case of drug laws. They must be fair and even handed, as in the case of our tax laws. They must be forthright and understandable, as reflected in our criminal and civil laws. Lastly, and most importantly, the line must not be continually crowded, as in advertising fraud. The laws we live under, and the manner in which they are enforced, mirror our commitment to our society. It is far better to raise speed limits and then enforce them, than to raise generations who grow up witnessing society's disdain for its own laws. There is no profit in systems that hold to a higher ground when the masses make an open and every day occurrence of subverting them. If we want government to be realistic, then in turn, the demands we make upon government must be realistic as well. There are some striking parallels between government and our interstate highway system. First of all the speed limit was, until recently, set at a "Politically Correct" fuel saving, safety oriented, speed of 55 MPH. Yet hardly anyone would adhere to it. In fact, many were indignant that those doing the legal maximum limit would be so bold as to venture beyond the far right lane [the slow lane]. In the face of this, law enforcement looked on as the masses broke the law and selectively chose who they would pull over. I've often wondered by what criteria they choose those cars alone the side of the road. It rarely seemed to be those darting back and forth and causing rows of break lights to flash. Those "Darters" are those among us who see the rules of conduct as being for the other guy. They are the ones who see their own circumstance as unique and justifying of plain old bad manners: and more importantly, special consideration. Perhaps their schedule has put them behind. But they set their schedule. Perhaps they are just running late, but they are the ones who slept the extra fifteen minutes. When the road narrows from three lanes to two, they will be in the far right lane at rush hour. That lane was designed to accommodate the slow; those unable to merge into the flow; or those who didn't see it coming. But these "Darters" know it is coming. You won't find them in the "Fast Lane" with those who have committed to that approach to travel. You won't see them in the center lane, with those who adhere to a more constant and consistent approach. They will file in with those for whom special considerations have been made, knowing that it is in people's good nature to accommodate them. If you watch traffic patterns in such a situation, you will see that as the center lane backs off, or merges with the fast lane, [which also backs off] that it is that lane of accommodation to the right, which becomes the fast track. Sadly, if you look ahead of the jam, you will see that far off, the road is scantily covered with traffic until you reach the next jam: because, in the end, "ALL" traffic moves slower because of these people. But somehow they are unable to see it. They see only that they have gained an advantage on those around them. As to how this affects

*George Bailey*

business? Business is the freight truck. It carries the weight. Its movement is slow to respond by the nature of all the forces it must overcome get rolling. It's moves must be carefully planned and executed, because it is as difficult to stop what has been set in motion, as it is overcome those forces which hold it back. Every time a "Darter" creates a jam or cuts off business by whipping in, in front of it; it not only stymies the forward motion of business but all those who are stuck behind it: for the success of all the individuals on the road of economics, depends upon the ability of business to move forward. I have often thought when setting in traffic that we would save a great deal of time and energy if we were to hold traffic speeds to 35 MPH during rush hour, and revoke the licenses of all the "Darters". Yet government, at every turn, panders to these people. It manipulates the tax code merely for the sake of one group at the expense of another. More and more people request and are granted special rights in the work place. Would, that we could eliminate the merging lane all together, and put in its place a huge parking lot from which exit is denied until after rush hour. Or perhaps a giant loop that returns one to the end of the line. But that is neither possible nor fair to those who ended up in that lane through no fault of their own. The answer, none the less, lies in a slower, steadier pace that remains consistent, and a revocation of the rights of "Darters" to drive.

The first step is to determine who belongs in that merge lane. In the 1992 Presidential campaign, Ross Perot held a "Town Meeting" in which a student from Gallaudet University [the renowned university for the deaf] asked, "what would Perot do for the student and his fellows?". It was gratifying to see a candidate who said, more or less, that he need do nothing for him. After all, this young man seemed normal in every other way. In addition, he had a college education. Perot made the statement that computers do not care if one can hear. Perot's response reminded me of John F. Kennedy's famous quote "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country". Physical impairment, race, and sex have become the million dollar war wound in America today. We are a nation of cry babies, each with a worse affliction than the next. It is time that the work place stopped being forced to accommodate people for what they can't do and people started coming forward to offer up what they can do. We can not go to a Mom and Pop donut shop, which sets six feet off the pavement to the first floor and eight feet from the street, with a fifteen foot frontage; and demand that they make provisions for wheel chairs. How does that expense help these people access the second floor? How does a nation converted to inclines justify all the injuries incurred by the walking public, from snow and ice gathering on these inclines. In addition we can not go to small business and demand that they pay for medical benefits for employees, when the owners of the business can't afford medical insurance for themselves. We should not penalize those who work for business by allowing these insurance laws to fall exempt on part time employees, thereby causing employers to cut worker's hours. We can

not mandate that recovering alcoholics and drug addicts be given equal employment opportunity if that means equal pay for unequal risk. We can not say that “Everyone who is not now fourteen, is now fourteen!” without repercussions. These are decisions that must be based in economics. Increased risk and increased expense requires compensation in some form or another. To put such accessibility for wheel chairs into building codes for new construction may have some limited merit, but it makes more sense to design a more versatile wheel chair and allocate money to that end. If you mandate the hiring of HIV positive employees, then you must also mandate that insurance costs can not be increased to employers as a result of the known risk. Furthermore, you will not be able to enforce that because it is untenable. In order for government to come to grips with the realities of the real world, it must function in the real world. That is, government employees must begin to have to live subject to the forces which play on the rest of society. The first step is to mandate that any rules passed into law must demonstrate at least one method by which this new rule can be implemented. Furthermore it may be that the cost of such implementation should be covered with an interest free loan, guaranteed by the government, and the interest paid by the government: if assistance within the industry is needed.

But it is important to remember that, any such regulation makes it more difficult for new businesses to develop in such market pockets. These interest free loans made to keep regulation from strangling existing businesses, cause a disadvantage for those who would compete because the equivalent money needed in start up, would not be interest free for them. Ultimately, it is the consumer who will suffer. Unneeded regulation translates into an unnecessary burden on the economy. But if we truly need the change we must have a plan for the change and we must bear part of the cost for the change. Remember, with a transition to a flat tax, government “will” be budgeted in a meaningful way. Government will still be responsible for the public well being. If it squanders what is given it, then its employees will be accountable. If a portion of the business sector’s gross monies goes to government in the form of taxes and if a portion of government monies goes to meeting with regulation; then prioritizing regulatory needs against other social, economic and administrative needs will seek a balance within an economic reality.

Election reform and the elimination of a system by “Party” will go as far as anything We could do to decrease the number of those employed by the Government. Included in those reductions will be many of those regulatory agencies that exist only to “Generate” Government jobs and payroll. Without the need for what President Lincoln referred to as “Teats”, We will require fewer personnel. The second step is to reduce the status of government employees to that of the working class. Nowhere has the disparities between those who pay the government and those who are paid by the government been more stark than in

*George Bailey*

the government furloughs of 1996. There are few Americans outside the government's workers, who have not faced an out of work period at some point in their lives. It is agonizing to be sure. It makes it all that much more difficult for those of us not on the government payroll to understand why we should be bound by such programs as unemployment insurance when government employees seem too good for it. After all, it was government that put them out of work, just as it is often the ramifications of the same government that often puts the rest of us out of work. I can not remember in my forty some years, a time when government workers have suffered a major work force reduction. Because of their numbers they are pandered to by Congress until many of them have rationalized their ten paid holidays, their sick days, vacation days, medical, retirement and all the other perks; as something they are entitled to no matter how far the rest of the country falls. To bring them back into the line in which the rest of us stand, the following changes are required.

Government retirement funds should be dispersed along with the union funds and government retirement funds abolished. Since there are probably nothing but government I OWE YOU's in the fund, government employees will make the transition to Social Security and receive the same benefits as the rest of the population using their federal retirement deposit amounts as the basis for their Social Security benefits. Government medical plans should be eliminated and government employees' fate left to ride with ours on the public medical plan. They should have no special privilege in maintaining a job they are not performing adequately. In addition, the base wage for federal government workers should be "X", which is the minimum wage for all Americans. For each ten workers, there may be only one at a function of "X" x [times] 1.2 {one point two}. For each ten workers at "X" x 1.2; there may be only one at a function of "X" x 1.7: followed by "X" x 2.4: followed by "X" x 3.3; to a ceiling "X" x 4.4. All this would be based on a forty hour work week. That is to say that, for salaried employees, wages would be calculated as "X" x 40 per week. And please, with the law of intent in place, don't allow Congress to begin to work by the hour, turning in sixty hour weeks. Employees should also get two "paid" sick days, six paid holidays, and two weeks paid vacation. Such sick days and holidays are considered fair and reasonable for working Americans, they should be fair and reasonable for those who work for working Americans; State and Federal alike. In addition, it shall no longer be the burden of the taxpayers to move government employees to new locations. If a government employee puts in to be transferred, the gains they receive from such a transfer will either offset the expense, or they will likely choose against it. If it is a mandated transfer then they will have to choose based on the same criteria that the rest of the nation uses. At the State levels it will be up the individual States to determine their own new salaries. But the rules will have changed. States and counties and cities who do not modify excessive salaries will lose tax base as discussed earlier on. The



Federal model will show what can be accomplished fairly and equitable. It should be noted that in Industrialized Japan, industry allows for one supervisor for every nineteen subordinates. I have calculated at a rate of ten to one. It should also be stated that these X values would be derived from the area in which one is employed, not a national average. In this scenario there is only one Government employee receiving 4.4X for every 111,111 employees. Within the same population there will be ten at 3.3X, 100 at 2.4X, one thousand at 1.7X, ten thousand at 1.2X and one hundred thousand at X. These numbers represent an X value relative to a number of employees. That is to say that in every group of eleven the salaries paid out will be  $11.2 \times X$ . Within a group of one hundred and eleven, there will be 100 employees at X plus 10 at 1.2X plus 1 at 1.7X =  $100X$  plus  $12X$  plus  $1.7X = 113.7X$  within a group of 111 employees. If it is decided that it would be better to have more "Grades" or classifications, or levels within that number of employees, that is fine, so long as Taxpayers only pay a total of 113.7X for every 111 government employees.

These changes, while I'm sure are horrifying to present government worker, will change things for the better. If you are a Government Employee, I urge you not to despair. You are not being turned out into the world you have helped create, but rather into a world We are creating. Government job openings should be among the first to be "split" under the new employment program. As people outside the government pool begin to move into the system, others who might have transferred to protect a vested interest in the old system will move out into the private sector. The system which prevails in government today has led to a work force that must work side by side with people that make life intolerable. With a secure private sector and less incentive to keep a distasteful job, people will have new opportunities to look for jobs that provide a better atmosphere, if not more fulfillment. Government workers will finally be able to weed out the bad apples. In addition, no one under the age of thirty may be hired by Government outside of special circumstance like such things as the Armed Forces or the Peace Corp. Nor should they serve more than twelve years. In this way Government will truly become Public servants drawn from the Private sector to serve and then return to the Private sector. In this way, those in Government will not come out of school to be indoctrinated to believe that they may do whatever they wish to the Country, without consequence. Nor will they come to see themselves as superior to those that they serve. They will have an understanding of what needs to be done and how to do it realistically. And at some point, they will have to return to the Private Sector they have helped to shape. With workers moving back and forth between the private sector and government jobs, government will be more in touch with what is working in government and what is not. These changes are only fair. It is not right that those who are employed live better than those who provide employment. Government work is not that difficult except by its own creation. What's more, much of the

*George Bailey*

specialized training done within government is little more than indoctrination. In that vein, it should also be mandated that any documents which the government requires to be filed out, come complete with someone from the government, qualified to fill them out. If government wishes to regulate some aspect of our lives, it should be the responsibility of government to supply [at our discretion] someone who can both explain and fill in the blanks. We as citizens or businesses may choose to fill in the blanks on our own, but it can no longer be made our responsibility to function as legal counsel. If the requirements of the document have merit, then someone versed in the understanding of them, is warranted. We provide the information, they fill in the blanks, unless we as individuals wave that right. By the same token, it should be the law that no government agency may require that paperwork be filed when the figures are "0"s. That is, if there is no movement in an account, the government can not insist that a form be filled in and mailed, in order to police accounts. It flies in the face of innocent until proven guilty to force such adherence.

On the state level, the "Public Utilities Commissions", of many states, were put into place to regulate prices of services with the aim of averting monopolies. The result has been a stifled free market economy and the preservation of the Status Quo. In many parts of the country, those who have "PUC Authority" could [up until federal changes in the law which are still under contention] petition that PUC to deny the right of others to compete for work. Furthermore, in some cases, small enterprise has been squeezed out of the market place due to the fact that inflated PUC rates make it unprofitable for larger firms to hire independents. It's a bad system. It should be abolished. The problems it is supposed to deal with should be dealt with through anti-trust laws. Only their function as price setter for true utilities, such as electric companies, will still be required.

If we are to challenge the way in which government uses its authority to subsidize business to the detriment of our resources and send a message to those employed by the system; we must reclaim our postal service. You probably didn't know it, but the Government has been trying to privatize the postal service for some time. It is controlled by government regulation, but Postal workers are not government employees, as such, any longer. They should be. It may very well be a dying entity as the age of computers expands in ever increasing ways. It is likely that bills will soon be sent and paid electronically. "In home" services may replace "Junk Mail". Commercial parcel services would disenfranchise the US postal service today given a level field. Regardless of this, the ability to send private messages on something tangible is a notion that is likely to be with us for a long time. Nothing that is transmitted electronically can be protected from eavesdroppers. The "MAIL" should be protected if only for posterity's sake. But a monolith dedicated to moving mountains from the printing press to the garbage can, using every thing from airplanes to fleet upon fleet of automobiles; is a

dinosaur that is ready for the garbage as well. We need to return to a simple foot carrier, who delivers mail to our door, not down the street a half a block. To get back to that, we simply insist that “all” mail be delivered at the same rate, determined by weight. Postal persons should not each have their own vehicle. It wasn’t necessary thirty years ago, when they picked up the mail from a Mailbox at the corner of the block and delivered it twice a day. And it isn’t necessary now: not if the “Bulk” rates are dropped and personal correspondence and bills comprise the bulk of their load. Let the advertisers innovate somewhere else at their own expense. We do not need a new stamp for each day of the week to increase income from stamp collectors. What we need is a system tuned to the business of dealing effectively and reliably; when that which is carried through the mail can very often change the fortune of an entire family. The bill that is not received and then forgotten, is a black mark on the record of the person who didn’t receive the mail. The check that came too late or not at all, can alter forever the future of its recipient. The mail is a public “Trust” and should be regarded reverently, not thrown in with a bunch of “Junk”. If doing away with the bulk rate does not stem the tide, then the bulk rate will bear the economic burden. Postal workers should be subject to the same wages and holidays as any other government worker. Lest you think we will have trouble finding willing people, compare those who work in the farm fields and under supervision, to the independence afforded a “Letter Carrier”. If I am wrong about that, then wages may have to be raised from X. In case it didn’t occur to you, the Postal Service will still retain its ability to generate revenue. Unless We decide that we will no longer let the Postal Service deliver packages or anything else inconsistent with bills and personal letters, then we will not be able to fund it from the General Fund. Because it functions in a realm that competes with private enterprise, the Postal Service must fall under what I will call the “Postal Exclusion”. While I hate to exclude any Government body from the prohibition of revenue gathering, this single exclusion is unavoidable. We often hear about the stress associated with life as a postal worker. The term “Postal” has even found its way into Americana. Without the ability to unionize, and faced with an X wage for most Civil Servants, it will now fall to the forces of Capitalism to see if people will remain within the Postal Service at an X wage or whether those wages will in fact have to be raised as in the case of Health Care Professionals. The way that one assesses that need to raise wages is simply to see at what rate new qualified applicants no longer apply; and then raise wages to a point at which they do. However, “bogus” qualifications set by government employees would constitute Fraud by those involved.

As we work to make the demands that Government makes of individuals conform to reality, we will have to make the demands that the courts make of individuals realistic as well. It is, once again, about morality. If there is a single lesson in the Bible that we have chosen to ignore, it is that of adultery, in all its

*George Bailey*

forms, and before your defenses rise to protect your self esteem, let me tell you a story. When I was around ten years of age I stood at a counter in a local department store with a bag of Gold Nugget gum and the money to purchase it. After, what seemed like, an eternity, I tired of not being waited on and I walked out: with the gum. I stole it. I would later return, upon advise of my Grandmother, and pay for the gum. Still in all, I broke one of the ten commandments. According to Christ, in the eyes of God there is no order of importance associated with those Commandments. It would not be the last time I would fall from the path. But it was the last time I ever stole anything. What's more I have asked to be forgiven and as I have been allowed a way to repent and I have taken it. If I fail to go to heaven it will not be over that gum. In this same light, if you have failed to be perfect in any way, you are free to be absolved of your guilt if you so choose, but you are not free to deny your guilt. Having said that, let me restate that we have turned our back as a nation on the importance of the Commandment which warns us against Adultery, and we are certainly not repentant about it. We have become a society which puts far too much emphasis on sex because, the sexual "HOOK" gets us to pay attention to things being promoted. We have become a society without standards and the effects of such activity ripple through our society at many levels; including divorce. It makes it easy to understand why the ten most cherished and basic laws given to Judeo-Christians include a ban on such practices. The Commandments are after all, the outline for the model life. And when one person breaks them, others are affected as well. Despite this, for the present anyway, people will continue to get divorced in America for all manner of reasons. Regardless of what those reasons are, Lawyers will continue to drive a wedge between couples and stir the pot if allowed to, and children will be caught in the middle. And as I have said before, I suspect that many of those entering into divorce cases today, do it because they prefer the power they receive from the law to the compromises demanded of marriage. This too, is a moral issue. To hamper such practices, I would refer you to one of my children's favorite stories about the wisdom of Solomon. If you don't know the story, it goes like this. It happened that two women laid claim to the same child. They both professed their undying love for the baby before King Solomon and bid that he decide who should take custody of it. It was his decision that the babe be cut in half and shared between the two. One of the two became overcome and implored the King to give the child to her rival rather than to harm it. In his wisdom, Solomon granted custody of the child to the one who would give it away.

If life is so unbearable between two spouses that it is better for the children that the parents separate, then that decision is the parents'. If your love for them is so great that you are the one who should have custody of them, then plead your case. But the scales should be balanced with the monetary positions resulting from your union, against the children. It is neither right nor just, that the one who

receives that which should be considered the most precious, should receive the balance by default. If the safety nets and guaranties of the revolution are in place, there is ample opportunity to begin again. Nor is it fair that the one who has lost everything, should then be made a servant to the one who receives everything. If you truly love your children, and the divorce is truly in their best interest, then you should be willing to make the sacrifice. If, on the other hand, you seek divorce for selfish reasons, then you should bear the burden. This is not to say that a spouse who gives up custody is barred from contributing to the welfare of their children. But it should be considered a gift and regarded as such. If custody is shared then different rules apply. This new phobia with “Dead Beat Dads”, is far more hype than reality. There are those who have selfishly abandoned their families, to be sure. But few of us in the middle class make enough to support two mortgages; and to say that because a wife is unhappy, that the husband should become an indentured servant without means or positions of his own, is wrong. To say that women should be protected from inequality with all manner of laws, but that they should be protected by the inequality of Fathers when a custody battle is waged, is just more of that same old double standard that Feminism abhors for everyone other than women.

The next change we need to make is to define the role of welfare. The most important consideration in the system after the revolution is that its main priority is to be the “temporary” care of those who have run on hard times. Perhaps just as important, is that those who use it understand that it is charity and keep their humility. With “X” as a base wage, and housing dealt with as we will later on, medical attention affordable, and a half day’s work nearly guaranteed; their are only four major groups who should ever need public assistance. The first is the elderly. Their situation, should they require public assistance, will likely not be temporary. In addition, as we honor our fathers and mothers rather than judge them, we will need to give special consideration to their needs: which should not be the role of welfare. The second group is those who are considered to be impaired either physically or mentally. If their condition is such that they are unemployable, then they belong in an institutional branch of the Federal Hospital System, not on welfare. As for the rest, like the student from Gallaudet, it is time to assess yourself against your strengths rather than against your weaknesses. The third group is un-wed mothers without a place to turn and individuals and families who have become temporarily disfranchised. For these people, the welfare system should provide clean, safe, temporary lodging and meals. It should not be unlike hotels quarters, with security and community laundry facilities. No TVs, no cooking facilities, but rather large structures able to accommodate large numbers of individual rooms with community dining access and entertainment areas. They should be located near mass transit routes and attention should be given to the quality of sound insulation. The meals should be basic government issue, augmented with additional protein sources. Residents

*George Bailey*

should be made welcome; but feel both lucky to stay and ready to leave when the time comes, even if that parting is sad as they say good bye to a community which is both caring and nurturing. If clothing is necessary it should be donated or government issue. Many will say that this is hard and inhuman; but I say to you that it is fair. What's more, it is workable. Our current system demands a mailing address in order to qualify, which has left many on the street: including children. It has become a game that is seen as a job, by generation after generation. This is hard, yes. But it is honest. It is there for those who need it but it should not be a substitute for a way of life. You need not have a child to enter. You need only ask. Which brings us to our last group: The dropouts. They are those that exist in our alleys, our parks and our shopkeeper's doorways. They litter our land with their wasted lives. They have little or no dignity and they gall us with their indignation. But what is this revolution about? Come on. You remember. That's right. Forgiveness. If we are to judge these people, it must be individually, For their stories are all different. Not only is it presumptuous, but it is time consuming. It makes far more sense to have separate facilities with small, modest, secure, private rooms: and pick up the tab. Remember, we have achieved a meaningful wage. There should be community meals and television. The showers should be in a small secure room down the hall, not part of the sleeping room. But they should be individual as opposed to a gang shower. They should have a lock on the door. Toilets should be designed similarly. And the whole premises should be under electronic surveillance. That includes the hallways and every place except for the showers and the inside of the rest rooms and the sleeping rooms them selves. If a shower or toilet is destroyed or a person is accosted, we need to know who did it. These places need to be safe above all else. We have decriminalized drugs. We have established a criminal system that has teeth, and a penal system that no longer revolves. If a human being within our society simply chooses [for what ever reason] to drop out, then let them. The cost of providing for those who are content with nothing but their freedom, is minimal compared to the social costs of trying to turn them around before they are ready. Unless these people are driven into the sea, they will have to be somewhere. It is a waste of police man-hours to roust them from spot to spot if they will move to a place provided. It is unfair that the less fortunate segments of our working class must have them at large within their communities. To be sure, the rooms we offer may well have to be bare except for a bed. That bed may have to have a plastic seal over the mattress and the floors and walls made of concrete, to facilitate hosing them down with a steam cleaner for vermin and vomit. But there should be a lock on the door to protect them from their fellows. There should be a "Clean" shower and "clean" toilet down the hall and three meals of government-issue food in the cafeteria. Violence should bring the police just as it does in the suburbs. I can say assuredly, that the clergy will find these places: that those who rehabilitate, will be known to those who have reached rock

bottom and are ready to try. Beyond these things, there is nothing more we should be obligated to do and nothing less we should be satisfied with. If you say that the cost is too dear, then you have not assessed the cost we pay now. There should be a dispensary for the drug program within the confines of such a place. It should include an inexpensive wine or alcoholic beverage that will accommodate individuals who suffer that addiction and are not willing to begin to heal themselves. Some of these people will waste their lives within the courtyards and the grounds, which encompass such places. Some of you will cry out against what I have proposed and say that we as a society can not participate in such a circumstance: but I tell you that we are participants regardless of what we do. The choice we are given is not whether these people will waste their lives. It is whether or not We will persecute them for doing so. Will we be there for those who are ready while we hold out a hand and ease the suffering of those who are not; or will we presume to judge them.

I propose that facilities designed for such people, be referred to as “Class One Welfare Housing”. They should be located in industrial sections of the city, away from homes and families. They should be federally owned and operated. It is not fair to put the financial burden on cities just because these people migrate to urban areas or warmer climates. It is not wise to entrust such care to locals that can not be overseen; or private business that can falsify use or drum up business. It should be funded through the Federal Health Care System, and coordinated with area health care to see that those who need and are ready for help, get it. It should be a place to spend the night not an apartment, but the number of nights should not be limited. It should be a place to go lay down when your tired or ill. It is important to make it clear that this place exists in a world that is different from the one we live in today. This will be a place that alcoholic and drug addicts end up in, if we make it open enough that they will come in. They won’t be the functioning addicts who fill their needs at a pharmacy and then go off to be productive citizens as they do in England today and as some will here in the future. These are the ones who are not ready to come in. If their drugs [and alcohol] are dispensed within the perimeters of the facility there is no law being broken. If they become violent then the law is being broken, and an appropriate response should be taken. If they disturb the peace, on or off the premises, the law has been broken. People who break the law lose their rights in our society. Perhaps the court will hand them over into the custody of State psychiatric facilities. But those who hurt only themselves have broken no law that we have a right to impose on them. Those who run such facilities should understand the tight rope they walk.

The other type of facility, of which I spoke; for families and the short term needy, should be termed “Class Two Welfare Housing”. It should be located near places of economic opportunity. Meals should be served cafeteria style. Food

*George Bailey*

should be largely government food program issue but supplemented with low cost protein dishes. The rooms should be well sound insulated. It should be a safe place to live. Within its walls should be found, teachers to tutor and evaluate those children living within; rather than forcing them to go to schools in which the other kids will recognize where they are staying: only to pull them out when the family is relocated. Counseling services should locate themselves within these walls as well. Every attempt to evaluate whether or not those things which led people to seek help are fluke or trend, should be made. And if help is deemed necessary, it should be administered liberally. But this should never become a place where families fear to go because the "State" will seize their children. These facilities are owned by the people of these United States and they have a right to use them without becoming serfs to government workers and administrators. Class Two Welfare facilities should welcome these people back if need be. But they should work hard to prevent it being necessary. The length of stay at such a facility should not exceed six months. It is a time for building up savings, healing wounds and beginning again. Those staying in Class II housing should be obliged to save 90% of their earnings, by law: unless those earnings go toward debt. At the same time, if someone wishes to declare bankruptcy, their ability to live for free, at taxpayer expense in a Class Two Facility, should not alter their right to bankruptcy. For those who are unwilling to face the demands of life, they should be transferred to a class one facility. In those cases where children are involved I'm afraid consideration should be given, at that time, to the parent's ability to care for a child. But let me say this: and hear me: If society takes a child from a parent, then know the gravity of what you have done. For all children see themselves through their parents. If we say that a person is not salvageable as a person and a parent, then we hold that mirror to the face of the child. With all the child abuse reported in our land, it is difficult to find the answers. It is more difficult when the criteria by which child abuse is assessed, is unknown and, often times, politically motivated. Regardless of the dangers, as a society, and in general, it is far preferable to heal the ills of the parent's nature, than to remove the child. As we move to a society which guaranties a place for every one willing to try, many of those ills will diminish. For those that remain, let us minister to them through our teachers, our counselors and our clergy. As I said earlier on, there is currently a system in existence called WIC It gives additional food supplements to pregnant women and families with small children. For families struggling on the edge and single heads of households working short workdays to be at home for their children, I believe it to be indispensable. It should remain in tact and be adequately funded. In addition, those within the welfare program should have access to medical vouchers for doctor's care and prescriptions, except in those cases where such facilities and personnel can be located within the facilities themselves. But other than bus tokens, those who fall to welfare have no right to ask for money or script. This is a national charity and



should be founded nationally, without strings; to put money into those areas with the greatest need. Physical and emotional security: and what else? You know. We must move away from a system such as the one we so despise today. If we offer the independence of an apartment and a paycheck to any young girl who will become pregnant, we will always find those ignorant enough to settle for the only life they have ever known. If, on the other hand, we do all that we can for all the “citizens” of this country, and at the same time, make our citizens accountable for their own behavior, their own choices, our children will learn by example. They will learn what is successful behavior and what is not. So long as we “guarantee” opportunity, the choice and the consequences will truly be theirs to live with. Single heads of households staying in Class Two facilities should have “Day Care” available for those hours that they are at work and their children are not being tutored. But once they have stayed their stay and saved an appropriate percentage of their earnings [90% taken from their paycheck and held on deposit until they are ready to move out]: they are ready to go out into the world to struggle with the rest of us. Special job considerations as outlined earlier, WIC and the “Blue Food” program; medical cost reductions and changes in the banking systems still to be outlined, will make life possible for anyone willing to try. It should be noted that class two facilities should be open to families who have two parents as well: or even couples and individuals who need to start over. Most of us are able to turn to family in times of crisis. Class two facilities is that extension for those who have no family to turn to. Again, the intent of Class Two housing is to give shelter that is clean, quiet, private and temporary. Rooms should not be too small, but individual bedrooms for brothers and sisters is not something that should be considered mandatory. A toilet and shower should be incorporated into the unit. Buildings should be free of vermin and therefore constructed of concrete and painted. The “intent” is that accommodations be adequate without being too expensive. The building should be owned by the federal government so that it not be locally subverted. Federally operated for the same reason, and coordinated in conjunction with the health system. Residents should be treated as citizen who have the right to ask the help of a government they support. Residents should realize that they have placed themselves as a burden on the shoulders of their fellow taxpayers and should be humbled accordingly. It should be a hand up, not a hand out. It should not become a dormitory for those trying to continue their education. Citizens staying in such facilities should not be allowed to work here at home long enough to save money in a class two institution and then go live in a foreign country until the money is gone. The system is a safeguard for all of us and therefore it should be safeguarded as well. But there should be no deterrent for those who are in need.

Look to a retirement community and what do you see; a lot of old people. They seem to flock together don't they? I would prefer for the sake of our children that they were more accessible and many are; but the point here is that it

*George Bailey*

is not a contrary notion that the elderly enjoy each other's company. After all they share the same history, the same knowledge of what it is to be beyond your prime and the same set of values. What's more, the other guy's musical tastes are not so offensive. This is to our advantage. As a society faced with the prospect of giving adequate care to an elderly population which collectively, lives a little longer each year: it is my fervent hope that as we reap the benefits of the revolution, we will try our best to return to the values that kept grandparents close, and cared for by their families. And as dealing with housing, deals with inflation, I hope to see a day when a savings account can see my generation through old age. But regardless of our progress in these areas, there will still exist a need to administer care and provide subsistence to some, if not all, elderly. Some elderly will still enjoy private retirement plans, but for those who relied on Social Security, other arrangements will have to be made. For those who are healthy and own their own home, thanks to Job splitting, the value of "X", the option of "X" x 80%, government food, and no taxes on property or utilities, coupled with free hospital care: the future is productive, rewarding and promising. For those who are left with little do to the excesses of the past, you have fallen to charity. But do not despair. As with the welfare housing, I propose that the housing for the elderly be concentrated vertically. It should consist of a "minimum" of a bathroom, modest kitchen, 100 square foot bedroom and 160 square foot living room. It should be furnished if so requested or left bare to accommodate your personal things. It should cost no more than 20% of your income for anyone over sixty five, regardless of their savings. If their income is "0" then the cost is "0". Now before anyone gets too upset over this, think for a minute. If a person saves and accumulates all of their life, have they contributed less than those who have not? If we charge the poor nothing to move into retirement housing, should we charge those with means double? The pride of ownership and the security of familiarity, will keep the elderly in their own homes until they can no longer stay. If the elderly decide to sell out and take up residence in an elder facility before they have consumed their equity, then let them. When my grandmother was institutionalized, my family sold her house and used the money to provide for her care. When she passed on years later, the money was gone. Yet, many families have seen fit to sign over the parent's possessions to their heirs and then pawn them off as wards of the State. Any method of trying to deplete the accumulated wealth of the elderly can be subverted. The result is that the honest pay and the less scrupulous profit. It is fairer and more honest to provide the housing to those who feel they are ready to except it. These facilities should be safe and secure. They should have an adequate medical staff within the facility, on retainer by the Federal government, paid for by the Federal Health Care Program and contracted from the private sector. They should have an adequate pharmacy to dispense drugs to residents as well as non-resident elderly, free of charge. The drugs made available should be

adequate: but not “Cutting edge” at the expense of the budget. In other words, if they are proven, we should make them available. If they have no long-term history of performance, then they had better be sensibly priced.

It will be necessary to have either separate, facilities for different levels of physical and mental health; or wings within the facilities themselves. The higher the concentration of elderly, the more outside traffic there will be. In that way care can be monitored. If you feel that this kind of approach is more Communistic than the old system, I would have to agree with you. But if we are to afford the elderly the kind of care and security that they deserve, then we must be realistic. The independence given to the elderly by the monthly Social Security check has become a greater strain on society at large with each passing year. The ability to live in the neighborhood of your choice has been tempered by the inability to get medical attention or even food and heat. Consider that after the revolution, without income you will pay no taxes. Also consider that, if each of your children contributed 5% of their checks to you rather than 15.5% in the form of Social Security tax, what would you have. If you raise no children then where are your savings? But I do not mean to judge. I simply wish to make clear to you that the old system did not work because Congress was allowed to spend us into debt. More and more social ills were demanding money from a system that was touted as being for retirement. Fraud has invaded the system like a virus for which there is no cure. The elderly, of which I hope one day to be a part, has either established themselves financially or been left to charity. Accept it in good faith.

In association with these “Class Three Retirement Aid” systems that I have just described, we should take over the responsibility for those elderly that move into infirmary. It should be handled in conjunction with but separate from, Class Three systems and called “Class Four Welfare”. Today we hear of psychiatric personnel using their credentials to move the elderly from care centers for the elderly and into accredited psychiatric institutions in order to defraud the Social Security system. If the structures [the building themselves] within which Class Three and Class Four systems are owned and operated by the federal government, administrated by federal government employees and staffed by “contracted” individuals and organizations, much of the fraud could be eliminated. If we build the class three and class four facilities so that they are connected or adjacent and promote interaction between the residents of both through an open cafeteria offered at class four [for residents of either building] or what ever means bright minds can work out; we have the most powerful and motivated monitoring force for Class four that we could hope for. It could, and hopefully would, develop into a “trust” between the two groups: a promise and an obligation that the residents of class three will watchdog the care of those in class four. In this way, not only can we better manage the class four facilities, but

*George Bailey*

those in class three will be insuring their own level of care when their time comes, while feeling confident that those who follow in class three, will watch over them. Such facilities will obviously only work in towns of adequate size, but every attempt should be made to make such facilities available close to home for our people.

One last note: no one feels of much value without a little money in their pockets. For those without anything left at all, including the ability to work even the occasional split shift, it should be that they be given an allowance. It should be the equivalent of two "X" per week. It should be given out as tax-exempt cash. The only tax exemption in the country. It should come from the chief administrator into the hands of those in that administrator's care, in their living quarters, on a weekly bases. So long as those individuals are coherent, they have a right to a little of the empowerment that money brings. It's also a good way to insure a weekly tour and contact between Administrators and those who depend on them.

If you think that by providing for the elderly in the ways I have laid out will allow us to move on from Social Security, you don't know much about the system. Social Security covers children whose parents have died and a significant number of impaired people; including those hurt in the work place. Within these ranks you can find a large number of those people I referred to as "darters", sliding by in the merging lain. I personally know of two people who suffered back injuries years ago, and who obtained Social Security benefits for their disabilities. One is a man who has worked odd jobs, cleaning out basements of accumulated junk and hauling off trash. He worked cheap and for cash. He paid no taxes and subsidized his income with money he receives from Social Security. The other is a woman who lived in a rural area with her husband. She is truly incapacitated when her back goes out; but most of the time she does chores around the acreage. Her husband, who regards himself as fiercely independent, ran a small shop and was careful not to make too much profit, lest they lose her benefits. This is the pitfall that has crippled Social Security. Just as with insurance in general, it has developed into the notion that one is deserving of benefits, as justified by having paid into the system. Even if neither of these people were able to do physical labor, even if they were confined to wheelchairs, they still have the ability to be productive. Even if they answer phones or sweep floors; as long as we protect a person's right to make an honest profit from their labor in the form of "X" wages, then, when they come to us for assistance, it must be understood that they ask for charity. Herein lies the crux of why all forms of welfare ultimately fail. It contributed to the fall of Rome in the form of the "Dole". Welfare and Social Security have become a "Right" in this country and as such, it has allowed people to rationalize their abuses of the system. The rationalization runs so deep that the man I spoke of was able to operate openly in

society, stealing from the system, and evading his taxes, with the knowledge and complicity of those who knew and hired him anyway. If a child's father dies before he or she graduates from college, that child may have the right to receive the benefits of the father until he or she graduates, under present Social Security law. But what about the child who never had a father? Are they less deserving because they started out with less? Did the one who "Fathered" them not pay into Social Security? But the Government has squandered what both fathers paid in and left both of these children with the debt. For those people who are not yet elderly and can not face life head on, there needs to be care provided. But as with the four systems I have just outlined for "Government Aid", it needs to be in some form of institutional structure. That may be a "Home" where the mildly retarded share lodging, or an institution such as described for the elderly. But we must move away from personal subsidies in every way possible. If people want dignity, they must earn it, not demand it. All the social agencies I have described in this section share one thing; they are designed for those who ask help from society. In the capitalistic system that I champion throughout this book, the opportunity exists for families and individuals to prosper and care for their own retirement needs. If one's family can afford private care then they are certainly entitled to it. What I seek is a system that is good enough for anyone. The idea that the facility is owned by the Federal Government and administrated by an "In House" administration from the Federal government but staffed by contractors, is a check and balance system that can only be enhanced by local community involvement. The complicity that evolves from the small closed institutions that we support through Social Security today, lead to no greater assurances of quality care. To the contrary, those without family to check on them are at the mercy of staffs there within. In addition, the money involved turns those living in such institutions into commodities.

There is a group in this country who is more helpless than the elderly, more disfranchised than the homeless. Their fate is bandied about in legislation and yet they have no vote. Still they are the most precious of all our resources; the hope for our future and the only lasting legacy we can hope to leave behind. "Suffer the little children un to me". This is a phrase you may have heard before. It is a quotation from Jesus Christ and it has an odd sound; this idea of suffrage. It almost sounds like the children are supposed to suffer somehow. But that it not what it says at all. It is you and I, and it is society that are supposed to suffer whatever need be suffered in order to bring God's children to Jesus. That means that if you don't get to watch violent entertainment or view things of a sexual nature because children are near, then too bad. You are to suffer that, for the sake of the children. If you don't get to buy something because the advertisements which promote the product, also promote notions or ideologies that are immoral and thereby lead children away from the truth, then you must suffer not getting that product. You and I have an obligation to make for the children of our

*George Bailey*

country, a place where they can grow up safe and with a sense of morality. When We allow pornographic materials to be called “Adult”, it is a fraud which infers to children that this is what adults are. It leads them in ways that are unhealthy. It distorts love and sex. WE need only look around us to see what happens to a society which does not suffer itself for the sake of its children.

When I was young, they used to read bits of ancient literature to us in school: things which had been written about the youth of civilizations past. They were quotes from leaders and philosophers long dead, about how the youth of their time was wild and rebellious; out of control. We were told it had been written by an ancient Greek, or some other personage from some great nation in the past. Then they would quip about how each generation had said the same of the next. To some extent that must certainly be true, as each generation finds its own path. But it must also be said that each and every great society of the past has fallen. Greece was the center of the world at a point in history. It fell from power for more than one reason I am sure. Still, without the generations coming up having a sense of what makes a society work, a society must ultimately fall into decay. When my generation looks back on its youth without admitting to our children that much of what We did was not as admirable in retrospect, as it seemed at the time, then We do not suffer the truth for the sake of our children. Now, many of you will no doubt argue this with me. But if you compare the world in which we were raised with the world in which We have created for our children, then you must admit that something has been lost that is far in excess of what has been gained.

I have this little reminder that floats around in my notes as I write this book, which is always looking for a place to be added in. So here, where I speak about Jesus and how He felt about the children, I will remind you of what He also said with regard to those who would harm children. He said that it would be better for them that they had never been born. That doesn't mean it would have been better for the children. It means that those who abuse children will, eventually regret having come into existence. That is certainly true of Nations as well. “Vengeance is Mine!” the Lord said, and you can bet if you abuse children as an individual or as a society, your time will come. Years ago a friend of mine was moving equipment out of one factory back east, to a building in another city back east. He was warned that when he arrived at the warehouse with the shipment, that he would be approached by the criminal element who controlled the street. He was given cash with which to pay the extortion, so that his truck would not be stolen or robbed. After the money was paid, the person who collected the extortion money, would place a small child on the hood of my friend's truck as a “marker” to let those who cared, know that the money had been paid. When a child is used as a participant in a criminal act, the crime being perpetrated against that child is far greater than the crime in progress. It should never be that a prosecuting

attorney bend the law in the slightest way to make a mockery of what I am about to say. We should never come to fear that if we are caught speeding with our kids in the car, that we will be punished with this law. Nor should a person caught with drugs while in the presence of a child be accused of initiating a child into a life of crime. But when “Children who are too young to understand the consequences of their actions” are used directly as “accomplices” in the commission of a crime, then surely, there should be hell to pay. It shall surely fall to a jury to decide and therefore I will not. But no country which allows its children to become victims in order to safeguard the privileges of some members of that society, deserves to endure.

It has also come to pass that, each year, some 5,000 children are abducted by strangers and never heard from again. If this number, which I have heard in the press, is a true accounting of fact, how can it be that we are focused on a drug war? What kind of a Government leadership could find this number, or 1% of this number, tolerable? Why is this problem not at the forefront of our anger and our allocation of resources? What International Terrorist threatens the world more than a single individual who would abduct a child? There is none. And yet it would appear that it happens all the time. Surely it is better for us that we were never born than for us as a nation to allow it to continue. It is for the children, yours and mine, that I have labored over these ideas. I hope that it will lead in the direction of a better and more honest world. I pray it will help to rebuild strong family units, bring honesty to light and put hypocrisy behind us. But aside from these things, it is imperative that we begin to understand that there is nothing we can produce in any factory in the land; and no work which can be laid down on paper, which can equal the achievement of producing, one, kind, honest, noble, intelligent, [and I believe Christian] human being. As I have said, I am opposed to subsidized day care because I believe the cost to be counter-productive to the goal of a parent in the home. But on the subject of education, I feel it is better to cut defense spending a dollar than to cut education by a dime. The educational system in our country is a disgrace. While we throw money at it, it continues to move in the wrong direction. For example: I am sure that many government workers were furious with my notion that they should be limited to two weeks vacation. Yet, there is a movement a foot to take away over two months a year of children’s vacations. It is one more example of the selfishness of the generation that couldn’t: My generation. We have looked to Europe for our standards of morality and been left with little or none. We have looked to Japan to model our educational system and the result will be the same. Educating a child, training a mind to think, is much the same as building a structure. In our attempt to hang the fixtures and draperies of the sciences, we have neglected the footings and the corner stones of education. I was in my third year of college before I chose a major and a minor course of study. Even then it was because I was forced to. I always envied those who knew what they wanted to be early on. Still, I am not so

*George Bailey*

sure that today they don't find themselves stuck in that profession. My grandmother taught school in a one-room schoolhouse. She taught first through eighth grade, all in the same room, and when those kids went on to high school, most of them were honor students. She used to say that the day you stop learning is the day you die. I have always agreed with that philosophy. Along those lines, it should be understood that the goal of education should be, first of all, to teach people to learn, rather than to stuff them with information. The first step is social skills. Without them, one can not function at any level in society. Yet, as I have said, more and more children are dumped into the school system for the sake of the second paycheck. With "X" in place I would hope to see an end to that practice. Even without a change in public sensibility, no child belongs in kindergarten without the ability to sit and listen and certainly not beyond kindergarten. No teacher should be forced to tolerate a student who will not obey. And no other child should suffer for the lack of those abilities in classmates. In the days of the one room schoolhouse, the teacher gathered a few students around her desk who were at the same level in a given subject and instructed them while the others studied. If you were gathered together to study reading, you might find yourself among a different group than if you were studying arithmetic. The flexibility to carry each child alone at their own rate at a given skill, is fundamental to both establishing a firm bases of understanding and realizing a child's full potential. It is an objective which simply can not be reached in a classroom of 20 or 30 or even 40 kids. Nor should we be shuffling kids between classrooms in grade school. So the first step is to limit class sizes by mandate to 18 children in grammar schools, grades one through six. If there are nineteen at that age and ability in the school, then you must provide two teachers and two classrooms of nine. That's the mandate. The second step is to lay off the rush, the push, to skills other than reading, writing and math. Throwing newspapers from a moving bicycle is not difficult once you can ride the bike without thinking about it. It is the same with education. Besides that, while I am not a strict "Creationist", I feel that much of what science "is" offered to young people is more often basic and strict evolutionary theory rather than the basic fundamentals of science. It is taught as fact, even as the theories themselves are evolving and in conflict. Instead, through those formative years, through the third or even fourth grade, the diversion of art and music, the study of what some call empathy training, should round out the curriculum. It is when we are young that we are open to one another. The coyote pup and the fawn romp together in the spring grass. It is a time when more can be done to lend understanding to the difficulties between us than all the acts of congress could ever hope to accomplish. It is a time to take young minds to foreign lands and bring them back through the eyes of the immigrants that formed our nation. It is a time to express to them what it must be like to be poor, or handicapped, man or woman, black, red, yellow, brown and even white. At the same time, it is not a time to lay guilt upon them



for a world that they did not create. It is a place in time where we can make better people and better citizens. It is an opportunity we are missing in an attempt to make a better physicist and computer programmers. It is a time for society to refrain from teaching those things that are in conflict with what parents and churches teach, so that when the time comes for such things to be introduced, children will be able to better judge one set of beliefs against the other. This approach does not teach Religion in schools, nor does it allow religion to be challenged in schools. It is fair. It is workable and it is in keeping with separation of Church and State. It is not meant as a “gag” order against teachers; and without unions to thwart the desires of parents, there will hopefully be respect on both sides of the issue.

There is another goal, which I propose but will not mandate. It has to do with sign language. Although the tribes of the Americas did not share a common language, they were able to communicate through sign language. I would urge that we push to establish a universal [global] sign language and teach it to our children, beginning at day one. It would allow both the mute and the deaf to integrate more freely into the mainstream. It would facilitate the learning of foreign language and it would allow all the world to communicate with a language shared by everyone but belonging to no one.

For those years between fourth grade and High School, I have no strategy other than education be kept well rounded. Upon entering high school [and with the rules for “X” in place I would submit that many more will enter high school] there are additions which are essential. For generations we have graduated students into a consumer nation without educating them in wise consumerism. What is quality and value as opposed to hype and glitzy, has been left for them to learn at the school of hard knocks. How to choose a mate, how to rear children, how to run a household. These were the subjects that were dropped from the curriculum when Women’s Lib said “No homemaking classes for me”. Fine: then if not just for girls then for both. Children should be instructed on how to think for themselves. How to identify and interpret what is biased in the press; how to judge TV, movies and books against their own values. They should have a fundamental knowledge of the Constitution. They should be exposed to the philosophies of the world, from the scientific to the religious. Today there is a lot of discussion about retraining those who have lost their jobs. Who should retrain them? Who should pay for it? We are not indentured servants, who are bound to the businesses that would invest time and money, only to have us take a job with someone who could pay more because they sponsored no training. The key to training a better American work force and a better American citizenry is to teach them to think and to learn, so that they are able to learn for themselves. Then we need to provide the training as needed. Once these lessons have been learned and the foundations set for a better educated and well rounded generation, it is time

*George Bailey*

for them, and not economics, to decide who will join the work force and who will continue on with their education.

To see that vision through, we must commit to free higher education as well as education through grade twelve. The amount of education that allowed one to prosper in the twentieth century will not suffice in the twenty first. Be it a basic college education, a doctorate or a trade school, it should be free. From physician to lawyer, to accountant or physicist, from plumber to mechanic: each seed we sew through a free education, benefits us many fold. There is no excuse for a country who squanders trillions and borrows trillions more for defense and political self interest, to deny the best education possible to a single person, of any age, that is willing to put forth the effort to learn. There should also be a closer assessment of what is needed in order to go on to higher education. For example, students who take college preparatory level classes will go on to college with some higher math and some foreign language skills. Once in college, they will be allowed to abandon higher math, but the foreign language requirement will still be mandated. We are not all of equal skill. This is what separates those who will excel in higher learning from those who will not. At the same time, it is unfair and ever unproductive for a society to say that those who have one strength may advance while those who have another may not. If a student can excel at math but can not master a second language, why should that person be denied a diploma when a reversal of the situation would not prevent graduation? At the same time, Students must bring to school an attitude conducive to learning in order to have the right to such education. Beginning with Kindergarten, those children, who are disruptive and show no respect for teachers, shall be expelled or even dismissed permanently. We will no longer waste our time and resources on children who don't want to learn; or teachers who don't want, or don't know how to teach.

In the beginning of this book I asked what is the promise of the new technology? What is our goal as a society? This, then, is my answer. Not to build a better automobile but to build better adults of our children. Not to build a civilization on Mars, but to build a better civilization here; and by that, hopefully, around the world. It will not be easy. Children instructed in empathy will question your prejudices. Children in search of a philosophy will question your lack of one. It will not be inexpensive, but the profit to industry resulting from the push to land on the moon was enormous. The result of a push to raise up future generations is profit immeasurable. Funding such an undertaking will not be easy. You may say that by eliminating property taxes I have killed the golden goose. But I believe that this is an advantage. Historically, the funding of education through property taxes has meant that those who "have" get a good education, and those who "have not", do not. By assigning an amount per child, to be paid to the school [not the school system], by the federal government: based

on multiplying a set figure by “X” [as it applies to that locality] we can level the field. The building or structure, in which learning takes place, should be the responsibility of the State not the city. It should be limited to bare walls and desks. No other monies may enter the school coffers; and no donations. Parents can volunteer but they can not pay volunteers. It will be necessary to assign a higher coefficient [the number by which “X” is multiplied], for children who have special needs. But beware of who is considered for special need. The children who do not speak English have no place in the American classroom. If we are to make such allowances for one group, we must make allowances for all groups who speak foreign languages. Anything less would be racist. These children belong in special language education programs, before they enter kindergarten, for their own sake as much as for the sake of others: hopefully before age five. And beware of special funds for the “Gifted”: lest we learn that all the children of the affluent are gifted, or even all those of the poor. Outside of the parents or guardians of those students within the schools, no free outside help may be given. Now why would I limit schools so? What could be my “Intent”? Because in the “UNITED STATES OF AMERICA” we should all rise or fall together. If it is necessary for a child on the rich side of town to have \$25 a day given to their school, per child, for a proper education, then it is so for the child on the poor side of town. It should not be that each is given \$10 and the school on the rich side be augmented by contributions. Conversely, if it requires \$35 to attract teachers to an area where they are not safe in the halls of the school: those parents should not petition the government for more money, but rather put their house in order for the sake of the children. That means standing behind school Administrators who expel troublemakers even though they are from your community or your race. Remember, you are no longer alone out there. Much has changed since the revolution. I will leave it to Congress to assign a coefficient of “X” for students. I have outlawed unions and tenure. Many teachers have argued that without tenure they are not free from the tyranny of local political influence. To some extent that is very true. But should they be? In the 80’s and 90’s, political correctness has been the driving force in our school systems. It is one thing to teach children empathy for others; it is an entirely different matter to teach the “morals of the day”. It is the right of the parents to pass on their values to their children. It is the place of society to question those values if need be. But parents, who are unfair, hurt their own children the most, and tenure has made teachers unresponsive to the needs of others. Higher education is an acceptable medium for such debate. But parent’s rights must prevail in public schools, grades k-12. A teacher fired for teaching that racism is bad will have recourse beyond the scope of tenure. It is the teacher who fails to teach who will not. It is the teacher who promotes an “agenda” who will find themselves on shaky ground. If we give teachers, students who are eager to learn, then they have some compensation already. At the other end, if we would pay a government clerk

*George Bailey*

“X”, then those to whom we entrust the future of our children should be paid more and scrutinized more, as well. Another thing that the revolution brings to teaching is time. The dollar amount per child, and the amount thereby allocated a school, is guaranteed. That means no strings and no paperwork beyond a head count. If government forms need to be filled out it is the government’s job to fill them out. If schools do not comply with Federal mandates, then arrest someone. But do not make bureaucratic shufflers of us and our teachers. We have work to do. In addition, as a rule of thumb, there should be no more than one administrator and one secretary for each eight teachers within the school district. This is “Intent” again. It serves no purpose to have more employed in the office than in the classroom. We will not tolerate an end run of our wishes, such as politicians using student’s money to pay for salaries of people put in posts for no other reason than political favor. Such use of public funds is treasonous under any circumstances, but especially repulsive when it cheats children.

There will be those who argue that free colleges for those who can only achieve “average” grades is too expensive. It’s not. The advantages to industry and society far out weigh the costs. Trade schools whose graduates actually find long term employment [two years or more in the field: 70% of graduates] should also qualify. But they will have to demonstrate a “track record”, otherwise, every body and his brother will be starting a school to feed off of the system: not to teach. In addition I have added the above conditions so that industry will not manipulate government into glutting certain trade labor markets in order to drive wages down. A student who is capable and willing should be able to find a place in Government funded institutions of learning that will carry them right on into medical practice. Dentists, Chiropractors and even Veterinarians should, if they are citizens of the US, be able to go from Government owned and operated Universities into internship, capable and debt free. What’s more, it should be the Capitalistic forces of the market place which determine people’s choices, not government. For those who must barrow in order to pay for living expenses, there should be government insured, low interest loans available to anyone who has never defaulted on a government-insured loan. These costs that are born by the public early on, will be repaid again and again in a multitude of ways.

I believe it was the Danes, who left their native land for America because in their homeland it was the rule, that, sons would grow up to be what their fathers had been. That is, if your father was a tailor, you had no option but to become a tailor. It was true of everyone from the doctor, to the banker, to the ditch digger. It put all the wrong people in all the wrong jobs. Today, the economics of education have caused something not all that dissimilar from those old days, to be the case here in this country. If We want doctors who are on fire to be doctors and who are the most skilled, to become doctors; then We need to insure them the opportunity to become doctors. This is true of all skills and professions.

It should also be said that, Children have a right to a summer vacation. They earn it. They need it. Show me a child who doesn't want a summer vacation and I'll show you a child who's parents do not get them involved in summer activities. This myth being propagated that school was out in the summer because of our agricultural heritage is so much fertilizer. Crops go in before kids get out of school and are harvested after they go back. Another new notion trying to take hold is the idea that kids should no longer graduate from high school, but rather they should develop a "Portfolio". Then, at such time as they have built an adequate portfolio they would then slip away to college unceremoniously. This is just some more of the "Fast Track" hype being shoved down the public's throat. It includes such provisions as "no college entrance for those who have not mastered a foreign language". We should never bar an individual's higher education in one field because of inadequacies in another. More importantly, everyone needs to feel a part of something. It is what the notion of country, and even Brotherhood, are all about. Of all the groups that one will ever belong to, there is perhaps none [outside the family] which is more tangible than one's high school graduating class. To accumulate the academic credentials that entitle one to graduate, is an accomplishment worthy of the pomp and circumstance of a graduation ceremony. To push to abolish the practice shows as clearly as anything I could convey, just how far out of touch those who currently make policy are, from the needs of the kids.

One last note on education. I am from one of the very last graduating classes in America to grow up with a "Dress Code" and "Corporal Punishment" in place. School administrators of the time were often heavy handed in both areas. As with all things, absolute power corrupts absolutely. It could be said of the times however that order was maintained. Today, because of numerous court decisions, some of which were pushed for by the "American Civil Liberties Union", it is the individual who has all the rights and the populist that must suffer. With the revolution we will be making education available to anyone with the thirst for knowledge. In return we will insist that they "Demonstrate A Willingness To Participate". So we come again to the "Intent". It is the intent of this stipulation, that, those who are given charge over the schools which we support, have the power to remove from the school, those who pose a threat and, or, prefer being disruptive to learning. It is not the intent to insist on or to deny uniformed dress. The point is that teachers have the right to teach. Students have the right to be safe and to be given the opportunity to learn. It is up to administrators to monitor that teachers are teaching and fire them if they are not. It is up to the school board and the "Parent Teacher Association-PTA" to monitor the administrators and vote them out if they fail to be fair and even handed. We do not want our schools to be day care for young neglected children. We do not want our schools to be "Juvenile Hall" for troubled kids. We do not want our teachers to be vindictive. We do not want our teachers to retire twenty years before they leave the

*George Bailey*

classroom. If we agree, for once, on what we want, we can achieve it. That's what this book is all about. When individual parents have a complaint that they can not resolve with schools they can go down to the Jury of the Day and plead their case without involving a bus load of lawyers.

Perhaps no subject concerning government spending has more people more upset than "Foreign Aid". I have to agree that, to some extent, I feel the same way. Money dumped into "two bit" dictatorships around the globe is a national moral disgrace. On the other side of that coin; much of what we got is what we wanted. Japan for example, was forced to agree to have no standing army at the close of WWII. We, in return, obligated ourselves to its protection. If times have changed, then we should push for renegotiations, not begin bashing the Japanese; for, it was our interests that were served by the arrangement. It just happened to work out better than we imagined for them. As for West Germany: there are those who speak as though greed is the cause of West German need. But remember that with the fall of the "Iron Curtain" and "The Berlin Wall", the West Germans were faced with trying to salvage an East Germany ravaged by Communism. It is the equivalent of the US adopting Mexico, and trying to bring it up to "code". If we didn't feel it still prudent to have forces poised against a volatile Russia, we wouldn't be there. This again is in our own self-interest. As for the Russians, I find it ironic and tragic that we have won the war and we are unwilling to win the peace. If this revolution comes to pass, there will be those who were better off when the system was less fair to all. You will see them kicking and flailing themselves about on the TV and in the press, saying that it doesn't work, won't work, and we should return to the old system as bad as it was. They will deliberately drag their feet and become an obstacle at every turn, because they are no longer assured favored status. This is the reality of Russia today. The old guard, who were on top and comfortable in comparison to the abject poverty around them, wish to go back to the old way. They would spill blood rather than try to succeed where there is no guaranty. And yet, as we have seen, no matter how much money our government hands out to other governments, things never improve for their people. The money lines the pockets of those in charge; and the worse the people have it, the less benefit it seems they see from our help. There is a way to change this.

The first step is to deny aid to those who hurt their own people or are aggressive against other peoples. As discussed under the penal system, it is often hard for us to criticize those who we so closely resemble. After the revolution that will change. The second step is to change the way in which we give aid. It is one thing to give humanitarian aid in the form of food, clothing and drugs. It is another to give military aid in the form of arms and hardware, or even assistance. But when it comes to money, to cash, to US "Green Backs", that is quite another. I propose that if a country is to be given monetary aid, that it be given out in

increments no larger than the average yearly wage, in the area in which it shall be given. Furthermore, that it be in the form of a low interest loan; at no more than two or three percent. That is, if the average yearly wage in the local area of the country We are giving aid to, is the equivalent of \$300.00 in US currency; then the size of the loans We will make in that area will be \$300.00.

In this way we can accomplish many things with a single action. We can, first of all, get the money to the people. They will, in turn, circulate it among “the people”. It will become a capitalistic seed, supporting other capitalistic seeds. It will create an economic base from which we can gain trade. It will create a tax base for the country we are trying to help. It will give the individual and those around them a taste of economic freedom and a thirst for social freedom. If it is repaid, it will be reclaimed and become a source of business opportunity for American banks. It promotes the sale of American goods and know how: and most important of all, it promotes good will, far more effectively than bankrolling government “Death Squads”. Freedom is not born on an empty stomach. Dictators know this. Oppression is an art form to them; and all too often in the past, we have played along for self-interest. Let us never forget what we did in Vietnam or in El Salvador. Let us not be a party to another Panama. It is better that the armies of the whole world turn on us, than that we back a killer, who kills their own people. If we are right we will prevail. But if we are not, all the dictators on the planet can not prop us up.

Many of us worry about the new trade agreement with Mexico. But if it is a way to make them comply with environmental and housing standards; if standards of political propriety can be raised: then it is worth it. You must consider that every oppressive country shares a common thread. It is that the wealth of the country is held in the hands of a few. Generally speaking it is through military force and the ownership of land. For example, it is said that almost all the land of one of the countries in South America is owned by twelve individual families. They wield the power, make the rules and keep the status quo. The government and the people yield to those who control all. Yet, with industry, large tracts of land are not needed to create wealth. It is innovation and a chance to perform that are quintessential. As an industrial base grows, wealth grows: wealth which is not contained within the old structure. It is the road to freedom that we in America took and it is more powerful than the armies of the world. If you don't believe, look to Japan and the Mini-Dragons of the Pacific Rim. But before you say that the last thing we need is another Japan on our heels, let me calm you. In time the Japanese will come to understand that it is of no consequence to run a race if you kill yourself in the effort. What good are the fruits of your labor if you do not have time to share them with your loved ones. As I said before, they are only at the half century mark of their new Capitalistic revolution. If we can refrain from the temptation of bashing them for our

*George Bailey*

mistakes, the time will come that a level field exists. The Japanese man and woman on the street still emulate the America we “Profess” to be. Do not let the peoples of our countries grow to hate each other and come to kill each other because of the “management” on both sides, that has lead us down a greedy path and now points a finger across the water. Our own revolution offers us a house, a job, food and medical care. All these things are possible if we never sold a thing abroad. The things which we will struggle for in a world market are the trappings, the niceties, of life. Remember also the lesson of Henry Ford’s innovation to put money in the hands of the workers of America and thereby create an Empire. These same principles can be used to allow participation by the entire world so long as a level playing field exists. Even the energy we derive from oil can be replaced if we are committed. When we come to realize that they are not worth killing or being killed for, we will be ready to move into something better than the world we live in now. You should also understand that if you are reading this, the whole world is reading this. And if you take what I propose to heart, then they will know what is in your heart and they will follow, each in their own way. Because we aspire, the world immolates us. For we Americans are, after all, the sons and daughters of all the countries of the world.

In order to secure housing for everyone willing and able to work, and at same time maintain a minimum base wage [“X”] that does not bankrupt business in the US: we must address the rules by which money is handled. There exists today a dichotomy, by which certain secured investments, are under regulated and venture capital is over regulated. That must change. In the case of savings, handed over to banks and savings and loans, government has allowed investment in everything from “Junk Bonds” to huge and speculative housing tracts. At the same time, those who wish to start up new ventures have been stifled by the existing regulations. If you saw the movie “Fargo”, you know that the man who started all the problems was a guy with an idea, who could not raise money in Capitalistic America. Even his own father in law, who saw the merits of the venture abandoned him and in his frustration he lost sight of morality. Never the less, it was this idea that those who innovate should be happy to sell their ideas for compensation which amounts to little more than wages, so that those who hold Capital can reap the rewards of innovation, which is at the heart of America’s decline.

For example, in 1990, if you were to come up with a innovative idea, even something as tangible as a patent; you would find yourself hamstrung to raise capital. As the laws exist today, if you wish to involve more than thirty two individuals in investing in your venture, you are forced, by law, to enter into the quagmire of stocks and bonds as it is governed by the Federal Trade Commission.. Furthermore, because those who control the stock markets are entrenched and limited in number, the laws which presume to protect investors,



actually preserve those who control the Stock Markets. The standard method of practice insists that you file a lengthy, technical “Prospectus” which will cost you \$20,000 to \$40,000 out of pocket, in legal expenses, right off the mark. This in and of itself, limits participation of many “would be” entrepreneurs before they get started. In addition, those in a position to sell such stock offerings, typically demand as much as 16% of your business before putting your stock offering on the market. This is on top of sales commissions they will ultimately receive. Yet, for all this, consumers lose their savings on the roulette wheel know as Wall Street every day. The prospectus is simply a legal document to avert lawsuits when things run amuck and impose limitations on who shall offer stocks. It is based on a presumption that the rich are somehow more ethical. If you saw the movie, “The Big Chill”, you understand that insider trading tips are inevitable. After all, who doesn’t advise a “pal” of a good deal. It’s like finding a sale item at K Mart and not telling your friends. For this reason, the middle class has no business in the stock market as it exists today. It is a well established rule among poker players that scared money never wins, therefore one should never gamble what one can not afford to lose. No matter what regulations we put on the drafting of a prospectus or on those who sell stocks and bonds, investments in business will always be a gamble. This is precisely the reason that the return is so great when they are successful. It should be regarded as such. Therefore, if you are going to play the game it should be up to you and you alone to research those with whom you invest your money, and that takes time and money. Through the late seventies and eighties we experienced horrible inflation. The Federal Reserve moved to check it through raising interest rates. One long term effect of such thinking was that the middle class was forced to pay higher mortgage rates, while at the same time, savings declined in value against inflation. If we deregulate the raising of investment capital to the preparation of a single “Statement of Intent”, it will be up to investors to decide if enough information has disclosed to justify their interest. If they choose to invest and the venture fails; so long as the “Intent” of the plan laid out is adhered to, they have no reason to complain and no avenue of recourse. If fraud was involved, then a simple twelve member tribunal that we call a jury, can be gathered. But a method of approach such as this allows not only for ventures to be capitalized, but it allows for individuals to join together at a grass roots level to invest in face to face endeavors with entrepreneurs. Let Wall Street stand or fall on its merit. But let it begin to compete fairly in the market place. There should be no “Wall” built between those who have an idea and those who wish to invest in that idea. The new tax system will have far reaching ramifications on “Wall Street” as well. The idea of moving client’s money around from stock to stock at the drop of a hat, will no longer sell as policy, once we begin collecting taxes on each transaction. This will seem at first, a devastating action imposed on investors. In fact, it will serve to stabilize money put into publicly owned companies. It is the brokerage

*George Bailey*

houses that gain from the short term scares within the stock market. Companies suffer from rumors that ravage their stocks, just as stockholders do. As I said, those who can't afford to "PLAY" shouldn't. Those who can, should profit from the success of the business they have invested in, not from moves in the market and or insider information. Like the "House" in a gambling establishment, the broker takes their commission, win or lose. Like the "house", we, the taxpayers, will have help in raising the money we need to safeguard our collective right to do business in a free country, as the transactions are taxed.

As for the banking industry, as it is propped up by the "people" it should serve the "people". There is an old story about the man who invented the game of chess. It is said that when he presented his game to the king, that the king was so overwhelmed with joy that he offered the man anything that he desired within the kingdom. He requested that the king give to him one grain of wheat on the first square of the chessboard. On the second square he asked for two grains. On the third square he asked that four grains be placed. Upon the fourth square place eight and so on to the last square. The King agreed and set his mathematicians to the task of calculating the man's reward. Later the mathematicians returned with the news that debt amounted to all the wheat in the Kingdom and more. At this point the King summoned the man and had him beheaded: for one with such a cunning intellect was a threat to the Throne. If you have ever taken the time to riddle through an amortization schedule you will see that the legacy of the inventor of chess is still with us. It is little wonder that a hundred years ago, when interest rates on houses were two and three percent, that inflation was stable and capital for venture growth was available: and an industrial empire was built in America. Add to all this that President Nixon dropped the "Gold Standard" and made a "Craps Shot" out of the world's currency values; and you can understand how the American middle class felt compelled to swim against the tide or sink during the 1970's and 1980's. The American worker has the right to put in an honest day's work and go home to their family, secure in the knowledge that it is enough to see them through. That security should prevail, not just during the productive years, but through the twilight years as well, so long as they remain healthy. Those who put forth more effort should know that they will not be taxed out of their reward and their savings should not be depleted by rampant inflation. To accomplish this, "Single Entity [be it a single individual or a family] homes" occupied by one working adult or two if married, should be sold at interest rates fixed at three percent. There will need to be stipulations. For example, the amount of the loan should not exceed 110% of the dollar amount of housing in your area as used to derive the value for "X" [the minimum wage]. The net worth of the individual or individuals obtaining the loan should not exceed 60% of the value of the home. The duration of the loan should not exceed eighteen years. The borrower must be a US citizen and at least eighteen years of age. Those who cost the Government money by damaging a home and then defaulting, will be

barred from another loan for ten years the first time and twenty years the second and third. There must be a down payment of six percent which will offset the realtor's fee [or whatever that cost is to whoever provides that service in the future] in the event of foreclosure. Aside from these few things there should be precious little that we would demand of a person. Congress makes special consideration for the young who have never owned a home; but what of those who have lost their homes due to hard times, or by risking equity in pursuit of the American dream of owning a business. Government gives veterans special consideration, but how is a state side soldier, who served in requisition, more deserving than any other working stiff. Government gives special consideration to immigrants, and yet, how are they more deserving than those whose ancestors served this country and who now find themselves disfranchised. If we see everyone in their own home, we will reestablish the sense of pride that keeps neighborhoods together, and graffiti off the street. With everyone settled in for the long haul, inflation due to speculation will decline. As mortgages are paid off in people's primes, they will have time to upgrade and save for retirement, help children get started on their own, spend money in the market place. Within a generation we will have an example for the next: that slow and steady can win the race, and in so doing we will bring economic stability back to business as well. It is not an impossible notion. There will have to be some changes in Banking as we know it today. I will deal with that later on in the book. And even though we are deep in debt, with a comprehensive plan in place and our house put in order, we will be able to finance the money. I know that it is not obvious to most of us, but it can be accomplished. This also becomes a subsidy for business. As home prices are held constant and mortgage rates held low, the value of "X" is held low and constant. With workman's compensation, unemployment, Social Security, Government Sponsored Day Care, medical plans and government pensions gone, the true cost of labor will actually fall; allowing, not only for business to compete internationally, but allowing for greater wage incentives to be offered to those who justify being offered incentives. All this, while protecting the basic needs and future needs of all Americans. It should be noted that lending institutions who wish to participate in this slow track approach can not expect to have it both ways. They can not expect to receive government guaranteed loans with few stipulations laid at their feet and at the same time, have the ability to lend low interest savings account funds to venture capitalists at inflated rates. In for a penny, in for a pound. They shall be identified as Tier One Banks. If guaranteed mortgages are your business, stick to it.

In this manner those banks which lend money to business will have to find another avenue to travel. Such banks should not be limited to such low interest rates in order to attract depositors. But they should enjoy the protection of Government insurance on their deposits under Federal Reserve regulation. They belong somewhere in the middle between guaranteed mortgage institutions and

*George Bailey*

the stock market. They should adhere to the regulations that government has or will set forth. Let them deal with those home buyers who wish to take that step ahead of the middle class security that 3% loans provide and get something grander than a middle class home. Such places tend to take care of the established without regard for those trying to better themselves from meager beginnings anyway. Let them flounder for direction until they are finally forced to compete. They shall be called Tier Two Banks.

You see, for years, US banks have played the loan shark with the lower and middle classes. The exorbitant rates on credit cards have kept down those who slip, for whatever reason. As those people find a decent wage, and affordable housing and learn to live within a budget; credit card debt, serving the well off at the expense of the impoverished, will dry up. Banks wishing to find people with whom to do business will be forced to deal with business. Other than mortgages exceeding 110% of "Average" housing, and individuals of net worth of 60% or more of that same value: Business will be the only game in town. All this is as it should be.

For those on the slow track of the tortes, there are the home mortgage institutions with low interest and guaranteed savings [FDIC] up to the amount laid out elsewhere in the book. For those who do not have tier one loans and who are free to put their savings in tier two banks, there are the heavily regulated, secured and higher rate of return on interest investments of American banks. Finally, for all you "Hares" out there, there is a fast track, high risk, buyer beware, with only the protection of stiff Federal punishments for fraud: the stock market. Pick your lane and live with your destination. But don't come crying to us if you fail and we pledge not to unfairly tax you if you succeed. And know that if you dare and you lose, the door to a 3% home is not barred to you: that you may begin again.

If we are to have all of the drastic changes outlined here within, it makes little sense to go on without addressing the electoral process. The government laid out by the founding fathers was slow and laborious for good reason. Sweeping change is nothing to be taken lightly. It was their intent that government "Fine Tune" rather than "Change Channels". Unfortunately, the power structure within both the "Democratic" and "Republican" parties controls the entire democratic process by controlling candidate recognition. The whole idea of the primary elections, as they have come to exist, is to parade the candidates of the two parties in front of the American voter for so long a period prior to the beginning of the actual elections, that anyone outside the parties is not considered a legitimate choice.

I'm going to elaborate here because it is so important that we understand the mechanisms at work in this situation. It is often said that elected officials have become little more than actors. This comparison comes from the way in which

they are promoted, as much as anything else. For example, in the case of Holly Wood stars, we see them as being important and of consequence. We believe that it is that “importance” that makes them a “Star”. We believe that it is that “Stardom” that causes them to be in the media. To some small extent, that is true. But, for the most part, the reverse is true. That is to say that, they are important because they are “Featured” in the media. So many of those programs which claim to inform, are little more than promoters of fame. It is a symbiotic relationship, in which, the famous are allowed to promote and advertise both themselves and their work or their cause, while drawing an audience for those who give them the exposure. Programs based on such a format can not draw viewers without celebrities. Public figures can not maintain celebrity without public exposure. From personal interviews to the endless awards programs that spotlight “Stardom”, we are told who is important. The famous are packaged and sold to us. So long as we continue to buy the package, the individual retains their celebrity. All of this is fine so long as we as a society understand that, who will be promoted, is decided by the entertainment industry, not by the public. When we understand this, the power of celebrity is deflated. We are less likely to give credence to the political philosophies of puppets, than we are of supposed “SUPER” Stars.

How this translates into the election process should be fairly obvious. The primaries and the media coverage they generate, comes from the same symbiotic relationship, except this time it is the News media and the two parties: Republicans and Democrats. In addition, it’s all done at taxpayers’ expense. Furthermore, either you are active within one of these two parties, or you are disfranchised. In Lincoln’s day, they lined up outside the White House to apply for rewards reaped for helping elected officials gain office in the elections. John Wheelks Both was, himself, in that very line. Lincoln said of the situation, “Too many pigs and not enough teats”. The problem has only gotten worse with time. When Clinton was elected as a Democrat, to the office of President, you may recall that Washington D.C. seemed to vacate and then repopulate, as republicans lost jobs and democrats found them. This would seem to indicate that everyone who had been working in Washington was inept and was now being replaced with someone who could do the job. But you know as well as I, that the jobs were given over as political favor. This is filling jobs in much the same way as the Danes we spoke of in the discussion on education. It is the method of the failed USSR. Those who help people get elected are not necessarily the best candidates for the job.

As a result, the slow and laborious movement of government has been in the wrong direction; steadily moving further off track, and with little chance that it can turn around at all; let alone move swiftly enough to make a difference. If this revolution should come to pass, it is imperative that changes be made to keep the

*George Bailey*

electorate moving the proper direction at all times, so as to keep up. The first step is to allow for a Presidential "Line Item Veto" to prevent the political games associated with selling one's vote to "Special Interest". Fortunately, during the time it has taken me to complete this book, the Republican's have pledged to do just that. Unfortunately, within the same time frame the Supreme Court has struck it down as unconstitutional on the basis that Congress is not allowed to relinquish power. This stands in contradiction to all the regulations that bombard you and I each day, that come to us from bureaucrats given power over us by congress: power that congress has relinquished without any outcry from the Court. It shall be the law that, with the revolution, the President shall have the power of a line item veto. If the President uses that power abusively, the Congress still has the power to enact any new law without the help of the President by reaching a two-thirds majority vote.

The second is to limit the length of service as an elected official, in any capacity, to twelve years cumulative total. This, because, the more one is schooled in the workings of politics, the worse politician one becomes. After all, twelve years is a long span of time for any endeavor other than a profession. And politics should be public service, not a profession.

The third step is to "Revolutionize" the electoral process as well. To begin with and to set the tone for change, there should be an abolition of the "Electoral College". It is not right that one who finds himself in disagreement with fellows within one's State, should have their vote negated on the national level in a matter of national import. It allows factions [such as the Ex-Patriots of Cuba] to extort Federal money in order for a particular party to carry the Electoral vote of a given State. Not only don't most people understand its workings; it is little more than "Gerrymandering". It makes a travesty of our belief that every vote counts. That is enough reason to see an end to it. It had its place in a colonial United States, where people were separated by days or even weeks of travel; but it has become a perversion of our system. In addition, it should be made impermissible for the media to speculate publicly as to the outcome of a political race. Now, the press is going to have a field day with this, and if they think their first amendment rights are being suppressed here, then let them prepare for worse when I get to them latter on. But bear with me. It serves no one except those who would hope to sway us, to engage in poles. It is well know that Americans, while loving an under dog, are unwilling to vote for a loser. Poles are not designed to inform, but rather to manipulate. And while it is necessary, in a free society, to allow a vote to even the ignorant and the ill advised, their manipulation should not be tolerated. That's why they closed bars on election days in the past. The Supreme Court had no argument with that, let them be silent now. In addition, news of what's going on in the voting in the "East" should not be made know until the poles in the "West" are closed. For that matter, the results of any

election, from city to federal, should never be divulged until all the poles in that election are closed. To that end, the outcome of national elections should be withheld, without speculation, until all the poles are closed. If you wish to call these things exceptions to the first amendment, then so be it. But we need no amendment to the constitution and this is not precedent to take away any other first amendment right. This is our revolution. We can do as we please. So then, if we are to vote on the issues and the issues alone; how will we judge what they are? A few ground rules.

If you wish to run for office, you must be of legal age. You must be an American citizen. You must put up some of your own money. How much? In the case of local elections, one day's wages. What ever you personally make in a year, divided by 260 [5 days a week x 52 weeks]: from the "X" wage to infinity. For State elections you must put up a week's earnings. For federal elections one must put up two week's earning, out of pocket and after taxes. Now I will not deal with local elections. They are "small potatoes" enough for citizens to be active and informed. At the state level, again, I will not mandate change, but rather hope that the people will see the federal model at work and emulate it. On the federal level however, sweeping changes must be implemented. You must remember that the "Primary" process was NOT set forth as such, by the constitution. It is, with the help of the Electoral College and the press, the method by which the machinery of the self serving two party system has skewed the process to usurp power from one State to the benefit of another. It is unconscionable, that those States whose primaries are held first, should decide from whom we as a nation shall choose our leaders. It is a side show devoted to attracting our attention to the candidates picked by the power structure within the two parties. It keeps those who do not sell out and play along, from participating. Let us make the Public Broadcasting System {PBS} the cornerstone of our new electoral process. For the price of admission, let those who would run for office make a prerecorded, self edited speech, on which they outline their qualifications and their visions. A simple ten minute introduction is all that is required to spur interest. If too many people run for office then perhaps the first round should be only two minutes in length. What ever the length, it should be consistent for all to use; whether they choose to use all their time or not. As for those who would profile candidates outside this forum; let them do so as they will: but always with each candidate receiving equal time, and each with equal exposure [be it "Front Page" or "Prime Time": last page or 3:00 AM]. If a candidate wishes to buy promotional time or mail flyers, so be it: so long as that candidate pays for equal time and equal mailers for each opponent. There is no justification for banners promoting the name of a candidate without any reference as to what that name stands for. That is the mentality of the "Line". It is the spirit of the "Sports Fan", who does not care about the issues nor understand them; but rather, wishes to be part of a winning team for the sake of their self esteem. It is a subversion of the

*George Bailey*

process. It should be replaced with a “Level Playing field”. It is the only way to take the money out of the equation for electoral success. And that is the only way to instill integrity into the system. There was a time when the electoral process was about issues. Then it became a question of Party politics in spite of warnings from both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. As the two parties gained power, they subverted the system by making it about money. They then set about to finance their own parties with government money and succeeded. There is a little place on your tax form, where you may choose to have money donated on your behalf to the electoral process. When that “box” first appeared on our tax form, congress assigned a dollar amount to the pledges made in that box. They set up matching funds to be distributed to the parties. Those funds were paid with your taxes, to augment the “Big Money” they say they so dislike in campaigns. In recent years, tax payers who were fed up with the money method of politics, stopped checking the box. Congress then raised the amount “Per Check Mark” to be put into the fund to circumvent taxpayers’ unwillingness to support the practice. “Parties” [no matter whose] must, by their very nature, become self serving in order to survive. To quote Jefferson “If I could not go to heaven but with a party, I would not go at all”.

We can never be free of the “Good Old Boys” so long as we embrace political parties. When Ross Perot ran for the Presidency the second time, He was trying to get enough votes to include his third political party among those who could get matching funds. For all his exposure and money spent, his party will lose its matching funds if they fail to carry 5% of the vote in 2000. The two Parties may disagree on the issues, but they have agreed privately that they alone shall govern. Each time you contribute money or time or votes to a political party, you have affirmed their right to subvert the electoral system that the soldiers of the Revolution fought, and froze and starved and died to give you.

With this Revolution, the election of a President should proceed much like a tournament. Each State would put forth its own candidate, chosen by an internal State primary held in May. In September, after new and longer candidate recordings are aired on PBS, and the media gives whatever coverage it wishes [but always in equal measure], the “Regionals” will be held. There will be four regions. They will be made up of the four corners of our lower forty eight states, with Hawaii voting as part of the southwest and Alaska voting as part of the northwest. All the while, in order to sell their ads, media of all nature will still focus on the candidates. But always, and by mandate, in equal amounts. The press will not be even handed. They rarely are. None the less, the exposure shall, by law, be equal. The President however, if he is eligible to run again, shall be exempt from these proceedings. It serves no purpose to have the President involved when he has matters of state to attend to. Remember, as an incumbent, the President is in the public forefront always: always at an advantage with



regard to exposure, and there is nothing to be done about that. So with the regional elections over, it comes down to four candidates, along with the possibility of the incumbent President. This is the point at which national attention and scrutiny should be drawn to all the candidates. Then in October, let us narrow the field to two with one last run off that includes the incumbent, in which the two candidates who will remain are chosen by a “Popular” vote nation wide. Then in November we should choose our President from between those two; along with our Congress, by a simple majority.

In the case of congress, the field should be narrowed to two in May if the incumbent is running again, three if not. Those running for a seat in the Senate should be chosen from a process similar to the one used for President, except that the tournament will use a county base. For the House of Representatives, it would be precincts. The winners of the “Regionals” would then challenge the incumbent in that October run off. The two remaining candidates would constitute the “Field” in November. One person one vote. And should it be that one vote elects a President, then it was your vote and it was my vote.

This same method of selection could be used to acquaint the voters to Governors and Judges. Perhaps at the same time as county and precinct run off elections used for Congressmen and Senators. Remember, because the process I have outlined will not generate the excitement that the old system did, it will have to focus on the issues. There will be no grand “Conventions” where power and privilege are traded for political proxies. Again, it will be the media who will attempt to generate the excitement. I have entrusted the task of introduction to PBS. But this is not to be construed as a blank check to that institution. In the last couple of decades, many of those who have gravitated to PBS have been far more to the “Left”, than center. As with any form of media, it is inevitable that those who seek it out have a view they wish to espouse. Furthermore, at its inception the PBS network was careful not to become dependent on commercial interests. As of late, that has changed. I know for my part, I do not support PBS the way I have in the past. While I am indebted to PBS for some of the information I have used in this work, it must be said that I have found some of their programming to be beyond the veil and too politically correct to be truthful. Perhaps I am not alone. But this is my right as a supporter, or for that matter, a non-supporter, because as a taxpayer [as I understand it] I also match funds. So today, as PBS caters more and more to advertisers, it moves nearer and nearer the day when it will lose my tax payer support as well. In the event of this, it may be necessary to purchase air time from commercial interests; be they radio, television, computer access or what ever is out there in the future. Or it may be that because elections are news, that they will always find a free forum. Whatever the case, Americans will preview their candidates in the format I have just described. In the same way that citizens will now be able to compare how their cities and states are providing

*George Bailey*

services for money received, they will be able to look at candidates for what they stand for rather than what team they are from, or what their party has learned you want them to stand for. Therefore, no monetary compensation should be given in return for airing what I have proposed if PBS is to be the major forum. Nor shall such an airing be interrupted by pleas for contributions. Should the day come when “The People” decline to support PBS, then government may have to purchase either time or space on the most common medium of the day.

This is true and simple election reform. In it there is no place for government by organization or special interest. There is no campaign expense to corrupt officials, or buy favors. There are no campaign contributions left over to line the pockets of those who run for office. There is only the power of the individual vote, cast on the merits of the candidate and what they have the courage to stand for. For decades, candidates have paid homage to the political machines in the big cities, and the Electoral College monopolies of the large states. Let them pay homage once again to the people who gamble everything on their leadership. And in so doing, let them in the White House and the Congress alike, be free to do the right thing in their time and then step aside to give the next a turn at the helm. Politics should never be an avocation. It is a privilege to hold the reigns of a country so powerful as this. It is an honor that should find servants willing to work for free. I would mandate it as such, were it not that it would limit the field to those well off or those bought off. To help the situation as it stands today, States should own the housing provided for Senators and Congressmen in Washington [if they don't already], much the same as they do the Governor's Mansion. This is our country. It is our sweat and blood which is shed to keep it afloat. Those who make politics their life have no idea what that means. No single act typified this simple truth more than George Bush seeing a “Bar Code” scanner for the first time in the year 1992. No one who is allowed by avocation to be above the law should ever be entrusted to make the law. And no one set apart from the people should presume to govern the people.

Another area in which the Democrats and Republicans have manipulated the rules to their own end, is voter registration. It is a travesty. In order to vote on any election, one should simply have to identify ones self in the same manner that you would apply for a job or pay your taxes under the new system: on the spot at election time. If people notify the “National Employment Data Bank” when they move, everyone from municipalities on up, should be waiting at the poles with the computer read out of those in their precinct. Most of us will be listed as a result of where we pay taxes.

If we want to change things, the process by which we elect our government must change. It should be obvious to anyone willing to be open minded that we choose our elected officials from those the two parties place in front of us. The press ignores or [as in the case of Ross Perot] belittles anyone out side of the

powers that be. They control the topics on which the campaign will focus and inevitably they are issues on which we are evenly divided. Abortion is a good example. We are fragmented by it, with half of the country on either side. We let them turn a none issue into the focus of the campaign in 1992. It has become a process of choosing between the lesser of two evils. Because money controls who will run, it is big money that steers us toward a forgone conclusion. . When this is our approach then we are left with those who are devoted to the pomp and circumstance of the electoral process. Further along in this book I will elaborate on the situation we find ourselves in with regard to the drug war. I will ask you to seek out a “front Line” documentary entitled “Snitch”. If you will do that, you will come to understand the ramifications that result from a governing body that is more concerned with finding a “Band Wagon” to ride through an election on, than it is about the laws which govern a people that it is sworn to defend. Like the lawyer/client privilege, and the drug war/cop dilemma, and even the non-enforcement of over regulation, today’s electoral process is another centrifuge which eliminates the best from the profession. In the end, the Democrats gather votes from those at the bottom of our economy and steal from the middle class to increase the lot of the poor and those who govern them through the various bureaucracies. The Republicans gather votes from the top and steal from the middle class to line the pockets of the wealthy to that end. The result is a decline in the fortune of the middle class as we polarize into a two class system of rich and poor. This is a fight worth fighting. Jefferson calls to you from his grave.

Lastly, as I explained earlier on in this book, We pledge allegiance to the “Republic” for which the flag stands. It is just not possible for the working class to stay informed on the issues to the degree necessary to make informed decisions on all the issues. That is why We delegate that authority to elected officials. But still, most, if not all, the states in the union, allowed within their state government’s framework, a way for the people to initiate law at the “Grass Roots” level. In most states they called it a measure or a proposition. When the famous California Proposition “13” passes back in the 1980’s, California had been a state for over a hundred years. “Prop” 13 was the thirteenth proposition to be proposed in California’s history. Before the end of the century Californians would be voting on propositions numbered somewhere around 250. The promotional campaigns associated with these propositions are, at best, misleading. More often than not they would qualify as fraud. It is best that an uninformed public refrain from voting at all, if it lacks the will to demand the truth. But in the face of so many privately funded and self serving propositions, the masses are forced to either vote on the basis of emotion or to strike down all propositions; which, in affect, makes impotent the whole proposition process.

Therefore, in order to safeguard the process and at the same time restore some integrity to it, We need a new rule. The framers of the laws, as they apply

*George Bailey*

to propositions, initially demanded of those who wished to sidestep their elected officials, that they gather a number of signatures from their fellow citizens. The number was large for two reasons. First, the process should not be taken lightly. A law once passed is hard to get rid of. Therefore, those trying to change things from outside the system should have to organize a lot of people, who in turn talk to a lot of other people about the problem and get them to support the movement by signing the petition: because a responsible electorate [that's the voting public] does not sign a petition and spend taxpayer dollars, and mess with the law, just to get some person with a petition in his hand, out of their face. So that through this process, the second function of the process is performed; the education of the voters on the issues. The way in which this process has been perverted is for those who wish to see a proposition on the ballot, to pay people to gather signatures. Suddenly those gathering the signatures are more about the signatures than the information. In the same way that the "Hired Guns" who run election campaigns thwart the candidate process, people who have come to do a job, now replace people who come to work within the process. It is not about political ideology, or right and wrong; it is about money perverting the system. It must end. Therefore, it must be the law, that with the revolution, no one may be reimbursed, either financially or through any other equitable arrangement, for the gathering of signatures in the proposition process.

It should also be remembered that any Proposition submitted after the revolution will come with a Statement of Intent attached to it, so that those parts of the Proposition which are in conflict with the stated agenda of the law it becomes, will be null and void.

Somewhere back around the turn of the twentieth century, a term emerged, know as "Yellow Dog Journalism". It referred to the practice of what we now call sensationalism. It made fortunes for the newspaper owners that engaged in it and drug the value of the written press down. Integrity still existed in some parts of the popular press and with the advent of television "news" in the 1950's, that integrity was emulated, thanks to the pioneering efforts of such people Edward R. Murrow, Walter Cronkite, Chet Huntley and David Brinkley, to name a few. But in time, two forces would destroy the foundation they had laid. The first was the business aspect of "Broadcast News": the absolute power that absolutely corrupts and which must, by nature, be controlled by the rich and powerful. The second is what I once heard a journalist liken to a little boy [or girl] running down the street, arms flailing, yelling "Guess what I saw"; which says in essence "Look at, and to, me". As a result, editorializing has moved from the realm of anything identifiable to plain old slanderous reporting. One significant example in recent years, that particularly bothered me, was on one of our national network news programs. There had been an experiment of sorts in Europe. I believe it was in Amsterdam. They local government had turned a blind eye to a place which they

named “Needle Park”. They allowed drug users and addicts to gather unharrassed; and there, organizations so inclined, were allowed to dispense clean needles and syringes in an effort to stem the transmission of AIDS. They hoped as well, that by making a place for these unfortunates, that they could keep them out of the other parts of the city. It was inevitable that by creating a vacuum with one solitary place in which to congregate, it would become a Mecca even for addicts from other countries. When the park was closed as a sanctuary, this national news program I refer to, reported the project to be a failure due to the fact that it did not solve the drug problem: furthermore it drew addicts from outside the city that had sponsored the program. The question of success in those areas that the experiment was designed to address; namely; the spread of AIDS and the concentration of the cities original addicts to a central location was never dealt with. In truth, the program was such a success that it was drawing people in from outside the country. The problem was that it was concentrating too many in that city because it was the only city in Europe to offer such a place. But this fact did not promote the “Drug War”. Consequently, the story was “Spun” in the opposite direction.

When “60 Minutes” began airing all those many years ago, I suggested, almost insisted, that my step father watch it as a civic duty. He told me that his life had enough problems without hearing the troubles of the world on Sunday. Now some twenty five years later, I tune into that show occasionally and wonder what has been accomplished by all that muck racking. I wonder how, if there are always two sides to every story, those programs can always be so consistently definitive. Is it the issue or the editing? I wonder if what such exposure has gained in the public interest, hasn’t been offset by the loss of hope and trust the show has left in its wake. I am reminded of a story they did on a lawyer in Queens Burrow New York, who blew the whistle on city contract corruption. He had admitted to having participated. He was disbarred, while seven other lawyers who were likewise involved [and who did not come forward] were allowed to continue to practice. It seemed a punishment doled out to a “Stool Pigeon”; by judge who was portrayed as corrupted. I never heard a follow up story. I suppose I could have missed it. Yet, it would seem that such a matter would find a couple of minutes of air time each week until the judge was out and the lawyer back in. In the end, the story was just one more case to justify everyone’s corruption on the bases of everyone else doing it.

Once “Broadcast News” shifted from its original public service orientation, to that of selling commercial advertising, it became an instrument of Big Business. Its knowledge of Congressional inside strategy is sketchy and speculative by its own admission. It is a tool used to sway the masses rather than to educate and for that, more’s the pity. No entity has fostered terrorism more. During the airline “Skyjackings” of the 1970’s, television programming was

*George Bailey*

preempted with live shots of airline passengers held hostage. For hours it dominated the screens with the kind of coverage no political party in this nation could afford to buy. Had it been to enlighten us to the cause promoted by the hijackers there may have been some amount of redemption in it. But it was sensational “Yellow Dog” journalism, plain and simple. Throughout the 1970’s, as pornography gained rights in the mail, then in book stores and the open news stands; and even into our homes on the cable: the press argued the merits of such proliferation, to preserve its own misguided sense of security. The tabloid press and television stood behind “Absence of Malice”: the notion that it is alright for the press to falsely ruin a person’s good name so long as it was not done with malice of forethought. Once again, main stream journalism edged left of center to preserve its own freedoms and power. In the end, all news: print, radio and TV, has been reduced to hearsay. As in all endeavors, when you set out on the low road, you are dragged down. It served the press to keep the acceptable levels of substantiation low. It made their job much easier. But, in the end, we, the public, lost some of our freedom and the right to know the truth. It was exchanged for the right of the press to blurt out anything at all.

Still another area in which the press has subverted our rights in favor of their own, is our right to a fair trial. Over and over again, people have been tried in the press without benefit of a lawyer or a jury; and forgotten after a verdict was delivered. Lives have been ruined for the sake of that “sensational” dollar. The most notable of such cases are the child molestation charges brought against many different Day Care providers. Charges were filed against more than one group, in more than one part of the nation. They became witch hunts, that spread fear and mistrust. They encouraged individuals within the mental health community to become overzealous; even manipulative. In the end, each and every sensationalized verdict would be overturned. But the press would be held harmless.

Sometimes, public opinion is swayed in such a way that when the verdict does not meet with the expectations of the public perception, faith is lost in the Judicial system. Other times, such as in the case of the beating of Rodney King, the public is whipped up into a frenzy; while the “Hate” crime perpetrated against Reginald Denny becomes a footnote. When three of the ladies who served on the O.J. Simpson murder trial were interviewed in the months following the trial, they said that they had been unaware of the racial tension the trial was producing. There were, of course, racial overtones due to the police who handled the case. Still, setting on the jury and being sequestered from the press, they saw the trial in terms of a murder of a wife and the trial of an ex-husband. So why did so many of us see it differently? Because the press created a situation that was more salable than just the accusation of a man murdering his ex-wife. The racial issue interested all Americans, not just those who would have been

interested otherwise. The same is true of Rodney King. His trial was about cops getting away with a criminal act. The Press turned it into “White” cops getting away with a criminal act perpetrated on a “Black”. Not only is this kind of reporting despicable from a journalistic standpoint, it is tearing us apart as a nation.

To begin to take back these rights which have been lost, I call for a few simple changes. The “absence of Malice” point of law, has already been lost to journalism with the repeal of law by precedent. It will now be up to a jury to decide if the tabloids had reason to believe a story was true or whether they simply paid someone to confirm a hoax. As for the promotion of nightly news cast which are all hype and no substance, or those advertised at the beginning of a program so as to lead to the assumption that they are the next story, only to leave them until the end: the new definition of “Fraud” should bring a few cases to justice and thereby put an end to the practice. But there will continue to be areas in which the press needs to be called down by the public. One of the clearest examples of this can be seen in a television station who advertised that an escaped prisoner was on the loose and believed to be armed and dangerous within the state. Then it advised viewers to tune in to the broadcast news program still two hours away to hear what part of the state he was believed loose in. This is patently wrong and they know it. As to the question of how to curb pretrial publicity, there is one simple rule which should become law. I will call it the “Law of Equal Measure”. Stated simply, it requires that for all coverage given before a verdict is handed down on a case, equal coverage must be given if the verdict is not guilty. Until a verdict of either guilty or not guilty is reached, for every minute of coverage, for each square inch of pictorial, every word of print, prime time for prime time, front page for front page; the same shall be allocated to exonerating those discharged as innocent: and payment shall be two fold. This also applies to retractions of reports proven, shown, or demonstrated to be untrue. If you wrong someone on the first page, the retraction should not be placed on the tenth page. After the trial, regardless of the outcome, the press may be free to expound endlessly. But until one has had a chance at a trial, [which is their right], let the press gamble something of its own against the good name of an accused. “What about those who are never charged” you ask. Well, let us look for a moment at the accusations made against Michael Jackson with regard to his alleged molestation of a child.

There were many who came forward with accusations. But without exception they were all paid to speak, by people who claim to be in the news business. However, none of them testified. Nor were they cross examined; which was Mr. Jackson’s right. So let us assume that he is innocent. Let us be charitable and say that the restitution which Mr. Jackson paid to the young boy was compensation for trauma as a result of the untrue accusations. In such a scenario, Mr. Jackson

*George Bailey*

has been slandered and perhaps ruined without recourse. The child suffers the slander but is compensated. Those who bore false witness got paid. We the public are left feeling that it's possible that heinous acts were committed and the perpetrator got away with it by buying off the victim. Most importantly, Michael Jackson suffers the pain of such an accusation and considerable financial loss: if not the end of his career. This scenario is totally unacceptable.

The other scenario is of course that Mr. Jackson is guilty. If that were true, then the buying of interviews by the tabloids amounts to tampering with the evidence. How could a prosecutor hope to convince a jury beyond a shadow of a doubt that the witnesses didn't fabricate their stories in order to sell them. The victim gets his money either way; either "Out of Court" or in Civil Court. Again, we the public are left feeling that money has been used to exploit the system.

Imagine for a moment that you own a tabloid TV organization. You get wind of the scandal and you organize with others in your field to purchase an interview with someone who claims to have "dirt" on Jackson. Together you pay \$400,000 for an exclusive interview and you market it to broadcasters. You make out like the bandit some think you are. Your syndicators [those who buy and broadcast your program] pay you big bucks and over the next six months you air twelve sensational stories about the alleged molestation [as one tabloid group reportedly did]. Then down the road, the prosecutor does file charges against Michael. Unfortunately for you he is acquitted. Now those who aired your syndicated show will be airing twenty four shows dedicated to exonerating Michael [or at least defending why he should not have been acquitted]. The station that carries your show must now air these shows by law. What's more, they have to find someone to produce the show for them to air because the law says they aired it, so they are responsible under the "Law of Equal Measure". After a couple of the programs have aired, people stop watching and advertisers stop advertising. No network, network subsidiary or press of any kind is going to risk being stuck in such a situation. That means that they will never air such a program to begin with. Therefore, since they are the ones who will have to pay the penalty, it will be the broadcasters themselves who clean up tabloid TV. More likely, is the scenario in which you [the tabloid] never buy the interview because you dare not air it until the trial is over [if indeed there is a trial]. By the time the trial is over that person you interviewed will have been called to testify, rendering their interview public knowledge and worthless. Now, the question, the focus, is on the prosecutor and why, if questions persist about an "undisclosed" celebrity's molestation of children, do they not pursue the matter? This is where the story belongs at this point in time. We don't need wild accusations, We need a press that asks "why is it that Michael Jackson paid that money to the child?". If it is an irrefutable fact, which has been verified, the press need not worry about consequences. If the press is questioning the system on behalf of the accused, it is



not an accusation in the press and does not qualify. However, if it becomes a situation where the prosecution is being “Bashed”, that too, merits recourse. This rule is to protect the truth, not to hide it. It was the job of the press to find out why Michael Jackson was not charged. Was it because he was innocent or because he paid off the child? We will never know. The tabloid press tainted the testimony of any witnesses and failed to “press” the prosecuting attorney for answers. They have defiled the press and should be stopped. This measure is the only tool we have that will not censor the press. The statements made against Michael Jackson are a perfect example of why we have the court system we do. It is the job of a jury, with the help of cross examination from a defense lawyer, to determine whether or not such accusations are true. To smear them across the front page of a news paper or the screen of a TV, infringes in the most devastating of ways upon a person’s “Right” to the pursuit of happiness and even to their Liberty and their right to justice. The public’s right to “know” is outweighed by its need to know the “truth”. Freedom of speech is not absolute, nor does it allow people to yell “Fire” in a crowded theater, any more than the right to bear arms means you can fire a gun in an unsafe or inappropriate manner without consequences. It becomes a dangerous thing in a Democracy, to allow for freedom of speech and freedom of expression, and even freedom of the press, when it is not in the context of a moral base. Unfortunately, by their own assessment, those individuals who make up the bulk of the press, are less apt to be grounded in the morality of the Bible. They tend, rather, to be in the business of setting the agenda toward their own morality and the subversion of those laws which impede them. For example, we are all familiar with the term “Invasion of Privacy”. But those who hide behind “Freedom of the Press” make a habit of using telephoto or, long range, lenses to spy on people. These same people find themselves championed by Main Stream journalism for selfish reasons. Because the law does not protect individuals as it stands, we will state that, with the revolution: unless there is a crime in progress, no lens which magnifies beyond the scope of the “naked” human eye, may be used to “Spy” on people in a private setting, [even if that private setting is in a public place] without a search warrant. [And please don’t subvert the intent here by enhancing images taken with a normal lens.] What’s more, an affiliation with the press should not give individuals the right to “Stalk”.

Because today’s press does not champion morality, they will point to the trial of Bill Clinton as a case in which the Law of Equal Measure is unworkable. After all, we heard him accused of crimes for over a year, with regard to his guilt in the act of perjury before a Grand Jury. They will say that, because the Senate would ultimately find him not guilty, that the press would have found itself in an untenable situation. I will tell you that the press wanted its cake and wanted to eat it too. It was the press who brought the scandal to light. It was the press that fed off of it for a year. But because Clinton champions the ideologies of a politically

*George Bailey*

privileged class and because Clinton was championed by the press who is part of that class, the press would defend him in the face of the truth. It would manipulate the results of politically motivated poles to steer public opinion. It would gather people to their lines and reinforce their rationalizations.

I would tell you that the trial of William Jefferson Clinton was the best example I could offer you of the need for the Law of Equal Measure. He was proven guilty in the press beyond a shadow of a doubt; but the press not only allowed him to be found innocent of the crimes, the press insisted on it. Because the press had no "Stake" in the truth, it did not champion the truth. Without the truth, there is no reason to allow freedom of the press. There is simple no need to have the right to run down the street yelling "look at me", if they have nothing of value to say. The soul reason for FREEDOM OF THE PRESS is to safeguard the truth. When the Senate found President Clinton innocent they perpetrated a lie on the American People. They could have found him guilty and pardoned him and that would have been the truth and they would have had to face the consequences of their actions. But they chose not to, and because the press allowed, even championed it, they made a mockery of a legal system that the Citizens of this country are forced to live under. This Law of Equal Measure is not something that I have taken lightly. I have reflected on it more than most of the ideas I promote here within. But in the end, I have come to feel that it is just. The law does not insist that O.J. Simpson would have all those hours of coverage dedicated to saying he was innocent. But it would have double the coverage dedicated to that verdict, even if it were to be "Spun" into what went wrong with the system, as in the case of President Clinton. The end result is that the press will be forced to use better judgment and restraint. They have no right to insight us if the goal is not worthy of our oversight. If the O. J. Simpson trial were broadcast without interpretation or comment, then it speaks for itself and the press has not endangered itself. But is the press reports or comments, then it wades in at its own risk.

Concerning the course of the press in the future, it falls to you, our youth. I urge those of you who see yourselves as journalists to resist the temptation of running down the street crying "Look at me". Do not "Spin" the facts to further your own point of view, but love the truth, seek the truth. Be content with the truth. Learn from the truth. Do not be content to pass on what you have been told by those who seek to fabricate the truth. In a free society there can be no job which is more important than reporter. If you would be content to take a "press release" and pass it on as the truth, then you are not a reporter, you are a copy boy; you are as a cop who spends his day in a donut shop while the city is looted. You are a soldier who deserts his post. You are a mother who abandons her children. You are a president who sells out his country.

Before moving on, I want to address the issue of television, be it network, cable, satellite or even cyber space. The content of these mediums has been altered by many of the same forces that play upon the news. They are granted the right to transmit by the public. They have a public responsibility. It serves no purpose to limit how far a field content goes for the sake of protecting our children, if the commercial messages aired within family programming are not consistent with those standards. We have little problem understanding that alcohol should be made illegal for children to buy, in spite of the fact that it can be found in their parents' liquor cabinet. It doesn't take any great intellect to know that if "Adult" programs are publicly broadcast that children will view it: whether it's because they sneak it like liquor or their parents are less than diligent. The content of television must be censored by the viewing audience. It is something that can't be mandated. But it is a cause to which, I hope, those who feel compelled to activism in some fashion, will gravitate. This is especially true when so much of what We air here, finds audiences around the globe. What We allow to be transmitted here is one of the measures by which the people of the world perceive us. It is not Just nor good, that We be portrayed as perverted and shallow before a world audience. As for the content of commercials within programming, it shall be the "Law" that they are consistent with the programming being aired. That is, if the time slot is allocated to family viewing, then advertisements within that time frame shall be consistent with the family viewing format. And please, that means a few minutes at either end should be safe as well. I would also ask that those of you who would monitor programming remain independent. Do not hand over your political Proxy to watchdog groups. Instead, if you feel that programming is inappropriate, call the broadcaster or the advertiser yourself. Tell them how you feel and if they do not respond, let them know that you intend to boycott their programming and their product and for how long: and then suffer that for the sake of the children.

There is another point of contention here. The idea that pornographic material is called "Adult" is a misnomer that is illegal under the new Fraud laws. The use of the word "Adult" implies that all adults view and enjoy pornography and vulgarity in general. That, in turn, entices children to be attracted to "Vulgarity" in the same way they rush to drink and smoke in order to appear adult. Such things should be called vulgar or obscene, or pornographic: not Adult.

It has long been held that commercial television is free to the public and as such "Take it or leave it". That is a false deduction. By watching commercials, you have fulfilled an unwritten agreement which gives you some rights: not the least of which is the right to control the volume. It's why the volume is adjustable on your set and on your radio. With the revolution, it shall be illegal to alter the volume of a broadcast for the purpose of commercial enhancement. That's just

*George Bailey*

the way it is, once we are back in control. Besides, if we are to move forward as a consumer nation, then we will need facts, not hype and volume.

Before moving on from this subject, I would like to reemphasize that the nature of “smut” is not benign. It is like second hand smoke. It is like toxic waste. It can be demonstrated that people become addicted to sex. It must be obvious that violence can be taught. So while we declare war on drug users and addicts, we allow Holly Wood and worse, to “PUSH” sex and violence on public air ways and all other forms of media. News programs ask how it is that our children have come to shoot each other in their schools. They ask if it is the movies or the video games or the parents that have led to this, without asking what they themselves have contributed, just as they once did when Hijacking became the sensation. No body wants complete censorship, but a public forum, of any kind, does not suffer the children unto that which is healthy, when it excludes modesty from its portrayals of sexual conduct and includes either graphic violence, or violence as a solution to every problem, or violence as the “HOOK” to every broadcast. That includes your local news looking around the world for murders, tragedies and other atrocities to hype throughout the day.

Of all the Government agencies I have criticized, attacked or altered in this book, there is one that stands out as the greatest threat to democracy. It is a organization that has well known and documented ties with organized crime. It is an agency considered a prime suspect in the assassination of JFK, reportedly because he intended to disband it. It has the ability and authority to spy on us from space as well as from most points on the globe. It has the potential to thwart anyone or anything with impunity. It is, of course, the CIA [Central Intelligence Agency]. For all its sophistication, power and funding; during the “Cold War”, it took double agents into its confidence and persecuted those trying to help our side. It is the nature of such business to produce paranoia. It is a vicious and deadly game they play. In writing this book, there has been no other issue addressed which possess greater danger to me or mine, or to the distribution of this work, than this agency and others like it. Since this revolution, if taken up, will head in what ever direction I lay out, it is within my capacity to disband the CIA; to recall its spy network from the heavens, and to open its files for the sake of a “New World Openness”: which far surpasses George Bush’s “New World Order”. If I were privy to the knowledge given to John F. Kennedy, then perhaps I would be so bold. Yet we still live in troubled times. It must be acknowledged that while terrorism remains a factor in an ever shrinking world, that we have suffered little from it within our borders those far. Still, the possibility exists, that as the communist threat fades and the third world evolves, there may be no other enemy to pursue other than those seen as subversive among our own. After all, absolute power will always corrupt absolutely. If it is true that one as capable and bold as JFK could not control the CIA, then who among today’s leaders would

dare try? [Least of all George Bush as a former head of that agency]. To this end I would mandate a simple “Check” to the “Balance” of things: a reverse strategy to the elimination to the CIA. Very simply, a question should be placed on the ballot alone side our choices for Congress every two years, to read as follows: “Do you reaffirm the Central Intelligence Agency?”. Yes or No? It should reappear every two years as long as the CIA exists in any form; by any name. Given America’s compulsion to go along with what ever those in charge advocate, it is very unlikely that this measure will see the end of the CIA. On the other hand, it puts the agency in the position of having to at least appear to work within the framework of our county’s sense of ethics. As stories of drug running from Vietnam to Iran Contra emerge; as involvement in the third world purges comes to light, the agency will become accountable: not to those whose private interests are served but to the voters of the nation whose name is tarnished by such actions. If there is ever to be the kind of peace and prosperity we all pray for among the peoples of this planet, it will come from the light of the truth. And if our hands are as bloody as those of our enemies, we will always be forced to hide what we have done in the darkness. I hope for a day when all the spies come home and say that their work is done: that they are no longer needed. But that day probably wouldn’t be acknowledged if it did arrive. Therefore, I hand over the fate of the CIA to the American voter. Should the day come when we feel either too afraid or too ashamed of the agency to continue to affirm its existence with 51% of the vote, then it is to be dismantled and all its files opened to the public scrutiny. The politicians may scream in terror and warn of a massive breach of national security, and so they should. It is not a matter to be taken lightly. Still, the CIA must have accountability with those who stand to gain the least and lose the most from a renegade agency; the American public. If Congress feels the need to hold confidential some of those files, so be it; but the names of the agency’s members will be disclosed and they shall be barred from further public service. In addition, if this revolution succeeds we will have full disclosure of the fifty one documents held concerning the assassination of JFK and we will have them before the end of the revolution.

This same kind of scrutiny should be brought to bear on the FBI and the DEA and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Fire Arms as well. Therefore, they too must be reaffirmed in the same way as the CIA. Additionally, agencies which have not yet come into existence or who are new fronts for old agencies should find their way onto this list as well as a matter of procedure in Congress. It would be a list that would include the IRS as it exists today. In that way those who find themselves oppressed by an agency which has been allowed by a disconnected government to wage war on its own people, can be thwarted.

As I have said elsewhere in this work, I do not intend to make this a book of conspiracy theories. But while we are at this juncture of the American Press and

*George Bailey*

the Clandestine agencies which will thwart our Democracy if not controlled by an honest and street smart press; let me make an observation. In the early 1990's, the fringe groups, who called themselves "Militias", were picking up members at an increasing rate. These radicals, who would have been considered far removed from main stream, were starting to find themselves aligned with more and more people who would have been considered moderate in years past. Regardless of the realities of the police action in Waco Texas, or the supposed massacre in Idaho, or the stand off in Montana; large numbers of reasonable, moderate people were edging away from their trust in Government Agencies and some were being polarized into more radical stances. After the bombing in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, that trend would be stopped. At least for the short run. Even the majority of those who had been looking for some kind of stand off with the government were repelled by the senseless slaughter in Oklahoma. You should know by now, that I sponsor no affiliation with any organizations; least of all militant ones. So it matters not to me that such a drift in the population was halted. But there were those who had reason to try and stop such a drift in public opinion. In Texas, in Idaho and in Montana, the government had been faced with people supposedly arming themselves against the government. Because they were armed, the monitoring of these groups fell to the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms: the BATF. This is the same organization who would be on the front lines against the Militia groups that were springing up: groups that were recruiting members and gathering money for arms and political clout. Not too long after the bombing in Oklahoma City, the news program 20/20 would air a piece of investigative journalism in which they claimed that the agents of the BATF, who had offices located in the same federal building that was blown up, were warned about the explosion in advance. It was further alleged that a bomb squad vehicle had been present at the federal building prior to the explosion that day. In fact, photographs of the vehicle were shown on the broadcast. Scores of people died in the Oklahoma City bombing; including children. None of the dead or injured worked for the BATF. So who profited from the bombing and who lost? I leave you now to draw your own conclusions. If you want a violent revolution, you will be given one, but you will change nothing.

When the press fails to make government accountable, there can be no democracy. A reporter, who shrinks from his duty to report the truth and insist that allegations of misconduct be answered, is a volunteer soldier who runs away. It is not enough to look good in front of a camera. It is a question of ethics and moral fiber. It is a responsibility that you are bound as a reporter to live up to; and if you can not, then it is better that you go to work in Holly Wood.

While the CIA was off toppling foreign governments and our young men were off dying in Southeast Asia to protect against the communist threat, there was a branch of our own government in the US in the infant stages of becoming a

world class communist organization in its own right. Like the members of the communist party of the old USSR, it usurps the assets of the nation to its own ends. It operates without the burden of taxes and it sells or rents or leases all that it controls, and it holds constant the standards of living of its members as that of the private sector declines. It is fraught with political pressure from within and from without. It has added to its numbers in almost geometric proportions over the last half century. It is known by many names. Among them are the US Forest Service and the US Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

There was a time when owning a parcel of homesteaded land surrounded by “Nation Forest” was a woodsman’s dream. Today, in its zeal to purify the deep woods of anyone other than its own, or to acquire the precious little level ground in some areas, to house its own, the US Forest Service has declared a silent war of attrition on such claims. In the great northwest, they infringe upon the rights of property owners to increase the range for elk herds, only to turn around and sell more hunting licenses for the elk; and increase the length of the season and thereby the stress, on the herds. They have embraced clear cutting [in the face of local opposition by even those in the timber industry], and the destruction of water shed. Diversification of the forest has often suffered in favor of a tree farm ecology. With each new species placed on the endangered species list, a new team of game monitors is hired on to record their decline. In Oregon, some of the funds which should come directly from the Federal Government for schools are tied instead to timber sales. In this way they blackmail communities already dependent to a great extent on the lumber industry, to stand by and watch it happen. If you believe that forest fires result in the loss of timber, you are only half right. When fires roll through “Old Growth” forest, fueled by decades of unattended fallen trees and deep beds of unaddressed pine needles, only the forest is lost. The timber is still largely marketable. And with the spring, the blackened forest floor will give rise to a bounty of exotic Morel mushrooms. The Forest Service will be there to sell the rights to the mushrooms, to market the timber, and to reforest with those brands of trees which they choose. The proceeds will go to furnish the armada of forest service vehicles, to build or maintain the subsidized [or sometimes even free] housing which some employees enjoy, while their health and retirement benefits remain in step with inflation. It will also be used to hire more members to the fold, to stand at the entrances of our National Heritage and bar your entry or assess you yet another fee for the use of something that belongs to you by birthright as a citizen of these United States. If we intend to take our government back, we might just as well take back the national parks as well. To do that we need to change a few things. The first is to put an end to this dichotomy of land grabbing to increase wilderness and at the same time destroying what existing land they hold. To do that, we simply make it illegal for any agency of the Department Of the Interior to buy private land from anyone who does not wish to sell it to them. And by way of retribution, we will

*George Bailey*

allow all those “forced” to sell since 1980, the right to buy it back at the selling price. If the Government built on the land it will be up to the previous owner to either keep the improvements or have the government restore the land to its original condition. Remember, even those within the Forest Service who wish to do the right thing are hamstrung by the politics of Washington, from where all meaningful decisions are made. In the end, it is those who intend to hand the land on down their own, who are the best caretakers. Under Reagan, tax laws were changed to force ranchers in the Northwest to clear cut their land by saying that, if any trees were harvested, those left standing would be assessed and taxed with a “Shelf Tax” of sorts. Anyone needing capital from timber sales was thereby forced to harvest all or none. We have changed tax law in order to stop it being used as a club against society. We have retained our laws to prevent land owners from polluting the land, and here within there are other safeguards.

The second thing we have done, has to do with the new tax system which allows for no government monies to be raised by any other means than income taxes. This will cause the number of employees within the Department of the Interior to decrease as they become a liability on the federal budget. Only those necessary to the performance of their necessary functions will be kept on. Those that provide a service will be necessary. Those that are tax collectors dressed in green, will not. As it is now, the Forest Service will continue to need to engage out side contractors to perform many of the jobs to be done. The number of temporary workers it will take to manage the “Burns” that are needed in the fall of the year, and for some time to come, may actually see an increase in those in the forest in the late fall and early winter. All of this will, of course have to come from the Federal General Fund. At the same time; any money raised by the sale, or lease, or rent, or license, or fine; or any governmental bureaucracy, at any level will be distributed as laid out elsewhere in this book. The reasons should be obvious by now. To further get those members of the Forest Service and their like, back in tune with the realities of the lives of their employers [the tax payers] a couple more changes. The first is that no employee of the organizations discussed here shall live in government owned housing more than three weeks in any two month period; except in an emergency situation, such as a fire. For too long the practice of affording housing within national parks to national park employees, has lead to the feeling that the rest of us are somehow intruding. In addition, government subsidized housing for government employees is a subversion of the new wage guidelines laid out here within.

Another subject of contention in the West is the use of Federal lands for the grazing of cattle. On the one side of the coin you have a group down in Nevada who says they want to take back Federal land usurped from that State and its people. Unfortunately, if you look past the rhetoric I suspect that you will see that this is not a “Class Action” kind of a fight. The people who are proposing the



“Take Back” are ranchers: ranchers who are established in the area, and who intend to take back the land for themselves; not for the masses. It amounts to some kind of Homestead Act for the rich. On the other side of that coin We have environmentalists who are jealous of the grazing rights on all federal lands. They are forever trying to raise the cost to area ranchers for the right to run their cattle on the meager lands owned by the public. This kind of thinking is typical of the selfish, one sided thinking that goes hand in hand with the environmental movement. If you travel to the West and drive through the vast holdings which are our national parks, you will see that in many cases, the Federal holdings are made up of rugged and poor ground. The flat productive valleys are mostly in the hands of private ranchers. More importantly, those private lands are productive because of the ranchers. Their time and their investment brings the arid region to life. Because of this, it is common to see wild animals grazing, not on the poor federal land, but on the rich private land. So what We have is a couple of neighbors. The one neighbor is the US citizen who owns poor ground and allows his live stock [elk, deer, antelope, etc.] to graze on his neighbors land without compensating his neighbor. The other neighbor is the rancher, who has fertile ground as a result of his labor and investment, and who pays his neighbor for the grazing which his livestock does on the neighbor’s poor ground. Oddly enough, those in the environmental movement believe that it is the neighbor who owns the poor ground who is being cheated. It must be said that cattle left to overgraze an area will end up in the streams where the last grasses are to be found. That is bad for the streams that run through Federal and State Lands. But this is a land use problem addressed best on an individual basis. Individual ranchers are as different from each other as the rest of the population. The good ones will rotate their herd according to guidelines which work well for all concerned. Those that don’t, should be denied access. For those that are allowed access, We need to change the rules. As I have explained, it is often “We the People” who are the bad neighbor. With the revolution, those lands which have been leased for grazing in the past, shall remain available for grazing. There shall be an accounting of all available lands and it shall be compared, in volume, to the amount of private pasture in a given area. From that ratio, those in charge of the Federal lands in question, shall allot the grazing rights for Federal land; dividing the lands with consideration to equal opportunity and convenience. In other words, the more land you ranch, the bigger your share of the Federal grazing allotment. Furthermore, the distribution of the allotments should be equitable with regard to grazing quality and try to take into account where you ranch in relation to your allotment. These allotments should be without charge. It is reciprocity [equal payment] for what our livestock [elk, deer, etc.] eats on their land. The reduced cost of production will show up at the meat counter in your grocery store. It is putting government out of the landlord business and putting them into the public servant business.

*George Bailey*

In addition, during the course of time that it has taken me to complete this book, it has come to pass that some States have attempted to drive ranchers out by making it the law that: private land which is located around area streams must be dealt with in ways that protect those streams from grazing cattle. As is so often the case with those who live in our cities, they think that because we live in a democracy that they may lord over the rest of society not because they are right but because they are many. Land use issues are complex and problematic. But to say that because we have the numbers to vote away people's property without consideration for whether or not it is fair or even necessary, is patently wrong. Therefore, all those Federal lands which are allocated as described above, shall have to conform to whatever provisions are made law in the States within whose borders that Federal land is located. In that way, it shall fall to the Federal Government to implement any regulations placed on individuals within any given State. In that way, the Federal Government can serve as example and advocate for area ranchers.

In dealing with the concept of forest management, it is important to focus on a "Hands off" approach, rather than the fiascos of the past, born of ignorant meddling. As a first step, there should be a total ban on the practice of clear cutting as it has been done in the past. This includes private as well as public lands. Unless land is to be converted to an alternate use, there is no excuse for such practices. If alternate use is the intention, then 70% of the money from the sale of the timber should be held in escrow; or put up as bond until the land is reclaimed for the new use. Since intent is difficult to prove or disprove, it is the only way to detour the practice of clear cutting for the sake of timber profits. If pasture is your need, then you will have to remove the stumps and seed. If you wish to build housing you will have to complete the dirt work and put in the roads and utilities. Aside from that; if you don't want to own timber, then sell it or don't buy it in the first place.

There are problems involved in saving our forests, while at the same time providing lumber for the market place and jobs for people within timber country. The key is, I believe, in what was suggested to me by a friend: that mechanization itself may have surpassed its peak. That is that bigger and faster must eventually reach a point beyond which it becomes counter productive. The timber industry is a prime example of just such counter productivity. It makes little sense to lay waste to large acreages of forest in order to justify the expense of mammoth equipment. When timber is removed by helicopter, it becomes far less labor intensive. As a result, the jobs lost to area foresters are merely translated into equipment expense in the form of hardware and interest paid on capital investment. Local economies and ecosystems are devastated in the long run; and jobs are usurped from the forest to the helicopter manufacturer's production line. The locals are forced into cities, and the Forest service hires yet

another employee into its fold. Our national forests, more than any other single facet of our society, should reflect the essence of conservation and renewal. In order to do that, the timber industry is going to have to take a Capitalistic step “Backwards”. It is not difficult to make such an adjustment. Private land owners have been using conservation, even today, while marketing timber. The process is called selective cutting. Here are the ground rules.

Within a mature forest, there will be some trees at the end of their days. It is not difficult for the journeyman forester to discern which ones they are. Such trees should be harvested. From there the process of thinning trees six inches and under should begin. Consideration should be given to such factors as steepness of terrain and normal snowfall amounts; since avalanches and high winds, both endanger survival rates of those trees left after the thinning process. After the removal of those trees past maturity [if there are any] and the thinning of the juvenile trees, the original board footage of the parcel as a whole [before the thinning process began] should be compared with what has been removed. If timber harvests are held to ten percent of that original gross figure, and harvests within these parcels are only allowed every ten years, then we will begin to see an increase in the size and diversity of our trees within our nation’s forests. If a ten percent of the total board footage amount is not met by harvesting the first two categories mentioned, then additional trees should be taken. The selection of those additional trees should show consideration for terrain, density and species. By including all the trees in the overall board footage figure, all the growth of new trees within the ten years between harvests will constitute an increase in the overall board footage with each decade that passes. This small figure will be augmented by the geometric figures we are about to discuss. The combination of the two, will see our forests increasing with time. This harvesting plan is for diversified forests and lends its self to more aired climates. There are, however, some scenarios in which a method similar to the old clear cutting is viable. For example: stands of Douglas Fur do best when the entire stand grows up at the same time. This generally requires higher rain fall amounts and probably other considerations of which I must plead ignorant. In such cases it is prudent to clear away areas to form new growth areas. If we look back at the great fire in Yellow Stone we can see that the natural way to remove forest is not in large ugly squares. Removal of timber in such a scenario should take the form of “fingers” or “dog legs”, which take into consideration the lay of the land, air patterns, streams and future harvests. In either of the two scenarios I have laid out, reseeding is not necessary. Instead, a low, cool, controlled burn in the fall will set the climate for a burst of new growth in the spring. In the case of Douglas Fur, [or for that matter all trees] a growth pattern can be established. If you graphed the growth of a healthy Douglas Fur forest you would see that growth explodes after it reaches a point just beyond the juvenile stage. This is due to the geometry involved, which I will explain in just a moment. But once it starts gaining speed,

*George Bailey*

it holds steady in its growth for around a hundred years. Then its growth slows as it reaches its waning years. By about age one hundred and forty it is done growing altogether. Once that tree's growth has leveled out at around a hundred years or so; from a forester's point of view it is time to harvest. But there is more to a forest than trees. The dead trees of a forest contribute in ways we do not yet understand. It has been suggested that even the dreaded Pine Beetle contributes to the health of the forest by cutting back the number of limbs on trees in time of draught. The point is that, we error on the side of conservation, because we don't know all there is to know. Because the aesthetics of the forest will ultimately be harder to protect than the trees, I will say that as an example, the Douglas Fir stand which I just described should not be harvested for one hundred and twenty five years. Therefore, from among the stands which fit this description in a given area, only 10% [of the forest] x 10% [every ten years] x 80% [every 125 years] = .8% [.008] of the timber could be cut each year. It may seem like slim pick'ins to take less than 1% of available timber in a year. But unless we agree to do something and soon the percentage will stay higher but the board footage will fall. Here's why.

Those who own the mills in the northwest are fond of saying that there are more trees today in the northwest than there were twenty years ago. On the surface it sounds like replanting is working, but look at this. A young tree can reach its full height in ten to twenty years depending upon growth conditions. But until it does, the amount of wood it produces is reduced by a multiple with respect to its height. That is to say, however much it grows around, if it has only grown to 80% of its height, it will only gain 80% of the fiber it would have gained had it been at full height. Secondly, we must consider "Pie". If you don't remember from high school, "Pie" is the amount by which one multiplies the radius of a circle to find the distance around the circle. Pie times the "Radius" [the distance from the center of the circle to the outside], times the radius once again [also known as pie x R squared]; tells you the area of a circle. The number represented by pie is 3.14. Therefore: if one has a tree that is one foot thick, then the radius of that tree is six inches.

$6 \text{ inches} \times 6 \text{ inches} \times 3.14 = 113 \text{ square inches of tree.}$

If you multiply that amount by the height of the tree you will find the cubic inches of lumber in that tree. Now let us suppose that in a good year that particular tree has a growth ring of one quarter of one inch [.25 inches]. Its radius is now 6.25 inches.

Therefore, the new figure for its square inches is:

$6.25 \times 6.25 \times 3.14 = 123 \text{ square inches of tree.}$

The tree increased its mass by 10 sq. inches x its height.

Now suppose the tree had been two feet thick and grown that same one quarter inch growth ring:

$$12 \text{ in.} \times 12 \text{ in.} \times 3.14 = 452 \text{ square inches of tree}$$

$$12.25 \text{ in.} \times 12.25 \text{ in.} \times 3.14 = 471 \text{ square inches of tree}$$

The tree increased its mass by 19 sq. in. x its height.

Notice that the amount of increase as a result of the same amount of growth is significantly changed. In fact, the amount of mass grown by the tree two feet in diameter is nearly double that of the one foot diameter tree. Now let us calculate for a tree that is three feet in diameter.

$$18 \text{ in.} \times 18 \text{ in.} \times 3.14 = 1017 \text{ square inches of tree}$$

$$18.25 \text{ in.} \times 18.25 \text{ in.} \times 3.14 = 1046 \text{ square inches of tree}$$

The tree increased its mass by 29 sq. in. x its height.

$$24 \text{ in.} \times 24 \text{ in.} \times 3.14 = 1809 \text{ square inches of tree}$$

$$24.25 \text{ in.} \times 24.25 \text{ in.} \times 3.14 = 1847 \text{ square inches of tree}$$

The tree increased its mass by 38 sq. in. x its height.

So we see the pattern emerge: for each multiple of the original one foot diameter, we see an increase in the amount of mass generated by the tree at nearly the same multiple.

Diameter of tree	increase in board footage as a result of one quarter inch of growth
------------------	---

12 inches	10 x height
-----------	-------------

24 inches	19 x height
-----------	-------------

36 inches	29 x height
-----------	-------------

48 inches	38 x height
-----------	-------------

The timber growing across this vast expanse called the US, is subject to enumerable variations which come into play with respect to how large their growth rings will be. Regardless of these factors, the mathematics do not change. The first ten to twenty years of a tree's life are generally spent accumulating height and a root system. It is not until this stage has been outgrown that it begins to accumulate mass. A tree that is harvested before its prime is over, has a greater percentage of its life spent in this start up stage, than one that has passed its prime.

Finally, compare the cross section of a tree harvested at two feet in diameter to that of a tree six or even eight feet in diameter. You can see immediately that many more boards, of much greater size, can be cut from the larger tree with possibly "less" waste. In addition, the heart of the two foot tree is almost none existent. The amount of "Clear" lumber harvested from such a tree is [like the numbers in the growth chart] an increasing percentage of larger diameter trees.

*George Bailey*

Trees also have individual growth “quirks” which develop in the base of the trunk as the young tree bends to accommodate its environment. As a result, boards cut out of trees that retain the tension from this grow pattern, [smaller trees] twist as they dry. And if all weren’t enough, trees are not turned on a lath in nature. That is to say that they are not straight. The amount of usable lumber that comes out of a tree is decreased substantially more in a smaller diameter tree.

If you remember the story of the man who invented chess, you might be able to see the same pattern emerging in reverse in our national forest. The question is why? Is it greed from those who run the mills? Is it greed within the government for timber revenues? Is it an attempt by forces who own private timber here or interests in Mexico and Canada, who want our timber depleted to raise the price of theirs? Is it the ecologists who leave vast tracts of over grown forest readied for the torch. Is it those who make their living in the woods who will not stop until it’s all gone. Is it mismanagement by the forest service? Does it matter?

The plan that I have outlined may not appropriate the kind of timber sales many would like to see. It does however address the problem in a real way. In addition, the amount of timber harvested from the national and state forests is constant. It means that those who win the economic battle of “Who within this country can most efficiently and profitably turn our nation’s timber harvest into product?”, will be assured a constant amount of raw material. With the new wage system, those factors which determine who that manufacturer will be, are managed so that workers do not bear the brunt of that competition. As time passes, usable and fine quality lumber, grown in this country, will increase with the same mathematical proportions that it has declined. Ideas I have yet to promote herein will decrease the need for lumber in some arenas. Plans I have yet to mandate will address the jobs needed to keep timber folks working. A healthy forest has, within it, dead trees, as well as mature trees and juvenile trees. The longer we stay the course I describe, the more timber we will have and the closer we will move to forest system which is large enough to fill market demand. It is inevitable that burned or diseased parcels will come into focus as being deserving of exemption from this formula. With regard to that, let me share with you some of the forest service’s own logic.

Ever since the introduction of the modern automobile, our nation’s roadways have been a place where wildlife pays the price of progress. In some places more than others, it is common to see the occasional deer wasted along the shoulder. Wasted because even the meat which is not destroyed in the collision, is off limits by law. It is an unavoidable policy. In order to safeguard against a cover up, to the act of poaching, it has been reckoned better to waste the meat. In the same way, we must sacrifice lost timber in order to insure against arson and unscrupulous forest management practices controlled in Washington. In the case

of timber, at least there will remain the advantages afforded against avalanche and some water shed.

Another practice that is still going on within the forest is that of road building. Those roads which already exist should be maintained out of the general fund just as all government functions should. But new roads only encroach on game and forest already under stress. There are enough roads through our national parks to allow one to drive all summer without using the same one twice. What is in shorter and shorter supply is wilderness and inaccessible land. Many of the roads the forest service has built are often gated off to the public anyway. We need no more of them. Let's put an end to the practice now before there is nothing left to preserve. If we limit access to forest in this way, and ban the old practice of clear cutting all together, we will begin to rebuild our forests while still harvesting from them. To answer the problem of making sure that there are still jobs for area residents, we will mandate a change to insure that harvest is labor intensive. To do that we will limit the size of the equipment that we allow off road within our national wood lands. If I thought that I would not be stoned, I would limit the "skidding" of logs from the forest to the road to mules and horse teams. Instead I will opt for limiting the horse power rating of all lumber harvesting equipment which may physically leave the road's right of way if beasts of burden are not employed. A 1992 D4 "Caterpillar" bulldozer has a horse power rating. I'm not sure what it was, but that should be the limit. Trucks hauling timber out by road will still function as they always have. Fallers will still work the woods in traditional ways. Away from the road where forest had to be forsaken to accommodate ever larger equipment, there will be a return to the more primitive. In that way, not only can the forest begin to heal itself, but also the small entrepreneur can begin to get back in the game. Outside the reach of the drag line there will be opportunity for those who are eager to work and given to innovation, in a vein other than bigger is better. As for air assaults on the forest, there are to be no more. If the land is that rugged then that timber is probably better used to preserve the ecosystem anyway. If it worries you that these changes will ultimately increase the cost of housing, through higher lumber costs, a few points: first of all, through the early 1990's timber was under priced to help hold up a declining economy to the detriment of our forest. Secondly; if we continue as we have, when our forests are depleted, prices will skyrocket. Thirdly; How can we point an environmental finger at a vanishing rain forest in South America if we show no reverence for our own wood lands. And finally; If we begin in the direction I will outline next, as we move into the discussion on environment, lumber will no longer be the stuff of which dream homes are made.

Imagine for a moment that you are a fisherman. You invest your time and money, and risk your life to bring in a catch. So here you come, into port, and a

*George Bailey*

representative of the Forest Service or some other branch of the government, meets you at the dock and assesses a fee on each fish as you unload your boat. Well, your going to be mad right? But soon after this practice starts, your going to accept it as inevitable and the fish market is going to have to pay you more for your fish in order to get you back out to sea. In turn, the market will have to raise prices to consumers. So what has been accomplished? The Government has taken a resource which belongs to those with the ability to harvest it and made it more expensive: a resource which, in the broader sense, belongs to those who buy it from the market; not the Forest Service. At the same time, the Forest Service has just become a source of revenue for the Federal Government. Now, instead of overseer of the sea, they have become its beneficiary. Government has been allowed to “Develop” a “Cash Cow” independently of taxes. As it becomes dependent upon that cash, it will be forced to make political decisions on the basis of its own need to preserve its income. It is obvious that by just letting the fisherman take his fish to market without interference from the Forest Service, the “People” are served much better all round. I don’t think anyone is going to take offence at what I have just said. So let’s take that same logic and apply it to another area of natural harvest: Timber.

What is the difference between harvesting the fishes of the sea and the timber of the forest? Other than the aspect of luck in locating the fish, they are almost identical. Both require investment and risk. Both take a breed of individual who risks personal injury and hardship against the opportunity to profit. Both bring a natural resource to the market place. Both have been over mechanized to the detriment of those who provide the labor. In both cases, if government adds cost to the product, the price of the product is raised to the consumer and the function of government as Public Servant is subverted.

You say that the timber on public lands must be valued against that in the private sector. But fish farms find a market independent of the Fisherman. The only real difference is that a fisherman may risk all and never see a fish, while the logger can see what is to be seen. But this is an advantage which works for us and our forests. Imagine that a given forest is divided into ten sections geographically, trying to keep individual mountains complete within any given subdivision. From there, the ten sections which make up an entire forest would be subdivided, giving consideration to the type of forest being dealt with. These small subdivisions would be numerous. Within the small subdivisions the Forest Service would assess and mark the harvest along the previously given guidelines. In addition, a coefficient would be assessed with regard to difficulty and market value of the species being harvested. In that way, a value which includes board feet to be harvested and difficulty of harvest, could be assessed. Difficulty would include such factors as terrain, distance from road, access due to altitude and therefore seasonal conditions due to snow or lack of it; and clean up. Once all the



subdivisions have been assessed, a value could be assigned to a subdivision or "Subsection". By matching various pairs of subsections, to provide an average sum total of those assigned values, in an amount which reflects a given time period of work: lots can be designated. Those lots could then be drawn by anyone who applied for them.

So what we have is a system where you go down to the Forest Service and say you want to participate in the harvest. They sign you up along with everybody else. When the lots are drawn you and your partner get two subsections of timber to harvest. The subsection's size was determined by such factors as how many people put in for a harvest and how big a piece of work [two months, or three months worth] it was decided would be a good allotment size. Your two subsections were pretty middle of the road and therefore they were pretty similar. You got two fairly accessible subsections in a diverse forest. You will be harvesting a few old dead trees, thinning the juvenile trees and harvesting some prime trees to reach the ten percent of board footage mark. The forest Service has marked all the trees. You harvest the timber, and take it to the mill of your choice and sell it at market value. You put up a bond before you started or you agreed to take your timber to a mill independent of you and have them hold your money in escrow until your obligation to the Forest is complete. You pull, or grind, the stumps from the forest where you fell the trees [because in nature, when a tree dies, it eventually falls over and pulls the roots out of the ground. It doesn't leave stumps all over creation]. You break up the stump and run it through a wood chipper along with all the other branches and shrubbery you find on your allotment. When you leave, the allotment you worked is pruned and manicured and ready for the controlled burn in the fall. The low hanging bows of the trees have been pruned. The entire mountain around you has been harvested and prepared in the same way so that in the late fall the Forest Service can bring in contractors or maybe the National Guard and they can walk the ridges and walk down the mountain with the fire. You go get another allotment. This time you get a rugged piece of ground in the back country. The harvest is poor, the reclamation is extensive and the trip out with your harvest is time consuming. It will take you six weeks and you won't make wages when you take your harvest to market. But that is why that subsection was assigned a value that was near zero. In order to balance out your "lot" you are also given a subsection in another part of the state which consisted of a easily accessible stand of Douglas Fir. [Remember Doug Fir grows best in stands of Doug Fir grown up together]. As a result you will be harvesting a small dog leg section of clear cut Doug Fir. In two weeks you will be able to harvest the timber, take it to market, and clean up. The clean up will include dragging some of the prescribed undergrowth from the surrounding timber, chipping it in the open dog leg and grinding up the stumps within your clear cut in preparation for a late fall burn. [Because it was clear cut, you will have to prune and manicure an area nine times the size of what you clear

*George Bailey*

cut because of the 10% every ten years rule]. But the clean up was minimal, because a healthy forest has some decay within it for wild life's sake and because there will be a controlled burn on that mountain too. In the old days that would have been dangerous, but because it was burned just ten years prior and the majority of the trees grow taller every year on the mountain, a slow controlled burn is safe and gets safer with every decade that passes . At the end of the second allotment you "Net" the same as you did on the first. You go back to the Forest Service for another allotment. You draw one that you determine is drastically out of balance. You feel you will lose money. So you return it to the lottery. It is your right to do so, one in four times per year.

Out in the real world some things have changed and some things haven't. There are still trucks out in the mountains taking timber to market, but they are concentrated on given mountains so there are fewer roads to maintain. It will be the function of the forest service to contract for the maintenance of those roads. There will be a lot of little operations going on all over the mountain. Two and three man crews, using labor intensive methods of harvest, will be everywhere preparing the mountain for a good, cleansing, controlled burn, in the late fall. In some cases there is excessive wood on the ground and much of what is being chipped is being hauled off for sale along with the timber. The mills which used to manipulate lumber prices politically, will only be allowed a one team allotment at a time just like everybody else. As a result, true market forces will determine the price of timber. Like the fishes of the sea, compensation shall pass from the market to the harvester without a Royalty paid to the Forest Service.

Private sector holdings will still be able to harvest, unless public referendum intervenes [such as in the Red Wood Forests], but always along these same type of guidelines, unless the land is given over to alternate use as described before. By only allowing for the harvest of something under one percent of the timber on Publicly held lands [including wilderness] it is not likely that all our timber needs will be met. This will allow the private lands to Capitalize on shortages. With the repeal of Marijuana laws, I hope to see a surge in pulp products made from that renewable source. All of these facts will combine along with an increasing annual harvest on public lands [as explained before] to the benefit of the forester, the consumer and the forest itself.

One foot note. It must be made a condition of this new policy that timber harvested from public lands may not be sold overseas. It is fitting and good that We should allow that lumber, which has been milled and dried [even if not planed], should be available for export to a degree determined by government. But the export of our natural resources, in their raw and unprocessed form, is an affront to the good will of the American Public. Because it is sometimes necessary for us as a Nation to allow Nations without their own natural resources [ such as Japan] access to ours : We should not bar the sale of lumber entirely.

However, because We no longer inflate our lumber, it is logical that we will see market forces outside the US rush in to Capitalize on this new situation. To prevent the benefits of such price reductions from moving off shore rather than to the American Consumer, the US Government will have to impose Export Taxes on US Lumber, to bring market prices in line with what other nations' markets are. This may very well devalue the holdings of the huge US Timber Monoliths. Unfortunately for them, these are the risks involved in the commodities game. If this seems crass, I can only say that there are those who believe that the devastation of our publicly held timber land is, in no small way, the result of just such interests. The less timber our forests provide, the more their timber is worth. The less We can harvest due to Environmental Suits, the more they control the market. Inexpensive lumber is good for the nation and helpful in lowering the cost of housing; which in turn allows for a lower "X" wage. My hope is that, in our new, environmentally sound, future We will turn to recycled metal for more and more of our housing material needs. But for the short run, Private timber owners will have to suffer the consequences of a changing market.

There are a couple of land use issues which need to be addressed, and this is as good a place as any. After the revolution, there will be an end to the subdivision of land outside the boundaries of municipalities. In addition, adjoining property, joined together under the ownership of a single entity, may no longer be subdivided after the fact. No one. If We allow a loop hole it will be the very type of subdivision We are attempting to stop which will prevail. If you don't want timber don't buy timber. If you don't want a large tract of land don't assemble one. There will be other changes outlined in this book that will relieve our need to expand. But what is truly at issue here, is people's desire to have a piece of property to call there own which is not within the perimeters of existing housing. They want to get away from others and they want to get their piece by buying a big piece and carving it up into smaller parcels so that they can get theirs for less. But in their attempt, they simply "Leap Frog" away from congested areas and in so doing, congest the next location. The continuation of this practice out in the west promises that no more vast tracts of open land will exist. Instead we will have acreages to the end of each horizon. By maintaining current parcel sizes wherever they exist within the country, it then becomes a question of economics as to who will get those most sought after parcels. The process of endless subdivision was part of the pyramid type expansion that has characterized the development of this country from its beginnings. It can not continue in the face of depleted resources, which include open land. I understand that many people will not like this. But you have yet to view the elephant. It will ease this pill. But it will not resolve the fact that this method of land acquisition is over. This may devalue some large tracts, but it will tend to stabilize as well. Because of changes I have outlined for the future, this rule will be the law of the

*George Bailey*

land for fifty years. At that time things will have changed enough to allow for more freedom.

As I write this, many State and Federal Agencies are in the process of land acquisition. Some of that was necessary to insure wildlife habitat, but it should be put under open review in light of this new rule. We will discuss inflation past and present in much more detail later on. When we do, it will be a good time for you to reflect on the practice of State land acquisition as it causes land to be inflated due to competition between the public and the deep pockets of Government. This is even more unnecessary if subdivision is halted.

In a related issue, with the enactment of Wet Lands legislations, many land owners have been told that they may not use their land which has been designated as Wet Lands, but they are allowed to pay taxes on it. In the spirit of fairness, those who have their land "Seized" by the Wet Lands legislation, will be able to petition the Federal government for compensation in the form of a yearly payment, on a 99 year lease, which reflects a fair payment for that amount of acreage, and begins with the revolution. If We the people seize property for wild life, we have an obligation to pay compensation to the owner, even though we do not take title to the land. In the course of the next 99 years, changes in our country's direction may remove our need to legislate land use protection measures.

Also, as I come to the end of my work here in 1999, there are rumors floating around in the North West that the Federal Government is in the process of giving, or has given, away parts of our National Parks to the United Nations. I can not believe that such a thing could be true, but if it is indeed the case, that any of our Nations Parks have been given over to any interest, foreign or domestic: we shall reclaim the property with the revolution.

Before I move on to leave the Department of the Interior to check its pulse, let me say this. As revenue becomes less and less an issue in forest management, it is hoped that the licensing of fish and game will begin to live up to its role of conservation. Since no fee can be charged, it will have no other purpose. Never the less, it is important that a watchful eye be kept on those who guard the hen house. They need to know that in our parks and forests, man should still have a place within the ecosystem as hunter and fisherman and harvester, so long as men and women feel the need and the forest can bear. With regard to that, the money brought in to local communities due to such activities is the life's blood of many such communities. Still, the need to afford outsiders [who are tax payers] such opportunities needs to be balanced against the need of those within such communities to participate. They too are tax payers.

Of all our problems, perhaps none is bearing down on us faster than that of the environment. Regardless of what happens to the peoples and the nations of the world, when the dust settles, we can begin again. But, we can do so, only if

there is a safe place to build and materials left with which to build. It will happen eventually, that any culture which rises up, will decline. From the point of view of the scientific method, there is not one example to the contrary. This being the case, how can we, in good conscience, continue to pursue the course of the nuclear age. What manner of egocentricity drives those who champion its cause. How can they affix a value to a kilowatt of power produced in a nuclear plant, when the spoils of such a process remain a threat for a thousand years. Never mind what natural or terrorist disasters threaten us. Never mind the inevitability of human error. Rather, look to Russia, where the internal structure has all but collapsed. Nuclear debris lies discarded in the sea they share with Finland, and now that the truth is known, there is no money to clean it up. Where are their physicists now? Why have they not come forward to volunteer to the task without cost? How many of our own technicians do you think will stand at the monitors when the money no longer comes, and the shelves in the stores have been looted? Who will dismantle the reactors; seal their contents in vaults and stand guard the tombs? No one. Not one. The promise of the nuclear age was and remains a hoax. It is better for the sake of mankind, as well as all life on the planet, that we face chaos in the darkness, rather than continue to sit on a powder keg. This must be the quintessential element of any environmental plan that may be put forth. Therefore, with the revolution, there will be “zero” nuclear testing done by the United States, anywhere. Furthermore, by the year 2007, all nuclear power plants must be off line and their dismantling begun. If a foreign country conducts a nuclear test they will be ban from doing business with us for a period of three years and it should be a mandate to our President to align as many nations as possible to the cause. It is a hypocritical notion for us to insist that others refrain, given our past. Still, it is that type of ignorance which we are revolting against.

It is also appropriate that we take this time to mandate an end to the use of depleted uranium in our military armaments. It has been demonstrated that by using depleted uranium in “Armor Piercing” projectiles, that substantially better results can be obtained over conventional projectiles. It can also be demonstrated that those who enter a battlefield in which such weapons are used are likely to suffer from the exposure to such armaments. It is the philosophy of the “Kamikaze”. It is a step closer to using the “booby trapped” child. It is the expendability of human life by those who sometimes fail to understand that if you fight to win at all costs, then sooner or later you become something that should not win. You become the victor at the expense of being the hero. Americans have always aspired to be heroes first and victors second. We will win without depleted uranium as long as we believe we are worthy of winning.

Finally, if other nations wish to contaminate their home lands I fear that there is little we can do. Despite the fact that the cloud from Chernobyl affected other

*George Bailey*

lands, national sovereignty is the cause of most wars. Instead we should look to the United Nations to do what it can to detour the use of nuclear power and insure that such waste remains within the borders of those who would produce it. We should use the same logic to include States within the United States. In that way all the States of the union will be inspired to seek out creative ways of disposal. In the case of those countries within the old Communist Block: if we can be assured that they will end production, then perhaps we have to help by taking over the care of some elements of their nuclear waste. But we must begin to develop a disposal method which is permanent in nature. Perhaps we could drill holes into the earth's crust where the tectonic plates overlap so that the crust in which we deposit nuclear waste is moving toward the earth's core. Perhaps we could fly it into the sun, or deposit in on the moon. Perhaps these are ridiculous ideas. But if they are, how reasonable is our current method of covering it over in concrete? It is my hope that we can lead the way by our own actions.

The question of the environment is at best a "Sticky Wicket". Information is sketchy and distorted. It seems the pendulum is always swung from one extreme to the other. Vested interests in all camps remain dug in and unwilling to compromise. I don't believe that many people are nearly as worried about the "Spotted Owl" as they are about the Spotted Owl's habitat. I don't believe that most people prefer plastic furniture to wooden, yet it seems that we are faced with the rape and plunder of our wilderness unless we stop lumbering efforts completely. The Spotted Owl was a vehicle used to pass through a legal "Loop Hole" to stop the process. A similar strategy used Kangaroo Rats in southern California to stop housing developments. I have done my very best to address the spotted owl issue to everyone's satisfaction. I have out lined changes that will alter land use in the future. But in the case of the Kangaroo Rat, you just can't eliminate change. The housing proposals laid out under Banking should slow "Population Drift" to some extent, and this section will include incentives to curb "Urban Sprawl". Never the less, if you live in a Growth area there will be growth. It's that simple. You just can't deny property owners the right to build on the basis that they will spoil your view. [As opposed to ordinances which limit heights that would "block" your view]. You don't own the view; not unless it was part of the deal. I was told by a California Department of Transportation [Cal. Trans.] supervisor that during the Jerry Brown administration, Cal Trans all but stopped working on or building any of California's roadways for the sake of environmental concerns. As an Environmentalist, his administration didn't want more roads, promoting more growth. The problem was that he did nothing to address the influx of new population. As a consequence of burying his head in the sand, the infrastructure not only didn't keep up, but decayed. As a result, people sit, stuck in traffic polluting the air, with no adequate alternate form of transportation. Today California spreads asphalt over thousands of miles of existing highways where its oil base is absorbed by the environment. Yet when

that same asphalt is taken up, it is classified as hazardous material. As I mentioned before, in the East, stories have surfaced of “Gang Land” members dumping hazardous Blood By-product waste into municipal dumps in Virginia. Fortunes are spent to control the disposal of all manner of Blood Waste material while every fertile woman in the nation dispenses her own monthly discharge in the trash can at home. It seems that everything we touch is being labeled toxic and someone is getting rich by crying “Wolf” and taking out the garbage. Mean while, nothing is improving. But if you don’t like what you find in the babies diaper you have to change what you feed the baby. So let us begin.

One major cause of pollution is the way We deal with transportation. The rut that We are unable and somewhat unwilling to get out off, centers around oil. I don’t think it’s a question of conspiracy as much as it is protectionism of old institutions which elevated us to greatness. It was the Rail Roads, which had functioned as monopolies for a century; the automobile which powered our lead as an industrial giant; the Airlines which are the culmination of our technological expertise and the oil which fueled them all. The age of the Auto brought with it the freight truck and the bus. The rail roads all but dropped out of the travel business expect for token service which was often mandated and subsidized. In stead, they left it to the bus companies to transport the lower classes and the Airlines to provide for the moderately affluent. Detroit took care of the rest. All this served us well for a time. The budding Airline industry helped to market the research and development of Aerospace technology, which helped defer military costs as the “Cold War” dragged on. Detroit dominated the world in auto manufacturing. Better and better road systems made trucking and bussing a logistically versatile alternative to the “rail”. All government had to do was sit back and watch the money roll in.

It was the invention of the transmission as much as anything that lead to our embrace of the internal combustion engine over steam and electric automobiles. The only practical source of fuel for such a motor was an abundant supply of oil. The combination of quick starting, long range and ever increasing “horse power” made it a natural in the wide open landscape of our nation. With diesel fuel so cheap and abundant, even the Rail Roads shifted to it. This, despite the fact that trains could not accommodate a transmission. This caused locomotives to become diesel driven generators which powered tremendous electric motors. They could not pull as much weight as the old steam engines, [engine for engine] but they didn’t have to contend with the problem of water and coal; and fuel was dirt cheep. Trucks became more powerful and more stable with heavier loads. All this coincided with the realization of the Interstate highway system. Finally, it was the employees of the railroads themselves that laid the last straw upon the Rail Roads’ backs. When Social Security was founded, the Rail Roads would be allowed to form their own railroad Retirement fund, independent of the rest of

*George Bailey*

the private sector. Rail Road unions would demand greater and greater wages and benefits while holding the nation's transportation monopoly hostage. Rather than fight the trend, Congress just allowed the Rail Roads to wither on the vine in favor of the automobile, bus, truck and Aircraft industries. It probably served them right. Unfortunately, it did not serve us well. The benefits of oil to the world can not be disputed. Not just in the form of fuel but in plastics, paints and on and on. Still the draw backs can not be denied. If We are to rethink our approach to the environment, this is as good a place to start as any. Is it better to finance the labor and fuel intensive Airline industry so that We can fight the logistics of getting to and from the airport, make all the connections and snatch our luggage on the way out in order to have an extra day or two at our destination? Or should We step back and examine a time when the journey was part of the vacation, rather than something to overcome before beginning? Should We continue to let airline companies employ price fixing so that we must accommodate their schedules when we travel or pay horrific penalties? Should We be forced to buy round trip tickets from an industry which is propped up by government regulation and ever increasing expenses from airport authorities? Should We continue to build bigger and longer freight trucks as We travel along side in smaller and smaller cars? There is a need for Airlines. But as business turns to computers and conference calls, its market dwindles; leaving it to search out the masses in situations where quality of time and the amount of money spent does not necessarily justify time saved when a reasonable National Energy Policy is factored in. Trucking will always have a place in "Short Haul" situations as well as in dispersal. But beyond that scope it is time for major changes.

To that end, with the revolution We shall call for the nationalization of all railroad rights of way. Where ever palatable, such railways should be three sets of tracks wide. Furthermore, all railways should be available to any enterprise capable of putting a train on the tracks so long as "Reasonable" safety and weight standards are met. It is important to note that my personal vision of our new railway system is not a "Bullet" train. It serves no purpose to have trains which, like Airliners, reach astronomical speeds only to begin slowing down for the next stop; that must be full of passengers in order to justify their expense, or that have commuters scheduling their travel around the industry rather than the other way around. In addition, We who are not on board should not become victim to blurred pieces of shrapnel, winging their way across our countryside and our towns. The technology exists today to change the world in ways we never dreamed of just a few years age. I will not elaborate on them here and now. For now, just let me say that if freight can move unencumbered by concerns of right of way, with fewer personnel and decreased insurance risk, on Government maintained rails, it will choose to do so. If Capitalism is allowed to compete on a railway system which allows two way travel and passing lain, it will embrace it. If travelers can move from a centralized location in a city to a similar location



across the country, based on considerations other than time; if their fare can be reduced by adopting alternate energy sources; and if frequently scheduled “Short Hop” or “Spur Runs” can connect them to frequently scheduled, on time, “Main Line Runs”; they will embrace it. To bring traffic back to a central location is an off shoot and a first leg of urban renewal. From there we can begin to undertake Mass Transit in meaningful ways, rather than the “Band-Aid” approaches of the past. The Bay Area Rapid Transit program [B.A.R.T.] in San Francisco’s Bay area, is a fine example of a system that works [except for the fact that its union workers hold commuters hostage for unreasonable wages and thereby inflated fares]. With the changes We have made in the drug laws, Law Enforcement, and the Penal Institutions; even New York Subways may once again serve the masses as safely as intended. Still, the Railroad system is the cornerstone of an environmentally sound energy and transportation policy for the new millennium. From a strategic defense point of view a rail system may be more vulnerable than a highway system. But the highways are in place and over taxed with traffic. Perhaps more importantly, they are inefficient from an energy point of view in a long distance scenario.

I said before that I would address urban sprawl. So, here is a carrot. To bring young working class families back into the city and curtail urban sprawl, I would offer up a two percent decrease in mortgage home rates to be paid by the Federal Government [on behalf of those willing to move into existing residential areas so designated], to the banks that secure their loans. This would be for the people and homes that qualify as laid out earlier in the book for tier one banks. The percentage should be a function of Government guide lines laid out with respect to the condition of the area. In this way We can rebuild our inner cities. By giving franchise to those who are now disfranchised, with an “X” wage, and bringing the productive back into the inner city, We can rebuild without bringing on the inflationary trends which see those who used to live in the neighborhood driven out if they are willing to become a part of the working class. As to the energy question? For those who work outside the home, and are willing to locate within one mile of their work, there should be an additional 1 1/2% paid on their behalf by the Government, so long as they have the afore mentioned mortgage and work within that one mile radius. In homes which have more than one “Bread Winner”, it shall be the one with the largest income who is qualified to receive the 1 1/2% “Logistical” incentive. The two “Promotions”, as it were, should not exceed 2 1/2% in combination. It is an inexpensive and meaningful way in which to return urban workers to urban housing, while at the same time, bringing new life to decaying cities and providing rewards for those who would lead the way. At the same time, it is a fair way to provide incentive to ease traffic and save energy.

*George Bailey*

Another basic consideration to our environment is population. There was much debate during my youth about the use of contraception. It centered around the phrase from the Bible "Go forth and multiply and cover the earth". As the twentieth century draws to a close it seems, to me at least, that that command has been honored. None the less, I can not view abortion as anything less than slaughter. In the end, what ever measures We may take to curb population growth; be it here or around the globe, the only methods which will make a meaningful difference are opportunity and education. The new rules We seek concerning foreign aid are ultimately our greatest tool abroad. To pursue the old course is ultimately to "Bank Roll" sterilization and abortion programs laid down by governments who use our good will money to impoverish their own. It is the best We can do for them. But more importantly, We must lead the way. The Industrial Revolution is over. Our wilderness has all been conquered. The wide open spaces within our borders face encroachment with each passing day. We can neither feed nor house the multitudes of the earth from within our boundaries. It is time to freeze our population growth at home. Immigration should be limited to the number of Us passed on, minus the number of new births in any given year; minus an additional .5% [1/2%] of the population at large. Yes, I am indeed suggesting that we begin a gradual decline in our population. For reasons which will become more clear as you read to the conclusion of the book, it is time to head toward a future where it is not necessary for governments to pit us against each other in wars to deal with our numbers as we deal with the issues of health care and hunger in the world. This book is about a movement toward a freedom such as you have not contemplated and over population is a threat to that freedom.

With this accomplished, We can refrain from the persistent expansion which threatens to leave us with nothing but cities and suburbs from sea to shining sea. Let us turn our energy to rebuilding those places which already exist as cities. To those Rail Ways that are already in place. To helping foreign lands meet the needs of their own within their own lands. The idea of a perpetually expanding construction industry is near sighted. A place for everything must include a place to leave the boundaries of cities and development for the undeveloped. There will be construction work on the new Rail Ways for some time to come. There will be reconstruction work for time enough to consider where a need exists [if any] for the contractors and their behemoth machines which swallow mountains and damn rivers. But there is a limit to how long they can find virgin ground to rearrange. Like those who would clear cut the forest until there is nothing left, let them face the future while We still have one. Let us turn our efforts from new construction to reconstruction.

The subject of our attempting to feed the world has always been at the forefront of arguments made by agriculture concerning the use of our water in the

West. Even today, the myth persists that no other concern bears consideration. In the great valleys of California, farmers, in the midst of a draught, were allowed to pump water from underground aquifers until they collapsed. They dug deeper wells to deeper aquifers and pumped them dry with the same result. Now the Government talks of using taxpayer money to try and revitalize the broken aquifer system by pumping water and dollars into permanently damaged systems. In the Northwest, Idaho saw the return of a single pair of a particular species of salmon in 1992, partly as a result of agricultural demands for area waters resources. All along the West coast the old fishing fleets are gone. The wealth of the sea which came to us without management, or cost, beyond the effort of harvest, has all but disappeared. If all these things were unavoidable in order to keep the harvest basket full, I would be far more sympathetic; but they are not. Never mind that the Government has been known to subsidize the disking under of melons in California when the yield was too great; in order to prop up prices. The problem is relatively simple. Farmers have been resistant to change and the Government has pandered to their political clout. As early as the mid 1970's it was demonstrated by Japanese American farmers in the West, that "Drip Irrigation" systems could reduce water consumption and labor costs and increase yields in dramatic ways. The fact is that for all crops other than grasses, drip irrigation is a sensible approach. The fact that Government has subsidized the true cost of water to farmers has led to the resistance to change from flood irrigation to drip irrigation. Despite the fact that it is extremely wasteful, the incentives to move away from the practice are not there. Even the irrigation techniques employed in spraying fields with water see much of the resource evaporate into the air.

Farmer defend the needs of agriculture on the basis of our obligation to feed the world. But that philosophy is a remnant of the myth perpetrated on us and perpetuated by our Government. In truth, food grown for the sake of live stock works contrary to any attempt to feed world populations. If We diverted the grains fed to cattle and hogs within our nation, to the people of the globe, We probably could accomplish the task of ending starvation for a while. Yet even Christ acknowledged that there would always be those left without. If We fed all of Africa today, their numbers would simply increase. It is more realistic to allocate water to the rivers in order to assure their ecosystems, and then to allocate the remainder to agriculture which develops food for human consumption, while insuring that it be used wisely: even if it means Federally subsidized and low or no interest loans to set up mandated drip irrigation systems. From that which remains We can grow grasses for animal consumption. I do not wish to see an end to the cattle industry in the West. No one loves a hamburger or steak more than I. I do not suggest that horses be destroyed to end our need for hay. There is enough for all if it is used wisely. If the rhetoric ceases long enough to look honestly at the problem, We will see that. Before this book is through, I will share with you knowledge that changes water needs as they

*George Bailey*

pertain to animal feed crops. But it does not necessarily work in all parts of the country. Therefore, those places which can implement the new technologies, may not be the same places which are owned by those who currently use our water resources. If they are barred from using water in traditional ways because new methods can replace them without using water in traditional ways, that will be Capitalism solving an environmental problem. It will be good for the country, but it will not be good for the traditional farmer and he will likely resist politically.

As for those starving at other points on the globe; We all know the old saying, "Give a man a fish and feed him for a day; teach a man to fish and you feed him forever. But that is a farce, if you provide him no net or a way to get one and eliminate the fish from the sea. The new foreign aid policy will address his need for a net but it will not stock the sea, which is our next objective.

Imagine the state of our Nation's wild life if there were no limits on the number of animals taken. What if hunters were allowed automatic weapons and no seasonal restrictions. It is the legacy of the buffalo and the passenger pigeon. Today similar techniques are employed by mammoth fishing fleets around the world. The Japanese, and many others who probably include us, seem to have little or no reverence for the fishes of the sea. We held their avarice for whales through boycott. The same can be done for salmon and dolphin. As our Presidents push to manipulate other nations to refrain from hostilities, they have turned their back on the seas that we all share. Let it be known that if a nation wishes to do business with us that they must limit the size of their fishing boats to something similar in size to our Alaskan salmon and king crab boats, and let us mandate such change within our own nation before the sea is destroyed. It should also become International Law that those boats which are used to harvest the bounty of the sea must return to their port with their catch. The floating canaries that pit automation and production against nature's ability to replenish itself, threaten all of us, world wide. It is my hope and intention that fishermen once more make a living from the sea where corporations now rule. In order for that to happen, automation must take a leap backwards. It is the same strategy I propose for our nation forests. It is about a place for everything, including a place for those who pit themselves against the sea and are rewarded. A nation, any nation, that sends a fleet of a thousand small ships out to do the work accomplished by ten ocean going factories, has served its people with opportunity and balanced the odds for the sea.

The stakes involved here are greater than the purchase of a less expensive TV or automobile. It is the labor intensive method which insures jobs for many, monopoly by none and preservation for all. It is fair and it is just. We must lead the way in establishing that those things which are used to harvest the sea are not destroying the sea habitat. Crab boxes which are severed from their return lines lay at the bottom of the ocean claiming crab after crab until they are full of

skeletons. Nylon nets strung out over vast expanses kill everything they come in contact with. Bottom dragging practices used to catch shrimp, devastate entire eco-systems. When the sailors of Europe entered the north Atlantic fisheries of the new world they told of dropping baskets over the side of their ships and pulling them up full. Today some tuna are all but extinct, and as goes the sea, so goes the world.

I would like to involve the world in something never before considered. I would like to put our President to the task of arranging a world wide moratorium on ocean fishing. I understand that this seems unworkable. Perhaps it is. But I have expounded on the Man Who Invented Chess. The mathematics of a population left alone to double itself again and again are astounding. If We were able to organize the world to subsidize those who make their living from the sea for a period of four to seven years, in conjunction with an end to the floating factories of the past, the sea would rebound. It can be demonstrated that a population left alone long enough to gain a foot hold can explode in numbers. Of course other food sources will have to be made available. We, as the promoter of such a radical idea, will have to provide a method and a means. We will have to take the lead in supplying the needs of those who count on the sea for their sustenance. But imagine the effort that was put into “Desert Storm” being summoned to this task. Imagine the coalition Bush mustered, being committed to something constructive: the money they spent being put toward revitalizing the seas. Imagine foreign aid for fish farms in advance of the moratorium. Imagine stored grain sent overseas instead of Patriot missiles. Imagine a leader able to lead in a consolidated effort which would unify the world on the common goal of preservation for all. These are the challenges of the leaders of the New Millennium; not to assign us each a WEB Sight on the Internet.

WE still have other changes in environmental policy to deal with. But it is important at this juncture to elaborate for a moment on the politics of the Environmental Movement. Consider the Manatee, which makes its home in the rivers of Florida and now faces extinction. It seems that the propellers from area pleasure boats, [particularly the big speed boats] carve up the docile creatures as they meander just below the surface of the water. Environmentalists clamor to end boating on the waters and, not surprisingly, recreationalists resist the idea. But where does the true power struggle lie? As far back as the early 1960’s my family owned a craft known as a jet boat. Much like today’s “Jet Ski”, it took in water and “Jetted” it out the back for the purpose of propulsion. This was a ski boat capable of pulling at least two skiers out of the water and reached speeds of forty to fifty miles per hour. You might think it the obvious solution to accommodate both pleasure boaters and environmentalists. Yet the “Propeller” type manufacturers do not wish to struggle in the market place against the less excepted “Jet” technology manufacturers. The well paid leaders who head the

*George Bailey*

environmental groups and their very well paid lawyers, do not profit from putting themselves out of a job. So the battle rages on in court, with the manatee diced up in the middle. The general public never hears any compromise proposals and the high speed “Racers” indulge themselves at the expense of everyone’s safety. The theme is consistent throughout the ecology debate: All or Nothing. It relates directly to our look a “Republic” versus a “Democracy”. As long as interest groups prey on the our elected officials and individuals attempt to govern themselves on the basis of “Sound Bite” knowledge, nothing will change. Elect your officials, make them take time to defend each position they take. Judge them on their record. Let them make an “informed” decision. I can make no greater argument for reforms in tax law, election laws and State Initiative laws than this very example of government by Republic. We need a government involved in solving problems. If all government, at all levels, devotes itself to new forms of raising revenue, then two things occur. First; every issue is solved by throwing tax dollars at the problem. Secondly, government fails to take the time to understand the problem because its time is devoted to finding new ways to “Generate Revenue”. A flat tax which budgets government, demands innovative approaches and allocates time for study. Election reform will allow government officials the freedom to do the right thing in their time and then move on. It is the duty of the press to spend enough time on the issues to become informed themselves, so that they are capable of asking informed questions. A free press does not serve a “Republic For Which It Stands” when it seeks to sell the news rather than use it to inform. A press which is sloppy and lazy is more detrimental than one which is censored. And just in case I didn’t make it clear elsewhere in the book, I will take this opportunity to restate that the State Initiative process was set up to allow citizens a way to over-ride their State Government without having a revolt. The “Ballot Measure” was intended to be a “Ground Swell” a “Grass Roots” kind of an action in situations where the masses were “fed up”. That is the reason for the large number of signatures required to put a question on the Ballet. Today, special interest groups routinely get measures on the ballet wish are ill conceived and self serving to those groups who initiate them. They are able to give them the appearance of “Will Of The People” by hiring signature collectors in order to meet the required number of signatures. In the end, an uninformed public is put at odds with the very people they have elected and therefore hold accountable. Government must Govern. It must be allowed to Govern. It must be held accountable by an informed and motivated press.

In 1997, new rules concerning program ratings were instituted for Broadcasters in the US. This is as good a time as any to mandate another change which has a place in a Democracy, governed as a Republic. The line is often confused, concerning Broadcasters in this country. The fundamentals of Capitalism and the much perverted rights of the First Amendment, have led many

to view those who “Transmit” all manner of information, images and ideas; as somehow independent of public scrutiny. Those who “Broadcast” or “Transmit” are licensed for good reason. The term “license”, itself, stems from the idea that privilege is being afforded. There is little opportunity nor is there great need to monitor the content of the written word in a Free society so long as that which is considered inappropriate by society is kept “In its place”. But just as with the right of public referendum acknowledged in the “Ballot Measure”: it should be that the “People” have a say in what should be circulated in their midst. This too, is an environmental issue. When We are inundated by that which is undesirable, our environment is soiled; even toxic. To that end; with the revolution, it shall be that an entity which “Transmits” in a public access forum shall be subject to revocation of its right to transmit by a public vote in the majority. From the revolution, the Congressional ballot voted on every two years, shall include a place which allows for a citizen to revoke the license of an entity such as described. In this way those corporations risk the wrath of the public when they fail to serve the public in a manner the “Public” feels is befitting. It is almost unimaginable that Americans would give up an alternative source of entertainment such as one of the Network Broadcasting Companies. Still, the threat of a public backlash is a positive thing. What’s more, it is a “Big Stick” for such enterprises as the Internet. It will not do for them to corrupt the minds of our youth with impunity. The financial risk to those involved by allowing for a situation as unpredictable as a disgruntled public, will go much further toward “Modesty” than I would ever want to mandate.

Before returning to the subject of specific changes which must be made concerning the environment, let us focus on the water shortage in the West for a moment. We must never close our eyes to the political chicanery which is involved in such issues. If the salmon runs of the northwest are truly being affected in a meaningful way, that is one thing. However, other issues involved, center on the construction of new dams and the price of the water itself. By releasing water from reservoirs under the guise of flood protection and fishery enhancement, the government has, in the past, raised the price of water to all consumers significantly while only lowering consumption in almost insignificant amounts. The result is, of course, increased revenue. It has been a broad sword to wield against the construction industry. Again, one would hope that the press would get to the heart of the matter; but in the end the press feeds on its own political agenda, and more’s the pity. After the revolution Government is barred from raising such revenue. That means that Federal waters will have to given to States at no cost. The cost to the federal Government will be offset by income generated and then taxed, as a result of the use of that water. What’s more, without the revenue going to the Federal Government, the incentive to “revenue” at the expense of the ecology is removed. Water delivery systems would then be maintained at the expense of the States which are at the receiving end of such

*George Bailey*

systems. The same, income offsetting expense, principles would apply. Allocations of water would fall along the same lines as existing water rights, but water which is not used could not be sold. At the local level; water treatment would be born out of General Funds just as are other services. Basic allocations of water would be distributed without charge. Usage amounts which exceed allowable limits would be charged for with a fine, rather than a bill, in order to curb misuse and those monies would distributed along guidelines as laid out latter on in this book.

There are other ways in which We can effect the environment and profit from the experience. It begins with cyclical thinking. If trash is trash, then We must pay to have it removed. If, on the other hand, it is energy and raw materials, it can be bartered for. If We could limit the contents of our trash cans to metal, glass and combustible materials, We could harness energy from the heat of its combustion, smelt down the metals and fuse the spent fuel's remnants in the remaining glass, or maybe even reuse some of the glass. This is no a Quantum Leap in technology. It exists today. If We simply limit the distribution of those things which can not be dealt with in this manner, We have solved the land fill problem. We have handled the problem of energy wasted gathering recyclable metals and We have contributed to our energy demands. Imagine for a moment that instead of dealing with city sewage at the local level, and using chemicals and energy, We moved it along "Slurry" lines, to arid regions of the south. Imagine the sewage of Southern California and Arizona pumped to the remote desert along their border rather than dumped into the Pacific with each heavy rain. Imagine a series of treatment ponds which ranged from marsh, to lake. The resulting compost could be mixed with sand for the production of fertile ground, used to grow corn and the water to grow it would also be made available. Given the nature of today's sewage, the corn would probably not be fit for consumption. But it would be good for fuel. Yes fuel. And not as a gasoline additive, but in the form of raw corn. My own home was heated with a wood "Pellet" stove. They are not uncommon where we lived. The pellets are made of compressed saw dust. Yet this stove works just as well on field corn. In fact, the corn burns hotter. With the development of "Highbred" corns, the potential exists to improve in this direction. In addition, if We could just learn to clean the "Trap" under the sink, rather that put chemicals down the drain and make some other changes in our habits, We might even be able to see this technology lead to the production of eatable food. Never the less, with corn fuels for steam engine driven electrical production, We could turn a huge liability into an asset. The heavy metals found in our waste water could be extracted. With the smelting of metals from our trash We find a inexpensive source of building materials such as steel studs, joist and rafters for housing, from tin cans and other metal products now straining our landfills. This, in turn, relieves the demand for wood, allowing prices to stay low



enough to allow for more aesthetic uses such as doors, trim, cabinetry and furniture.

The world produces more energy than We could ever use if only We set about to gather it. As for the question of waste, there is no waste except that which is artificially created by mankind. When We allow toxic [automobile] antifreeze to be sold along side biodegradable antifreeze for the same price, We subsidize toxic antifreeze. If it is true, as I have heard, that the toxic brands of antifreeze are actually a byproduct of the manufacture of certain plastics or their components, then We subsidize the manufacture of plastics by putting toxic coolants into our ecosystem. Until We arrive at a fair assessment of cost versus value in our economic system, our ecology will suffer unnecessarily. The solutions must come from government and they should work something like this.

Get on the phone and call around to see where you can recycle your “Green”, probably toxic, antifreeze coolant. You probably won’t find any place. There are machines in place to clean it up and take the water out of it. But you will probably not find anyone accepting quantities of it for disposal. The reason is that it is a one way system. Coolant goes into the environment at one end and never leaves. When your radiator hose breaks you have dispensed coolant onto the freeway never to be returned. When your company spills some you are likely to be fined, but even if there is a clean up, the coolant/antifreeze remains in the environment. When your car is finally junked the junkyard will deal with disposal. But in none of these scenarios was the manufacturer made responsible for the disposal of their product. Now there are those, in all sorts of industries, who are going to say that, in a situation where they were made to be responsible for reclaiming the products they manufacture, they would go broke. But as a student of Capitalism, you know that, that is not entirely true. Within a given industry, all things which are equal, effect each player equally. Of course in the field of antifreeze/coolant, all things are not equal. Some are toxic and some are not. The cost of being liable for the reclamation, and or disposal of those which are toxic, is far more than for non-toxic. If the toxic brands are truly the byproduct of the plastics industry, then the economics of Capitalism as they relate to our environment, have been thwarted. The cost of production using plastic over, perhaps metal, is being subsidized through the sale of toxic coolant. If government moves responsibly; to make the industry, any industry, which produces a product which is classified as toxic, responsible for the disposal of that product, a level playing field, which includes the environment in the cost of doing business, can be established. It will not do to punish industry for its poor choices after the fact. By forcing manufacturers to include the “TRUE” cost of their product in the sale price, industry can make informed and competitive judgments. Regulation can be kept to a minimum. Products which do not justify a place in an environmentally sensitive ecosystem will be barred from participation

*George Bailey*

economically, not by government mandate. Example: if you own a business which ends up with nickel [the heavy metal] in some of your industrial waste, you will be forced to place that industrial waste in a holding facility. Not only will you pay an exorbitant fee to place that waste in the holding facility, but you will be liable for its care into perpetuity. The cost of extracting the nickel from your waste is far in excess of the cost of producing new nickel. But this is only true if we discount the disposal fee and the ultimate cost to the environment.

On a related note: as I said before, when I was young they allowed lead in paint. It was good for paint because it blocked the ultraviolet rays that broke paint down, but it was bad for people so we banned it. It also used to be that, we used lacquer, to hold paint suspended as a liquid [lacquer based paint]. Back in the 1970's, the government [some governments anyway] put an end to lacquer based paints. They shifted the industry to a new breed of catalyst paints. Now it should be said of lacquer paints, that prolonged exposure to the could be dangerous or even deadly. But the long term effects were not all that much. In a closed and unventilated room one could get very light headed or even pass out and eventually die. Still, with adequate ventilation, lacquer and lacquer thinner [used to clean the spray gun or brushes] were safe. On the other hand, the replacement paints, of the catalyst generation, are deadly. A fresh air mask, with air filtered and pumped into the spray booth, is a must. It begs the question "Why?".

The environmental movement has very often been a pawn for political misbehavior. It is about a press who is uneducated and content to print what it is told without knowing enough to ask an intelligent question. It is about billions of dollars flowing out of legitimate business and into the hands of those who bribe officials to add another item to the "TOXIC" list [even if that bribe was a legal campaign contribution]. It is about their fellow officials turning a blind eye. It is about a lack of morality and the cost of it to a society.

There are far too many problems in our world for me to address them all, so let me end this segment on the environment with a rule of thumb on how I feel we should deal with the problems such as these in the future; and with a warning. Remember, in a Republic, compensation is given to those who, in return, study all the facts and make the decisions. As discussed earlier under the topic of election reform, go to your representatives with individual letters. Letters from you, not your organization which most likely tells you one side of the issue. Spend the time to hear your representative's informed point of view. Pay attention to how they have voted and why. If they make the wrong decision and it becomes known down the road; consider if it was an honest mistake, if they are incompetent or if they are corrupt. If it is the first, be content that they tried to rectify the problem. If it is one of the latter, "Vote" them out of office. And if they are replaced because they are corrupt, make certain that their replacement

sees them brought to justice. Pay as much attention to their problems and methods, as you do to those in tabloid TV or your favorite sports team and not only will you be better informed, but you will know those you vote for by another means than “Sound Bite” and political affiliations. You will have a face to go with the name at all levels, first hand knowledge of who they are when you step into the voting booth and true Democratic political freedom.

As for the warning: We have come to a point in history where the preservation of some animals has become of greater concern than the preservation of the people who live near them. In some parts of India it is now necessary to prove that a crocodile has eaten more than one person before the government will allow the crock to be destroyed. Today in our own Northwest, there are those people in Idaho who believe that the “Problem Bears” from Yellowstone National Park are being released within the parks of Idaho. Grizzly bears which have not been hunted and have no fear of man and who have a history of being “Trouble”, and were therefore removed from Yellowstone, are now assumed to be roaming free in northern Idaho. At the same time, the National Parks ignore our Constitutional right to bear arms and demand that those entering the park must go unprotected. This is a scenario for catastrophe for those who live near and around the park. It is tantamount to demanding that rattlesnakes be reintroduced to the inner cities in the West. It is the equivalent of saying that alligators in Florida have more right to the play grounds than the children.

In the late 1980’s Californians put an end to the practice of using dogs to hunt cougars. Unfortunately, it’s about the only way to find a cougar. The result has been a dramatic example of the kind of population rebound we could see in our oceans. Unfortunately it doesn’t address the problem of over population. Consequently, rather than the old situation where some of the animals were taken using dogs, now all of the population faces that old horror of starvation. Left with no alternative, the big cats now feed on house dogs and on occasion, people. It serves no one. And it is particularly hypocritical that at a time when wolves [who rip their living prey to bits, as that prey looks on] have been reintroduced by “environmentalists”, that the idea of a cougar being treed and then shot, is deemed callous. Yes, it is true that dogs do attack lions and bears. It does seem cruel. But it is in the nature of the dog and hopefully not the hunter. It can not be legislated: And starvation is a much crueler adversary; Crueler for the deer as well, who suffer from over populations of lions. It is unfair to the ranchers who must bear the losses. Now, with the flight of that special breed of Californian from California; who would legislate their own vision of reality throughout the West: spreading their political clout and self serving ideology: similar laws have passed in Oregon. It is a farce and a dangerous course. This revolution is about a place for everything and just as importantly, it is about

*George Bailey*

keeping everything in its place. I too, want to know that somewhere beyond the veil there remains a place that is wild. Where it is possible for people and the wild to cohabitate we should embrace it. Where it is not, We should preserve that which is established and protect it, letting those who enter, enter at their own risk. But it is not just nor prudent at this point, to begin to return settled land to the animals. Perhaps if the population of the world declines, such a dream can be achieved. Perhaps We as a country can champion such a social ideology. But We must never allow those who live in the cities to dictate to those who do not, strictly on the basis that those in the city can vote it so. It may be Democratic but it is immoral.

This section was to be strictly a mandate for changes within government or brought about by government. But it is fruitless to continue this section without confronting the core of our problems. Furthermore, the changes We must make in order to prevail can not be mandated: at any rate, not by man. If children are to be educated in any manner, they must first be educated at home and on the streets and within society itself. It is our example that teaches children in the most profound ways. It is not enough to tell young boys that women are human beings, when they are portrayed as faceless bodies in advertising. It is not enough to tell girls that, who they are, and the attributes they convey, are what counts; when the magazines which profess to further the cause of women, emboss their covers with pictures of beautiful “busty” models in plunging neck lines and with air brushed skin. It is not enough to tell kids to study hard when a high school diploma has no value. It won’t suffice to tell them that drugs are bad when alcohol and tobacco are the pass times of their parents. During the period after Vietnam, when the people who were active in the peace movement became divided and took up their individual banners, there came a philosophy which coined its name from of a book of the period. It was called “I’m OK Your OK”. Psychiatrists and Sociologists had compiled their information on the more “base” inclinations of our species and concluded that we all shared them to some degree. As a consequence, it was widely surmised that since we all shared these short comings, they must be natural inclinations and therefore acceptable. But long before this consensus was reached, these truths had been known to those who had read and heard the word of God; and these thoughts and deeds were known as “Sin”. And they knew from the “Word”, the word of God, that none of us is without sin. Whether you view it from a religious standpoint or a point of logic: the practice of promiscuous sex within a society will always lead to epidemic. Whether God set the rules to protect us from what he knew to be a temptation or whether he punishes us for breaking his law: whether you believe it is His law or the unbreakable laws of chance and nature, it doesn’t matter. Consider for a moment the human body and its openings. Four were designed to receive things into the body. The eyes, light ; the ears, sound; the nose, air; and the mouth, sustenance. All were designed to protect the body from invasion by harmful

organisms and particles. Of the two that remain which men and women have in common, they were made for purposes of excretion only. That is to say; they are one way openings. Defeating their intention is to defeat their design and in so doing, their safeguards. In the case of women there exists an additional situation. A design in which entree is intended; but there is no safeguard built in. As a result of this [along with the physical bodily abuse of homosexuality in men] AIDS was inevitable in a promiscuous society. If it had not been AIDS it would have been something else. I do believe that something of consequence needs to be done in order to find a cure for AIDS. But unless we change in practice and in attitude, there will be another epidemic to follow in its wake. This is not new. Gonorrhea and syphilis have been with us and remain with us. And "Safe Sex"?; what is this? When any percentage of condoms fail, how can you have safe sex. And why would people promote such a notion, if not simply to justify their own actions or perhaps it's because we have become a consumer driven nation and the hook used to sell nearly everything is sex. To say that kids are going to have sex anyway is to say that they will do "Crack Cocaine" anyway, so we should give it out in schools and promote it in our movies, our TV shows, our music and our advertising. It is a death sentence. Whether you see it as retribution or evolution, the promiscuity of our Nation insures it. Regardless of court decisions, public protest or political pressure; it is women who hold the key and in the end, bear the burden. It is women who are the vessel and it is a responsibility as well as a gift. It wasn't all that long ago that women understood that. It gave them pride and self esteem. It was a gift to be shared with only one. The reverence men held for women was directly related to that issue. It still is, more than most of us are willing to admit.

The mind set of the modern woman, it seems to me, draws much of its rationale from the sciences. With the contention that creation as recorded in the Bible is unlikely in view of professed evidence; faith has come under criticism and even mockery. I had occasion some years ago, to be traveling when I happened to tune into a talk show on the radio. The interviewer's guest was a Doctor of anthropology. She was expounding on her hypotheses and promoting her newly released book which, I believe, was being offered for sale by phone as the program aired. She theorized that humans are by nature predisposed to change "mates" about every four years. She sighted chemical changes which occur in the brain during the "euphoric" infatuation stages and others that were more sedate, which she associated with the comfortable "settled in" periods of marriage. She surmised that on the primitive plains of Africa, family bonding resulted from little more than the inability of plains homosapiens of the female gender [now becoming more upright as they descended from the trees] to carry their very young on their back. She sighted a four year period, as that time in which the pair would be mated, until the young would no longer be required to be carried by the female. She seemed to infer that the bound was more sexual and

*George Bailey*

survival oriented than anything else. When a younger man called into the program and asked as tactfully as he could if that hypothesis didn't sell men short, the question seemed to elude her. She continued by saying that as hunters and gatherers, men and women had been equals; each contributing to their survival. She credited the old "Double Standard" of sexuality to a move to an agrarian life, where men held the land and therefore the money and power. She referred to the animal kingdom, theorizing that promiscuity on the part of both sexes had probably been the norm as hunters and gathers. Unable to divide the wealth associated with agriculture, [and therefore unable to leave I suppose] women,[she thought] had been forced into single partner sex; while men had simply continued in the old ways. With the industrial revolution and the use of money as a commodity, now women could take half of the money and go. With the 1940's and women bringing home money, [back to the hunting and gathering] women's promiscuity was on the rise again. She professed that women's sexual drives were as great as men's and referred to the well know axiom that women flower sexually in later years; although she added that such norms of promiscuity tend to exist less in women with children and still less with in women with greater numbers of children. She spoke of an anthropological study, in which two of her colleagues had spent a thousand hours monitoring courtship in singles bars and the ramifications that such work may have in helping us to avoid conflict in the form of sexual harassment in the work place: how we might benefit by the knowledge of what not to do to insight sexual interest [or even aggression I suppose]. She held up as evidence, that other nations around the world now change mates every four years and that it is normal. She stated that, because Africa is the birth place of humanity, that rampant promiscuity there, is proof of its normality. She surmised that because female primates rub their genitals against each other and male testicles are formed at a different time than male chemical implanting of the brain, that homosexuality may be normal. She suggested that as plains hunters and gatherers, young girls reached puberty as many as ten years before becoming fertile and used the time to engage in promiscuous sex to practice the skills required for [what must have been a four year] marriage. She further sighted that, with the birth of the agrarian age fertility [due to lack of exercise] came earlier.

There was another caller, an elderly man, who sounded very much like an immigrant. He was nervous and inarticulate; trying very hard it seemed, not to offend. He asked if this wasn't a feminist view point. She insisted that there were no preconceptions involved and as I recall, the interviewer tired of the man's inability to make his question clear and shut him off. Whether he was safeguarding his guest or his percentage of the book sales, I can only guess; but consider this. Those who make their living interviewing the, so called, professionals of our time; be they anthropologists, economists, politicians or what ever; rely on their ability to acquire an interview in order to make a living

and as such; often times, owe their allegiance to the professional community rather than to the truth. What is the truth? I can not say that I am privy to all those bits of it that make up the whole. I can not argue that the theory of evolution does not hold some truths that are in conflict with literal interpretation of Creation as told in the Bible. But I do know that anthropology, as with psychology, is a subjective science and as such, does not qualify as science at all. I do know that before she [this anthropologist] began to ponder her [so called] facts, she brought with her some baggage. By becoming a doctor of anthropology she gambled her life's work that all those who taught her weren't incorrect. I know, that because she stated that she was on the board of "Planned Parenthood" somewhere, that she has little reverence for the miracle of life. I know, because she looks for evidence of our society within the animal kingdom, that she does not understand that it is not logic that differentiates us from other animals: for crows have the logic to leave walnuts on roads, in traffic, to crush them. Chimpanzees use sticks and tools to draw ants from their mounds. Grizzly bears have been known to out hunt those who set out to hunt them. It is not even language: for gorillas have learned to think and speak in sign language. It is the sense of immortality that makes Man something more than other animals. And while immortality is at odds with those who put their faith in science, it was, I believe that sense of immortality, that brought the idea of family to the plains of Africa; if the concept of evolution is your slant. We see ourselves reborn in our children. It is feminist propaganda that women were equal partners as hunters and gatherers. For the female Grisly Bear, courtship and copulation is short lived because she can take care of herself; but for those within the primeval food chain, the gathering of food was only part of the battle. As people moved away from the equator, the taking of hides for clothing and shelter was an essential task that could not be carried out by "gatherers" with poor upper body strength and subject to third trimester impediments. For that matter, the defense against other male humans was a function that was historically, largely left to men. So why then, with young firm girls dispensing sex all around in a promiscuous fashion, would men settle in with one? Why would they protect them at great risk to themselves [and don't say that it was because they held them as possessions because the Anthropologist said that these women were able to change mates every four years, remember]? The reason that these men protected their mates was because men have just as much capacity for love as women and because birth is humanity's only true form of creation. In the joining of a man and a woman, the only worldly link with immortality is achieved. If the progeny of your protected mate is the image of another male it is his immortality to which you dedicate yourself. This anthropologist assumed that at the end of four years the bound was broken when the offspring took to its feet upon the plain. But in the course of a four year sexual bond, would their not be another offspring conceived? Or would this sexually promiscuous society have promiscuous sex at four year intervals? If she

*George Bailey*

wishes to draw from the study of other cultures, then consider the infant mortality rates among hunters and gatherers bound by the seasons. You will find that family size in agrarian society is held in check only with relation to the ability to farm more land. Constant stores of food decrease the need to multiply, as more and more children survive. The “Double Standard” which infuriates modern feminists so, was just as likely the repercussion of women’s unwillingness to participate in a unwanted, unneeded and [with age] dangerous pregnancy. If men were [in general] as dominant, overbearing and totally sexually oriented as this doctor professed, then they would have simply had their way with the woman at home until they reached menopause or died in child birth. Women’s sexual drive is far more a mental function than men’s as far as I’m concerned. There is little evidence of physical “foreplay” [touchy-feely, as opposed to courtship] in the animal kingdom: of which anthropology is so fond. No need of it for the primitive men these young plains girls presumably prepared themselves for. It is my personal belief that, if in fact, women become more sexually stimulated in mid life, that it relates more to being freed from the exhausting task of child rearing. Or in the case of professional, or non child rearing women, it maybe an expression of the lack of personal fulfillment as evidenced by her own findings that women with children are less affected by this pattern. That, of course, brings us back to the search for self esteem through sex.

Another caller asked the author/anthropologist about the connection between the laws of the “State” and marriage. As I recall, she alluded back to her contention that in agrarian society, couples could not divide up “The Potatoes”, but with the dawn of the industrial revolution they could divide up the money; and so entered the “State”. I don’t know why they couldn’t divide up the potatoes. I don’t know how a doctor of anthropology could miss the fact that the Egyptian Empire had money to split up after selling the fruits of the harvest, two or three thousand years before the industrial revolution. If what she meant was that the land couldn’t be divided because men owned the land and women couldn’t, then she is buying into more of the feminist propaganda that says all men share in collective ownership of the world; as if all men own land and all men have wealth and good high paying jobs. In an agrarian society, it is the land “Lord” who owns the land, up until the New world was colonized.

On a related note: I saw one program on PBS which explained that women had controlled the art of healing since the beginning of time, until men [jealous of their power and wisdom] classified the art of healing as Witch Craft, murdered those who practiced it, and set themselves [men that is] up as healers in their place. According to this program, it led to the deaths of “millions” of women and gave the power of healing over to the newly formed, male run, medical profession that we see still in existence today. But I digress.



I don't know why she can't see these things, unless as a feminist, she is unwilling to except the fact that society as we know it is an extension of the sanctuary created for women by men, all those many years ago, in order to safeguard his and her immortality. Marriage itself is an institution to assure that the pregnancy to which he dedicates his life is of his own making. The reason for the State to become involved was not because of intervention by the church as has been suggested. Instead, it was so that all men would insure that each man would fulfill his own obligation. That is the reason for the "Common Law" marriage, which is not recognized in the church but was a creation of the State. It was a way to connect women with the possessions of the men they co-hebetated with, in order to insure that those men bore the financial responsibility of that woman, so that the "State" would not have to. It has not been the ability of women to earn their own money which has caused women to be more promiscuous in America today. It was not the industrial revolution, but the vote which liberated them. The women of the United States have turned away from men as provider and protector, in favor of the state. I am sure that many Feminists feel pleased with this. It gives them power, and power over men, whom they feel had power over them. But do not lose sight of the fact that society was, by and large, created by men and it can not stand without their support. Furthermore, if there is no place in society for men, they will not support it. You need only stand on a deserted road, alone, to understand what that implies. If the promiscuity of Africa is to be our mile post, then contemplate what the AIDS epidemic has brought to them. If anthropology intends to alleviate sexual tension in the work place, it will have to address the fact that hair style, nail length, scent, jewelry, cut and color of clothing, the gestures of the eyes, face and body, voice tone and intonation and makeup; will all have to conform to those acknowledged as correct for the male corporate warrior, before women will at last, not be viewed as feminine. And finally, if political and legal oppression of males is the ultimate aim of the feminist movement, I give you another movie to preview. Like "A Clockwork Orange", it was far ahead of its time. While "A Clockwork Orange" would show what happens when the rights of criminals outweigh the rights of society; this film showed the two possible options society may choose in the event that there is a total collapse of the one we know today. In each society, women had a place different from their place today. The movie was called "A Boy and His Dog".

My step father once punched a man out for cursing in front of my mother in a night club and being indignant about it when asked to stop. It was about reverence. As our women were protected, so were our children. Yet today a comedian can't seem to find a punch line without using profanity. Oft times the profane words or gestures are the punch line. We have become a society with reverence for nothing but our individual selves. Winning means more than participation in competition. Money, success and power are the only attributes

*George Bailey*

we applaud. When a mother takes a job for the sake of her husband's income, she will be judged by her children. When she takes a job for personal freedom, she may call it what she likes; but she will still be judged by her children as well. Make no mistake, the intuition of children is absolute. We have, all of us, been trying to live our lives to the fullest without concern for anyone else; least of all the children. I speak of professionals and drug addicts and all those in between. I speak of political forces which put all manner of issues ahead of the welfare of our children. I speak of the families of America as well, who have put body ahead of soul. America's children have grown up bitter and afraid. Their fear and low self esteem has manifest itself in tattoos, nose rings, gangs, drugs, sex, and all other manner of moral decline. It has been projected away from the families and onto society in theft, murder and crimes of hate. They wear advertising on their clothes to tell themselves they have value. They grow up in single parent homes without learning how the give and take of successful mirage is accomplished. They are taught by society to look for fulfillment in a partner who is only human and destined to fail: when they should be taught to forgive one another and seek fulfillment in God. If you put it on a graph, you will find that our economic strength and stature has declined along the same lines as our moral fiber and social conscience. You say that we are the only remaining Super Power? That is not America's strength. You say that these, the late 1990's are good economic times? You do not know the truth of what you have lost as it compares to the generation now retired. If you want to change this, it will cost you more than lip service. It will cost you more than money. It will cost you things that We as a Nation seem to value above truth and ideology. I remember when Gary Hart ran for the office of President of the United States. His campaign ended when he was caught being unfaithful to his wife. At the time, I heard a woman journalist ask a forum of her peers on television, if this was something that We as voters needed to concern ourselves with. "After all, we're looking for a commander and chief not a Saint", was more or less her slant. A number of years later a baseball star would spit in the face of a umpire. This same journalist would ask her peers what was happening to the rules. She seemed to feel that something of consequence needed to be done to curb this breakdown in the fabric of society. Her question concerning Hart was a significant contribution to the deterioration of that fabric. Within a few short years "Bill" Clinton would be able to get elected in spite a reputation for womanizing and philandering. It would be a dichotomy worthy of the Feminist movement that at a time when Congress is increasing the scope of "Harassment" laws, they would vote in a President with a reputation such as Clinton's. Of course it matters if a candidate cheats on his or her spouse. Two people who get married, have pledged themselves to one another. If a person would not keep a pledge to someone they once loved, why would you expect them to keep a pledge to you. If those who are known to be immoral and untrustworthy are championed as leaders, how can We expect our

children to adhere to our laws. Why should We care about the rules of conduct on a baseball field when We don't think them important enough to be considered when electing a President. One reason is because those who ask the questions [journalists] have more reverence for the institution of baseball than they do the institution of marriage.

In 1997, in the midst of a big up roar about a basket ball player kicking a camera man on the court; the question was posed, "How do We stop this". Some suggested harsher penalties for the player. Others said that there is nothing to be done to the players that will make them change in light of the money they make. I'm afraid the "others" are right. If We, as a society, care more about whether our favorite team wins than We do about the kind of players We have on that team, then We as a society are doomed. That may sound overly dramatic to you, but it is, in fact, the case. So long as We will tolerate any and all manner of behavior in order to win, team owners will be forced to allow the most talented players to play, regardless of their behavior. They have no other choice in a Capitalistic endeavor than to please their customers, the fans. So long as those same individuals are in the "Lime Light", so to speak, they will be role models. They will be emulated. Their lack of values, and contempt for the rules of society will manifest themselves in our youth.

The rules of society are based on religious law whether the agnostics and the atheists like it or not. We can not decide as a society that We will discard those laws which are in conflict with our personal life styles and expect the rest of Society to adhere to the ones which serve us personally. Supporting a society takes sacrifice. When you hear on the news that a well known shoe manufacturer uses under age kids in "Sweat Shops", on the other side of the globe, to make the shoes your kids wear: you have an obligation to insist that your kids don't buy those shoes. It doesn't matter if you have to fight with your kids to make them understand that morality is more important than fashion. That is your obligation. It is your "Obligation" to stay away from those hamburger "Chains" who are endorsed by "Bad Boys". It is your "Obligation" to stay away from the stadium when players miss behave. It is your "Obligation" to vote "Out" those who cheat on their wives or their taxes or their constituents. You must suffer the children unto Jesus. If you are not willing to stand for what is right when given the choice, there will be no recourse for you. Once society has raised up a generation, it must live with them. You can not mandate that those without moral fiber be put away. You can only put them away after they have hurt someone. So if you endorse a basket ball player attacking a referee, don't complain when a youth, who idolizes that ball player, attacks you in your home or on the street. You have endorsed it. Don't say that it is OK for movie heroes to "Blow People Away" without "Due Process" because they are the hero and as such don't make mistakes. Our policemen see themselves as the hero. We all see ourselves as the victim and the

*George Bailey*

hero. We all see the world from our own perspective and through our own prejudices. When “Dirty Harry” did what the courts were unable to, We began to give license to police in the real world, rather than address the Courts themselves. In our frustration, We, as a society, have embraced “An Eye For An Eye”. But those who understand the Gospel and those who study the lessons of the Middle East, can see that violence begets violence. Hate begets hate.

Today, many people put alarms on their cars to protect them from theft. They are quite loud and they go off at all hours of the day and night. When I was young they would never have been allowed on the basis of “Disturbing the Peace” ordinances. When we allow people to install a car alarm, we are saying that we will not stand together, but rather we will defend our own and that those who can not, shall suffer the consequences. The same kind of thinking can be seen in other theft deterrent products being promoted out there. This whole idea of “Don’t let it be you, let it be the other guy” is even being taught by law enforcement, even as it relates to our personal safety. It is the notion that, “those who are not smart, invite trouble on themselves” is a turning away from standing together to see things improve. It is the old “Divide And Conquer” axiom, and at its core is a lack of morality. It shows the drift away from a “Humane” social order and toward the social order of the natural world. It is survival of the fittest, the mentality of the herd.

No group has used this idea of “I’m OK, Your OK” to their political advantage more than those who call themselves “Gay”. In the Bible, the Lord declared the act of a man being with a man carnally, as an “Abomination”. From the medical point of view, ask a doctor about the physical repercussions of such an act. From a scientific point of view, because they can not reproduce, nature is constantly in the process of trying to eliminate them. Never the less, in our society, we have asserted that these people should be allowed to live among us with impunity. I have no problem with that. Forgiveness in the face of disapproval is the Christian way, and what I am promoting. Yet, they have pushed for the legal right to inflict themselves upon society in every forum from housing and the work place, to the right to teach their life style as an “alternative” to our children. They are disproportionate in the fields of art, and cinema; and they inundate our entertainment and fashion industries with their philosophies. They exaggerate their numbers and band together to the economic detriment of any city who would stand against them. They have used their ability to legally marry in one State to try and usurp medical liability benefits from others. They have tried to perpetuate themselves through recruiting of the young; and dared to be given custody of, and adopt, children. Enough! But before you accuse me of inciting people against the Gay community, let me reemphasize that violence and hate have no place in the work I promote. We live in a democracy, and as such

everyone is entitled to speak but we are also entitled to demand that our legislators say no to those ideals that society opposes.

In the end, homosexuality is little more than an incorrect sexual imprint. Like a hatchling goose who follows a surrogate mother, it can be demonstrated that humans can become sexually aroused by, violence, pain, feet, shoes and even cars. As pornography has promoted lesbian acts at a time when women have promoted the alienation of men, we find an increase in lesbianism. As homosexual men have gained legitimacy in our culture we see increases in homosexual males. If it were a manifestation of a physical reality, would we not expect to see that all homosexual males were more feminine than all homosexual females, and vice-versa? It will happen in nature that individual children will be born with the genitalia of both sexes. As a result of today's medical expertise, it will fall to the parents to decide which of the genitalia to keep and which to do away with. If sexuality were not, by in large, a learned response then we would expect to see larger numbers of Gays within this group as a result of a wrong guess by parents. If sexual preference were not learned we would not expect to see thin women as sexual symbols today when nearly all of the previous history of man embraced a far more robust version of beauty. Look to any hetero-sexual couple who married at an early age and who still has sex in their sixties. You will find individuals who were once sexually stimulated by young bodies and probably repulsed by infirmity, but who are now excited in spite of that infirmity: possibly even because of it. I am at a loss to understand why Psychiatry has pandered to the Homo-sexual propaganda in spite of Pavlov's clear and uncomplicated discoveries about the learned response. But that does not alter the reality of the situation.

The Gay community must ultimately take most of the blame for the way in which the public perceives them today. In the same way that "equal pay for equal work" has manifest itself into a unworkable "Feminist" fantasy in the work place; the open acceptance of Gays into our society has put many of us at odds with the teachings of our God. This is not something we can negotiate. We are not at liberty to exonerate homosexuals. Love is not sex and sex is not love; but rather it is an expression of love. If you truly Love a member of your own gender, why would you defile them with perverted sex? When the Gay community begins to show the kind of Love for members of their own gender that is not sexual in nature, then they will not be in conflict with what I am instructed. Until then, the fairest way for all concerned is "Don't ask, Don't tell, Don't adopt, Don't push" in those situations where such a response is appropriate, and in all other situations embrace modesty.

And what of our heroes? Would Michael Jordan be hailed for his exuberant love of the game for its own sake, if he had less ability or made less money? Can not a man be found to run for president who does not have to keep a mistress.

*George Bailey*

Would Santa Claus himself be exposed as a hoax if it were not for the revenue he produces. We look to movie stars to lead us when we know them to be the most insecure among us. It is fitting, in this age of unrealistic expectation, that we look to those who “Make Pretend” for answers. They speak to us of just causes from ivory towers, but I hold out little hope that they will champion this cause at the expense of their own powerful unions. And no actors can compare to some of those who preach the Gospel on mass media. The heroes and heroines are gone. They have been exposed as mortal by the press, in the name of good journalism and for the sake of a quick buck. But it is the nature of humans to fail. Therefore, it is all the more reason that we, you and I together, be the heroes of our children. We must begin to teach them by example: to show reverence for one another and to be deserving of reverence in return. For those times when we our selves fail; there is one hero you many give them will not be exposed. Who has nothing to be exposed. His name was Jesus. And while many hide from him and refuse to accept his existence, none has been able to discredit him. Consider this. It is up to each of us to discern our own place in the universe. I can not give you faith, although I wise it for you above all else. But if you have none, then the word of logic is all that is left you. If it is true that heaven and hell do not exist on another plain; then they exist only as the direction one chooses to live. The thief will live among thieves. The murderer will live among murderers. The good and the kind will find themselves surrounded by those like them. If sex is the focal point of your life, you will be consumed in the pursuit of it. The same is true of money or power. But if love of people, rather than of their bodies, is your goal, then you will find yourself surrounded by that as well. So you see, if you believe, or if you choose not to, the rules which raise nations and without which nations fall, haven’t changed since Sodom and Gomorra or Rome. They are the rules handed down through the ages and the credit for their origin has always been given to God.

When I was young, we listened to the explicit language of “Louie Louie” on the radio and snickered as children will when they sneak something by their parents. Today the song still plays on “oldies” stations, and far worse pervades the airwaves. The difference is that it is condoned. The parents that arose from the “Baby Boom” have some how come to believe that because they have grown to maturity, that all manner of knowledge should be open and exposed. But to everything there is a season. Among them a time of innocence. Children need to be protected from premature exposure. To deny such protection is just so much more of the selfishness so characteristic of our generation. It is better that our television shows be “Air brushed glossies” of those things we aspire to; than mirrors of the sad society we have become. If a parent left a child exposed to the elements, or an infant home alone while going out to party, that parent would be punished by society. So how is it that we as a society feel no responsibility to monitor what is left on news stands and broadcast or cabled or beamed; when it

has become obvious that children are being exposed. It is not enough to say that it is the responsibility of the parent to preview or sensor what their children see. In the first place, it presumes that all parents are willing and capable of monitoring a child's every moment. In a society where so many forms of media have access to our homes and our lives, it is the equivalent of allowing prostitutes to do their business [not just solicitation, but the acts they perform] on the streets of our neighborhood and proclaiming that those who are offended should keep their draperies drawn, and their children from the window. We, who choose not to be inundated by such things, have been schooled in the belief that our right to be free of such things is secondary to the rights of those who wish to be exposed to them. It is not fair, nor true to the constitution. The airways and cable franchise monopolies belong to us every bit as much as they belong to others. What's more, the society which is being denigrated is every bit as much ours as it is those who wish to drag it down. And the costs paid as a result of such decay is leading to the demise of all of us in equal measure as well. In addition, the American people at large are represented around the globe by those entities who transmit from within our borders. We are demeaned as a nation and perceived accordingly. There is a place for everything. But each thing should and must be limited to its place. This idea does not escape liberals who fight to ban second hand cigarette smoke. Why does it evade them on every other issue?

Concerning the education of children; if we are to raise them to respect our laws then "we" must respect our laws. If you buy something you suspect is stolen then you are a thief's accomplice. If you work or pay some one to work "Under the table", you show contempt for the government that you may very well ask your child to lay down their life to defend. If you sign a contract, you agree to all the terms of the contract, not just those which suit you. We have in this country what is known as a generation gap. It was bigger rift when I was young but still it exists. We speak of it as universal but it is not. In simple tribal societies it is often nonexistent. The causes of such "gaps" lie in the realization that society is hypocritical. Hypocrisy is an affront to innocence. Always has been, always will be. With the realization that what we have been taught is not what is practiced, comes indignation and loss of respect. If my generation and their offspring suffered less from this "gap" it is because we have neither hidden the truth nor professed to aspire to anything that wasn't self serving. It is the responsibility of Government to keep the laws within the realm of what is reasonable to ask of society. It is the responsibility of Society to honor those laws which have been forced upon it. At the same time, it is the responsibility of society to resist those laws which come into moral conflict with what is true and correct. You are obliged, in a free society, to either honor all the nations laws, or if you think a law unreasonable, you have the means to try and change that law. But when you break the law because you disagree but are not willing to put forth the effort, then you are a threat to democracy and a champion of anarchy. Today, because people

*George Bailey*

are not willing to stand for change, but rather disregard the law, you allow government to put us all outside the law; so that government may come after anyone it chooses to, so long as it leaves everyone else alone. This was the formula for Nazi Germany. It is the mentality of sheep.

There is a quote from the Bible which most of us have heard and even used, while its message has become almost obscure. It is “and the truth shall set you free”. Its reference is to the laws of the Jews and how the “Covenant” of the “OLD TESTAMENT” was exchanged for the covenant of the “NEW TESTAMENT”. The original covenant was the “Contract”, so to speak, between God and His chosen people, the Jews. If you haven’t read the bible you probably know from the movie, “Raiders Of The Lost Ark”, that the tablets of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written, were placed in the Arch to signify that covenant. Delivered by Moses, these laws, these Commandments, of the Old Testament are beyond our capability as mortal beings to live up to without failures from time to time. The recompense, or payment, of the sin offering had, according to the Bible, become ritualistic to the point of not serving its original purpose any longer. Like the pomp and circumstance of the “Church”, its followers were simply going through the motions. Indiscretions were still a part of every day life. They simply paid for their indiscretions with offerings. With the coming of Christ there was a new covenant made. Christ, “The Lamb” would be the new sacrifice of the New Covenant. It is a covenant of faith. Faith in God and in Christ. God: who is good, and who Is the “Light” and the “Truth”. And with faith in these things, and in the “WAY” [the way in which the bible instructs us to live], “The truth shall set you free”. This is how a young United States could have both unheard of personal freedom, and at the same time be known as a nation of high morality. It is why the old USSR lost all sense of itself when freedom came. For when you love “The Truth”, you will see what is false for what it is. Ask a dying human being what is precious and they will tell you of all those things we have cast away as a Nation. But if you live according to the Gospel and in the “Way” that it prescribes you will find your rewards daily. Now there are those who believe that what I have just suggested is that you live your whole day in prayer. But that is not “The Way”. Life is a journey to an end which is not within our understanding. The “Way” is the set of precepts we are to use to deal with what life has in store for us so that when we reach the end of our journey we will have learned the lessons of life.

When the first Spaniards landed in South America, the Emperor Montezuma could have had them slain, but he did not. He had heard the prophecies of the return of a kinder God; a God who, presumably, did not require human sacrifice. As a result of his inaction, the Conquistadors annihilated most of the natives of the region; and yet, in so doing, the God of Moses was instated, perhaps reinstated, in South America. In that very harsh way, the prophecy was fulfilled.



It is not given to us to anticipate or understand the will or the doings of God. And just as the leaders of the Jews would expect the Messiah to “Report” to them upon arrival, so would Montezuma be thwarted. There are those who would point to the mix of Catholicism and paganism in Central and South America, and say that it is not the God of Moses who is being worshipped there; and I would have to agree. Just as there are those in this country who pick and choose what they will accept or reject from the Bible; the churches of Man are very often in conflict with Christianity. They very often create their own version of God and put that god before the one true God. But because the churches of Central and South America profess to be Christian, they do introduce the people to the Bible. It is a letter to you from God that many of you have not bothered to open. It describes “The Way”. If you look through it for excuses to live outside the way, you will find them. In the same way that lawyers have justified the ruin of our legal system, specific lines and phrases can be manipulated to bolster your argument. After all, it was translated into Old English from languages of another age. At the turn of the century, it would be translated once again into modern English. But if you take its lessons as a whole; if you look for understanding, for The Way, you will find it.

It is difficult for a modern civilization without Kings ruling over us, to deal with both fearing and loving some one who rules over us absolutely. Yet, like any father, when a child is bad, they will be punished, and that which has been given them, will be taken away. And when they return to that which is good, they will be forgiven. And when they tell us what we want to hear but continue to disobey; a father will continue to hold out hope, but grow estranged. You can not demand God’s love on your terms. Do not try to judge what you can not fathom. After all, if God created us rather than the other way around, then our purpose is to affirm his glory, not the other way around. People who have a problem with faith always seem to point to the horror and suffering on earth as proof that God either doesn’t exist or is not worthy. But earth is not heaven. God gave you life when you were deserving of nothing. He gave it to you out of love. The story of “Job” is the story of the purpose of human kind. We are here to affirm God. When We do that, We are rewarded. When We fail, Satan laughs in indignation and yet, even then, God will forgive us if we are repentant and ask to be forgiven. Now, what does that mean? Do you think that the murderer who gets last rights on his death bed is going to heaven? Is that why you doubt God? Think about it. A person is a piece of clay to be molded; a blank tape to be recorded on. It is what we make of ourselves that makes us what we are. A person who is frail but continually fantasizes about beating people when they wrong him, hurts his soul as much as any thug [who does it for real] hurts theirs. When you fantasize about sex with someone, it is imprinted on that which makes you, “YOU”. We have come to this place to see if we can make ourselves into something that would fit in heaven. Someone who could murder isn’t going to be that. And yet, someone

*George Bailey*

who repents after having once murdered could be. The catharsis, the metamorphosis, of a murderer into a Christian could be worthy of God's forgiveness. This then is the meaning of "Judge not lest Ye be Judged". The story of the Paul is the story of a man of power and authority who repented and followed in the way.

There have been those who worship animals and there are those who worship nature, but if we alone have souls then it should be clear that we are given dominion over the earth as a child is given toys by a parent. As all children learn from toys, we too learn whether we will honor our Father and cherish His gifts or be destructive and disrespectful of that which has been provided for us. The earth and all that is in it is a reflection of what we have made of ourselves. It is a tool which we use to mold ourselves, each in their own way, and should we fail to honor our gift we will be left with nothing. But nature is also a guide for us. I remember once hearing a women's right's activist say that God was a She. But God does not rule by emotion. All things die to make room for that which is to come. Look at the way the strong pray upon the weak in the scheme of nature; and ask yourself, "Is this reality reflected in the strengths of motherhood?" And yet, how could a system of renewal work in any other way? How can power be passed on if it is not relinquished. Without the predator there is starvation. Without the passing of the torch there is only the preservation of the status Quo. As I have tried to explain to you, you are free to create what ever gods you choose. But the Bible, which teaches the Word of the Lord God, refers to Him always in the masculine gender. If it is He whom you wish to worship, then surely you will worship Him as He wishes and not according to your wishes.

The way in which the women's movement has turned its back on the role for which nature obviously designed them: in favor of a role they view as some how more gratifying, or as affording them more freedom, is at the heart of the matter. As for freedom: who among us is not a slave? It is in our nature to enslave ourselves, despite the freedoms of our nation which we so cherish. We are slaves to ambition, to greed, to lust, to drugs, to food, to fear, to anger, to pride. And yet, when we become the servants of God, these false masters lose their luster and we become free. The "Truth, Sets Us Free."

To all those of other beliefs, whom I may have offended by entering this passage, I would say that I do not defend the organizations which profess to lead us to Christ through the building of temples or shrines. The Bible speaks of the Disciples returning after building many churches, but there is no mention of them setting in place a single stone. It is Christ who is the cornerstone and it is in the hearts of those who follow him that you will find his church. But I ask you to examine your own beliefs. Ask your self if that to which you pay homage has set you free or left you servant. If Jesus was not the Christ, then ask yourself why God no longer speaks to directly to the Jews: why they were scattered from their

promised land and why their enemies were allowed to abuse them so and yet they have not been destroyed. I am no prophet. I have been approached by no angles, have heard no voices, seen no miracles beyond those given to all of us: the birth of my children, the renewal of spring, the setting of the sun. But I have faith. And while it is not as strong as it could be, it is something I work at. Work with me. "Seek the truth and ye shall find it". "And the truth shall set you free". Take this time, your life, your situation, and revel in it; not in its trappings. And as good begets good, we will see a change.

There were two versions of "The Poseidon Adventure"; the book and the movie. In one the faithful prayed and were saved along with those who fought to reach the surface. In the other, those who prayed but did not make the effort, perished. I am of the belief that God rewards those who make the effort. If we are to have a revolution, it will take effort. I know you are out there. It's in your music. It's in your movies and books. You've been waiting for "The dawning of the age of Aquarius". You've been watching for extra-terrestrial beings to swoop down and take charge. You've been setting back in restless anticipation, awaiting the arrival of every one from Ross Perot to the "Mighty Quinn", to turn things around. But it can't happen without you. I urge you to prepare to stand for the revolution. Not to bark or to strike out; or to gather in angry mobs: but simply to stand up and be counted. Like the followers of Gandhi and the Christians in Rome; speak the truth in face of adversity, and stand with humility in the face of opposition. For the truth is light and in its presence darkness can not exist.

Throughout this book I have continually returned to discussions on God. The God of Abraham and of Moses and of David. I have encouraged you to read the Bible for yourself so that you can grow closer to him and understand "The Way". I can not tell you the meaning of life, nor can I prove God's existence to you. But I can tell you that He reveals himself in every way short of appearing to us. I know that there are many of you who can not find faith. I find that a tragedy; for all that we enjoy in America we owe to God. The very fact that it is against the law to kill you or steal from you, you owe to the Word of the Bible and the faith of others before you. If we were to live by the code of nature, which is survival of the fittest, you would have no argument against those who broke the Ten Commandments. The fact that they prevailed over you would assert and justify their right to do so. When a male lion takes over a pride, he kills the cubs of the male he displaces. The female, whose cubs were killed, will court his attention and bear his young. They are not wrong. They know no shame. When God gave the Ten Commandments to the Jews He was teaching them shame. And contrary to what most of us have been taught, He told them to take an "Eye For An Eye", not for vengeance [which belongs to Him] but as a limit. Not a hand for a loaf of bread, but a loaf of bread for a loaf of bread. He made them pay offerings for their trespasses to teach them to feel loss; for, guilt is to feel the loss of the bond

*George Bailey*

between you and God. It is a debt for transgressions made against He who gave you your very life. But He taught them that they could relieve themselves of that debt and with it, their guilt. The scientific community will say that this is simply positive and negative reinforcement at work, and I would agree. I would also tell you that you were made from the beginning to be programmable, and that it is you who chooses which programs you will incorporate into that which is you.

People often speak of the guilt associated with being raised as a Catholic, but no one who has made an acceptable offering and asked for forgiveness should feel guilty if they are repentant. Remorseful? Sure; but we are taught in the Bible that the Jews made a covenant with God. That covenant [symbolized by the tablets of stone on which the Ten Commandments were written] was placed in the Ark built as the Lord had instructed. But the Jews broke their covenant, their contract, with God. They had the Ark of the Covenant taken from them. They no longer had a means by which to exonerate themselves of the guilt which all of us bring on ourselves in one way or another. Now, if you don't know the story, I can tell you that it left them in the same boat with the rest of the world. They didn't see it that way and most Jewish people still don't. But we know that because they had no covenant, no contract, they could not atone. But the Prophets had told of God's promise of a New Covenant. They spoke of a Messiah, the Christ, who would be the Lamb that was the sacrifice for all mankind. In the same way that Montezuma would expect the God who returned to Central America to raise him up, the heads of the Jewish faith expected the Christ to glorify them. But you know the rest of the story. There have always been Jews who were believers in Christ. Jesus was, after all, himself, a Jew. Unfortunately, for most Jews however, it has been easier to discount Jesus. Like all those who need a set of rationalizations to justify their actions, being God's only chosen people allows for a broad scope of superiority. Please do not take this as an indictment of the Jewish people. On the contrary, they do themselves enough harm. Surely the ways in which God has declined to intercede for them, even into this century, is legendary. Had Christ not died as a result of their folly, the world would have had no deliverer. Surely the one who Hitler served was angered at that and not at the fact that they allowed Jesus to be killed. So do not place your hate at their feet for fulfilling the prophecy that has delivered you. It is the Jewish people who were chosen, and as I understand it, they are still given the promise of the Prodigal Son, if they will but except their Savior; our Savior. In fact, when a Jew excepts Christ it is to God's glory. It is the fulfillment of prophecy.

Because Christ died for you, you have an acceptable offering. I tell you these things because I want you to understand that, that guilt which society has taught you to feel so that we can live together in peace, need not drag you down. There has been a sacrifice made in your name and his name was Jesus; and he died to exonerate all mankind, Jews and gentiles alike. All you need to do is except that,

admit your guilt and repent. That means understanding your error, be ashamed, be guilty, so that you will have negative feelings about doing it again, and be forgiven; so long as you understand that the forgiveness comes to you as a divine gift. It was provided for you by God Himself through His only son, your Savior Jesus Christ, the Lamb sacrificed for your sins. You are in his debt and it is only through him that you can be exonerated.

There are those who will tell you that you can forgive yourself. But if you had the power to do that, you would feel no shame to begin with. There are those that say that mankind has made the Ten Commandments and that teaching our children right from wrong is enough. But without God, the rules are subject to change. We see it today as groups like the “Man Boy Love” organization [ a group of Pedophiles] try to promote that theirs is a natural love. Today they promote their agenda by saying that they have the right to make films in which adults who look like children are involved in sexual acts. It is a continuation of the battle at the edge of the envelope. If the films can be made, at some point in the future, they hope to justify the activities depicted in the films, with the same old notion that: because such activity exists, it is “OK”. But it is like the lion who destroys the cub because he can and because he knows no shame.

In the days of Royalty in which Monarchs reigned Supreme and Lords and Ladies were given the power of life and death over the peasants that lived to serve: there was a man of some power, who was given over to an obsession with sex and worse. His twisted thoughts and deeds would become legendary as a result of his writings about his dementia. He is known as the Marquis De Sade and what he did to others [including young boys] is the stuff of nightmares. Still, he was able to carry on such practices, even write about them, so long as he did not directly confront the power of the days Church Politic. And why? Because he could. For the same reason that a life boat capable of holding over seventy people, would be lowered into the water with twelve on board, as hundreds waited, locked in below decks on the Titanic.

There are those who say that man has evolved to be above the law of the jungle, but science teaches that those who have not learned right from wrong by age five, will not learn it ever. And if it must be learned, then surely it is society which has evolved to teach us, not us who have evolved. Our society based right and wrong on the laws handed down to Moses. These are moral issues. Whether you like it or not, morality and politics can not be separated, as society itself it built upon morality and politics determines whether or not a society will endure. In 1998 I heard a Black man defend President Clinton’s sexual escapades with a young White House intern. Morality was not the issue, he said, but rather the state of the economy. But slavery was a moral issue neatly separated from politics for the sake of economics; as was Women’s rights, as is the border issue, as is the Drug War. So I must ask all those politically correct thinkers to

*George Bailey*

contemplate their position on whether or not Mr. Clinton's activities in the Oval Office are private and without moral implication. What about if it had been a eighteen year old "Mark" Lewinski? What if he were seventeen; or seven? In the end, they are all moral issues. When someone takes a shopping cart from a grocery store, they have stolen it and it is a moral issue. When the elderly vote to lower their taxes at the expense of school children, it is a moral issue. When teachers use their unions, to use students, to justify a paycheck, instead of teaching; it is a moral issue. When children disappear in this country each year at the hands of strangers, never to be heard from again, and we put our efforts into imprisoning pot smokers, instead of helping those kids; it is a moral issue. When Black youths kill other Black youths and that subculture is celebrated in "Gangster Rap" music, it is a moral issue. When the sale of the music becomes more important than the lives of the children of the inner city, it is a moral issue. When the promotion of violence becomes a source of pride within the Black and Hispanic community, it is a moral issue that requires a moral leadership to defuse.

The world is a difficult place and history demonstrates that there is much evil in it. Many would let it turn them away from God. But I ask you, if a great benefactor gave everyone a new car tomorrow, would you complain if you got a less expensive make and model. Would you proclaim an injustice if someone else got a lemon? From your first thought, all that you have ever known has been a gift to you. Would you be an ingrate? Do you feel entitled? By what right? How do you come to judge what you can't understand? I can tell you this, that all things have a purpose. How have we come to this time? Through history. Through the history which dates back to the beginnings of the cosmos. Through the history in which dinosaurs ruled and left in their wake the fossil fuels of coal and oil. Through the history of Egypt and Greece, which established cultures in the old world. Through the history of the Hebrews which established right from wrong, and morality based on the value of an individual: and the proof of that value based upon the gift of life granted to them by their Creator and the love of that Creator. Through the history of western Europe which embraced Christianity and Chivalry. Through the history of the Magna Carta and the Constitution of the United States of America which established the concept of human rights as God given rights. Through a bloody Civil War which established those rights for ALL men, and ultimately, all women. Through an industrial revolution which freed mankind and enslaved him in the same stroke, with energy stored up from the days of the dinosaur and with the power of Capital. The world is forever in conflict and the forces of evil do battle against the forces of good toward an end that will ultimately glorify God. He taught us guilt so that that we might live in peace. He limited our wrath with "An Eye For An Eye" and reserved vengeance for His own so that we would not be consumed by it. He taught us, through Jesus, that the way to deal with those who wrong us is to forgive them and let them

burn with shame. This is the God who is the Light, The Great I AM. So why would he insist that each trespass be returned with a trespass in kind, when even mere mortals like ourselves can see what that brings to places like the Middle East, where both sides proclaim themselves to be the followers of the God of Abraham? Is the God of Abraham pleased by the perpetual torment of his children? Do they fight like Pit Bulls or Cock Roosters for his entertainment? Of course not.

When Rodney King was beaten, who paid? The tax payer. And who benefited? The lawyers and those who gained power by propagating hate between the races.

When you hate your spouse who pays? You and your spouse and your children and your family. And who gains? Your lawyer and the government service industries.

When you hate God who pays? You and all those around you. And who gains? You know his many names.

When you hated Communism who Paid? All of us, in taxes, in blood, in the loss of trust. And who gained? Arms manufacturers and arms buyers, the government and the military.

When we hated Iraq who paid? The same. And who gained? The Princes of the desert and the arms manufacturers

When you hate abortion, who gains? Those who sponsor abortion and those who perform abortions. And who pays? The children who can not hear the truth for the shouting.

When you hate drugs, who pays? the Addict, and those they hurt. And who gains? The drug dealers, from the ones on the street to the ones in government.

When you hate prostitution who pays? The prostitute and the runaways. And who Gains? The pimp and the pervert.

When you hate those who wrong you, who pays? You do, for it will eat you up. And who gains? The lawyers and the Devil himself.

And when we set aside a special designation for those who commit an offense by calling it a "Hate" crime, we polarize ourselves into groups and set ourselves apart in ways that only perpetuate the problem.

I try to draw you back towards God and morality because it is morality which gives us value. Were it not immoral to kill me, my life would be of no value. Were it not immoral to practice sex except in the confines of a loving relationship, rape would simply be a manifestation of Survival of the Fittest. "I am able to, therefore I have the right".

I have outlined many institutional organization changes here within. From health care to taxes, from the Postal Service to election reform. These represent a

*George Bailey*

blueprint, the nuts and bolts, of a country designed to serve its owners. I have labored for a decade to solve our physical problems. But what has come to me over the course of this undertaking; what has been revealed to me which is most important, I never could have imagined when I began. The changes I will call on you to make are truly worthy of a new millennium but be patient, the best is yet to come. Still, without a sense of morality as a nation we can not save ourselves from those forces which enslave us. When we reject the ideology of mankind as a base animal and except that, that which we all strive for is self worth and self esteem; then we can to rebuild. When we can face our rationalizations without fear, comforted by the knowledge of God's love and forgiveness, we can triumph.

Look to your religious leaders as teachers who can help to explain the text of the Bible. This, then, is their purpose. It would be 1996 before such a teacher on TV would explain to me the limitations of "An Eye For An Eye". But do not look to them as holy men who can exonerate your sins. Seek out the truth for yourself. Do not allow your church to stand between you and your Savior and your Savior will intercede on your behalf with your Creator. Remember always that a belief in God will not save you unless you are a perfect soul, for Satan surely believes in God. Your salvation is in the hands of the lamb.

The final leg of part two of this book begins with political interest groups, other than the environmentalist groups. These organizations band together in the self interests of their leadership and drive a wedge between those sensible people found between either end of the spectrum. The first of these groups we will deal with is the "Women's Movement". Through the late 60's and since, many changes have come to pass. Some of them, such as equal pay for equal work, are fair. Beyond that simple equity, most of our new laws have flown in the face of reality. For every woman who can claim success in a career, there are a hundred who simply got a job. Not only did our educational system shift its focus from teaching, to child care; but other government agencies in the social services grew as well. The lowering of wages through a glut of available labor also saw more and more falling into entitlement programs such as welfare and food stamps. But the real problem is one of supply and demand. When women left the profession of home maker for the workforce they changed the dynamics of the workforce. It works like this. If you are a single person or you are a married person who is the soul supporter of your household, you will require a certain amount of income in order to live at the standards we Americans have come to expect. You will have to receive that amount or you will not be able to take the job. If everyone in your job market is in the same situation, then in order to find workers, employers will have to pay that amount. That was the situation in the 1950's and 60's. But as women began to enter the workforce in large numbers, the equation changed. If yours was the second income within a household [or even the main income if



your spouse worked] you could afford to work for less. Therefore, as married women began to enter into the workforce, any couple who had two incomes would do well, even if they both individually made less than the amount just discussed as the bare minimum. Because working couples could work for less, they were far more employable. This would mean that, not only could they work for less as individuals, but as more and more jobs began to pay less in response to this reality, the good paying jobs would decline in number. And while single income families would be barred economically from competing for the jobs whose wages were in decline, dual income families would not be barred from competing for one or even two of the better paying jobs. Young married couples could compete in such a workforce. Even married couples whose children had grown, could compete against couples who chose not to have children. But it wasn't the couples who decided not to have children who caused the situation. It was the majority of households: those with young children, that had seen the success of those who first began the trend and decided to embrace it. The result would be that married couples with children would either have Mom at home or economic security. Single people would either get the good jobs or flounder.

Today we hear more and more about the need for Daycare and the need of the State to pay for it. As you should now understand, the implementation of such a program would only lower the amount that people are able to work for, thus lowering the bar further, and at the same time, it would increase taxes. The end result would be to grow government while lowering wages. Similar dynamics can be seen in parental leave situations that insure that once a member of a family unit has acquired one of the better paying jobs, they will not be forced to risk it in order to take time off to have a baby. Employees who do not justify special consideration with market forces [how indispensable they are] can use socialist legislation to place a financial burden on their employer. While I have not read the legislation I am inclined to believe it largest percentage of recipients are government workers which means that it is taxpayers who are the employer. I am also inclined to believe that small businesses are exempt in the same way they are often exempted from paying today's "Minimum Wage". So that the net affect of such legislation is to provide a sort of "Welfare" subsidy for government and pseudo-government workers at taxpayer expense, during a period when Welfare for the poor was being dismantled.

This is the reality of the world in which we live in today. Changes I will outline before we are through will help us head back toward a place where Mom can stay home, if that is what we strive for. I do not suggest that women should remain "bear foot and pregnant". Rather I suggest that if you don't wish to be a "Mother of Consequence", you refrain from having children. I suggest that both men and women put more effort into choosing a mate, than into purchasing a new car. Seek out and marry some one who can be your best friend and sex will

*George Bailey*

find its place in your marriage. Mary because the sex is good and it will not sustain you. These are of course, things which can not be mandated. They are matters of conscience.

In the area of mandated change, let us address the negative impacts of those laws which have come to pass over the last twenty five years. While I stand against abortion, there are limits to one's ability to affect change. In the campaign of 1996 when the press was again busy stopping the spread of tax reform; it happened that Steve Forbes was asked about the issue of abortion. He replied something to the effect that while he wanted to put an end to abortion; when a democratic republic is split over such an issue, as ours is, the only way to put an end to it is to change the way in which people view the issue. To put it another way, you can't force your half of the country's beliefs on the other half of the country. For one thing, you will never get the votes you need to go either way. Not only does this reflect democracy in action, but it reflects the Christian realities of life. So long as government money or facilities are not used for the practice, we, as Christians within a democratic republic are forced to try and change public opinion. So long as such decisions do not force us to participate personally, we need to voice our opinion, stay separated from those so engaged, help to offer alternatives, and remember to always forgive those who seek forgiveness when they are repentant. Instead of holding to this philosophy, the so called "Christian Right" said that Mr. Forbes' views were unacceptable and the press was eager to spread the news. The "Christian Right" gave their support instead to Buchanan and his message of global mistrust. As a result, the republicans were split and Clinton was allowed to win again: which is what the liberal press wanted. Once again the non-issue of abortion had determined the outcome of the elections.

There within, lies the reality of abortion in America today. For those among us who would have it banned, there is the reality that it is neither your right nor your moral responsibility to change the law; but rather to turn the people, as prescribed by Mr. Forbes: so long as you are not forced to be involved. It is with this in mind that I say that the Gay movement has crossed that line. The laws which proclaim to give equality to homosexuals have gone beyond protecting their civil rights. As Christians we are told that such behavior can not be condoned. As American citizens we are told that it is against the law not to condone such behavior. It is the latest "twist" in the laws which have come out of affirmative action. Laws that were designed to give a leg up to minorities have been perverted to cover women [a majority of the total population] and now Gays.

This is a copy of the 1996 Forest Service rules entitled:  
Harassment-Free Workplace Policy

**POLICY:** The National policy states: The Forest Service will not tolerate harassment based on race, national origin, religion, age, mental or physical disability, color, gender, or any other factor such as sexual orientation, marital status, union affiliation, veteran's status, or political affiliation that might be used to categorize or identify any employee.

The National policy is our standard as the FS [forest service] strives for a harassment-free work environment where people treat one another with respect. Managers, supervisors, and all employees, as well as our contractors, cooperators and volunteers have the primary responsibility for creating and sustaining this harassment-free environment [ by example, by job supervision, by coaching, by training, by contract enforcement, and by other means]. All employees, contractor personnel, and visitors must take personal responsibility for maintaining conduct that is professional and supportive of this environment.

**ACTION:** Managers and supervisors must take immediate action to

**REQUIRED:** stop harassment, to protect the people targeted by harasser, and to take all reasonable steps to ensure that no further harassment or retaliation occurs. Employees who witness harassment should report it to the proper authority.

**LOCATIONS:** The FS work environment covers any area where employees

**COVERED:** or where work-related activities occur including travel. This includes field sites, government buildings and other facilities such as fitness centers and campgrounds. Also included are vehicles or other conveyances used for travel.

**WHAT:** Harassment is coercive or repeated, unsolicited and

**HARASSMENT:** unwelcome verbal comments, gestures or physical

**IS:** contacts and include retaliation for confronting or reporting harassment.

Examples of harassment include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Physical conduct:** Unwelcome touching, standing too close, inappropriate or threatening staring or glaring, obscene, threatening, or offensive gestures.

**Verbal or written conduct:** Inappropriate references to body parts, derogatory or demeaning comments, jokes, or personal questions; sexual innuendoes; offensive remarks about race, gender, religion, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, political beliefs, marital status, or disability; obscene letters or telephone calls; catcalls; whistles; sexually suggestive sounds; loud, aggressive, inappropriate comments or other vocal abuse.

**Visual or symbolic conduct:** Display of nude pictures, scantily-clad, or offensively-clad people; display of intimidating or offensive religious, political,

*George Bailey*

or other symbols; or derogatory drawings, cartoons, or other graphics; offensive T-shirts, coffee mugs, bumper stickers, or other articles.

Individuals who believe they are being harassed or retaliated against should exercise any one or more of the following options as soon as possible:

Tell the harasser to stop the offensive conduct; and/or

Tell a manager or supervisor about the conduct; and/or

Contact your personnel office, a special Emphasis Manager, or any other individual you trust that would take action.

In addition, you may seek help from: Civil Rights Office: Employee Dispute Resolution Office: your local Employee Assistance Program office, or the RO Employee Relations Group.

**PENALTIES:** Any employee who engages in harassment will face consequences ranging from verbal warnings and letters of reprimand, up to and including termination from employment, depending on the seriousness of the misconduct. Managers and supervisors who do not take action when they know or suspect that harassment is occurring will face the same range of consequences. Contractor staff who engage in harassment may be subject to comparable penalties from their employers, and a contractor who fails to enforce this policy may have its contract terminated. Visitors who harass may be removed from any workplace and prevented from returning.

So this is what we have come to. A subjective and ambiguous code of conduct, which ignores freedom of religion and freedom of speech. In the midst of the Civil Rights Movement, Martin Luther King stood at the podium at the Washington Monument, [a national park]. Were he to return today, would you tell him that he may not enter the park with his Bible in his hands? That he may not speak of Christianity from its steps. For these things have been objected to by Gays who point out that the book depicts them as an abomination unto God. For a woman has said that the depiction of Eve as the one who corrupted Adam, and Lot's wife as the one who would not be saved is offensive to her as a woman. Would you stand by as the park police expelled him from their work place and prevented him from returning. And now you say to me that no one would say such a thing and I say to you that a single objection has been made against a cross which stood on a hill overlooking San Diego Bay. They objected to the historical land mark on the bases of "Separation of Church And State", because it stood on public land. And now you say to me that no court in the land would uphold such an act; and I say to you that the cross no longer stands on public land, but had to be moved to a private location. These laws and regulations do not protect the people of this land. They are a "GAG ORDER". They are an avenue to take the taxpayers into court. They are a means by which those who have no morals become rich and powerful by corrupting the morals of the nation.

I would remind you that because of the changes in our laws, we have lowered our standards in the work place. Height and weight requirements which were based on safety and performance considerations have been scrapped to allow for the inclusion of women and with them, smaller men. We, as a society, pay the price in reduced performance and/or medical disability payments. It will not suffice for those who should be considered to be under-qualified to say that they will get the job done at any cost to themselves. Concerning war, General Patten said "The idea is not to give your life for your county, but rather to make the other poor S.O.B. give his". In the world of civil servants, we should demand that the job be done by those who can do it day in and day out without becoming a public liability. With that in mind I would mandate that all criteria, with regard to physical size and strength be reinstated to those in force in 1965 when ever such regulations can be found, and applied to both sexes. Efforts should be made to allow for transfer to related duties. Where that is not possible, notice of three months should be given and retirement funds dispersed if applicable. As to quotas; we can no longer pass up quality employees in favor of sexual percentages. Nor can business afford to turn away from quality employees because they are women. But businesses and government alike, can not afford the expense of accommodation involved in helping individuals to realize their dreams. That is to say that, a city fire department can not afford to build separate accommodations for women when large percentages of a fire station are not women. To say that they will live as "one of the guys" is an infringement on the guys and their wives. Just as men who do not meet the size or health or age requirements will have to be set aside their dream for the good of society, so will women in circumstances such as I have just described. If the day comes when the men of this country come to reject women in this country, and those same men should somehow become capable of carrying a fetus to term, it is not likely that we as a nation will embrace the idea that we should pay the costs of their personal aspirations. It is not likely that we will tell them that no matter what the costs are to society, we will not only pay the costs of their pregnancy but we will augment their income so that their dreams of parenthood can be fulfilled. But this is what Feminists have asked and we have squandered our resources to accommodate them.

If women want true and meaningful equality in the market place, they must find it by performing. If the threat of law suits exists for every indiscretion perpetrated by any employee at any level, business will resist exposure. If women can learn to defend them selves in the work place with the same expertise they show in social settings, they will get by in a world that is fair to every one. If an employer does not provide for you a climate which is up to your standards there will be a minimum wage in place to assure that you can move on and survive. And in losing you, your ex-employer's penalty will be directly commensurate to your ability. If your ability is that outstanding, then read to the end of this book

*George Bailey*

and I will share with you a means to start your own business without the help of special privilege and you can have your revenge by competing with those who did not appreciate you. If women learn to vote for those who further the cause of all Americans rather than those who would suggest that women are abused by society, we will have meaningful change. If they continue to elect people such as the woman mayor of Sacramento, who's first official act was to rename "Man Hole" covers, we will spend our wealth re-stamping the emblems of our nation.

Compare the women's movement with the Civil Rights Movement, to the Union movements at their beginning, to Kent State, to Tianamen Square. You will see, if you but open your eyes, that you have been given all you have asked for out of love and respect; not because you are "invincible", as Helen Reddy suggested. You have been used by those who sell you books and those who advocate this breach between men and women in the courts. You have been a pawn for lawyers and politicians, and forgotten those who love you. Help us change this land for the better. Embrace modesty in all things. Stand for love not sex. Respect your self and you will command the respect of those from whom you can not demand it. Remember that those opportunities you take away from men are the opportunities of your sons and of your daughter's husbands. Know that yours is the most important task that can be assigned a human being and revel in it. And when the authors of discontent remind you of life's inequities, remember the corner stone of our revolution. "Forgiveness". Understand that society is simply an extension of the cave. If evolution is valid, then society had its beginnings with first man who provided sanctuary for a woman and her young. With the success of the arrangement, the dominance of the male over the female was subdued by other males. Whether these impulses came from spiritual awareness, female pressure, reverence for motherhood, or a simple sense of fairness; who can say? Regardless, it is the willingness of men to participate in society that makes society itself possible. Understand that it is a side affect of socialism within our government that has lead to the "Politically Correct" profile of the "Dead Beat Dad". It is government's attempt to shirk its responsibility when a single income fails to meet the needs of a household split in two. This collusion between feminists' hatred of men and government's lack of accountability have found an ally in the courts and used the "Kinder, Gentler" gender of our nation to reinstate the institution of the Debtor's Prison into the Twenty First Century. Recognize that most divorced men end up married to another, as do most women. This creates new providers: while the old debt, which the government and the courts create jobs from, still persists.

At no time in the history of civilization have women demanded so much power while at the same time, shrinking from so much of the responsibility. At the beginning of the twentieth century, when it was a "Man's" world, if a husband was displeased with his wife he probably could have beaten her and

gotten away with it. He might have been able to throw her out of the house and onto the street. He might even have been able to take her children away from her. As we come to the end of the century it is the women who have control. It is the so called “kinder, gentler” sex who has all the power. Today, men know that if they have sex with a woman and she becomes pregnant, she may hold him responsible under the same Victorian laws which protected women a hundred years ago. But now she may take his children from him and put him on the streets. What’s more, he can be assigned an amount for which he is responsible to pay whether he can afford it or not. And should he fail to pay said amount, he may lose his driving privileges or perhaps even find himself imprisoned as a “Dead Beat”. Somehow this smacks more of “Catty” and “Vindictive” than virtuous. Consider the effects upon the women of the Middle East and South America. Ask yourself if your example in the use of power is likely to encourage the men of these regions to loosen their grip of oppression on those women, when what you came to us asking for was “Tootsie” and what you have come to demand is “One Flew Over The Coo Coo’s Nest”.

It has come to pass, that it is now possible for science and medicine to cause the deaf to hear. There now exists an implant which will give children the ability to synthesize sounds. At its introduction, it would be those who claim to speak for the deaf community who would challenge the notion of implanting such a device. They would be quoted as saying that the world that deaf people share with each other is a rich and fulfilling place and that deaf children born to hearing parents were going to be removed from that world on the basis that all hearing parents would not understand that this is the case. I can understand how that sense of camaraderie and common interest would develop such a notion within a group. Those who “sign” are members of a rather exclusive club. They have a common bond with a secrete code, so to speak. They want to feel good about them selves and they do, collectively.

Sometime after the news of the implants was aired on a news magazine format, it was repeated. At the end of the repeat broadcast, the commentator related that those who spoken against the implants had reversed their stance on the matter. Again, it is in my cynical nature to believe that they had reconsidered the effect of telling the world that there is no good to come of making the deaf to hear, while some of those same deaf, collect money from Social Security to help them overcome their physical “Challenge”. This is the dichotomy of all special interest groups. It becomes necessary for them to champion their group while protecting their entitlements, even if they are not entitled.

Today, it seems that half of the working women in America peruse fulfillment through their career pursuits, demanding equity and dignity; while the other half seeks out the nearest plastic surgeon in an attempt to become a sex goddess. But this is really not all that new. If you want to get to the root of the

*George Bailey*

difference between men and women you are going to have to look at their individual roles in nature. The conventional wisdom of past generations held that women were the intuitive gender and I have always found that to be the case as far as my wife and I were concerned. What's more, it tends to be how women deal with life in general. Anyone who's ever tried to figure out what is wrong with a female's car can probably attest to the fact that they are more likely to "feel" that this, or that, is the problem. If you questioned their logic, and it turns out that they are right, it will not soon be forgotten. But where does this come from; this tendency to feel as opposed to evaluate? It's natural selection. Why not? OK, you've got a family unit. It consists of a mother, a father and some children. They come into a dangerous situation: maybe it's out in the woods, maybe it's out on the savanna. Suddenly Mom gets this sense that something isn't right and she acts on it. She gathers up her children and prepares to defend them. Often her best defense will be to flee. Or perhaps she will remain motionless and quiet while Dad goes and checks it out. Either way, her best defense, her best chance for survival, is to identify that something is amiss. If she runs, Dad will cover her escape. In either scenario Dad will end up facing the danger, if danger does in fact exist. But for Dad, it is not enough that he "feel" himself to be in danger. The successful male; the one that will be selected, is the one who best assesses the threat and therefore has the best chance of coming up with a successful defense strategy. The male who runs away, loses his progeny and his genes are selected for extinction. The male who runs at danger with arms flailing is, himself, selected for extinction. It works much like the forces that caused women to have shrill voices and men to have low, base, voices. Out on the Savanna, where African men developed those low pitched vocal cords, which are so unmistakable, men needed to be able to communicate over long distances. As a lower pitch carries better, those who had lower pitched cords survived at higher rates. Back at the cave, or in camp, the women who screamed at their young in lower pitches, attracted predators from a larger area and did not get selected for survival: nor did their young.

As it turns out, natural selection works very quickly. If we had been left on the planet by aliens as a newly created genetic experiment, just a few thousand years ago, the differences between men and women would already have manifested themselves in those who had survived. The female who nurses the young will always be allocated the care of the young in a social structure which uses logic as a format. Those females which do not develop their intuitive abilities, as well as those who hang around to analyze the situation, will be selected for extinction. Those males who respond emotionally in a life and death situation will suffer the same fate. As it happens, this is not a bad state of affairs. Because nature insures both imagination and logic within the family unit, it insures that the children of the family unit are exposed to both even though they are selected to excel at one over the other. It has been said that Veterinarians



must surely be the worlds greatest doctors because their patient can't tell them where it hurts. This intuitive sense makes women the best child care providers for the same reason. The problems occur when a society such as ours decides to try and deal with its challenges with emotional defenses.

Are all women emotional as opposed to analytical? No. Are all men analytical as opposed to emotional? No. If they were, there would be nothing for nature to select from. Therefore, it must be assumed that these distinctions are diminished with each passing generation who lives in a modern [socially engineered] setting as opposed to a primitive [natural] one. When one views the gender issue from this perspective, things make a lot more sense. For instance, in the area of sex, women tend to be emotional in sex while men are aroused through their senses. Few women I suspect are aroused by a man's moans and yet men find the moans of a woman to be extremely provocative. While women have purchased magazines which featured nude pictorials of men and gone to watch male strippers as part of a Feminist right of passage; we are all aware that women are not as sexually aroused by these stimuli as men are. Many women find that sex in a dim or a dark room is more conducive to gratification, while many men find the visual aspects of sex more appealing. Of course, no rules are steadfast in every case. But a pornography star, who was elected to political office in Italy, chastised that all men want a saint in public and a whore in the bedroom. And while she exaggerated the case for her own sake, the truth is that men do want to be stimulated. But she failed to understand that men also admire and seek modesty outside those very private moments, if for no other reason than they don't want to have to defend a woman against the aggression of other males. This emotional slant versus the sensory, or physical, orientation is the basis for the gulf between men and women. And if what I have said is true, then when women sit around all day and watch "Soaps", it is little different than if a man sat around all day watching pornography. You say that, that is too big a stretch. Maybe. But in either case, individuals engaged in such practices are modifying what they find sexually stimulating as discussed in relation Gay imprinting. Look at the movie, "The Bridges Of Madison County". In it, the heroin builds an emotional bridge with a stranger; a world traveler. They have an adulterous affair. And while she stays with her husband, she remains in love with the stranger. The truth is, that it is the fact that he is a stranger which allows him to stay the love of her emotional dreams. As a friend of mine once said, we all have warts. After your around someone long enough you see all their warts. Sometimes their warts get so big that you don't want to be around them any more. It's easy to hide all your warts for three days. What's tough is to accept people's warts and love them anyway. Which begs the question, "Why wasn't she at the fair with her family, building bridges and memories with them?" In the feminist fantasy, the children of the woman from Madison county are deeply moved by her self sacrifice to stay. In real life, these kids have got to feel like "if her family life was so painful, if she

*George Bailey*

was so unhappy in the company of those who loved her, why didn't she hit the road?" The life she lived was a fraud. A hoax perpetrated on a family who thought she was a willing participant, when in fact she was living the role of the martyr in a world that existed only in her mind. It's too bad we couldn't see her after traveling with this photographer a couple of years down the road: living out of cheap motels, suit cases and a pickup truck.

On the other side of the gender coin, we have the male who gets caught up in a situation that fulfills his sensory fantasies, in the same way that the heroin from "The Bridges Of Madison County" fulfilled her emotional ones. When he happens on to his dream encounter, a politically correct society will see his fantasy for the improper flight of fancy that it is and name his movie "Fatal Attraction". One could argue that wild "Physical" sex that extends to the visual and auditory senses is beyond the veil of what some people, especially religious people, consider decent; and I would not necessarily disagree. At the same time, with the movie "Titanic" it has now become necessary for young men to die for their lovers on the first date in order to be worthy emotionally.

The sad part of all this is, that it is women who have set the agenda and men who have been blamed. At the turn of the century, to see a woman's ankle exposed would have been enough visual stimulation to satisfy most men. It is women who have revealed all. It is the silent majority of women who have remained silent at their own expense so as not to offend their so called sisters. It is those same sisters who have told you that you should raise your daughters to play with what were historically "boy" toys so that they can learn to think like boys rather than girls. And if you do, and if it succeeds and your daughters do learn to be analytical rather than emotional, what have we gained as a society? What have we lost? It is women who have embraced fashions from fashion designers who are homosexual and who have discarded the classical feminine form for the tall thin frame of a young man in the "Twiggy" image. With time they would pervert that image to include oversized breasts. It is women, who dress for women, who have raised up a generation of girls with dysfunctional eating habits, and a compulsion toward plastic surgery. It is women who have set the agenda for the society we live in and it is women who must realize what is important and what is real.

I know a man who was asked at the end of his marriage, how many times did you buy your wife flowers. "Every time she said she loved me, every time she initiated sex, and every time she kissed me;" he answered. "Probably a half dozen times over the course of our marriage". Build you bridges with your mate. Forgive them their warts. And if those warts are too big to forgive, then tell your mate and give your mate the opportunity to change. Men will not intuitively know that their warts are bothering you, they aren't wired that way. Women will not be able to analyze the situation in the same way that you men might expect,

so explain it to them. We have to work together on this because we're all we've got. It matters not if it is a woman fantasizing about a soup opera star or a man fantasizing about a centerfold: if you make love to someone other than the one you are with, you are imprinting your sexual preference toward that fantasy and away from your mate. You are moving away from that connection between sex and its ability to promote self esteem. What's more, in a very real sense you are cheating on your spouse in the same way that those who fantasize about vengeance imprint those thoughts upon that which makes them who they are and who they are to become.

I would warn you women of America that just as the women's movement has been about power and all the things that power provides: today's woman, more than any other that I am aware of, chooses her mate for power, money and status. As I have said, society as we know it is built on the submission of men to society. In many old world cultures however, it would be men [the fathers of daughters] who would decide who would make a good husband for women and the decision would be irrevocable. With time, not only would women be allowed to choose for themselves, but, by the end of the twentieth century in America, they could discard an unwanted husband without much difficulty. When the lion takes possession of the pride through force [power] the females will embrace him. There will be no divorce but rather he will remain so long as he can prevail. When he is vanquished the female will embrace the victor because he is the strongest and therefore the best. It has become a paradox that a society such as ours, which has its origins in the submission of males, now finds its females in pursuit of those who dominate; while at the same time, these same females, seek more power for themselves. In a natural setting, those males who dominated by force would choose the women they wished to have dominion over just as the lion does. And just as with the lions, those females who did not understand to submit would be selected for extinction.

We live in a society in which men are held in check for the good of "Society": that volatile social fabric which allows us to live together in nonviolence. Because of this, men practice courtship rather than conquest of the opposite sex. It then becomes a natural selection process based, not on survival of the fittest, but on the whim of the females of the species. George Bailey had a "Wonderful Life" due, in no small part, to the fact that he had a wonder wife. She chose him for his strength of character, his kind heart and his integrity. He was what the Victorians referred to as a "Gentle" man, or, as it would later be known, a Gentleman. She was happy to live a humble life that contributed to her family, her husband and her community; and together they reveled in their time. It should also be remembered that it would be Mary Bailey who saved the Building & Loan from Old Man Potter. It would be her fantasy honeymoon money that

*George Bailey*

would hold over the town's people, and it would be her idea to use it for that purpose.

In 1998 President Clinton would disgrace himself and his family by finally having to confess to not only having an adulterous encounter with a young woman, but then lying about it to the American public and in the court room. In August of that year I would watch a panel of women giving their views on the subject. The feminist view point would hold that we must separate the man and his actions from his public policies. They would continue to defend him on his record. And while by the end of this book, it will be obvious to you that his record had very little to do with the economic strength of the day, the question remains, why? Why would feminists, of all people, defend a fifty year old man who used the power and prestige of his office to seduce a young impressionable woman into performing lewd acts in the Oval office. It probably had something to do with the fact that he was their champion and it would have been difficult to explain how they could have been so wrong. They defended him on the basis that his stepping down could hurt the economy. One of them chastised that it would be irresponsible to force him out because of the global ramifications as they applied to world instability. The second half of the program dealt with the issue of sexual harassment in the schools and the prevention and punishment which should be implemented in order to curb the problem. The irony of the two issues being the subjects of the program did not elude them, but in the end they just brushed over the connection so as not to make too much of the fact that the feminists of this country talk out of both sides of their mouth and it is politically incorrect to call them on it. In the end, there was really no conflict in the feminist agenda as it related to the two issues because the feminist agenda is about power and nothing else. The rest of what they say is all negotiable, just as Clinton's politics are. Had we, as a nation, forced President Clinton to resign and the result was death and instability in other parts of the world, then that would have been on the President's head for being what he is. Because we did not, when the next generation of Americans grows up with no sense of decency, when they learn to admire power above all else; when they come to believe that might makes right: then we will have put the most powerful nation in the world into the hands of people who will surely abuse their power, just as the President has done. And that will be on our heads. These are the choices left to a nation who elects a man they suspect of being immoral and re-elect a man that they know to be. But it must be said that, in defending Clinton in order to retain power, the Feminist movement has born out the fears of those women, who at the turn of the century, opposed "Women's Suffrage". As they feared, when women enter into the political arena they do, indeed, abandon their moral principles for the sack of political power. As a result, the Moral Compass, the Standard Bearer, once revered above any institution in the land, has gone the way of "Mom and Apple Pie". And more's the pity. The same women who will tell you that it is immoral

for a man to use his physical advantage to batter his wife, will tell you that women have every right to use their legal advantage to batter their husband, and they will discount the eight hundred thousand men in this country who are battered by their wives each year.

When the leaders of the Women's Movement speak of power and empowerment they speak as though women in generations past had no power. They talk about sharing power with men but what they are really speaking of is absolute power. To understand the true nature of the power as it existed in past generations of American Women, you must first understand that the male population at large has never had much power in the world. In the same way that Feminists have championed the notion that all men have wealth which they withhold from women, they promote the myth that they all have power which they refuse to share. This self indulgent view of the world is prevalent in nearly every women's forum I see or hear. For example, I watched a PBS documentary about a renowned female reporter. She was the first to attempt to realize Jewels Vern's adventure of going "Around the World in Eighty Days". She was the first to expose the horrors of the "Asylums" of the day. During the telling of her life and times, her biographer referred to the horrid conditions of children forced to work in the industrial revolution. The program spoke of children caught in a system from which there was no escape. It was asserted that, while the boys would be given the opportunity to become supervisors, girls would be stuck at entree level positions.

If you work in the real world, as most of us do, you know that there are very few supervisory jobs as compared to those which are not supervisory. So while some of these boys might, indeed, rise to the level of supervisor, most would remain workers. And while few, if any, young girls would make supervisor; over time, the vast majority of them would marry and escape the industrial dilemma all together, while the boys would remain trapped. The old phrase "A man's home is his castle" is really as much a statement about an individual's lack of power in the world outside the home as it was about his absolute power within the home. Men were, and remain, humbled by their environment outside the home, while women held dominion over home and children but submitted to the "Man Of The House". The "Power" of women stemmed from "Moral Authority": the dynamics of which can be observed in a movie called "The African Queen".

In the "African Queen", Catherine Hepburn played the part of a Spinster daughter of a Missionary who was thrown together with a "Rounder" of a steamboat captain; played by Humphrey Bogart. The laws concerning the legal authority of a Captain on his ship are International and absolute in nature. The film is a case study of the power of "Moral Authority". It is a study of a time in which women were forced to make their case rather than have their way. It was the balance of a world which women have rejected. I told you earlier on that the

### *George Bailey*

women of today are caught up in a search for men of power. But what they have not come to understand is that what they really long for is a man of strength. Perhaps it is because so many women of my generation thought that letting men be part of the decision making process made them weak. But in the end, it is the rejection of God as their source of power in the world which has left them to seek out the wrong kind of men; for strength of character is often at odds with attainment of power in an immoral society. Mary Bailey chose for strength of character rather than power. George Bailey did battle with power and succeeded, not by becoming powerful, but by holding power at bay. And as for riches, oddly enough, Mary Bailey saw the man who had money but lacked strength of character as a laughable jack ass. Unfortunately, strength is a quality which demands that people say no when the case is made on an emotional basis rather than a moral one, or even a logical one.

Today, American women hold dominion over their children in the home, over their environment in the work place through legislation, and over their husbands in the courts. As absolute power corrupts absolutely; in 1998, as Californians moved to end affirmative action for minorities, the new Governor enacted a new policy to appoint women to 50% of all government posts. Today the act of sex has become an expression of power for many women. It is simply a point of leverage. As a result of the perpetration of the myth that women need "It" as much as men, girls have become "one of the guys" to most young men. The reverence is gone, and young women now try to demand respect through law, when they can not command it through their actions. In the much acclaimed film, "Courage Under Fire" we see the feminist warrior portrayed as the hero who died for her command. But if you examine the situation it depicts with objectivity, you may see a different picture. As the story unfolds we find a rescue helicopter trying to retrieve a group of Americans who are pinned down and cut off by hostile forces in the Gulf war. The commanding officer of the rescue helicopter destroys the enemy's tank by dropping a fuel tank on it from the helicopter and then igniting it with a flair gun. If there is no time to call for a fighter to take out the tank then she has gambled and won for the sack of the men on the ground. But if she has charged in to take on a tank with a machine gun and a gas can when other options existed, then she has confronted a dangerous situation with an emotional response. As a result of their confrontation with the tank, the woman officer and her crew find themselves shot down. One of her crew is badly wounded. They are surrounded that night by a force which is greater in number than they can hope to withstand, and it is understood that, with the dawn, they will be attacked and probably be overrun.

When I was young, this country had just won a World War. It was celebrated in our lives and in the mythologies of our movies. Among its themes were the stories of those who were wounded in battle in situations where it was obvious

that no one was going to save them but themselves. The message of these glimpses of Hell was that in war, it is self-sacrifice which saves the collective. They were the stories of those who stayed behind of their own free will so that their fellows could escape, not only physically, but also from the guilt of leaving a fallen comrade behind. It is the story of the one who jumps on the grenade and the one who stays behind to die a warrior's death, alone.

Not too long ago, I listened to an interview with a group of young American soldiers who had been involved in a police action in Africa. One of their comrades had fallen, dead, in an ambush set up by a faction, that was run by a War Lord, that We had targeted. The soldiers spoke of a code they followed; a code which stated that they would always fight to retrieve the remains of their fallen comrades. The problem with such a strategy is that by killing one soldier, the War Lord had baited a trap with which to draw in the others. In a reenactment I once saw, of the story of Japanese Americans who were interned in this country during WW II, a Japanese American father counseled his son, as the son prepared to go to war to fight for his country, even as his family remained interned by that country: America. He told his son that when he went to war that he must prepare by holding his life forfeit. He must consider his life lost before leaving so that if the time came that his life was taken, it would not be wasted. He would not die without being counted; without contributing. He would not die foolishly.

The commanding officer in "Courage Under Fire" found herself with a wounded soldier whose survival was in question regardless of their course of action. She decide that it would be better to risk the loss of her entire command than to risk the guilt of seeing the wounded soldier die as a result of moving him. When her command became divided as a result of her decision, we observe a woman in a command position who demands respect when she can not command it; and when she is not obeyed she paints her subordinate into a corner rather than turning him. Before he is aware of his proximity to the "line", she has proclaimed him over the line. He now reacts like a trapped animal in a tension situation and her entire command suffers for it. These are the mixed signals sent by the mother of "Billy and Suesy", in the little story I wrote earlier. They are the rantings of a mother who over reacts and then relents in the home. Except that these rantings are now outside the home and are being used in situations where threats can not be taken back. It is about the difference between demanding respect and commanding respect. In the movie, before she can relent, circumstances cause her to be wounded by accident. She is now at odds with her command. In the same movie, the officer who is investigating the events of the woman officer's command, is himself dealing with the idea of courage and accountability. His conflicts arise from his decision to fire on a tank when that tank turned out to be one of ours. His mistake is made, largely as a result of misinformation given him by one of his crew. Yet, in spite of this, when that crew member comes to voice

*George Bailey*

his regrets, that crew member is exonerated by his superior [the tank commander, that same investigating officer], who takes responsibility as the one who gave the order to fire. It is this same investigating officer who will take the blame for the mistakes made as a result of his command. This is the burden of leadership. But the movie asks us to judge the woman officer by a different set of rules. She will rush in to do battle against a tank using only a gas can and because she prevails in this fiction we will judge her a hero and those who question her acts a coward. She will lose control of her entire command and bring on calamity; and when her subordinate comes to her with his apologies she will promise him that he alone will be punished, and what's more, he can "Count on it". When the rescue helicopter arrives she will be the only one who fits the profile of the one left behind in the WW II themes I spoke of earlier. She is the one who would not allow them to sneak away to a place from which they could safely retreat by air. Air power can not help you when the enemy has moved so close. It will take ground forces and none are available on a rescue helicopter. So, while she will cover their escape from a situation which is of her making, she will not exonerate them to save themselves, but orders that they return with "guns and a stretcher" into a situation which is hopeless and probably lost before they reach the rescue helicopter.

The mixed emotions and unreal expectations of this story play well in the movies. They tug at our heart strings and promote the Feminist ideology in ways that are not held up to the scrutiny of reality; where most of the Feminist ideology fails. When people go to war without expecting to die, they run the risk of dieing foolishly. When We as a country, instill in our soldiers that they go to work to do the job of killing but are not expected to die in return, then We do them a disservice, for we know that often times they will die. Not only that, We become a nation who takes the killing of others lightly because We perceive that it costs us nothing. Win or lose it costs us more than can be shown on a ledger. No life, American or non-American, should ever be taken lightly, nor should any life be lost foolishly. If you are a soldier I urge you to exonerate your fellows from their obligation to your corpse. Free them from their guilt. Your soul is what you should concern yourself with, not your mortal remains.

Historically, women have had three avenues of power. The first form was the role of the harlot. It is the independence of the world's oldest profession. From the Biblical accounts of the death of John the Baptist; to the story of Samson and Delilah, the role of woman as a temptress is well know. It is the low road; the easy way. It was a role rejected by women of principle, in favor of Moral Authority. The second avenue of power was political. Until modern times, this avenue would only be available to a privileged few. Cleopatra, Queen Elizabeth and Marie Antoinette, all had power as a result of the politics of the Monarchy. When this type of political power became the ambition of the "Women's



Suffrage” movement, women who feared that the vote would corrupt women, opposed the idea in favor of Moral Authority. They were defeated. As a result, today we find that there is no Moral Authority. The strong man who resists the emotional response with a “No” will find himself over ruled and disfranchised in the courts. Instead we have a country in which Feminists proclaim it a woman’s right to play the Temptress or the Political Despot, and morality has no champion. Motherhood is seen as impotent and the steam roller of emotion which is characterized in the illusion of the diamond industry, rules the day.

As I have told you, this book is for the children. So it is at this point that I will close my thoughts on the Feminist women of America with what I believe to be their greatest cruelty. Because women have been lead to abandoned Motherhood, they have found it necessary to devalue, even trivialize, Fatherhood. Archie Bunker has been replaced with “The Tool Man” who is in need of constant instruction and improvement with respect to his role in society. This is not to say that the involvement of men within the family unit was not improved by making men more able to show affection or be more empathetic. But those who wish to promote the Feminist view have belittled men in a way that removes respect from the equation. The male contribution is seen as a given. It is often reduced to a pay check which will be received from the father even if that father is forced to leave. You may think that I speak only to the adverse affects this has on the male children of our society and their sense of self worth: but it extends to girls as well. No one would think to challenge the importance of a mother to her son, but the role of Father to his daughters is of no less importance. Today, the media in all its forms, from news to entertainment, professes that a family unit is complete when a child is bound to a loving mother. When we look around our country it is not difficult to see that young men sense that they are not respected in a culture which is all about the choices of women. They do not revere women who neither show them respect nor revere themselves. This strategy will not perpetuate a culture nor sustain a nation.

There will be those that say that I would deny women the right to contribute to society and to be compensated for that contribution, in any other avenue but motherhood or house wife. But that is not what I have said. There will be those who say that I have said that all women are emotional and incapable of analytical thought; and that too, is untrue. But what I have said is that we are a society which has chosen to gratify our own hopes and expectations at the expense of our children; who are the future of our society. When the idea of company health care and company retirement spread from the private sector and into government, it was extended to the spouse as well. The reason for that was simple. Most workers were men and most of their spouses were involved in raising up the next generation. In this way, society provided for the medical care of the family as a whole and acknowledged the contribution of the wife and mother to society.

*George Bailey*

Today, homosexuals insist that they have the right to marry so that they may qualify for the contributions of society which were extended to those who carried the burden of the next generation. It then becomes a question of the allocation of resources. It becomes a matter of whether we as a society intend to use our resources to protect, defend, nurture and fulfill our children, or whether we intend to use them to fulfill our own aspirations. It has been demonstrated conclusively that we are unable to do both. Furthermore, since women hold the majority of votes, it falls to them to decide our course. Find yourself and we will be waiting to stand beside you rather than behind you. Be responsible and we will work with you. Be deserving of reverence and we will revere you. It is the source of your greatest power to do good in the world.

To those of you who call yourselves “Gay”, I would say simply to consider yourselves fortunate that we live in a society where personal choice is of major importance, and be cognizant of those who find your actions distasteful, and yet still approach your situation with tolerance. Understand that the tide has turned and that under the terms of the revolution you will have no special rights above the rest of the country. Resign your selves to “Don’t ask, Don’t tell”. Be content that you are allowed a place. And when you do emerge from that place, emerge as a member of society at large and not as one with an agenda. Even if my perceptions of your situation are totally incorrect: even if it were to be proven that Homosexuality is as natural and normal as rain, you would still not be exonerated from your obligation to public modesty. It is time that you considered the feelings of others. I refer you to a movie called the “Crying Game”. I ask you to understand that regardless of the feelings Christians have for you and how deep those feelings run, we find the acts you perform to be nauseating. What’s more, our merciful God has instructed us to feel that way. Like the absurd hero of the movie, we as a society can have a meaningful relationship with you, but only so long as you do not insist that it be sexual in nature. Be content to participate as a human being without making sex an issue. But do not attempt to recruit, for that is an infringement on the rights of those who stand to preserve your rights. When you push you invite others to push back. I grew up in a time when Gays were not tolerated openly, but I do not remember them as being victims of violent reaction. You know I do not wish harm on anyone. But as evidenced by an increased aggression, those of you who push and intimidate with the law, cause animosity which will always reveal itself as violence in a violent society. It is not Homophobia, it is human nature, and you visit it upon your fellows as well as yourselves. Before this book is through I will allow an avenue for the women of America to decide their own fate with regard to women in the military as supposed “equal” participants, as opposed to their historical role. If it should come to pass that they come to understand that they take away more than they contribute to our armed forces and as a result they stand down from their personal aspirations for the sake of our society as a whole, then it will fall to you

to consider whether your participation is a net asset. There are many ways to serve one's country. The question then becomes whether or not you are willing to make the sacrifices needed.

For those Americans who call themselves Blacks: I would ask you to refrain from reveling in "The Blues". Instead, look to what can be accomplished together rather than on what has occurred in the past. Given that we live in a democracy; when reflecting on what progress has been made, it should be obvious to you that you are not alone. When the majority of this country votes their approval on issues that seek to improve racial equality they are voting their conscience. More importantly, they are often voting against other Whites to do so. Like those Whites who marched in the Civil Rights Movement, and those who died for the North in our great Civil War, we have stood by you all these many years. And as evidenced by the workings of our democracy, we together, are a majority. We are not perfect. We have not realized, with you, the promised land. But even so, when you speak of us in general terms, and lay blame at our feet because we are White; you do us an injustice. More importantly you fail to instill in your children the sense of hope that will be necessary for us to complete the promise of America and of the dream we ALL shared with Martin Luther King.

There are those within the Black Community who would rewrite history so as to remove themselves from any indebtedness they might be obliged to feel toward those who fought and died for them, who were not Black. In the PBS landmark documentary on the Civil War we would learn of the forces that would converge in Kansas and of the catalyst that "Bloody Kansas" would become in the abolition movement and, ultimately, in the Civil War. A number of years later, a piece done in a similar vein, which discussed the history of Blacks in America, would draw a distinctly different picture of "Bloody Kansas". In the "Civil War", it was explained that abolitionists flooded into Kansas immediately prior to its bid for Statehood, in the hope of preventing any of the new western States from becoming "Slave" States. There would be bloody, murderous, raids against some of those abolitionist forces, by pro-slavery factions. In retaliation, the infamous John Brown would murder pro-slavers to avenge the raids. When Black historians recounted "Bloody Kansas" in the Black history documentary, they alleged that there were two camps within the White Kansas population. The first camp would be the pro-slave element, which they viewed in the same light as the "Civil War" documentary had. The second group, however, they would describe as White bigots and racists, who flooded in to Kansas in order to prevent it from becoming a slave State for personal reasons. The reason? Because they were so racist that they didn't want to work side by side with Blacks in the fields. Think about that. These historians would have us believe that there were two factions of White America in the 1860's and that both of these factions disliked and hated Blacks so much that one would die to enslave them and the other

*George Bailey*

would die to keep them out of their neighborhood. In fact, they would have us believe that the group who would not work beside Blacks would fight a bloody civil war, brother against brother, to free slaves; and to bankrupt their brothers, so that free Blacks would not be moving into Kansas. Of course, freed Blacks “could” move into Kansas; or anywhere else, for that matter. Even without a Civil War, there were free blacks in the north who could have moved west into a non-slave state. In another documentary I viewed a Black historian how spoke of the Blacks of history as “WE”, in the present tense. She promoted the idea that she was a member of this group who was abused. But it is a cross that was born by another generation, and while she has an affiliation to that group, she has absolutely no right to proclaim herself a member of it, any more than I have a right to feel malice toward the Queen of England for the way I was treated before the Revolution.

There are those in the Black community who look to the apology given Japanese Americans and wait their turn: demand their turn. I would tell you that the Civil War was your apology. The Civil Rights Movement, Civil Rights Legislation and Affirmative action were your acknowledgments. But it is unlikely and unfair, for you as a group to expect to be consoled further, until you begin to separate those who are your friends from those who are your enemies on the basis of race and you acknowledge the debt you owe to those who stood and sometimes died for you.

In the beginning of this book I spoke of Jefferson and how he is remembered. I am certain that there were those among you who mumbled or perhaps even shouted out in indignation as you read: for in a very Biblical way, the nature of the male “Y” chromosome seems to have born out the claim of generations of Blacks, that they are in fact, the descendants of Thomas Jefferson. According to the accounts, he was widowed in his forties and from that time on, to the end of his life, he had relations with one of his own slaves. But relations is not a strong enough word when she is said to have traveled to Europe with him. When she is said to have bore him numerous children; both male and female.

If I use the “N” word, it is hurtful to anyone who considers themselves to be of Black lineage. It is an affront to their self esteem and if I call them by that ugly name it is to call them down and to make them feel ashamed. That is the nature of the word as it stands today in our society. At the same time, there are those who claim that it is only Whites who can be “Bigots” and “Racists”: and they use those “Catch” words of Bigot and Racist in much the same way as bigots use the “N” word and to the same end. These are words that are associated with White middle class males in the politically correct light of the day. It is “The Meat Head” who stood down for affirmative action and waited his turn behind minorities, who is now the whipping boy. When women speak of special consideration for women and minorities and special interest; it becomes a

scenario in which the majority becomes a coalition from which White males are excluded, making them a minority which may be bashed and discriminated against. Blacks may revel in their Blackness. They may wear necklaces which reads "100% Black". They may demand power for Blacks. They may slur individuals and even States as "Racist". Hispanics may wear the emblems of Mexico, or promote "Brown Power". You may even sport a bumper sticker which proclaims you to be "Hawaiian and Proud", [whatever that means]. They may exclude Whites from conversation by speaking Spanish in their presents. Women may forbid men from having any organization which is exclusive of women, while retaining all manner of exclusive Female organizations and promoting more of the same in public forums and even with public funding. Blacks are free to contribute to the National Organization for the Advancement Of Colored People. But for a White male to promote White males has become a crime of the "Politically Incorrect". If a White male promotes White Power he will become a pariah. And if that male commits an offense against any other member of society, and he has a political opinion which is considered to be incorrect; he will receive the severest of punishments as a result of his political opinion, on the basis of it being designated a "Hate Crime". But if you conclude from what I have said that I stand with, or even condone those who promote White Power: then, like the public perception of most things I have addressed here in this book, you are 180 degrees off. I, along with all the other "Meat Heads" of this land have denounced those who would promote White Power; because it is wrong. This, in the face of our declining circumstance. At the same time, there is no other faction within our society who can make the same claim. It is the nature of a Fascist, Politically Correct power structure, to hold elements of a society in check in the face of a flawed ideology; by making scapegoats. Today that scapegoat is often the "Meat Head". This reality was reflected in Jefferson's time, in the form of the institution of Slavery. It could be reasonably argued that, because he [Jefferson] kept this same Mistress for so long and in the face of so many children, that He, in fact, loved her. It is not hard to understand that he could not marry her in the time and place of which he was part because of ideologies which were different from those of today, but that were implemented with the same Fascist rhetoric of 1999. And if you would say to me, that he was afraid to marry her, then I would remind you that Jefferson was not a man to back away out of fear. Not only would he sign the Declaration of Independence, he would take credit for writing it. He was not an American citizen protected by the Constitution. He was a colonial, and a British subject. He was the property of the king that he stood defiant against and he would have hung with his fellows had they failed in their revolt. It is said that he allowed two of his daughters to disappear into the society of the time, and it is not unreasonable to assume they were able to do this as a result of lighter skin tones, which did not betray their heritage; but I am only guessing. The realities of why he was unable or unwilling

*George Bailey*

to free his other offspring are and will remain, the subject of conjecture. For his part in that Institution which was slavery, it could be said that “The sins of the father were indeed visited upon the son”. Regardless of what you believe or how you perceive Jefferson and the paradox of his life; you must come to the realization that the ideology which Blacks and the other, so called, minorities promote today is of the same fabric as the ideology which was once used to enslave a people of color. I have not come to chastise you, but to call you back to brotherhood and reconciliation.

Some in the Black community have looked at television programs such as the “Cosby” show as negative. They say that to depict Blacks in such roles is to give unrealistic expectations to Black children: but will young Blacks aspire to great heights by clinging to their “Right” to sing the “Blues”? If nothing else was gained by that show, it planted the seed in the minds of all our children, of all our races, that there is nothing abnormal about Blacks being successful. I understand that the changing of attitudes in America has tended to be a process of out living those who are set in racist ways. But if we preserve a future for our children, and they see the world as a place where in having a “Huxtable” as a friend is a positive thing, then the challenge begins to shift to Blacks to live up to the standards Mr. Cosby attributed to his people in his show. I am reminded of a riddle from the 1970’s which goes like this: A man and his son were in a plane crash. The father was killed and the son was rushed to the hospital. Once on the operating table, the doctor came in, looked at the boy and said “I can not operate on this boy. He is my son.” Today it is not difficult to discern the answer to this riddle. Yet in the early 1970’s few people would guess that the doctor must have been the boy’s mother. It was a question of perception. The “Cosby” show generated that kind of change in perception and Bill Cosby should take great pride in that. If we are to move forward in race relations, we must first address the economy. Hard times and economic uncertainty always look for a scapegoat and give voice to bigotry from all corners; including Blacks. As will be understood in part three; {The Method of the Revolution} having a job, any job, is the most critical step that one can take in the direction of change. In order to help create them, I would ask Blacks and minorities for a very great concession. Great, Land Mark, Civil Rights decisions and bills were passed during the early Johnson administration. Those since have been ever more divisive and ostracizing. Therefore I would ask you to offer up the Civil Rights and affirmative action and “Quota” laws passed since 1968 as your added cross to bear for the sake of the revolution. It has become a source of great contention. It is a tool to line the pockets of lawyers. It assures a place for some, if not many, where they do not measure up. It is fuel for the fires in racist camps. It is a burden on our economy. Most importantly it belittles the accomplishments of those among you who have excelled. No one is better served by this revolution than minorities. It is an open door to the middle class for anyone willing and

capable of applying themselves to “any” task within society. It offers a two-parent family, education, medical protection, compensation for a life’s work, self esteem, greater freedom from police aggression and much more. Never the less, I would venture to guess that in reading this your mouths are still dropped open at my suggestion that you give up the laws that you have worked so hard for. Therefore I offer you an out, a “Big Stick”. Let us continue to keep our government statistics. Let us monitor the progress of minorities in America. Then after a period of twenty five years let there be a vote. A national vote in which only minorities may participate. At that time it will be up to all minorities who offered up their safeguards in the revolution, to decide if those laws shall be reinstated. But let me stipulate that a vote not cast is a vote against reinstatement. In that way apathy will not serve the discontent. This gesture will serve as a double edged sword. It removes the tinder from the mouths of those who would blame you for our nations ills and places it under their back side to bring you along; lest the quotas and the laws suits be reinstated. For your part, if minorities would waste an entire generation singing the Blues for the days when the government headed their household, the racists will be vindicated. More than any legal measure which could be taken, it is up to Black America to change its perception of itself. You must recognize that bigotry is inherent to no one race or color, but rather it is an expression of a fear of failure. In the system we struggle for, there is room for everyone to succeed, but only if we work together to quell the anxiety of those who fear that competition will leave them at the bottom. Let us all move forward together in prosperity for all. It is up to you to call down those among you who preach hatred. It is up to you to have the courage to stand with those who are right, rather than those of your own persuasion. Losing the laws that you have gained will be a challenge but the benefits of removing the shield from in front of those who abuse it will see us all better off. Still, the greatest challenge of the nation which will emerge from such as I have described here within, is of another sort altogether.

I have spoken often in this book of the power of rationalization. With the coming of the revolution, the doors are opened and the gauntlet is thrown at your feet. Opportunity carries with it responsibility and the possibility of failure. It will be up to the government to provide you the opportunity for education. It will be up to you to seize that opportunity. It will afford you the opportunity to find a job doing something that will provide you with a future: no matter how many employers you have to try in order to find one who is fair. But it will be up to you to seize that future and to be fair in return. You will have to be productive to work in a Capitalistic system. It will not do for you to simply put in your time. It will take time for those who run in open gangs to move either to the work place or the prison system, but it will happen. If the mothers of the ghetto have to band together and walk their children to school and back again with shot guns in their hands, it is you who must break the cycle. You can not sit in your homes while the

*George Bailey*

gangs harass your children until they join a gang. You can not allow those who disrupt your schools and make dangerous your schools, to make your schools anything other than a safe haven. If you are a single parent, then you will have to rise to occasion in the situation which you have placed you and yours. It will be up to you to focus on the needs of your children, not the dreams and aspirations the Feminists would have you chase.

For some time now, many in the black community have been seeking some sense of themselves. Alex Haley's "Roots" was an American history lesson that extended all the way back to Africa. In his odyssey we find that "Chicken George" is the biological son of a White slave owner. At a time when Blacks hold up Tiger Woods [who's mother is of Asian decent] as a Black example, they disassociate the Black community from its White, paternal, blood lines. It is understandable. It is the story of a people abandoned and sold into slavery by their own fathers. It is only natural that they would wish to disassociate themselves from that truth. The resentment they feel toward that "White" ancestor is also perfectly understandable. But even this is overshadowed in the scheme of things. It is just another line that we stand in either by choice or because society has placed us there. It was a line that Whites, who felt guilt, put their own blood relatives in, in order to disassociate themselves. Today it is a line which rationalizes Welfare, Affirmative Action and hatred.

Many believe that the ancient Egyptians were the ancestors of the African peoples. I have been told that the "Moors" too, were Blacks. Many in the Black community now turn to the Muslims for their religion. So, from where can young Black American's find themselves? When I try to make sense of the world I often turn to history and to the Bible. I know that it was the Hebrews, the Jewish people, who God chose as His people. I know that He sent Moses to deliver them from their slavery and that would come to pass. In so doing He revealed Himself to the World and to Mankind. Pharaoh would be undone by Moses and in time the great Egyptian culture would crumble. In its time, Israel would raise up a great nation under its "Covenant" with God. But the "Stiff Necked" Jews would offend God over and over until, finally, He allowed them to be scattered to the four winds. Their "Old Covenant" was broken and they were subjected to all manner of persecution by Nebuchadnezzar and the rest of the known world. Power would shift to Rome before the coming of Christ. With the "New Covenant" ; "Many will be called unto the Lord". The apostles of Jesus would spread the gospel and build His Church. And after a time there would arrive another who would call himself Muhammad, teaching the Koran. The Koran would base its history of God and mankind on the "Book" which was the record of the Hebrews which they themselves called the "Torah" and from which Christians draw the "Old Testament" of the Bible.



Among the teachings of the Koran would be the following:

The Koran Interpreted by A. J. Arberry:

THE RANGERS-115-120

We also favored Moses and Aaron,  
and We delivered them and their people  
from great distress.  
And We helped them, so that they  
were the victors;  
and We gave them the Manifesting Book,  
and guided them in a straight path,  
and left for them among the later folk  
“Peace be among Moses and Aaron!”  
Even so We recompense the good-doers;  
they were among Our believing servants.

The Koran confirmed the covenant between God and Israel

TA HA 80 - 85

Children of Israel, We delivered you  
from your enemy; and We made covenant  
with you upon the right side of the Mount,  
and sent down on you manna and quails:  
“Eat of the good things wherewith  
We have provided you; but exceed not  
therein, or My anger shall alight on you;  
and on whomsoever My anger  
alights, that man is hurled to ruin.  
Yet I am all For-giving to him who  
repents and believes, and does  
righteousness, and at last is guided.”

And the Ancient Egyptians it remembered in this way

THE BELIEVERS 45 - 50

So God guarded him against the evil  
things of their devising, and there

*George Bailey*

encompassed the folk of Pharaoh the evil  
chastisement,  
the Fire, to which they shall be exposed  
morning and evening; and on the day  
when the Hour is come: "Admit the folk  
of Pharaoh into the most terrible  
chastisement!"

And it confirms Jesus

MARY 34 - 35

He said, "Lo, I am God's servant;  
God has given me the Book, and  
made me a Prophet.  
Blessed He has made me, wherever  
I may be; and He has enjoined me  
to pray, and to give the alms, so  
long as I live,  
and likewise to cherish my mother,  
He has not made me arrogant,  
unprosperous.  
Peace be upon me, the day I was born,  
and the day I die, and the day I am  
raised up alive!"

It affirms the teachings of Jesus

IRON 25

Then We sent, following  
in our footsteps, our  
Messengers; and We sent,  
following, Jesus son of  
Mary, and gave unto him  
the Gospel.  
And We set in the hearts of those who  
followed him tenderness and mercy.

ORNAMENTS 60 - 65

And when Jesus came with the clear signs he said, "I have come to you with wisdom, and that I may make clear to you some of that whereon you are at variance; so fear you God and obey you me. Assuredly God is my Lord and your Lord; therefore serve Him; this is the straight path."

But the Koran refutes Jesus as our savior  
And cast Jesus in the role of prophet of the Koran

THE RANKS 5

And when Jesus son of Mary said, "Children of Israel, I am indeed the Messenger of God to you, confirming the Torah that before me, and giving good tidings of a Messenger who shall come after me, who's name shall be Ahmad."

And the Koran mocks Jesus and tells the followers of the Koran that when they encounter a Christian they should:

ORNAMENTS 80

Say: "If the All-merciful has a son, then I am the first to serve him. Glory be to the Lord of the heavens and the earth, the Lord of the Throne, above that they describe."

*George Bailey*

Then leave them alone to plunge and play,  
until they encounter that day of theirs  
which they were promised.  
And it is He who in heaven is God  
and in earth is God; He is the All-wise  
the All-knowing.

The Koran teaches that Muslims and God have a covenant. And while its origins were not clear to me from the reading, I assume that it must be based in part on:

THE PILGRIMAGE 75

O Men, bow you down and prostrate yourselves,  
and serve your Lord, and do good; haply so  
you shall prosper;  
and struggle for God as is his due, for  
He has chosen you, and has laid on you  
no impediment in your religion,  
being the creed of your father Abraham; He named you  
Muslims.

I know and understand that it is based on the old testament, and confirms the Torah and the New Testament

THE BATTLEMENTS 155-160

Said He, "My chastisement-I smite with it  
whom I will; and My mercy embraces all things, and  
I shall prescribe it for those who are God fearing  
and pay the alms, and those who indeed believe  
in Our signs, those who follow the Messenger,  
the prophet of the common folk, whom they find  
written down with them in the Torah and the Gospel,  
bidding them to honor, and forbidding them  
dishonor, making lawful for them the good things  
and making unlawful for them the corrupt things,  
and relieving them of their loads, and the fetters  
that were upon them. Those who believe in him

and secure him and help him, and follow  
the light that has been sent down with him-  
they are the prosperers”  
Say: “O mankind, I am the Messenger of God  
to you all,  
of Him to whom belongs the kingdom of the heavens  
and of the earth.  
There is no god but He.  
He gives life, and makes to die.  
Believe then in God, and His Messenger,  
the Prophet of the common folk, who believes  
in God and His words, and follow him; haply  
you will be guided”

But it does not teach the Gospel according to Jesus Christ. It does not teach forgiveness or the turning of the other cheek.

#### THE COW

And fight in the way of God with those  
who fight with you, but aggress not: God loves  
not the aggressors.  
And slay them wherever you come upon them,  
and expel them from where they expelled you;  
persecution is more grievous than slaying.  
But fight them not by the Holy Mosque  
until they should fight you there;  
then, if they fight you, slay them-  
such is the recompense of the unbelievers-  
but if they give over, surely God is  
All-forgiving, All-compassionate.  
Fight them, till there is no persecution  
and the religion is God's; then if they  
give over, there shall be no enmity  
save for evildoers.  
The holy mouth for the holy mouth

*George Bailey*

holy things demand retaliation.  
Whoso commits aggression against you,  
do you commit aggression against him  
like as he has committed against you;  
and fear God, and know that thy God is  
with the God fearing.

In time, the Roman Empire would fall as well. In time the Moors would build an empire of their own. Their grip would reach all the way to Europe and their influence and their yoke would befall the Saxons of England in the 8th Century, until the day they were at last driven out. They would hold dominion over Spain until El Sid would lead his people to freedom. Perhaps the Moors were a Black society. Perhaps the Arabs and Berbers who made up their masses were a remnant of Egypt, but it certain that they were Muslims. From the 11<sup>th</sup> century into the 13<sup>th</sup> the Crusades would send men off to die to reclaim what they perceived as Holly Land. They would fight and kill to reclaim the sight of the old Hebrew Temple in Jerusalem in which the Ark of the Covenant had been kept, and they would fail. In that, surely there is meaning for those who should understand Christianity. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the great Ottoman Empire, which is today's Turkey, would surge across Asia Minor. Islam would stand once again at the gates of Europe. But they would stop short. The leader of their army would become concerned with events within his own government and simply turn and leave for home. In a turn of events that rings of stories of the Old Testament, Christianity would be prevail. Just as importantly, Martin Luther would translate the Bible into German in the 15<sup>th</sup> century and in 1611 King James, would see it published in English. Luther's work would mark the beginning of the Reformation and the understanding that God is a God of love, and that forgiveness comes to us as a gift, not through works. From that seed would come those who would brave the unknown to colonize the New World in a search for religious freedom. And while it can not be denied that the churches of man would involve themselves in all manner of abomination in Europe and throughout the world; Europe, the spring board of Christianity [and with it Christianity itself], would be protected from invasion by the East, not by might, but by the turning back of the Ottoman at their own hand.

Over time, the Christian ethic that had brought the Pilgrims to the new continent of north America, would be rivaled, if not replaced by greed. The institution of Slavery would rise up in Colonial North America, in the same way it had in the Southern Islands. In the same way it had raised Egypt to power, it would raise up the Southern Plantations to power. And just as the God of Abraham had delivered the Hebrews from Pharaoh because they followed God, so did He deliver the slaves of the new world because they believed in Him. The

slaves of the Americas did not worship their God through Muhammad. They worshipped God through Jesus Christ their Lord and Savior. Like Pharaoh, the hearts of the Old South were hardened, and like Pharaoh they paid the price of retribution.

If, as some Blacks now claim, America's slaves were the remnant and the prodigy of those who had abused their dominion over the Jews in Egypt or the Saxons of England; then it is not difficult to see the symmetry of God's hand. But regardless of validity of such claims, with time, those who were enslaved would be freed and those who had made slaves of men would be punished. Christianity would move from its birth place in the Middle East, to the shores of Europe and on to the New world. Eventually, it would push westward once more to circumvent the globe. Power would shift from nation to nation, but freedom, freedom would travel along a line that was marked by the God of Abraham and his son Jesus Christ, our Lord; and it would cover the earth. Blood lines would cross and co-mingle. The "Y" chromosomes of the victors would undoubtedly travel among those of the vanquished. But I tell you, Black America, that you are a race reborn. I tell you that you have been freed from your slavery by your belief in Jesus. I tell you and all mankind, that the Ark of the Covenant was taken away from the hands of man by God. I tell you that; as the Koran says, "Glory be to Him! He is All-sufficient. There is nothing you can give to God that He needs." If you are to be forgiven, it is by His grace. There is no temple built as the temple of the Ark was built, and there can be none; for the Ark can be found no more.

The Koran has a saying that it uses frequently. "Surely in this is a sign for those who will see". The Koran teaches:

#### REPENTANCE 110

God has bought from the believers their selves  
and their possessions against the gift of Paradise;  
they fight in the way of God; they kill and are  
killed; that is the promise binding upon God  
in the Torah, and the Gospel, and in the koran;  
and who fulfills his covenant truer than God?

But is not God all powerful? Who confirms Him more, those who martyr themselves by killing women and children or those that died in the Roman arena without denying Him. Who demonstrates their faith: Martin Luther King, who took abuse and death threats and did not retaliate or those that seek out the vengeance of the Old Testament in the form of the Koran. When the rockets of Saddam Hussein fell on Israel in the Gulf War, the Jewish people held their hand

*George Bailey*

and in so doing assured the humiliation of Iraq. If Israel is to find peace in the Middle East it will be because they have turned the other cheek. And those who would stop that peace, saying they do the work of the Lord, preach the word of "An Eye For An Eye"; as vengeance, not as a limit. And their children grow up in a war zone; And their fathers have blood on their hands. They are not free men but they live under Monarchs. In that, surely there are signs for those who have understanding.

The Nation of Islam is a force which does not serve Jesus Christ in whom we must seek our salvation. The Black community is at a place in time where the bitterness of their situation has made them susceptible to the impulse of revenge; which is fostered in the Koran. But remember:

#### THE TABLE 55

O believers, take not Jews and Christians  
as friends; they are friends of each other.  
Whoso of you makes them his friends  
is one of them. God guides not the people  
of the evildoers .

This is not a teaching that could raise up a nation such as ours to greatness. It is a stumbling block to the teachings of Jesus. Not only will the Blacks of our nation be divided but here is the future that the Koran has promoted for you who resist.

#### THE SPOILS

O believers, when you encounter  
the unbelievers marching to battle, turn  
not your backs on them.  
Whoso turns his back that day to them,  
unless withdrawing to fight again  
or removing to join another host,  
he is laden with the burden of God's  
anger, and his refuge is Gehenna-  
an evil homecoming!

But even if you are confused by this appearance of tolerance:



THE TABLE – 70

Surely they that believe, and those of Jewry,  
and the Sabaeans, and the Christians,  
whosoever believes in God and  
the Last Day, and works righteousness-  
no fear shall be on them,  
neither shall they sorrow.

But In teaching that all may be saved, the Koran also teaches:

REPENTANCE 3 - 7

An give thou good tidings to the unbelievers  
a painful chastisement;  
excepting those of the idolaters with whom  
you made a covenant, then they failed you naught  
neither lent support to any man against you.  
With them fulfill your covenant till their term; surely  
God loves the godfearing.  
Then, when the sacred months are drawn away,  
slay the idolaters wherever you find them,  
and take them, and confine them, and lie in wait  
for them at every place of ambush. But if they  
repent, and perform the prayer, and pay the alms, then  
let them go their way;  
God is All-forgiving, All-compassionate.

Christ taught that it is by our faith and through Christ, that we are given salvation. The Koran teaches that it is by the righteousness of our actions. In the end, it will be up to you to choose. But if you will choose the path of vengeance then you must be certain of the lineage from which you stem and know with certainty who it was that started each fight down through the history of man. My lineage is not known to me but my Salvation is. For those of you who look to find your heritage in the color of your skin, your history is obvious if you have eyes to see. Whether or not America's blacks are of a blood line that stems from Egypt, the Moors or the Ottoman Empire I do not know. But like all the sons and daughters of Man, you are adrift upon a sea of human history: A history of which

*George Bailey*

you are a part, in ways that you can not possibly know. You are, by your mortal nature, at variance with the straight path and your salvation lies in the hand of the one who died for all of us. His name is Jesus Christ. His message is tolerance and what? You know. FORGIVENESS. This is your time. Revel in it. And if you want to take an example from that part of your heritage which gave you your skin tone, then look to South Africa. It is a place where there is hope for a peaceful future because they have chosen to try and forgive the atrocities of the past. Compare their progress to that of the Middle East. Surely in that there is a lesson for those who have eyes to see.

If you want to be main stream Americans, it falls to you to conduct yourself in a manner that conforms to mainstream America as the “Huxtables” did. I myself have brothers. If one of them refuses to become a part of Society, you would not allow me to insist that your resources be allocated to them. Nor would I expect it. Why then would you make such demands for those who call themselves your Brother by virtue of their skin color when We are all brothers under the skin. You must always remember that Long Shanks will promote division between us and he will use the mythologies of the past to that end. In the movie “Bullworth” we would be told that the forces of evil have killed all those Whites who would help the “BLACK” community. We were revisited with the old tail that business has moved all the jobs out of the black community for the sake of profit, so that there is no opportunity for those within the “Hood” who would change if only there was hope. I will dispel the notion of business as the bad guy in due course; but as for the lack of opportunity in the Hood: Oakland California has one of America’s largest concentrations of disfranchised Blacks in the country. Oakland is situated on the eastern shore of the great San Francisco Bay. On any given morning you can witness the movement of thousands of commuters, many of whom travel into the Bay area from as far away Sacramento and pass through Oakland on their way to work. If you look to any ghetto in any metropolitan area, you will see commuters passing through it on their way to work. And yet, we are told that those within the ghetto can not find work, as though they are not allowed to leave.

When I was a young man, the racists within my community used to point the idiocy of Blacks who would live in a run down “Tar Paper” house and have a new Cadillac parked in the driveway. Of course, in truth, the successful Black male of the period, [the 1950’s] could buy a new Cadillac, but he would be barred by segregation from purchasing a home in a good neighborhood. We changed that. In generations preceding the 1950’s, there had been those who had attained some financial success. But never before had the bulk of the Black population moved forward economically in the way they would immediately after WWII. As a result, SOME of those within this disenfranchised group which existed in the generations prior to the war, would find their self esteem, not

through home ownership, or Cadillac ownership, but through the only avenue open to them; sexual conquest. The “Blues” and this same set of circumstances would walk hand in hand with this lifestyle. While this mind set finds its origins in poverty rather than the Black culture, it would become part of the mythology of the Black subculture. It would become part of the fabric which elevated the self esteem of Black women, that they could fulfill the self esteem of those who had no other means, through sex and in so doing, elevate their own self esteem. It is a lifestyle which is at odds with the notion of reverence based on virtue.

If I have hurt you as a Black, or if I have offended you, please forgive me. I wish only to call you home. These are not traits exclusive to Blacks. If you look around, you can see the same dynamics at work in the “Latin Lover” stereotype, and other downtrodden cultures which do not turn to God for self esteem and reassurance. The subculture of the inner city is a reflection of a culture which existed before the opportunities afforded Blacks as a result of Civil Rights laws and the economic prosperity which has existed for most of this century. And yet we see it in resurgence. If you look around our own country you can see the same ideology being emulated by more and more young women of our nation, across all ethnic and racial boundaries. The common link is a lack of self esteem as a result of unrealistic expectations. It is about poverty and a loss of hope. In the same way Black leaders have convinced you that you are unable to succeed without special consideration, the women of our country have been told they must either be Bright or beautiful or both. For Blacks it is often because the systems which have raised up some of you have left you feeling guilty about those who were left behind and who still buy into the old mythologies, so that you do not challenge those mythologies. For women in general I suspect that without Motherhood as a viable option as a place in society, those who feel unable to succeed in a career, gravitate to the only remaining option.

I have championed Thomas Jefferson. I hold his memory in the highest regard. And yet, it must be admitted that, whatever his feelings or intentions; in the end, he would leave his own prodigy, the fruit of his sustained relationship, enslaved. Whether it would have been better that they never been born I can not say. But now, I would say to you of the Black community, that if you would continue to promote the mythologies of self pity and self esteem through sexual gratification, and violent aggression, that it is you who enslave your prodigy. If you are not willing to give up those things which Long Shanks gives you for your political “Proxy”, then in return for what you take, it will be necessary for you to keep those ghettos full of voters; that you may deliver them to Long Shank’s table. And if that is to be their lot in life, then you face Jefferson’s dilemma.

In the end, it is about validation. It is about the idea that one is stable in their conviction that they have value as a person and that that value is equal to those around them. Sometime back in the 1960’s, a teacher in Iowa divided her class

*George Bailey*

up into two groups: blue eyed children and brown eyed children. She then told them that brown eyed children were inferior. Within a day the reading ability of the brown eyed children had regressed. They formed into two groups which were at odds with one another. But more importantly, the superiority felt by the blue eyed group was reciprocated by the inferiority felt by the brown eyed group. It was a big step forward in our understanding of ourselves. It has become a battle hymn for those who wish to make us feel guilty about how Whites have treated Blacks within this country. But in the end, I believe it has led us in the wrong direction. In the end, I think we would have been served much better had she chosen the attribute of height, or size of head or even gender. Had she used another attribute then maybe it would have been more clear that it is not just about racism. We tell kids from the wrong side of the tracks that they can't succeed so they don't. We tell girls that their lot in life is second class so they abandon their efforts at life. We tell the kids from the other side of the tracks that they are superior and so they do not act as Christians toward their neighbors and society. All this brings us back to the founding of this great nation and the emergence of a philosophy, a belief based in the Christian ethic, that all Men are Created Equal. And even though that statement would not include Women, as Men were "Validated" so were women. What's more, that notion would later be stated as law. It is no longer Men or even Whites who are telling Women and Minorities that they are invalid. It is Women and Minorities who tell them that they are. Jesus is your Validation. You are loved. You are capable. You can be more than you were when you began. Even Forest Gump understood that "Stupid is, as stupid does". This is your time, this is your place, this is your life; revel in it. You can be all you want to be, but you must do it yourself. What's more, You must believe that you can.

To Hispanics: the challenges your people face, as well as those you create for yourselves, are in many ways the same as those of Black Americans. Sociologists and Psychologists have a term, for when people [especially the minorities] gather up all their negative emotions and carry them around because they feel they have paid for them, and they become prize positions. They call it "Gunny Sacking". It was an unrealistic notion of Blacks of the 60's and 70's, that they could somehow return to Africa. Whether the idea was put forth by Black radicals or White bigots, it made no sense; as Blacks in America have been Americans as long as White Americans in general. This is also true of many Hispanics. But for those of you who do not whole heartedly except this nation as your own, it is time to head south. It is unfair to divide us through language when so many other immigrants, past and present, have honored the rationality of one nation, one language. As with the black community, and minorities in general, if you embrace bigotry against other races, you will live under the tyranny of racism. If you enjoy the power of intimidation, it will be visited upon you as well: for fear will always reveal itself as anger. You already know what economic limitations

will confront you if you retain Spanish as your only language. To that the revolution will add a condition which prohibits government from printing material intended for the general public, in any language other than English. This is not intended as a punishment, but rather as an attempt at consolidation. At the same time, it should be noted that those of you who take our charity and our Social Security and feel no need to learn the language of our nation, appear the ingrate. It is you who punish your children by holding to Spanish in the home and in your communities. You could be helping them in the same way that every other immigrant group did. Instead you insure that they remain second class citizens in a classless society. Again, if you can not embrace a classless society, then you need to return to that place were you can look down on those below you and in turn, be looked down on as well.

In addition, a change is in order which demands one of a child's acknowledged parents be a citizen in order that citizenship due to birth in the US be a birth right. If you consider what you bring to the revolutionary table to be too great, then you are considering your situation from the standpoint of Hispanic rather than American. Many within the Hispanic community rationalize their own bigotry and racism with claims that it is White America at large who allows illegals to be used as they are. I would suggest to you that you are wrong. I would suggest that most Americans who see people they suspect to be here illegally, turn a blind eye, not for the sake of those who abuse, but for the sake of those who they know have come only because they needed the work. We speak of ourselves as free and democratic; but as I have endeavored to teach you with this book, all people, including White people, stand in their lines. And the reason they stand in those lines is because they feel powerless. If you reflect on this, I am sure that you can see that it is true. In turning a blind eye to illegal immigration, America at large does itself, and illegals alike, a disservice. But I do not believe that most Americas do it for the wrong reasons. The chance that illegals are afforded is not a good one; but contrary to what you are told by those who stir the pot for Long Shanks, a chance is all any of us gets. What's more, all of us see our chances diminish with time as we continue in the direction we are heading. If we are brave enough to change things, the world will be a better place: but it is important for you as Hispanics, to understand that you have more friends than you know. You must not let your dissatisfaction turn you into a pawn for those who wish to keep us divided. Turn away from hate and from the past. Do not buy into the dream that one day you will reclaim part of this nation for Mexico. If it were, indeed, to come to pass; then like those Jews who asked to be rid of Judges in favor of a King, you will have traded away the liberty this country affords you, for the promise of property that will go to those who oppress you.

I had occasion to make the acquaintance of an elderly gentleman out in a California bar. We talked about work and we talked about history over a drink.

*George Bailey*

He shared with me some of his exploits and among them he related his days as a bombardier in WWII. He had flown mission after mission over Germany. He had dropped bomb after bomb in a battle for good over evil and was proud of his contribution. And rightly so. But even more true to the nature of this man's sense of patriotism was the fact that he was the son of immigrant parents who had come to America from Germany.

America is a nation of equality, of freedom, of promise and most importantly, it is a nation of individuals who put country ahead of race. We are the grand experiment. We are the hope of the future of mankind. To be an American is not about race or gender or even country; it is a state of mind. It is to embrace brotherhood and freedom. It is to be the huddled masses joined together as One Nation, Under God, Indivisible, With Liberty and Justice For ALL! It is a grand notion. Join with us and let us be as one. Burn your Gunny Sack and spread its ashes upon the water. Teach English to your children in pre-school or before the continuation of their education. If you do not, then you divide students by race during the formative years as: Whites in English classes, Hispanics in Spanish classes.

To Japanese Americans: I hope I have made clear my personal fondness and appreciation of your continued contribution to this land that we love. Remember that time heals all wounds. Remember that truth and knowledge are the enemies of bigotry and divisiveness. Hold tight to your family values. Continue to practice brotherly love in the face of adversity. Understand that Americans know that the restitution given you for the injustices you endured during WWII was more in spirit than in equity. Let the lessons of the past be neither forgotten nor points of contention. Open your hearts and let us try once again. I would tell you I fear that we are headed in a direction of great uncertainty. Later on in this book I will explain in detail the workings of the monetary system. As I work to complete this book in 1999, the US economy is polarized. Those investing in the stock market reap record rewards, while the working class loses earning power in the face of a stronger dollar. At the same time, the Pacific Rim is in economic and monetary turmoil. I will not speculate on the motives of those who control the monetary systems of this world. I will not attempt to anticipate what moves they will make to manipulate the world economy in order to remain in control. Instead, I would ask you to be vigilant for parallels between today's world and the world prior to WWII. Be watchful, so that if those who push nation against nation to their own end, should try and deal with economic calamity, at some time in the future, in the same way they did in WWII; you can be a calming voice across the water. It may be that the world economy will rebound. It may be that things will plod along drearily but without incident, for the next fifty years. Or it might also be that we teeter on the brink economically as well as morally. I do not see into the future, but I can see the lessons of the past. Those at the top, pit

nation against nation in the same way that government and special interest, pit individuals against one another. It is the promise of a nation forged from the marriage of the peoples from all the nations of the world, to bring the world into the future without bloodshed.

To Chinese Americans: My request would be much the same. Take pride that, while much of our western railways were built upon the broken backs of your forefathers, your spirit was never broken. Learn to forgive the way in which it was done; and understand that those who profited have long since had to explain themselves to our Creator. Know that those who stand in their place oppress us all and exploit our differences to that end. And always remember that some of them are of your race. Replace your distrust and hurt with a smile and an open heart. And when these things fail you, pick them up and try again. For, we face a long up hill climb, full of snags and pitfalls; but was it not your people who first came to understand that a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step? For myself, I am happy to walk with you. It is true that the number of Chinese allowed to immigrate to this country have been held down. It is unfortunate and it is a source of contention. But just as with all facts from the past, this too must be understood in the context of the times. In watching a historical documentary on the building of the Western Railways and the contributions made by the Chinese I think I came to understand more clearly. The documentary explained that the [White] foremen hired by the Railroads found that when dealing with a group of Chinese laborers, that they would only take direction by their own Chinese group leader. It wasn't that the foreman minded. Fact was, it probable made their job as foreman easier. But this banding together was contrary to the times. Unions were none existent out West and in their infancy back East where the rails themselves came from. In the independent spirit of the West, such clannish behavior was probably perceived as a threat. Many of those who when west, probably did so to escape the "Clans" who were in control in the places they moved away from. It is a scenario not unlike that of the Jewish community, where unfamiliarity clouds the perception, leads to ostracization and gives rise to rationalizations on both sides. I don't imagine that the fact that opium was associated with the Chinese helped much either. This is particularly ironic, since it was the English who introduced opium to the Chinese. Never the less; the inability of the Chinese of the day to integrate into the Society of the day would lead to an awkward situation that would persist even to this day. Please do not misunderstand. I do not mean to belittle your grievances. I wish merely to point out that as cultures clashed in the new world which is our America, there would always be two sides to a story and people anxious to exploit the differences between peoples. But there is cause for optimism. In 1997, Washington State would elect its first ever Governor of Chinese decent. These things seem far too slow, but the distance that separates us from our goals is much nearer our destination than to our beginning. Hold on to that.

*George Bailey*

Constraints I have put on immigration quotas may seem particularly untimely for you and for that I apologize. It is my personal hope you will understand that it is a result of complete and packaged approach to our problems and not an assault on you. I would ask you to help those who have immigrated here in recent years to understand our systems. As they have come from a society which is not Capitalistic in nature, they do not always understand the system or their obligations within it. It is a source of contention and it should be our goal to educate all our people so as to alleviate contention. As an example, I happened recently to use the facilities at a Laundromat that was owned by a Chinese couple. Many of the machines were out of order, but they did not say that they were. The Hispanic ladies, who were using the machines, guided me away from the ones that did not work. The next time I entered the business, those machines which did not work had been marked by the customers with magic markers. The owners were in the process of cleaning up their machines. But even as the owners were cleaning the graffiti, and the racist remarks from their equipment, they did not mark the broken machines. I am guessing that in a communist country, those machines would have been furnished by the State and free to the citizens. So that if they did not work, one would simply find another machine. In a Capitalistic system, were minimum wage workers put money into machines that do not work, they are not allowed to move to the next machine for free. So we find an immigrant business owner who feels besieged by an immigrant consumer who feels abused. We also find a minority segment of our society who needs the help and guidance of others.

Along the same lines, you understand better than most that in China, aggressive and impolite driving is the norm. It is accepted and not seen as an affront to civility. But when large numbers of immigrants are allowed driver's licenses without understanding the differences in cultures, they become sources of friction. In this book we have discussed the anti-social behavior of those who do not feel a part of this society, and how they threaten this society. We have championed an end to the welfare system because it has deteriorated into a system that encourages young women to have children in order to obtain a pay check. I have tried to convince America that those who live within the world of the drug user and the prostitute are better served by our forgiveness than our self righteousness. At the turn of the new century, a White male baseball player would get in way over his head for shooting off his mouth in a politically incorrect way. He would proclaim his unwillingness to ride on a subway with the three social elements I have just described. He would use the word monkey to describe a friend of his and the press would run with it, even though the man referred to was not Black but Latin. In the same way a high ranking government official would be forced to resign for using the word "niggardly", which has no relevance to the other "N" word, the words fat and monkey have now become politically illegal. The press is in the business of stirring us up, not to improve



society, but to get us to tune into their coverage of a society which is in decline and getting plenty of help in that direction from the press. And while I don't know enough about this ball player to defend him beyond this fine point, I want you to understand that we are being incited against one another and it needs to stop. The President has made claim that he has put an end to the old system of welfare because it is bad. Presumably because it creates a class [not a race] of people who are bad for society. Other wise we would aspire to raise all our children that way. He has passed legislation to put those who commit hate crimes in jail with stiffer sentences. He has signed legislation to put drug users away in prison. So while our President may put these people in prison or on the street, this ball player may not say that he doesn't like to be trapped in a subway car with them. The reason I have included this observation in this segment which is devoted to Americans of Chinese decent is that this same knuckle head made the statement in front of a journalist that a particular bad driver that was, at the time, in his path was probably an Asian Woman. We are talking about the same dynamic I explained in relation to the bygone verb "To Jew". Do not let us be divided. As I have traveled the freeways of northern California I have observed may aggressive drivers. I have observed that they are disproportionately young women. I have also observed many "entitled" drivers and they tend to drive up scale cars in disproportionate numbers. I have also observed many rude drivers and I have observed that many of them are Asian, but it has become unacceptable to make such observations.

Please do not take this as an indictment. To the contrary, I hope very much that you will try to fit in and that you will be accepted. It should be obvious to you if you look, that White America does not stand in protest of any particular group which legally immigrates to this country. To the contrary, an African immigrant will be afforded the same affirmative action privileges and civil rights protection as a Black whose ancestors were once American slaves. These same protections have been given to Asian immigrants. At the same time, it is not possible to maintain a family, if some of its members are allowed to speak to the improper behavior of other family members, while other members are bared from reciprocity. We Americans are either family or We are failed.

To all the new immigrants from around this diverse world, welcome. Forgive me for not acknowledging each of your individual counties. You have arrived from your sojourn at a time when we stand at the threshold. At a time when it seems as though we are lost. But you most know that America's wealth is a reflection of its people. Although we may seem to be in decline; it is, I pray, more a case of a lack of direction. Americans, of which you are now one, have consistently been willing and able to right wrongs. It is our greatest legacy. We have been wrong for quite sometime now; but it is my hope that this humble effort on my part, will contribute to helping us find our way back. The reason

*George Bailey*

that most of you, and those who came before you, came to America, was to embrace what is right and what is true: to be free. Don't lose sight of that. Despite disparities in economics, we are still a classless society. Embrace it. We are a nation which integrates those things are appealing from new comers and is offended by those ideas which repulse us. Honor that. Ethnicity in general, has become the "Sacred Cow" which may not be spoken of in a negative way in present day America. But it leads the young away from "Main Stream" America and from fitting in; when fitting in is all any kid ever wanted. Today's White community has apologized over and over again for wrongs perpetrated on minority races by those gone before us. But I have never heard any minority thank that White Majority for its efforts; but rather, minorities have taken personal credit for all the change and chastised Whites for all the problems present in the real world. Be that as it may, no minority can accomplish anything within a Democracy without the consent of the majority. As immigrants to this county you are of a culture which is a minority. And while it may appear to you that we are a nation fragmented, we are still, at our core, a nation of one culture. It is made up of a majority that transcends ethnic and racial lines. If you can't understand that you are now Americans and as such, part of an established culture: if you reject the culture of the "Melting Pot" in favor of your own minority's social history, you belong back in your respective minority country. If, on the other hand, you embrace this country, then welcome. You, above any others, should understand the importance of what this grand and noble experiment we call America is. You should also understand better than most how fragile it is. Never before in the history of man has a nation been created from a cross section of the nations of the world in which all its members were afforded equal status by law. The fact that we have come to be counted as one of the most powerful of nations is a testament to those who have gone before us. But there is no guaranty that we will survive as a nation. It is easy to imagine our states as fragmented countries in a constant state of agitation, not unlike Europe. Lincoln understood that. He also understood that without America, the promise of freedom might well die for all the other nations of the world. Americans have become complacent, lazy, and apathetic. It is up to you to help them to understand that they have an obligation to keep the dream alive. If we fail, there will be no far off land in which to incubate a fledgling Democracy. It is easy in the land of plenty, to imagine that things will continue on as they have. But you know better. Become Americans. Become advocates, zealots, of the Republic; One Nation, Under God, Indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for all.

Some of you have come to us with only a dream and we applaud you. Some have come with the assets of education or financial worth; we wish you success. Some of you have come with political favor: and have been overly compensated with wealth usurped from the working class and it is a festering soar. There must be an end to this kind of political pay off whether it takes the form of cash, loans

or tax breaks. If immigrants need help in getting started, then it should be in the form of Class II Welfare Housing. Any other system is unfair to tax payers, to competing businesses and perhaps most importantly, to the offspring of those immigrants involved. The end result of such unfair practices in the past has led to bad feelings and ostracization. It must end. Remember that the amount of energy required to smelt different materials together will always be a function of those materials tendency to fuse together. Let us join in a common effort to realize the dream you came seeking. Make yourself as malleable as you are able. Do not listen to those who tell you that this is your country to do with as your own. It is a Democracy, which listens to your suggested changes and decides which ones it will embrace. There are those who would tell you that you have the right to retain your Ex-Patriot Nation's identity. They would have you believe that blacks who dress as Africans and Mexicans who speak only Spanish, are fulfilling the American Dream. But that is untrue. You should feel privileged. You are a guest who has been given a portion of "OUR" home to keep for your own. You have been given a seat at our table. Any other perception of your situation is pure rationalization.

When I was still an adolescent, I heard a speech made by a man who preached hatred and violence. He wore a white robe and he spoke for the Klu Klux Klan. I saw a film clip in 1999 that was an excerpt from that speech, and the memories flooded back of a time in my childhood when children feared another civil war; but this would be a race war. In the speech, this man spoke of the need to keep the races separate, on the basis that, if we did not, that we would become a mongrel race. A race without blood lines. That man and his philosophy would be rejected by a white majority. But today, as we look around us, it has become politically correct and acceptable for members of minority groups to champion the notion that their race needs to be kept racially pure. Native Americans have taken suit against individuals who would try to adopt Native American children. Like those who derived power from the numbers of followers they gathered around them in the "Klan", those of all minorities derive power by keeping you in your lines. If you put a prefix such as Native or Mexican, or African or Female, in front of American when describing yourself, you might just as well leave the American off your description; because it really doesn't apply in your case. You do not understand the concept.

If you traveled to the small Dutch Immigrant communities of the Mid West near where I grew up, you would have found [and may still find] Dutch costumes and May Pole Dances that commemorate their heritage and their contribution on May Day. But, other than that one day a year, you would see no wooden shoes; no Dutch attire. It wouldn't be because they were not proud of their heritage, or that their heritage did not contribute to the society of which they felt a part. It would not be because they didn't feel a connection to their past. It was just that to

*George Bailey*

do so would have been as out of place in the American landscape as Scottish “Kilts” on the school bus driver. Yes, you might still find a Dutch Windmill erected as a tourist attraction. The Motel might have a Dutch “Motif”. And down at the bar they might even gab at each other about how some of them weren’t Dutch but Germans. But the day to day life of these communities is as American as Mom And Apple Pie. Beer may have come from Europe but Coca Cola was invented by a American Black man. American music, from Rock and Roll to Country Swing is a mix of Ethnic influences. American-Chinese and Tex-Mex food are a national tradition. Our dress, our architecture, our automobiles and our furniture are not European or White; they are American. Even our English based language is uniquely American. Oddly enough, when ethnic groups refer to ours as a White culture, they are demeaning the contributions of their own group. It was black slaves who were called house boys and stable boys and yes, even cow boys. Ask the Irish if a white nation embraced their numbers. Ask the Italians, over crowded into the ghettos where once the Irish lived; and, who, in their turn were lorded over by the Irish. We are a nation that has always been pitted against each other by those who hold wealth and power: and while those who were preyed on without the benefit of civil rights protection were often immigrants of the “White” race, they and their descendants have worked to protect you regardless of your race. But beyond that, We are a nation of Men and Women; not of the sons of daughters of men gone before. That is the foundation upon which the American dream was built, but it has been distorted by those who wish to prosper, not by their own accomplishments, but by the accomplishments of those who have gone before: even if those who went before were slaves. It is the line they stand in and the rationalizations they hide behind. From the Hispanics who claim lineage to the Land Lords of the early Californias, to the sons and daughters of farmers handed down the small and failing farms of the Midwest, they speak of entitlement. This includes women who speak of the thousands of years of oppression they have suffered at age fifty, when their entire career has been propped up at the expense of the rest of society and celebrated by a liberal and ignorant press.

The Danes left their homeland for many reasons I’m sure. But, among them was the fact that if your father was a shoe maker, you would be a shoe maker. I doubt that many Danes left, who’s fathers were land Lords. Most Blacks do not wish to draw their lineage from the Whites who are, in fact, part of their blood line. I can understand that. But aside from disassociating themselves from ancestors who wronged them; by clinging only to the maternal “Roots”, Blacks may stand in a line that comes with entitlement. This is understandable and not at all unique. But it must be recognized that if those same ancestors who were born of those untenable situations had been given a choice, they would have almost certainly have chosen to stand in the lines reserved for their Paternal blood line [their White father]. That is to say, they would have happily forgone the right to

the entitlements of their mother's heritage for the right to stand in the line of Free men and women. They probably would have even adopted the rationalizations of that line. Even if that meant that their half brothers and sisters, who had Black fathers, were to remain slaves. Am I degrading Blacks and their character? How can I be unless it is their White heritage that I am degrading; fore I have just described them as having White fathers. I speak instead, of their human nature; for in the scheme of things, that makes them White from a standpoint of their lineage. In God's holly plan, if it is lineage that gives honor or dishonor to those that were our individual ancestors; then the revelation of the "Y" chromosome as a genetic "Tracer" must surely bear witness. It's not about Blacks or Whites, it's about humans in general. It's about the lines we create to try and make a place for ourselves ahead of others. It is about the rationalizations we embrace in order to justify the lines we find ourselves in, either through choice or by chance. The promise of America is in its ability to challenge rationalizations. Freedom of the Press is dedicated to the proposition that rationalizations can not long survive when the truth is allowed to be heard. America is not a nation of the son and daughters of men, It is a nation of individuals who have joined together as One Nation, a nation Under GOD, an nation Indivisible, with Liberty and Justice For ALL. It is a notion that many have died for. Were it not so, you would never have been allowed to participate. Do not be an ingrate. Do not adorn yourself as a foreigner in a land that We have shared with you and expect that We will not treat you as an outsider. Do not resist the use of our language in your home, or demand the use of your language in our schools and public places and accuse us of separatism and bigotry.

As it was explained to me by an immigrant friend of mine, many of those behind the Iron curtain looked at America's foreign policy of handing out large sums of money, as evidence that we were corrupt and unfair. Because they could not understand Christian Charity in the vacuum of a Godless society, they surmised that if we could afford to give money away, we must have much more than we were entitled to. Today many of you, the new immigrants, have come at a time when affirmative action laws have pushed you to the front of the line ahead of those whose families have been here from the beginning. And while all of the immigrants who ever came here expected that the streets would be "Lined with Gold", all those before you found a harsh reality waiting. I have not come to chastise you for your good fortune. Nor do I come to take away from anyone. But I have come to slay your rationalizations. By the end of this book, you will come to understand that, the lot of the average American has been in decline for thirty years. Among the forces which have adversely affected that average household is immigration. If I am unable to draw you in to that group which calls itself Americans, without a prefix, then the task at hand will be that much more difficult. Do not be afraid to be counted as Americans. Do not be afraid that your sons and daughters will become mongrels. Fore if you stand in your lines you

*George Bailey*

will miss the greatest potential for America, which is, brotherhood. Students of history will note that Native Americans were placed in a line over a century ago and many tribes have stayed in that line, champions of its rationalizations. They have shifted from a Paternal society to a Matriarchal society, in which Mothers still have a place so long as there are children to rear: but Fathers have no place except as they function within the confines of the "State" system. These families do not go out and build a future for themselves, but rather they wait in "Line" for the Tribe to provide one. Fifty years ago, the Welfare System implemented the same set of principles into the social structure of the Black community. The results were duplicated almost exactly within the inner city. Today the on slot of these dynamics is focused on middle class America across all ethnic barriers, through the use of divorce laws and child support. We are becoming a Matriarchal society which does not go out and make its future, but rather, stands in its Line Of Entitlement, repeating the rationalizations of the line as taught.

The flood gates of immigration have been left open for the last thirty years. I have heard an estimate that by the year 2010 here will be three hundred million people in America. That means that for every two or three people within the population, born in this country, there will be another who was not. To understand the ramifications of this, one need only to look at the freeways of Metropolitan California where the rules of etiquette are none existent. Not only are people not being assimilated into the society, but it is Politically Incorrect to suggest that they should be. It is my hope that this book becomes an aid to all those of you who have come to our table, so that you might understand what it is to be an American. At our core We are Christians. It is the basis for all that this country was built on. Whether you believe or not, you must understand that it is not inner peace, nor the search for it, which allows us to live together. It is an unflinching commitment to treat others as we would wish to be treated. If you have come here to stand in a line you will be a weight upon the neck of a once great nation. But if you have come here to stand side by side with us then there is, indeed, hope.

I would like to offer New Immigrants to this country a view of two of my favorite American Heroes. The first was a little girl when she was thrust into the Civil Rights Movement. Her name was Ruby Bridges. Ruby was just a child when she integrated an all White school in the south, back in the 1960's. I think it was Bill Moyer who I heard relate her story. He told of how the White "Adults" heckled and jeered at her as she walked toward the school. In the middle of the throng, Ruby began yelling back in the direction of the crowd in earnest. Face to face she stood, hollering back toward the mean faces that chastised and scorned her in their hate and ignorance. Bill Moyer recalled that, some time after that day he would ask Ruby what it was that she had been yelling at all those grown ups. Ruby told him that she hadn't been yelling at those people at all. She had, indeed,

been looking into the faces of the crowd; but she had been screaming to God: and she had been asking him to forgive these people because they didn't know what they were doing.

My second "Great" American was a young man by the name of Bruce Lee. I don't say this because he was a successful Chinese American, nor because he was a master of the Martial Arts; both of which are true and undeniable. Bruce Lee made a conscience decision to teach those things that he knew of the Martial Arts to his "Countrymen" in the face of opposition from the Chinese Community. It is something he fought, and some say, died for.

Little Ruby Bridges put her God ahead of her fear and what could have been justifiable hatred. Bruce Lee put the Nation he loved ahead of his Race. They gave better than they got in return, but that is often the case with Heroes. As immigrants, you have much to live up to. How well you understand this will directly influence the outcome of all our futures. The plans I have for immigration will make it difficult for some to bring their extended families to the US. To that end, I would make this offer. For all those who only came here for the money, We would offer you \$10,000.00 for your citizenship. Or if you feel you can do better in the country you left, please return. We will give you \$10,000.00 dollars for each family member as well. So long as they were born within six months of the time this book becomes public and they give up their claim to be an American Citizen; the money is yours as soon as you leave. In fact, I would make this offer to any American who doesn't think this is the best place to be. A half a trillion dollars tacked onto the national debt is a small price to pay to remove 50 million malcontents from our midst. At the same time, those who went, for what ever reason, would become a Capitalistic seed spread across the earth and the cornerstone of our new foreign aid program, while making housing more available here at home.

In "The Searchers", Ethan and his adopted nephew spent years on the trail of the Indian who had stolen the young girl Debbie; Ethan's White niece. When they found her she was a young adult and a member of the culture that had been her home for those many years. It was the intention of Ethan, the uncle, to kill her when he found her. It would be her adopted brother who would intercede. She was still of the same race as Ethan, but because she had become a part of the rival culture, he believed that it would be better if she were dead. Of course, all those, of all races, who ever watched the movie could understand without instruction that, that was incorrect. It was the love of the adopted brother for his sister that would save the day and the girl. It is this same separation by culture which is at the heart of our racial and ethnic problems today, here in America. The idea of separate but equal was abandoned after it was proven to be unworkable. Today it is minorities who push for separate but equal and then demand compensation for inequality and special interest. With this in mind, let

*George Bailey*

me say that if you can see that this kind of thinking will drag us down, if you understand what the American Dream truly is, and Dream it, then We welcome you. This is Our home, yours and mine. Not Government's and not Political Activists; but yours and mine. Let Us revel in it.

To all you White males out there. I have defended you throughout most of this book. I have held you blameless for the most part. But you and I are not blameless. For those of us who found ourselves siding with the "Meat Head" against Archie Bunker on the TV and against our fathers across the dinner table, something was lost. As "Pink Floyd" put it, we have become "comfortably numb". "When we were young, we had a fever". In doing the right thing in the face of opposition about the Vietnam War, "We caught a glimpses out of the corner of our eyes". It was a glimpse at the true meaning of the American Revolution we were raised to revere. It was the will of the people standing up to government for what was just. But we lost it. We allowed ourselves to be fragmented. We had no vision or sense of purpose beyond rebellion. With the war ended, we were unable to "Put our finger on it now": that which needed to be done. Instead, one by one, we took our places in society. Our jobs and our pursuit of the ideology that "He who dies with the most toys wins" were the "little pin pricks" that sent us off to face the day. We stood by or encouraged, or insisted, as our wives went out to bring in a second paycheck in order to live up to the standards our fathers had set for us. But we did it without appreciating the greatest wealth bestowed on our generation: which was that someone had been waiting for us at home when we were children. We failed to recognize the social contribution of all those mothers in our childhood, who peered from behind open windows and kept us on the straight and narrow path. We belittled the bridge clubs which were the mental salvation of women whose only companions through the day were children. We didn't recognize that our fathers, who seemed to be forever at work were driven by the same demons which now drive us. We didn't learn from the experience that family and simple time spent together is of greater value than those things measured in dollars. The disillusionment of the 60's and 70's, sent many of us off to the work place with higher ideals. I think many of us still hoped that we could contribute in a positive way, and I like to think that we have to some extent. But still in all, I think we have become "comfortably numb". Today there is a new generation which seems to have a fever. But theirs is not one born of affluence. It is not tempered with an ideology of peace or love, or even dope, in the same way ours was. It has been forged from despair. Its heroes are "Terminators" and "Rambos" and "Dirty Harrys". Its slant is hate and vengeance. The purpose of this book is to suppress the hemorrhaging of their wounds. But I fear I can not quell their hate. I hope to offer them an alternative to violence; but it can not succeed without bringing that "Glimpse" back into your focus. In your quest to achieve, you have taken your fathers place. You hold the reigns past on to you. You have the power, the temper and,



hopefully, the wisdom we so lacked when first we set about to change the world. You have become the silent majority, and you must awaken from your sleep. Even more importantly, if our revolution succeeds, it will fall to you above all others to preserve it. You must commit yourselves to appropriating as much time to keeping an eye on your government representatives as you do to football or to what ever other diversions you embrace. And damn you if you fail to give equal opportunity to those who gave up unequal protection under the law for the sake of “All” our futures. In our Civil War, brother stood against brother in order to save our Union. If your brother embraces bigotry, dishonesty, greed or immorality, it is up to you to do no less than stand in your time as they stood in theirs.

To those of you who embraced love of country above all else; by serving in Vietnam, let me say that you are respected for having done what you considered to be the right thing. It is regrettable that our government was not as honorable as you. If the experience has left you full of hate, then let it go. If you feel guilt, seek forgiveness through the only one who can give you peace. If you feel betrayed, seek truth with the same tenacity you mustered all those many years ago. And if you find fairness in this book, then stand with us. But just as it must be said of police, and Government in general, if we as a nation are to become indebted to veterans for life, then it is better to fall to an enemy than to be made slaves by those who claim to protect us. What Government promises to one group within society must, of necessity, be taken away from the rest of society; not from Government. Remember always that you fought for freedom and equality, and embrace those ideals over your own special interests. I was fortunate enough never to have to go to war. I hope that, that fact will not cause you to close your hearts to what I have just asked of you. There can be no compensation great enough, no words eloquent enough to compensate those who lose a part of themselves to war. Within our population today there are soldiers who have gone through the unimaginable in WWII, Korea, Vietnam, the Gulf and perhaps dozens of other police actions around the world. So while it may seem presumptuous of me to ask any soldier to give up any thing, I can only say that I have not asked it of you for my sake but for the sake of the people of the country you served.

This book would not be complete if it did not address Native Americans as well. Despite the fact that we tend to think of most “Indians” as living on the “Reservation”, many are working class Americans. Hopefully, they will be served as well by this effort as any of us. But for those of you who still cling to the reservation, I ask that you allow me to speak to your situation. There has been a great upheaval of emotion over the five hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Columbus to your shores. It is ludicrous to think that you would have managed to live in secrecy forever, once the realization that the earth was round came to pass.

*George Bailey*

The fact is that he found this hemisphere without conceiving of its existence. What is relevant, I think, is that the first immigrants came in peace and in peace they were received. It is relevant that with the introduction of the horse, western technology was embraced: so much so that your ancestors of the plains became some of history's most renowned horsemen. It was the introduction of governmental influence that played upon old wounds between tribes and led to the invention of scalp taking. I know and understand that most people don't see the world in a Biblical sense. But consider that the first emissaries to this country brought with them the greatest treasure of humanity: the news of Jesus Christ. Had this message not evaded native Americans it would have been impossible for the French and the English to divide and conquer you as they did. This is not a story unique to America. It is a story as old as mankind. It was just as true in America before the arrival of the "White Eyes" as it was after they arrived. But regardless of your religious perspective, it was the manipulation by the forces in power that caused history to take the course it did. Jefferson believed that it would take a hundred generations for his vision of an agrarian culture to reach the Pacific. In the process I am sure he expected the native cultures to integrate with much more success than they did. It would be the Robber Barons of Capitalism and their unbridled thirst for growth, who would push government. And it was government that persuaded people that they could divide up land that was not theirs. It was the press that stirred them to hatred. It was the church of man that sanctified their self righteousness. It was the savagery of a wild and sometimes brutal native culture that fueled the rationalizations of the Whites. All these forces which played upon the peoples of the time are the same forces which played upon mankind from time immemorial. They are the same forces continue to feed upon you today as you foster self pity in your children. If you are a Native American woman, before you spend your life longing for a return to the old ways, remember that those ways included the buying and selling of women. If you are Sioux, remember that it has been said that the Black Hills you lay claim to, once belonged to the Crow.

Your ancestors reveled in their time. They adapted to the horse and to the gun because they were warriors. Ask yourself what they would think of you who are kept by the government: used as pawns to devastate the natural resources of your sovereign lands; your children succumbed to alcohol and despair. Today's warriors do battle in a global economy while you remain on your reservations and bask in the injustices done a people long vanished, by a people long died. Forgive the dead. Forgive the past. Understand that the memory of your ancestors is revered by all Americans. That to be part Indian is a source of great pride to many Americans who are not part of the reservation culture. Except the fact that the past is the past and move to make a future for your children, that one day you may be remembered as the ones who embraced the ways of a modern nation of which you are a part, and made a future for your generations to come. The nature

of our revolution does not allow for participation from those who do not work outside the reservation. Still, to truly mend the wounds of the past and unite our nation as it has never been united before, I offer up this solution. Bear in mind that if the revolution should come to pass, that the fringes upon which tribal businesses operate will disappear. Federal, State and local taxes on things such as alcohol and tobacco will be illegal. Gambling will find its place based on different criteria than before. If you are to build a future for your children which offers them self esteem, you will need capital. To that end, I would advocate that government guaranteed loans, equivalent to ten years of your subsidized income be offered in exchange for your right to such income: if you have such income. Furthermore, as is already the case for some of you, commercial enterprise involving fish and game shall be subject to the same regulations for you as for any other American. If you, as individuals, wish to live off the land in traditional ways, then do so. But anyone caught in the commercial pursuit of those resources would forfeit that special privilege for life, and for their children. Furthermore, I suggest [and this is only a suggestion] that you consider division of your lands to the individuals of your tribes. Your lands need not be usurped by counties or state: but if you are to be members of this country you will have to come under federal law. This autonomy has not proved to be a problem for Disney World in Florida. In this arrangement, all Native American lands would be turned over to those tribes who are able to assign ownership of reservation land to a specific list of individuals. This will mean working out land disputes before the land is turned over. But once assigned, all tribal land whose owners wish it, would become private deeded land, free of the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or any other agencies which interfere in the lives of people living on the reservation. It will not cause the land to become taxed, because that has been outlawed for all land. There would be a five year covenant for these lands with regard to subdivision in order to allow the owners of the land to decide on a course. If the land is to be divided it will be up to you to decide how. If it is held communally, then it should take the form of a corporation, with you as its stock holders. You will be subject to taxes. You will be entitled to those things which the revolution provides for all. But if you intend to participate in a competitive world, you must know that "A fool and his money are soon parted". You can manage your own government, be your own police, but you can not prop up those among you who insist on failure or you will be drug down together. If parts of your land are sold to people outside your Tribal circle, then they will have the rights of any other American to do with their land, what is allowable for all. Don't listen to those who say that this is abandoning your brothers and sisters. I do not suggest that the weak should be cast out. What I do suggest is that you begin to live again as nations reborn, with us as your brothers and sisters of a common heritage. And when your people fail, pick them up. But let it be known that yours is an act of

*George Bailey*

charity and theirs is an obligation of gratitude. But it is the struggle which gives meaning to life.

When they made the movie “Free Willy” they used a captive killer whale as the main character. After the second movie was made, money was gathered to buy the whale so that he could be returned to the sea, FREE. I don’t know if it ever actually came to pass or not. I know that there were concerns about whether he could survive if released. But that’s the point isn’t it. Your ancestors knew that. Those who resisted the notion of being locked on the reservation would surely wonder who you have come to be unwilling to leave it. Free yourselves. Free your children to go out into the wildness which is life and see if they can survive, FREE.

You will need time to prepare for such a great change in your lives. You will need to school your children in the ways of business, remembering always that success in business is no substitute for honor. You will have to teach them to trust. You will have to put the past in the past and begin again. And you will have to teach them “Forgiveness”. Do not wait for the rumblings of the revolution to start your journey into the future. If it comes to pass you will have a ten year window from the date of the revolution to take up the offer of capital and freedom from Government agencies. This stipulation is for no other reason than to insight you to begin. I hope you will.

If we are to straighten out the injustices of the past, we must also include Puerto Rico and any other US satellites in the discussion. For almost a hundred years Puerto Rico has functioned in limbo. Its people are taxed by the Federal Government , yet unable to vote in federal elections. It stands opposed to all we profess to be. With the revolution their should be an election held in which the citizens of Puerto Rico, both on the island and on the mainland, decide to become our 51st state or free and autonomous of us. But they should be mindful that we are an English speaking nation. It’s just that simple; period. We need to reassess, in an open forum, our relations with all those “satellite” countries with whom we have relations. If we continued to be the “Great Society”, we would be dragged down by adding new states just as communist Russia was. If we are a capitalistic nation which speaks one language and loves freedom, growth is not a threat. If these places are necessary to our well being then they have the right to be considered as States. We as democratic voters have the right and the need to be educated in a public forum concerning why they are a benefit. And they should have the right to decline our invitation.

The questions surrounding the separation of church and state, stand as testimony to our lack of “Faith” in this country. One need only look to the first line written in the “Declaration of Independence” for an answer. “We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights.” What Creator were they talking about?

On what other basis could such a conclusion be drawn: on size or strength, on wisdom, mental agility, personality, demeanor or pleasantness of features? There is only one way by which all men can be attributed equality and that is through the eyes of God. It was a revolution born of that single notion. It fostered a nation which flourished as a result of that realization. Why then would these men of wisdom and religion add such a proclamation as “Separation of Church and State” to their hopes for their beloved country? The answer can be found behind the pawns on the chess board, along side the King and Queen. It can be found in the Spanish Inquisition. It was evident in the institution of slavery and in the Indian wars. It can be found in the simple truth that the churches of this earth are controlled by men; and are very often used to absolve themselves of their own sins. But it can also be seen in twentieth Century Russia and China, where religion and worship was denied by the State.

John Lock argued to the Founding Fathers, that the State should be independent of the Church and that it would be a reflection of the moral beliefs of the populist, that would hold government to a moral course, without its being controlled by the church. But without moral fiber within a society, John Lock’s counter balance to the corruption of a Government, is disfranchised. Today lawyers argue that because pornography is justifiable, that the making of films promoting pedophilia are technically correct so long as the participants are, in fact, adults made to look like children. Today, lawyers argue that because information is sought out rather than presented on the Internet, that it is technically correct to apply a standard of “Absolute” Freedom of Speech to this media that enters more homes every day. But it is neither necessary to the preservation of Freedom of the Press or Freedom of Speech, to allow access in this forum; any more than it is necessary to allow nude pictorials on billboards.

Those who wish to promote pedophilia have the right to speak their case in a Democratic society. They will, no doubt, use a win in this battle, as a stepping stone to champion the political correctness of the acts portrayed in these films as an alternative form of sex, in the future. But, just as they have the right to promote their ideologies within a free society, Christians and other religious groups who oppose such activity have a right to denounce them in the strongest possible terms. This truth seems now to evade us. The Supreme Court has allowed privilege to those who acknowledge their belief in the existence of God by showing their hate and contempt for Him. This despite that, in a democracy, if the “Majority” wishes to spend public funds on religious endeavors, we have the constitutional right to do so, so long as it is the voters and not a “church” which decides. The attempt has been to separate religion, spiritualism and faith from the people of the State; and it has been very successful. The sad irony is that this could not have been accomplished without the help of the church. Today’s would be bishops of the chess board, gather around public officials, preaching politics;

*George Bailey*

not Christianity. Their churches which read from a Bible nearly two thousand years old, change their interpretations of it with the political winds of the day.

Imagine for a moment that you stand a short distance from two great crowds of people. It doesn't matter their gender or color or dress or age. In one crowd the people are smiling, alert; contented. They speak to each other in soft gentle tones and laughter echoes from their midst. They beckon you with their arms outstretched and call to you "Come, join us. Live in the way and you will find the peace we have come to know. Fall and we will help you up. Fail and we will not judge you, and we will forgive you even your mistakes so long as you are repentant. Leave behind you those things which degrade you. Help us to seek out that which is good and true".

Now imagine that the second group stands in a tight circle. Its member's arms are linked except for a small opening in the front. Their faces are stiff, severe, suspicious and judgmental. From behind the perimeter a few of them point fingers and hurl insults. Along the back you can see the occasional member slip between the clasped arms and wander off. Out in the distance, among the departed, stands a man dressed in fine clothes, taking notes and making deals to return the disgruntled to the fold. Suddenly, you notice a smiling face near the opening at the front of the circle. You can hear him calling your way; like one of those guys along the midway at a carnival. "We've got it; and you can have it too. Step right up and join in. You say your life's in the toilet? It has no meaning? I'm here to tell you that all the answers are right inside the circle."

Which crowd will you head for? More importantly, in which crowd will you find Christ? When I was young, the children of America were looking for the meaning of life. Many of us turned away from the church because it seemed to support the "State", yet we didn't turn away from God. Not all of us anyway. But we didn't embrace Him either. Probably because we were young and saw ourselves as changing the world and living forever: and probably because we lacked a forum; a place to feel close, that was not tainted with patriotism and national rationalization. Today not much has changed it seems. One popular "Head-banger" song in 1992, which addressed the kids feeling of abandonment and domination by society and family, referred to the church this way. "Light my candles in a daze cause I found God". If churches are to help us in this struggle, it must be by professing forgiveness while demonstrating uncompromising strength and conviction. It must be a forum for understanding "The Word" and a reminder that Christ said "He who is not for me, is against me.". Beyond that, its politics must be a reflection of its members politics rather than a voice from the pulpit and that is the reason for the inclusion of "Separation of Church and State"; Not to deny the love of God to his children, or to mute their prayers to Him: but just as importantly, it was included to protect the Church from the State. If we look

around today, it is obvious that the State has been very aggressive in denying Christianity a forum.

To all you communists out there, let me say that the provisions of this revolution to feed and house our people, surpass the abilities of the now defunct USSR to do for their own. Give up your illusions and join with us in a system that embraces reality. To those of you who desire a socialistic approach; be content to redistribute your own personal wealth in whatever manner you see fit. Recognize that we intend to venture only as far as outlined from capitalism, lest we remain servants to the nonproductive, and those who champion their cause. America is the land of opportunity, of freedom of religion, of freedom of expression, and of tolerance, of modesty and of reverence. To remove any of these, is for it to cease to be America. To you Capitalists, know and understand, that while we acknowledge the value of your system of economics, we will not be its slaves. Nor will we offer up our environment or our resources to it as sacrifice. Any system, governmental or economic, which does not provide adequately and equitably for "ALL" its members, both in sustenance and in dignity, is a failed system. Any system which is short sighted will, by its own nature, fall in the long run. My hope is to see a new type of Capitalism emerge from our efforts: one that is tempered with humanity, one that is worthy of our nation. In the beginning of this book I promised you that if you would read all of what I had to say concerning the "elephant", that I would share with you a vision of a new society. If you are still with me to this point in the book, you have been patient and I thank you. You have been given much to ponder. I have shown you how we can once more join together as a people, under God and indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. But in spite of all the change I have outlined thus far, there is much more: and I have saved the best for last.

I have endeavored over the better part of this, the last decade of the twentieth century, to change the world. It has been a pilgrimage for me. In the beginning, I would hear an issue being debated and I would try to come up with a solution. But oddly enough, within a very short time, it seemed that the process was reversed. That is to say that, in dealing with one issue I would have to deal with another; and it seemed that no matter what issue would come to be in need of being addressed in order for me to proceed, that issue would find a forum and that forum would find me. It would be easy to say that because I set about to find answers, I was open to information and therefore I noticed discussions that were always ongoing, but that I might not otherwise have been interested in. Still, with the progression of the book I have felt a sense that knowledge was being imparted to me. There is an age old question which asks, "When someone comes to make a breakthrough in science or philosophy, was it that the knowledge which has lead to the point of discovery was in the world and therefore the "Time" had come for someone to surmise the next step?", "Or does knowledge

*George Bailey*

come from a Divine source?". It will be up to history to decide if there are any quantum leaps to be found here within, but I would be lying to you if I told you that I have not come to feel that I have been led to of these last two ideas I am about to share with you. What's more, their timing and potential are Biblical in proportion.

To begin with, when I started this journey I had never heard the words "Fuel Cell". Like most of the rest of you, I assumed that if we were ever to have electric cars it would be with batteries. Furthermore, it seemed that we were never going to have a way to store large amounts of energy. The modern world would function on energy from oil, or nuclear, or perhaps fusion; or not function at all. But without the appearance of a grand "Alternate" fuel, from the scientific community, we had little choice. Regardless of which one it would be, our homes would get their power from a utility. We would buy our automobiles from Detroit or the "Detroit" of some other industrialized nation. But like so many things that I happened onto on my journey to this revolution, I had learned a valuable lesson when I was young that would unveil the truth for me when I sought it. What I learned was that a BTU [British Thermal Unit] is a BTU, is a BTU. What does that mean? It means that a British Thermal Unit is the amount of energy required to raise the temperature of one gallon of water, one degree Fahrenheit. And furthermore, no matter how that heat is used, the same amount of BTUs will be released when a given amount of fuel is burned. By the same token, when electricity is converted to heat, a kilowatt of power will produce the same numbers of BTUs of heat no matter how that heat is used. As an example, we all understand that a microwave oven will heat a potato using a lot less energy than a conventional oven. But it is not that the microwave makes more BTUs with a kilowatt of electric power. It is, that the microwave oven, concentrates the BTUs inside the potato, whereas the conventional oven heats the interior of the whole oven. So, it doesn't matter whether you burn oil or corn or use an electrical space heater, the amount of heat you create will be measured in BTUs and a BTU is a BTU. Remember that.

I have told you many things about California and its politics which I dislike, but it would come to pass that in their attempt to clean up their air, they would set in motion a chain of events that will change the world; if we have the resolve to make it happen. What they did was to insist that, by a certain date in the next millennium, they would have the option of buying an electric car. They blackmailed car makers in affect, and said that the Auto Makers had to have electric cars available in the California market in order to sell regular internal combustion engine cars in that market. Because California is such a huge market, auto-makers would be lured into a new technology. More importantly, the promise of the new market would bring in investment money to entrepreneurial electric car design and manufacture.



The problem with electric powered automobiles lies in the problem of energy storage. The problem of energy storage is the stumbling block to alternative energy; and even more importantly, individual freedom. All this has changed with the arrival of the fuel cell. We now have a common denominator, and just as important, the ability to store unlimited amounts of electricity in the form of Hydrogen. The fuel cell converts hydrogen into electricity in a chemical process which combines hydrogen with oxygen, leaving water and heat as a byproduct. As the hydrogen combines with oxygen it forms H<sub>2</sub>O [water]. What's even more important is that the reverse is true. Hydrogen and Oxygen can be separated from water with electricity. The question is, what are the coefficients? That is, at what rates can they be converted? Is it economical? As it stands today, electricity can be converted into Hydrogen at an efficiency rate of about 50% to 60%. Today's fuel cells reconvert that hydrogen back into electricity at an efficiency rate of about 40% to 50%. These conversion rates allow excess electricity to be stored and reused at a rate of about 20% to 25%. If we compare the cost and efficiency of the first "Horseless Carriages" ever built to the cost and efficiency of a model T Ford; it is easy to see the potential for the fuel cell industry.

In 1998, in an attempt to bring a working model of an electric car to California [or at least to give the illusion that they would] Chrysler showed a working prototype of an electric car which used gasoline to create Hydrogen. The Hydrogen was then used to power the fuel cell, which created the electricity, which ran the car. Chrysler claimed that the car would get 40 miles to the gallon. It is ironic that the first working electric car would still run on gasoline. Were this book about conspiracy theories, I might have drawn some conclusions from that. But as it is, I will be content to use their boasts to show you the future you can choose. If Chrysler has a technology that converts one gallon of gasoline into enough Hydrogen to power a car for 40 miles, then no one in the Mid West should ever have to buy energy for their transportation again. Nor should they ever have to have an electric service to their home or pay an electric utility company again. Why? Because a BTU is a BTU: and if Chrysler can convert a gallon of gasoline into 40 miles of travel, then you can convert your home heating fuel into, at least some of those 40 miles of travel per gallon. If you use a thousand gallons of propane in the winter for home heating, you can generate enough Hydrogen in the process to take you at least 10,000 miles, if not the full 40,000 miles [adjusted for the difference in BTUs between gasoline and propane and some other conversion factors]. If you were just to take the Hydrogen producing portion of Chrysler's car, out of the car, and put a bottle of hydrogen [like welders keep oxygen in] in its place, your car would be ready.

Now, I don't think Chrysler's car burns the gasoline. If it did, and you took the gasoline burning part down in your basement and hooked it up to your furnace you would have a system that would work to heat your home. Why?

*George Bailey*

Because a BTU is a BTU. That is, if they burned the gasoline to make Hydrogen, the Gasoline would develop the amount of BTUs that gasoline produces when it burns. That heat [those BTUs] would have to be expelled through a radiator like the one in your car today. If you took that radiator and put it where your heat exchanger sits in your home's furnace today, that heat would heat your house as it made the hydrogen you need to run the fuel cell in your car. Whatever the process is that Chrysler uses; if they burn the gasoline, the gasoline produces as many BTUs as a gallon of gasoline produces. If Chrysler uses the gasoline in a chemical process which somehow "strips" the hydrogen cells from the oxygen cell, then a different method of hydrogen gathering must be employed to make the system that I propose work.

So let us look at the potential for fuel cell technology at present. It is a fact that you can buy a fuel cell today, ready made, that would produce 200 watts of power from hydrogen. It would have a life span of up to 50,000 hours and when it was used up, the polymers and graphite which make up its composition would be non-hazardous. It can convert the energy from the hydrogen into electricity at a coefficient of about 40% to 50%. That means that if you are using fuel cells to create the electricity in your home, you can use the heat byproduct from the fuel cell [the other 50% to 60% lost in the conversion] to help heat your home in the winter: so that 25% to 30% of the heat energy you used to create the electricity you originally converted into Hydrogen, can be converted back into electricity and an equivalent amount can be utilized as home heat, which greatly increases our conversion rate. But these are the statistics of a fledgling industry. This is a glimpse of the promise of a technology which will rival, if not surpass, computers in importance.

Let's say that you heat your home with propane. Now, imagine that not too far in the future, you can buy a system that uses that propane to run a boiler. That boiler produces steam. That steam runs a small steam engine, which in turn, runs a generator. The steam that is expelled from the steam engine is sucked into a radiator. A gentle and constant breeze through the radiator blows warm air into the ductwork of your house, while condensing the steam. This creates a vacuum in the radiator, and that vacuum is used to pull on the back side of the piston that is being pushed on the front side by the steam, in the steam engine that is running your generator. The condensed steam goes back to the boiler as water and starts the process all over again. The speed of the generator depends upon the speed of the steam engine. If you turn down your thermostat the engine may have to run slower. That will interfere with a consistent amperage and voltage from your generator. But this doesn't matter, as you don't use the generator to run your appliances, or even your lights. The peak demands of your house, [or of industry for that matter] can't be dealt with by a generator which is run by the steam from a boiler that only puts out enough BTUs to heat the average home. So you run

your home or your business with fuel cells. Your generator uses its moderate but steady electrical charge to separate the water that was collected as the second byproduct in the creation of electricity using your fuel cell. As the water is separated into hydrogen and oxygen, the hydrogen is pumped back into your hydrogen tank or other hydrogen repository. The oxygen is pumped into the combustion chamber of your boiler, where it aids in the combustion of what ever fuel you use to heat your home. The fuel cell itself may sit in your heating system's cold air return, where it can both be cooled and at the same time, preheat the air returning to the radiator. In this way, while the hydrogen may not be converted into electricity with 100% efficiency, your system utilizes the heat by-product which helps to make up the conversion loss. So that, this heat is a by-produced left over from the conversion of the electricity, which was made from the heat, which went into your boiler to run the steam engine, which ran the generator, which made the electricity that was turned into hydrogen, before it was dispersed into your home. Your fuel, which included propane, produced more BTUs as a result of the introduction of oxygen to the mix. Now, whenever you need hydrogen for your car, you simply fill your car's hydrogen bottle from your home system. Out in the back yard you might have a wind mill that runs a little generator. The electricity that it generates is just a trickle and was of little use a few years ago. But these days, every time the wind blows you make a little electricity and so do all your neighbors. You all convert it into hydrogen, the common denominator; and you use it as needed. Some people now have little water wheels if they live by a stream. Every once in a while you buy some hydrogen or maybe you sell some. Maybe you sell some oxygen as well. Some people may even have photo-electric cells, if the technology is inexpensive enough. It will have to be inexpensive though, because the world now runs on electricity and electricity is cheap. Maybe there is a new utility that gathers your hydrogen and then redistributes or stores it until you need it. Maybe they have gas pipes to your home which transfer both oxygen and hydrogen, so that you don't have to compress the gas at home. Maybe someone has come up with a "solid" that will hold the hydrogen and the computer industry only wishes it could sell half as many computers as that company has, hydrogen repositories. All around the world people are gathering energy in a thousand small and ecologically sound ways and it is being converted to the common denominator of hydrogen. Down at the dump they're generating Hydrogen. They burn the methane from the decomposing trash, along with the garbage. They also include a lot of oxygen in the mix, which allows them to burn hotter and expel a lesser volume of exhaust. That makes it easier to deal with scrubbing the exhaust air after it is filtered through the trash beds. Along the ocean, some people have made tide pools that capture water at high tide and run it through a water wheel at low tide and they convert the electricity into hydrogen. The passenger trains run on it and they are beautiful, comfortable, lightweight and affordable. The freight

*George Bailey*

trains run on it. The cars and trucks run on it. Industry runs on it: and the air is clean.

So why am I telling you this instead of Chrysler? It's not for me to say. But let's look at the world we could have as I have explained it. We no longer need foreign oil. Domestic oil, natural gas, propane and coal are fossil fuels enough when cars, trucks and trains run on left overs from heating homes and industry. Utilities that burn fossil fuels or create radioactive waste have no market when you have fuel cells installed in your home and you store your own Hydrogen and burn your own oxygen. When your car has an electric motor powering each of your four wheels, you don't brake down very often. You don't need a transmission, exhaust, drive shafts, cooling system, or oil changes. The heavy chassis that supported the heavy engine is not needed. You can hear any suspension problems clearly in the quiet of the electric purr of you motors; and when you suspect a loss in power, you put each wheel on a treadmill that checks the strength of each motor. You replace any that aren't up to snuff [after you check the output of your fuel cell as a possible problem] and the whole thing took twenty minutes and cost you nothing compared to what you used to pay for diagnostic work that never seemed to hit the mark with your internal combustion engine. You never break down because if one of your motors goes bad, you disconnect the power to it and drive home using the other three. What's more, the car you bought at your first job, may well drive you to your last.

I heard a report which alleged that there are currently an estimated 500 companies that have set about to build an electric car for California, and in the future I dream of they have spawned a new industrial power base with a world wide market. The future also sees the "Big Three" auto makers still trying to put them out of business by getting government to increase regulation and add more safety junk to the cars to make it harder to comply. As the trend continues, more and more of the old power structures are losing their grip on individuals. Down in the south west they're growing corn to burn as fuel for home heating. There is a tree I once saw a man taking about on PBS, which produces something like a ton of oil a year and people have planted them everywhere. An entire new industry has cropped up building and installing furnaces that make the BTUs from the fuel that people heat with, "jump through a hoop" before they are released into the home or business as heat; because a BTU is a BTU is a BTU.

If the utility at the end of your electrical outlet makes electricity from heat and dispenses that heat into the atmosphere or into a body of water, it is a BTU lost. They may be more efficient at converting that BTU to electricity than your home system, but your electric power now comes free as a byproduct of home heating. In addition, you had no voltage loss between your source and your consumer and they did. There are no power lines and no power grids to fail. Some systems may even convert back to DC as opposed to AC and that will

mean safer electricity. In the future, some people burn wood and the addition of the left over oxygen to the combustion, makes the wood burn hotter and cleaner. People pay no tax on their home, their electric bill doesn't come any more. They have no one to pay at the old gas pump unless they travel away from home by car. If they do buy gas it is Hydrogen gas. Their car expense is now a matter of how much of a slave they are to showing off.

Do you think that these things will come to you if you do nothing but trust in those who control your destiny? In his 1999 State of the Union Speech, Bill Clinton promised almost everybody something. You should know by now that everybody can't get something unless government takes something else away from everybody. Clinton may talk like John Kennedy, and he may copy his gestures and mannerisms, but he will never be the man of vision that J.F.K. was. It was Kennedy's push to take us to the moon that would ultimately lead to the development of the fuel cell. Were Clinton a leader, let alone a visionary, his speech would have been about developing the technologies that would set the world right. But it was not. John F. Kennedy said, "Ask not, what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country." And in so doing, he united a country. William Jefferson Clinton polarized a country with a sex scandal; and in his State of the Union Address he promised something for everyone by promising money to a variety of "Lines". The promises will galvanize people back into those lines from which they will receive their piece of the "Dole". Not Bob Dole, but the welfare allotment that brought down the Roman Empire. They will defend their line and their piece of the government pie with "Pretzel Logic" and the rationalizations of the line they are paid to stand in and to defend, and We will be further polarized.

If we are to have the kind of freedom that can come from these advances in technology, We will have to make it happen ourselves. Today, in the San Francisco Bay area of California, in the midst of an economic boom, many, if not most, of the small machine shops are going out of business. There are those among us who have abilities in the field of software and they are in demand. But it is those of us who have a gift with hardware who hold the key to the future of freedom. My next and final alteration to the future of our country will be to change the economics of money. It will allow for freedom as it has never been known by the middle class: or any class, aside from the ruling class. But just as important as Blue Food, and just as important as money; if a people who live in metropolitan areas in a modern age, can have the energy they depend on, manipulated by a foreign government, or even their own government, then they are a people at risk. I have endeavored to show you a path that will lead us to freedom; true freedom. In order to realize that goal it will be up to all of you hardware guy's and gals to build us a better mouse trap while you can. All you "Motor Heads" need to put your heads together while there are still so many

*George Bailey*

possible auto manufactures out there who will work with you to make hydrogen power a reality that is not controlled by the powers that be. The present fuel cell technology is too expensive; but like the computer, mass production and innovation can bring the cost down as it brings performance up. There are people in the modeling industry who have steam engines in production, but they are not up to the task at hand. Still, they can demonstrate the potential. We need simple and safe systems that will convert electricity to hydrogen and oxygen. We need inexpensive and durable generator\motors. We need bigger and more efficient fuels cells. Well need boiler systems tailored to this effort, which utilize all manner of fuel: boilers that are safe and durable and low maintenance. We need steam engines that operate on low pressure steam and utilize vacuum as well. They must be safe, low maintenance and durable. And all of these components must be priced within economic realities. These are the economic opportunities for those who are not part of today's technology. Innovate and build us a future. For, if there is to be change, there will have to be a new world order unlike anything George Bush envisioned. If there is to be change, it will come with a cost to Detroit, to the nuclear industry and the rest of those who are the utilities, and even to banks. They will not go softly. In the same way that toxic anti-freeze manufacturers lowered prices to keep less toxic competitors from seizing the market, those who control our world today will endeavor to manipulate our situation in order to stop change. Without a "MORAL" leadership We will be thwarted. The rationalizations of those at the top, that justify our world as it is, at the expense of how it could be, will not give in to the truth unless We have leaders on conscience. For those who stand at the head of the line, it is better that we continue on to an unavoidable demise with them at the head of the line; than for the world to improve at their expense. This is the nature of greed. Do not be fooled into believing that greed is good. It is free enterprise which we strive for, not greed. Greed would make all our prisons private enterprises and fill them with our citizens for profit. Greed would use RICO laws to confiscate private property without due process, to fill the coffers of government. Greed would never build an institution like Boy's Town through philanthropic endeavors. But it would put children to work for the good of the country's bottom line. It is ambition which motivates us in a positive way, not greed. And, even so, it must be morally tethered or it becomes blind ambition.

There was a time in the history of man when the chosen people of Israel walked in the presence of their God. God himself was their Lord and their King. But there was to come a time when they would ask of the Lord that they might have a King to rein over them who was of flesh and blood. And so it came to pass that the Lord appointed Saul to be their King on earth. As we read the Bible, we see that it was not long before the frailties of human kind manifest themselves even in Saul; and so it has been from that day to this. Since that time it has remained as it was before the time of Moses, that Man has been "Governed" by

Man and not by the Lord. It has been understood to be the “Divine Right” of Kings to hold as their positions everything in their kingdoms, even unto the very lives of his subjects. It was as true of Pharaoh as it was of Henry the VIII.

Because God no longer speaks to man in the open manner that the people of Israel enjoyed when God was their only King, it would be the church politic who would push Kings in the direction of the day. It would be the church who offered legitimacy to the claim of authority of the King; and to his claim to all that existed within the reach of his power. We have covered this sufficiently already for you to understand that it was the Church of Man, more prevalently than the Church of Christ, who bent Kings to their will. Still, the churches, which claimed to speak on behalf of God, became crucial in sealing the ownership of the Kingdom to the King. Moreover, it would, in fact, be the Church who would pass on to the king, the holy right to “Mint” the “Coin of the Realm”. You see, then, perhaps better than today, the idea of trading gold and silver for real property or for servitude was understood to be a dangerous undertaking. According to William Greider, author of “Secrets of the Temple”; the right to mint coins had originated with the Temple Priests of the ancient past. It would pass to Kings [who’s authority stemmed from God, through the church]. The King’s gold, the Church’s holy integrity, the Kings image on the coin: these things contributed and combined to give substance to the idea of trading food, clothing, shelter, land and even servitude for “Coin”. It is this liquid asset of coin which is the basis, the medium, for all commerce as we know it. Societies themselves could never have developed as we recognize them today, without the ability to substitute assets of all manner for the common denominator of coin and then currency. But money was also, as we all know, the root of all evil.

With time, there would come the birth of a new idea: interest. The idea that, in order for one to secure coin, from another who owned coin, [without selling one’s assets], a royalty of sorts should be paid by the borrower to the lender. It would come to be figured as a percentage of the amount borrowed over a given time frame. But the idea; the concept, that interest could be used to set a trap, would not take long to rear its ugly head. It was not new to land owners of the Middle Ages. Like the story of the man who invented chess; it would not take long for those who worked with numbers, to figure out that a small amount, multiplied rapidly, soon becomes an insurmountable amount. According to Greider, it was customary for land owners in some part of Europe, to give a wedding feast for their daughters. There came a time when, unable to provide for such a wedding, many of them began to borrow money against their land to pay for the event. At some point the interest being charged rose to a level so high that the farmers were unable to pay the debt and ultimately lost their farms to creditors. The term for interest designed to such an end would come to be known as “USURY”. This connection between the Church and money and interest,

*George Bailey*

would lead to the laws still present in Twentieth Century America known as “Usury Laws”. Because unfair interest rates could be used to ruin people, it would be the Church, in its capacity of overseer of morality, who would speak out against such practices as immoral. In more modern times, “Usury” laws would put a ceiling on the legally acceptable limits to be charged for interest within individual States in the US and provided criminal penalties for “Loan Sharking”. [Loan Sharking is the practice of lending money at exorbitant rates and is generally associated with physical harm being perpetrated on the debtor in default. Because charging higher interest than was allowed by law constituted a crime, the lender had no legal recourse. This is what led to the physical manifestations resulting from default]. But beyond that, it was still considered immoral to charge interest in excess of Usury limits, even in modern times. And these laws would owe their existence to the influence of the Church. Those limits would vary from State to State, but the highest acceptable rate in any State [until the laws were abolished] was around 10%. In Iowa, for example, it was 7%. The abolition of these laws would coincide roughly with the arrival of the Baby Boom Generation into the work force.

The story of Rob Roy, at least as it was told in the movie that came out in the 1990’s, is the story of another aspect of coin; of money. You see, Rob Roy was the head of a clan in Scotland who owned some land. Unfortunately, while they were the acknowledged owners of the land, they had nothing to produce with the land, and therefore Rob Roy’s people were very poor. But Rob Roy had a plan. He felt that if he could get some cattle, he and his people could prosper. He knew of a person who had some cattle available in a far off place. He reasoned that if he were able to get those cattle, there would be profit enough for all concerned. The problem was an old one however. Because the owner of the cattle was in a far off place, even if he were to take Rob Roy’s title to his land as collateral against the cattle, the land would be too far away to be of value to him in the event that the “Plan” failed. But this is, after all, the very purpose of money: to facilitate such endeavors. Therefore, Rob Roy would go to a third party; a Nobleman, and borrow the money for the “Deal”, using his land as collateral against the debt. You notice that I put the word Deal in quotes. The reason for this is that I want to make a distinction between what Rob Roy did and what would be referred to as a “Venture”. The term Venture, at least as it applies to “Capital” today, and what is called “Venture Capital”; is not the “Deal” that Rob Roy was offered. When Rob Roy borrowed the gold coins from the Nobleman, he agreed to pay back the money, and to give the Nobleman one and a half times his money in return. Had the owner of the cattle given him the cattle and shared in the profit of the joining of their two assets [land and cattle]; that would have been a joint Venture. Either they would both profit or they would both show a loss [the cattle owner his cattle, and Rob Roy his labor and feed]. If the Nobleman had purchased the cattle and put them up as his share of a joint



Venture, he too would have shared in the risk as well as the potential for reward. But he did not. He risked nothing [because Rob Roy had put up his families land as collateral] and yet he expected a 50% return on his money. Of course, in the story of Rob Roy, the coins are stolen and it is left to Rob Roy to save his people. For that he would become a hero. But this concept; that those who hold the liquid asset of coin, could somehow hold a people hostage until they would risk everything; while at the same time, the lender of the coin would risk nothing and then use this idea of usury to entrap them: that idea would surface again as people became uneducated in matters of money.

From the beginning of civilization itself, men have been ruled by men. Except for that brief span in which the Jews were ruled directly by God Himself, it has always been so. The American revolution and the French revolution, would signal a change in political power. The Magna Carte and the Constitution of the United States of America would give Mankind a new vision of freedom. But the concept of "Ownership" would not change. Capitalism, the economic engine that propelled America forward, would still harbor a remnant of the Monarchy. Even at the end of world domination by Monarchies, it would be the "Capital" in a "Feudal" type of Capitalism, that claimed ownership and thereby power, even over the new Government and its politics. In the wide open American landscape it would be easy to perpetuate the myth that a man was free to develop the land which he owned. But with time and government intervention, it would be obvious that while men could be stewards of the land, it would be government who owned the land; and Capital who ran the Government. No man, or woman who is forced to pay government taxes on property or lose that property, can say with justification that, that land belongs to them. In truth, "Ownership" as we perceive it in America, is the right of an individual to rent the property they control, from those factions of government who collect the rent in the form of tax. Communism and, to some extent, Socialism would try to address this issue by seizing all property. But, as absolute power corrupts absolutely, it was inevitable that the "State" replace the Monarch as Lord and Master: owner of all that is surveyed. Because Capital [wealth] must increase in order for Capitalism to prosper, while wealth need only be usurped from a monarchy when overthrown by Communism [Marxist Socialism]; Communism would ultimately lose its struggle against Capitalism, once the original wealth of the communist nations was depleted. Of course there are elements of productivity even in Communism, but because it is the State making the financial decisions, inevitably the wealth produced by individuals or groups of individuals will be squandered by government and the original wealth will be deteriorate to zero.

But what is it that empowers Capital? At the inception of Capitalism it was the same Church sanctioned "Coin of the Realm" that stemmed from the Monarchies of ages past. It was the "Gold Standard" that gave legitimacy to the

*George Bailey*

paper money of the country. It was gold and silver, the tangible goods that were balanced against “Currency”, the “Liquid” wealth of the world. Those who controlled that liquid wealth were in fact the real owners of all the real property subject to taxation because money is power. Because, as we all know and recognize, one is unable to borrow money unless one can demonstrate that one does not need it. That is to say that one must be able to show that they have wealth that can be converted into an amount equivalent to that being borrowed. Furthermore, that wealth must be liquid in nature. Just as it was for Rob Roy, an asset which can not be readily converted to cash can not be used as collateral unless cash flow, adequate to service the debt, can be demonstrated. Other wise, the asset must be converted to cash in order to raise Capital. What’s more, wealth held in the form of money is not taxed were as real property is.

This book has been very hard on the different factions of my generation, “The Baby Boomers”, thus far. It is important that each of us understand our role in the deterioration of the American fabric and face up to it. Until we can admit our own mistakes we will not be ready to teach others from them. At the same time, I have been slow to criticize those who have gone before us. At this stage it is time to shed light on the major economic reasons for America’s decline. It will not be flattering to many within the Senior community.

At the end of W.W.II there were a number of economic conditions at play that would be totally foreign to any American under age fifty. Some of these I have mentioned before, such as, Europe and Japan being in shambles. The US had been using Government money to expand US manufacturing capabilities for the war effort and was now turning over those capabilities to the private sector at “Fire Sale” rates. The “GI Bill” was making it easy for veterans to purchase a home with little or no money down. Over the next twenty years the “Boomers” would be the largest market in US history to accommodate. All these things you know. You know the losing end for the “Boomers” as well. You know the crush of workers into the work place. You know about the addition of Women into the work force and the compounding of the problem by immigration. You know about the rebuilding of Europe and Japan. But these are not the real reasons for the failure of my generation to succeed. In fact, from a purely economic standpoint, if all things had been equal between the generations we should have seen prosperity unlike the world has ever known. After all, people who are working, have money. People who spend money, buy goods and services. When goods and services are purchased, the money circulates back into more jobs, more workers, and more wealth, just as Henry Ford had demonstrated. As Europe and Japan recovered they should have contributed to the growth, not stifled it. There were no World Wars to impede our grow. So what happened?

If you were a young man entering the work place in 1947 you would find a totally different world than exists today. To begin with, your employee

contribution to Social Security would be 1%. Your employer would pay an additional 1% to match your contribution. If you were self employed you would not be liable for any contribution at all. Remember that your contribution to FICA is based on gross earnings, before such deductions as home mortgage, personal exemption and dependent deductions. During your first ten years in the work force that "Tax" would only increase to 2.25% for those who had employers matching contributions and 3.375% for the self employed who became part of the equation for the first time in 1953. By the time you reached twenty years in the work place your contribution would have become 4.4% for matching participants and 6.4% for the self employed. Remember that this is a PERCENTAGE of wages being paid into the Social Security system. Remember also, a percentage is immune to the effects of inflation. If a worker paid 1% in 1947 on wages of \$100.00 a week, as those wages were increased due to inflation, that 1% contribution would increase accordingly. The reason for the increase in the rate as well as in the increases due to inflation were a function of a number of different factors. To begin with, at its inception, Social Security was started to put an end to the miserable conditions in which many elderly found themselves; particularly through and immediately after the Great Depression. With time, new entitlements, in addition to the elderly, would find their way onto Social Security roles. Limits would be put on the amount an individual would have to pay into the fund so as to exempt the earnings of those most highly paid Americans. Money earned as interest would always be exempt so as to protect Capital from its obligation to protect the elderly. But by far the greatest cause of the rise in Social Security contribution percentages to levels in excess of 15% in the 1990's was due to the political clout of those voters who had reached retirement age. They would come to see Social Security as a retirement fund designed to allow them to retire in the manner to which they had become accustomed. Paychecks received by those on Social Security would begin to rival those of Americans working for minimum wage. It would be used by those who needed the money, but also by those who applied simply because they had paid in. And finally, Social Security would become a grab bag of programs funded by the workers of the private sector: Workers who were forced to contribute to a fund to which Government workers, Railroad workers and even some teachers, would not have to contribute, by reason of their exclusive retirement funds. The fund, which began with twenty seven people contributing for every one recipient would eventually come to reflect a ratio of closer to only three to one.

Because of this new view of Social Security, the fund would nearly go under in 1983. In the election campaign of 1996, one of Bob Dole's supporters would point to that 1983 bail out of Social Security as one of Mr. Dole's great achievements as a political leader. She would proclaim that the legislation enacted would keep Social Security solvent for thirty years. In fact, that thirty year mark would be 2013; the year the Boomers hit their mid sixties. All

*George Bailey*

government really did was up the ante on contributions and forestall the problem. By 2013, the age requirements for retirement benefits will, by necessity, have to be raised just out of reach of the “Bulk” of the elderly population unless contributions are raised beyond what those left in the work force can hope to be able to pay.

If you had started out in 1947 in your own business, you would have found only a very small fraction of the government fees and regulations which exist today. And as we have discussed, while some of it was needed, most of it is Government Revenuing and “Pork”.

During the 1950’s you would see the introduction of a new thing they called the sales tax. It would begin at levels of well under 1% and, like all the other negative influences on the economic reality of the Baby Boomers, would rise, not only as a function of inflated prices but as a percentage as well.

No matter what you did back then, if it required Capital, you would have found prime commercial interest rates at around 1% to 3% for the first fifteen years of your adult life. For most of the next ten years, Usury laws would keep all rates below 10%. During this same period, and key to the fantastic success of the generation which proceeded the Boomers: there was constant inflation. Ironically, it would be the fight against that very inflation that would ultimately indenture the working class of America.

Imagine for a moment that you are allowed to purchase a home at an interest rate of 4%. At the time you are working for an average national wage of about \$75.00 per week. Over the next fifteen to twenty years inflation doubles the value of everything. You now making \$150.00. Your taxes haven’t increased much because the economy is strong, the National debt is relatively small [and shrinking due to inflation] and the percentage of tax you pay has remained relatively low and constant. At the same time, government revenues have increased as a function of your inflated pay check. In addition, the house you purchased at \$15,000.00 is now worth \$30,000.00 and you continue to pay on that 4% loan, but you have been paying with ever inflated dollars that are, by now, worth only half as much as when you borrowed the money. Because the Boomers are about to enter the work force you are able to climb the ladder, taking advantage of seniority. In fact, because you and your peers are healthier and living longer than any generation before you, you will be able to keep that job longer. You will see legislation enacted to see to it. Just as with everything else, your son’s and daughters will just have to wait their turn a little longer and things can only get better for you. If you were fortunate enough to borrow money against your equity and invest it wisely, your Capital fortune has increased in the same proportions as Home Mortgage investment.

All this growth was good for America: good for the world. But it was not good for “Capital”. And it is important that you understand the distinction

between “Capital” as I refer to it here and “Investment”. “Capital” in the sense of the wealth of the world and those who own it, is not an investment but rather a “Marker”, like the coin lent to Rob Roy. If a person invests in a venture, they “Gamble” on the profitability of that endeavor. They take a risk for which they will be rewarded or suffer the consequences of failure. “Capital”, as a marker, like the Nobleman in Rob Roy, risks nothing. That is the reason that only those who can demonstrate that they do not need the money can attain it. “Capital” is the “Sovereign”. Its authority stems from the Church and the minting of the Coin of the Realm. It was the hoarding of “Capital” by the rich, which stopped the circulation of wealth and brought on the Great Depression. The draw back for “Capital” in the inflationary 1940’s, 50’s and 60’s; was that because it took no risk, it did not ride the tide of success. To the contrary; with interest rates at 1% to 4% and inflation running about the same up until the late 1960’s, the wealth of “Capital” was eroding. After all, banks don’t pay out as much interest for deposits as they collect in interest. What’s more, Banks have expenses too. At the same time, and unfairly, the government [with the approval of the voters] was increasing the tax burden on the “Rich” [Who coincidentally own “Capital”] as a result of “New Deal” politics. During certain periods of this century, upper end tax brackets would rise as high as 70%.

All this might have gone on happily to the Millennium had it not been for a few factors. The first major player to bring an end to the post war prosperity would be the oil producing nations of the Middle East. Those countries, who would later gather together as OPEC, had a big stake in what was happening to the US Dollar by way of inflation. You see a couple of things were going on. First, the OPEC nations were accumulating wealth [Capital] in the form of US currency and bonds redeemable for US currency, in exchange for their oil reserves. In addition, during his term in office as President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon had been forced to abandon the “Gold Standard”. This meant that the US Dollar was no longer linked to US reserves of gold and silver. What’s more, since many of the world’s currencies were based on US currency, it was now the word of our government which guaranteed the value of our currency and stabilized other’s. In 1973 the emerging OPEC would flex its muscles in response to growing concerns about inflation with, what would later be know as the “Arab Oil Embargo”. For those of you too young to remember, it was not the best of times in America. Shortages of gasoline around the country threatened what American’s had come to view as the American way. Fights broke out in gas lines. People began hoarding and even stealing fuel supplies and opportunists struck at will. We were shaken as a nation. After all, we had built a society based on oil and cheap energy and now we were being threatened with being cut off.

The embargo would pass into history, but inflation would begin to take on a new tone; a new hue. Spurred on by concerns about the devaluation of the dollar,

*George Bailey*

investors began buying up every thing they could imagine to be a hedge against inflation. From Art to Gold, from undeveloped land, to single family dwellings; the bidding escalated out of control. Inflation would run between 5% and 9% to the end of the decade. In a few short years it would become public enemy number one. At that point the middle class would be split into two camps: those who owned substantial “real” assets, and those who didn’t. When the inflation train left the station, those who had no home and no investments, would be left behind. The subtle shift of wealth from the top to the middle classes who missed the train would come to an abrupt halt and once again “Capital” would seize control as interest rates began to climb. It was a shift that was almost imperceptible to my generation. We had not been around to profit from inflation during the 40’s, 50’s and 60’s. By the time inflation became rampant in the late 70’s some of the early Boomers were in position to capitalize on it in the same way they seemed to be able to capitalize on everything kept just out of reach of the bulk of us. By 1980 inflation was around 12%. By 1981 it would be around 14%. A home purchased in the right location would nearly double in value in the seven years between 1974 and 1981: [It would mark the second, possibly third, doubling of the value of the home bought by the class of 1947]. Tax rate percentages were on the rise too by now; but those who cashed in on the housing market would find tax breaks if they rolled the money over into another house. If not, they would find lower tax rates for Capital Gains, and they would not be expected to pay Social Security Contributions on that income. But the majority of those “Coming Up”, found the inflated tangible assets out of reach all together. That included homes because homes were being snatched up by speculators in an attempt to capitalize on the inflationary spiral. In an attempt to curb inflation, the Federal Reserve began to push up interest rates in the late 1970’s: Enter the other players.

In 1980, Americans kicked Jimmy Carter out of office in favor of an actor by the name of Ronald Reagan. Reagan had entered politics through the Screen Actor’s Guild and rose to the post of Governor of the State of California on his way to the Presidency. During all those years, California was the recipient of untold wealth which had been taxed from the rest of the country and pumped into its economy in the form of defense and aerospace spending. Not only did southern California weather suit itself to the cold war endeavor, but the number of electoral votes the State held, made it a natural Pork Barrel. It is, no doubt, from that cross section of the elite, that Reagan would come to believe that all America had to do to regain the growth and prosperity it once enjoyed, was to cut taxes so that, that entrepreneurial class could find the venture capital to rebuild; to reinvent, itself.

It would be during this same time period that the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board; a man by the name of Paul Volcker, would set out to kill the

beast, inflation. As is so often the case in our society, the assumption that a set of credentials is a guarantee of knowledge and understanding, would be our downfall. It is an absurdity that in a field such as economics, where individuals within the field disagree on cause and effect and where scientific method can not be brought to bear, that we should hand over the wealth and future of a nation such as ours to the speculations of a single body of “Technocrats”: but that is precisely what we did. It is not my intention to defame Mr. Volcker. Whether his intentions were pure or not, I can not say; nor does it matter. Regardless of his motives, in the end he would come to view his charge to be to save “Capital” and its interests, without regard to the damage he would inflict on individuals or even the country itself.

When Reagan took over the office of the President in 1980, he set about to create a climate of growth. His first order of business was to implement a huge tax cut for the rich. As we have discussed before, if you want money to circulate within an economy, there must be money at the bottom. It is the consumer who puts money in at the bottom. The Reagan tax cut manifest itself on all levels. To begin with, because it did not help the middle class directly, it did not show up as money spent on goods and services [with the exception of a booming yacht industry]. This left the rich with a large amount of cash in a sluggish economy. Had it been an economy in motion, the money might well have been converted into venture capital as Reagan believed. But because the economy was slow and the “Fed” [Federal Reserve] had pushed up interest rates far beyond what would have ever been legal under the old usury laws; the tax cuts of the 1980’s would be converted into “Capital” [a marker, lent as a liquid asset against real assets put up as collateral]. It would also become money lent out for the purpose of speculation. Not speculation such as entrepreneurial investment capital, but high risk, high gain speculation. It was inconceivable to the Fed, and presumably Volcker, that lenders be asked to consider the merit of loans by any other criteria than the ability of the borrower to repay the loan. This is the only concern of “Capital”. But in fact, there is no mistake that could have been made which is more fundamentally incorrect than to use the capitalistic principles of supply and demand to allocate the distribution of “Capital” [or liquid] assets for the purpose of controlling inflation. That is to say that: if you raise the interest rate in order to curb inflation, the investments you are eliminating from your list of potential candidates are the very same investments which are the least likely to be inflationary. Conversely, those candidates who will most likely be able to pay the inflated interest and still show a profit, will be those who are by nature the most speculative. Therefore, since it was speculation which was fueling the fire of inflation, Volcker’s approach only compounded the problem. So now those Boomers who are trying to buy their first home were competing with speculators, pushing inflation upward. Faced with no other choice, the Boomers would go ahead and buy into the mania. They had no historical perspective at age thirty

*George Bailey*

something. Their biological clock was ticking and they had no political clout to force change had they know what to ask for. It wasn't as if they could wait to begin their families until the bond market settled down. Consequently, they were forced to enter into the bidding wars. The Fed responded with a dividend for "Capital" by raising the interest rate, which killed industry. Reagan chimed in with a tax cut for the rich which ended up in the speculation pool. Government revenues continued to fall as a result of a dying industrial base, causing an increase in the national debt. The Federal Reserve, who was in charge of selling Government Bonds for the US Treasury,[to cover that debt] now had to offer a higher percentage rate for the bonds in order to move them in the face of rampant inflation. This in turn caused "Capital" which was given out in the form of a tax break, to find its way into Government Bonds as well as into wild speculation rather than into capital investment and moderate risk taking. Because the earnings from interest and capital gains would be exempt from Social Security Taxes, and because earnings in the middle class were down, the borrowing to maintain the still growing "Entitlement System" [a majority of the federal budget] would be increased. The tighter the Federal Reserve's strangle hold on the money supply became, the worse the true economy got. Of course many people were doing quite well. Many people still remember the 80's as the good old days. But it was money making money for those who already had money. The country's industrial base was being cannibalized. If your line was the one that traded labor for wages, you were losing ground through the 1980's. If you were investing in the country's industrial base, the high interest was causing you to lose money as well because industry profits went to pay inflated interest on industry's borrowed working capital. That caused more money to find its way into "Capital" ["Feudal Capital" the marker] and the situation spiraled downward out of control. Many people were in fact working and making money, but those who worked for wages, even good wages, were losing ground to inflation.

To understand what went wrong, we must first understand the difference between the inflation that America experienced in the 50's and 60's and the inflation brought on by Reagan and Volcker. As you saw by following the progress of the young man entering the work force in 1947, a slow inflation rate actually moved wealth into the middle class in a way that had never before been seen. This kind of inflation is inevitable in a banking system such as our. As banks are repaid monies on loans they have made, they re-lend the money in the form of new loans. Because they are allowed to lend out more than the total of these assets, they are actually in the process of creating new wealth [on the books] each time they make a loan. This process is laid out in "The Secrets OF The Temple", as follows.

"When the Fed bought Treasury bills or bonds, it simply credited the newly created money to the reserve account of which ever financial institution sold it



the securities. It didn't much matter which bank was the seller, because once the money was in the banking system, it was free to flow wherever it was needed. If the Fed bought from a brokerage firm instead of a bank, it had the same effect. The Fed credited the reserve account of the broker's bank, which in turn credited the broker's individual account.

Either way the Fed's action increased the total reserves of the banking system-and thus allowed the total money supply to grow too. The Fed injections, whether they came through the Discount window at the Reserve Banks or the Open Market Desk at the New York Federal Reserve Bank, were called "high-powered money" because of this unique property: whatever money the Federal Reserve added would be multiplied many times through the money creation powers of the commercial banks.

The act of multiplication would be dizzying too. If the Fed injected \$1 billion in new reserve deposits, the banking system could immediately commit \$840 million of it to new loans, setting aside 16 percent to satisfy the reserve requirement. The \$840 million in new loans would instantly create \$840 million in new deposits. It didn't matter which bank got the deposits accounts; the new deposits would immediately be the basis for new lending. The banks would set aside 16 percent of the \$840 million and lend out another \$706 million. Those loans would immediately become new deposits again and permit still more new lending, another \$593 million, and so on in diminishing sums. This multiplying process in which new credit became new money continued until the banks exhausted the additional lending capacity created for them by the new reserves added by the Fed. The original \$1 billion injected by the Federal Reserve became more than \$5 billion in new deposits-deposits that were now counted in the nation's money supply, the M-1 aggregate."

This new wealth being created can be a reflection of the capital assets of the country. For example, if you build a home or a factory with borrowed money and that home or factory is worth more than you invested by virtue of your work that you invested or an innovation you utilized; or the labor and materials that were gathered together, then you have created wealth as reflected in that created capital asset. If on the other hand, if you buy a home or a piece of property and make no change in it other than to inflate its price, you have created nothing but inflation. You have, in fact, devalued all other wealth [currency] by whatever amount of profit you realized. This is simple "Supply and Demand". If a bank creates money and that money is used to build a house, then there is one more house in the market place to offset that money created. If no house was built, but rather, speculation doubled the price of the house: there is now an increased amount of money in the money supply competing to buy a house from the original number of houses. Lowered supply, increased cost [demand], devalued money: this is the nature of "Capital" as I have described it. The type of inflation

*George Bailey*

prevalent through the period from 1947 to 1970 can then be seen as a positive influence on the economy and on Society at large. It was, in fact, “Good” or “Positive” inflation. By the same measures, inflation through the 1970’s and 1980’s had a negative affect and was “Bad” or “Negative” inflation [not to be confused with deflation]. During both periods, banks were creating wealth in the form of money “on the books”, but from 47’ to 70’ assets were being created to offset the increase. That would stop in the 70’s.

Often times wealth is created through the use of “Capital”, and shared between the borrower and the lender: but in a climate such as the one created by Volcker in the 80’s, most, if not all, of that wealth would go to the lender unless the ventures were highly profitable. That, of course, would lead to speculative ventures being sought over others. That is, of coarse, the seed for bad inflation as opposed to good inflation. That creates a situation in which few houses and even fewer companies are being built as compared to the amount of bare land being purchased at inflated rates, for speculation.

All through the Reagan years there would be no price that Volcker was unwilling to let the country pay. His mission, as he saw it, was to hold inflation at any cost. He would swing the pendulum back to the side of “Capital” no matter what “Pain” it caused. But his power extended only to American banks. He could not stop Reagan and the Congress from piling up a National Debt of two trillion more dollars. Each year the tax breaks would continue. Each year Government employees would receive their cost of living raises [employees doing the same work for more money: bad inflation]. The elderly would demand theirs as well [same thing]. The Entitlement System would continue to index cost of living increases as well [again: bad inflation]. The only segment of the economy over which the Federal Reserve had control was banking and the only lever they were willing to use was the law of supply and demand; which did not have any place within the control of the money supply. Had the Fed. been willing, they could have set up guidelines by which lenders could not have made loans which would lead to the type of “Undermining” inflation that was so prevalent. Without the ability of speculators to borrow for the purpose of speculation, there would have been no market for the speculative kind of endeavors that would ultimately bring down the “Savings and Loans”. Ironically, it was the interest rates spawned by the Fed. which caused the S & L’s to seek out such speculative endeavors in the first place. They were having to pay out double digit interest rates on savings and therefore had to go for the big returns. The banks were in the same boat, but ultimately the Fed would save its own and let the S & L’s fall. The whole idea that the Fed might set some limits [some “Criteria”] was totally foreign to its concept of “Capital”. If “Capital” can be guaranteed its return in the form of assets [money for those who could prove they don’t need it], then who was the bank to say no? Instead, with each round of inflation, the Fed would turn the

screws on the only ones they were willing to impose upon: the Free Enterprise System. American industry was being kicked in the teeth and the only card it had left to play was to take away from its employees; the middle class. If the unions tried to regain some of the ground its workers were losing to Government workers, or the elderly, or welfare recipients or speculative inflation: the Fed threatened to increase the interest rate. That would stall the economy and lower the expectations of business. Over the next fifteen years the average wage in America's households would remain stagnant. Meanwhile, Government workers, the elderly and those on welfare would continue to receive cost of living increases. In fact, between 1970 and 1994, the median income for the average American family would go from \$9,867 to \$38,782. When adjusted for inflation, that 1970 figure would be \$35,407; making the increase a little less than 10% total, over a twenty four year period. At the same time: during that same 1970 to 1994 period Social Security's budget would go from 30 billion to 319 billion, a 250% increase. Medicare would go from 6 billion to 144 billion: and as went Social Security, so went Government and Pseudo-Government employee's wages and benefits. This would leave the private sector to wonder how it came to be that the paper pushers in Government were living so well in comparison to those who were footing the bill. The answer was that wages in the private sector were falling all along to offset the increases. Unions were turning on their own. Employees were being laid off and rehired at lower wages. So that for every increase given to those who could use their political clout to move to the front of the line, some family which did not enjoy that political clout, would lose real income after it was adjusted for inflation. For every dollar over that median average paid to protected employees, an unprotected worker would fall a dollar below that rate, in affect, doubling the disparity. All this was pleasing to Volcker's Lord and Master "Capital". The "Weak" American Dollar was growing stronger and stronger. The owners of wealth and "Capital" could buy more and more for less. Unfortunately, that strengthening of the dollar would make it harder and harder for American business to compete abroad. The strong dollar meant high labor costs as compared with foreign competitors. Even in the face of a lower standard of living here at home, the strong dollar excluded American labor from competing on the world market. Japan became the object of our anger and fear because we did not understand the dynamics of our situation and the reasons for our demise. Business could move off shore in the face of American scorn or go out of business all together. Less America jobs, less tax base, bigger Budget Deficits, all meant a bigger and faster spiral downward. But of all the changes between that worker entering the work force in 1947 and their counterpart who entered in the 1970's, perhaps the most unfair was the way that unemployment would be dealt with. For the worker who began his adult life in 1947 there would be work and plenty of it. The government would insist upon it. Full employment was a National goal. After all, these were the survivors of the

*George Bailey*

Great Depression. They had lived through a time of staggering unemployment. For a period of several years in and around 1930, unemployment had reached levels of 25%. Americans had come to understand that it didn't matter how well the rest of the country was doing if you were the one out of work. In fact, the "hard" money situation of the Great Depression made it a good time to be around if you had a steady job with the Government or the Railroad, or someone else who was stable. Wages didn't go down during the period; prices did. So the 75% who were working were enjoying the consequences of deflation and a strong dollar in much the same way as the "Wall Mart" commercials depict the falling prices today in 1996, 97, 98, and 99. But the difference between the worker beginning in 1947 and the one in 1973 is that, the worker in '73 would enter an economy in recession and a work force that had 10% and 12% unemployment. Unemployment would linger on at high levels throughout much of their young adult life. In fact, by the 1980's, the Federal Reserve would adopt a position that unemployment was a good hedge against inflation. Through the 80's it would determine that if unemployment rates were not allowed to fall below 7% that it would be easier to keep labor from challenging their declining position with regard to those market forces which continued to be inflationary and which the Fed was still unable to control: namely, cost of living increases to Government employees, the elderly, the Welfare System, and the growing cost of the Federal Debt as a result of Government spending and the interest on that debt. These days, many people seem to be aware that when the Federal Reserve Chairman, Allen Greenspan, announces his intention to raise the Prime Rate it is time to remove money from Stocks and put it into Bonds. It should now be clear to you why. If that Prime Rate goes up, the economy will stagnate to some degree as business pays more for its money supply. If the economy stagnates the profit will move from those who produce wealth to those who only reap it: "Capital". Expensive money means a strong dollar, and a poor economy. If you have been watching, you now understand why every time unemployment used to drop, the Federal Reserve would threaten to raise the Prime interest rate. After two decades of American decline, the same forces are still at work. Regardless of what politicians may promise; without a change in our monetary policy nothing can change. Nothing is supposed to change. Because the Federal Reserve operates independently of Government and its elected officials; and because it has chosen to champion "Old Man Potter" and Feudal Capitalism, without regard for the S&Ls and the people of Bedford Falls, it is not likely to change.

When I began this book, I had no idea of the parallels between Bedford Falls, with its Building and loan and my America. I look around today and I can see that the institutions of Old Man Potter have indeed, turned my country into Pottersville. Loss of hope and loss of opportunity for those at the bottom, have made us a nation prone to vice and corruption. What's more, the way in which "Wealth" was moved from the middle class and into the upper class within this

country was bad enough; but “Wealth” was being exported as well. As American industry faltered and then disappeared off shore due to the ever strengthening dollar, profit was moving off shore as well. In the face of the artificially inflated interest rates, pumped up by the Fed, that profit was returning to the American Bond Market to enjoy the “Windfall” the Fed had created. US Bonds, which were being sold to cover the National Deficit and the growing National Debt, had to continually offer higher interest rates in order to compete for “Capital”. This increased the Deficit in the face of the Reagan tax cut and pumped more “Wealth” into the pockets of “Capital” at an ever accelerating rate. In many cases, that would be foreign “Capital”. Through the 80’s it became a feeding frenzy; but to some extent those same forces are still in affect today. Ironically, [according to Greider]; one large group profiting from our untenable situation was OPEC. In spite of their Muslim beliefs, which do not allow them to charge usury rates, the Arabs of the Oil Producing Nations figured out [with the help of American banks] how to enter into the game as well.

In his 1996 Presidential campaign, Linden La Roush would argue that the troubles of America could be traced to the generation of the Baby Boom. He stated that all the country had to show for our thirty years in the work force was a bunch of environmental laws. He urged us to appoint him to the task of putting us back on track, in the footsteps of his generation. The “Can Do” generation I guess we should call it. But his view is self indulgent.

I think if there is one single statement which can bring a nation, any nation, to ruin, it must surely be “There’s nothing I can do about it.” When I spoke of President Clinton and his lack of moral leadership, I told you that it was morality and the sense of it, that brought and end to slavery. Prior to that, there would have been those who heard of atrocities perpetrated on slaves and “There’s nothing I can do about it.” would have been their answer. I can tell you today that there are still those who work illegal Mexican workers, only to rob them. And there are border bandits who prey on them. And there are those who say “There’s nothing I can do about it.” I can tell you that there are children raising themselves because their families have lost sight of what is important and many of you will say “There’s nothing I can do about it.” So now let me tell you a story of generations.

I will preface this by telling you that no two people are exactly alike, so that even within a generation there are a myriad of types of individuals. But even as there are children born into the world on every day of every year, within a given period of time there will be a group which immerges from the pack who will hold the reins. Their philosophy will dominate regardless of their numbers, and regardless of the opinions and realities of individuals within the group. Having said that: there was a generation in this country who road high on the economic winds of the day. They would be encouraged to think of America as a land of

*George Bailey*

equality in order to get them to fight in WWI. They would enjoy a kind of economic freedom that no other generation in their class had known and they would owe it all to Capitalism. At their core would be a working class that was allowed, in the face of the “Socialist” threat, to unionize. They would be allowed to force improvements in health and safety in the work place, and life would be good. So good in fact, that it would become Decadent, bawdy; greedy and arrogant. So arrogant, that even as “Capital” was allowing them to participate in the division of the countries wealth, they allowed their political leaders to have increased power over the Monarchy of Feudal Capital. The leaders of the newly formed Russian Republic were always skeptical and very much afraid of the forces behind Capitalism. But in the US, the masses roared through the twenties, borrowing to gamble in the rising stock market and calling it investment: until one day the plug was pulled. To put it into industry terms: there was some profit taking. In deed, all the profit was taken out, and those who were not on the “inside” were left with worthless stock certificates and stock options when the wealthy converted their over valued stocks back to currency [Capital].

The generation waiting in the wings during this period would have been the grandparents of the Baby Boomers. They would come to adulthood in the face of economic despair. Like the oldest of the Boomer generation, those who were nearer the top of the age group would enjoy an advantage as a general rule because they had very likely acquired some assets before the “Great Depression” set in, and would be more employable with more age and experience. But this generation would grow up humble, frugal and distrusting of banks and government. They would see legislation enacted to prevent the merging of Banks with Insurance Companies with Stock Brokerages. They would put their faith in God and, when the judge in “Bonfire of the Vanities” spoke of right and wrong, as “it’s what your grandmother taught you”; it was of this generation that he spoke. They would spend most of their productive years in modest economic circumstance. Their chances of prosperity would not be realized fully until after World War II. Some at the top of the generation would fare well in the war economy. Some at the younger end would be sent off to fight and some to die. Those who had “Capital” after the war might still have time to be prosperous, but it would be after their prime. This is the generation of George Bailey. Their sons and daughters would be the children of the depression. They would be raised in an atmosphere of despair that would shape them in profound ways. The children of the Depression; those who lived through the shortages of WWII, would be likely to save a jar of buttons or a ball of twine like their parents would have. But unlike their parents generation, they would come to embrace Government blindly. It was Government that saved them from the depression. It was Government that saved them from the Axis Powers of Germany, Japan and Italy. And it was Government who protected them from the Communist Threat of the Cold War. Many of them had had to go and fight in WWII, and all those who

hadn't, knew someone who had. They also knew someone who had died. They were a generation of people brought up with a good "Christian" work ethic, but they were not a generation who was able to afford higher education and they wanted that for their children. They were a generation who, while raised up in Christianity, drifted away from Christ and from God. In fact, while it was the Baby Boomers who are blamed for the moral decline of this country, it is fair to say that the decline began with their parents. It was the parent's generation that embraces Marilyn Monroe even though she had posed in the nude [something unheard of in that time]. It was the parents who supported Holly Wood's rationalizations about premarital sex and even adultery in the endless war movies that glorified the exploits of a victorious America. It would be that generation that would support and give rise to Las Vegas and its trappings. It was the mothers of that generation who got their first taste the free enterprise system outside the sweatshops and liked it.

This then would be the Generation That Could. But because of their fierce patriotic fervor and because they were largely uneducated and because they had a tendency to say "There's nothing I can do about it."; some of the truths about the way America remained affluent, eluded them. This is a good thing for a nation that wishes to be a world power. It means that when the colonial interests of the influential are at risk, they will be defended without question. And when the colonial interests develop the wealth of another nation and deplete "ALL" of that wealth, some of it will find its way into the pockets of the masses that support that Imperialist power. Like the Citizens of the Roman Empire, so long as the wealth is usurped from the world outside the empire, the citizens will prosper. So long as they Hear No Evil, See No Evil, Speak No Evil, power will use them for its base of operations and appease them generously.

There was, however, a snag. A generation, my generation, the Baby Boom generation, would grow up in the affluence that was afforded the Generation That Could. It would be a generation that would be educated in percentages far beyond the levels of any previous generation. More importantly, it would have, embedded somewhere deep in its psyche, what their grandmother had taught them. And that would cause an absolute eruption in the social and political fabric. It would cause the youth of a nation to challenge the right of an Imperial Nation to force a colonial nation into submission. The Imperial Nation would be France and the colonial nation would be, of course, Vietnam.

It may be true that the actions of the Federal Reserve under Volcker were just the idiocies that Greider believes them to be. Or it may be that forces which are not readily obvious were at work. For me it doesn't matter either way. I do not believe that power begins in Washington. In fact, I am quite certain that those who control the uni-party [Republican \ Democratic] system decide who will do their bidding when they choose, from whom we will choose, when We vote. But

*George Bailey*

beyond that, it matters not, how many layers one must peel back in order to find the human embodiments of the true sources of power. It doesn't matter because, no matter who they are, they themselves are subservient to evil. They are the ones whom the heads of the USSR feared. They are the ones who topple governments that do not submit. It does not matter if it is a group of men who discuss their intentions or if they are unrelated individuals who serve their own greed and avarice and as such are manipulated by Satan to an end. It doesn't even matter if in the end we are all just trying to get by out of fear, because when we stop looking out for each other, Satan manipulates our fears and paranoia to turn us one against the other. This is the nature of the world in which God has warned us that Satan has power over us until we are delivered. And as I believe in God and He has told me that Satan exists, then surely I must believe that he does. What matters is that, there would come a time when "The Generation That Could" would be told that the usury laws which had protected them, should be dropped. And while they should have known in their hearts, that to do so would be bad for all those who had to borrow money; because most of White, middle class America, of that age group, was now a lender, not a debtor, they said "There's nothing I can do about it."

I have not come to tell you of conspiracies of individuals. But I have come to tell you of conspiracies of the heart. It was a moral issue, and as with all moral issues, it had an economic manifestation. For the next three decades, the sons of The Generation That Could would put their noses to the grindstone in an attempt to duplicate the achievements of their fathers and they would fail. They would fail because 15% of their gross income would go directly to their fathers [and mothers] in the form of Social Security "Taxes" shared with the Government agencies that administered it and anyone else who could show they had a need. They would fail because the lesson, of the man who invented chess, had been used against them; so that profit from their labors would go to the "Nobles" who controlled the liquid wealth and not to those who produced the profit. They would fail because the tax structure would be subverted to build a Socialistic economy. They would fail because they were so busy playing the game, that they didn't notice the rules being changed. Today there is not much talk of inflation, but it should be obvious to everyone that housing costs are on the rise in many parts of the country once again. Social Security still gets increases, even if they do all go to Medicare. In fact, because they go to Medicare, The Generation That Could competes with the working class for medical services with greater advantage. And as you should understand by now, that causes health care costs to rise, and often as not it is the children who go without care as a result. At the same time, the US dollar is strong and growing stronger. This indicates deflation. So what's happening? Wages in the private sector are going down in many fields when indexed for inflation. The North American Trade Agreement and other trade arrangements made by the Democratic President are seeing the cost of



goods drop to offset increases in those bad inflationary pockets such as existing housing. If you look around you can see a frenzy of mortgage companies vying to lend you money against your home equity. They offer up to 125%` of equity. But most of these loans are not being used to gamble on the stock market like they were in the “Roaring Twenties”. They are being made to consolidate credit card debt and the number of people affected is incredible. There will be a fee attached to the new loan which will increase the debt even as the monthly payments may be lowered. It is the King’s chess board. And if it feels like every time you get close to climbing out of debt, something in the economy hiccups and you fall back or perhaps they just raise your rate on your cards: And likewise, it seems that every time you are at the brink of collapse, the interest rates go down and you continue to muddle along; never really gaining any equity that you don’t have offset by debt: it is no coincidence. When the head of the Federal Reserve sets before Congress and drolly speaks in glib tones and technocratic terms, what he is really saying is that the debtors are gaining too swiftly against their debt and therefore we must raise the rate at which they borrow and slow the economy. Or he is saying that, the debtors are too close to the edge, there have been too many bankruptcies and we must therefore lower the interest rate a bit and speed up the economy a bit, so these people can get in some overtime.

As a result, the children of the Baby Boomers have come up pretty much on their own. They were not educated in large percentages in matters that were not commercially valuable in nature. Their education has been focused on earning potential, not “Higher Education”. It has been a process of “Dumping Down” education in order to teach young people how to better serve American business without learning how to think for themselves; because a people who think are a people who won’t always be led. There was certainly not as much “Freedom From” as there had been for the Boomers and certainly no one to lead them “Too” anything which was not discarded when the Boomers lost themselves to groveling over the spoils. Now the task for “Power”, who ever wields it at the very top, is to unravel society so that it can not be united as it was against Vietnam. If our society can deteriorate to the point of pre-Mussolini Italy or pre-Hitler Germany, then the Evil which has shaped the past, can galvanize the youth of America to unity. Watch “Cabaret” and then look at San Francisco. Look at the origins of the Civil Liberties Union and its, supposed, agenda which threatens to destroy Capitalism from within. The function of the “Dumping Down of America” is to teach the masses only what they need to know to be productive at work and to lull them into submission with a six-pack of beer until the insurrection comes. It has been implemented by allowing teachers to unionize and thereby teach at what ever levels of productivity teachers wish. It has been implemented by Feminists creating a job market that devalued male labor to the point that it will not sustain a family; thereby removing Mothers Of Consequence

*George Bailey*

from the home. It has been implemented by allowing an irresponsible press to promote sex, violence, despair, racism and moral deterioration. The stage has been set for a generation raised on vengeance to come to power as the new Fascists, versed in the Politically Correct or perhaps in response to it. It doesn't matter. Or maybe we shall just be allowed to wither on the vine. But it need not be that way. I have told you that we have arrived at this point in history along a line that began with the dinosaurs. I have told you that the energy from that time has been stored to give us the opportunity to move into a new age of inexpensive and environmentally benign energy sources. It is a path that has been prepared for us if only we will take it. But there is more.

I blame the behavior of my generation for many of our Nation's ills. This book is ample testimony to that. But I must tell you that for all its shortcomings, the environmental movement in this country speaks well of our generation. We have endured the longest economic decline of any middle class generation in our nation's history and yet we have been unwilling to throw away the future of our children and the planet in order to maintain the dreams we grew up with. While La Roush tried to run for the Presidency on a platform which tried to sell us on the idea of colonizing Mars, the Baby Boomers have insisted that We clean up this old planet. They have resisted the notion of a disposable world; to be discarded for the sake of an industrial America backed by a militaristic government. If you browse through the "Statistical Abstract of the United States" or the "Historical Statistics of the United States", in a short time you will come to understand that "we could have been a contender" had We been given half a chance. American productivity has increased steadily throughout our working life, while our average income has remained stagnant. We have been denied nearly every advantage that the worker of '47 enjoyed and still We have survived. We have had to deal with ever depleted resources because of the excesses of the past. We have paid the price of trying to clean up, what was left as spoils, by those who went before us. And while Government has allowed us to be defrauded in the effort, We have not lost our resolve. La Roush would have us believe that it was our generation that sailed our Ship Of State on this course, but it was his. In example after example, those who went before us have put one grain of wheat on the first square, two on the second, four on the third; and then demanded that we fill the next three squares in our time. We have only now begun to come to power. He would argue that Clinton is of our generation, but Clinton is a politician who trades tax breaks and false promises for votes. Our time is just now at hand.

The result of business being forced to lay off workers in order to "restructure" with new job titles and lower salaries and wages, in conjunction with the Fed's 7% unemployment policy; would leave many in the private sector out of a job at some point in the 1980's. No cash flow and banks inherent

unwillingness to lend money to the unemployed, would leave many with no other option than to borrow money on credit cards. The Fed and the Government would both come to view this method of survival as inflationary. Reagan would eventually move to eliminate the tax deduction for interest paid on money borrowed on credit cards. He would claim the move was to stem the tide of credit card borrowing. It seemed to ignore the obvious fact that many had no other choice. It was indicative of the kind of responses that were prevalent with regard to the economic problems of the day. It was the kind of an atmosphere that led to many types of conspiracy theories. People were unable to understand those forces that were thwarting their every move. The ramifications of all these things I have just described were compounding each other in an almost geometric fashion. The futures of entire families were being irrevocably damaged.

In the winter of 1995-96 the U.S. Government would be shut down for a period of around two weeks while congress played “Chicken” with the budget. It would be the first time Government workers had been faced with losing a day’s pay due to forces beyond their control, in the entire span of the nation’s memory. By the end of the second week a bank in Grand Junction Colorado would get national “Media” recognition for setting up a loan program for those local government workers inconvenienced by the furlough. Before all was said and done, all those Federal Employees who had been sent home, would be reimbursed by the government for their days off. The public reaction by many of those Government workers interviewed during the “Furlough” demonstrates only the tip of the ice berg in the rift that divides them from the private sector. In the face of a Government bent on bankrupting the country, it seemed that Federal workers felt they were above being inconvenienced. The gulf between those who have been shielded and those who have paid the price of the economic “Atrocities” perpetrated on the American Worker in the “Private” sector, is the source of the whirlwind that threatens to engulf us all.

If you intend to challenge the conclusions I have made and the changes I am about to suggest you will need to understand the historical record of the period discussed. If you intend to champion the cause of this book, you are likewise obliged. In either case you need to read “The Secrets Of The Temple” by William Greider. I have asked for no other reading on your part and will require no other with the exception of the Constitution. It is a long book, but well written. In view of the sacrifices made by those who died for this country, it is a small request. Still, because of constraints on this book’s length and because so much of my understanding of economics is owed to what Greider reveals in his work: it is imperative that you do your studies. Whether you believe that “The Secrets of the Temple” is the truth about the Federal Reserve’s blind allegiance to the sovereignty of the institutions of “Capital”, or whether you believe it to be a White Wash of a conspiracy to control the world: does not matter. Greider will,

*George Bailey*

if you allow him the opportunity, enlighten you with the knowledge of how the system “doesn’t” work for all of us. If you will not invest in this knowledge, then you have no right to ask another single soldier to risk their life in the defense of this country. You have no right to ask another to pay a single dollar’s tax to sustain a system which was handed down to you and about which you do not care enough to read the operating instructions.

As I told you earlier on, no one owns any real property in America any longer. Property taxes have returned all Americans to the position of tenant: of serf. The Government, in one form or another, is the real owner your home and your property. The idea that Empowerment and Authority have once again laid claim to all the possessions of the Kingdom is a coming full circle of the Monarchy. It mirrors the structure of the fallen USSR in that it is the government who will preside over the division of what remains of a once great nation. The only difference is that it is “Capital” rather than the “Communist Party” who is in control. It champions the view that the sovereignty of the Church awards ownership of the kingdom to those who hold and mint the “Coin of the Realm”. It is Feudal in its nature, hence the new economic term “Feudal Capitalism”. But wait: “The King Has No Clothes!!!!”.

The Lord works in mysterious ways. And I will tell you now that the foundation has been laid for a change worthy of the new Millennium. It was a way unclear to me when I began this journey in the early 1990’s; but I will share it with you now. When we learn about money as children, it is a concept that must be explained; like when your child fails to understand how you can be out of money when you have checks in the check book. It is this concept of trust and obligation, [that we use when we exchange a check for goods and services] that we teach to our children. A check is used as money because we as individuals guarantee, under penalty of law, that the bank will exchange it for cash upon demand. This cash is available in exchange for the check because we have deposited our own cash [or the equivalent thereof] in advance of that demand. This is simple enough. But the cash itself is different. Currency, American Money, and the other currencies of the world, were not created in this way. The paper money [currency] of nations was created with the guarantee of gold. Fort Knox and the Federal Reserve Banks, were the repositories of the Gold and Silver which was the wealth of the Nation as reflected in its currency. Gold and Silver, the “Coin of the Realm” in bar form: was the Church Sanctioned equivalent of wealth. It was the measure of “liquid” wealth and the only “True” moral representative of such wealth. Therefore, logically, if the “Capital” of the Nation were controlled by the “Wealthy”, then they were the “True” and entitled owners of the Gold and Silver reserves that US currency represents. In essence, to amass “Wealth” was to amass the only commodity which could be exchanged for “Wealth”.

By this criteria Capitalism was formed. The “Wealth” of a Nation, held as capital, and lent to a Nation as “Capital”. For example, when we vote on a School bond issue, the citizens of a municipality vote on whether or not to borrow money to build a new school or fix an old one. If the vote is yes, they [as a municipality] will sell “Bonds”. The Bond itself is a pledge by the city to pay back the “Capital” to the Nobles who own currency [liquid assets], along with interest [usury, if that interest is excessive]. The Government of the United States does the same thing. This is how it is done. This is what we have been taught. But it no longer has any basis in reality. It is no longer the fact of the matter. During the Nixon administration the “Gold Standard” was still in place. That standard guaranteed that US currency could be exchanged for gold or silver. In this way, if the Government of the United States printed more money, they devalued their own currency accordingly. That was the difference between currency and a check. A check can not be devalued by writing more checks. The threat of devaluing currency was the “Check and Balance” which safeguarded the trust between citizens and those who held currency and the Government. At the time the Gold Standard was dropped, US currency was also the standard for the nations of the world. Many countries held US dollars in their treasuries just as they might hold gold. Due to the market forces, which Greider points out as occurring during the Nixon administration, a run on American gold reserves caused The United States, under Nixon, to drop the Gold Standard. Most of us didn’t really understand what that meant at the time. We seemed to understand that Government could now print money without it being balanced by a devaluation against gold and silver. But we were never educated in monetary issues in public schools.

What the move away from the Gold Standard did mean however, was a break in that “Spiritual” tie between “Gold” and “Wealth”: between “Wealth” and “Capital”. It was no longer possible to trade US currency for gold or silver upon demand as one could with the original “Gold Certificates” and “Silver Certificates”. The value of US currency was now based solely on the pledge and honor of the American People. From that point on, when a municipality pledged to repay “Wealth” borrowed as “Capital”; it would be pledging to pay back “Wealth” that was “Wealth” based on their own pledge of honor, at a National level [American Currency, not gold]. If your lost at this point, don’t despair. It’s not an easy concept to grasp at first. But, remember when Ross Perot said something about the ability of a country to endure after it realizes it can print its own money? That was the threat in the 80’s. Because money [currency] was no longer tied to the Gold Standard, it had value only relative to indicators such as other currencies and commodities; which included gold. When the stock market crashed during the Great Depression people were jumping out of windows. People who had borrowed money for speculation or those who bought options on margin would be ruined. Their “Capital”; their accumulated “Wealth” would be

*George Bailey*

lost to them. They would face being penniless in an economy that was unraveling. But that wouldn't happen to the generation of La Roush. By the time the Savings & Loans fell in the 1980s, virtually all the "Wealth" of the Nation [86% of it] had moved to the top 10% of the Nation's population. It consisted of the wealthiest families in the country of course; but the top 10% also included many within the generation of Linden La Roush. They were the ones on board when the train left the station. They were the children of the depression. They were the workers who started out in 1947. They were the politically powerful elderly. And when the wealthiest individuals in America, and the world, proposed legislation that would save them from losing that wealth as a result of their greed and their folly; it would be the generation of La Roush who would allow the rich to save themselves at the expense of the generations to come; here and in the third world. They would not do it knowingly. They would simply allow it to happen without a fight. In the same way that the usury laws would be dropped and inflation would be targeted, the children of the depression would see it as a good thing for themselves and never stop to consider its cost to the rest. If anyone pointed out what it was doing to the rest of the country, they simply said "There's nothing I can do about it.". It was as simple as a departure from the Christian Ethic. By 1996 it had gone so far that Steve Forbes would dare to run for president on a platform that championed a flat income tax which exempted money earned as interest from being taxed: as if only those who worked for a living or invested in the future, should bear the cost of our society and our government, in the same way they bear the cost of Social Programs through Social Security.

Because the bail out of US banks in the 1980's, would cause debt and because paying off that debt by printing more currency would devalue the currency ["Wealth"] held by the rich: the bail out would be financed with more US debt. Translated, that meant selling more US bonds. Those bonds would compete for money on the open market already being artificially inflated by the Federal Reserve. Even more tragically; just like the municipal bonds described earlier, We The People, were selling bonds [who's value was based on our word], to raise money who's value was also backed solely by our word. Let me express this concept another way. Imagine for a moment that, that same municipality we talked about wants to borrow money, but instead goes to the Government of the United States of America for the loan. In turn, instead of going to the rich and borrowing the money, the US Government goes to the Federal Reserve and tells them to print up enough money to make the loan. Is that inflationary? Well, only slightly if the loan is repaid. Remember that banks create "Wealth" regularly by lending out the same money over and over again as explained by Greider. That is, there is no difference between a bank going to the Federal Reserve for money and the Municipality going to the Federal Reserve for money; except that if the bank goes on behalf of the municipality, the bank gets to raise the interest rate to

the municipality and pocket the difference. In the past, that was the only acceptable way. Like Rob Roy, the citizens of a community owned the property, but they did not own any liquid assets that could be converted to money for the municipal project. And like the Nobleman, those who gave money for bonds, whether they were a bank or an individual, made their liquid assets available to the city by buying their bonds. In return the city had to pay the interest. [I told you to refer to Greider]. So what's the difference if the citizens go to the Federal Reserve and ask for some money instead of a bank? There is no difference. There used to be a difference when the Gold Standard was the safety check. But the Gold Standard has been gone for nearly a quarter of a century as we near the millennium. Perot's fears about a lack of checks and balances are born out in our recent history, NOT by the Fed's willingness to print too much money: but rather in its willingness to sell bonds which caused debt and sacrifice the future of the country and its generations, for the sake of a "Strong Dollar". After all, bonds are simply an IOU that tax payers are obligated pay back and on which they pay interest. So when the Federal Government bailed out the Banks and the depositors who had money in the Savings and Loans back in the 1980's, they did it by borrowing money in the form of bonds and giving that money to those who had accounts in the savings institutions that failed. That money they borrowed would become part of the National Debt. And not only would the generations to follow be obliged to pay that debt in the future, but until they did, they would be obliged to pay inflated interest rates on it as well. At the same time, those who invested recklessly and were protected in the Bail Out, would receive the benefit of the higher interest rates created by this situation, when they took the money they received from the Government and put it in the bank. If you can comprehend what I have just explained, then it should be clear to you at this point that there is no justification for higher interest rates. They are sanctioned, not by market forces but by the Federal Reserve's ability and willingness to manipulate the percentages. For example, many of you have adjustable rate loans. Their interest reflects the prime interest rate plus a percentage which is the lending institutions profit. That 1% to 3% profit margin is what is needed to make Capitalism work. To keep the institutions of lending showing a profit. The prime rate is what the Nobles demand before they will let you play. But, as currency in America is backed by our word, not Gold, it is We who have the right to say who will play and when. When the Federal Reserve charges 7% as a prime rate, the Federal Reserve banks are allowed to make that seven percent on money which is yours. It is money which you, as a citizen and owner of this Nation, have given them, and which you have instructed to them oversee in order to keep banks solvent and to make sure individual banks can get cash when they need it. It does not reflect their cost of doing business, it does not return to the Department of the Treasury; it is a windfall they receive on money marked on a ledger or currency they are allowed to print for the cost of the paper and the cost

*George Bailey*

of the printing. Even if it did return to the Treasury, it would be one more tax that we were paying that strangles our economy. If currency is valued by our National Pledge, and if our national assets are increased with regard to the increase in the money supply when it is used responsibly, then the higher the interest rate the more our forward progress is impeded. The only advantage to higher interest rates goes to the Nobles who hold the liquid assets. When the Fed raises its prime rate, all those in a position to lend Capital see their competition to lend decrease and thereby enjoy a higher percentage of the fruits of our labor as well. In the beginning of this book, I told you about the compounding effects of interest as explained in the story of the Man who invented chess. I also related to you the story of the compounding affects that were brought to bear on the new drivers at a mid-west concrete company and the rationalizations of those on the other side. Now I will tell you another story.

In 1999, my oldest daughter was working part time as a waitress. She worked the Sunday shift, 6:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. One Sunday a group of Elderly people came into the restaurant where she worked and sat down in her section: all fifteen of them. You know me well enough by now to know that my daughter understands how to earn a good tip. In fact, she does well enough for her age. So when given the opportunity to serve a table of this size and potential, she set about to do her best. The fifteen Senior Citizens had a nice long lunch. They got her full attention and left smiling. As they headed for the cash register they called back to my daughter to inquire if she had included their Senior Citizens Discount; to which my daughter replied that the cashier would see to it. She then proceeded to the table to find that the entire table of fifteen had “stiffed” her for the tip. Now I know that you will say that these folks live on a fixed income. You will say it, not because its true, but because it is one of the rationalizations taught to the people who stand in the line known as the Senior Citizen. It is a rationalization that was first uttered as a battle cry against inflation. The generation, that was the Grandparents of the Baby Boomers, had made their start in the Depression. They had waited their time through WWII. They had come to retirement in poorer health than their children would. Their Social Security Benefits would be designed to help them through: not to continue their pay check. As inflation began to rise, they would be affected adversely. But ten years down the road they would be fewer and fewer in number. In time, inflation would be strangled along with the future of the Baby Boom generation. The generation of La Roush, the Generation That Could, had amassed more wealth than any generation in history. Each year, for most of the 1980’s and through the end of the century, real wages would be in decline for the private working sector. Those who had investments would continue to live at levels reminiscent of the golden days of the 50’s and 60’s. But anyone who didn’t catch the boat, would drift out there in the private sector. However, if you were on welfare, or the welfare for the elderly we call Social Security; or if you worked for the government, or if



you belonged to a union that held a utility hostage [or some other government protected “Pseudo-Government” industry], your lot increased in relation to those who worked out in the real world. It did seem that things were harder, but they were told it was because they lived on a “fixed” income. But, in truth, their children and their grand children were suffering far more from the decline of the nation as a whole.

Each of those Senior Citizens that my daughter waited on, spent an average of just over \$12.00 for a lunch in a part of the country where one can find a lunch “out” for one third of that amount, without a lot of effort. In fact you could find a prime rib dinner. As a working guy who makes only average income, I could never afford to take my kids out for such a meal. Still, these folks have bought into the rationalization that they are “Entitled”. My daughter, on the other hand, is not. She will pay in excess of 7.5% of her wages to Social Security and Medicare, and it will be divided between the bureaucrats and the elderly: including these same people. Her employer will pay the same, and you should understand by now that, that is her money too. She only gets \$3.00 an hour in wages and the rest is tips. Because of this, the IRS has begun assessing waitresses an estimated tax on tips. So she will be assessed a tax on the tip she should have gotten on that \$175.00 check, even though they stiffed her; and she will have to pay it. So in the end, she can lower their tax burden for them too, for the privilege of serving them. As if all this weren’t enough, the poor kid has back problems. They’re not real serious. They give her headaches. It’s nothing that a chiropractor couldn’t fix. Unfortunately, I can’t afford to get her in often enough. The rates are too high and I have neither the money nor the insurance. One contributing factor to the high cost is, of course, Medicare’s ability to “bid up” health care costs. So I can’t pay it, and she can’t pay it and as a result, over time, a minor problem will possibly get worse. Meanwhile, those elderly, on fixed income, can afford the medical care that my daughter can not. They all left and went out to get in their cars, and I can promise you that some of them should no longer be driving. I can also promise you that each day they will get worse. But we can be certain that no insurance company would dare to raise their rates for fear of accusations of age discrimination. Oh, they might have some discounts taken away; however, my daughter, who is a good driver, with a perfect record, can be discriminated against, and she will pay three times their rate, even though insurance is a “pool” against accidents and we “ALL” had to be first time drivers at some point.

I am well aware that I have committed a great blasphemy by speaking out against those who hide behind the rationalizations of the line known as the Elderly. I will, no doubt, be quoted out of context, and come to be hated and feared. But I can not stand idly by and allow another generation to be yoked to a system such as this, without speaking out. When Washington tells those of my

*George Bailey*

generation that they too, may retire in the manner to which they have become accustomed; they are inviting you to embrace the rationalizations of to the elderly of today. If you do, it is your children and your children's children who you betray. When you embrace the monetary system that thwarted you, on the grounds that it will somehow serve you in your time, you are buying into betrayal. It is Long Shanks who forms the lines and He who writes their slogans. But it need not be He who controls your destiny and that of your generations to come. The next time "It's a Wonderful Life" comes on the TV, all you Baby Boomers make sure you catch the part where George goes to Old Man Potter and "Begs" for his help to save his family. Remember that the failed generation of which you are a part, thwarted the avarice of America's war machine in Vietnam. Remember that you impeded the rape of our environment, and stood for the rights of the common man and woman to live with dignity and equal rights under the law. And when you look back at how you tried to do the right thing at the expense of "Progress" and "Power", listen to Potter's answer to you, even as he denies you the wealth that he has stolen from you and threatens your freedom. If you are of the generation that "could", then consider that now that you know the truth, you have become the one who pushes Potter's wheel chair. You are the old woman who eves drops at the door. I have come to sweep your rationalizations away from you and from all those who have been held up by a corrupted set of principles. But I have not come to belittle you. I have not come to point a finger without showing you the way. YOU DID NOT KNOW. But now that you understand, if you choose to defend your position, it will not be out of ignorance.

What I propose is a new economic system like no other in history. I call it "Capitalization". It is based upon the belief that "Wealth" once amassed is not the basis by which "Wealth" is created. This is a total departure from every system of economics ever recorded. It is based upon the assumption that "Currency" and the "Wealth" derived from it, is redeemable for goods and services; but it is not "Spiritual" in nature. The value of currency is not based in the Church or in the "Divinity" of precious metals. Its value is based in the pledge and honor of the people who stand behind it: as it should be. After all, to paraphrase my mentor Gorge Bailey, "They're the ones who do the living and the dying in this country". It is based on the Divinity of Mankind Under God. Today it is our moral obligation to honor our debts, which gives value to our currency in the way that precious metals once did. As morality stems from God, so then does our pledge become linked to Divinity in the way that the Church's sanction linked gold. It is an evolution not possible for a Godless People, or a society based on survival of the fittest. It is the reward of a Nation of Faith and a snare for a Nation who shows contempt for morality. In the world's past and within the system we now live, stable money, borrowed from the wealthy, made sense as we were weaned from the security of the Gold Standard. In the system in which we find ourselves today and in the system we are creating, it does not. What We

propose is, once again, “Revolutionary”. It has its own checks and balances, and it works like this.

Remember, the Federal Government will operate on a fixed income. It will receive 10%, or so, of the gross of this Nation across the board. From that money it will, by law, have to meet its requirements for “Blue Food”, Medical, The Elderly, Education, Military, etc.; by order of importance as determined by the people [on a special five year ballot if need be], before it can fund “Pet” projects [but always with Blue Food first]. Spending which occurs beyond its means will be funded by the printing of new currency. That will be inflationary in the worst possible sense. It will in turn, make it easier for existing loans to be paid off with inflated currency and cause the erosion of “Old Money” [Accumulated Wealth]. Therefore the wealthy will work hard to safeguard against it. City and State governments, likewise, will no longer have the option of selling “Bonds” or raising money in ways other than taxes on income. Citizens will vote, as always, on whether or not to borrow for such things as school buildings, libraries and infrastructure: but now they will borrow at the Fed Window. They will borrow inflationary currency, which they will repay at an interest rate of 1%. In this way, the “People” will stand behind their pledge [currency] rather than borrow from “Feudal Capital” [Old Money]. In this same way “We the People” can underwrite “Tear One” banking for home loans. As Greider explained; if the Fed puts \$1.00 in a [Tear One] bank it will resound throughout the banking system until it is depleted by way of reserves placed back in the Federal Reserve, which is where it originated. In that way, Americans qualifying for home mortgages through First Tear banks can be collateralized by the word and bond of the people and the interest can cover the cost and profit of the Tear One Banking System. As those deposits move out of Tear One banks and into Tear Two Commercial Banks, the Federal Reserve can call for increased or decreased reserve amount requirements in order to control M-1 growth outside of the Tear One arena during the initial implementation of the Revolution. Once things settle down, this method of “Pumping money into the system” should be the measure by which new wealth is created. That is, rather than the “One foot on the brake and one foot on the accelerator” approach used in the past: under the new system the creation of new wealth shall coincide with a new home buyer entering into society. It shall be a meter by which wealth is increased, so that, at such time as an individual enters into the adult realm of home and responsibility: that an amount of wealth, in the equivalent of the price of a qualifying home mortgage in their region, will be entered onto the books on their behalf. Once placed on the books it will be paid out to the private sector as payment in full for the home. Once in the private sector, it will be deposited to collect interest and re-lent at margin [showing the bank a profit] in a declining fashion as explained by Greider.

*George Bailey*

By controlling reserve requirements outside of Tear One and putting money into the banking system at the Tear One level as a priority, the Fed can feed money to Tear One Banks and still control M-1 growth in the banking community at large. During those times when the Fed requires larger reserve amounts in order to control for excess growth in money creation, it shall be obliged to stiffen the “Criteria” by which loans are allowed until the supply and demand of money reach equilibrium. In this way the constant growth of money [wealth] insures inflation. Reserve requirements control the amount of that inflation. And the implementation of “Criteria” champion “Productive Inflation” over Non-productive Inflation”.

“Criteria” as I have envisioned it, is a set list of types of investments from automobile loans, to loans for unimproved pieces of land, to home improvement loans, to loans for businesses big or small. The Federal Reserve would be responsible for categorizing numerous groups and subgroups of loans for which entities might apply. They would then arrange them numerically on an individual basis. Since a home improvement loan and a loan for a business tooling up to produce a product, would both, theoretically, create a productive inflation; they would have a much larger number than money to buy a large tract of undeveloped land or even a restaurant. Once the criteria are in place, the Fed could then limit who the insured banks lent to, according to economic conditions. In times of excessive inflation, ventures which seek to capitalize on speculation would not find funding in Federally insured forums. If the Fed sets the criteria at 49, then the forty nine most negatively inflationary types of loans would not be available. This, I believe, was what Carter was grasping for when the whole roller coaster ride left the station in the 1970’s. But the idea that “Capital” had to be controlled when it threaten the productivity of a nation, was concept that eluded those shaped by the system they protect. If a person lies about their intentions for the money, then they should be prosecuted.

In the new system of “Capitalization”, “Old Money” will now be obliged to invest in stocks and other Capital “Ventures” in order to buy into the game. Money which sets idle will dissipate over time do to low but constant levels of inflation. So will “Wealth” lent out as “Capital” for interest rather than investment. The rich will pay the same tax rates as the rest of us; and on income only, just like the rest of us; but that income will include interest. There will be no inheritance taxes. Money which moves back and forth between family members is not income, even if one of the members dies. At the same time, the laws of economics, as set forth in “Capitalization”, will compel “Wealth” to participate in the “Risk” of investment or to dissipate over time. In this way the old and unfair “Progressive Tax” system will be replaced with inflation. Big money interests will say that this will lead to hyper inflation. It will not. Because, in our new system, virtually everyone works at least four hours a day and

everyone has access to a home at 3% interest or less, and the minimum wage guarantees a cash flow ample to the task of a mortgage: the main investments that an individual makes can not be inflated. Why? For several reasons. Municipalities will be forced to protect against speculation in order to keep minimum wages down; as it is tied to housing costs. Speculators will probably not be able to borrow at the same low protected rate as home buyers. The flat [approximately 10% or 15%] tax will eliminate profit from home buying speculation. The Bond Market will be defunct as we know it, once Government is barred from participation. Wall Street will no longer driving up prices, trying to out guess the Federal Reserve. As long as raw materials are available; growth, which leaves real property in its wake, will not lead to runaway inflation. Remember, the Fed will still have its "Criteria" standard to slow inflation. It should apply to municipalities who wish to borrow as well. What's more, a "Criteria" approach is fair and it targets the Princes and not the Whipping Boy.

They will tell you that constant inflation will rob the elderly of their savings. I say that we should look to the elderly of the 80's and early 90's. They reaped the rewards of inflation during their productive years but refused to pay the cost when the next generation came along. Because of their ignorance they allowed the rich to turn them against their own children and grand children. The very creation of new wealth is inflationary. The myth that wealth can be created without causing inflation has been perpetuated by offsetting that inevitable inflation with deflation of the Private Sector within the middle class. Such a strategy can not long endure. Low interest means growth. Growth means the rich will prosper as well as the poor. Inflation means the rich must participate. "Criteria" insures that the rich will force the Fed to police their own. The wealthy of our Nation and of the world, will not allow our government to inflate our dollars directly through printing money to pay for budget deficits. But, so long as the Treasury and the Federal Reserve sell bonds to cover our deficit, the debt will flow to the tax payers and the profit will flow to the wealthy; creating inflation that leaves nothing in its wake but debt. We don't have to take this in our country. We own this country. It does not belong to the wealthy or the Government and certainly not to the bureaucrats. If you can grasp what I have been saying, then you can see that this is the next evolutionary step in Government and Society. It takes control of the wealth out of the hands of the wealthy and relegates them to "Player" status. They can no longer withhold funds and have their way as was done in the Great Depression.

You will be told that the anxiety over this on "Wall Street" will send things into a tailspin. In fact, if you read "The Secrets of the Temple" you will come to understand that it is the anxiety over what the Federal Reserve will do next, which has eclipsed the hopes of a generation. Greider's book is not a dooms day study in paranoia. And if you are a "Baby Boomer", or younger, you owe it to

*George Bailey*

yourself to read it so you can understand why your life has been so difficult. If you want to change things, you've got to understand the problem. If you are to understand that what I suggest will work, you must educate yourself. Read Greider's book! If we lay out the terms of transition to Wall Street and the world, they need not be alarmed. The world's economy did not collapse when the poor and middle classes lost their future or when American industry was devastated. It will not collapse if industry is allowed to flourish, even if it is at the expense of "Old Money".

The natural reaction of the "Bond Market" and "Banking" would be to stop lending money in order to bring the economy to its knees and thereby thwart the revolution. If they do that, it shall fall to the Federal Reserve to fulfill its obligation under its charter to protect industry. The Banks can cut off their nose to spite their face if they so choose. American Enterprise which needs capital in order to keep its doors open, may, immediately after the "Revolution" has begun, go directly to the Federal Reserve, if banks refuse them. They may borrow newly printed money for "The cost of the Paper, and the Cost of the Printing" until the Banks come around. The Federal Reserve shall continue this practice until the revolution is complete in all its aspects listed in the terms of reconciliation or until the banks play along.

As for those bonds in existence today; any entity which holds State or Federal Bonds, which includes the Trillions that are our National Debt: those bonds will be reissued at a rate of 3%. Bonds which do not "Roll Over" and find no buyers, will be paid off with newly printed money: inflationary money. Furthermore, the tax on the interest paid will be 98%. If you have been following along and studying the lessons of the past, then it should be obvious to you what this means. It puts the ball in the court of high finance. For thirty years they have squeezed us in an attempt to keep the value of their money high. The Great Depression was a grueling decade without social programs to help the lost. We have endured three decades, but our soup lines were not visible: our despair has been ignored. It will now fall to the "Wealth" of the nation to purchase bonds at 3% until we are able to pay off the principle on our National Debt or "Capital" will suffer the inflationary effects of trillions in currency pumped into the world. The inflation would be horrible; but it would be a one time event, not unlike a controlled stock market crash. I will not taunt the Financial Sector by saying which way they will go. Instead I will give you their alternative. That alternative would be to fund the debt at 3% in order to stop inflation. It is an ironic twist that they will now bear the burden of inflation fighting. Remember, the industrialized nations of the world, who's rich also prospered as a result of Fed policies, will, by necessity, have to try and help American "Capital" finance those bonds. Why? Because excessive inflation in the US will lead to a devaluation of our currency and there by a strengthening of foreign currencies by comparison. This is the

very situation which drove American jobs “Off Shore”, only in reverse. Foreign manufacturers will, of necessity, insist that the Financial Institutions of their respective countries do what ever they can to hold up those bonds until they are paid off for fear of shrinking markets. As for the nations of the Middle East who helped to begin this phobia surrounding inflation: I would say this. Come and join with the rest of the world in a new age of freedom. Honor your own religious teachings to turn away from usury and help us through this transition by investing in our bonds to stabilize the situation. Then, in the future, invest instead in the prosperity of all men or explain yourself to your people. In return, We will allocated money from the Federal budget as outlined later in this book, to pay down the debt. At a 3% interest rate, much of what is allocated will be applied to the principle. We should, in fact, be able to come close to paying off the debt within a decade or less. As for you Americans, remember that it is only money. Regardless of what the domes sayers say, if today’s dollar were worth one cent tomorrow, it would not adversely affect you so long as it was a one time event. In fact, you would still own all that you own and you could pay off what you owed with dollars worth 1 percent of what you borrowed them at. This should make it clear that finance will not let it happen in that extreme.

Not since before the days of Saul has any man, within a society, enjoyed the kind of freedom of which I speak. I have come to believe that God has laid a foundation so that we might once again be free of Kings. The society I have outlined is built on a Christian ethic. It seeks equity for all its members. It forgives all its trespassers. While that may be in conflict with Muslim teachings, you Muslims can not dispute that usury is a cruel instrument. I urge you then to invest your wealth in the future as a hedge against inflation. It is in accordance with your teachings. Given the upswing in productivity by virtue of a more capitalistic system of economics, We will pay down the Debt. As we do, Finance will find a formula by which to pay down these last American Bonds: relaxing the 98% tax along a sliding scale for those who keep their money in 3% bonds, by 10% each time the Debt declines by 10% of its base amount: until We can pay it off. Remember, one of the greatest single Bond holders is Social Security, which we are dismantling, thus relieving us of that debt. Those bonds which will be paid off without penalty in a given year will be those who’s serial number ends with the number of the respective year. Bonds ending in the number one will be paid off in the year 2001. Those who wait to cash in their bonds along the schedule would pay taxes at normal post revolution rates. Spurred on by their wealthy friends, Government will at last be in earnest to pay the Debt. What’s more, this will introduce a new safeguard to the system. Once the Federal Reserve is obliged to apply “Criteria” rather than affecting interest rates, it will be free to air its opinions in public; which will stabilize the Stock Market. It will be obliged to lend at rates which reflect the cost of the paper and the printing and the cost of administration. In our new “De-Socialized” system, causing inflation

*George Bailey*

is the only way in which the Nation at large can “vote itself a pay raise”. So long as the Fed uses “Criteria” to limit loans, it can adjust inflation. Therefore we can regulate inflation at between 2% and 4%. This will help the young get started and force “Wealth” to participate. As for retirement savings: they should be invested in low interest bearing accounts in the “Tier One” banks if you have a Tier One loan. If not, it should remain in Federally insured banks and perhaps some of it should be spread out over a large number of stocks. Because of the new tax laws which govern the purchase and sale of stocks, the market will be, of necessity, far less volatile. Investments made by individuals should be considered to be for the long haul. They should be an investment in a productive concern rather than a bet placed on a roulette wheel, with the house taking a piece of the action every time a bet is placed. These types of investments will be stable in the face of inflation. They will be good for investors, good for business, good for the Country. The prudent American will set aside around 10% of their income for savings and investment. They will look for a cross section of stable stocks and may even take one percent for start up ventures. Those who put 5% in the bank will see it shrink slightly against inflation over the years. But they will do it anyway for two reasons. It will allow them access to cash without borrowing or paying taxes on the sale of stocks when special needs arise or that “Raining Day” appears. It will also help to keep money available for Tier Two housing and business that will not be inflationary, in the way that money borrowed at the Fed Window is. In this way, citizens will fulfill an unwritten Moral obligation to do their fair share. The more money that is available for entrepreneurial endeavors, or even housing above the value of X, the better the state of the nation as a whole. That will cause their stocks to appreciate far in excess of their savings losses to inflation. Because they understand that and because they are moral people who look out for each other and want to contribute their fair share, they will. And when the wolf knocks at their door they will have money in the bank and they will see that they are rewarded for doing the right thing by their brothers and sisters. After all those who qualify for Tier One loans have been Capitalized following the revolution, the constraint against keeping your deposits in a Tier Two Bank as opposed to a Tier One Bank can be lifted. This because, as I have explained, new money will be created in order to cause that constant inflation desired after our transformation is complete.

Finally, We will have a return to the idea of “Usury”. That is, that there is something immoral about lending money at an interest rate that is too high. From the day that the Revolution is acknowledged by Congress, the legal limit on interest will be 7%. That’s as high as you can go. It is within the range of inflation We are willing to accept. If you want a greater return on your money, invest in the economy of your country. In addition, it should be understood that, that same seven percent ceiling shall include the operating costs of those who lend money. It serves no purpose limit interest rates, only to allow fees and other



bank expenses to be tacked onto the loan, to defraud that seven percent limit. If you are in the business of lending money, then your costs of doing business are subject to the same capitalistic challenges as any other company. That would even include appraisals. Those who can do the business of banking with the most efficiency should become the same entities who prevail. As the Fed pumps money into the economy through Tier One banks, those banks which can perform for less than the 3% maximum will win out in a Capitalistic environment. It should also be noted that the more consolidated the banking system becomes, the greater the danger that Government will be unable to let bankrupt banking institutions fall. This problem is lessened to some extent as the Federal Reserve is forced to prop up banking with printed money as opposed to taking on new debt. It is, never the less, still prudent to begin dismantling the larger national banks, because failed banks {like any other business} should be allowed to fall when they fail. Unfortunately, at the close of 1999, President Clinton would revoke a law written as a result of the stock market crash of 1929, which forbade the merging of Banks, Stock Brokerages, and Insurance Companies. It should be obvious to you at this point in your education that if this is allowed, failed Stock Brokerages and Insurance Companies can now hide behind the privilege of Banks and be protected from losses by a Government which dare not let the Big banks fail. True to the psychology of the times, such bail outs will ultimately come from the pockets of tax payers or be added to the National Debt as a marker around the neck of generations to come in the form of bonds.

You must understand that We are not alone in this. Getting our country back on its feet monetarily is good for the whole world. The inflation from those at the lower end of the spectrum; the middle class and the elderly, who cash in their Bonds out of necessity immediately after the revolution, will help the third world in its struggle to pay off old debt by devaluing the dollars they owe, or the Fed can increase the percentage of money Banks must have on deposit at the Fed. and those monies can be used to offset runs on the Bond market as well. Perhaps it will be some of both. But We are no longer bound as serfs to the Land Lord except that we are trained to be. We are obliged to return goods and services against our currency in order to protect Our good name; but We are not obliged to borrow currency from those who would enslave Us. The right to "Coin" the currency "OF The Realm" has passed to Us as a birth right in the nation which first proclaimed "All Men to be created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights". It is a matter of honor and of conscience. So long as We have honor and are guided by conscience, We will prevail. If We have none We will perish as a nation. This is true regardless of the economic path We take. You must also come to understand that there is no justification for higher interest rates other than the fact that those who once held all the liquid assets of the world said that that was how much they wanted. They have manipulated the system without a moral tether. They have eroded the economic strength of our nation and

*George Bailey*

dismantled our industrial capabilities out of their own greed and God has allowed you the eyes to see the historical proof of, not only their actions, but of your ability to maintain a stable currency even as you free future generations from their grip.

In the wake of this book their may be those who push for a return to the Gold Standard. This would only mean a return to the same thing We finally out grew. Besides, in a world as unfair and volatile as this, what would happen if we put our stock in Gold and Silver only to have a terrorist group contaminate it with radioactivity?

Additionally, there may be forces who would try to engage the country in a war to thwart our resolve. Let them know that from here forward, that all wars will be funded, not with bonds but with currency. Just as Lincoln printed “Green Backs” to fund the Civil War, We shall forever more, fund America’s wars with newly printed currency. Some historians have even alleged that, that was the reason he was assassinated. But, unlike “Green Backs”, currency printed to fund future wars will not be recalled. It is only fitting in a free nation that the “Capital” of the wealthy be diminished to fight a war in which the Blood of the masses is shed. It is a balance never known before in history and it is long over due. Why should those who do the fighting return to pay the debts of the war?

There remain two segments of American Finance which have not been directly addressed; they are Credit Cards and the Stock Market. To begin with, let us discuss Credit Card Companies. It should be noted that I am speaking of those Credit Cards which are issued by Banks as opposed to those offered by merchants such as J.C. Penny or Sears. As the credit card has gained in prevalence, merchants have been left with little choice but to accept them and reflect the cost in the prices of their goods and services. This means that whether you use credit cards or not, you bear the cost of the credit card company’s profit. With the revolution the Card Companies will be forced to reduce their rates to no more than the 7% the law allows. It has also come to pass that many credit card companies now sell the debt which people owe on their card, to other credit card companies. In many cases, consumers [debtors] find their interest rate being raised by the new card companies and they have no legal recourse. This is a case of a government who has abandoned its people. No home owner would expect to have their mortgage increased arbitrarily, nor would they have to tolerate it. Yet, those who are forced to pay the highest interest rates to begin with, find that they may be prayed upon at will. It is a practice which needs no more mention here; as, in a culture which embraces morality it would be inconceivable. But in the case of charges to retailers who except the cards, we must adopt a very broad rule which States its Intent to be that: “Those who initiate the use of a service in the private sector must bear the cost of that service directly”. As an example, if your use of a financial instrument [such as a credit card or electronic account] causes

someone to pay a fee as a result of the transaction, YOU are the one who must pay the fee. You will see the fee registered on your billing statement and not as a reflection of higher retail costs perpetrated on consumers in general because it is a form of extortion. We would not expect that the people who accept our personal checks be billed for the expenses incurred as a result of our checking account. We will not allow such practices in the electronic realm either. The lessons We have learned from Credit Cards bear out the correctness and fairness of such a rule.

The last institution of Finance which we must deal with is the “Stock Market”. While I must confess to a degree of ignorance in the way the present system works, I do understand how it must work under “Capitalization”. The first thing you must understand is that the Stock Markets are private institutions. Under today’s system an American tax payer has no right to step onto the “Trading Floor” and offer their company’s stock for sale on either “Wall Street” or the “NAZDAC” market. As private institutions they have the right to bar outsiders from participation. That is as it should be. But because the government has mandated that no company may sell stock to more than thirty two investors without involving the Securities and Exchange Commission and investing in a costly prospectus in the process, they have constrained Business, in a round about way, to seek investment capital through the only conventional avenue: The Stock Exchange. I have discussed the costs and the supposed purpose of a “Prospectus” earlier on in this book. I have related to you the 16% ownership condition associated with a Broker’s willingness to offer a Stock on the exchange. It is the power of “ Feudal Capital” at work on a different plain.

With the revolution We intend to “Capitalize” the individuals within our Nation in the best way available to us: a home. Indeed, it is our intention to use our new Foreign Aid Policy to “Capitalize” the “Peoples” of third world nations. To achieve true Capitalization we must be free to gather together capital at the bottom, without constraint from those at the top. The safeguards supposedly imposed by the prospectus within our current system do more to relieve Brokers of their liability when Stocks fail, than they do to protect investors. If you want to understand what a free society loses when the powerful control who will be capitalized, go and find the movie “Tucker”. I have also heard as of late, a quite call from out on the perimeter that Michael Milken, the dreaded “Junk Bond” mogul, was not the bad guy. His champions suggest that he saved Mattel, MCI, and others with his bonds. It may be that when historians look back they will discover that his crime was not that he robbed investors but that he bucked the system. He Capitalized companies that would challenge those who manipulate the competition by manipulating the system. In any case, if you want to see what Capitalizing the outsider can do for the good of the country, look at your phone rate before MCI and compare it to the competitive world of today.

*George Bailey*

Within the new system We propose the safeguards shall be four. The first shall be that no investor with less than a 10% interest in a venture may invest more than 10% of their total assets in that venture: and furthermore, that investor must certify their position by signing an affidavit. This rule would apply to investments larger than an amount equal to three months wages at the national average of “X”. Secondly, anyone selling stock must be registered [at no cost] with the bureau in charge of employment registration and their fingerprint recorded accordingly. If that stock is being sold for a third party, they too [the third party] must register. Thirdly, they must have a written plan which must be adhered to unless it is altered with the consent of the majority of the Stock Holders. If those in charge do not adhere to the plan or if the plan is deemed to be a “Sham”, all those involved in that sham should be prosecuted. Those found guilty should face a mandatory ten years in prison. If they are convicted and they should withhold money [hide money from the sham until they get out], it should be considered a second crime that they may be charged with after serving their sentence. The withholding charge should not be subject to a time limitation and should carry a ten year prison sentence. Lastly, any Stock offered by American Business should reflect a percentage of ownership in that business. Public Companies and Corporations should be obliged to publicly place a value on their stock if it is traded openly. It should be on a quarterly basis. Those who assess this value will be subject to the laws of fraud and law enforcement should be obligated to see violators prosecuted. Stockholders should be able to expect a yearly dividend, a rise in the value of their stock or an explanation. If a Public Corporation collapses it shall fall to the Justice Department of these United States to do an audit to verify that a legitimate effort was made to succeed. Beyond these constraints it should be an open system. But remember, poor business skills do not amount to a sham. It should be up to a jury to decide, if in fact charges are brought. Of course, under our new system, stock holders will have the right to ask a Jury of the Day to indict if the Government drags its feet.

When Americans own their homes and Federally Regulated Banks are obliged to lend 60% of the equity of those homes to their owners, [except under the most extreme “Criteria”] there will be money at the bottom. When capital can be gathered together by those who are not currently in control, there will be competition. Competition will force those at the top to innovate or be swept away. Those who invest will be rewarded and those who do not, will not. The purpose of the new Stock system as laid out here within, is not to make a “Craps Table” of our Entrepreneurial system but rather to nurture it. If the citizens of these United States will work together as one, they will succeed. If they concentrate on the basics of home and family under the systems outlined here within, they will find themselves rewarded; Capitalized, in their later years. If they will save one half of their liquid assets in “Tier Two” banks [or in Tier One Banks as explained], and half in a diversified stock portfolio, they will insure

safe and sustainable growth for those that follow and security for themselves. A Stocks system such as this is an investment for the long term. It is a hedge against inflation which does not contribute to inflation in a negative way. The new tax system will discourage the kind of Stock manipulation indicative of the old system. A large number of diversified Stock Holders will stabilize American Enterprise as never before and put the profits in the hands of Business and small investors rather than Stock manipulators and Brokers. In today's system, money rushes in on the basis of speculation. There is no reference point at which to value stocks. As more and more money floods in, stock is increased in value, not according to a comparison to its assets or even its potential, but according to the amount of "Capital" thrown into the market. If, instead, Stock were valued by the companies who offer it; then when it became over priced, that same over abundant "Capital" would have to seek new ventures of necessity, or sit idle. In such a scenario a collapse of the stock market can only occur as a result of the collapse of the country as a whole. If that were to happen, what would it matter what the value of your portfolio was? In today's system investors gamble on how high the value will go. Long before the value drops, those who are in a position to know, have cashed in and taken the profit; leaving the unwitting to realize too late that the "Profit Taking" occurred at the time they invested and their losses will balance the scales. It is not a system of investment; it is gambling. It is not Christian in nature and therefore it is cruel and unfair. It is in need of change. The new system will not stop people from buying over valued stock with laws and regulation. But it will give them a reference which will take away their right to complain when they lose. In such a system we see that it is people's investment in the Venture We call America which is our reward and our protection for the future. It is not the scrambling to get to the front of the line which affords people Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of happiness. Instead, for the vast majority, slow and steady wins the race each and every day of their lives.

Before moving on, this is as good a place as any to include that, with the revolution, we will have full disclosure of all those who own shares of stock in any Corporation, incorporated in the US. We should also do what ever we can to get full disclosure of the stock holders of foreign corporations who want to do business in the US. A level playing field is much easier to achieve when one knows who the players on that field are. Here at home, honesty and openness are key to the world we hope to build.

I have endeavored to help all those who were good enough to read this book through, to understand how the world works. I have challenged many of the concepts you have been raised with. It is not an easy thing to contemplate as much change as I have outlined. One of the most difficult concepts is going to be the minimum wage. I would like you to stop for a moment to consider the wage disparity in this country and how it affects us all. For example, if you were to ask

*George Bailey*

the average person on the street how much money one must make in order to make twice as much as some one making minimum wage, their answer would probably be twice the minimum wage. Of course they would be correct in terms of gross wages; but in terms of elective purchasing power they would be way off. It is that amount which it costs a person, or a family, to survive which is today's minimum wage. Even the most simple niceties such as new clothes rather than used, are beyond the realm of a family on minimum wage. That means the "Discretionary" spending of that family is at or near zero. This makes it particularly distressing for such families when schools and teachers [who's wages have risen way out of proportion over the last thirty years] demand that students spend family money to buy materials for "PUBLIC" education. If you make twice as much as them, your "Discretionary" spending is many times that of those making minimum wage. At the other end of the spectrum, the Clintons lived in the Governor's mansion for twelve years prior to the Presidency. They paid no rent, or insurance; their car and food were provided by the State along with their housing and medical bills: leaving virtually all of their earnings for discretionary spending. It is then little wonder that they would champion the idea that most of the income of the middle class should flow to Government and the poor.

Now, with the revolution things will change dramatically for those at the bottom. Anyone with a job will have some discretionary spending. If they invest in a home and a family, the amount of discretionary spending they enjoy will be severely limited until the mortgage is paid off, if they work for minimum wage. This is fitting for those who contribute to society at the "Minimum" level. But beyond the "Minimum Wage", the "X" wage, it is not fitting nor is it appropriate, that Tradesmen or even Professionals make five and ten and twenty or more times the minimum wage due solely to their position in society. This is especially true when you view wages in terms of discretionary spending. If for example, it is determined that in your town the "X" wage must be \$10.00 per hour and you make \$17.00 as a factory worker then you make perhaps as much as \$8.00 an hour in discretionary spending while your fellow citizen makes \$1.00. What's more, because in order to retain your position in society you "Sanction" this kind of inequity, you help to enslave us all. How? Because in a society where such inequity exists, those who make more than the minimum wage, dare not stand up for what is right, for fear of losing their position in society. No one making a fair living in this country today, dare to fall to the level of today's minimum wage. It is pocket change to many near the top. Because higher wages and salaries for some will inevitably lead to higher costs for goods and services for all, what is gained by this disparity to those in the middle is lost to the increases in the prices they pay for goods and services which are inflated as a result of everyone else pushing their way to the head of the line for higher wages. This is the inevitable result of supply and demand. Higher taxes are used to supplement those at the

bottom and the cost of administration is tacked on. Insurance rates are raised to compensate for those who are too poor to contribute to the system, even though they work. Those at the top however, benefit at the expense of those at the bottom. When Social programs intervene to help those at the bottom, the cost is always born by those who pay the taxes, [those in the middle] resulting in a net loss for the middle class. This is the cycle that a Nation who has lost its way, is destined to follow. It is America's path. It does not honor God or his word. That portion, which is held out to entice you, will always be taken away. Let me restate this principle. If everyone gets \$10 to go shopping and everyone buys an item which costs \$10, the market will see enough of those items made to get one for everyone so long as raw materials are available, even if some have to wait on production. If, on the other hand, half the group has \$8 and the other half has \$12, the initial shortage will likely see those with \$12 get what is available. When all the factors of production are assessed, in some cases, the lowered incentive of producing that item for \$8 may be enough. Then again, sometimes it will not be. Those with \$12 will not receive more in this situation, but those who have less will receive far less. There will be fewer items produced, putting fewer people to work. We will discuss this in greater detail later on.

A minimum "X" wage will bring more safety to the work place than any legislation ever written. When a job is unsafe, workers will leave because they can afford to. It will bring other positive social changes as well. But beyond the "X" wage, where will the numbers for society at large end up? Well, the economics of Capitalism should see them rise above "X" in proportion to a jobs distance from the capabilities of a person who is 18 years of age, has a High School education and is fluent in English. So if your truck driver for example, your level of expertise should bring you more than the minimum wage, but probably not much more than 10%. But remember, 10% more means twice the discretionary spending, not of someone starving at today's minimum wage; but twice that of a homeowner who is getting by and building for the future. If you spend time away from home, you should enjoy even more compensation. If you unload the truck manually, you will expect more compensation than your counterpart who does not. The truck driver who starts out at X, while learning, should find himself at 1.1X when he or she can do the job [provided 1.1X is were Capitalism has determines a truck driver's wages should be]. They should see increases that reflect what they give in return. If they are loyal, they may even expect something for their longevity. But when they have grown too old to unload the truck, then they should have to give up that compensation. It should not be an issue of seniority, but of value and ability. As members of a protected work force [protected by an X wage], we have an obligation to understand that the strong, young man, who is compensated for his physical ability, is not entitled to that compensation when that ability fades. Even those who are loyal, should not feel affronted when that loyalty is not reciprocal if payment was received for

*George Bailey*

that loyalty, in the form of increased wages. These are market factors that Capitalism can deal with fairly. But does your ability give you the right six or seven times the discretionary buying power of the person who sews your clothes or stands behind the counter at the convenience store? Should you make \$25.00 an hour on an assembly line making automobiles while someone else makes \$5.25 an hour on an assembly line making fast food? Your Christian up bringing should tell you. Nobody on an industrial assembly line ever had a tour bus pull up looking for a car for each of its passengers.

In the end, any money you scratch up beyond what is necessary to survive is going to the government under today's rules in the form of a graduated Tax Code and more and more it is redistributed at the bottom with the "Earned Income Tax Credit". So what is it you think you need to protect? "Love thy brother as you love thy self." These were the words of Jesus with regard to the Ten Commandments. The commandments are the rules by which we must govern: a blueprint for society. But to love thy brother as you love thy self, gives us a standard by which to administer those rules. If your brother works a day's work in your society, would you deny him a day's pay? If you would do so in order to add to your portion, then We will continue on along this path until We are ground under. You will have that portion that you denied your brother, taken away from you and given over to those who oppress you. It is God's work at hand for you to see, that you might understand that he "IS".

Of course the risk and expense of being in business should entitle one to more, even to what the market will bear if the system is not corrupt. But even in this, moral precepts apply. I was once told by a manufacturer that the Three M Corporation was the pioneer of the idea that the value of a product should be based, not on the cost of production plus a reasonable percentage of profit, but on the full amount that the market will bear. For example, if a company were to create a product which reduced the time it takes to perform a task by fifty percent, then the cost of the product should not reflect production cost plus profit, but rather just under that 50% cost of the labor it replaced. I don't know that this was true about Three M.. Nor do I know if they would be offended if it were true. After all, "Whatever the market will bear", is not a new term. Still, we are all part of the same economy. When such a scenario as I have just described is the rule of thumb, then the innovation made by all the players within the economy is nullified by profit taking and greed. Because of this, productivity is stifled as compared to its potential. So in the end, the profit potential of a more active economy, is lost to the greed mentality. It is the idea that it is better to sell two of something for \$100.00 total profit than ten of something for the same total of \$100.00 profit. It misses the point that while your profit may be the same today, your future is less bright because only 20% as many people were put to work, which means less at the bottom, which means less all around. When we stray



from the Christian ethic, the repercussions are real and they are often swift. It is the nature of things. So that when individuals make exorbitant profits at the expense of the economy, only to turn around and give some of that wealth away to their own glory or sense of shame, they weaken the very country they wish to embrace. It is the George Baileys, who contribute in ways which do not engage in self promotion, who are the shield of Democracy.

For those who must maintain an office, such as lawyers; twelve or thirteen dollars an hour won't cover expenses. But still, after the expenses are taken out, should an education entitle one to twenty five times the discretionary spending of those who keep this country moving forward: especially in a society where tax payers paid for your education? It is a sad thing that the sons and daughters of professionals are required to become professionals simply to maintain the standard of living they have grown up with. It is bad for society as well. Doctors who become Doctors because their fathers or mothers were doctors tend to make poor doctors. Just as important, because of limited resources, such practices cause the exclusion of many potentially great doctors from the field. These are the forces brought to bear within a society which tolerates such disparity. We have become the victims of our own design. We are held hostage by our greed and our selfishness. But it need not be that way. If an individual is guaranteed a home mortgage, and if that mortgage is guaranteed by the People: then that individual can be "Capitalized" with their own bit of the American Pie at even an "X" wage. They can have security and take pride in themselves and their community. And if We can be safeguarded in the ways laid out here within this book, We can all move forward together rather than backward in a society which pits us against each other to the detriment of all. If we look at the housing of the past, we can see the increases in our standard of living reflected in those houses. As the wealth of a nation grows, it is reflected in its housing. This increases X at a sustainable rate. Thereby, all individuals see their wealth increase as a function of X. For example: the truck driver making 1.1X, makes more as X increases.

Today, if a person goes to a Dentistry professional for a procedure known as a "Root Canal", that person will be charged between \$600.00 and \$800.00 for a procedure that takes about an hour. It can be argued that the cost of education, coupled with the cost of buying into a practice for as much as \$250,000, justifies such extreme rates of return. As you know by now, I am not a dentist, nor a professional: but I am a business man. So let us examine the economics of this profession as it relates to business. I know a man in California who owns and operates a construction truck. During the period in which a Dental Professional [of the same age] was in school, this young man was saving money. Both of these young men had to live frugally. But all the while that the young Doctor was in school, living off of money he borrowed from society at a low interest rate and with deferred payments; our young truck driver was paying taxes into the

*George Bailey*

government which supported the Doctor with loans. Both of them worked hard and after seven years they were both in a position to move forward in their lives. The young truck driver would invest his savings and the knowledge he had accumulated in the school of “Hard Knocks”, in a truck and trucking business. He would put down \$3,000.00 on a truck and borrow another \$17,000.00 against it. He would operate his business on the \$10,000.00 he had saved from wages. The young doctor would go out into the world and buy his way into an established Dental practice. The cost to the Doctor, as I said, would be around \$250.000. Over the next couple of years, both of our young men would work hard and move forward. Our Doctor of Dentistry [an Endodontist], would begin to pay down his debt, But it would be a slow process with interest rates being what they were for so many years. He would apply what he had learned in school; a school funded, in part, with taxpayer dollars.

By this same time, the young truck driver had finally accumulated enough credit history to purchase a “Brand New” truck. His investment would be right around \$120,000.00. His new truck would make him gross earnings of \$62.00 an hour and he would make a pretty good living. The dentist would use an investment that was two, or even three, times as large and make thirteen times as much per hour. These are West Coast prices of course. Back in the Mid West, the Endodontist would only charge \$600.00. However, while the cost of the truck would run nearly the same, it would only generate \$35.00 per hour and the season would be much shorter.

There are those who will say that the expenses of an Endodontist justify \$800.00 an hour. But I find that hard to believe. There are those who say that an Endodontist, who performs a Root Canal, holds your life in his hands. But it is the truck driver, not the Dentist, who is obliged to take random drug tests to insure the safety of hundreds, if not thousands, who travel along side his truck at risk of his performance. There are those who say that not everyone can be trained to be a Dental Surgeon. I’m not here to dispute that. I am here, however, to challenge the elitists. I am here to say that every person who contributes has a right to the bounties of this nation; and those bounties include the knowledge imparted to our professionals through our systems of higher learning. No Dentist, nor Doctor, nor mathematician, learned what they know in a vacuum. That knowledge was handed down within educational systems supported by the citizens of this country. Those who suffered the mistakes made in the acquisition of that knowledge, paved the way in medicine. It is unfitting that professionals view themselves as autonomous, when so many of those they regard as beneath them, contributed to their rising fortune. I am also here to tell you that it is the small business which creates the jobs which creates the wealth, which circulates through our society to allow professionals to exist. It is not correct nor prudent,

that credentials out strip achievement any more than money should lord over intellect.

When we look to the rising cost of health care We are always told by the press, that part of the problem is that, because fewer people now have health care insurance, the cost of those people must be born by the system. That, they say, is a major factor in driving up the price. But you have come to know Capitalism for what it is and you should be able to see that when the market can not bear the cost of a service or a product, the price of that service or product must fall. Instead, as fewer and fewer can afford coverage, the price has continued to rise. We would expect health care professionals to be losing ground to inflation in the same way that the general population has, but that is not the case.

If you were in the class of “47” and you bought a business as a young man, you would have seen that business grow with the economy; provided you were a good business man. You would have paid off the debt you took on to buy the business and over time you would have accumulated wealth. For many of those of the Baby Boom generation, who used the same approach to life, the outcome would be different. A self employment tax of 15%, interest rates in the double digits and taxes at 33% would find many of those who bought a business, or even bought into the idea of a business, working for little more than wages when all was said and done. Sons who took over the reins of their father’s store or business or farm, would realize too late what the farmers of Europe had learned in the middle ages. These same market forces would be brought to bear on the dentist who bought into a dental practice for \$250,000.00. But the dentist and the doctors of our time would still see their fortunes rise in ways reminiscent of the class of “47”.

Within the circles of the surgeon and the others at the top of the health care system, the rationalizations are shared by those in the lines in which they stand, just like any other line. It is elitism that has held the compensation of the health care field high. The leverage power of Medicare and Medicaid, civil servant and union health care, has been held hostage; to create a shortage for the masses, which includes many of the who would have traditionally found themselves well within the middle class. It is the closed system described in the old verb to “Jew”. Because what ever price doctors need, in order to live in the manner which their peers have told them they should expect, can be extorted from the population at large by using the political clout of the elderly and the government and pseudo-government worker and the others I have labored to identify for you; health care Professionals are free to do business with those in the private sector or not to do business with them. Increasingly, they have chosen not to, by raising rates out of the reach of more and more of the working class. It is the ideology which I heard attributed to Three M. It accommodates fewer at a higher price. Perhaps there are not enough hours in the day to make the money expected, if professionals work

*George Bailey*

at payment levels which are affordable to those who once would have been considered the middle class. Perhaps the average of \$10 is not enough, so that after those who can bring \$12 have been accommodated, those with \$8 can not be. If that is so, then that is precisely the point. As elitists you have managed to find a seat on board the life boat leaving a sinking ship.

There were and are currently, good doctors giving up the profession because they are not happy trying to be business men. Like the Lawyer/Client privilege, it is a centrifuge which eliminates some of the best from the field. But at the core of the problem lies a competition for services in which Capitalism is thwarted and privilege, entitlement and elitism prevail. The pinnacle of financial success within a capitalistic economy does not belong to professionals. It belongs to entrepreneurs. If we had a press corps that understood that, then they would be able to see the truth and ask the questions that would expose elitism. They would be able to see that it is too many with privilege that is driving up health care rates rather than too many without means. But when we examine our press, we discover that they too are of the elite class. When the best known news casters command seven to ten million dollars a year in salary, they have no perspective from which to analyze. I heard one of them suggest that it is the public's unwillingness to lavish wealth upon Congress which is at the heart of why we lack leaders of character and foresight. But elitism does not serve in Congress or the Press. When the members of these two categories are rewarded at the levels they are currently, it is not because Politics or Journalism creates that kind of compensation in a Capitalistic system of economics; it is because Entertainment does, and that's what they are: Entertainers. That is why they are spoon fed what to say. That is why they say it so gratefully. It is the line they stand in. It is their line of compensation and they defend their rationalities just like everyone else. I have eluded to one or more "Front Line" documentaries in this work. If you watch them you may notice that the reporters are not the focal point of the story. In fact, you will never see the face of the reporter, nor will they introduce themselves. You will see the story. That is the difference between reporting and entertainment.

We do not make doctors show their "Batting Average", so to speak. We do not say that no doctor may operate unless they have been doing it for a long time, because it would be unworkable. All doctors have to learn and they have to do it the hard way. When they do less than the perfect job we have to accept and forgive them, so long as they did their best. But, in being at the losing end of the proposition, the population, as a whole, holds as a debt: something of value to balance against the accumulated skill and knowledge of doctors and health care professionals. It is not reasonable for doctors to view themselves as having made something of themselves, when so many gave so much in the effort. Too often doctors view those in their care as having no where else to go. Often times that is

true. But just as often, people give up what little time they do have left, for a change at more time. Sometimes they get it. Sometimes they lose what they had and only the doctor gains from the experience. The counter balance to elitism is humility. As reflected in today's health care experience, there is no humility in medicine today. But I hope to see a return of both humility and morality to the profession. Still, it will be difficult to teach such ethics when the teachers themselves are elitists. You understand the dynamics of Capitalism by now. So, let me ask you, what increased costs have America's institutions of higher learning incurred over the last thirty years? Have they had to pay the cost of purchasing inflated land? No, they have probably not even had to pay for existing land, as most of them have owned the land for decades. Have they had to pay more for books? No, the students buy their own books. Have they had to pay more for payroll? Oh yes. Those who "profess" to hold the knowledge of the world, have found a seat in the lifeboat along side their contemporaries. And, as is often the case, because it would be a challenge to their rationalizations to have those who work along side them living sub-standard lives in the face of their success, employees from Administrators to janitors have found seats as well. In the same way that those in Health Care have been able to thwart the Capitalistic principles of supply and demand through selective practices, Higher Education has used Scholarship and low interest, government guaranteed loans to skew the system. Ironically, students have been going into debt to receive an education which is often little more than propaganda. From the politically correct ideologies of the left to the blind gropings of economics and money management, they have been taught the company line. They have not been taught ethics, nor even helped to understand the declining position of small business in America. They have not been taught to think for themselves or even to learn for themselves. They have not been given the HIGHER EDUCATION that Jefferson intended when he helped to open the first College in the history of modern man that was not devoted to Biblical study. They have instead, paid a great deal of money to either learn how to make more money for others or how to become part of the Elitist Class.

I have an old and dear friend who makes his living as a fireman for a municipality in the mid west. They are union fire fighters and his union is of the opinion that the city is trying to get rid of them and their union in order to have private contractors bid to provide the services the union fire fighters now provide. He feels that the city makes a habit of disregarding contract provisions in order to force the union to hire lawyers, thereby bankrupting the "Rank and File" of that same union. In the past, the state and federal government has allowed the city to throw out existing contracts that they had signed with the union, even though they were binding and signed in good faith by both sides. It is a situation which seems unfair to the fire fighters; especially when you consider that they are barred [as emergency personnel] from going on strike.

*George Bailey*

On the other side of the issue stands the city. They are forced to pay wages and benefits to a group of people who were allowed bargaining power but who are not able to see the world around them from any perspective other than their own. As I have explained, as evidenced by the falling prices at Wal\*Mart, many in our society have been watching their earnings decline over the last couple decades or so. From the perspective of the fire fighters: they see their wages as in keeping with union construction workers. For example: area framing carpenters make \$17.00 an hour. Area finish carpenters make \$21.00 an hour. Furthermore, they see their medical benefits as in keeping with the 75% of the local population which has health care benefits. Lastly, they see their retirement benefits as in keeping with either union construction workers or local government. But this is a kind of mix and match, selective assessment. To begin with, let's look at union carpenters. At the fire fighting wage of \$15.00 an hour, it would appear at first glance that even the framing carpenter has an advantage over fire fighters. But in the real world, while a fire fighter will work his assigned shift day after day, week after week, year after year; the carpenter will sit home part of the winter. He will miss work as one job ends and another fails to come on line when scheduled. He will suffer economic trends that will give him good years and bad years or even bad decades. What's more, the fire fighters have compared themselves with union carpenters and not carpenters at large. And because unions only make up between 5% to 10% of the work force nation wide, it is an over estimation of private sector wages.

At the same time, if we say that 10% of that area's general population is union, then, as I have explained, that 10% enjoys its health care at the expense of the private sector through political clout. If 10% of that population is sixty five or older, then that portion of the population also enjoys its health benefits at the expense of taxpayers, [ that group of taxpayers which does not include anyone exempt from Social Security contributions or self employment taxes]. If 5% is on welfare, and if 10% works for the government in some capacity, then they too, enjoys health care at the expense of taxpayers; which includes fire fighters and government workers at all levels. But if 75% of the population has health care in this area and 45% of the total population within that area can be identified as in the above mentioned groups [which all have health care]; then only the remaining 30% of health care is left to be distributed among the 55% of the work force at large. That means that the non-union carpenter, who does not make the union wages, nor receive the union benefits, will be among the 55% of the work force who compete for the 30% of the health care left over. Among that 55% of the population will be those at the upper end of the scale financially and they will have health care coverage. White collar workers will also be among the population and they will have much higher percentages of health care coverage. So that in the end, the chances that the non-union carpenter will have health care insurance are not that good. Today, that group finds itself with about a 50\50

chance of being insured and that percentage is dropping: not for those in government, or those who government supports, but for the working class and their children. And while these fire fighters will pay three thousand a year “out of pocket” as matching contributions, they will mark insurance down as a given, when assessing what it is the city brings to the table. Furthermore, as I have tried to explain, they will become part of the group who drives up health care prices because they can afford to compete for health care, against the non-union carpenter: the same non-union carpenter who will bear an equal share of the municipal burden that includes firefighter’s wages.

Many of the same principals can be used to assess the fireman’s retirement fund as it compares to the union or non-union carpenter. On the side of the fire fighter, one can argue that his work schedule is erratic. But he will report to the same place year after year, while the carpenter will never know how far he will travel to the next job that comes along. You may argue that the fire man puts his life at risk; but carpenters get killed too, and when they do there are no parades in their honor. You may argue that a fireman will lose a part of himself to the heart break and trauma of emergency work and I can only respond that, that is why we hold firemen in such high esteem. But it is not cause for elitism. In the same way that cops let cops go for drinking and driving, they often let firemen skip. In the face of the extreme measures now perpetrated upon the general public for such an offense, it is self serving rationalization. It is elitist. It is divisionist. It is treasonous. It is bureaucratic tyranny. And at its core, it is a lot more about letting others go so that they will reciprocate in kind when the situation is reversed. It is the notion that they are not appreciated enough or compensated enough, so that they may barter power.

I have not elaborated on the circumstance of my good friend in order to defame firemen. It is however, necessary to our cause that we all understand the forces which prevail today, that we might throw them off. Because the firemen view the world from the perspective I have just outlined, their demands will be unrealistic. Because our systems are adversarial in nature, were the municipality to prevail, they would almost certainly be heavy handed. Were the city allowed to set fitness requirements they would use them to punish and harass. Because fitness requirements are not allowed, there are those within the force who are beyond “out of shape” and still protected by the union. With an “X” wage in place, we could move toward a situation of equilibrium. Over time, as compensation becomes based on wages and wages alone, rather than including health care and retirement, parameters could be found. For example: let us say that at the end of the day, a national average of fire fighter wages is assessed at 1.19 times “X”. It would not be a result of arbitration. It would not be won by unions or city attorneys. It would be a function of what it took to keep the average fire fighter from walking off the job in the average city. In cities where

*George Bailey*

equipment is second rate, cities must pay more to keep good help. In cities where all the good fire fighters walked out, not as a union, but as individuals who quit; service quality would drop and city officials would be replaced. In cities that showed support though good equipment, fair wages and community respect; wages would be lower. This is the promise of the free market system when it is allowed to function in the face of a fair minimum wage. Individuals will suffer. People will be unfair. But the system will not be unfair. That is the difference and it is a difference worth standing up for. It is a system based on positive and negative reinforcement, and as I have explained, that is how God designed us to work and learn from our mistakes. In a Capitalistic system, labor, like any other commodity, will be assessed a value relative to its demand. It should, therefore, be obvious, that in the presence of a fair minimum or base wage, that fire fighters will receive compensation in excess of those who shuffle papers at the city clerk's office. But if the stature and prestige offered by the job of fire fighter are of great enough value to those who aspire to become firemen, the increase in compensation may not be that great. In fact, it may be the janitorial staff who cleans the public rest rooms, who is the most highly compensated. And of the dentist and the truck owner? They are both of similar fabric. Therefore, if there is no collusion between doctors in any field, a fair assessment of value will be derived from the market place. But it is imperative that we never lose sight of the fact that all of the afore mentioned occupations draw their compensation from the pool which is the American economy. That pool is filled, not by bureaucrats, or doctors, or even carpenters. It is filled by risk and innovation. We have watched as an entire generation has had the fruits of its labors taken away by high interest and high taxes and elitist manipulation. Those of my generation, who have been able to amass equity, without it being handed down to them, are more likely to be from the bureaucratic end of the spectrum than from the private end of the spectrum. This is the formula of the failed economy of the USSR. It is an economy which uses socialistic principles to separate profit from those who develop it and redistribute it along political lines. It can only endure until the wealth of a nation is depleted.

As a post script: in 1994, the median money income for all house holds in America was \$32,264.00. At \$15.00 per hour, my friend made \$31,200.00 from his single income, while most American households have two full time workers. At the same time, he had a retirement package and matching health care funds.

So many of the things I have tried to address in this book, I have dealt with by reversing them, with a mirror image. By taking profit out of the hands of those who usurp it and returning it to those who produce it, we increase the volume of the pool from which we all derive our compensation. We can move forward together toward prosperity for all or we can grovel over the spoils. It is your choice. But the children of the next generation will chase the carrot which was



the model for success in the generation that proceeded them. That means that if we fail to reward those who make the system work, then all the bright minds will gravitate to positions that pay well by virtue of their political status. In the absence of those who are able, being busy at the task of creating wealth, there will be no wealth created. This is the scenario of Russia, China, Cuba, North Korea and today's United States of America. When the truck owner and the Dentist faced off in our system of Economics, they both gambled capital. Capital saved and capital invested in education. But the Dentist brought his ability, his level of expertise, to the forum; and while an argument could be made that the problems of the truck owner called for expertise as well, it must be acknowledged that, today anyway, the Dentist must function as a business man as well. Given these factors alone, it would be the Dentist who was entitled to a higher compensation. But it is the element of risk which is the equalizing factor. Today, there are far too many Americans who can not afford dental care. In a Capitalistic economy scarcity disappears over time as production increases to meet demand. This risk factor, which exists for the truck owner's ability to find work, has never come into play for Dentists or Doctors, who are allowed to "Practice" their skills and at the same time, be assured of work in a medical system which insures a shortage of Practitioners. Professionals in both fields will tell you that setting up a practice takes time and that they can in deed find themselves without work. But that is because they do not lower their rates to raise demand. The proof of what I say can be seen in the fact that people go without dental and medical attention. We need a socialistic approach to the cost of the hardware of medicine, but we need a Capitalistic approach to the value of Doctors and Dentists in our society. It is this element of risk that is excluded from their equation of compensation that devalues what they should expect to receive. I am not saying that they do not deserve to live at the upper most end of the middle class. But it neither fair nor moral for them to maintain their position by using politics to prop up their compensation and by creating a false shortage with the use of the elderly, the indigent and those employed by government and psuedo-government. In addition, the idea that a Dentist should have to "Buy" into a practice is unreasonable within the system we live today. As I have tried so vary hard to explain, monetary compensation has been paid in excess of what was the reality for those who have been left to bear the brunt of our economic decline. Interest rates have been held so high by artificial means, that every business endeavor which was sold after the Carter administration saw all it's profits go to interest. When the value of a business is devalued by high interest rates, which take all the profit out of buying an existing endeavor, that business becomes worthless. So that retiring Doctors and Dentists who "sold" their practices, took advantage of both high interest and their overvalued income and indentured their patrons with the debt they perpetrated on the next generation of Doctors and Dentists. In the private sector these forces would manifest

*George Bailey*

themselves in a life's expectations lost to high interest and high taxes. But in the fields of Medicine, Professionals would grab a seat on the life boat. If the \$250,000.00 "buy in" price represented the cost of Material assets, then that cost was justified. But if large portions of that amount represents the commitment of the patients themselves, then the debt laid upon the next generation of Doctors and Dentists must ultimately be passed on, along with the interest on that debt, to those who pay the costs of medicine.

I have also mandated that government employees be limited to twelve years of service. It is easy to see how a government could replace the people in the clerical positions within government; but at the professional levels it is much harder to imagine. Still, the key to change lies in the term "Public Servant". It is a mockery that those who lord over our society should dare to present themselves as servants to the people. It is this notion of service that is, in fact, what we have lost. On the average "Big City" fire department there are going to be any number of older members of the department who must either be retired or kept on after they have grown too old to be effective. Within the police department there are going to be those who move up to higher positions of Sergeant or Lieutenant or Captain, but the rest will either be retired or stay past their peak of effectiveness. In addition, because they know that they will be there at those jobs for the rest of their working years, they are always in the process of feathering the nest for the next guy.

There is no doubt that those who risk their lives to fight fires and criminals are deserving of our gratitude and admiration. They should be entitled to our respect. But what has developed is a situation in which respect is being lost and these individuals feel themselves to be under rewarded monetarily. As with so many public employees, the intangibles of medical benefits, retirement, sick days, vacation days, job security, lack of performance requirements, insider benefits and more; which are not part of the compensation received by those in the private sector: are not understood to be compensation by "Public Servants". They look at wages and expect equity, dollar for dollar. Sure police die in the line of duty. Yes firemen die in the line of duty. So do fishermen, construction workers, factory workers, lumber jacks, truck drivers, and people of a thousand other occupations as well as "Volunteer" firemen. And when they do, their peers do not receive time off with pay to attend their funeral. Nor do cities close down streets to honor them in funeral processions. Now some of you will say that I speak out of turn; that I suggest we deny "Public Servants" who die in the line of duty their due. But you are wrong. I think the funeral procession is appropriate. I think that we must honor the "Public Servant". But that is compensation in the form of respect. What I have been advocating is that we come back to the understanding that there can be no monetary compensation for the work done by

those who serve the public, nor should there be. That is the point. When “Public Service” becomes a career, it is by definition, no longer “Public Service”.

So how would it ever work in the real world if police could only be police for twelve years and firemen could only be firemen for twelve years? First of all, remember that the society which we have built under the new systems is one in which all its members are union members. Those who go into “Public Service” to serve their community in their physical prime, emerge while still in their physical prime. They still have their union affiliation [American Citizenship] which assures them the “X” wage as a very minimum. They still have friends in the police department. They are still mentors to the guys on the fire department. The only difference is that their “Service” does not then become a liability on the rest of the population. They have no incentive to push for unfair compensation which they will pay rather than receive, when they move back into the private sector. A policeman whose years of service have come to an end will still probably carry a weapon for some time, just as any other retiring officer would do. He will surely have the support of officers still on the force if those criminals he has faced, should try and get even, in just the same way as any other retiring officer. But police will no longer view the world as their piece of turf. Illegal activities will be short lived within a twelve year window. Bribes will have to be revisited on those who are coming in and on those who are going out, in order to keep things hushed and that will make the whole practice more difficult. Most importantly, just as it will work at all levels of government, those who are in the system, will see it as their time to improve the system; so that it will serve them when they once again return to the private sector. They will, in fact, be motivated to make the job description one of “Public Service”. For those who find themselves on the job for twelve years or more when the revolution takes place there must be a phasing in period in which up to an additional five years could be served. It may even come to pass that policemen who are particularly talented in the area of crime solving will contract with departments or research crimes like bounty hunters from the private sector. But those individuals will not have the power over citizens that police do and because of that, the torch has been passed on. It must also be remembered that in the course of twelve years, one’s mortgage only has about six years remaining. You will have equity and lowered financial obligations and you will still have opportunity.

This approach can not work in the military for obvious reasons. No mentor is going to travel to a foreign theater and risk his neck to see his old buddies. In addition, we have barred those in the military from entering the private sector defense industry under Ross Perot’s guidelines. At the same time, no one ever really confused the military with what has become synonymous with Public Service, mostly because those in the military are motivated to perform by the nature of their work. The military will also have to be exempt from wage,

*George Bailey*

housing and transportation requirements. Officers and career soldiers may even have to be paid retirement. We can not hold the military to the same rules as the private sector or government at large, as long as we can have them shot for quitting their job before they are released from service.

Two other areas of exception are going to include teachers and Federal health care staffers: as nurses and other health care staff come under federal employment. In these two cases, the checks and balances needed to assure performance and to scrutinize wage adjustments are in place within the system. Teachers without the ability to unionize and who must face national testing standards will be accountable to the parents of the students at lower level institutions. In higher education, those who do not teach will find no audience. As for health care staffers; both patients and doctors will have avenues of recourse. But, because all wages, at all levels, are now considered to be compensation in full, neither of these two professions needs a retirement plan. This is not a perfect system that I have outlined. It will only be as good as the people in it. But unlike the system it replaces, the people who are in it will now be in a constant state of change. It will be in their best interest to make it a system that is better for those it serves.

The story of the American farmer is the story of Long Shanks and the Noblemen, with a twist. Back in the 1970's, when the roller coaster that was called inflation took off, farming was at a crossroads that wasn't apparent at the time. There was more than one force at work in the mix and they added together to obscure each other. The first one was automation and increased productivity. As we discussed in relation to foresting and fishing, the size and cost of the new forms of mechanization had outstripped many farmers' ability to provide enough land to put the equipment to work to its full potential. Just as there are only so many trees and so many fish, each farmer only had so many acres to farm. As the newer equipment became more powerful it became more expensive. Farmers competing for more land to farm to appreciate the full potential of their equipment in the brief span, which is a growers seasonal window of opportunity; began to edge up land prices. The industrial revolution had passed American farming by in the first half of the century. Tractors didn't really come of age until the late thirties. Even then, they were primitive as compared to what was to come. By the seventies, machinery had outstripped the family farm.

Coinciding with this was the rising cost of energy as a result of the Arab oil embargo. The rising cost of energy was causing its own inflation and as I have explained, the way that the Federal Reserve dealt with that inflation was to artificially inflate interest rates. Farmers, like the rest of the population, are of different ages and different circumstance. But because of the high cost of land and equipment, they were largely of two groups: Farm Owners or sons of Farm Owners. The high cost of land prevented anyone who didn't already own a farm

from becoming a farmer; and with good reason. There was no money in it. An investor had a lot of ways to make money with money back then and farming wasn't one of them.

Within the group, "Sons of farm owners" there were two groups as well. Sons who inherited their father's farm and son's who owed their fathers for the farm. Within these groups there were those who owned the farms free and clear and maybe even had some working capital: and there were those who owed money. Because of the high cost of equipment and the high cost of the money [interest] to buy the equipment and the high cost of the investment in the land; once you added in the fuel, the seed corn or beans, the insecticide, herbicide and fertilizer: there was no profit. It had become like using helicopters to deforest mountains and starve the timber industry. Just as the timber profit had gone to the helicopter manufacturer, in the farmland, the profit went to those who produced all the ingredients of modern farming. All that was left to be contributed by the farmer was labor and that labor was reduced to operating the machinery for those intense but all too brief periods of planting and harvesting. If you owed your farm and had your operating capital in the bank, you made money, in affect, by lending yourself your money at the rate the bank charged other farmers. It looked like farm profit, but in fact it was a business expense that your competitors paid, and that you didn't have to. The more land you owned, the better chance you had of using your equipment closer to its full potential. Those who had less land were forced to share crop if they were lucky. But over time the practice of share cropping was abandoned for land rental. Under the old Southern Share Cropping, the landlord supplied the seed and the sharecropper supplied the labor and then the landlord kept all the profit. That had been replaced in farm country with a fair percentage of the profit being distributed to both landlord and entrepreneur [farmer]. But when rental was introduced, the tenant would become responsible for labor, seed, equipment, and everything else, while the landlord would risk nothing for a set rate of return. It was a moral shift that was subliminal in the climate of greed that persisted right on through the end of the century. The land was owned by those with wealth and if those who did not own enough land wanted to play the game of Capitalism they would have to give the nobles their share of the purse regardless of profit or loss. Here again, the farmer who owed his land could show a profit by not having to pay rental, or payments at high interest on a mortgage for the land they did own. It would feel like farm profit, but it would be money made off money; off pre-existing wealth. Farmers who didn't have to borrow money could leave their grain stored in bins and elevators until market prices were favorable. Those who borrowed money would be under high interest and high pressure from banks to liquidate at harvest time; so that at harvest, prices would fall from the glut but because the bank loans were designed that way and "Take It or Leave It"; those who borrowed would be forced to sell, leaving those who could hold on, able to capitalize later in the year. It would

*George Bailey*

appear to be “savvy” judgment on the part of those who held on, but again, it was money making money on commodity prices.

In a Capitalistic system, these forces could not have long prevailed. Smaller farmers, who did not innovate would have been driven out of business. If they sat on their land rather than planting and playing the game, it would have been taxed away from them over time. If they continued to play they would have lost money and lost the farm. But there were a couple of wild cards at play.

One was inflation itself. Because inflation was so rampant, the value of the family farm was going up at about the same rate as the family farm business was losing money. It became the standard for farmers who were not of the established end of the Nobel class to go into the bank each year and use their lesser nobility to get a loan against the increased value of their land, even as they showed a loss on the company books for the year. Even though, without a positive cash flow, no other business in the country would ever have been able to leverage money, farmers would. It was in the nature of the Nobel class of which they found themselves. It became the norm to see farmers buying new equipment, which often included a new pickup truck, on money lent to a failing business. Of course, because they could still afford to rent land at those exorbitant rates as a result of this infusion of money each year, land prices continued to escalate. Because they still purchased equipment, equipment prices continued to climb. Out in the world, outside the farm community, these failed business men and women were competing in the market place for that new pickup against city folk as well as farmers; and that drove up prices in the inflationary spiral of the time. It made money scarce throughout the mid west, for enterprises outside the farming industry, and it kept a lot of potentially good young and innovative farmers from ever getting a chance to try their hand at farming because everything was so over priced.

This was bad, non-productive, inflation. This was Feudal Capitalism as I have tried to explain it. When Jimmy Carter asked Paul Volcker if there wasn't something to be done about inflation other than bankrupt the nation, Volcker could have said to the banks, that those farmers who could not show a profit could not borrow the money. This is simple Capitalism. But when government holds money back from productive endeavors with high interest rates and allocates it to non-productive endeavors for political reasons, what you have is the socialistic economy that we have always called Communism. When the whole thing collapsed, tax payers picked up the tab. Some families did lose their farms. Some were saved and still others made it because of their profits from their existing wealth and because they qualified for the farm subsidies right along with every body else, rich or poor. After going half way around the world to stop the Domino Effect from bringing Communism to our front door and losing so much of ourselves in the process, we opened the back door wide to let it in for

the sake of the family farm. In our nostalgia for an agrarian life that had been eclipsed by modernization, we had failed to understand that progress has a price and that price has a human face.

We have outlawed taxes against property so that the family farm will not go to the tax man. We have given those who still hold small farms or those who wish to buy them, the opportunity to market your harvest through the Blue food program; if you are able to innovate and adapt to a changing economic environment. We have even established an “X” wage which promises that you can make a living outside the farm and keep the property if you like. But just as the twenty-mule team was replaced because it could not compete with the internal combustion engine, and the Cowboy was pushed off the range by the Rail Road and the farmer, the day of the small farmer must evolve or die. Like the Danes who were forced into their fathers profession to save those at the top from the struggles of life, the sons and daughters of the American farmer have convinced us that they are “entitled” to grow the nation’s food so that they can preserve their way of life at the expense of the general population. But it is not a birthright. They were given an opportunity and a head start over most of us. Some will prevail. But some will fail. When they do, the system we have designed will give them a future, but it will not preserve their right of nobility.

The state of farming in America is in flux. The ramifications of the new technologies will be as disruptive as industrialization was. I speak of genetics. As production increased due to the introduction of technology through the 1950’s and 60’s and 70’s; it had become the dream of the farm community that prices for their harvests would remain constant while the farmers enjoyed bigger and bigger yields. This would, of course, translate into more profits and more leisure time. It was a pipe dream that the Government contributed to, by promising to control supply here at home, by promoting new markets over seas. Unfortunately, no country wants to be dependent upon another for its food, so just as farmers were propped up here at home, foreign countries propped up their own farming community: and all presumably with the same sort of nostalgic rhetoric. Had farmers been listening when the Capitalism they so fervently defended was explained in school, they would have know that, the promise of Capitalism is not to make those who travel in a pack wealthy. When everyone uses the same tactics to increase productivity, that increase is passed on to consumers in the form of lowered prices. That’s why “Free Enterprise” is so good for those who play the game. It is Communism that rewards those who follows along and are guaranteed a job by the government no matter how poorly they contribute. In the old days, the world renowned soil of Iowa, coupled with its humid climate and substantial rain fall amounts, would make it some of the most sought after farmland around. By the 1990’s, with modern agricultural methods, Iowa farmers could expect to get corn yields of up to 160 bushels an acre. Out west in Nebraska and other

*George Bailey*

more aired places, which had much poorer soil, the use of irrigation systems was changing the game. The lower cost of land, balanced against the increased cost of production as a result of installing, operating and maintaining irrigation equipment; was making Nebraska farming more and more equitable. New farming methods were producing up to 200 bushels per acre and offsetting some of the increased operating costs. In addition, the increased availability of land as a result of lower prices in these less fertile and more aired climates, was allowing for better use of the increased potential of automation. Tractors operated by one individual could now plant twenty four rows of corn or soy beans in one pass. But the new wild card, GENETICS, is about to turn things over on their ear all over again.

Today, there is seed corn available that can produce that same 160 bushels per acre [that Iowa farmers produce], in the poor ground of Nebraska, without irrigation. What this means is a devaluation of traditional farmland over time. It means that as more and more ground is given to the plow in the west, in places like Idaho, there is no reason to allow our national rivers to be bled dry to subsidize irrigation as a way of farming; any more than we need to allow commodity prices to be manipulated to protect the value of traditional farm lands.

These changes will not happen over night. To understand the dynamics of power within the new equation, we must first understand the nature of seed corn and soybean seed themselves. You have probably all seen “Field” corn on the cob before. What you may not know is that if you were to plant that corn seed, you would not get a ear of corn that yielded nearly as much as the parent. Conversely, the yield on an ear of “seed” corn is very poor. Seed corn being the corn which is then planted to get the high yield ear of field corn. This corn grown for the purpose of obtaining seed has become a “High Tech” endeavor. Those who are in the business of growing seed corn and then selling the seeds to farmers, have some constraints of their own. For one thing, obsolescence. You probably didn’t know it, but that corn seed producers change the genetics of those plants every three years. By changing the characteristics of the genetic makeup of our corn frequently, it is much less likely that a blight of any kind can develop that will devastate our crops on a national scale. It is a fail safe mechanism against our own Irish Potato Famine. But it is not without cost. It fact, the cost of seed is now, more than ever, a factor at the core of the future of farming. As new break throughs in genetics make it possible for such things as corn to be grown in poor soil and dry climates, the tendency of seed producers to raise prices will negate some of the potential of the new technology. This serves both farmer who own traditional ground and farmers who employ irrigation, by propping up prices artificially. By gleaning increased profits for innovation in the vacuum of non-competition, seed growers who blaze the trail will enjoy a wind



fall in the short run. But these are the spoils of innovation. This is the natural transition under Capitalism. The danger that exists is that seed producers will not compete once they all share similar technologies. The danger is that they will fix prices and thwart competition. The possibility also exists that seed producers may also become corn and soy bean growers, which would see the emergence of monolithic growers who could control production and prices.

In order for the system to have safeguards which protect consumers, farmers and seed producers, we must limit the amount of land which any one organization may own. The participation of individuals within these organizations should then be limited in the same way as ownership of utilities is regulated. Down at the family farm level, people will have to come to terms with the fact that they didn't necessarily inherit enough land to qualify them to make a living off of it as a farmer, by competing head to head with the big boys. Perhaps family farms will become parts of loose fitting cooperatives that farm several farms with hired help and share in the risk and the profit, while the owners of these farms make their living at a regular job up town and consider the farm an annuity passed on from their parents. But it will have to produce a lot for a little, because the evolution of farming has brought us to a time when we can produce far more than we could ever use within our borders and in a Capitalistic system, that means that consumers get it cheap. It is no fairer to ask taxpayers to prop up farmers than it is to ask them to keep construction workers busy when there is no need for their work. Even the idea of land conservation through Government rental of farm land is unfair in Capitalism. Farmers would never expect to have to pay a lumber jack to sit home for the sake of our forests, or to bear the cost of building our auto makers new environmentally safe foundries in order to save the air. These are the costs and the sacrifices called for in business. This is especially true when you look past the rhetoric long enough to realize that field corn and soy beans have little to do with feeding the world. Field corn is mostly used for animal feed, and soy beans are used from everything from ink to plastics. It is the "truck farms" that produce the vegetables that feed the country. But this is not all together bad. In a future where plastics come from soy beans rather than oil, we have a renewable resource which has proven its value in our economy so long as we can dispose of it cheaply after it has outlived its usefulness. Corn can, theoretically, find a market as fuel, but it must not be a subsidized market.

If land needs to be set aside for the purpose of Soil conservation, then a rotating percentage of one's land needs to be mandated. It then becomes a question of what lands must be left to rest in this manner and which lands can implement other techniques. In order to assess and oversee a fair and reasonable course of action, Government will ultimately be given the power to govern over the situation. It then becomes painfully apparent of how important MORAL ACCOUNTABILITY becomes in a Republic such as ours. I have endeavored to

*George Bailey*

explain to you that, without a moral base, Government can not govern a Republic: and that, for a Republic to try and govern itself through a Democratic process in which individual issues are decided by an uninformed and manipulated populous: is folly. This book is a collection of systems. Systems that endeavor to work as the pathways in which those things necessary to the function of a Nation such as ours, can be accomplished. But without a moral leadership, none of these systems can achieve their objective for long. They will be manipulated toward an end that is self serving for those who steer its course. In our country, it is the President who sets the tone and as it stands today, Americans don't seem to care if our tone is moral or not.

To understand the dynamics of the country's economy we must turn to the analogy of the river. The dynamics which control the body as a whole are subject to innumerable forces as it winds its way along. The eddies which develop in the backwaters of the Great Plains are linked to the whirlpools that develop in the rapids of the Coastal West. Any forces that are exerted in any part of the river will manifest themselves in unforeseeable ways and in unexpected places, both up stream and down. Most of us are well aware that the cost of housing in the mid-west will be far less than in California. Most of us would attribute that difference to the amount of people wishing to live there. But it was not just the horrible weather of the mid-west that caused the exodus of a generation from America's heartland. It was a lack of opportunity. And that lack of opportunity was political in nature.

I would not presume to be able to give you all the reasons for this state of affairs, but I will give you some examples. Remember that it is the cost of land which is at the core of this dichotomy. After all, the cost of pretty much everything else has the same base price. Food, which starts out in Florida or California or Chicago will cost 50% to 100% more on the shelves of an LA grocer than it will in Norfolk Nebraska. One of many factors involved is the cost of building the store and that is based, in part, on land value. On the other side of the coin, scattered throughout the mid-west, are small family farms which have passed from one generation to the next. Some are more profitable than others, but fewer and fewer are capable of sustaining a family at the levels which we have come to expect. Because of this, many of those farm owners work in the work force of the area, in addition to making some income on the farm. In the same way that the dynamics of Working Mothers caused a reduction in the wages of the country through the affects of "Supply and Demand", these small farm owners are able to "undercut" their competitors in the work force. Many wives of farm owners now work, not for the extra income, but for the medical benefits. The result is devastating to the value of "Labor" within the community. For those who are not being subsidized by an inheritance, there is no option to work for the current minimum wage so that they can get a premium health care package in

place of hirer wages. Therefore, one contributing factor of the low cost of wages in the farm communities of the mid-west must be considered to be rising health care prices. Furthermore, the fact that health benefits are not taxed as wages causes the tax laws to be a catalyst in the devaluation of wages in such a scenario. Lower wages means lower housing costs.

On the reverse side of the issue of housing costs, let us again look at the State of California. While it boasts the sixth largest economy in the world, that economy is built on [among other things] Socialism and a pyramid scheme. The pyramid scheme has to do with immigration. Since 1970 our population has grown by 25%, not just as a result of Americans having too many children in the face of global overpopulation, but as a result of immigration. Why? One reason must certainly be the greed of the California approach to prosperity. When immigrants come to this country, be it San Francisco or Ellis Island, many of them do not pass through immigration and board a train for the interior. Instead, they move into a urban setting. Perhaps it is a Ghetto [Ghetto in the traditional meaning of a community made up of largely one faction sharing a common bound such are Religion or Race]. From that place they would historically melt into the American collage and become part of the fabric which is America. At the turn of the century, one of the big eastern news papers would actually go so far as to lead the populist in that direction by telling them what it meant to be American; so as to form a consensus. People would change their names to Americanized versions which did not betray their ethnicity. Today we would be told that this is a bad thing; as it is necessary to remain tided to your culture of origin. But these people came to become Americans and as a result, they did become Americans. But I digress. Never the less, because of this tendency for immigrants to remain in the place at which they landed, both New York and California would see the greatest influx of people as a result of this frenzied immigration policy. Supply and Demand would then see property value increased accordingly. There were other contributing factors as well. If the population came from South and Central America, it would be likely that they would be uneducated and speak only Spanish. They would be a cheap labor force to exploit. In addition, if they were illegal immigrants, not only could they be exploited directly, but by setting up Federal Government agencies within California to deal with the self induced problem, Federal dollars could be taken from the Fifty States and channeled into the pockets of California residents who performed those duties. This same approach to “Milking” the Federal cow could be applied to other “legal” immigrants as well. Federally funded Social Services would inject untold amounts of US taxpayer dollars into programs which attempted to allow immigrant children to go to school and study in the language of their parents country. Housing could be subsidized. Food stamps could be provided. Social Security benefits would be handed out to people both of and under retirement age. It was and remains, a giant whirlpool which sucks money

*George Bailey*

down from the economic river which is the US economy as a whole and redistributes it in the California economy. The inflation which results from the higher economic standard in conjunction with the market affects of Supply and Demand on California housing, has led to a inflated economy within the sphere of influence of these factors. Of coarse, all these things are relative. The average Californian does not live better than the average mid-westerner to the degree that one might expect. The reason is that the money which is being sucked in, is going to those in the real estate industry. Those who make the 6% at sale and most of all, those who are able to capitalize on increases in the market and in the value of bare land.

So, now that I have explained to you the dynamics of today's American farm economy and the dynamics of the river, let me show you how morality has been defeated by Long Shanks in the Midwest. If you watch the commercials of those who raise money for the various "Money Funds" you will see one that claims that if a person had invested \$10,000.00 with them in 1970, that their return "to date" would be in excess of one million dollars. That means that if you had been a farmer on just 40 acres of ground back when the roller coaster took off and you had sold that land for the going price of \$2,400.00 an acre, you could have got \$96,000.00, kept \$70,000.00 after taxes on Capital Gains and got a job in town. Today you would have been worth seven million. Most small family farms are four to ten times that size. So while the rest of the country has been portrayed by the press as getting rich and living large, farmers drink coffee in a circle down town and wonder why they have so much invested and make so little. It is because the numbers are an illusion. Land that requires an investment such as is the case with the family farm, that makes a return at levels of the family farm, does not justify nearly that much value. No one would buy a business which costs as much as the land that makes up a family farm in order to set up an operation which required the cash outlays of farming, for the return that farmers get. Of course farmers will tell you that they continue to do it because it is a way of life that they love. But it is just as much, a "line" that they stand in. In any other business, the losses incurred by farmers would have seen them out of business. But government has bureaucracies who's existence depends upon large numbers of farmers. Small towns depend upon farmers. Implement dealers depend upon large numbers of farmers. Insurance companies, banks, pickup dealers, chemical companies and area merchants; all see themselves as dependent upon large numbers of farmers. If farmers fell as a group, land prices would fall. Capitalism would decide how big farms would be and who would own them. Capitalism would decide if seed corn producers would sell seed corn or if entrepreneurs would raise their own. Capitalism would decide how to fertilize and who could afford a new pickup and local labor costs would rise because the situation I described previously with regard to farmers moon lighting in town, would no longer exist. It "is" fair to say that farmers remained farmers rather

than investors because they loved the land and the work. But it must also be acknowledged that had they known the future and all began to sell out in order to become investors, land values would have plummeted as a result economic realities. But because farmers, as a group, would use their political clout to force government to subsidize prices, government could in turn, manipulate farm income to lower and lower standards by guaranteeing that, that income would continue so long as farmers played along. So that as they looked around themselves, at withered local economies and lowered wages, that they helped to establish and perpetuate, they became afraid to fly in a free economy for fear that they would be sent to the back of a line which was worse than the one they were in. So they stayed in their lines, and because they all did, land did not go on the market for sale based on its earning potential, but rather it became a function of who would be allowed to stand in that line; and because that line was so coveted, land values were propped up in a system which was not Capitalistic but Socialistic and the wealth of a once great economy was eroded and continues to erode.

There is a mechanism which has naturally developed from a climate in which money is available to the wealthy and not to the middle classes. Imagine a Chess board. Everyone playing the game of life in America must, of necessity, own a square on the board in order to have a home. That space may be rented or owned [which means rented from those who tax]. Without a square, one becomes homeless. But all the squares are not the same size. Some squares are large enough to be divided into smaller squares. In these scenarios, those who can divide their land can reap the benefits of inflation through land speculation. Those who are occupying the square they hold must, of necessity, replace their square if they sell it or become homeless. Therefore, the only one who can profit from the inflation of the property are those who can hold enough land to sell off portions while retaining a square large enough to live on. The illusion of increased wealth for those who own a single square has been the calming factor which has allowed the game to go on. As immigration has continued what was began by the Baby Boomers coming of age, demand has continued to drive up home prices across the country. Particularly in certain "Hot" markets. In a Capitalistic market system, supply would rise to meet that demand to moderate it, but because "Land", which can not be created, is one of the necessary ingredients, Capitalism fails to address the problem. The process leads to inflation. In this Landlord/Serf relationship, those who hold wealth, are thereby able to purchase land in excess of their personal needs. Those who hold wealth create inflation with the help of market forces: market forces such as; population concentrations do to job market, immigration and population growth. Two of these can be manipulated: the job market, with tax breaks and immigration through politics. As discussed before, this unbridled "Nonproductive" inflation is then countered by the Federal Reserve Board Chairman by strangling the

*George Bailey*

potential of the working class, stuck on their single square, to offset the inflation. What is left is “Falling prices at Wall Mart”.

This problem continues to become more acute. In 1999 a five bedroom home in a San Francisco Bay area community sold for \$600,000.00. When the new owners of the newly completed home came for the walk through, there were twenty four people on the tour. The five bedroom home had been sold to a collection of five families; each of whom would occupy a single bedroom and share the rest as a common. So it may now be demonstrated that even as property values sky rocket, the inflation is due to a reduction in the living standards of Americans. In the past, municipalities would never have allowed so many people to inhabit a dwelling such as this. Because none of these five families would be able to purchase such a home without the help of the other four, the price of the house would have had to be lowered to reflect that market reality in the past. But in the climate of greed and speculation which is the new American landscape; not only will it come to pass, but ultimately, the Federal Reserve will see the private sector’s future diminished to compensate for what will appear on the surface as inflation in the housing market.

Government bureaucracies which produce nothing except paperwork, and the increases in land value, which in turn, do not produce anything but increased costs, are both examples of what I have termed detrimental or non-productive inflation. They are two of the catalysts for the dynamics at work in the California economy. Again, you can see that it is government involvement which is at the heart of the disparity between the two economic systems [ Midwest and California]. Through immigration on a scale not seen since the turn of the century and with Federal tax dollars, California has used its “Electoral College” weight to move to the front of the line. In 1998, Governor Wilson of California would drop the State sales tax on goods sold through the “Internet”. After years of watching States grovel back and forth over who should be able to attach their fees and taxes onto transactions made between entities in two different States, Pete Wilson has come forward to champion the notion that a fledgling enterprise such as the “Internet” needs a break. Never mind that all taxes that have grown from this old system of “Tax the “Out of Stater” were illegal under the Constitution on the basis of “Restraint of Trade”. Never mind that every other fledgling business which ever started, in any State in the Union, would be told that those were the rules and they could live or dye by them. These things are not at the heart of the matter. The real agenda here is to see that those who do not do business on the “Internet” will be assessed a sales tax, while those who do will avoid that 8% cost increase. Mr. Wilson has promised to use his administration to try and make this a Federal law. Should this happen, virtually all “Mail Order” business would be put at a disadvantage against their competitors in the “Virtual” world. And since even those “Internet” companies who are not located in

California, would be bolstering computer sales: and since California is the center of the computer world, Mr. Wilson is again trying to get the other forty nine States to prop up the California economy with tax manipulation. What's more, the representatives of the other forty nine will probably go along with it.

These same dynamics would find their way into Arizona, Texas and New York as well. The main component would always be immigration. The middle class of the Baby Boomer generation had held its number of offspring to the lowest "Per Capita" levels of modern times. They were aware that Social Responsibility included not having more children than you could afford. They had been warned of world over population and they had responded appropriately. However, in order to continue the pyramid growth scenario which had been the economic model from the beginning of Capitalistic America, Government would thwart their effort by bringing in something like 16 million immigrants in the period from 1970 to 1995. Among them would be elderly, who would move almost directly to Social Security roles. That would be good for the closed system of economics within those states with the most immigrants. The Welfare money would work in the same way. But because the number of immigrants would be so great an impact on the population; and because it had become politically incorrect to suggest that these people assimilate from their native culture into something more main stream, we would become a culture divided. It was the same dynamic seen in the Pennsylvania coal mines.

It serves no purpose to question any underlying motives within the Government. It is enough to look at the facts and see the results so that we can address the problem. This then is one the positive dynamic functions of an X wage. By eliminating the old tax system in favor of the flat rate for All, Mr. Wilson has been thwarted at many levels. Obviously, the "Internet" scheme will not work. But the boarder scheme has been dealt with in two ways. Not only does the Data Base we discussed keep illegals from being hired, but as the Federal Government learns to live on a budget, it will be less likely to build and fund, mock bureaucracies. Remember, with election reform, California becomes less potent as well. But it is the "X" wage which will ultimately level the field to its true value. It shall be what the "ECONOMIC MARKET WILL BEAR", not what the "MANIPULATED MARKET WILL BEAR". But what will the "X" wage be?

I know this is a major concern of any of you who have been thinking as you read. After all, an "X" wage which allows home ownership to anyone and everyone is a big thing. So, let's look at the numbers. To do that, I want you to separate those areas of the country in which housing is moderately priced from those areas where it is very expensive. So, to begin with, let us look at the forty states between the coasts. In almost all of those States one can still buy an average dwelling for \$100,000.00; certainly for no more than \$150,000.00. The

*George Bailey*

figure may, in fact, be far below that. At \$100,000.00, a house which is amortized over eighteen years at an interest rate of 3% will cost its owner in the neighborhood of \$700.00 a month. Under the old tax system, one would have had to gross at least \$1,100.00 a month just to pay the taxes on income, and the mortgage on the property itself. In the new tax system, it will take only \$825.00 [ $\$825.00 \times 15\% = \$123.75$ ]-----  $\$825.00 - \$123.75 = 701.25$ ]. It then requires that an individual be able to make an “X” wage which will provide them with \$825.00 over a 80 hour period: 80 hours being four weeks on a spit job; or roughly \$10.00 per hour. Remember, the function of an “X” wage is to provide a survivable bottom rung. If one has to reach into savings for essentials and put “Blue Food” on the supper table until things get better, then that is life. Revel in it. Down at the Fast food place, kids with no high school diploma and under 18, will still face bus loads of patrons at 60% of “X”. Those without the language skills to make it a safe work place for those around them, will work for 40% until they reach age 18. For the employer, it will now cost a couple of bucks more for the employee earning X, but the government is the one who will lose. Most of that increase will be offset by all those things we discussed before. Because government can no longer mandate that employers provide anything other than an “X” wage, all manner of expense has been eliminated. Employers no longer have to hire people as part time workers in order to escape the grasp of government intervention. They no longer have to hold a job for someone who needs to be elsewhere because a replacement job is easily found. And when a job is split, it will be because there will be government incentives to do so.

With such an “X” wage in place, a 40 hour week in a 4.5 week month, has consumers spending at the bottom and probably saving some as well. At the end of 18 years of house payments, that amount will undoubtedly become savings and investments and better life styles. The formula for the calculation of the X wage is then: the value of the housing in your area, as described earlier in this book, amortized over eighteen years at 3% and divided by 80 hours: and multiplied by 100% plus the percentage of taxes you pay under the new system in your area. If the tax is 15% total, then the formula is multiplied by 115% to offset taxes. This means that those who work full time [160 hours or more per month] will require somewhere around 50% of their income to pay their mortgage.

In California and places priced similarly, there will be what the guys at the federal Reserve like to call “Adjustment”; maybe even a little “Pain”. It will be up to the market to set prices in the end. Those jobs which are elevated to perhaps as high as \$15.00 an hour will be in turmoil temporarily. But at the same time, the moderating affects of the age, diploma and language requirements will help through the transition. In communities where property is too high, for too many, to support industry, industry will move out. For example, if it happens that the figure for housing in your area is \$200,000.00, then the amount needed to



amortize your home mortgage is nearer \$1,400.00 a month and the X wage has moved up to \$20.00. Property value in small inflated pockets will fall as those who live there, decide to become an expensive bedroom community in which the janitorial staff drives a nice new car; or until the realities of the situation force people out. That will leave a glut of houses, which will lower property values by true market amounts. In cases where properties begin to fall, banks may become unstable as well. Houses worth less than the mortgage owed, may find homeowners walking away from loans. In such a scenario, it shall fall to the Federal Reserve to do what must be done to stabilize the situation, but it shall be limited to printing money. It shall not let the Treasury take on debt for tax payers in order to save the value of the currency it is giving away to banks to save them from their own greed. As conditions moderate, "X" wages will fall to what the "True" economy of an area warrants. In the mid-west property values might well rise. Economics will prevail over politics. This is as it should be.

Remember, always, that it is the market place that should dictate prices. Because it is so important that you be able to defend this transition point, let me give you another example. The city of San Francisco sets at the northern most end of the southern peninsula of the San Francisco Bay. It is a Banking center, a city of commerce, and a undesirable place to have to commute into because of the traffic. Oddly, enough, one reason is that commuters spend hours a week stuck in traffic so that their government can asses a two dollar tax on them as they cross over the various bridges which lead to the city. As a result, a small two bedroom house or apartment could rent for between \$2,000.00 and \$3,000.00 a month. Housing prices moderate somewhat as one moves down the peninsula. Then at about forty miles to the south, you run into the "Silicon Valley" and the prices sky rocket again. Ten miles across the bay housing moderates substantially. As a consequence of all this, almost all those who work within the two areas, [San Francisco and the Silicon Valley] live outside of them. Most live across the bay or even over the mountains to the east. In 1998 the state of California would double the toll rates across the bridges. It would take an additional \$250.00 out of the pockets of those who did not make enough to live in the inflated areas, while relieving those who could, of some of California's tax burden. In the same way that those working poor are subsidizing the California tax, they are subsidizing the inflated rents and property values. It is, after all, supply and demand which has escalated the property values. This fact is not in contention. Furthermore, supply and demand operates within the confines of "What The Market Will Bear". Therefore, the inflated property values are subject to the limitations of a population's ability to pay. If those who live within the boundaries of these two areas, receive services from those in the work force, at the minimum level which is undervalued, then their [the residents of the two areas, San Francisco and the Silicon Valley] ability to pay higher rent is being augmented, subsidized, by the under valuation of a fair minimum wage. To state

*George Bailey*

it another way: if services cost more within an area, then less money can be allocated from one's budget for housing, thus lowering one's ability to pay. That in turn lowers demand. It is not a sound policy to have three families living in one apartment in order to increase housing prices, just because those who own housing see it as advantageous to them. Do not let those who have prospered, as a result of a flawed system of economics, convince you that it is right or just, on the basis that it would disenfranchise them if things were fair.

Out in places Back East, where the elderly used their clout to "Freeze" rents in order to have the "haves" subsidized by the "never gots"; things will be in turmoil. Why? Because rent freezing is price fixing. It is not fair that those who once got into a rental unit, could hold their rent stable while those who came later would have to pay what the market would bear and pick up the true cost of providing that housing to all the tenants involved. It was the eastern equivalent of "Prop 13", which said that, because I am established, I will use my political clout to force others to pay what is a cost we should bear collectively. It had its place back when the elderly lived within a truly "Fixed Income", but that time passed long ago. It has become a system of double dipping where elderly pay the same rent even as their Benefits rise with inflation, while the youngest within our population make less money each year and pick up the expense of the frozen rents reflected in their newly acquired, over-inflated rents. Properties, and wages must be allowed to find equilibrium within a Capitalistic medium, or wages will be held down by giving advantage to one group over another. The corruption will continue its cycle and the X wage will be manipulated. This will be a source of extreme anxiety for the elderly, who will, no doubt, be driven to panic by those who wish to stay the revolution. I urge you to do your best to help them see that they will be taken care of, and that we really have no choice in the long run.

It may appear that one way to make the numbers work is to moderate the amount of money calculated into the X wage beyond what it takes to service the mortgage. That is to say, if it takes \$1,400.00 a month to amortize the loan, why double that figure in the more expensive markets in the same way we would in the more moderate markets? The answer is that the percentage sets a fair coefficient for the amount of one's income that should go to housing. In fact, anyone trying to qualify for a conventional bank loan today would only be able to use something like 35% to 45% of their net income to make the numbers work. If We skew the numbers beyond the 50% figure, We only allow land value to be escalated in ways I have just tried to explain as wrong.

There is little doubt that if you own a home in one of these inflated areas, you are probably beside yourself with fear or perhaps anger, right about now. But I want you to stop and think for a moment. If the rise in the X wage causes a mass exodus from your area and your property value drops to one third of its original value, what will it cost you? If you are among those who make up a community

which is in the same boat as you, you will probably be able to renegotiate your mortgage with your bank. If you can not, then you will be able to purchase a similar home in your area for one third the amount at an interest rate of no more than 7%; and perhaps as low as 3%. If you see your property value fall only enough that you lose your equity, then you will still see your mortgage rate drop to the new usury level of 7%. In the end, as I have attempted to explain with the analogy of the chessboard, you have to live some were, so what does it matter? That is, of course, unless you hoped to cash in on the speculative market and move away from that “Hot Market”; or into a lesser dwelling and pocket the difference under the new tax laws. But in either of those two scenarios you are speaking of retaining wealth that was acquired due to forces that I have labored long to explain as contrary to what is fair for all.

I must make clear, that if an area fails to have enough decent housing to make to “X” wage work, then housing prices will likely fall in that area, to a point at which the work force base can be accommodated within that area. In so doing, we lower the need to commute and we help to address our environmental problems. It should be noted and understood that if there is no housing for the worker base in an area [based on “X”]; then that housing market is currently being supplemented by government money, which is our tax dollars being usurped from us in order to skew things in favor of those making money off of inflated housing. Such inflation will ultimately have to be paid for by lowered expectations within the working class to offset the Fed’s phobia with inflation. It should further be noted that if you move into a home to live there for the rest of your life; whether the value of the house increases or decreases is of little importance. Without taxes assessed against it, it is your home, so what does it really matter? A house will always have value in a healthy community. That is what is important. So even if housing prices fall initially because of the introduction of an “X” wage, only those builders who gouge, and those municipalities who build bureaucracies from the influx of growth and those who speculate and inflate prices, will lose in the long run. And these are the very forces that keep many Americans from owning their own home. If you buy a home with a Tier One loan when you are young, you may want to sell it and acquire a larger one when you begin a family. At that time you will pay taxes on that home. When your children have grown, you may wish to sell out and purchase a smaller home to grow old in, or you may move to Government housing. At that point you will pay taxes on your home. Many viable strategies will emerge; but the most important factors will be that they will all function within a community and an economy which is stable and not manipulated.

If we want to save our environment, we can. We can have inexpensive, renewable energy without being manipulated by utilities. But we will never escape the grip of those who feed on us until we become a republic which elects

*George Bailey*

honest individuals to the task of running the country. I had a conversation with a man in the tire business. He had been changing and fixing the big truck tires for thirty years. He told me that by the time the radial tire was invented, tire manufacturers had become pretty good at making rubber compounds that last. So good, in fact, that when the steel belted radial designs came out, the casings were being recapped over and over for as long as fifteen years. If you don't know, the casing is the part of the tire that is still there when you have worn off all the tread. Now, a fifteen year casing is a very good thing. After all, we have all become aware of what a big and expensive problem it is to get rid of the used tires. But for some reason, as the years passed and radials became the norm, an interesting thing happened. The casings began to deteriorate over a period of about seven years. Of course he claimed that it was planned obsolescence on the part of the tire industry.

At the same time, in California, the government had been charging a recycling fee on disposed tires for a decade or maybe two. In northern California they were told that the money went to the research and development of ways to safely dispose of the old tires. Then a decade ago I heard that one of the places getting the research money had found that by burning the tires at the extreme heat they use to produce portland cement, the tires could be disposed of in a ecologically sound manner. As tires are made of combustible synthetics, they should contribute to the heating process. That should turn them from a liability into a asset, and yet it still costs to dispose of tires and the price is rising. But it should also be noted that one of the places that was allowed to charge \$600.00 per truck load, to get rid of the tires in California, simple built a mountain of tires. There was a big fine, so the government made money too; but the mountain of tires is still there. Maybe this turns out to be the place government officials were bragging about.

I have done my best to stay away from conspiracy theories in this book. They serve no purpose. But if I had confidence in my elected officials to do the right thing, I would know that the reason things are as they are, is because they must be and not because people are making money as things stand and therefore there will be no change. If an entire industry has colluded to shorten the life of tire casings because everyone but the consumer and the planet, is better served by a short lived one, then why isn't someone explaining themselves to congress? You know why: and unless We change the system WE will be denied what is at hand.

So then, an environmental plan that brings a marriage between industrialism and an unpolluted environment begins with a simple principle. Those who create things which are at conflict with the environment are directly responsible for the materials they introduce.

So what does that mean and what does that change? Good Year is a major tire manufacturer. If Good Year is responsible for the disposal of all the casings it

manufactures then Good year will get to the truth about their incineration. If, when your Good Year tire wears out, you can set it out with your trash and Good Year will be billed the disposal fee; Good Year will make every effort to accommodate you, to entice you, to bring your old tires by their store. They will seek out the least expensive way to dispose of the tires in order to compete with others in their industry. If We as a society, demand that the tires are disposed of in a safe way, We will pay the cost of disposal when we purchase the tire rather than when we want to dispose of it. The cheaper the disposal cost, within the parameters set by society, the cheaper the tires: Capitalism. We still need leaders in the Republic to deal with the longevity of the casing issue. And if We have no leadership, We will be thwarted. If collusion and conspiracy are discovered and the stock holders of Good Year and the other tire manufactures pay, nothing will change in industry. But if those who conspired go to prison in a Tier One facility, American business will begin to honor the Golden Rule. If we have no leadership: those who manufacture their tires outside the US will try to dispose of their tire carcasses out of the country, only to build a mountain in some third world country. Someday that mountain will catch fire and the air We share will be just as polluted as if they were burned here. But this is a formula for disposal. Now for collection.

In my utopian dream, every drop of water that falls on a city street, or runs off a city roof, is gathered in a storm drain or flushed down a sewer; flows to the south. It is gathered and then piped to the aired regions of the south and southwest. As I discussed before, it can be treated. But more importantly, it can be kept out of our natural water systems. If every industrial polluter were forced to discharge their waste into the system, rather than dump it into rivers or sewers or oceans, then two things of great importance would happen. The first is that whatever went into the system could be separated, extracted and contained. Secondly, those who discharge these various substances could be assessed their portion and charged the cost of the extraction. This method works on several levels. Say, for example, a toxic polluter on the Missouri river is dumping waste water into the river which contains mercury. It is assessed that their percentage of the total mercury extracted from the pipeline is three percent of the total. The cost of extracting mercury from the system is four million dollars per month. Their cost is 3% of the total, or \$120,000 a month. Can they afford that? If they can not then the cost of the clean up is assessed too high and who is in a better position to see a fair price assessed; the industries which discharge mercury, or consumers and the municipalities down stream? Or perhaps the cost of the clean up is fairly assessed. Then if the manufacturer/polluter can not afford the cost of extraction they are not charging enough for their product. If this is the case, then this manufacturer/polluter is being subsidized against his competitors at the expense of the environment. Perhaps their competitor does not use mercury or perhaps their competitor cleans up the mercury at their own place of

*George Bailey*

manufacture. All these are viable possibilities. But what is important is that a manufacturer who chooses to use mercury must either keep the mercury out of the environment on their own or pay the cost of clean up once the mercury is in the system. If the market value of the goods they manufacture will not support one of those two scenarios, then that product has not demonstrated its value in the market place. It then becomes a question of whether or not We will allow our children to be poisoned in order to sustain those jobs. Incidentally, if the manufacturer ceases to manufacture, someone, somewhere will create a new job for someone; manufacturing whatever it is that took the old product's place. In other words, the job won't be lost, it will just relocate.

A system such as this can be accounted in another manner. For example, it has been said that nickel, in powder form, is a carcinogen [causes cancer]. So long as it is suspended in another substance it is not considered to be hazardous. But, ultimately, any powdered nickel put into the environment is likely to separate out. When it does, it will logically end up in the water gathered from our urban world [urban water]. By extracting it and assessing a charge against those who produce nickel powder, a fair market value which reflects the environmental costs, can be assessed. One material that I know of which uses the nickel powder, has a competitor who uses copper powder. So far as I know, copper powder is not considered to be a carcinogen. Therefore, the environmental cost of nickel will make it harder for nickel to find a market. Perhaps it still will. So long as We have leaders who assess what should be labeled hazardous in a fair and realistic manner, a true "cost" can be found by which to compare. So long as it falls to industry to defend their product rather than to consumers to pay for disposal, we have a check and balance system which seeks the truth. Remember, all the tread that was on the tire when you bought it, made it into the environment before you ever had to deal with getting rid of the casing. Much of it could be found in urban water.

This system would supply the aired regions of the south land with more water than they could ever use. It will create a new industry that will be mining heavy metals from our sewage rather than unearthing more and more. It will be creating energy as well and from sewage. Most importantly, because northern manufacturers will have their northern congressmen and women to stand up for them, the cost of cleaning the water will not become a source of extortion. If such a project were to become a government undertaking, it will fall under a category like that of the Postal Service, in that government would be able to assess a cost and charge a fee. It is therefore best, I believe, that it be a private undertaking. For that matter, it may be best to have many companies bidding for smaller territories, with mandatory participation by municipalities who must supply the waste water. It will, no doubt, become a political football. Still, the possibility exists to turn vast tracts of desert into vast corn fields for the purpose of fuel, if

not grain. With the introduction of the fuel cell into the ecological picture, the future looks promising for the first time in my generation. As batteries become a thing of the past, vast amounts of lead, nickel and cadmium will be taken out of our environment. As fuel cells replace power lines, PCBs can be removed from the environment, as voltage transformers become obsolete.

As we learn to clean up the water resource from the pipeline, we can then begin filling the same irrigation canals we now use for water from the Colorado river to send this reclaimed water through out the south from California to Texas. Archer Daniels Midland, [ADM] is a company who boasts that they have developed a fish that can gain a pound for every 1.8 pounds it is fed. If we contracted with business to farm fish in these publicly owned canals, those who could “Wholesale” the fish for the least amount could win a territory along the canal and supply us with domestic fishes. Fishes that would be quarantined from native species. [I refer you to the native species of trout in Montana who were once immune to a parasite which now infects them]. These same systems could be put in place around the world and we could be marketing the expertise along with fuel cell technology.

There will be those who say that such a mammoth undertaking is impossible, but look at our Interstate system. Look at the Alaskan pie line. Their will be those who say that the volume involved in the extraction process is unworkable. But you can drive through Nevada and see mountains of earth that have been “Leeched” for gold, using the same types of processes necessary to our cause. The return on that process is calculated in fractions of ounces of gold per cubic yard. In any case, as I have explained, we pay the price already, in one way or another, and it is the function of this system to determine whether such costs are sound in an ecologically sound economy.

As for solid waste: it is going to be very difficult to take back our garbage. One of the first things we are going to have to do in the revolution is to mandate some changes as they apply to utilities. As you may recall, one of the major reasons for the creation of the Public Utilities Commissions, or PUC, in the different united states, was to insure against monopolies by criminal elements. There are some who would argue that government has once again failed. Whether that is true or not, in order to safeguard that innovation be free to proceed in the disposal of solid waste it shall be the law of the land that no one who is related by blood or by marriage within three generations may own more than 2% in combination, of a publicly held utility. Furthermore, no ethnic group may band together to hold more than 20% of a utility. There are enough investment opportunities out there in the free market without the utilities.

Additionally, if individuals own old garbage sites, they should be allowed to keep them. If large groups of individuals own individual portions of old dump sites in the form of individual lots on top of old land fills, then they should be

*George Bailey*

able to keep them. But Corporations or other groups of people, who are in possession of old or existing landfills, should be barred from ownership. Those sites should be purchased at area acreage rates by local municipalities, and bids should be taken from the private sector to reclaim the resources in those repositories as soon as the technology emerges to do so. Operating expenses will be taken out of income generated. Local labor will be employed in the process. But the profit will have to be distributed along the guidelines as defined for the distribution of all government income. That will be addressed later.

In my utopia, all the solid waste that makes up the garbage in you home and at work, is loaded up into the garbage truck in front of you house as it has been since you were a kid and makes its way to the dump as it always has. It picks up lawn clippings and tree branches and leaves as well. But the dump is not too far from the city center; and it does not smell, nor do papers fly about. In stead, the trash, which maybe even includes tire casings, is dumped into an enclosed building. From there it moves by conveyer belt, or perhaps an overhead crane; it may even be a bulldozer that pushes it; but it is placed into long deep concrete furrows that are perhaps as much as fifty yards across, one or two hundred feet deep and five hundred feet long. The furrows are covered either by a concrete cap or a removable roof. This is were the garbage will remain so long as it continues to produced the desired amount of methane gas. The gas will be captured and used to generate electricity, which will be converted into hydrogen and oxygen. The capturing of the gas and the generation of electricity from it, is currently an old technology. Such systems have been in operation for some time. Once the garbage has stopped producing the prescribed amount of methane gas, it will be time to start it on its way to the incinerator. As it makes its way toward the furnace room it will be heated by the water which is being cooled as that water cycles from the steam driven engines that run off the heat generated in the furnace. They are not turbine generators because they require too great a temperature variation between the liquid stage of water and the "Dry" steam stage required. These are push\pull, piston, steam driven engines which make use of the vacuum created in the system [much like the one you have in you home heating system in the year 2010].

As the trash moves down the conveyor to the incineration chamber, it is shredded. All the while it is getting hotter. In fact, by now it is so hot that the convey has ended. In its place is a long slick incline of firebrick material or ceramic. At the end of the incline the trash drops off into the top of a mammoth caldron made of something akin to what they use in steel foundries. The temperature inside the incinerator is high enough to dispose of anything that enters. The heat is created not only by the burning of the trash, but by the introduction of oxygen and perhaps hydrogen into the chamber, which is being produced with the electricity made from the burning of the methane and also the



steam driven generators. At the bottom of the caldron there is a pool of molten metal so hot that the debris from the burning trash floats on it like slag. I have been told that when smelting aluminum, large tungsten rods are inserted into the molten aluminum and electrified to create an arc much like a welding rod. If this is true, then maybe this too can be employed to create the desired temperature in the incinerator using some of the electricity being produced with the steam engine. As the molten metal accumulates in the caldron, it is eventually removed a little at a time to keep the amount of metal at the bottom constant. Perhaps it can be separated and even formed into its next application before it cools. Perhaps clever minds can figure out what to do with all the left over glass. As the exhaust air is cooled over the incoming trash and spun like a centrifuge to remove the particulates, it will pass through whatever safeguards are necessary to make it safe to expel in the city's center. Perhaps some of the furrows filled with trash can be used as a giant filter which cools the exhaust air and extracts all the particulates. If other gases need to be used to create the desired temperature in the incinerator, then there are engineers with more knowledge than I to figure it out. The important thing here is that you understand that trash is just another form of raw material. It wastes time and resources to separate and recycle materials in the "piece meal" ways we have embraced. It wastes much more when we bury raw materials for lack of a method to use and recapture the rest of the trash. If we are growing fiber for paper products using hemp in place of trees, we have a renewable resource that grows fast, doesn't need to be recycled and produces energy when disposed of. It may even prove to be a crop that works in place of soil bank conservation. I don't have this one all figured out for you, but you can take it from here if given the opportunity and the will. The cost of extracting the mercury from the exhaust can, once again, be assessed against those who sell products which contain mercury. On the other hand, if a thermometer manufacturer uses no new mercury in its thermometers but instead buys reclaimed mercury or reclaims their own, they may avoid being assessed. What's more, the price they pay at the point of extraction offsets the cost of the process. After all, if they buy reclaimed mercury, they are paying for the cost of the extraction. If we have to have people separating those things that can not be incinerated as the trash travels down the conveyer, in order to make this work, again: we can back charge industry for those items. Those that can't justify a place in the system should be removed. This is a blue print upon which to build, but it is not all inclusive. For example, mercury evaporates when boiled and will condense outside our collection methods. The same is true of acid which falls as acid rain. Therefore the environmental laws we have fought for must remain as a standard to be improved upon. It will take innovation. Perhaps a moral government could sponsor a competition for the development of such an incineration system, or offer prize money. Perhaps some chemicals will have to be outlawed to make any such system work in the real world. Perhaps instead of

*George Bailey*

outlawing freon, on the basis that it depleted O zone [freon which is still available but extremely costly] we could have allowed those manufactures to introduce O zone molecules into the atmosphere at a rate which offset those molecules being depleted by the amount of gas produced. In this way, the manufacturers would incorporate the cost of replacing O zone into freon's market value. Perhaps these measures should be taken against other O zone depleting products. This is the only sensible way to deal with waste. If it means that some materials have to be outlawed in order to make the system work then it is a small price to pay when compared with where we are heading.

There is one other aspect of the environment which I would like to address before I close. In the 1950's, this country embarked on an ambitious quest to tie this country together with a highway system unlike the world has never know. If you are not old enough to remember places like Rabbit Ears pass and Wolf Creek pass, or the long winding stretches of narrow highways that placed cars and trucks within feet of a head on crash as a matter of daily life; then you probably can't fully appreciate just what was accomplished. But the Interstate system had some serious design flaws. Because it was made of concrete, and often reinforced with steel, it would last a long time. Unfortunately, those very strengths insured that the inevitable replacement of those highway surfaces would be extremely costly. Not only would we have to replace the surface, but we would have to remove the old surface and carry it away.

Way back when they were putting in the first roads in my home town, they used paving stones. These stones were about the size of a brick; only twice as thick. Their surface was very slippery when it was wet or had snow on it. But because they were individual components in the road, not rigid like poured slabs of concrete, they would move with the "Bust and Heave" of the frost in the winter. In fact, after a century or more on the ground, and exposure to salt in the winter, some of those streets still exist; and many were paved over, using the stones as a base. Today there are paving bricks being manufactured using concrete. They are laid down in interlocking patterns. Their road base is prepared in much the same way as it would be for paving with poured concrete. Then a layer of fine sand is leveled just under the paves themselves. It is my hope that we can develop an interlocking paving brick of perhaps as much as a foot in depth. It would be made of concrete and perhaps fly ash, which gets harder and harder as it ages for the first one hundred years. The roadway would then float on the road base, rather than be rigid. When irregularities, such as ruts, began to develop, a large machine would travel down the roadway, pulling up a lane at a time. A sonic wave would record if any parts of the road base were seriously damaged. The broken paves would be crushed and used as filler in the fine sand base as it was leveled and smoothed under the machine as it passed over. Up in the machine, the undamaged paving bricks would be put in place like pins in a

pin setting machine down at the local bowling alley. Toward the back of the machine, they are laid back down so that as the machine moves down the highway, the only place that the road is torn up is under the machine. In this dream of mine, we have developed a bio-degradable sealer which works a lot like the hot tar you've seen the road crews put in cracks in the highways. At the very end of the paving machine, the sealer, which was melted off of the old paves as they were readied for the "Pin Setter", is mixed in with whatever additional "Virgin" sealer is needed, and a squeegee at the tail end of the machine seals off the new, level, road surface for a smooth quiet ride. Or maybe we decide that a sealer is not needed at all. In those places where bad spots were detected in the sub-structure of the road base, crews come back later to deal with problems. Because the interlocking paves can be removed and replaced in a seamless manner, repairs of any kind [even utilities], that used to leave uneven blemishes in the road are no longer a problem. If we could adopt such a system, we might be able to use some of the old existing roads as a base, without having to pay the cost of removal. We could get all of that asphalt out of our ecosystem. We could resurface for much less and without losing access to large segments of our roads. We could make the roads renewable for generations to come. Without asphalt roadways and internal combustion engines, we could reduce the amount of urban water collected to sewage and run off, to just enough to slurry that sewage. In addition, inlaid within the road surface there would be a rail similar to a trolley rail line. Perhaps it would only be in the fast lane. But it would accommodate a small set of metal wheels that would be timed to the speed of your car's tires, so that once in the fast lane you could engage your steel wheels and engage your cruise control. Perhaps there would be a hooking device that would keep you on track even in snow and rain and wind. All that tire tread that used to end up in our environment would be diminished. All that lane changing would be unnecessary. When you got close to your destination, you would lift your metal wheels, which would set down your rubber wheels at the correct rotation speed by simply turning your steering wheel, and you would change lanes the way you always have as you move over to the exit. There would be no high tech computer system to fail. Perhaps there would be a distance detector which stopped you automatically when objects appeared to close in front. But the rest of the system would be low tech and low cost.

Away from the highway, my personal vision of the nationalized Railway system of the future, sees "Main Line" trains that move from coast to coast or from Canada To Mexico without ever slowing down. They travel at speeds of perhaps 60 to 80 miles an hour. Their cars, which are attached to the locomotives, have their own electric generator/motor systems which can propel them along independently of the Main Train. When entering a station the rear cars detach and enter a side rail. As the Main Train leaves the station an outbound car gives chase until it is linked to the Main Train. When going down

*George Bailey*

hill [or decelerating] all the cars on the train are capable of engaging a generator which adds drag to the train while creating electricity which is then converts H<sub>2</sub>O into hydrogen and Oxygen. When going up hill; [or when giving chase] fuel cells convert the hydrogen into electricity which powers the motors to assist the locomotive. Passenger trains and freight trains could move at constant speeds around the country. Lighter passenger trains may well travel faster in open areas, passing slower moving freight trains. But the massive girth that was once necessary to pull a train of cars from the locomotive through to the caboose will no longer be needed. Each individual car will no longer have to be strong enough to pull all the cars that follow behind it. Because each car can have its own power in the form of an electric motor at the wheels, the entire train can be run from a command post placed in the front [or in the rear for that matter]. A railroad car which once had to weigh over 100,000 pounds empty, can now weigh no more than a trailer from a freight truck. Maybe its a double-decker with sleeping births, dinning cars and lounges. The air which had to be overcome by every freight truck as it moved down the road is now replaced with the wind tunnel created by the car ahead of it. How to configure the trains, how to man the trains; these questions are best left to the will of Capitalism. But in order for Capitalism to decide, We must first build an open Rail Line System which embraces Capitalism. These are my dreams for our children. But it will be necessary to push for change even if such a method could be employed. Even the size and configuration of the paving bricks would become a political football if someone on the inside could hold a patent on such a design. It is a matter for a diligent press.

A government which is willing to serve can do just that. A republic which is held accountable by a press who is involved in asking informed questions instead of looking good in front of the camera; can effect positive, innovative change. But it will be a fight. Those who mine raw materials do not wish to see you recycle everything. Those who sell you your energy don't want you to be able to produce your own. Today there are boiler systems being manufactured that can burn tires within today's Federal Guidelines. The "Wild Card" is how much sulfur is in the composition of the tire. Sulfur released into the air falls to the ground as sulfuric acid: Acid Rain. So by mandating lower sulfur amounts in tires, we eliminate a problem, but we disfranchise those who currently profit from a bad situation. Because of this, We are held hostage. This book is about freedom. You have to fight for freedom. What's more, you have to defend it once it is won.

Imagine a society in which you can be educated as far as you are able to go regardless of your parents financial status. Imagine that no matter your station in society, if you enter the work force in your youth you can count on a steady income and a home free of a mortgage or taxes before you reach forty. Imagine

that at age forty you could begin saving for retirement or just begin living better, knowing that your paycheck and your assets were protected. Imagine that over the span of your working years your house and your wages inflated at a rate that doubled their value one and a half times. When you retired your property continued to increase in value due to inflation to offset the 3% or 4% of your savings lost to inflation over the last fifteen or twenty years of your life: property which could not be taxed away from you. Or imagine that you could walk into a bank and be assured of a loan of up to 60% of your home's equity, at an interest rate of no more than 7% to start your own business: knowing that if you failed you could start over with another home mortgage at 3% and find a job, any job, to pay that mortgage. Imagine that no matter how good a year or bad a year you had that you would pay the same tax percentage on the gross as everyone else and as long as you did that the IRS would have no complaint with you: no interpretation of your situation or how the laws apply to it. Imagine that if you or yours were sick you could afford to seek help. If you were accused you could count on the truth being what everyone was looking for. Imagine if you were old and had no resources that you would be provided for: and that if you were too old to be free, that your right to humane treatment would be watched over by your peers and not bureaucrats. Imagine that until that day came you could get a four hour a day job that would put real money in your pocket and keep you a part of society, involved and contributing: and if you quit for a while for a vacation or due to illness, or to be with your new born child, you could find another one with little effort. Imagine a mother in every home where there were children in need of one. Imagine an end to humiliation in the work place. Imagine stability in the currency you worked for, so that speculators and banks could not manipulate the equity you accumulated into their pocket. Imagine and end to the "Drug War". Imagine an end to hunger in America. These are the things which the revolution guarantees. Such things will, in time, bring an end to the social ills which have been born of our current system. I have shown you the problems and the solutions. I have laid out the method. I will conclude with the time table. The rest is up to you. I am told that after the Constitution was signed a citizen said to Benjamin Franklin, "So you've given us a Democracy?"; to which Franklin replied, "Yes, if you can keep it.". We have lost the freedoms which Franklin and his contemporaries won for us. They have been usurped by Robber Barons, Socialists, and man's inhumanity to man. It is up to us to save our country and to preserve a place for Democracy in the world while our Democracy still exists.

There are those who would point the system that will replace welfare as laid out here within. They will say that there will be those who will stay in the public housing described for the term allowable, saving 90% of their wages as mandated; and then when they are released back into society they will squander that money and end up back in our care. I say , "Is it not better that people who can not manage their money have a safe haven? Is it not better that the children

*George Bailey*

of such people be close to help and care? Does not the money that they squander end up back in the economy to the benefit of all who work; and are those who stay in the shelters described, not part of that work force as laid out in the system?"

Those same people will warn that there will be those who borrow money to buy a home under our new system only to sell it when it is paid off, so that they too may squander the money. And I say, "Did they not pay off the mortgage with interest? Did not the money they spent go back into the economy to the benefit of all?" Do not be confused into thinking that because they only paid 3% interest that they have been subsidized. It is a fair rate of return. Do not think that because you have been told that higher rates are the will of bankers [The Federal Reserve] that it is just or moral. Woody Guthrie said that "This Land is Your Land, This Land is My Land". If that is true then why would we allow our government to tax our property to provide for the services it provides us and yet fail to tax "Capital". Your home is probably your greatest asset. It is probably 75% or more of all your worldly assets. Under today's system the property tax on that asset means that you pay such a tax on 75% of your assets: while someone with nine million dollars in tax free municipal bonds [or \$9 million in cash for that matter] and a house worth another million pays the equivalent tax on 10% of their assets. Even more frustrating is the fact that the home owner who may have as little as 20% equity in their home, will be assessed a Property Tax on 100% of the home's value. Surely if this land were yours and mine then we would not pay rent to the government to occupy our own share of that land. The wealthy and powerful know the story of the man who invented chess and they use it to their advantage against you. They entice you with a pledge to hold you up slightly above those around you if you will help them to hold the others down. I bid you to turn away from their advances. Money ["Capital"] can and should be used to make capitalism work. And it should not be taxed when it stands idle any more than a field set aside or your home in which you live. At the same time, inflation should be allowed to erode at the wealth of those who will not play the game of Capitalism; for without risk there can be no reward. And from that reward let us take our toll, our tax. Be it the rewards of labor as wages, or the reward of earnings as investment, let us all contribute to the financing of our government at the same rate, using a percentage which is equitable. In that way the figure shall remain constant and not be manipulated: for the slightest discrepancy shall surely bring us back to where we find ourselves today.

America has always champions the myth of the "Self Made Man". It is the carrot which taunts us, but it is not true to the realities of the world we live in. Yes, there are those who have made fortunes in this country. But the common thread that holds them all together is that they were all collateralized. From what I know of the story of J.C. Penny, he was in fact, a man who lived in a time and

place where a lack of taxes and expenses, allowed him to save enough to capitalize his own venture. But if you look at Andrew Carnegie you will see that he used his insider position at the railroad which employed him and a ethically questionable collaboration with his mentor, to amass the capital with which he built his empire. If you look to the, so called, “Amazing” Howard Hues, you will find that his father left him a tool manufacturing company which held a patent on the only oil drilling bit that was self cleaning; a drill bit which was coincidentally invented by one of his father’s employees, not Mr. Hues. As I understand it, Ted Turner began with his father’s television station; Donald Trump with his fathers bill board business. I was told that the “Amazing” Bill Gates purchased the original computer software which would ultimately propel him into history for \$50,000.00. But where would any other young, uncollateralized man go to borrow \$50,000.00 for a computer program in that time frame. What institution of lending would grasp the concept of a computer program and its potential; and lend money on it without collateral? None. And venture capital? Did Mr. Gates give 90% or even 98% of his share to investors? Not to my knowledge. So then, I must assume that he was collateralized from the inside.

I have not included the names of these individuals to belittle their accomplishments. I tell you this so that you can understand that these achievers were successful because they were given the opportunity to be successful and they ran with it. I tell you this because they come from a very small group who has opportunity. Yes, it is true that some have been helped by the Small Business Administration. But they are of a select group as well and that group is politically franchised. But if we were to have the changes I have proposed, from the tax system, to Capitalization, we would see a hundred men and women building for the future were today we see five. The benefits to the peoples of the world might just be enough to save us all. Remember always, that there are no truly “Self Made People”. We are given opportunities by family and society or we are not likely to succeed at anything. We can improve upon those things which are given to individuals by their families, by freeing their families from an unfair system. This revolution will do that. We can improve upon those things which are given to individuals by society, by implementing a fair system in its place. The revolution will do that as well.

I have endeavored to help you understand how we have come to where We find ourselves in America today. I have tried to warn you where We are headed. I know it is difficult for those of us who love our country to understand how others could sell it out in order to profit. Those of us who make up the masses look to our Nation and our government for protection and for most of us it is given. Especially when we compare ourselves to the war torn areas of the world, we must feel fortunate indeed. Our way of life, our standard of living, and our security; are a great source of pride and thankfulness for each of us. But these are

*George Bailey*

things which the wealthy can claim due to their wealth and they can be claimed anywhere in the world.

When the heir to the Campbell soup fortune was told that our government wanted something over one billion of his three billion dollar inheritance, he renounced his American citizenship and bought an Island or two or more outside the US. I do not blame him. The tax was unfair, but unlike the rest of us he didn't have to take it. Congress has moved to stop such "Flight" by others. But the point is this. With the billion dollars he didn't pay in taxes, Mr. Campbell could make a campaign contribution of one million dollars a year for the next one thousand years. He can afford his own security, be a visitor in the "States" for as long as he wants through the year, and "BUY" protection for his island with campaign contributions to US politicians. The citizens of the Nation of "Capital" are not bound by border nor do they become the serfs of conquerors when the Nation in which they preside, falls. Instead, they shift sides and buy their way in. That is the purpose of the banks of Switzerland and what gives Switzerland it protection in the face of even the Hitler's of the world. I do not tell you this to insight you against the wealthy or even the Swiss. Let them keep their wealth so long as they are able. I tell you because We are a society in decline. We are past our Zenith; And while there is a way to turn things around, it is not the path that will be chosen for us by the wealthy, should We fail to act.

The movie "Titanic" had, among its themes, the story of the classed system of America as it existed in the early part of this, the 20th century. The among those present within the Aristocracy on board the Titanic was the real life character of Molly Brown. She was considered to be "New Money". The term referred to those who had come to wealth from a social position of the lower classes as opposed to someone who had inherited wealth. On the surface it may seem an inconsequential, even ridiculous, distinction. But the difference between New Money and Old Money is not the money, but the rationalizations that go with inheriting wealth. It is the set of beliefs taught from one generation to the next, with which they justify the "Rigged" games of politics and economics that keep Old Money on top. As I explained in the beginning of this book, it is imperative that we be able to feel good about ourselves. It is at the core of mental health that we be able to justify our position on issues. So when those of the lower class were locked below decks aboard the Titanic in order that Aristocrats could be saved, it would be necessary for those in the life boats to be able to rationalize their right to live at the expense of those below decks. And it would certainly offend, to have that right questioned by someone such as Molly Brown. But without the rationalizations of Old Money firmly in place as part of her upbringing, of course, that is exactly what the outspoken Molly Brown would probably do. The original meaning of the word Aristocracy, refers to a form of Government we did not discuss earlier. It is "Government by the best citizens". It



is “government by a privileged minority or upper class, usually of inherited wealth and social position.” [Webster’s]. There will be those who say I have wrongfully defamed FDR and his motives concerning Social Security. I do not know his motives but I do recognize the rationalizations of his line. Before Social Security was passed into law it is said that it ran into trouble with the Supreme Court on the grounds that they considered Social Security to be unconstitutional. Whether their concern was to stop Socialism or to protect the citizens of this country from what was to come, I can not say. What is known is that he is said to have threatened the Justices with changing the law as it pertained to their terms for life on the bench and they folded.

When WWI ended, the soldiers who came home from that war were promised that when they reached retirement age, they would receive an endowment, a one time payment, from the Government. When the dust bowl blew the families of the mid west from their homes during the Great Depression, some of those same veterans headed for Washington to ask their Government to give them those endowments then, rather than let them and their families starve to death. Many of them congregated in Washington DC and a shanty town arose in the shadow of the Nation’s Capital. When it became clear that their Government would refuse to give them the money, they marched toward the Capital. They were greeted by an American military force. Franklin Roosevelt was the commander and Chief of that Army. Among it’s officers were Macarthur and Patton. The veterans were fired on. Some died and the rest were dispersed. The shanty town was evacuated and burned. Its inhabitants were scattered. When the Japanese Navel Air Force was in flight toward Pearl Harbor they were detected on American radar scenes. Word was dispatched but no response was given. Some say that the information went all the way to Washington. Some refute it. In either case, the war that ensued would see a blank check written to “Daddy War Bucks” in all his many disguises and the wealth would once again begin to trickle down, bringing an end to the Great Depression. More importantly, it would restart the economy without “Giving” “Anything” to the common man, because within the line that is the Aristocracy, it is understood that the masses must be controlled. It is understood that they can not be controlled if they will not be driven, and they can not be driven if they are free, and if their survival is guaranteed by their Government, they will be free so long as they prevail as a people.

In the late 1930’s Adolph Hitler was out of politics but not out of luck. He would be brought back into the political arena by those who mistakenly thought they could use him to their own ends. Then one day all the members of Hitler’s old political faction dressed up in their militant uniforms and went to their house of law. Those who were members of the ruling body took their seats in what was their equivalent to our Congress. Those who were not members stood outside or

*George Bailey*

in the isles. Then Hitler stood up before that Assembly, that ruling body, and told them that they were to hand absolute power over to him. They did. No one stood, nor spoke, in defiance. And because they were afraid and because they were weak, Germany would be laid to waste. Its people would be forsaken.

Leadership is best served by the Public Servant. By the Patriot would has come to give of themselves not to take for them selves. The Congress of the United States of America has been besieged by power and money just as the ruling body of Germany was besieged by a gang of thugs: and to the same end. When George Bush ran for President in 1988 he was portrayed by the press as a self made man. After he was out of office he would be interviewed at his Father's old estate in New England. During the Bush administration Phil Collins would come out with a song about the homeless. Against the backdrop of the lyrics of the song,, he recorded Bushes unfulfilled promise to take care of America's homeless. For reasons unclear, the British singer who makes his living as a result of American influences, decided to censor himself, and remove Bush's speech from the song. George Bush Jr. would seek his fortune in the Great State of Texas where the only thing bigger than the State and its piece of the pork barrel, is its Electoral Vote. He would find himself championed by those who stand in the line known as Republican. He would raise so much campaign money on his own that he would not use matching Government campaign funds because they would limit his ability to try to buy himself the position of President. If he succeeds he will come to office twelve years after his father in a time of great economic prosperity. It will be at the Zenith of the Great Society, which denies the middle class the fruits of its labors in order to provide for the needy and which still finds 600,000 Americans homeless.

Just as important to the survival of the Aristocracy aboard the Titanic, was the understanding on the part of those below decks that the Aristocrats had a right to feel as they did. Those who knew their place would not presume to question that the wealthy and powerful go first. This kind of thinking would all but disappear with WWII. It would be difficult to get a republic to go to war to defend a country which was not theirs. The balance would shift from Nationalism as a "Subject" under the monarchy of the Feudal Capitalists, to Nationalism as members of a free and democratic nation. It would be a move in perception that was almost "Socialistic" in nature. As "Comrades" in arms, all levels of the economic and social classes would be fussed together in the effort for survival. Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans and Women would gain equality in a classless, sexless, struggle.

If we look around us today, we can see some very obvious signs that we are being trained to know our place in society: but today, the lines are being formed politically as well as economically. If you watch the police shows and the lawyer shows on television you will see the prosecuting attorneys using plea bargaining

as leverage to gain convictions. Out in the real world, real prosecuting attorneys are using the same kind of tactics in a way that can only be described as extortion. I know of one such case in which a Sheriff's Deputy tried to "Turn" a young girl with threats and extortion, when her only crime was driving her father's car when "he" had mistakenly let the license plates expire on that car. When the local judge was told of the incident his reply would be that it was done in a noble cause. In the movie "Guarding Tess", the hero "Law Man" would shoot off the big toe of a suspect in order to gain information to save the life of Tess: an ex- First Lady. It would be a Nobel cause which would justify the physical torture of citizens, so long as the law enforcement officer felt certain of that citizen's involvement. It would make exception on the basis that she was a ex-First Lady. In "Air Force One" [the movie] the President of the United States would make a speech proclaiming that terrorists would never be negotiated with regardless of the consequences to Us citizens. He would hold his ground while his subordinates were executed and then make an exception in the case of his own daughter. Of course, in the movie, he would defeat the terrorists by his own hand, so as not to give into their demands. But in the end, the message would be clear. That message would be that, when it comes to their own, leaders can not be expected to suffer what they would have the rest of us suffer. So you will say to me that these are movies. That they have no relevance in the real world; and I will say to you that in 1998, it was proven that hundreds, if not thousands, of government workers, "Conspired" with a number of "Fraudulent" Universities, in order to obtain "Sham" diplomas; which they used to either keep their government jobs or to obtain promotions which included pay increases. If you go into the rest room of a Wal\*Mart, you will probably see a sign on the wall which warns that if you shop lift, you will be prosecuted. You will not be allowed to return the item and avoid prosecution. And you will certainly not be allowed to keep the item. If you watch the "Front Line" program I mentioned, entitled "Snitch", you will see that by being in the presents of those who do drugs, you may be incarcerated as a "conspirator", regardless of whether or not you profited from the their illegal activity. And, yet, while all those who submitted diplomas from these fraudulent Universities, can be traced; no one at the Pentagon intends to do anything to those employees there, that defrauded the government. They won't even take back their raises. The other agencies of government involved probably won't either.

In 1999, a scandal broke concerning allegations of bribe taking by members of the Olympic Committee. It was said that individuals may have been lavished with gifts and gratuities in order to sway their opinion in designating the future Olympic sights. In a situation where millions or perhaps billions of dollars hung in the balance, those on the committee who were involved were facing the possibility of being, not jailed, but fired: and they were indignant at even that possibility. Back in Iowa, the new Governor elect would promise to make the

*George Bailey*

thirty year old war on drugs one of his first priorities, in his inauguration speech. A week latter it was announced that the federal government would allocate two and a half million dollars to the fight. In the end the money would go to law enforcement. They will use it to blackmail and extort witnesses. In turn, those witnesses will roll over on anyone they can in order to escape the system and the State will split what it is able to confiscate from all concerned, with Federal Law enforcement. Those put in jail will maintained at tax payer expense: not out the money gathered by law enforcement. It is the "Line" that the nobles stand in. It is this line that Long Shanks contributes to. And it is the serfs who the Nobles place in jail for a Nobel cause and the serfs who pay the taxes that maintain those who are jailed. And while it is true that the Olympic community is not a US organization, it is subject to our laws if its members "Conspired" to accept bribes in Salt Lake City. I know that many of you will still say that those on drugs and those involved in the manufacture and distribution of them are at the core of this counties problems. I have told you that I believe them to be a symptom rather than a cause. In either case; after thirty years of this war it can not be argued by rational people that the drug war helps those on drugs. In light of that, we are faced with two courses. One is persecution and the other forgiveness. In the case of those individuals on drugs our government has chosen persecution. In the case of those who take bribes or falsify documents in order to get government job promotions, the government has chosen to do nothing. In the case of an American President, they have chosen to find him innocent when he was proven guilty. This is the class system of the Soviet Union, which proclaimed that those who have political clout were of the upper class. We have been driven below decks and we have accepted our position as second class citizens in return for a place in line. It is something that we should be ashamed of. Patrick Henry would be wild in the streets in the face of such an affront to liberty. But he lived in a time when our options were not available. Still, when the day comes for you to stand down for the revolution, there will be those of you who believe in what I have said. There will be those of you who do not believe in what I have proposed and that is your right. But many will fail to stand for what is right for selfish reasons and say that it is because they disagree. For them the truth will become a terrible burden.

I have spoken of many things and all of them are lines within which people stand. There are lines that are not bad. To be a Brother, a Father, a Wife; a Field Hand, a doctor, a Mother a Husband: these are all lines which are fulfilling and should be honored as such. To be a Christian is a line as well. It is one of many lines that people may stand in at the same time. But, unless "Christian" is the first line you stand in, second to none, then you risk being true to your lines rather than yourself.

At the end of WWII, our own intelligence community brought the head of the Nazi intelligence agency into its ranks. This is a fact related to all those watching a PBS program that I saw but that, regrettably, I can not name. Never the less, for the purposes of this discussion, we will assume it to be fact. He was allowed to escape the Nuremberg Trials and enlisted to furnish information about the Soviet Union at the dawn of the Cold War. It is in the nature of those who run the government within a Democracy such as ours, to distort the facts. Because what is right and what is just, is often at odds with the design of those in power, it is easier for them to shape public perception and with it, the direction of the country; than it is to act covertly or against public opinion. I have told you the facts about the Oklahoma City bombing as they were related by the media and I have left you to come to your own conclusions because I myself am not even convinced of what I fear. Nor is it necessary for me to convince you of conspiracies within the government to champion this book. At the same time, I would like you to look at the way we have been divided by faction. We, the peoples of these United States of America, are the last man standing in a struggle that really began with WWII. Whether we will lead the world to peace and prosperity in the new millennium, or unravel into a mob which is controlled by a government that seeks a new world order, is not for me to say. Perhaps we will go in neither direction. But as I write these last passages of this work, it has become the law that banks will be obliged to monitor the activity of individual bank accounts for the government. The Drug War has been the Trojan Horse used to strip the Constitution of safeguards for American Citizens. Violence is the soup of the day in entertainment and the press, every day. And if the majority can be held down long enough, and frightened bad enough, and can be educated in Fascism long enough; then they can be used as they were in 1939 Germany to promote an immoral but Politically Correct solution to the problem. And because we are the last man standing: as goes the U.S. so goes the world.

These are the challenges of the future: not the economy, not Feminist Empowerment, not Welfare Reform or even the Environment. In the end, it does not matter if men conspire to send us down this path or if it is Satan himself. I have not come to tell you that these things are about to happen but simply to give the facts that you may arrive at your own conclusions. I tell you this not to make you angry with your government, but so that you will understand that you may well be sitting on a time bomb; and to let you know that this work is a manual to defuse that bomb in the only way I know how. The answer has passed to you without your knowledge. The time has come. ACT!

I have told you how elections are run in this country and tried to help you to see that the votes of mainstream America are negated by splitting us on one issue and then pandering to fringe groups and coalitions to swing the elections in one way or another. I have told you a story of generations, and explained how one

*George Bailey*

that trusted its government blindly would enslave another and prosper from it. I have attempted to help you understand how the RICO laws are being subverted in ways that would never have been allowed under the “Law Of Intent”. I have taken you back to the time of my youth to explain to you the various factions that made up the day during Vietnam; and I have argued that the real connection between the use of Marijuana and “harder drug” use, is the connection between “Pot” and the “Underground”. But there is another connection. In the 1960’s, President Richard M. Nixon had a problem; a real problem. His problem was his ego. He had determined to go down in history as one of the world’s greatest statesmen. But it was the Police Action in Vietnam that was engulfing him. It was a problem he had inherited from John Kennedy, who was foolish enough to get us in the war and Linden Johnson who turned it into a bloody crusade. Nixon’s dilemma was not a moral conflict with the war. It was that the war had stirred up a generation to challenge his authority and the authority of the Government he had waited so long to hold dominion over. Had that generation been willing to die for him, or had he been able to force their participation with a “Pearl Harbor” the way Roosevelt had with their parents, Nixon could have been the leader that he had always wanted to be. But he was not being allowed to steer the course of the country. He was forever having to deal with malcontents. When he looked at this troublesome generation, he noticed that their leaders shared a common thread. He noticed that those who were most active in the movement were likely to be free thinkers who did not conform instinctively to the rules of society. They were more likely to be part of the Sexual Revolution and they were more likely to self medicate. That is to say that, they would take it upon themselves to decide which of nature’s herbs and drugs they would take, rather than allowing the medical or political community to decide for them. It would have been difficult to begin jailing the youth of America for promiscuity; but there was a ready made avenue with regard to marijuana. For reasons which I have never fully understood, the government had instituted a campaign of propaganda against the dreaded “Mary Jane” a generation before. The movie “Reefer Madness” had been a Holy triumph in generating irrational fear and paranoia with regard to the realities of marijuana use, within the previous generation. It is not unlikely that if we could peel back the layers to find the truth, we would discover that those who were looking closely at the emerging Communist movement in the Russia and wondering if it wasn’t better that the oppressive Capitalism of the day; didn’t share that common thread of free thinking and use of marijuana. Or perhaps they had realized that when the veterans of WWI came home and found that they could not drink liquor because the “Holly Rollers” had gained control in their absence, that they might seek out an alternate form of stimulation. Given that we had just come of age as a world power, government might well have rejected the idea of a nation of sedate, giggling and contented people in favor of a drunken mob that could be easily

pushed into a fight. Whatever the reasons, the fear of marijuana was deeply embedded in the psyche of “The Generation That Could”. Nixon began that war against nonconformity known today as the “War on Drugs” by enlisting the help of the Mexican Government. They began with well publicized campaigns of “Hemp Eradication” in which herbicides would be liberally administered to Mexican land and Mexican people, in a manner which has by now become a way of life for those who live where ever drugs can be grown south of our border. Just as today, of course, the “pot” continued to flow north along a trail of money. Over time the distribution would come under the supervision of the “Mob” and they would reap the benefit in cash. But the real benefit would be to Nixon. Down in Mexico, the occasional American decedent was ending up in Mexican jails as drug offenders. Here at home the penalties for pot were very often minimal. Of course, in the paradox of the American landscape, individuals were serving life sentences for “Possession” as well. But this idea that you could use marijuana to control political decent had merit. So much so that it would remain the tool of government to the end of the century. At the local level, cash incentives could be handed out to local court and law enforcement at the same time as the rationalizations of that line were administered. So long as the those who used pot could be kept from speaking out with the threat of seizure of assets without a trial; and the “Flag Wavers” within “The Generation That Could” could be used as a voting block to keep the hysteria alive, and marijuana could be lumped in a group of drugs that could clearly be shown as dangerous: the McCarthyism, know as the “Prohibition” of marijuana could continue to make political prisoners of citizens of these United States of America. In this way, free thinking and political activism could be kept to those issues which did not confront government. The “Protesters” would simply keep their heads down and try to get through life as best they could. Some of us would give up pot as we moved into adulthood and some others would continue to use it. Those of us who stopped would not feel the need to buck the system of oppression and those who hadn’t, wouldn’t dare. Those who once had nothing and nothing to lose, would become invested in America and quiet, if not content; and in so doing, they would teach conformity to their children.

With the revolution, the Drug War will be over. Just as importantly, those who are currently in prison on drug charges will be freed, so long as they are not a threat to society in any way other than their connection to the drug culture, regardless of their participation within that culture. Remember, we have promised amnesty to corrupted cops. Forgiveness, remember? Those who can test drug free should be released as soon as possible once job spitting is in place. Their cases should be reviewed on an individual basis. Just as with all prisoners released from Tier One and Tier Two prisons after the revolution, they will be Capitalized upon their release with travelers checks in the equivalent of 200X, at the time of their release. For those released after the revolution but before X is

*George Bailey*

calculated, that figure shall be \$2,000.00. In this way they can get started again. It's a small price to pay when you consider that if they fail to stay out in society, it will cost us \$30,000.00 a year to keep them locked up. In this way they can begin again, independent of those people and forces which sent them to prison. If any of them test drug positive then it should be a matter for the press to look into. When they are released it should be according to the new guidelines laid out here within. In the end, this release will facilitate the free space we need to begin our new penal system. At least one in three individuals currently held in our nation's prisons will probably find freedom through this amnesty. By placing Tier Three prisoners in our most modern and secure institutions and Tier Two in the most modern and secure of those that remain, we can empty the remaining prisons to begin to set up tier one institutions.

I spoke early on in this book of a vision of the future and what it should be. I see it as based upon a capitalist system of economics which is tempered by a Christian sense of enlightenment. Among its safeguards are a base wage of "X", "Blue Food", a health care system and a welfare system. It upholds an educational system which teaches thought, reality and accountability; and in turn, it strengthens a Democratic Republic, which elects its leaders in an independent and incorruptible forum. By replacing immigration with foreign aid in the form of economic opportunity We can begin raising our lower class into the middle class where they are less likely to multiply their numbers. The pyramid growth which has been the model since the arrival of the pilgrims, is replaced with an imploding model which contracts over time. As population decreases at very low rates of perhaps as little as 1% per decade, urban expansion is arrested. Better housing is maintained as poorer housing is eliminated. Automation and the computer age replace the need for labor from the masses. New energy sources, realized in the grand forward march of mankind that used humanity and fossil fuels to achieve an end that was part of the grand design; have freed humanity from both toil and pollution. It then becomes a question of who among us will be wealthy as compared to those around us within society. As I mentioned before, our standards by which we judge our circumstance have changed dramatically over the last half century. It then becomes a question of median wealth, which is reflected across the board within the nation as a whole; as opposed to wealth in excess of that median. It is, after all, an impossibility for each of us to be of the wealthy class. Were there not those who were still in the acquisition phase of accumulating wealth, there would be no one to perform the services or make the goods, which one uses their wealth to purchase. With that in mind, it becomes necessary for us to assess the value of all occupations and come to a "Moral" judgment of their value within a society. If we do not, then we will polarize as a country, rather than move forward to the full potential of the promise of the future. I'm I suggesting that we set salaries, and "Fix" wages and prices? NO! But what I am trying to do is to make you understand that market forces within a



Capitalistic economy will cause competition for goods and services that increase prices and negate increases in income so that we are manipulated to fight over nothing. The result is the kind of inflation we saw in the 1970's. It is the same type of inflation we are witnessing today in over valued stocks within the stock market. The historical way of dealing with this glut of wealth within the middle class is for the system to move wealth back into the hands of the few; either through inflated interest rates or through stock market implosions. In a system of "Capitalization", Government seeks to maintain a balance between growth, consumption and the accumulation of wealth, by working toward a shorter work week within the private sector. Once a short work week is established, then and only then, does Government shorten the work week for Government employees.

Let us examine what I have just explained from another perspective. Let us suppose that the Baby Boomers had been given their chance at a lower interest rate and that they had succeeded as a group in a big way. Let's say that they did so well in fact that the growth that We as a country experienced was so great, that everyone who worked a steady job from any time after 1970 until 1999, was now a millionaire. Let us further suppose that we were so productive that we produced enough goods that the price of those goods was not inflated due to our competing for them; so that it did not negate our accumulation of wealth. In such a scenario We will still find ourselves competing for services. Because the majority of the population has accumulated wealth, that wealth is devalued by inflation at the service level. Why? Because it has to be. Not everyone can sit and be entertained or served or even administered to: not even a majority. Only the chosen few can have that "LUXURY". In the system of Capitalization which I propose, that Luxury class is drawn from those who innovate and take risk. Because of their innovations or because they risk Capital; they reap the rewards of the system and in so doing they raise the bar for the masses. Today it is the "Elitists" who use Professionalism to achieve their place within the system who are rewarded. It is those who have the political power who usurp wealth from those who produce it. It is the accumulated wealth of the "Nobel" class who gleans the profit from the Capitalistic endeavor. When "WE", as a Nation, determine that those who produce wealth from investment of innovation and capital have a right to their reward: when we determine that the vast majority, which is not of this group, shall be allocated an economic position along a line which begins at "X" and extends along a spectrum that reaches to a position well below that of the Luxury class: when We strive, not to stand on each other's shoulders, but to move toward more leisure for all, while maintaining and improving our standard of living: then We will fulfill the promise of Democracy. Some will say that we currently have thousands of new millionaires in this country and that many of them made it as entrepreneurs. But many of them also made it through 401K retirement plans. Of those who did innovate for it, the overwhelming majority of those fortunes were made in the computer industry, and while it is an important industry, it is not the

*George Bailey*

only industry: although, and unfortunately, it is fast becoming our only industry and that fact illustrates my point as well as anything I could show you. What's more, their fortunes tend to be on paper. At the turn of the century, there were 4,000 millionaires in America at a time when workers worked a ten or twelve hour day for \$1.25 a day. Today the average postal worker will make a million in wages over the course of twenty five years. Most of our new wealthy class is an illusion, and while they live a life of affluence, the price they pay for that life of affluence is that they live in a society which is violent and precarious, because they are only wealthy relative to the poverty around them.

On a related note, not everyone can live forever. Without the willingness of one generation to move on or at least leave the planet, there can be no room for generations to come. Again we are faced with moral dilemmas without moral leadership. It is not difficult to imagine a very different world than the one I have promoted. It is easy to believe that those who hold Old Money will convince us that survival of the fittest is born out in their achievements. That the Monarchy of which they are a part, is both, Ordained by God and worthy by right of their conquest in the game of Capitalism. In fact it is easy to imagine us being marched off to the lower decks as losers in a rigged game. But it is not my mortality that concerns me, it is that of generations to come.

It is not an improvement in society to make idle the hands of a people any more than it is to have the rich live forever. It should not be the goal of a nation to become stagnant or lethargic. In the vision of the future that I propose, people do not aspire to be served by others, but rather they look forward to taking their turn as he who is served and then as he who serves; he who administers and he who is administered to. People do not waste their lives waiting their turn, nor do they fail to prepare for their future. They do not try to live for ever, but they are healthy in their time and they revel in it. There is abundance and conservation. There is power and there is power relinquished. There is struggle and there is security. And above all, there is Brotherhood. As populations decline, population centers contract. Rural populations become more and more a part of the ecosystem in which they reside. The earth is renewed, vibrant, and the people of the world find that their greatest challenge is to be worthy of their bounty. They have time on their hands and they spend that time in the pursuit of a kind of contentment we can not begin to fathom and they look back upon the darkness which was the world in which we live today and give thanks to God and to those of us who stood when we had the chance.

We have debated these issues discussed within this book for the last thirty years and have reached no consensus of opinion. During the writing of this book, Ross Perot emerged with the promise that he would be a consensus builder, and I thought that perhaps my work would be done and the burden I feel, lifted. But even if Mr. Perot were to have been elected and managed to stay alive through his

term, he would not have been able to cover all these things we have discussed, within the short span of his “Town Meetings”. He would have been forced to confront special interests one at a time; and as some gave up their political and social advantage, things would have begun to improve, only to hear those who still retained advantage say “Enough change”. This work, be it good or bad, is singularly significant in that it is the first of its kind. I have tried to cover the grand scope and confront each person and each group with what they must bring to the table in good faith. I have stirred the pot and tried to disperse what has been given up, amicably and without preference. Like a patent, this idea is unique. It can not be remade without becoming a copy. If a copy is considered as a substitute, then others will follow; each changed slightly to favor one point of view or one special interest over another: and the process of debate over which plan to advocate will rage for another thirty years. That’s if we have another thirty years. You see, in writing this, I had anticipated the possibility that things would only get worse between when I began this book and the year 2000. Had that been the case, then violence is the lesson of history. So far that has not been the case in an economic sense. And I don’t hold out much hope that anyone would move to improve the nation for the sake of those to come, if America at large is prospering economically. Still, the future is in the hands of God in the end and with this book I hope to avert that violence as much as I hope to see these things I have put forth come to pass. It is a safety valve. For I realize that even in the poor economy of 1992, and the social insecurity of 1996, people are not ready to revolt. Some talk of tax revolt at tax time. Some talk of election reform at election time and again at tax time. But most people are still more afraid of change than they are of a corrupt system that they can survive in. It is when it becomes unsurvivable that people will seek change. For the young, who love change, and embrace new ideas, and who still remember the sting of hypocrisy; who feel disfranchised and betrayed, I offer this up to you. Study it, consider it, discuss it. If you feel that, as a whole, it serves; if it is fair, then embrace it. Spread the word. Offer it up to those you meet but do not deny them the right to disagree. Do not forget that change does not come easily to those who have invested their years in old ways. Educated yourselves. Become indispensable and productive members of society. Live in the truth and prepare for the revolution.

For those of you in my generation: ask yourself if you will take the opportunity while the helm is at your command, to make the changes you sought to make all those many years ago, when you were young, naive, ill-advised and finally thwarted. Ask yourselves, as I did, if you have done all you could to leave this world a better place, as all the generations before you have. Let your contribution be not a better standard of living but a better standard of life. If we are adamant, we will see change without revolution. If we have consensus, government will move to appease us. But if government is unwilling, or more

*George Bailey*

likely, unable, then we have a plan in place, ready and I believe, God willing, up to the task. NO, it is not perfect. But there is no perfect plan for life in an imperfect world; and as I said, it is this or nothing. Furthermore, if you fail to take this opportunity for change, then it falls to you to defend your actions to your children. If you can show them that this revolution is not necessary to their success in their time, then you must also teach them the rationalizations of “Old Money”; because they will prosper at the expense of those who were not franchised by money and privilege. But know that if they should fall from privilege by their own mistakes or by the manipulations of government or Capital, then you have left them stranded in a world without means, and from which there is little hope of escape.

Had I been able to finish this book as I envisioned it in 1993 or 94, it might have been less obvious to you why I chose George Bailey for my pen name. I had no idea when I started out, that I would come to understand and to challenge the Banking system under Old Man Potter. The forces of the old order under oil and money which I have sought to overthrow were intangible, even irrelevant, to the lessons I understood when first I set out to change the world. In spite of all that I have learned, the same simple truth that I began with has not changed. It is not he who does a great thing who changes the world but he who does the right thing over a life time. You can find George and Mary Bailey in all of us. And if we can find them together we can have our revolution. As to why I call this Revolution Number Ten; it is a reference to the revolution we have been losing for over a quarter century. Back in the sixties, during the formative years of my generation, the “Beatles” came out with a song called “Revolution”. It called us away from the violence of the “Weathermen” and “Black Panthers”. When “Thunderclap Newman” called on us to “Hand out the arms and ammo”, we refrained because we had come to understand that violence solves nothing. Today’s generation does not know the fear brought on by the threat of nuclear holocaust that mine did. It senses something more tangible. Its heroes do not speak of a search for truth, but of an “Eye for an Eye”. If revolution must come, then let us prepare for it in a way that retains the spirit of the song “Revolution”. But this time let us be agreed upon a plan. That same Beatles “White” album also contained a song called “Revolution Number Nine”. The music was strange, disjointed, erratic. In many ways it was much like the political struggle of the last thirty years. It lacked cohesion. It was not tied together in a way that made the notes into a song. My hope is to restore cohesion to the political struggle that began with the best intentions. Like the lyrics of the song “Revolution”, I have tried to prevail upon you how “NOT” to proceed. But unlike the song, I have tried to provide solutions. This time, let us be agreed upon a plan. Let us have our demands laid out and our will consolidated.

Revolution Number Ten is based on the lesson of India under British occupation and the leadership of Gandhi. It was the method used by Lek Fluenza to bring down the old USSR. It barrows on the simple principle that, if all those who bear the burden of society lay down their loads, government and industry ceases to function. Faced with that, the terms of the working classes must be met in order to resume operations. In the case of India, Britain simply withdrew. In our case, government will have to agree to initiate our demands. It would be impossible to make all the changes laid out in part Two over night. To that end, I will attempt to lay out a time table for change and the consequences for goals not met. It will be as exacting as possible and as realistic as I am capable. Beyond that, You are on your own. I will not lead you. I can not. I will not defend this book in a public forum. It will stand or fall on its own merits. I will not be scrutinized under a national microscope for I am a mere mortal. I do not wish to become a public figure. I will not become a leader nor will I become a martyr if I can help it. In fact, I would ask only one thing of you in return for my labor: that I be allowed to remain a “private” citizen. It is for each and every American who carries a burden to carry this on his or her own.

Do not gather in crowds. Do not shout from mountain tops or from pulpits. Do not argue with those who feel threatened. Simply offer it to those who will listen. Carry it with you and prepare. Always remember that this book challenges the belief systems of many people. Rationalizations based on those belief systems, as we have discussed, are at the core of our mental health. Those who come to understand their own rationalizations for what they are, may find themselves willing to change. But if you attempt to champion this cause, you must understand that you can not force people to accept responsibility for the problems of today. You can not tread on their self esteem without putting them in a corner from which they will defend themselves rather than open up to the truth. If they read it for themselves in this book; if they come to understand through their own discovery: they can reflect and choose to face up to the fact that they, along with the rest of us, are part of the problem. But if you challenge them, they will be compelled to deny responsibility, and that can only strengthen their rationalizations. Remember always that no part of the book stands well on its own, and that there is hardly a soul in the country who is not asked to give up something that they are afraid to lose. Therefore, bring them along slowly. Or better yet, encourage them to read for themselves or even read it to them. There are far too many changes outlined in this plan to assimilate in one conversation. Discuss its merits with your peers: but refrain from trying to convince those who refuse to look at the whole elephant. You can defend none of its parts to those who remain blind to the animal. But if it should truly become the will of the people that these things should come to pass, it shall be so.

*George Bailey*

With the coming of the end of the millennium, if the people are so inclined, we will have our revolution. Because so many of us live in temperate climates, I think it prudent that we wait until we have summer before we engage in such an endeavor. The Founding Fathers had good reason to chose the 4th of July to stand defiant. The weather is good, the crops are in. It is as good a day as I can imagine to begin again. On that day of enlistment, only one thing is required of the army of the revolution. They must resign themselves to stay home when the holiday weekend has come to a close. It is important that we stay home, as opposed to going to a park or shopping. The shopping should be obvious, since a shut down of the economy can not be accomplished if revolutionaries support local "Tory" businesses during the shut down. As for the parks, especially in the beginning, there will exist a great danger that those opposed to the revolution may try to insight violence. Such a situation would allow the government to impose Marshal Law if so inclined and thereby seize what is left of our personal freedoms to put down the revolution. There may be concerted attempts of all manner to create leaders to lead our struggle so that they can be manipulated and in turn manipulate us. They may raise leaders only to destroy them in order to detour our resolve. It may be that I find myself at home alone, while the entire world goes to work as if nothing ever happened. But remember, if we are to have a revolution, we will have no leaders in this other than ourselves and will accept none. Our demands will be met as laid out or we will continue to sit out. I understand that most of us will find it difficult to close our business or stay away from work for even a day. It is a paradox that has always baffled me that those who are most eager to fight or even to die, are often those most afraid of persecution or even criticism. Even the twelve Apostles of Christ were subject to such weakness. The Bible tells that when the soldiers came for Jesus, the Apostles drew their swords. One of them even severed an ear from one of the soldiers. But Christ stopped them. He then healed the soldier's ear. Within that same night, the apostles, faced with persecution, were scattered in denial. In the end, it seems that it takes more courage to stand for justice than it does to die for it. Because of this, I would urge those whose hearts are with us, but who resolve is weak, to sign up for vacation, or save your sick days. It will be that first day that sets the tone for our struggle. It is not impossible that the media will distort the truth of the number of you who drop out. To this end, you may want to call your friends, communicate on the citizen's band radio or the Internet, or even send a representative of your fellows out to scout. But refrain from the temptation to travel out if you can. For one thing, it may cause you to buy gasoline, which is in conflict with our goal. More importantly, we want the streets to be empty so that our will is obvious.

Remember that, while I hope that government workers will join in our struggle as well, it is not necessary to our cause. It is those who produce goods and services, who carry the weight of the nation; and regardless of what

bureaucrats do, without those same people producing the wealth, the wheels of commerce will cease to turn. For those government and private workers who perform essential services, such as the police, the military and fire departments; as well as emergency personnel, hospital workers and those who take care of the elderly, it is best for all that you man [stay] your post. Essential services such as garbage pick up and utilities should also continue to function. In order for you to show solidarity with those who stay home, you can wear a yellow arm band to symbolize your wait for the return of liberty and justice for all. I very much hope that you will do so. Remember that this is not a revolution against government workers. Your jobs are just as endangered as those who work outside the government if our system falls apart.

It is impossible for me as an individual citizen, to fix a time frame within which the government will give in. What's more, it would be imprudent to disclose it if I could. But if our numbers are great enough and our resolve strong enough to bring things to a stand still, it will be all the shorter. It may well be that such a movement will meet with much less resistance than I anticipate; but that is unlikely when you consider that it is the two "Parties" [Democrats and Republicans], who run Washington and every political seat from there to your home town, who will become impotent should we succeed. It is they, and those who pull their strings, who will be disfranchised under election reform. Many of the laws that protect the powerful from meeting justice will fall away as well, which leads me to believe that even if we are succeeding we'll be told by our leaders and our press that the revolution has failed. If the conspiracy theories of world domination have the smallest truth in them, then surely those who are so close to accomplishing their goal will stop at nothing to break our resolve. But even if they bring us to war with foreign nations, we can not lose our way. If it comes, and well it might, we must resolve that on the first 4th of July following the end of the war we will have our revolution again. And when we succeed we shall surely deal harshly with those who conspired to divert us; for if a Democracy stands for change, then those who would subvert it have committed treason.

There will be those who will tell you that there is something wrong in what I suggest. That we have a government which we should follow because we are a Democratic Republic. I would tell you that the fact that we are a democracy is exactly why we have every right to proceed if we wish to. If We the people have come to a point were we feel so disfranchised by our government that we are ready to stand up to that government, then, according to Thomas Jefferson, we have an obligation to do so. This book is a vehicle for fulfilling your obligation without violence; and you, as a citizen of a Democratic Union have every right to demand these changes.

*George Bailey*

Some will tell you that this book has infringed on State's Rights: that because I have made changes at State levels which are uniform throughout the nation, individual States will be forced to go along. That is true. But because uniformity serves the residents of those States and keeps the good old boys of those States from taking advantage of those citizens, those States will ratify those changes on a State level as well. We will not be divided for the perpetuation of the "politically entrenched". States rights are preserved to serve the people of the State, not the politicians. And with this revolution, the people have spoken.

Some will tell you that I have not worked out all the details, and they are right. For instance, taxes on gambling. Will we tax each bet? Of course not. We will assess the income of gamblers and gambling establishments pretty much the same way we do now. Then we will tax our percentage of gross. But if you sell a stock option then you have received compensation for a real asset and you owe the tax. "Futures", as well, represent real property. I said I would address the dispersal of monies gathered by government which is not a flat tax on income. So I will say now that when States, counties or municipalities raise money in any fashion other than income tax, it shall go to the Federal Government's General Fund. And when the Federal Government raise money through fines and the like [which do not fall under other provisions made here within], that money shall be equally dispersed to individual Federal taxpayers. By now you should be able to see why. You should be able to find your own way by looking at the goal of watching out for each other, as you would like to be watched over. In the end, it will be up to each of us to decide if you will resist and for how long. And should the strength of our character be great enough to bring our governments, from the Federal to the City, to their knees, we will proceed as follows.

On the date of concession [that is the day when all the governments under who's jurisdiction you fall, [ Federal ,State, County and/or City] concede: people within that locality will return to work and reopen businesses. On that day, even before the various legislative branches have ratified the passage of such laws into affect; it shall be that these things are the law:

- A. "The Right of Self Determination" as expressed in this book
- B. No fees or charges for Government services: no taxes or costs as explained in part two
- C. "The Law of Equal Measure"
- D. No more law by Precedent
- E. "Payment In Kind" for police and Prosecutors
- F. Suspensions and prosecution for illegal gathering of evidence
- G. End of defense by reason of insanity



- H. “The Law of Intent” and the “Statement of Intent”
- I. The legal Axiom that the custody of the children equals all other assets.
- J. Fraud in the scope as discussed in part two is a felony
- K. Patent infringement as theft
- L. Abolish R.I.C.O.
- M. Abolish “Quotas” as they apply to Women and Minorities
- N. Abolish Sexual Harassment laws
- O. Abolish special protection, privilege or marital status for homosexuals
- P. Abolish the “Teaching” of Homosexuality as an alternate lifestyle in public schools
- Q. Repeal Civil Rights laws passed since 1968, and mark the beginning of the twenty-five year period
- R. End Citizenship as a birth right unless one parent is a U.S. Citizen
- S. Taxes for churches on worldly endeavors
- T. Separation of Church and State is not to be construed as separation of God and State
- U. Outlawed Unions and frozen their pension funds
- V. Naturally occurring drugs shall be legal for adults
- W. Controlled substances shall be decriminalized as outlined in the part two
- X. The U.S. Forest Service shall freeze all future timber sales and anything not harvested by December 31 shall be a sale considered void
- Y. An end to road building in National Parks and other National Property without the express and specific act of congress for a specific road
- Z. Gambling and Pornography shall be banned from being broadcast or transmitted by electronic means
- AA. Drug testing shall be viewed as the unconstitutional suppression of an individuals rights of presumption of innocence that it is
- BB. The 51 files which pertain to the assassination of John F. Kennedy shall be made public
- CC. The U.S. Forest Service and its sister agencies shall amend their land acquisition practices as outlined in part two
- DD. The use of long rang telephoto lens for the purpose of invasion of privacy shall be a felony
- EE. Capital may be acquired through the sale of stocks without the involvement of Government
- FF. Malpractice suits for Pain and Suffering shall be abolished

*George Bailey*

GG. The ten year window for Native Americans shall open

HH. The term “Non-Profit” redefined to mean that no one involved makes more than the X wage

It shall be stated that those monies generated by the cities, counties and states in the form of fines, shall be handed over to the federal government at the end of each quarter. Conversely, all monies gathered by the federal government from fines shall be equally divide between taxpayers on a yearly basis. The goal is to encourage systems to find alternative methods of modifying behavior. More importantly it is to put an end to the misguided practice of supporting government through fines imposed to generate revenue. If the “Speed Traps” of the country, in all their many mutated forms, are forced to pay rather than benefit; then they will cease to exist. It is more productive to have a point system on driver licensing that carries over from State to State.

From that time, when we return to work, government from the Federal to the local will have 60 days to implement the following.

Compute and implement the minimum wage, subject to:

- A. The education standard using current diplomas and the equivalents there of.
- B. The language requirement using local standards until Federal standards can be outlined.
- C. The age requirements, both high and low.
- D. The college exemption.
  1. Implement Job Splitting through the local employment office until a permanent office for their purpose is set up using unemployment insurance benefit monies to subsidize employers
  2. Implemented the 20% “Head Of Household” incentive for jobs four to six hours and tailored to school schedules
  3. Put an end to tenures and government job protection practices
  4. Implement 1 1/3 time for overtime.
  5. From the day US workers return to work, all taxes and fees etc. as mentioned in Part Two, will be outlawed with the exception of the income tax on gross income as discussed. The beginning rate will be as follows:

- A. Federal 10%
- B. State 5%

- 6. There shall be an end to the collection of:
  - A. Unemployment insurance
  - B. Employer's matching social security
  - C. Employee's Social Security
  - D. Union Dues and their associated charges to employers
  - E. Workman's Compensation Insurance Premiums

At the end of the first full work week, area State and Federal tax collection centers must be established and made public. It shall be collected using the thirty working days from receipt of income deadline rule. This will be the case until States have worked out their percentage splits with counties and cities. Mail sent so addressed shall be free of postage charges now and forever. Employees may opt to have their taxes withheld and paid directly by employers, but it shall not be the obligation of the employer to withhold taxes at the request of any government authority. It shall stand from here forward that the masses have the right to make their own contributions so that a tax revolt is easier to accomplish should the need arise. Taxes will be due on "All" income starting from the first day we return to work. But the government shall forfeit all the taxes due for the period Jan. 1, 2000 to the day that we return to work that have not been paid [with the exception of me personally. I will continue to pay at whatever the new rate turns out to be]. And it shall be passed into law that the Federal government may not barrow money.

- 7. The Federal Government will reestablish the Postal Service as a member of the Federal bureaucracy and affix a postal rate which is consistent for all mail by weight and or volume
- 8. All of the corruptions outlined by Ross Perot concerning government employees [including the military] and lobby groups, shall become Federal offenses, with a mandatory three year, first tier sentence
- 9. The content of commercials and broadcast volumes shall be consistent with guidelines from part two, by law
- 10. The U.S. Forest Service and its sister agencies shall begin reconciliation with those individuals [or their heirs] who wish to apply to reclaim land seized in the last ten year as outlined in part two

*George Bailey*

11. Municipalities should have reimplemented height and strength requirements
12. The various Government printing offices shall have stopped printing materials for general public use in any language other than English [the American version thereof]
13. The new immigration figures will be in force and those who are not already on line to immigrate, will be subject to them. Special consideration shall be given to Asian Immigration in the short run
14. Government days off as discussed in part two shall be in force a. All employers, both Private and Government will have the right to dismiss employees.
15. A national Usury limit of 7% shall become law
16. Withdraw depleted uranium weapons
17. Reissue ALL government and municipal bonds and other securities according to guidelines laid out in part two at a 3% interest rate
18. Open the Fed. Window to business if banks are seen to be thwarting our effort
19. Redefine PUC regulation as defined in part two
20. Completed prison amnesty as discussed in part two
21. Abolished Federal government's right to sell bonds or borrow money
22. Government employee wages shall have been changed to meet guidelines as laid out in part two
23. End special subsidies to immigrants

These are the changes that shall be implemented by the end of the first sixty days from the date we return to work. Remember, in cases such as Sexual Harassment laws, they will simply be null and void. Government printing will just cease to print mainstream material in languages other than English. For those laws which must be written or rewritten; the Preamble of Intent and the Supreme Court's inability to use the Laws of Precedent to muddy the waters will streamline the process. There will still be court cases over the Constitutionality of laws. In the future those arguments will be less weighty on individual cases because the rulings will only apply to individual cases. But for those laws that we have demanded in this revolution: if the Supreme Court finds any of them in conflict with the Constitution, they shall come under a special exemption as a result of the revolutionary nature of this event. Were we to sight precedent we could look to RICO or IRS statutes, or drug testing. But we need not. We have stripped the courts of their Precedents and forced them to give us our day in court rather than

judge us with the past. It should also be noted that We, the United States Of America have just had a revolution and as such We are not obligated to acknowledge agreements made the Governing body We have just revolted against if those agreements are in conflict with the provisions of the revolution.

If these things which we have demanded have not come to pass in the first sixty days, then we shall walk off again. We shall stay off until these things are implemented. In addition, those in charge, at whatever level of government, who have not discharged their duty under the revolution shall be fined sixty days of their pay. For example, if Congress fails to ratify adjust government worker's wages and see that US bonds have been reissued as discussed, then all of Capital Hill, from the President to the aids and the secretaries of both houses shall be fined sixty day's wages or resign.

At the State level, these things will need to be ratified as well. Governors and State's Senators who fail to achieve these goals shall be subject to the same penalties as their Federal counterparts. City and County administrators who fail to find a suitable sight for the unsavory practices of prostitution and gambling, within the prescribed 180 days, will be penalized along the same lines. There will be those who say that they will not find such a "Red Light" sight on the basis that their county or city will not tolerate such a place. I tell you that they throw the first stone against their own glass house. If such activities are found a place in which to occur and held to the limitations set forth here within: then if in truth, there is no one in the area who would use these facilities, they will disappear. But if they are used, then those practices are currently under way in a manner which we have made illegal. I have explained to you that, at a critical time in the history of my generation, a President would ask of a technocrat, "Is there no other way?". To which the technocrat would reply "No". It was untrue. There will be those who look at this plan and say it will not work. I will tell you that if you tell them to make it work as outlined, that it can be done. If they find a flaw they will pick at it to kill your resolve. They must be held true to the "Intent" or they will subvert it. And when it is implemented it will be up to you to decide if it is working. Do not let the press lead you as they did in the story of "Needle Park". People will die in Class One institutions just as they do now on the street and just as they did in the opium dens of the past. The question of the success or failure of this program is whether or not it gets drugs off the street and out of the hands of the non-addicted. For decades the government has failed to do little other than feed itself and grow. These obstacles are not insurmountable. The path is laid out for them. Let them act and act with haste.

After having achieved those goals laid out here to fore, it will be necessary to work toward a second milestone. By the end of 180 days, We will be a nation caught in the middle of transition. We will have placed a large burden on insurance without relieving it of all of its left over problems from the old system.

*George Bailey*

We will have added new expenditures for government without relieving it of its obligations under the "Great Society". By the end of the first 180 days it will be time to implement some additional changes.

From the beginning, Congress shall instate a Head of the National Health Care System. That Head will begin the process of setting up a system of enrollment for those health care professionals we have discussed. It shall begin to appoint Federal Administrative agents to take their positions as members of the local hospital boards. It shall begin the process of outlining the rules of acquisition for the nations hospitals. The value assessed for those buildings, which were the nation's hospitals, will be based upon square footage of area commercial property. The assessment of the equipment within those buildings shall be based upon the un-depreciated value that remains on that equipment. If it has been fully depreciated, it shall pass to us without charge. In cases were that equipment is owned by a private entity other than the hospital, the same rules shall apply. For those who have used their position to engage in investment schemes, there will be some set backs. For hospitals that are currently owned by charitable organization, or churches, the rules of acquisition shall be as follows. If area needs can be met by acquiring other than charitable or religious based properties, then those properties may be spared or acquired at the request of their owners. Of the properties considered, only the best shall be selected first. If it is necessary to include all local hospitals in order to care for area populations, no entity has a legitimate argument to resist such a take over. No charity is of more value than the free care these buildings will facilitate after they become part of the National Health Care System.

Once figures are in place for the acquisition of the equipment and properties. it shall fall to congress to find the funds to begin to amortize a payment schedule at 3% interest, to those who have been forced to sell. It is a hard pill. But it is not of our making. As soon as those figures are in place, and a roster of those members of the health care community who will become Government employees, is in place; the National Health Care System will move to take possession of that system. They will have six months. Within that time frame, it will be up to that same National Health Care System to find and accredit the various disciplines of accreditation as discussed in part two. If no one within the field of endeavor can be found, then it will fall to insurance carriers to supply both insurance coverage and accreditation until such time as the disciplines themselves find an organization of oversight.

It will fall to Government to decide how to transition debts and payments from the old heath care systems to the new. Insured and insurer alike will hold onto their tentative relationships until that 180 days have passed and the new system comes on line as laid out in part two.

Through the first 180 days Workman's compensation, unemployment insurance and Social Security will be liable for claims made against them. Furthermore, they shall remain so until the programs which will take their place are online and functioning. In this way, those States in which private insurance companies administer workman's compensation will be prodded by Insurance Companies to move forward. As we move into the new system, workman's compensation will end. Old outstanding claims will be reassessed by government in the light of a changing world. Settlements may be reevaluated along guidelines laid out in part two. Until that time, benefits shall continue uninterrupted.

In the same way that the FHCS [Federal Health Care System] shall acquire the nation's hospitals, it must be in the process of acquiring buildings for Class One and Two Welfare and Class Three and Four Retirement Aid programs. Using the guidelines set forth in part two of this book, those members of the current Social Security Administration shall be divided along lines which mirror their current functions and begin the acquisition of buildings, contractors and personnel to accommodate Class Three and Four Retirement. As buildings come on line, they will be filled on a volunteer basis. Those with the greatest need shall be accommodated first. The process will not be complete until Social Security benefits cease as we know them and a 2% surplus in available Class Three And Four units exists.

The process of removing individuals from Social Security shall proceed at a rate which is determined by the availability of Class Three housing. At the end of the first 180 days Social Security benefits shall be reduced by 10%. Social Security will continue to reduce payments by 10% of the original figure, at the issuing of each month's check. Should Class Three housing fail to keep a 2% surplus, the next decrease would be postponed to the next check issued within a specific county. But it will proceed once again at the next month to insure that government does not drag its feet.

The buildings themselves shall come from the private sector and shall be purchased at a rate which in keeping with area commercial real estate as it exists 90 days into the revolution [after our return to work]. Because an exodus of renters from private housing to public housing would cause a drop in real estate values that would be adverse to stability, this method of acquisition sees the "Mean" [an averaging method] properties become public, thus moving the population from private buildings into public and vice-versa in a shift that does not vacate the area. Instead it redistributes them without lowering demand in the remaining private sector. In the future, buildings which can be made customized to the intent of the system as laid out in part two can be built or modified by the FHCS. For now, the half a trillion dollar budget which is currently used to take care of those who will fall into Class Three and Four, will be able to move us in the prescribed direction.

*George Bailey*

As for Class One and Two Welfare; Those who currently administer our existing system, will be entrusted with the task of setting up our new one. Acquisition of properties will use the guidelines laid out in part two. As with Classes Three and Four, the buildings will use those same 90 day commercial market values. All the classes from One to Four, will amortize their payment schedule like the FHCS did with Hospitals, but Classes One through Four shall pay at 6% over 18 years.

Of course, when the system is fully functional it will all be part of the same FHCS. It will not be "Welfare" as we have come to know and despise it. But it will be a new type of Government charity system which embraces the charitable precepts of the first Insurance companies. It is entitlement which is neither humbled nor proud.

Note: if any of these housing facilities is not statistically as safe or safer than the surrounding community in which they reside, then the contractor shall be found in breach of contract and not entitled to compensation [domestic violence statistical data excluded].

It will be difficult to set up the "Blue Food" program as outlined in first 180 days. Therefore, in order to insure that Blue Food be on the shelves for Christmas, that part of the administration which currently administrates the WIC program shall be entrusted with the task of purchasing and distributing Blue food as outlined in part two. However, in its initial implementation, all those commodities used shall be purchased from retail manufacturers and packaged as outlined. It shall then fall to the old Farm Bureau agencies to work out the acquisition of commodities as soon as possible.

At the end of 180 days:

- A. Hospitals must be on line under the new Federal Health Care System
- B. Class One and Two Welfare housing should be available for all those who are still in need after the X wage has gone into affect
- C. Class Three housing should be available for all those who would take it in place of a Social Security check
- D. Class Four housing should on line for no less than 10% of those who will ultimately need to be there. That percentage should increase by 10% every 30 days until every one is accommodated
- E. Blue Food shall be on the shelf and available to anyone who feels the need, without restraint or registration
- F. The drug distribution centers discussed in part two shall be operational



- G. Government shall have instituted the changes in the laws as they relate to stocks
- H. Tier one banks will come on line to borrow money from the Federal Reserve and open their doors on the first working day of the year 2001
- I. The Federal Reserve will have established a list of Criteria as outlined in part two
- J. The Federal Reserve will be abolished if it has failed to prop up industry in the face of any bank instability brought on by the revolution: its function shall be handed over directly to the Department of Treasury
- K. The prison system, which has been in the process of implementing those changes laid out in part two is operational and ready to be scrutinized by the press
  - 1. The right to protection shall be over riding
  - 2. All other rights may be subject to restriction
- L. Congress has adopted the new election reform rules and the States have ratified them
- M. Disperse all government and union retirement benefit funds held in escrow, to those individuals so entitled without taxation. If no such funds actually exist in a form other than bonds or other government debt, then the citizens of the country shall not be held liable for the debt
- N. There shall be in place within the IRS, a branch prepared to receive, administer and enforce petitions against
  - a. Foreign Government subsidized goods by tax or grant
  - b. Inequitable wage subsidizes
  - c. Environmental subsidies:for goods sold in the United States as outlined in part two
- O. It shall be on the 180th day that the door is opened for law enforcement to come forward to apply for amnesty as discussed in part two. There shall be a thirty day window of opportunity, except in “Special Circumstances” as determined by a “Jury of the Day”
- P. The National Attorney’s File Board shall be in place; within which, District Attorneys are obliged to enter complaints against lawyers, and citizens are able to verify that their complaints have

*George Bailey*

been entered; and years of practice Vs number of complaints can be accessed by the public

- Q. The Federal Government shall have fixed a value to use in figuring educational allotments per child, per school. These monies should begin to flow 180 days from the day we first return to work. They should be for the purpose of academic and trade schools as laid out in part two
  - a. Federal monies shall be string free
  - b. Curriculum changes at the State level should be in place
  - c. Administrative positions should be limited as outlined
- R. Municipalities must have designated zoning for Vice as outlined in part two
  - 1. Identification cards shall have been implemented and
  - 2. State guidelines for health inspections set up [no fees]

Through the months of July through December of the year 2000, all those individuals on Welfare will be allowed to work without penalty to their Welfare allocation. In January of the year 2001, Welfare, as we know it, will cease to exist.

If We want this revolution to succeed swiftly, smoothly and without blood shed, then We will have to compromise. Because pensions for government workers have been dispersed and because there are not likely to be any such funds set aside for Federal Employees, but rather they exist as debt, just like Social Security, Congress is faced with an end to their jobs through the twelve year limit and a loss of their pensions. It would be justifiable to let the situation stand. But it would be unwise. We have limited their length of service and outlawed lobbying after the fact in more than one way. To force Congress into a corner is unwise. Therefore, if the revolution proceeds according to the plan outlined here within, Congress shall be allowed to keep its retirement at the rates they had in 1998. But if We are forced to stand down at any time other than immediately after the 4th of July weekend, Congress, the President and all those who have previously retired from either position shall be disenfranchised from their pensions. This is the carrot and the stick.

Some time in the spring of the year 2001, We should be ready to have those entities know as our Satellite countries, vote as to whether or not they would like to participate as American States in a Union of English speaking States.

By first anniversary of our return to work, we should have a National Employment Data Bank for employee identification as outlined in part two in its start up phase.

By that same one year anniversary We should be busy implementing the new Foreign Aid program as outlined in part two at levels which are at least as high as our old Foreign Aid program.

By the second anniversary of the revolution, Congress should have assessed a value for the nation's rail road's rights of way. It shall be assessed as commercial acreage unimproved, or as a business by the value of its stock,[ less the value of its trains]: which ever is less. In July of the year 2002, the Federal Government will begin to amortize a loan at 3% over an 18 year period, for the payment of those rights of way. They will come under government control on the second anniversary date of our return to work. At that time, they will be open for use to any entity as described in part two.

By the time school starts in the fall of 2002, we should have accredited all those trade schools who qualified and the funding for higher education. A rate of 110% of whatever the local rate for public education is, should be made available to anyone who wishes to receive the education. It should be noted however, that this amount shall constitute their full tuition or we will have merely inflated the amount such education can squeeze out of students. If Higher Education does not respond then innovation will have to be the key. Beyond the four year College or University education, it will be up to Government to design systems which insure Graduate studies are within the scope of what is available. If the majority of today's new Doctors of Medicine come to us from Third World Countries, then surely we have both a right and an obligation to equal that accomplishment here at home. If the best they can do is assign a larger coefficient, then at least that is a start.

By the elections of 2002, we should have voter registration as outlined in part two. States should have ratified the changes outlined for State Ballot Initiatives and Propositions as outlined in part two. The conformation of the various government spy and enforcement agencies as discussed in part two should be on the ballot. On that same Congressional ballot We shall take a vote as to whether or not We will continue to allow Women to pursue a career in the Armed Forces in the capacities they have aspired to over the last few decades. We will ask the simple question, "Do you affirm Women as equal participants in the Armed Forces of the United States Of America?" Furthermore, the vote shall be limited to Women voters. If Women are affirmed to participate, then that participation will come with two stipulations. The first will be that, should it come to pass that a "Draft" is reinstated, women will be drafted right along with Men, without regard to their status as it relates to family or motherhood. Secondly, it shall be that any woman who becomes pregnant after once being inducted into the Armed Forces, shall be subjected to Court Marshall. Furthermore, in time of war, such a Court Marshall will carry a mandatory sentence equal to the charge of desertion. In accordance with the decision made by women with regard to their right to

*George Bailey*

serve in the Armed forces, we should reexamine the participation or non-participation of Gays in the military and decide through which avenue they best serve their country.

By January 1st of the year 2007, all manner of nuclear energy production, with the possible exception of submarines and space probes, shall be banned; along with testing and subject to sanctions as laid out in part two. This would not stop nuclear medicine applications.

It is my fervent hope to see America celebrate the two thousandth anniversary of the death and resurrection of our Lord, as a Nation reborn. A free people who are protected by their government while retaining their liberty. A people who do not hide from their past and who are not afraid for their future. A humble people who are a beacon unto the world. Furthermore, while all the hype that surrounds the coming of the year 2000 speaks of the new millennium as beginning on Jan.1, 2000; it seems to me that the second millennium is not complete until the year 2000 is over as this is the 2000<sup>th</sup> year of our Lord. That would make the year 2001 the beginning of the new millennium, wouldn't it? All this constitutes a great amount of change in a short span of time. It requires vast new expenditures in some areas and an end to others. You may well ask how we can lower taxes and address all these new issues at once. So let me spell it out for you as simply as possible.

Federal Government Finances and Employment

No. 537. Federal Budget—Summary: 1945 to 1998

[In millions of dollars, except percent. For fiscal years ending in year shown; see text, Section 9. The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 put all the previously off-budget federal entities into the budget and moved Social Security off-budget. Minus sign (-) indicates deficit or decrease]

YEAR	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus or deficit(-)	Outlays as percent of GDP <sup>1</sup>	GROSS FEDERAL DEBT <sup>2</sup>				As percent of GDP <sup>1</sup>
					Total	Federal gov't account	Held by the public		
							Total	Federal Reserve System	
1945	45,159	92,712	-47,553	41.9	260,123	24,941	235,182	21,792	117.5
1950	39,443	42,562	-3,119	15.6	256,853	37,830	219,023	18,331	93.9
1955	65,451	68,444	-2,993	17.3	274,366	47,751	226,616	23,607	69.4
1960	92,492	92,191	301	17.8	290,525	53,686	236,840	26,523	56.1
1965	116,817	118,228	-1,411	17.2	322,318	61,540	260,778	39,100	46.9
1970	192,807	195,649	-2,842	19.4	380,921	97,723	283,198	57,714	37.8
1975	279,090	332,332	-53,242	21.4	541,925	147,225	394,700	84,993	34.9
1980	517,112	590,947	-73,835	21.7	909,050	199,212	709,838	120,846	35.4
1981	599,272	678,249	-78,976	22.2	994,845	209,507	785,338	124,466	32.6
1982	617,766	745,755	-127,989	23.2	1,137,345	217,560	919,785	134,497	35.4
1983	600,582	808,380	-207,818	23.6	1,371,710	240,114	1,131,596	155,527	40.1
1984	666,486	851,874	-185,388	22.3	1,564,657	264,159	1,300,498	155,122	41.0
1985	734,088	946,423	-212,334	23.1	1,817,521	317,612	1,499,908	169,806	44.3
1986	769,215	990,460	-221,245	22.6	2,120,629	383,919	1,736,709	190,855	48.5
1987	854,353	1,004,122	-149,769	21.8	2,346,125	457,444	1,888,680	212,040	50.9
1988	909,303	1,064,489	-155,187	21.5	2,601,307	550,507	2,050,799	229,218	52.5
1989	991,190	1,143,671	-152,481	21.4	2,868,039	678,157	2,189,882	220,068	53.6
1990	1,031,969	1,253,163	-221,194	22.0	3,206,584	795,841	2,410,722	234,410	56.4
1991	1,055,041	1,324,400	-269,359	22.6	3,598,498	910,362	2,688,137	258,591	61.4
1992	1,091,279	1,381,681	-290,402	22.5	4,002,136	1,003,302	2,998,834	296,397	65.1
1993	1,154,401	1,409,414	-255,013	21.8	4,351,416	1,103,945	3,247,471	325,653	67.2
1994	1,258,627	1,461,731	-203,104	21.4	4,643,705	1,211,588	3,432,117	355,150	67.8
1995	1,351,830	1,515,729	-163,899	21.1	4,921,018	1,317,645	3,603,373	374,114	68.4
1996	1,453,062	1,560,512	-107,450	20.7	5,181,934	1,448,967	3,732,968	390,924	68.8
1997	1,579,292	1,601,235	-21,943	20.1	5,369,707	1,598,559	3,771,148	424,507	67.4
1998, est.	1,657,858	1,667,815	-9,957	20.0	5,543,589	1,746,773	3,796,816	(NA)	66.4

NA Not available. <sup>1</sup> Gross domestic product as of fiscal year; for calendar year GDP, see Section 14. <sup>2</sup> See text, Section 10 for discussion of debt concept.

Source: U.S. Office of Management and Budget, *Historical Tables*, annual.

No. 538. Federal Budget Outlays—Defense, Human and Physical Resources, and Net Interest Payments: 1980 to 1998

[In millions of dollars. For fiscal year ending in year shown. Minus sign (-) indicates offsets]

OUTLAYS	1980	1985	1990	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998, est.
<b>Federal outlays, total</b>	590,947	946,423	1,253,163	1,409,414	1,461,731	1,515,729	1,560,512	1,601,235	1,667,815
National defense	133,995	252,748	299,331	291,086	261,642	272,066	265,748	270,473	264,112
Human resources	313,374	471,822	619,329	827,535	869,414	923,765	958,254	1,002,323	1,048,983
Education, training, employment, and social services	31,843	29,342	38,755	50,012	46,307	54,263	52,001	53,008	55,114
Health	23,169	33,542	57,716	99,415	107,122	115,418	119,378	123,843	131,772
Medicare	32,090	65,822	98,102	130,552	144,747	159,855	174,225	190,016	198,135
Income security	86,557	128,230	147,076	207,299	214,089	220,493	225,989	230,886	239,349
Social security	118,547	188,623	248,623	304,585	319,565	335,846	349,676	365,257	381,499
Veterans benefits and services	21,169	26,262	29,058	35,671	37,584	37,890	36,985	39,313	43,114
Physical resources	65,985	56,821	126,004	46,762	70,575	59,197	64,236	60,000	81,087
Energy	10,156	5,609	3,341	4,319	5,219	4,936	2,844	1,483	403
Natural resources and environment	13,858	13,357	17,080	20,239	21,064	22,078	21,614	21,369	23,822
Commerce and housing credit	9,390	4,337	67,600	-21,853	-4,228	-17,808	-10,472	-14,624	3,525
Transportation	21,329	25,838	29,485	35,004	38,066	39,350	39,565	40,767	41,535
Community and regional development	11,252	7,880	8,498	9,052	10,454	10,641	10,685	11,005	11,802
Net interest	52,538	129,504	184,221	198,811	202,957	232,169	241,090	244,013	242,694
International affairs	12,714	16,176	13,764	17,248	17,083	16,434	13,496	15,228	14,480
General science, space/technology	5,832	8,627	14,444	17,030	16,227	16,724	16,709	17,174	17,093
Agriculture	8,839	25,565	11,958	20,363	15,046	9,778	9,159	9,032	10,580
Administration of justice	4,584	6,270	9,993	14,955	15,256	16,216	17,548	20,197	22,274
General government	13,028	11,588	10,734	13,009	11,303	13,835	11,892	12,768	12,878
Undistributed offsetting receipts	-19,942	-32,698	-36,615	-37,386	-37,772	-44,455	-37,820	-49,973	-46,366

Source: U. S. Office of Management and Budget, *Historical Tables*, annual.

*George Bailey*

These are the numbers which rule our lives. If 20% of the Gross Domestic Product [the GDP] for 1998 was \$1,667,815 million, or \$1.668 trillion, then the G.D.P. was \$8.339 trillion.

Big numbers aren't they? But don't be put off. Look at it this way.

$\$8.339 \text{ trillion} \times 20\% = \$1,667,815 \text{ million}$  [Federal Outlays 1998]

That figure of just over 8 trillion is the total of all the newly manufactured goods and services in the country for the year 1998. The Federal Receipts are how much the Federal Government took in for that same year. Our new tax system will tax not only those things listed as the Gross Domestic Product, but it will assess the same tax rate against used goods, and goods as they move through the system. In addition, we can anticipate that many of those who used to cheat on taxes will find it harder to do so when every one stops working with them under the table. Therefore, it is logical to state that a 10% flat tax at the Federal level will generate more than:

\$8,339,075 million	the GDP
x 10%	the flat tax
\$833,907 million	

If you compare the above \$833,907 million dollar figure with what the government spent [outlays] you see that it is about half the money needed. So that when we take into account, used and existing property, tax exempt merchandise, earnings from interest and less tax fraud, we may, in fact, find that we must reduce the percentage of flat tax. For argument sake, let us assume that we can not. Let us say instead that we have to raise the tax to 15% and at the same time, lower Federal expenditures by 25%. This would assume that nothing that existed before 1998 is sold. No interest is paid, no components are taxed as they move from manufacturer to manufacturer and everyone continues to cheat. You now pay the equivalent 7.5% you used to pay as Social Security and Medicare on your gross, and you now pay 7.5% on your gross income as compared to what you paid on your Federal Taxes on earnings after deductions under the old tax system. In this worst case scenario the Federal Government's budget takes a cut of 25% across the board. So let us suppose that no one sells their home, and no one collects any interest and the Federal rate is pushed up to 15% and the State [your State, County, and Municipality] says it needs 10%. You are now paying 25% on your gross income. So if you subtract the 7.5% you paid to Social Security and Medicare, that means you will pay 17.5% taxes on Gross

income as compared to the old system. So compare this unrealistically negative scenario to what you used to pay. But when you do, remember that you now make at least the X wage. You no longer pay fees, licenses, or any other taxes or charges at any level. You have affordable medical coverage, and you pay a substantially lower interest rate on your debt.

As for business; it escaped the same 7.5% on Social Security and Medicare that it used to pay as matching funds on your wages. It was allowed to dump Unemployment compensation, Worker's Compensation Insurance, and the Company Health Care Plan. It walked away from an army of bureaucrats who could no longer justify their jobs. It was shed of the burden of the tax code, property taxes, shelf taxes, sales taxes, taxes which inflated shipping expense, and fee after license after charge after fee.

In the end, I can promise you that the rate will be much lower. But even if it is, you might well ask, how can we have all these things from government at the existing rate of expenditure. Look to no. 538 "Federal Budget Outlays":

If I could never convince our military to learn from the lessons of the Spanish Armada and make Americans realize that the more sophisticated our war planes become the harder it becomes to train pilots in time of war: If I could never make the people understand that a nation which is an industrial manufacturer can convert its manufacturing capabilities in time of war, where as, a country who manufactures only "Software" rests all its hopes against the possibility that no one can find a way to turn off or otherwise thwart their technology. If we were to continue along this same course, supporting the same hypotheses and the same political and economic power structure, which is the Industrial Military Complex: We could do it at 1998 levels and still be keeping in step with the "Cold War" levels that ran Russia into bankruptcy.

In 1992, President Bush, spoke of deep reductions in military spending. Some in Congress talked of 40% cuts. But as you can see, they were nearer 10%. It is important that personnel levels within the armed forces not fall during this crucial transition period. The job market will be absorbing many that were here to fore in government, or on Welfare or other entitlements and subsidies. But even if Defense had to be cut temporarily to finance education, military personnel levels could be maintained: defense will still be able to fund itself adequately by Congress' own admission.

My vision of our educational system is, as you know, about teaching, not baby-sitting. With the changes I have laid out concerning what is necessary from a student in order for them to participate in our school systems, that change will come quickly. With that in mind, a teaching year should return to roughly 40 weeks. That's about 10 weeks vacation in the summer and two at Christmas. Some may decide to have three one month breaks, or whatever configuration they wish so long as kids get at least three months a year vacation, [not to include

*George Bailey*

long weekends]. Teacher's wages should be based on 50 weeks x 40 hours x "X" in return for 40 weeks x 40 hours of actual service. This represents a 1.25 coefficient of the "X" wage for teachers. They are, after all, worth it. But we must not fall prey to a new era of teachers in place of lawyers. If they are educators, a 1.25 coefficient will be enough; and since they may not unionize, if it is not, we will see the writing on the wall soon enough to adjust wages accordingly. Just as with firefighters, time will tell the true value of a teachers wage as it compares to job difficulty versus job rewards, both monetarily and by virtue of personal gratification. If we arrive at a maximum of 12 children per class, and an average of around 10, that reflects a need for 200 x "X" per child to fund an individual teacher [2,000 hours divided by 10 students]. If We allocate 250 x "X" for each student to fund teachers, along with supplies and administrative costs; it is enough to guarantee a solid basic education. In the end, as we have learned the hard way, the rest has little to do with how much money we throw at the problem. So you tell me how many children there will be in grades K through 12 , what the national average for "X" is as a minimum wage, and I'll tell you how much we need to allocate from the federal budget. What ever that amount turns out to be, it should not be left to compete with those old enough to vote to find itself funded. Education, is the corner stone of any democracy. It should be funded right behind "Blue Food" and ahead of all else, including defense. For it is a lack of defense from within that threatens us in the most profound ways. I would also guess that right about now, teachers are looking at that 2,000 hour figure and doing the math for a scenario where X = \$10.00 and panicking. But as educators, you of all people should be able to understand that these wages are adequate as well as equitable in the world we are creating. Like most protected industries, education has been edging up wages in comparison to the private sector in the face of stagnated average national wage. As educators, you should have known, but you did not look beyond your line. You compared a forty week work year and all your other benefits to the private sector and demanded parody dollar for dollar. Then you used your unions to blackmail the public, by holding our children hostage. I urge you now to look and see that these new wages should not be compared dollar for dollar with those of today. As educated individuals, you more than most, should be able to appreciate this truth.

So then, under Education: let us assume that 15% of the population is currently in K through 12. That means that about 40 million kids need a Federal Allotment. If we put ten kids to a class room and pay the teachers \$35,000 a year, as a national average [which included the figure for administration] then we are going to have to have



\$35,000 per teacher  
x 10% ten students  
=\$3,500 per student  
x 40 million number of students  
= \$140,000 million

If you do the math you will see that, that figure represents about one and two thirds of a percent of the G.D.P. for education. In reality, that probably means around 1% in flat taxes or less. But in either case, it still represents a large decrease in State expenditures. It eliminates the need for bussing. It is string free and it is constant in relationship to housing and labor, which makes it free of political manipulation. If We allocate a \$50 billion dollar outlay [\$50,000 million], in the fall of the year 2002, in order to pay for Higher Education and Trade Schools, it would take less than one half of one percent. The return would be incalculable.

When We begin to look at the new FHCS [Federal Health Care System], it become obvious that We have abandoned the idea that whether or not you get medical care depends upon the line you stand in. With the possible exception of those who receive Veteran's income for disabilities from injuries, either physical or mental: pretty much all of the one trillion dollars can now be used to amortize [pay off over a given time frame] the property and equipment for the new health care system. It will cover the cost of contractors and staffers as laid out in part two. It will provide for every one who stands in the line known as Citizen of The United States of America. It will not discriminate by age, or race, or gender, or politics, or income, or military service, or religion: not even if the age is fifteen, or the race is Caucasian, or the gender is male, or the income is average, or the military service is none, or the religion is Christian. It will protect you from the cradle to the grave and never, ever, exert control over you. It will function within a Capitalist society, but it will remain charitable in nature. Because of these things, it will function better for less. Its properties will become investments maintained by the private sector at competitive bid prices, which guarantees lower costs in the future rather than higher. Its Doctors will administer care according to need rather economics or politics.

If we look at it in terms of individuals; let us suppose that 15% of the population ends up in Class Three Retirement Housing. Let us further assume that all of them are single individuals, requiring individual accommodation. That would be 40 million individuals. If each one required an apartment space within the system that was of an average national value of \$40,000.00; and that amount was amortized over 18 years at 6%, it would cost under \$300.00 a month.

*George Bailey*

Maintenance, utilities and security could all be included for a total of under \$500.00 per month; or \$6,000.00 per year.

40 million individuals  
x \$6,000.00  
\$240,000 million

So that this new distribution method costs 63% of current Social Security rates. Furthermore, as time progresses, We, the tax payers, will own the properties. When we look at Medicare, it is not hard to imagine that as the money which used to flow into the hospital building and equipment, will begin to pay us dividends as well. From dialysis to \$10.00 aspirin, taxpayers will see relief and Capitalism will be brought to bear for medical professionals through Education and consumer involvement.

Income Security, which takes care of the blind, the lame and the otherwise impaired, will move to facilitate many of these people in the same way as Class Three Housing. Some will retain those methods which have proven affective in the past. But the idea that those who can contribute, should contribute; the notion that We should reevaluate who has a right to live entirely on the charity of a nation; and how extravagant that charity should be: will have to be reassessed. Independence is something that one should contribute to. In a fair system, a disability is a valid reason to ask for assistance, but it is not an occupation which can demand equity or equality as an occupation. As We move toward an understanding of these principles, those costs which make up Income Security will probably fall considerably. But, it is certain that they will not rise.

The very first issue that the budget shall deal with is "Blue Food": the free commodities acquisition. If entitlements fail to insure that no one go hungry in this country then they are of little value in a democratic society. The second is education. The third priority shall be to serve those who have no where to go and are unable to help themselves. These are the recipients of Income Security. These are not the graduates of Galudette University, or even those bound to wheel chairs if they have the use of their minds and their arms. It is for those who can contribute nothing. We will to see to their needs as I have tried to outlined. From the remainder, let us fund at least a major down payment on Class 1 Welfare housing and Class 2 Welfare Housing as well as our National Hospital System. Money must also be allocated for the operation of those facilities.

If we compare my estimates of \$140 billion for K through 12 education plus \$50 billion for higher education plus \$240 billion for Class Three retirement housing plus the 1998 level of \$240 billion from Income Security [if we didn't change a thing]: and compare those expenditures of \$670 billion to our 1998

Human Resources figure of \$1,048 billion, we still have nearly \$380 billion left to administer the Federal Health Care System. Remember, as we discussed, today we pay \$1,000.00 per day to warehouse people in need of Psychiatric help. Under the new system FHCS administrators will use government staffs to perform the same maintenance, but Doctors will be contracted by administrators so that their involvement in a patient's treatment is assured. If we then rotate administrators within the system and give the Hospital boards oversight, and allow for community involvement through family intervention against overbearing institutions: if we refrain from the practice of allowing Doctors to "detain" individuals in our society who have not broken a law and allow a Jury of the Day to hear grievances from families who feel that the system is unfair or being misused, we can work toward a better Mental Health system, and for a lot less money.

As We look at the rest of the expenditures under the Federal Outlay, We can estimate that some will go down and others will remain constant. But the one that remains, which of the greatest importance is Net Interest. If the total Federal Debt was at 5.5 trillion in 1998, and in that same year we paid 242 billion in interest, then we paid interest at a rate of about 4.4%. After the revolution We will be paying off the debt for the sake of future generations and to prepare for our new system of financing the Government. We will be lowering the interest to 3% while making the same annual payment of 15% of the Federal Budget. In addition, We will forgive ourselves all those debts, such as Social Security, which We owe to ourselves. Municipalities will be refinancing at the Fed Window at lower rates as well. Once the press understands how the system works, they can begin to ask informed questions and pass on the "information". It won't be until all the numbers are revealed, that we will see how fast We can pay off the debt.

Remember that X wages will be implemented for 89% of government jobs. Days off and length of vacation will be greatly reduced which means a reduction in their work force over time as funds begin to flow out of Government's pocket. Hospitalization plans will be gone along with pensions. Veteran's hospitalization as a separate entity will be gone. Medicare and Medicaid as separate entities will be gone. Agencies will receive operating funds from government rather than gathering it themselves and therefore personnel once engaged in that capacity will not be needed. Many entitlements will be gone as well, which will lower the number of allocation positions. Attrition is a good way to shrink the ranks of government. But I am confident that with lower taxes and government wages lowered and government retirement funds dispersed where applicable, many will see this as a good time to retire as well.

Even with the addition of hospital staffs to the fold of Federal employees, the number of employees can be shrunk to meet the budget if jobs are a function of

*George Bailey*

necessity, rather than the “Pork Barrel”. Note: Hospital employees will not be subject to the 89% at X wage rule. But rather, Capitalism should set the price of their wages to draw the necessary numbers of health care workers from the private sector. Eventually a true assessment can be reached just as in the case of Firemen.

Stop and clear your mind of all the figures I have laid out in this last section. I have put them down only to demonstrate that the money needed to operate in the manner I have described is already in our budget. If we need to print money and devalue the currency held by the rich, we can do so to set up the programs I have described. But regardless of the screams you hear from the “Old Guard”; buying and converting these buildings costs very little in comparison to what our government squanders every day. Use logic and reason for just one moment. If we could afford to operate under the old wasteful systems, when We were being defrauded from all sides, how can We fail to be able to pay for the systems I have outlined herein? Reagan devalued our money to line the pockets of the rich. During the turbulent 1980’s, many families would accumulate debt. Through the economic recovery period from 1989 to 1995, the debt to income ratio for the average American family would remain flat [which means they stayed in debt]. But for the period 1980 to 1997, Commercial Banks would see their assets grow from \$1,856 billion to \$5,015 billion [\$5.015 trillion]. So if our economic future hangs in the balance, why would it bother us to see money devalued a bit more, when our personal possessions are either real property [which becomes more valuable as money is devalued] or they are non-existent. When the movie villain “Gold Finger”, went after the gold in Fort Nox in the early 1960’s, the sum total of the nation’s gold reserves was 15 billion. Compare that with a 5.5 trillion dollar national debt. It’s only paper thanks to Nixon, and I sincerely mean “Thanks to Nixon”. If we devalue it to squander it, we throw away our children’s future; but if we use it to create a metamorphosis we preserve our children’s future. Remember that logic tells you that if 10% of the GDP is half the national budget; and between you and your employer the government is getting nearly 14% of your wages for Social Security before you are ever taxed; somebody isn’t paying. The truth is that the amount of money generated by this percentage of tax, assessed as explained earlier in part two, will probably far exceed the revenue gathered under any other tax year. But it won’t be until the dust settles and we see just how badly we have been cheated all these many years, that we will know where an honest percentage should be. At that time, we can increase allocations to the military.

I am certain that many of those in Government are both frightened and angry at my assessment of their situation. I can only give you the facts. If the average national income is just over \$32,000.00 and the average income for Postal workers is just over \$42,000.00, and Postal employees are paid in accordance

with Federal pay scale guide lines, then it should be obvious to you that your average and our average are not equal. Like everyone else in this world, Government workers stand in their line. That line is known as the Government worker. Many of you came out of school without ever entering into the private sector. Your truths are the rationalizations of your line. Your productivity is often none existent. Your contribution is often negative. The system outlined here within serves you better than you have served your countrymen as evidenced in the inequity of our wages. At the same time, let me say that, like the Generation That Could, You did not know. Now you know. If your skills are so exceptional, so exemplary, that you can not be compensated at the future levels, then by all means come out here into the real world and compete against the rest of us for your piece of the American Pie. Show us how its done. I mean that sincerely. And when you have succeeded, remember that you have succeeded, in no small part, as a result of the changes made in this revolution.

I know that many of the elderly will feel that this is a betrayal of their life's contributions to the Social Security System; I can not argue that it is not. But as I have said, it was not the revolution, but those we revolt against, who betrayed you. To continue on in this folly is to ignore the facts and to pretend a little longer in the hope that we can live our lives to the end before the whole house of cards collapses. It is unrealistic and it is unfair to those we leave behind. We will have descent, safe housing for all elderly who desire it for 20% of their income, or we will have new leadership. It is not an impossible dream if we stop, as a nation, trying to be all things to all people. If you as elderly are forced to leave your home, you will have a place to go. If you own your home, and have your health, with "X" wages in place, no other taxes, free prescription drugs, free hospitalization, and access to "Blue Food"; you can live well by working two hours a day if you have no savings or family to support you at all. If you have nothing and move to Elderly Housing where these same things are provided, you too can live well with the same effort and live happier lives for the effort. These are the challenges we face and this is the best plan I have. It is the only complete one I know of. To be sure, there are many flaws. But this work has addressed the roll of the Federal Government for the most part. States, counties and cities, will have 5% of their State's gross income to work with. It will be up to them to fill in the cracks as they see them. The "WIC" program that I mentioned before might also be expanded to the elderly.

No one wants to loosen the grip of the Federal Government more than I. For that reason I have tried to make such things as money for schools free of "Strings". But the Federal government is still the best way to keep the "Good Old Boys [and Girls]" from corrupting small pockets and backwaters of the nation. We must be ever vigilant that the wealthy parts of the nation don't grab up all the

*George Bailey*

marbles when the nation as a whole pays the taxes. It is the balance and the scrutiny we need to achieve our quest: The American dream.

In addition, states and cities may have to raise their percentage of flat tax in order to perform those services which the Federal Government can no longer carry. But there is a major advantage of having the difference made up at the state level. All we citizens of the United States must pay Federal taxes. But if the States raise taxes without off setting the cost with services, people and businesses will begin to move out to other States within our nation, who do a better job of using taxpayer dollars. It is Capitalism for Government. It is perhaps the greatest single reward of a fair tax system that outlaws other forms of revenue gathering. As the tax base in a poorly run State or County or City, shrinks, they will have to raise taxes which will intensify the problem. In other words, governments will have to compete for business and for labor forces. And as long as the level field of a flat tax exists, with everyone [business and individuals] paying the same rate, one can not be taxed to subsidize and therefore, lure the other. This is the critical aspect of an across the board, flat tax. Should it come to pass, let no generation loss sight of its importance.

There will be those who point out that under the new system of tax, if property is sold when the owner holds less equity than the amount of tax, that person will be indebted. This is a truth that is inescapable in the system's design. However: by allowing individuals to declare Bankruptcy against the IRS in the case of such an event, and by allowing the sales agent to receive their compensation ahead of the Government, a second chance can be preserved. It then becomes a comparison between the old system which allowed one to escape with nothing and no collateral to begin again in a dog eat dog system; or a system which provides temporary assistance if needed and allows for the purchase of a new dwelling as soon as 6% [area sales commissions] can be saved. The old system protected the Banking system. If there was no equity, taxes were not collected. This method insures that equity was taxed as well, but provides an avenue to the future for the party in question if they retain no equity.

I have tried to address the funding of the purchase of the nation's railways. Considering that an entire railroad and its right of way in the southwest was sold to a Japanese group in the late 1980's for one hundred million dollars, it would seem that the its value should not be over estimated. It is, after all, the maintenance of them that will become Government's greatest expense in this area. It is for that reason and the fact that railroad operations now in business will enjoy a head start; that I suggest that rights of way be purchased at area acreage rates as they exist at that time, or at the assessed value of the stock [less the value of the trains them selves], which ever is less. Congress can either print money to pay for the rights of way, require or allow the railroads to carry the mortgage at 2% interest, or raise money from the budget if that is feasible. But it may not

borrow money from banks to fund any of the reforms mentions herein. Remember always that such deals are too big not to attract greed. So remind your local press of their obligation to look out for all of us. Remember also, that as with highways, if you want them maintained properly and efficiently, then 99% of all the work [and therefore maintenance] money allocated, should be to private contractors by bid. When ever possible, such maintenance programs should try to specify the quality of the maintenance program rather than the method. In this way government can encourage innovation and reap its rewards; so long as the end result is in keeping with expectations. Since there may be no money in our transition budget to accomplish the job, we shall allow two years for the economy to settle down enough to allow funding to begin if need be. We may have to increase our federal taxes 1% to begin the task. But each dollar put into transportation here will decrease the cost you pay for goods which are transported in the future.

Remember, in the year 2001 the numbers I have used will be skewed by inflation or deflation. But the percentages will always remain constant and that is another major safety factor in this flat tax. It's like when waitresses and waiters asked for tips to go up from 10% to 15% due to inflation back in the late 70's. It was a sham; a fraud. The price of a meal was inflated right along with everything else. So the tip had automatically been raised; even with the percentage remaining at 10. Don't buy into slight of hand. Pay a percentage and rich or poor, you pay your fair share.

It should also be noted , that in the interest of fairness, at some point we need to go back and make sure that a review board is set up to reevaluate those on permanent lifetime disability plans as a matter of course in the revolution: government and private.

If at the end of 180 days from the day we go back to work, all these things have not been accomplished by the State and Federal legislatures, their retirement fund dispersals should be withheld permanently, and new elections should be held at both levels.

As we gain against the national debt, theoretically anyway, the money allocated for the payment of debt interest [15% of our overall budget] will begin to pay part of the debt principle as well. Let us note that, that is what we wish it to do. Let congress resist the temptation to siphon it off. And when at last we come to that glorious day when the debt is no more, we will enjoy a reduction in our flat tax. Just imagine the sling shot effect of that. And imagine the national celebration. Now I think we all understand that congress never really intends to pay off our nation debt. It is the kind of thing that exists as a quagmire out on the fringes. It is part of the illusion created so that money takes on a surrealistic kind of concept. It's like gambling with poker chips. It's not really your money even though you paid your money for them and they are redeemable for money. As

*George Bailey*

long as a nation debt exists, no alarms will sound when government out spends its income. This revolution is about changing that.

It is my belief that the “Snow Balling” effect of a flat tax will only require 10% total to meet all our tax requirements at all levels from the city to the Federal. It is likely that government and those who find our current system rewarding, will tell you that such tax rates will bankrupt business. If that is true, then we, the working class, have been subsidizing business with our taxes for too long. If we have been paying 15% to 25% of our gross incomes at the old 30% of net rate, and still pay nearly that; then what contribution have the wealthy and the big business been making. If they tell you that this represents an actual increase in taxes raised, then let them simply lower the percentage to meet our old Federal budget, adjusted for inflation. As I keep telling you, they can not play with the figures in ways that pervert the system if everything is based on percentages and no other taxes or fees may be assessed against us, and we all pay the same percentage. I’m going to repeat this one last time as well. Please remember, that this may raise the cost of goods some what. Even housing may go up some what. The complexities of the taxes and fees we now pay are too great to fully anticipate how much they will offset the effects taxing of goods at each level of production. But if there are, indeed, substantial increases in the cost US made goods, those increases will be offset in US markets by the import taxes as laid out in part two: and will be subsidized globally under the same rules. In addition, individual Americans will have more discretionary spending. After all, what is accomplished when everything is half price; but after paying your bills and your taxes, you have nothing left to spend. This tax system insures that if you work, you will have the “basics” and Capitalism. Our old system guaranteed nothing at all. It’s fair America, and it’s time.

There are those who believe that the world is run by a group of faceless men like those described in “The Captains and the Kings. There are those that believe that the Jews some how run the world through world banking. Still others believe that the CFR and the Federal Reserve banks are trying to run us into bankruptcy as a nation and conspiring to have the Army of the United Nations take us over. We can be certain that evil lurks in the hearts of men [and women]. We can be sure that as long as world governments allow the Swiss to hide money: and protect them on all sides in time of war, that those who hold the wealth and the power of the world at any given time, are involved in things beyond our knowledge. It would be easy to look at the way President Clinton has successfully promoted the sale of Nuclear technology and missile technology to the Chinese and cry wolf. And because there have been suggestions that he drug his feet in stopping security leaks of advanced nuclear systems to that same country, even as they were contributing to his campaign, it would not be difficult to accuse him of conspiracy. After all, we have proven him to be a liar. It would



not sound unreasonable that our own Industrial Military Complex is looking for a new bad guy for us to pay them to face down. In fact, within the world we live today, it might be harder for some to believe that, this is not, in fact, the case. But I have refrained from conspiracy theories because they serve no purpose here. The world is a wicked place and therefore it is logical to assume that those who control it from behind the scenes are the most wicked of all. The purpose of the work is to assure a place in the sun for all of us here in America and hopefully, in time, around the world. God has delivered us to a place in history where we are able to say no to unjust wars. The system of Democracy in league with Capitalism has, in fact, worked so well that Americans have become sedate. So much so, that I have severe reservations about whether we would revolt in any fashion, regardless of what rights we lose. If we can spread the word of Democracy and Capitalism in the ways suggested in this book, it would be very difficult for any power, hidden or not, to turn us on each other again. If you know who is running the world and why they have failed to make it a better place, then you know more about it than I. But unless you have a plan to alter the way in which we watch out for each other, nothing will change. I believe this might be such a plan.

At this time, in the late fall of 1999 I find that I must add a post script of sorts. In the previous paragraph I again referred to theories of conspiracy. As I understand the concept of conspiracy, it is a process unseen. It is a method by which those who wish to do wrong can hide their actions. What we have come to in this country, is a system which is so unbridled that it may operate openly. In October of this year I watched a speech by a man named Johnny Young on C-Span. He is the man who made the illegal campaign contributions to the Clinton Campaign. He admits that he is guilty of the crimes he was convicted for, and in spite of his claim that he was unaware that rules were being broken, he accepts responsibility for his actions. He has, in fact, gone to jail for his acts. He has also told the Justice department all he knows and yet he alone, went to jail. He cooperated with our government, wore a "Wire", went into witness protection, and yet he alone served time. Twice, according to his law enforcement guardians, hit squads were sent to kill him. What is ironic, is that the only people implicated other than Johnny Young, the only people he is a threat to, are Americans who are not of Asian decent, and yet both "Hit Squads" came here, flew here, directly from China.

I have told you that it was a Bob Dole campaign supporter who championed him as the one who saved Social Security. I have told you that it is my belief that we are given two choices at election time and that I believe our decision is between the lesser of two evils and a forgone conclusion. I have tried to explain to you how Medicare and Medicaid have allowed health care cost to rise unchecked because they skew Capitalism with a blank check. You may recall

*George Bailey*

that not too long after the elections of 1996, Mr. Dole became a spokes person for a pharmaceutical company. As we prepare to begin the side show know as the election process, it has been reported that Richard Gephard and some of his colleagues have suggested that pharmaceuticals be included as part of our current health care system.

It is true that I have set up our new system with pharmaceuticals for the elderly. But that is in a system, which is on the other side of the looking glass from the one we have today. Therefore, with these things in mind, rather than leave the question of pharmaceuticals to congress, I will address it here. In our current system of patent law, it is common to see powerful commercial interests end up with someone's patent rights by paying them a royalty of as little as 2% or less. Once our Federal Health Care System is operational it will begin to dispense pharmaceuticals to the elderly, which can be produced by competitive bid. That is to say that, those pharmaceuticals, which are under patent protection, will not be available until the patent has elapsed. We will, however, allow a loop hole. We will pay a royalty of up to 7% to those who will allow us to manufacture our own generic version of their patented pharmaceutical, through the low bid process. In this way we can make these drugs available to the public through the FHCS with a formula that provides incentives to researchers but is accountable to the public purse and its ability to pay. Because such an arrangement would ultimately lead to the most expensive drugs [expensive to manufacture by virtue of raw materials and manufacturing technique] being sought after: a check to the balance. Within the normal spectrum of drug costs there is a high and a low amount which is within the norm but unknown to me personally. The percentage of royalty shall be paid along a line which is inverse to the cost of the manufacture of the drug. In other words, if your drug is among the most expensive to manufacture your royalty will be 1%. If it is among the least expensive, your royalty will be at 7%. Of coarse, patent holders will retain the right to withhold those rights and refuse such an offer from Government. This is the business of medicine, and without a moral tether neither buyer nor seller will be treated fairly.

I have set the date for this revolution as the first workday after the Fourth Of July weekend, in the year 2000. For posterity's sake, I will leave the door open to the future by saying that from here on, the door is open at five year intervals, so long as we are a nation. In this way, whenever the government of this nation drifts from its course far enough that its people are ready to overthrow it, that on the first work day after the Fourth Of July, a general strike by the people of this nation shall demonstrate their intention to return to this starting point described here within this book.

Concerning those things which can not be mandated, let me say that when I concluded my first draft on this book, we had just moved into the holiday season

of 1992 or 93. My children had come home from elementary school with their pictures of the cornucopia and brass buckled shoes of the pilgrims. They had even been taught the story of Pocahontas and John Smith. But it had been made a crime against the State for teachers to mention the name of who it was that the Pilgrims gave thanks to. Soon they would rehearse for their Christmas program. They would sing the melodies of the old Christian carols but the lyrics would be about rabbits and spiders, lions and puppies. Chris Cringle, the King of consumerism has replaced Christ in our national celebration of Christmas. The Nativity scene has been banned by a national court which has come to see itself as "Supreme". Thanks Giving has been renamed "Turkey Day". It is only a matter of time before the phrase "Under God" is removed from the pledge of allegiance to the flag. Today we are told that in a nation as diverse as ours it is politically incorrect for us to force our beliefs onto others. This is a reflection of how far we have drifted in our faith of God. Those who found them selves at the first Thanks Giving and those that made it our nation's first national holiday were not forcing their religion on anyone. They were sharing their greatest treasure with the guests they had gathered together to share in the bounty of the Lord: that treasure was a knowledge of God. Because we have not honored it as such, we have been lead astray from spreading that message of hope. If you think that because you were not asked to vote on these particular issues, you share none of the guilt, let me share this with you. There is a quotation which has gained a lot of popularity in recent years. I believe I first heard it in connection with Alcoholics Anonymous. It goes something like:

God give me the serenity to accept the things I can't change,  
The strength to change those things that I can change,  
And the wisdom to know the difference between the two.

Now, I have not come to take away those things which help people to deal with life. But I have come to take away those things which you use to rationalize your place in line. I have come to tell you that this quotation which is so often repeated within our society, is not from the Bible. A friend of mine told me about a young Christian group who put on a stage show in which the players walked along a balance beam. Christ stood on one side and Satan on the other. As they passed along, they were beckoned from either side. One by one they jumped to their chosen sides of the fence until they came to the last person. He looked to one side and then the other and then finally and courteously he said to the two, "I believe I will stay right here." At that point, the kid playing Jesus spoke to him and said, "That is your choice, but understand that the fence belongs to Satan".

*George Bailey*

Christ said that those who were not for him were against him. You can not stand quietly by while others do wrong and say that you are powerless to change things. It is an illusion that you see yourselves as uninvolved. I know that there will be many who work for the government who view this revolution as an assault on them. They see themselves as safe within a line that I have proposed we should dismantle. But a Government, which is not subservient to the people, is a threat to all the people; and whether you have questions about the bombing in Oklahoma City, or whether you trust your government implicitly, your freedom is only as safe as the freedoms of the lowliest, and poorest of us all.

I happened, quite by accident, to catch a broadcast of a taped speech made by a gentleman whom, they said at the end of the program, had passed on some time before. It is rare that I will listen to religious dissertations on television. But there was something in his look and his manner that caught my eye as I scanned the channels. I never even caught his name but I retained this bit of wisdom from that short segment of his speech that I happened on to. He said that throughout history, each social revolution has been accompanied by a renewal of religious awareness. I believe that the selfishness and greed in all manner and form which are taking us down as a nation are simply a reflection of the fact that we have turned our back on God and His law. As I said before in the book, the people of my generation have been looking for leadership ever since our national heroes John, Bobby and Martin, fell. Many of us have turned away or even come to hate God because we prefer our will to His, and we have turned our guilt to disdain and denial. People are always saying that God doesn't take care of them. Why should we be surprised, when living in a Welfare State, that there are those who think that God should somehow provide for their welfare. There is a story about a man who sat on the roof of his house in the middle of a rising flood. Another man approached in a boat and invited him on board. "No thank you, the man replied. The Lord will save me." After a while a helicopter flew over head and threw down a rope. "No thank you, the man yelled up. The Lord will save me." Of course, in the end the man drowned. When he went to face his maker, the man asked why it was that God had failed to save him. To which God replied " I sent you one man in a boat and another in a helicopter, but you turned them both away."

The people who came to this continent in search of a place to worship their God, understood the concept of "Free Will". They reveled in it. They were a group of people who found themselves unrestrained by any conventions other than the constraints they put upon themselves. There were no governments, no bureaucrats, no police, no one even to tattle on them to the folks back home in Europe. Yet they remained modest in all things. They did not kill Native Americans, they embraced them. They understood that Freedom came with a price and that, that price was the uncertainties of life. And when they were

successful in their endeavors they gathered everyone together to celebrate. That group included Native Americans who had welcomed them and in fact contributed to their survival. They invited all, without prejudice and in the spirit of brotherhood, to give thanks for that which had been given to them by God. Today these same people are grouped together with those that would follow in their wake and blame is laid at the feet of the Pilgrims, not for what they did, but for their race.

There are those who would say that it was not God but nature who gave them their bounty. And, to that, they would have told you that nature is God's handy work. There are those who would say that it was not God but their own hard work that produced their good fortune. And to them they would have said that all things come to us through God. Today, there are many people who preach that because there is war and hunger in the world, that God has failed us. But if you listen carefully, what they are really saying is that if you will denounce God and Free Will, that they will see to your needs. If you will surrender all of your thoughts for the ones they give you, if you will defend them as omnipotent, then they will allow you to vegetate, spoon fed, happily bound and gagged. God has never failed you. The sun reveals itself to us daily. Gravity holds us firm. Water never fails to freeze or thaw on cue. Possibilities abound, but man fails man. Throughout time, Man has created cultures which endeavored to provide for the members of that culture. From the Egyptians to the Congress of these United States of America, there have always been rulers of men who promised them that their lot could be improved if they followed and obeyed. They have led man to war. They have turned neighbor against neighbor. It is the injustices of men and women against men and women that bring inequity to the world. In some third world countries, where the substitute for Social Security is a large family to provide for one in one's old age, Fathers who can not provide for the children they have, produce more children in order to increase their personal chances of being provided for in their old age, even as they increase the risk that their children will starve to death. Where grain to fall from heaven to feed them, such backward thinking would have us standing shoulder to shoulder until we cried out to God for more land to stand on.

There are those who wondered why Communism was not promoted by Christians and I can tell you that it was for the same reason than Communism abolished the worship of God. It is not for governments to take away from individuals what they have worked for and give those things over to themselves, or even to someone they see as deserving. It is not for governments of man to take away from individuals what God has bestowed on those individuals. People say that because there is inequity in life that they do not believe in God. That because men are evil and innocents die, and life seems inequitable, they do not believe. But I believe that those who speak of God in such ways, do in fact

*George Bailey*

believe, but are hurt and angry. For, these same people see a government which is of men and which is corrupt, and yet they would still fight to defend the democracy run by that government. It is Satan who they hate, but ironically it is Satan that they serve with their hatred.

God has given you the means by which to do for yourselves. He has arranged circumstance to afford you an opportunity to be truly free. He has given you Free Will to take this opportunity or to pass it by; and while I have no way of knowing what course you will take, He has known from the beginning. Am I saying that God delivered this plan and this knowledge to me? Of course not. I have said that I am no Prophet. But He has, In Fact, prepared this place in time for you and for reasons beyond my knowledge, the truths I have shared with you have become clear to me. It may be that because I sat out to look for answers I found them. But, like the man who sat on his roof in the flood: I did not call for a boat or a helicopter, they simply appeared. That is to say, I did not drop the "Gold Standard", nor did I invent the fuel cell. But the changes I have outlined could never work without out the realities of the past. I did not lay the foundation for change but because I have looked for a way to change things, I have seen a small window of opportunity which would have been there whether I saw it or not. I am a messenger and nothing more. It is for you to seize what has been given you. If you fail to do so, it will be you who has failed you, not God. It will not do to congregate on Sunday and live outside "The Way" the rest of the week. A nation that turns its face to God does not buy stolen merchandise. It does not take graft. It does not extort its citizens. It does not honor those who break the law. It does not make light of criminal elements, or promote their rationalizations to the youth of a nation. It does not hate its neighbors for the color of their skin, even if that color is white. It renders unto Caesar that which is Caesar's when taxes are due. It does not put money or success ahead of God's teachings. It remembers that tolerance in the face of disapproval is the Christian way. It remembers that forgiveness is the key to peace and brotherhood. It remembers that God judges who shall enter his kingdom, but God has given us the law by which to judge each other on earth.

There are those who will point to Eastern philosophies and Eastern religions and tell you that these same precepts of right and wrong have come about without the influence of the God of Abraham. And while no one can be sure of the workings of God, it can be acknowledged that they did not and many still do not, worship the God the King James vision of the Bible called Jehovah: the GOD that the Hebrews are said to have called "Yahweh". But as we look East we do not find the kind of equality that would be born of Christianity in the West. The Eastern Philosophies have always viewed the world as circular in nature, whereas the Bible has portrayed the world as linear and headed toward an end that was foretold from the beginning.

For centuries the constellations were thought to be constant. It has only been in the last half of the twentieth century that science would seem to have proven “Creation” in the form of “The Big Bang”. The concept is spelled out beautifully in yet another PBS special series, “Steven Hawking’s Universe”. It is an introduction to astronomy that is worthy of your attention. It has been some time since I have seen it. Because I have watched so many informative programs on PBS, it is difficult to remember if all I am about to impart to you comes from that particular one. So please forgive me if I am borrowing from the wrong source. Never the less, as I understand it, Einstein’s theory, which he used to explain the universe, was flawed. In order to make it work mathematically, it had to be multiplied by a constant [a number which adjusted the equation, like Leap Year adjusts the calendar]. At the time, it had always been held that the heavens were hung in position like a giant mobile. They were viewed as orbits “Fixed” within the universe. That is to say, that from the beginning of human history, those who studied the stars, believed that the universe hung in suspended animation, circular and timeless. It would be an astronomer by the name of “Hubbell”, the same one they named the telescope for, who’s work would help lead to our realization that the universe is expanding. As a result of this new understanding, the “Big Bang” theory would emerge.

If you don’t know what the Big Bang theory is: it states that the entire universe began at a central point that could have rested neatly on a pin point. This central point is referred to as the “Singularity”. It suggests that at a point in time, which can be calculated mathematically, there was an explosion of proportion significant enough to blast the universe into existence and from that time to this, the universe has been expanding away from that point of origin. Furthermore, once it was understood that the universe was expanding, the constant, which Einstein had used to make his calculations work, could be dropped from the equation. In other words, the realization that the universe was expanding confirmed Einstein’s theory as Einstein’s theory confirmed that the universe was expanding. Einstein would express the fact that he did not anticipate the expansion of the universe as “the biggest Blunder of my life.”

It is not a new thing for religion to look for confirmation of God through science. I have heard it said somewhere that science itself began as a quest to look for conformation of God. It is true that the Church of Man burned Giordano Bruno at the stake in 1600 for suggesting that the earth was not the center of the universe. It is true that Galileo was forced to confess his error in order to live, when in fact he told the truth. But before you attribute such acts to God rather than the Church you must remember that in 1536, William Tyndale was burned at the stake for his, the first translation of the “Scriptures” from the old Hebrew and Greek into English. It is also true that today some scientists scramble to find an alternative to the idea of the Singularity because it seems to substantiate the

*George Bailey*

concept of Creation. Religion has always looked for God in the details, even if the stupidity of men has clouded the truth. In this same way, the scientific community of this century has looked to refute God on the basis that it has been able to catalogue some of His workings. So in the end we find that it is power that is at the heart of the struggle. The power of the Church of Man in the case of Bruno and Tyndale, and the power of the Church of Science today. But God is in the details and that is how He reveals himself.

If you have read this far, then you are indeed a patient individual and I thank you. I have tried repeatedly to condense or modify these next ten pages, so that reading them would not be so laborious. I have been unable to. But don't give up. I think you'll find it worth the effort.

Imagine that you have been assigned the task of computing the odds on winning a game of solitaire. After an infinite number of attempts, you still have not won a single game. It is then that you realize that you have been playing with a deck of fifty one. If we remove Oxygen, or hydrogen, as an element from the universe, life can not exist. It is not just that we are composed almost entirely of water ourselves [Hydrogen & Oxygen H<sup>2</sup>O]. It is not even that water is the cleansing agent, without which, the planet could not renew itself. The wonder of water is also found in the properties of water. All things in nature expands when heated and contracts when cooled. All things except water. Water vaporizes and expands as it is heated, to be sure. But at the other end of its spectrum, it expands as well: as ice. If it did not, it would not displace water in its crystalline form. And if it did not displace water as it froze then it would not float. Water would freeze from the bottom up, because heat rises and cold falls. The lakes and rivers and even the polar ice caps would be solid blocks of ice. All the moisture of the world would gather at the poles and the earth would be barren: if it even stayed in orbit. Random chance, which is the basis for evolutionary thinking, functions within the parameters of a reality that is not random: it is "DEVINE". There is no place in the language of science for such things as irony and paradox. Yet when we look at the chemical composition of water we find that, while Hydrogen is flammable and that oxygen accelerates that combustion, when the two atoms are joined together to form the molecule H<sup>2</sup>O, they make up the most basic "non-flammable" component of life itself. In that there is irony and paradox and even metaphor for a man and a woman.

Scientists look out at the infinity of space and state that the infinity it self, insures that life exists elsewhere. But it is also plausible that because of the innumerable probabilities which come to bear in making our earth a safe haven for life, that when all those probabilities are multiplied one against the other, that we get an answer that is so close to infinity that it must be expressed as a fraction which is stated as one over infinity. The astronomers of today can look back in time to the millisecond after the Big Bang, by plotting the movement of the



heavens and then running the progression in reverse. But the instant at which the universe began, the Creation of the foundations of the world, eludes them. I am no physicist. And I speak out of turn at this point, at the risk of my own embarrassment: but I would like to ask you to reflect upon something.

Go to the children's section of your local library and look for a book entitled "You and Relativity" by Mary Lou Clark. If you have read this far then you will be able to understand what she has to say as she walks you through grammar school physics. You will come to understand that all things are, in fact, relative. You will learn that within our world there is no true up or down, no absolute motion; not even absolute time. You will learn that even an objects length appears to shorten with speed, and that in fact, there is only one constant in the universe and that is the speed of light. You will also learn that "MASS" increases with velocity. Once you have mastered those concepts, you will be ready to read another book from the children's section entitled *Albert Einstein and Relativity* by D.J. Raine.

With those two works under your belt you will be ready to ponder this. Physics teaches that time, as we perceive it, is a manifestation of the speed of light itself. That is, it can be altered by velocity as that velocity approaches the speed of light. To understand this, you must first imagine a pulse of light as if it were a base ball traveling through space at a CONSTANT 186,000 miles per second. Imagine further, that you stand on a tight rope stretched across the universe. 186,000 miles away stands a friend of yours on that same rope and 186,000 miles on the other side of him a star explodes. One second after the explosion, the pulse of light, which carries the news of the stars end, reaches your friend. Another full second passes before you are aware of what has happened.

The events which make up our experience as we accelerate through space and time can then be depicted on a space/time diagram. Mary Lou Clark puts it this way:

"Another part of Einstein's theory tells us that the length of a body shortens with speed. As an object approaches the speed of light, an observer will measure the object to be shorter than it really is. The object appears to shorten in length in the direction in which it is going. According to the theory the object would disappear if it traveled at the speed of light, 186,000 miles per second. This does not mean that the matter making up the body would disappear. It means that the body would be going so fast that no one could see it. No object can move faster than the speed of light. If it could it would return before it started. Then there would be two of them."

*George Bailey*

“There once was a lady named Bright  
Who could travel much faster than light;  
She left one day in a relative way  
And came back the previous night!”

Clark goes on to explain of Einstein’s theory of Relativity that:

“This does not mean science has thrown away Newton’s law’s or Maxwell’s equations. Their ideas of mechanics and electricity still hold true. Rockets are being built according to Newton’s Laws. Radio and television use Maxwell’s equations. The theory of Relativity does not take the place of the long-existing laws. It is used for special happenings. It is when objects approach the speed of light, when sub-atomic particles are involved, or when an absolute measurement is needed with respect to reference systems that the classic law set forth by those men need some revision.”

Raine explains that because light does not function within the parameters set forth by Newton and Maxwell, that the old science did not predict the outcome of experiments in the real world. It could not predict how fast light would return when reflected from one end of a train car back to its point of origin at the other end of that same train car, as compared to how fast it would return if that same train car were in motion. Because the speed of light was not effected by the laws of Newton and Maxwell, it would come to be understood that the speed of light is constant even in relationship to a moving object. For example, if you throw a rock forward from a moving car you increase its speed to that of the car plus the velocity you added to it by throwing. But if you are traveling a thousand miles an hour in your car when you turn on your head lights, the light they emit will still only travel at 186,000 miles per second [the speed of light]. Just as significant, the light from your tail lights will not be affected either. It will head off in the opposite direction of your head lights at 186,000 miles per second. If your headlights shone all the way to Mercury, the trajectory of that light beam could be bent by gravitational pull of the sun, but its speed would remain constant. It was, in fact, the light reflected from Mercury as it arced around the gravitational force of the sun which was the first confirmation of Einstein’s theory. According to the theory as it is held today, a space ship traveling through space will slow down time, as that time is relative to earth, as it approaches the speed of light. As Clark explained, an object will appear shorter, even to the point of disappearing. But it will not vanish physically, nor even shrink. It would disappear because light could not be reflected from it in our direction. Like a base ball hurled at a passing car, the car travels away at the same speed as the base ball sailing through the air after the car. Because fewer and fewer waves of light will catch

the ship, fewer can be reflected. It is also theorized that an atomic clock placed on board that spaceship would slow down as it approached the speed of light.

Imagine that you board a space ship for a distant galaxy. At some point after leaving earth your ship approaches the speed of light. Let us say that those who waved you good bye, stayed and had a picnic and never left. From the time you left, every minute that passed they drew a new number on a chalk board, beginning with 1 and progressing on toward infinity. Let us say that you had a telescope on board that would allow you to view the Earth from where ever you were. So that as you approached the speed of light, the number on the chalk board would change less and less frequently for you in relation to the one minute intervals on Earth. When you reached the speed of light it would stop changing altogether, because as you traveled forward, the beam of light which carried the image of the number in your view would always be the same wave in pursuit of you. Now let us assume that at some point you slowed your space ship down to the same speed as Earth as it travels in its orbit and in its galaxy's trajectory. Because you are now traveling the same speed "Relative" to earth you will see the numbers on the chalk board increase by one each minute according to your "on board" clock. But they will not be the same numbers as those being written on the board because the light, the "News" of those numbers is in transit between you and the chalk board. The light waves from the sun, being reflected off of the chalkboard will take "Time" to reach you. You will be viewing those light waves that have been in pursuit of you in the space between you and Earth.

The reason we need a telescope to see back to Earth, is because as light is projected or reflected, its energy is forever expanding, much like our Universe. Imagine a balloon as it fills with air. The dark colors of its walls become lighter and lighter in color as the density of the balloon wall diminishes. Light travels in waves that are made up of energy packets. The wave length will determine the color we perceive. The amount of energy left in the packet as it spreads out along the balloon shaped sphere will determine the intensity. If the light from a source is intense enough, such as light from a distant star, we are still able to see it even after it travels to us from light years away. Even though its intensity is diminished, diluted, it is still enough to be visible. When that light encounters an object, it is reflected away and it is diminished in intensity by the amount of light absorbed by that object. The energy in the packet that makes up the wave of light is diminished by the amount of energy absorbed when it shines on that object. In this same way, light leaving our chalkboard is less intense than when it arrived from the sun [because the light on our chalkboard came from our sun]. The chalkboard will feel warm in the sun as a result of the energy it has absorbed. Light leaving the chalkboard will also diminish in intensity as it moves further away from Earth. Its energy will spread out along the front of its ever expanding sphere, like the walls of our balloon did. The larger the lens, the

*George Bailey*

larger the area upon which the image can be gathered. To adjust for this, the curve of the lens of our telescope focuses light particles back to a configuration that is not as expanded. This allows us to see the light reflected from objects far away by gathering back together those diffused light particles. Those particles of light that were no longer intense enough for us to see can be gathered back together and configured by the lens, so that they are once again perceptible to our eyes. The lens of the telescope you use on board your spaceship would have to be the size of our solar system before you got very far away from earth. The curve of its lens would be a curve that matched the light wave as it expanded away from earth in a sphere with a radius that grows at 186,000 miles per second. Because that wave would be shaped like a balloon with its center at earth's surface, so would the lens be crafted, so that all the light from that single expanding wave could be reassembled in an image strong enough for you to see.

If you now turn your ship around and return home, the faster you travel, the faster the numbers on the chalk board will change as you view them through your telescope. They will become a blur as you charge head long into the waves of light that have been in pursuit of you. When at last you touch down and you look at the chalk board, you will be looking at the number of minutes you have been gone relative to earth. But that number will not coincide with your "on board" clock. Today's physics teaches that as you approached the speed of light, you slowed time in the same way you outran the images from the chalk board. But when you turned around, you slowed time on your return trip in the same way and independent of the images still moving toward you from earth. Physics teaches that on the return trip you will avoid the time you escaped as you traveled near the speed of light just as you did when approaching the speed of light when you traveled away from Earth.

Einstein's theory of Relativity said that  $E=Mc^2$ . That is that Energy = Mass [which is the quantity of matter] multiplied by a constant, and by that constant once again [squared]. That constant is the speed of light. The theory, as stated by Raine, supposes that:

"energy, or heat, is equivalent to mass, and that they are changeable, one into the other."

Of course even the figures within the equation are relative. That is to say, the speed of light can be expressed as 186 thousand miles per second or it can be expressed as a metric equivalent. Using miles per second you will get an answer expressed in different terms than you will using a metric equivalent. But in either case the result will vary according to the amount entered for either Energy [E] or Mass [M], as they relate to the speed of light [c]. So that it is the relationship between Mass and the square of the speed of light which is the key to finding the value to E: the Energy contained in that Mass.

Consider for a moment the nature of water. If you take a quantity of earth in the form of dust and gather it together to mix it with water, you can create a bond that will hold the dust together. Even after the water has dissipated, the structure of the particles will remain in tact as a dirt clod, but it will be do to other forces. If you mix dirt with water and spread it out to dry and add another similar layer later without properly combining water in the mix between the two layers, the bond will be inferior and the layers will remain more independent and sedimentary in nature. The atoms which make up the world in which we live are the building blocks of all that is. They have and atomic weight which is relative to their mass. They can be gathered together to form molecules. Those molecules can be broken down into their atomic components, or they can be joined one to another; often times with the aid of water.

If we look around us we see that most things in nature are in the process of decomposition. Life itself lives kind of a “Half Life” existence. Those things which are not in the process of development are in a state of decline. When we sit around a camp fire in the darkness of the night, we are witness to the Mass of the wood on the fire, being converted to light and heat: or “E”, energy. Now imagine that process run in reverse. That is to say that the heat and the light could be gathered up once more to form that mass. We don’t see it happen exactly that way in nature, but we do see the concept at work. Imagine that the forces at work in photosynthesis, which we perceive as a chemical reaction occurring between carbon dioxide and water, within chlorophyll, in the presence of sunlight are actually better described as follows. Carbon, hydrogen and oxygen, the basic building blocks of life are configured in such away within Chlorophyll that they act as a “net” that gathers light particles as the glue which holds existing mass together in a sedimentary fashion to form bio-mass. The length of the light wave which is excluded from this process of gluing those atoms together is the one reflected by the color green. Along similar parameters, life gathers mass from the heat escaping from the earths core at the greatest blackest depths of the deep blue sea to form bio-mass. The building blocks of life can then be described as those elements able to be configured in a way as to become a vessel, a container for energy, even as that energy binds it together. Just as those things soluble in water are bound by water, those things which make up all mass as soluble in energy and therefore bound by energy, as it is the basis of all mass. The radiant energy, of light or heat, is captured in bio-mass until it is released. The energy trapped in bio-mass can be converted. Animals convert that energy as measured in calories. But atomic mass is not being created nor are the atoms themselves being dissolved, in these scenarios. Bio-mass is being converted. Molecules made up of atoms are being broken down or gathered together like dust being gathered together to form a moist dirt clod. So long as energy in a free state is captured in the composition, like moister in dirt, there is energy to be converted. Because all things are in constant state of

*George Bailey*

decomposition, unless that energy is replaced, the vessel will eventually become empty in the same way the dirt will dry out in the absence of moisture. So that, except for the energy which we receive from the sun and the energy we receive from the gravitational pull of our earth which causes the heat at the core of our planet, we would no longer see mass gathered together to form life. The gravity which holds us is a function of existing mass. Our orbit is a function of the sun's gravitational pull as it is opposed to the energy of our orbit which finds its origins in the Big Bang. All of these components are in decomposition, even as the Universe expands with energy left over from the Big Bang. Water, which is the "glue" of life is a conductor of energy and a vessel as well. We are all in a constant state of deterioration and decomposition. Science teaches that the dust which fills our homes is in no small part our own skin as it returns Dust to Dust. At the same time, we are in a constant state of rejuvenation as a result of the energy that is in transit from the sun. Energy which stops here but does not stay. Energy which is captured and converted over and over again, but that will eventually escape the planet. Energy which was interrupted long enough to kill the dinosaurs. At the same time, we do not see mass decompose on Earth at an elemental level [the atomic level] with the exception of man made nuclear reactions, nor do we see it being created in the Universe.

When we view the world in this way, "Cold" as we perceive it is a reduced energy level between molecules. Cold air, cold water and the cold of space are the wicking effect of the osmosis of energy, as energy drifts off independent of the gravitational forces which act upon mass. Ice can then be described as water in the absence of the energy between its molecules, much like a dried up dirt clod lacks water between its components. We then see its strength and cohesion as due to the sedimentary nature of those elements. This is why it shatters like stone. The expansion of ice comes as a result of the crystalline nature in which the molecules of H<sub>2</sub>O interlock when they collapse together. When we touch ice the cold we feel is the drain of energy from us, much like a drain on a battery, which is in fact what we are. Steam then becomes water which has been bathed in energy in amounts sufficient to dissolve the bond between its molecules but not its atoms. This is in excess of what are typical average energy concentrations found on earth. When that energy disperses we perceive it as heat. In the absence of that excess energy, water returns to its liquid state, where it remains in the presence of adequate energy to prevent it from becoming ice. Once again the special properties of water make it a storage vessel for energy that helps our fragile planet retain and distribute the heat from the sun. When we cook food we are dissolving the bonds of the composition of that food by adding energy. When we burn that food we have released all the energy and only the carbon and trace elements remain. These are the forces at work in the world in which we live. When we look at ice as an absence of energy we are referring to energy in a free state between molecules and atoms. But even in the form of ice, water still retains

its atomic components of Hydrogen and Oxygen. Atoms which contain Energy equivalent to  $Mc^2$  according to Einstein's equation. Ice still retains the component of the Hydrogen bomb. When we split an atom, we unleash the force that was pent up in the process of Creation. We have caused the decomposition of mass as opposed to the crumbling of molecular bonds that we refer to as biomass. When we consider the energy housed in a single atom, it becomes even more humbling to imagine the amount of power and energy that were gathered together to form the Universe.

We have all walked past a window on a brilliantly white day and seen the shimmer of dust particles billowing up from our path. We immediately grasp the consequence that our lives are filled with the unseen, that must obviously be present at all times, but is only noticed in circumstances such as this. This same experience reflects the same circumstance as it relates to light. Our sun is in the constant process of converting Mass into Energy and radiating that energy away from itself into space in the form of light. Only a tiny fraction of that light and energy given off by the sun is cast upon the earth as the light radiates away from the sun in the manner just described with regard to the image of the chalkboard and the expanding balloon. The rest travels off toward the end of a never ending universe. In such a scenario, if the Universe does indeed fold back into itself, eventually we must expect all the images in the heavens to reappear as their beacon circumvents the universe. By the time they got back, those waves would be too defused to see, just as our numbers on the chalkboard were. But, because energy and matter can be converted but not destroyed, that energy would still be present within the Universe. Perhaps the universe is still too young and too big for this to have occurred. Or perhaps the universe extends to its own perimeters which are expanding even now, toward a linear end which began with a Big Bang. This same process of mass conversion into energy illuminates all the stars in the heavens toward an end which sees all their mass converted to energy. Some of it will be in the form of light which travels radiant in all directions but which we can only perceive along a direct line which is perpendicular [a right angle] to the curvature of our eye. In the same way, when we are in a lit room we perceive only the light source and those objects which reflect that light, even as we are bathed in its radiation. Radiation which becomes visible when reflected off of the dust particles around us. So that we could imagine that when the foundations of the universe were set in place, there was nothing but light. That, just as all that is, is in the process of returning to energy in the form of light, all that "IS", began as energy in the form of light. This is, of course, an oversimplification. Gamma rays, X-rays, Micro-waves and any other form that energy takes as a result of the conversion of Mass into Energy, must be considered as a contributing component in this assessment of light.

*George Bailey*

Eventually, even light decomposes to a more fundamental form. After all it can be separated into colors through a prism. But as scientists accelerate particles in an effort to find the most basic and fundamental components of life, we see that space is filled with the “Dust” of stars. In this way, Light, as I have described it, is synonymous with Star Dust as I have just described it. These are the packets of energy that fill our Universe, even after they separate from packet form. If this is the case, then all matter was created from these particles, so that energy itself is bound and compressed to make up those things which are the building blocks of life as mass, and they are bound together by energy, just as molecules can be bound one to the other by the energy found in water. So that, when energy is released the bond is broken causing a reduction in mass just as bonds are broken between molecules when the energy present in water is removed.

Let us imagine that, just as we are unable to assess our world independently of gravity on earth, we can not escape the nature of energy. Imagine the Universe as a sphere with a radius of a distance which represents the farthest distance traveled by a particle of energy from the Singularity to the here and now: so that within that sphere we can only register forces which react upon that energy. Because such energy exists at all times it is undetectable. Because it has no mass it is unquantifiable. It does not react with similar forces at speeds below the speed of light and may well be the limiting factor of the speed of light. It is in the nature of what we witness when a street light shines down on us without lighting up the sky. We know that light is emitted in all directions, but if our senses could detect that energy as it traveled away, the universe would be ablaze and we would perceive nothing from it. Like water in a still pond, we find these forces at rest on the dark side of the moon, even as waves of light from the sun are bent around the moon’s gravitational pull which decreases the effects of the moon’s blocking those waves. In a manner which mimics the way that air creates a vortex as an object passes through it, leaving a void behind the object in the path of the object’s trajectory, light bends around the gravitational pull of planets: but in this case it does not fill a void.

What I have just described is not all that different from what the ancients referred to as the Ether. The stuff that filled the heavens. It was presumed that if ether existed as a medium in which light traveled, then light would travel slower in the direction of the earth’s trajectory in its path around the sun, than it would in the opposite direction. This because light would be swimming “up stream or down stream”, so to speak, as the ether flew by. The “Ether Drag” theory was dispelled by Michelson and Morley and so the possibility of ether was dismissed. Then in 1965 Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson stumbled unto the microwave radiation left over from the big bang. It was what remained of the heat radiation from the beginning of the Universe. What they found was that the



radiation was pretty much exactly the same coming from all directions. There was no “Dark Side” on our planet. This would indicate that this energy had bounced around the universe since the beginning of time, until it was equally distributed in all directions and from all directions even as it dissipated within an expanding universe. What if those were the same principles at work with light and all the other components which make up the energy created as matter disintegrates and decomposes into energy? Because it has no mass, it is not effected by mass and therefore mass traveling through it does not effect the speed of light as Michelson and Morley supposed. Light itself, travels in small “packets” of energy that make up waves of a given wave length. All light which is emitted from all stars will eventually strike an object in an infinite Universe. When it does it will be broken down into heat, or microwaves. Eventually, those waves will decompose into the energy particles which made up those waves. Regardless of what form that energy takes when it has decomposed to its most basic composition, it will still remain as energy, because matter can be converted but not destroyed.

Perhaps light waves travel as a function of displacement. What if space were like a row of theater chairs and all the chairs were full. Each time someone came to the isle seat at one end of a row and forced his way into the chair at that end, the person he displaced stood up and did the same thing to the person sitting on the opposite side: and so on and so on. In this way, the energy would displace energy along a line, leaving energy diminished at one end and increased at the other in equal measure. Now suppose that when one of the largest stars in a distant galaxy exploded that it is like setting off a charge at the depths of the ocean. With enough magnitude we could create a void that displaced enough water, that when the energy of the blast is used up the water would begin to collapse in on itself. Without a gravitational force being exerted from its epicenter, it would fill back in a manner similar to osmosis. Some of the rows of theater chairs would bend in the direction of the void. Even if energy travels through space without such displacement, it finds itself in the company of energy which is adrift toward the blast center in such an event. In such a scenario, would that drift bend light in a manner reminiscent of light drawn into a Black Hole?

So imagine that at some point in the future of time that all mass will have unraveled into its natural state of energy as we witness each day in the presence of the sun. Imagine that all energy, all “Force” will reach equilibrium so that the galaxies will not only stop expanding away from each other, they will cease to exist as mass. In a universe where there is nothing but Star Dust it becomes akin to the question which asks “If a tree falls in the forest and there is no one there to hear it, will it make a sound?”. If the universe is nothing but LIGHT, can it be seen if there is nothing for it to reflect off of? If this is the natural state of

*George Bailey*

energy, then even if galaxies are in fact being created, then it is a manifestation of energy left over from the Big Bang which began at the Singularity. In such a scenario, time is both linear and infinite, but the Universe, as we perceive it, is linear and bound. The “Hot House” effect of too much energy in the Universe is mediated by its expansion. Remember also that, while the speed of light is constant, the length of light waves is not. It would, in fact, be the realization that the light waves coming to earth from distant galaxies were from the longer end of the spectrum that would give us our proof that the galaxies were moving away. In fact, during a Lunar eclipse, when the moon is totally obscured from the sun by the shadow of the Earth, the moon will appear three dimensional in the red glow of space. In the reverse application of this “Red Shift” phenomenon, we use the Doppler effect to measure the speed of an object moving in our direction. Such an object will produce shorten wave lengths of light in which the peaks of the individual waves will be crowded together by the velocity.

But what if time is not a manifestation of light and/or velocity? There is little doubt that our perception of time is relative. I gave the example of two men on a tight rope. Einstein explained it as two bolts of lightning which struck at the same time as viewed from a side angle as compared to the perception from a point which was in line with the two strikes. In the same way, I would suggest that perhaps the forces within our three dimensional world which act upon an atomic clock, are just as unreliable: thereby making all our perceptions of time relative.

It is the height of arrogance for me to disagree with the scholars of our times, and yet what if Clark is wrong about what she has said with regard to traveling faster than the speed of light? In the same way that time “Flies” when we are having fun but drags when we are not, what if it is our perception of time which is at odds with reality? Just as a dream which seems to last all night can be shown to occur over a span of a few seconds, we can not judge time in a sensory deprivation tank any more than we can judge our speed in an car or and airplane. Even if we could alter the effects that we associate with time as it relates to the atomic clock and even of aging, through the manipulation of velocity, it might well be our perception of time that is at odds with reality.

We are all familiar with the optical illusion of a wheel which appears to rotate in the wrong direction on film. It happens as a result of the sequencing of pictures which makes up the moving picture. It is also possible to see this same illusion with our naked eye. This tells us that what we perceive as being liquid motion is really a sequence of pictures imaged in our mind. Light itself, travels in small “packets” of energy that make up waves of a given wave length, which ebb and flow in the direction of our eyes. It is our mind that imagines the gaps in between the individual frames. The liquid flow of movement that we perceive is an illusion. I believe “Time”, as we perceive it, may be a similar illusion. Even

the slowing down of the atomic clock and of the aging process, as we near the speed of light in our space craft, I suspect, are not a manifestation of time but of speed [velocity]. In the same way we are unable to judge the speed at which we travel, we are unable to judge time. We gage it by the seasons, which is in affect the orbit of our planet around the sun. We gage it by the speed of the planet relative to the sun, in the same way we gage up and down against gravity and time as light reflected in our rotation on the earth's axis. Because of this, we have come to understand that up and down and time [as we perceive it] are relative. But I am inclined to believe that, even though our perception of time is relative, "Time" it self is absolute: that light is an image of time much like a snap shot from a camera. Even in Einstein's example of relative time, it is conceded that the two lightning strikes did, in fact, occur at the same time but were perceived as occurring at different times. I am inclined to believe that if the girl in the poem were to travel through space at a speed which exceeded the speed of light that she would not see herself. She would see an image of the day before, but she would not be in the day before. She could not alter the day before other than to transpose her image across the image of the day before. It might even be that what she was viewing was a page from what the Bible refers to as the "Book of Life".

Once again, forgive me my arrogance. But I wonder if it isn't possible that, just as Newton's theory fails in the presence of greater velocity and strong gravitational forces, Einstein's theories may fail to explain the Universe due to constraints on velocity within the world we live. It leads me to wonder if it could not be that time may be of another dimension and within it a different set of rules applies: a set of rules for which we have no sensory devises.

As our planet earth rotates around our sun, our solar system rotates within our galaxy, even as our galaxy soars across our universe so that we must establish our speed "Relative" to solar systems and galaxies around us. We are on a giant merry go round, which spins upon the deck of another merry go round, hurled through space. Still, at home in our chair we feel ourselves at rest, motionless. In the same way, our lack of ability to perceive time makes it relative to the forces around us. It is therefore necessary to concede that velocity may very well change time relatively. It may even alter the physical world around us within the dimensions we exist, including the atomic clock and even the aging process. But within the plane that one finds God, be that the forth dimension or another all together, I am inclined to believe that both time and velocity are very much absolute.

I am not Physicist. I do not understand the Cosmos. I may be horribly mistaken about some of the precepts I have just suggested to you. But science has looked to the here and now and tried to explain the origins of the Universe by running the sequence backwards. They have succeeded in finding an explanation

*George Bailey*

for its history which goes back as far as the millisecond after the beginning, but at that point their understanding falls short. I suggest that the answer to understanding the origins of the Universe can be found by looking to the future. We can look to the heavens and to Earth and see that all things are in a state of decomposition. Furthermore, as Einstein explained, Mass may be converted into Energy, but neither can be destroyed. All things will continue to exist in one of those forms or the other. So while some scientists attempt to refute God by finding a scientific explanation for the forces brought to bear to form the Singularity, let us look to the future when all that remains is energy at its most fundamental form, and imagine that just as all things in nature are in the process of decomposition, so is the Universe returning to the state of dust to dust, from which it began. Indulge me by letting me suppose that if  $E=Mc^2$ , then by the rules we learned in high school algebra,  $M=E$  divided by  $c^2$  and therefore Energy and Mass are equal and interchangeable relative to the speed of light. Keep in mind that MASS increases with velocity, and velocity is a function of energy. So that, if in the beginning there was but a single word and that word was God, and God were pure Energy, traveling through time and space at the speed of light squared, that He, The Great I Am, The Alfa And The Omega, The Word, And The Light, could become the Singularity. Imagine that "LIGHT" [which is synonymous with energy in its most fundamental form] was compressed against LIGHT at a speed which was the square of the speed of LIGHT. Imagine that, perhaps in another dimension which is time, LIGHT moves at a velocity which is the speed of LIGHT<sup>2</sup> faster than the LIGHT it encounters. It moves at the speed of LIGHT<sup>2</sup> relative to LIGHT which is in turn at rest, relative to the LIGHT which is in motion. At this juncture of time and velocity we find energy in its fundamental form being converted and compressed into shorter and shorter waves, as witnessed in the Doppler Effect, until it fuses into the building blocks of the universe. The energy packets which make up the individual waves become a single mass as one wave is overcome by another. At this point, HE, could convert some of His energy into mass in whatever form HE chose, making HIM greater than the sum of all that is. Furthermore, all HE would have to do to release that mass from the Singularity formed and thereby "Create" the heavens and the earth and define the various elements of the "Periodic Table": is to slow down. I would also suggest to you that as HE alters his speed, he travels along the time continuum from the beginning to the end: and while you and I see the world in snap shots of so many frames per second, HE views time as a panorama from one end to the other.

Just as Newton and Maxwell have described the dimensions of the world in which we live, Einstein has described the dimension of light and space. But I have come to ask if is not in another dimension that the unifying theory of the universe exists. A dimension in which Einstein's equation is still valid but subject to different realities. For, the event which I have just described leads us

back to the moment of Creation when the universe could have indeed passed through the eye of a needle. Is it by chance that the constant [the c] in Einstein's theory is the speed of light? It is the formula by which mass unravels, and as such it is the most likely of formulas for the creation of mass. Because the constant "c" is squared it may be that the velocity at which light traveled at the moment of creation reached the speed of 186,000 miles per second squared, relative to the light it encountered. Or it may be that the answer is better expressed in the relative relationship between energy and mass and the speed of light. What if we express the speed of light in the form of its absolute value? What if we convert from using miles per second to a form which resembles a measurement of distances in lengths of time in the same way we use Light Years as increments of distance? What if we say that in the beginning, all the Energy of the Universe was propelled toward a central convergent point at a speed of light squared. Let us say that our increment, our distance traveled by light in our equation, becomes "one light second", rather than one light year or 186,000 miles per second. We then find our equation to be  $M = E$  divided by  $1^2$ . Or, Energy is equal to Mass relative to the absolute value of light. You can dismiss the metaphor of God as the "Light", but because light itself is established as a metaphor for a speed which is absolute, the work of His hand seems clear to me, for God is absolute.

As I said, I am no Physicist. Nor am I a Cosmologist. I don't have the math skills to confirm or deny the mathematics that infer that time is altered as velocity approaches the speed of light. I have far more questions about the nature of the universe than I have answers. One of those questions centers around a very old theme. When Hubble looked to the distant galaxies he found that the further away they were, the faster they were moving away from us. Even more interesting, he discovered that this is true no matter which direction one looks. What has not been made clear to me in what I have read or heard, is whether or not the distances at which these increases occur are consistent in all directions as well.

Take a spoked wheel from a bicycle. Place an oversized compass at the center of the wheel. Then make a sweep around the wheel marking the spokes as you make a circle. Now repeat the exercise several times, increasing the radius of the circles made by the compass with each sweep. Imagine now that each mark, on each spoke, is a Galaxy moving away from its origin in the Big Bang. If the Universe were expanding from a Singularity in all directions and the further one traveled from the Singularity the greater the distance between galaxies, then it would seem that those galaxies which exist between us and the origin of the Singularity should be moving away from us at a rate which is less than the rate of those galaxies on the opposing side of our galaxy. Or shouldn't we at least expect that the distribution would be more dense in the direction of our universal origin. If this hypothesis is true for either case and all galaxies are in fact moving away

*George Bailey*

form us in an equal manner, then do we find that while the Earth is not the center of the Universe, our Galaxy is? Now that would be ironic wouldn't it?

I doubt that Physicists will think much of my theories. What's more, this last question about our galaxy at the center of the Universe is so obvious that I must be missing something. The Black hole scenario is likely to be at odds with facts I am unaware of. I have added this section to try and help a cynical people see that life is no accident. These last dozen pages have troubled me more than any other because, while they do not alter the course of the Revolution, in going so far a field, I risk my credibility. What's more, because of the solitary nature of my work in this endeavor, there is no one I can turn to for conformation or rejection. So I must either expose myself to even more ridicule or leave this section out all together. Still, so often the questions of life are so complicated that we let others do our thinking for us and accept their conclusions as fact. For that reason, I have chosen to risk including this section. There are few facts. Even Einstein's theories break down under certain circumstances, and while many new theories seem to hold some truth, they all fail at some point. There still remains only one Unifying Theory and that is a belief in a Supreme Being. If the answer to the creation of the Universe is found, it will be God's work we are witness to. That is the fact that you should not lose sight of. Don't let science take God away from you because they claim to have proven He does not exist. They have not. They know not. What's more, because science is bound within this dimension, it is possible that they will never know the truth of the beginning of the Universe: and they will certainly never prove or disprove God, for He will not be tested. I urge all of you who live in the city to take the time to travel away from the lights on some warm summer night. Spread a blanket down under the stars and lie down next to your children under the infinite midnight sky. In such a circumstance it is easy to show God to your children. Do not deny them the right to revel in the Glory of God and to feel a part of something infinitely greater than themselves.

There are those scientists who are today, experimenting with the forces of creation in the arrogant belief that, because they have cataloged some of the paths left by God's hand, that they are wise enough to tinker with the forces of life itself. It is the warning of the Frankenstein Monster realized. It is not something that I can address in this book. It is a matter which can only be dealt with by a moral leadership; and as we are told that morality is not an issue for the American public, it would seem that we are doomed. Yet, all things are possible in God, and if we will but see that, we may yet overcome.

It is neither possible nor prudent that I decide every side of every issue. I have addressed the most major in an attempt to turn things around in the only way I see as possible. That is all the major points of the system, all at once. For those things which are left untouched as well as those things which need adjustment, we of consensus will have set a course: a course that will profoundly

alter what we give to and what we expect to receive from, Government, our fellow man, and God. From there even politicians can steer our course, so long as we remember to keep an eye on them. I have gone as far as I can with you. I urge you to begin to prepare. Find a job, any job; and be as indispensable in it as you can. Make your employer as indispensable in the market place as you can. Pay your debts. Save your money. Pack away some food under your bed a little at a time. As nothing has come of the Millennium scare, for many of you, one more necessary component of our revolution has been dealt with in advance of your need. Talk to your friends and listen to them as well. Discuss, invent, and reinvent: embrace the word of the Bible. And if you can't, then embrace truth, for that will ultimately bring you to it. Be patient. Be humble. Be forgiving; and be of good cheer. For if change is in order, change will come.

For those of you in other lands who may happen upon this book, I urge you to watch and see. If this revolution comes to pass in the United States, then you will know Americans for what they wish for themselves and for you. It will then be up to you to struggle with your bureaucrats and Rulers as well. I wish that a plan such as this could work for all nations, but a plan for our system can not easily be fitted to another. There are however a few elements which are universal. "Blue Food" as I have outlined, is a line below which no government has the right to fall and call itself a governing body. Education at a basic level, great enough to give the peoples of the world the ability to see beyond themselves and their boarder; to be more than the pawns on a chess board is a step in evolution that the world should not shrink from. Some form of shelter: a simple space from which you may not be driven in return for a life's work. These three things are universal and central to the cause of saving this planet. They can be addressed in any nation with the "Blue Food" model, a fare minimum wage based on "X" as described herein and a mandate from leadership to provide education. Even more important is your right to worship. Any government which denies its people the right to worship has demonstrated with that denial, that it does not value individuals as equal under God. It has demonstrated that its leaders are challenged by the precepts of fairness that are celebrated in Christianity as well as many other religions. It is proof of their position that your are a serf and they are your master. If we in America stand down, those of you who live in free societies should take the next day off work where ever you are, to let us know and to let the world know that you embrace what we have embraced here at our home. Let them come to realize that you will not be driven below decks. Perhaps the greatest tragedy of the Titanic was that, had they had leadership and worked together to find alternative materials from within the ship to keep people afloat, and used their life boats with a Christian ethic that had all those involved watching out for all those involved, they might all have been saved. As here in the US, it is imperative that you not be turned to violence. A government faced with a working class shut down has three choices. It can give

*George Bailey*

into the demands. It can use force to Marshal slave labor; but the instrument of choice throughout history has been to divide and conquer. If government or even anti-government forces can draw you to crowds and insight violence, they can assign blame, and responsibility. They can divide your will and set you upon each other until your resolve is gone and your cause is lost. People drawn into crowds for any cause are a target and an accident waiting to happen. Draw your strength from God and He will stand beside you. You do not need the comfort of the mob to do what is right.

On the other hand, it may be that the course of history will be changed by nations other than the United States. Recent developments in the economy of the nations of the Pacific Rim may see those governments adopt much of this book even as America fades from glory. With “Hedge Funds” and currency speculators causing instability throughout the region, they are more likely to see their governments adopt the economic vision of this book. In an economy based on a monetary system such as described in here within, when outside forces begin purchasing the currency of a government, that government is free to print currency to offset demand. By trading the newly printed currency for a cross section of foreign currencies, that government is then in a position to buy back that currency when the speculation swings in the other direction. If the value of a nations currency drops initially then it is a result of either internal mismanagement or outside manipulation. If it a result of internal miss management, then the economic system described, sees that those who own the wealth of that nation see that wealth eroded while the debtors see inflation improve their economic position. If it is an outside sources, the National Government can defend itself by imposing temporary import sanctions: or even turn such speculation to its own advantage, by using taxes on exports to purchase its own undervalued currency. By encouraging exporters from their country to trade their exports for their homeland’s currency, the export tax can be offset to some extent by the increase in value of that currency, as the Government retires the currency purchased with the export tax. A sound and consistent currency value is then contingent on the integrity of a people, rather than a Gold Standard and speculation by outside forces is held in check by a MORALY ACCOUNTABLE Governing body.

When being chastised for destroying the “World’s” rain forests, the President of one South American country replied that the interest on his countries 111 Billion dollar debt left his country with no alternative. By reinstating Usury laws and making them applicable to US Banks in their foreign investments as well, we in the US can help to save the globe as well as the global economy. There may be those who make the argument that Capital will withdraw from American business and even American Banks in light of such usury laws. But as we are Capitalized from within and because the Federal Reserve is obliged by its



Charter to protect American Business in such an event, foreign competitors who pay higher interest on borrowed Capital, operate at a disadvantage against us. As we stabilize here at home, we will begin to Capitalize the World. By putting Foreign Aid to work in countries like Brazil in the manor laid out here within, we can make significant contributions to the world's rain forests.

In recent years, US banks have made mergers and acquisitions without government interference. As they grow larger and larger, the stability of those individual banks becomes more critical to the economic stability of the nation. As a result, the Federal Reserve, under its perception of its duty, holds the nation hostage and the banks harmless. It is nothing short of economic enslavement. It is the Share cropper of the Old South. It is the Company Housing and the Company Store of the coal mines. It is how power reveals its self: and it is corrupted and corrupting. Historians can point to World War II and show that Japan's involvement was due in no small part to economics. Caught in the grip of the world wide "Depression", and unable to import the necessary raw materials to restart their industrialized nation, they were easily swayed into following their Emperor into war. At the other end of the spectrum, today's Brazil, with its enormous debt, must squander its nation's natural resources in an attempt to industrialize. And just as the numbers are always manipulated to squeeze credit card debtors to the brink of bankruptcy and then revised downward to keep them from going over the edge, a nation, once in debt, is thereafter enslaved as well.

There was a time in America when the Constitution was honored. A contract, once made, could not be altered without the consent of both parties. Yet today, in America, the debt owed by individuals to credit card companies, can be purchased by other creditors and the interest rate increased without the consent of the borrower. The Supreme Court has not interceded, nor has the Congress. It will not do to have the courts tell you that those increases came as a result of what was in the fine print. Government is not exonerated for allowing individuals to fall to the grip of Loan Sharks by defending their position with explanations of how they allowed us to be defrauded as well. At the same time, those debtors who are about to go bankrupt are often able to renegotiate the terms of their debt and still retain their good credit. By that same standard, I suggest that debtor nations, who are manipulated by the worlds' banks, have a right to have their interest lowered to no more than 7% or even lower and we should support them in this and even lower interest rates. If their debt is in the form of National Bonds, then the methods laid out here within for the US will work for you as well. The methods I describe could conceivably cause an upheaval not unlike a stock market crash. But it will be a one time event. Unlike the stock market crash of the late 1920's, the economics of recovery will not be the Trickle Down economics which threw money at the rich until they were appeased, but the economics of Capitalization. In such an environment the components of Capital and labor can

*George Bailey*

be found internally; leaving only raw materials as a wild card: raw materials which can be traded or bartered for with printed currency if “Wealth” will not participate. In the US that means that in the event of a depression or deep recession the Federal Reserve will be obliged to print currency and make Capital available to those 95% at the bottom in increments large enough to jump start the economy. Government can make sure that business remains capitalized, and until people are once again working, unemployment checks will go out to everyone who applies for how ever long the workers are out of work, until all facets of the revolution are complete. When the unemployment reserves are depleted, the Fed will begin printing money to pay the cost. This, then, becomes the model for any depression.

Once established with a system of Capitalization in place, in which minimum food, housing and wage requirements are met; struggling nations can move in directions of environmental responsibility in order to neutralize the constraints of trade as discussed with respect to a truly “Level Playing Field”. The import taxes, as outlined, do not prop up our goods against a lower standard of living. That is to say that when We calculate our import tax as it relates to an “X” wage in another country, it will not necessarily be as high as ours. For instance a modest home in a South African country may not even include those things which We consider essential. None the less, if our goal is to encourage trade with Capitalistic Democracies, as those people gain wealth, they will accumulate those things which We already have. In so doing, their cost of labor will increase or their import tax on goods brought into this country will increase. Those things which make up an “Average” home will increase as a country prospers. Those increases will close their advantage as it relates to labor costs. Those governments which allow their economic system to deprive workers of their rewards, will be punished in the open market through the appropriate import tax. In this way, We can elevate the standard of living throughout the world by simply allowing foreign competitors a even playing field. We can keep our edge with innovation while moving money to the bottom of the world economy to circulate back to us at the top in the same way the system I have described to you will circulate money to the bottom here at home. As the affluence of those countries rises, they will become a market place for us to sell our products in without contributing to Governments of ideologies which are at “CONFLICT” with ours. Security and opportunity are the only ways in which to deal with World Hunger and Poverty, and War.

A revolution such as ours will be a difficult task for those who do not enjoy the freedoms of America to undertake: especially in countries who were Communist. Because those countries that made up the old USSR are in a state of flux and because they have fallen to internal corruption, it will be up to them to move in the direction I have outlined as best they can. But for China, North

Korea and perhaps even Cuba, where no privatization has occurred, let me make a proposition. Suppose that everything that makes up the communal wealth of your country were assessed a value. Suppose that from a figure “Z” you assessed so many Z for each home, so many Z for each factory, so many Z for each parcel of land that was not designated a park or a public structure. Suppose that when all those assets had been assessed a figure, you divided that number which was the total number of Z’s, by your total population. Suppose further, that the figure you arrived at, was each individual’s number of Z’s that they were entitled to. Children under 18 would receive a portion of Zs which is proportionate to their age. For example, if you are 14 years of age, you will get a fraction of an adult’s portion of Zs which is equal to 14 over 18. If you are three years of age you will get a fraction equal to 3 over 18. Now let us suppose that your country were to create a new currency. This currency would be equal in value to your old currency, and it would be indexed against the true value of Z. Once these things had been accomplished it would be time to assess a figure which was equal to 10% of the value of each individual citizen’s share of the collective assets of the nation [10% of each person’s share of Z’s].

With these figures in place it would be time to prepare for the privatization of the assets of the country. A lottery would decide the order in which individuals would choose which assets of the country they would trade their Zs for. Some would choose a dwelling. Some would choose a portion of a farm. Some would choose a portion of a manufacturing facility. I am not privy to the assets of China. I do not know how many people have a place to live, but the citizens of China do. If each of them lives in a dwelling of some sort, then the portion of Z’s allotted to one family will be greater than the number of Z’s necessary to trade for a dwelling because there are more assets than just dwellings to be divided. So that, if you are a member of a family and you use your Z’s to obtain a place to dwell you may have some left to purchase part of a factory or a farm. You may have enough to trade for another dwelling. If you own two dwellings then someone who has purchased part of a commercial concern may end up renting it from you. If, as you have never know Capitalism in any form, you agree [as a nation] that you would limit each family to one home until everyone has a home, that is appropriate as well. During this period of trading Z’s for assets nothing would change. It would all be on paper and the biggest national pastime would be the American board game known as Monopoly. When all the assets of your country became divided up on paper, there would be a period of trade in which individuals would have their newly acquired assets deeded to them, but they would still not be in position of those assets. Everyone would still go to work as they always had and live pretty much as they always had. But during this period assets would be traded much as properties are after they are acquired from the Monopoly board in the American “Board Game” called Monopoly. Farms would consolidate within family groups, as would small businesses. People would be

*George Bailey*

going to town meetings where they would be educated in the ideas of the free market. The less adventurous would work toward securing a dwelling, while those so inclined would prepare to elect a board of directors for the manufacturing endeavor they had invested in. Government would be in the final phases of setting up a banking system which functioned much like the system laid out here within for America. It would also be in the process of setting up a “Blue Food” program.

At the end of this period it would be time to disperse the new currency to citizens. They would each receive currency in the amount of 10% of the value of their assets [their number of Z's: 10% of the assessed value of the nation as a whole]. It would not be used as currency until the day of transition, which would be the day that all deeds became valid and custody was taken of those deeded assets. Before that can happen, the new economy will have to be capitalized. During this period of Capitalization manufacturers will raise the Capital they will need to begin operations when they take possession. If the Z's which individuals used to purchase such things as factories are considered as stock in those factories, then by splitting the stock to reflect how much of the value of the factory itself is needed to make it operational; individuals can use their script [the new currency] to purchase a portion of that factory in the form of a stock in that company. By doing so, they will collateralize the venture and in so doing they will increase the assets of the business they have just purchased a share of. If families gather together to control an entire enterprise, such as a farm, they will want to save their script to collateralize their own endeavor. If those who chose to purchase a dwelling are afraid to capitalize ventures of any kind, but would rather put their money in a bank and get a job, that is fine. They should put their script in one of the new Tier Two banks at the highest Insured Interest rate they can find. Companies and Ventures should then go to those same banks for loans at interest rates which are no more than 7% by law to collateralize their projects. At the end of this period it will be time to make the transition. Deeds will become affective. Ownership will become a reality, script will become currency. At that time the transition from a Communist economy to a Free Market [Capitalist] economy would be complete except for exchanging the old currency in the world for new [or vise-versa]. The nation will have devalued their old currency in a one time event. The irony will be that while America, the seat of Capitalism, is a nation of debtors, you will be a nation of owners. Because China nationalized its assets under Communism, you will not owe banks for the property which you currently own as a collective.

Should I, as an American, point you in the direction of freedom if it will mean that your economic freedoms may in fact surpass mine? As a Christian I am obliged to do for you as I have attempted to do for my own. What's more, your freedom strengthens my freedom and that is the reward of Christianity. It

has been an even 100 years since the Boxers took their vengeance against the American missionaries who came to share the knowledge of the Lord with you in China. Just as the Pilgrims now find themselves accused of the trespasses of those who followed in their wake and took advantage of the trust they had built, the Boxers could not see the truth for their hate. They killed their friends and empowered their enemies. They would not embrace God when he was at hand. They retained their religion and remained impotent. I attempt to do the Lord's work and if you would embrace these ideas then I must believe that they have come to me so that you will be led to Him. You will not have housing that is the equivalent of American housing at the time of transition. Your manufacturing capabilities will not be as modern. But you will be free, and with freedom comes all manner of possibility.

For those of you in Cuba, I would urge you to offer the Expatriates of your country an equal number of Z's: man for man, woman for woman, and child for child as you would for your citizens, should they wish to give up their American Citizenship in favor of Cuban. In this way, those who return will give up any claim they have against the past. They will come back to you with assets from their lives here in America, plus the \$10,000.00 for their American Citizenship. They will be vested in your new endeavor and thus they will endorse your claim to Cuba. In return, you will be obligated to take ALL those expatriates who wish to return home. From that point on, it will be a matter of Christian forgiveness and tolerance. It will be a matter of letting the young revel in their time rather than be bound to the hate of their parents past.

If Russia can provide for its own, it will find its peoples less intent on breaking away. If the Russian Government can assess a fair market value for existing Capitalistic endeavors and purchase those companies for script at their appraised value at the time of transition; giving the owners of those companies their fair share of Zs along with that script then you too can use such a method of transition. If you allow the companies to choose to keep their business but turn over their physical assets [which were not the fruits of their labor but rather a government subsidy] for Zs or even keep those assets in stead of their portion of Zs, such a transition is also possible. If the physical assets are greater than the Z allocation of those who own the business, then currency must offset the difference. That could be facilitated through cash assets of the business or stock sales for script. The problems arise when the assessment of value Z is unfair when compared to the acquired assets of those who have already been successful at Capitalism. Again, it becomes a moral issue. So we see that you stand before the world as an example of what happens to a nation which allows its Government to separate it from its God. I pray that you will now become an example of what happens to a nation who embraces God once more.

*George Bailey*

Caution is the only suggestion I have left for all you citizens of non-democratic lands. Your governments have proven their unwillingness to deal with turmoil. It may be that your best course is to be content to show your desire for change as I have outlined it. If it should come to pass that you embrace these ideas; if you would venture into Capitalism, chance Free Will, champion freedom of Religion and expression, validate the ideas of Blue Food and Capitalization: If that becomes your Will as a nation, I would suggest that on a day which is determined by those who have promoted your desire, you show up five minutes late for work. From that simple act you will have made your wishes known. From there it will be a matter of letting your leaders lead you in the direction I have indicated. I wish you God's speed.

In a world were every one is fed and has a place to call their own, there is little that would make a person leave home to wage war on another. One need only look to the complacency of the citizens of the US to champion such an argument. As my cousin is so fond of saying, "So long as they have their six pack, there will be no change." It is only when people have nothing to lose that they can be incited to aggression against another nation which has not somehow challenged them. So then, World Peace can more easily be accomplished by insuring that each man and woman has their own particular "Six Pack" than it can through military force. And more "Six Packs" can be made available through Capitalization than through Capitalism, Socialism, or Communism.

I dream of a New World Order in which people are free; in which prosperity is sufficient that the selfish do not overpopulate the globe in order to insure their own retirement. With Global prosperity comes the realization that more children means less for each. With a decrease in the birth rate comes less demand on the environment. A shrinking population means better housing and more food and opportunity for future generations. A place for everything and everything in its place, must include a place for nature and a place for man or there is no place for either. These things are possible, but they must be taken through peaceful action not violent reaction.

If you Americans intend to decline the revolution because you feel that you have already achieved financial equity in your life, then consider this. Today we can look at an over inflated stock market and see the results of a society of disparity. While many still flounder just above the poverty level, stocks like "Amazon.," have risen to a total value of 30 BILLION dollars. In order to justify the stock's value at that amount, the company would have to sell every book that is sold in America [according to a "Sixty Minutes" segment I viewed]. It is far more realistic to assume that it will sell between 30% and 70% of the books. That means that, at best, and in my opinion, it is likely to be over valued by 30% to 70%. Regardless of its true value in terms of market share, because it is a newly formed competitor in the market place, what ever its share of the market

becomes, that percentage of the market will be lost to those companies who were previously in the book selling business. So that all the public companies in the business of selling books are likely to have inflated stock values which are in direct proportion to Amazon's true market value.

I do not know how often this scenario will be plaid out on the Internet. Perhaps the foreign markets included within the Internet will enlarge the total market and off set some of the disparity. Still, it is the nature of the stock market that some stocks will sore, some will have steady growth and still others will falter. It is the craps shoot called Capitalism. I would hope that in the future, there are still cities and towns rather than web sights; but that is the choice of the consumer in a Capitalistic economic system within a Democratic Republic: unless it becomes the public "Will" to do otherwise. It would seem that, in the end, that it would be easier for companies who exist in the real world to start a web sight, than it will be for Internet Companies to build buildings all over the country. But when the smoke clears, there will be winners and losers in the stock market and the prize will be the lion's share of the market. What is important to remember in crisis is that, whatever the true value of any stock, if you rush to sell after the profit taking has occurred, you only throw away what little equity you have left. I refer you back to my mentor, George Bailey.

I have tried to explain as best I can, that I do not see into the future; but the past is clear. The parallels between the 1990's and the 1920's are many. The stock market is, of course, one. But the coming of age of a generation that would challenge the class of Capital with Social Reform is another. Whether you believe in this revolution or not, whether you participate or not; I urge you to begin to hold on to your stocks for the long term. I also urge you to stop raising the anti on today's over priced market and begin to look for ways to invest in the fuel cell technologies I have described in this book. If you will hold firm in the stocks you have without adding more fuel to the fire, it is less likely that the system will collapse. But the only way to make the "market" worth what you have invested in it, is to increase the number of goods being created: new types of goods to offset the money you have invested in new ways to sell existing goods. In addition, the inflationary effects of the revolution may see the value of real property increase against inflated dollars, thus compensating for some of the over inflation in the stocks.

As the usury laws are once again established, with rates of 7% as a ceiling, it is logical to assume that debtors will flock to banks to renegotiate their loans. Some will just roll over at a lower rate. Some will withdraw to take advantage of tier one loans. Regardless of where the loan ends up being made, people will either see a decrease in their payment or a decrease in the remaining length of their loan. Depending upon the economic circumstances surrounding the country at the time of the revolution, this infusion of money may help to jump start an

*George Bailey*

economy in trouble: or it may pump more money into a system which has already over priced stocks as a result of too much free cash chasing existing investments. In either case, those of you who enjoy greater discretionary spending as a result of these changes have a moral obligation to roll most of that increase into a savings account; either first or second tier, in order to help facilitate this transition. It will be a moral decision because, while the Federal Reserve can initiate Criteria to insure that the loans made are for the purpose of Capitalizing those who are being Franchised with this revolution, it can not bar individuals from speculating with that individual's increased cash flow. In addition, as our "Real" economy improves, there will be gains in the stock market. And while these gains serve to stabilize the situation which I have previously explained to you, it will be those who have already invested who seem to reap from the illusion that the market is growing rather than solidifying. It is not hard to imagine the owners of Capital, in one last final "Hurrah", dangle the carrot. If this newly freed money chases their lure, they will be in position to do some "profit taking" and the system will collapse as it did in 1929.

So we see that it becomes a question of moral accountability from the President of these United States down to the homeowners of the country. In 1995, just under 65% of Americans were homeowners. That National average is skewed from place to place. In the heart of Elitism, the District of Columbia, only 38.2 % own the dwellings they occupy. Where the forces of the pyramid rule: Hawaii, California and New York, the percentages were the lowest in the country, with 50.2%, 55.4% and 52.7% respectively. Of course, the term "Homeowner" does not necessarily indicate that they own the home free and clear. Within these ranks there will be those who do. There will be changes in property value as I have explained. But, as the dust settles there will be a substantial number of this disenfranchised 35% who are not homeowners who would like to participate. There will be some who walk away from old mortgages. There will be some who do own their homes free and clear, but I suspect that, mostly, those people of the 65%, which represents homeowners at large, will refinance at a lower rate. Because interest paid out by Tier One and Tier Two banks will be in line with the realities of Capitalization rather than Feudal Capitalism, the only change this will constitute is that money will stop flowing out of the pockets of the working class [who in fact own this country], and out of the coffers of businesses big and small; and into the pockets of the Nobles. Many of the loans will not qualify for Tier One. They will simply roll over in Tier Two Banks at the lower rate. Those that qualify for Tier One, who pay off loans that are already established, will move money from the Federal Reserve into what have become Tier Two Banks, but this should not cause an increase in M1 [circulating liquid or cash assets], as they pay off loans that already existed on the books. Its affect will be the same as any loan currently refinanced between institutions.



If the Moral Fabric of the nation holds, money will find its way back to Tier Two Banks as Tier One Banks begin to Capitalize those who are not included in that 65%. But it must be remembered that the 65% figure is derived by dividing the number of homes in the US by the number of homeowners. Because not everyone lives as one family per dwelling, these numbers will be distorted. In addition, only about 60% to 70% of “Housing Units” are “Single Family Detached” type dwellings, which makes our 65% group closer to 40% or 50% of the nation as a whole. On the other side of the coin, some units are not “Single Family Detached”, but are still privately owned. Furthermore, some individuals prefer to rent, some will be satisfied to own Mobile Homes, others will prefer units within units [Condominiums], and still others will move into Class Three Retirement Housing,

It will fall to the Banking Industry and the Federal Reserve to facilitate the move of banks into Tier One and Tier Two Banking. It will fall to the Federal Reserve to use its Criteria to find a balance between holding inflation to desired levels, propping up Banking, safeguarding industry, and Capitalizing those who do not currently own a dwelling and who want to. Because it is impossible for me to know how many, if any, will choose to expatriate for \$10,000.00 apiece and because there are so many other variables, it may not be possible to Capitalize everyone with a home at the time of the revolution. Of those who want to and have the required down payment of 6%, it will fall to the Federal Reserve to set up a schedule, on a continuous scale, which Capitalizes the remainder of the population before the year 2010. Because it is the older end of the population that is in the greatest need of building equity in the face of the new realities, we shall give preference according to age. Younger individuals will not be barred from purchasing a home through Tier Two Banks, at interest rates which may not exceed 7% by law, unless the Federal Reserve sees housing prices inflating due to supply and demand and initiates Criteria to bar those individuals in Tier Two Banks.

This is the core and the heart of the Revolution. This is the field upon which the battle for ownership of this country shall be waged. It is the changing of the guard. It is a path that has been prepared for you, but to paraphrase Ben Franklin, it will be up to you to keep it. Remember, if the stock market doubled in value tomorrow and deflated to one tenth of that value the next day it would make no more difference than if those same people lost all their money gambling in Las Vegas so long as two things remained constant. So long as the money, the wealth, the “Capital” which existed independent of how much the stock market said was there, remained in circulation. After all, stock is a valuation of the assets and ability of a company in the same way that currency is a valuation of the Country it self. In the Great Depression, the Capitalists said that all businesses were not worth the value of the Capital that the Capitalists held. They refused to

*George Bailey*

put money into the system and thereby stopped the system. Without work, people could not buy goods so that goods could not be sold to start the economy to give people work. It was a self fulfilling prophecy. In the event of the same scenario after the revolution, because the Federal Reserve is obliged to pay wages through a system similar to unemployment insurance if job spitting can't get everyone employed, and because if the Federal Reserve refuses, it will be dissolved and its function handed over to the Treasury Department: if business at large is devalued by the assessment of existing Feudal Capital, it will find itself reassessed by Government through Capitalization. Losses will be incurred by stock holders, but the system will not remain stagnant after a collapse. This is only fitting. The second constant is that you own a home. That too is safeguarded as it has been outlined. After all, if you own a home and other real assets, they, along with all the other real assets of the country are the scale by which currency is balanced. Among these real assets are the companies whose value is represented in the stock market. As that amount, which is associated with the value of stocks, either real or imagined, increases; the amount which is representative of those assets which you own out side of the stock market are devalued to some extent by the inflationary affects of the stock market in comparison to the total amount of the Nation's assets. That is to say that, because there is more wealth associated with those businesses, a smaller percentage of the total wealth of the Nation is associated with your assets outside the market. Remember, in our current system there is productive inflation, but it is often overshadowed by non-productive inflation. A balloon in the value of the stock market, where money rushes in for speculation is, of course, non-productive. So that as wealth is increased in the form of currency, if the stock market soars as money chases the assets of business, these increases in wealth show up in the value of stocks, rather than, say, housing [or even the tooling up of manufacturing if they are all "Tech" stocks]. The paradox of this situation is of course that as wealth is increased in the stock market as a result of this assessment, the supply and demand forces on the housing market can see that stock market wealth reflected in an inflated value of your house. So while the press focuses on the "Great" economy of the end of the century, it misses the fact that for those who do not own a home, or stocks, or work at a job which is indexed for inflation, the "Great" economy disenfranchises them. In a stock market inversion, these same forces are brought to bear in reverse. In a world where people are disfranchised, where people own no home and can be left without a job and without means. So that, they become disfranchised in either scenario. They miss the train as housing costs escalate and they find themselves out of work and when the bottom falls out. In a retrospective of predictions made for the end of the Twentieth Century, it was reflected that people had once looked forward to thirty hour work weeks by the end of the century. By now you understand why that never came to be. If we can come to understand that in the game of Capitalism, when we work longer to save

more, to compete for fewer products, that we gain nothing; we will be ready to work toward that shorter work week. When the middle class becomes more centered around the an average yearly income, even if that income was made in fewer [or even greater] numbers of work hours, the bidding wars will decline. When people come to understand that in Capitalization luxury is, of necessity, reserved for a very few; when, as a result of an end to insecurity, people begin to live in the moment and save appropriately and also spend, without clawing their way to the front of the line, we will be ready to fulfill the promise of Democracy. What happens in the stock market should be irrelevant to most Americans because it is only a gambling house. Large losses of capital see individuals within those groups, who come out on the bottom, unable to perpetuate the supposed increases in the value of assets they have bid on. Those [including banks] who find members of this group in default, will find it necessary to remove value from their ledgers in a reversal of the money creation power of banks. Sometimes, just as with any business, this means that banks will go under. Savings accounts in the amount specified earlier will be insured. But if the economic systems that provide your job can be defended by the economic institutions of your government, independently of the folly of those who gamble with currency and its value: and if the wage you work for at that job is indexed to the cost of your home whether that cost goes up or down, and if your ability to own a home is underwritten by this Nation under God, then those on Wall Street play with paper and they play at their own risk. The value of currency becomes less relevant to individual citizens and at the same time its value is stabilized by a population which holds a majority of the Nation's real assets and does not speculate. It is a gift that every man and woman who ever gave of themselves for this country has bestowed upon you. It is a place which God has prepared for you.

The time has also come for your final exam. I am going to tell you about the pork industry as it existed in the winter of 1998/99, and then I will ask you some questions. I would like you to take what I have attempted to explain to you of the way the world works and apply it to this situation and the people in it, in this time and place. Your grade will determine the future of our country.

Through the end of the 1990's, the face of the hog market was changing. The little Mom and Pop farm operations that had historically supplied the market with pork products were being forced out of business by large operations, known as hog confinements. Where the traditional hog operation would have hogs counted in tens, or perhaps hundreds, hog confinements would count their hogs in thousands. Where the traditional operation would feed the grain grown on the farm and maybe put in some supplemental additives, the confinement would buy a quality checked, higher cost, state of the art feed by the truck load. Whereas the traditional operation would "slop" the hogs, the confinement would use an automated system to dispense the feed. The traditional operation would have the

*George Bailey*

hogs in and out of the hog shed periodically, the confinement hogs were, well, confined. And while the traditional operation would have a little odor around the place, the confinement would gather the fecal waste of these thousands of hogs in open pits, and the stench produced would foul the air for miles down wind.

It was this aspect of stench that would put the confinement operations at odds with non-farmers. Most of the new confinements were being built by large corporations or conglomerates. Generally speaking, if they built confinements, they built in a big way; maybe fifty buildings within a community. But there were others trying to play the game as well. Some family farm operations were building confinements of their own. They were borrowing against the equity of their land to finance the building. If they wanted to expand, many of them would use different parcels as collateral, but the banks would often insist that the confinements be built on the parcel offered up as collateral, so that confinements were scattered around the country side. As the number of small operations declined, some of the local grain elevator who had traditionally sold feed and supplements to the small operations were losing their revenue base as well. Some of them were entering into contractual agreements with these independent farm operations in order to stay in the business.

When confinements were proposed, they would be built with only one limitation. That was that they could not be built within a half mile of someone else's home. Of course, the flies travel several miles. Area farmers who were not part of the hog mania didn't like the idea of having one of the stinking places down the road from them, but in the end, they would champion the right of any farmer to do anything on that farmer's land; even if it devalued the property surrounding them. There was also a dichotomy as related to the way humans and hogs were treated by Government. If an individual or a family wanted have a septic system put in or even replaced, the contractor would be obliged, by law, to call in a Government representative. That county official would assess the size of the system needed to deal with a given dwelling. Houses that had functioned for decades with a given system, might well be forced to increase waste management capabilities by Government mandate and the county would tack on a couple of hundred dollars in fees to pay for the agency in charge of oversight. At the same time, the fecal waste of a thousand or two, or five, hogs could be washed into an open pit and left. If human waste was gathered from home septic tanks it would have to go to an acceptable waste facility, but the fecal waste of hogs could be sucked out of the open ponds and spread over farmland without regard to its proximity to homes or even towns and the smell would be nauseating. History had demonstrated that the concentration of cattle excrement in feed lots had contaminated ground water around the country with microbial life forms, so that even after the cattle were removed the contamination remained. That was in situations were only rain water and concentrated fecal materials were at play. At

the hog confinements, these “Fecal Ponds” kept contaminated water leaching into ground water continuously, leaving some to wonder if the process didn’t put even deeper aquifers at risk.

Some of the family farmers who got into the hog confinement game, contracted to buy their feeder pigs [the little pigs raised for slaughter in the confinements] from large feeder producers. Some contracted to feed pigs for other people. The BIG BOYS, who had the large corporate operations, it was said, contracted with slaughterhouses to supply those slaughterhouses with pork for five years in advance. When the whole thing fell apart, pork prices went through the floor. Farmers were selling hogs for less than they had sold for during the “Great Depression” [Adjusted for inflation]. Farmers who were contractually obligated to buy feeder pigs from feeder pig producers were killing the pigs rather than feeding them and losing even more money. The stories were all over the news. Some blamed the BIG BOYS. Some blamed government. In Iowa, some blamed the Ex-Governor, who had promoted the BIG BOYS and the idea of Iowa as a leading pork producing State, and then retired about the same time they succeeded. Some of the family farmers who had contracted to feed other people’s hogs and invested family money in to confinement buildings, never got the hogs when the house of cards collapsed, and when they insisted that a deal was a deal, they were told “So sue me”.

For all this, the price of pork did not plummet in the retail market. People would find pork products reasonable, even below normal and consumption would rise, but for the most part, the supposed industry wide glut would not show up at the meat counter, causing accusations to hurled at grocers as well.

Over time, and with enough sympathy from the press, government would begin by acknowledging the problem and then resolve to fund a bail out of the family farmers.

1. What caused prices to drop so dramatically and why weren’t those drops reflected at the meat counter?
2. Was it a sinister plot?
3. Who was being subsidized?
4. What principle of the chess board is at play within the struggle between The BIG BOYS and the family farm?
5. How did the rationalizations of the line known as the family farm help the BIG BOYS triumph in the market place?
6. Discuss the parallels between Feminism, the Cultural Revolution and the hog confinement bail out
7. Did the Governor of Iowa serve his constituents, or was he corrupt?

*George Bailey*

8. Why did the press fail to make these things a matter of discussion
9. Is this Communism, Socialism or Capitalism?
10. What is the environmental irony in all this?
11. Name the lines and their rationalizations

1a. If you said that the price drop was caused by an industry wide glut, you missed the big picture. The big pork producers did not run into trouble because they had contracted for the sale of their hogs far into the future. Because they are businessmen and women, they probably contracted for their feeders and their feed far into the future as well. Their risk was then limited to their ability to produce the number of hogs contracted for at the weight targeted, with the feed and labor allocated within that time frame. Because so many large operations got into the market, a large percentage of the meat packing market was spoken for contractually, and in advance. Therefore, all those pork producers who were not locked in contractually when their hogs came to market were left to compete as suppliers for that much reduced segment of the meat packing industry who is not already contractually obligated. Those meat packers were in a position to Capitalize on the glut within that smaller segment of the remaining producer market. Those meat packers would sell to retailers at rates that were comparable to competing meat packers who were locked into contracts at normal market prices with the “Big Boys” and pocket the windfall profit. You may think that this makes them the bad guy. But they are not in the business of propping up farmers who made bad business decisions. If you make money in the stock market, do you give it back to those that lost money? Of course not. Had they helped some farmers, do you think that when the situation was reversed, and there was a shortage in that smaller segment of the meat packing market which lived or died day by day, that farmers would give those meat packers their hogs at reduced rates to save the meat packers? Many of those involved had seen the figures at the bottom line for big producers and jumped in without understanding the game. Some had seen no other way to keep the family farm in business so they opted for the emotional response, jumped in and failed.

2b. No, there is no plot here: at least as it relates to the BIG BOYS and the lower prices. This is Capitalism at work. By guaranteeing a constant supply of reasonably, and probably lower, priced hogs, the large confinements guaranteed reasonable and consistent, and perhaps lower, prices to consumers. Had it not been reasonably priced, meat packers would not have dared to contract at that price. Some of those family farms that contracted to buy feeder pigs, did so blindly. Had they contracted for their feed and for their sale price by using the commodities futures market, they too could have locked in a profit or decided not to invest time money and labor. It then becomes a gamble for those who trade in

the futures market. Those people would not presume to go to the public if they lost money in the type of speculation which did, in fact, occur with regard to the hog market. It should be noted however, that there are volume constraints on the futures markets. That is to say that small traditional operations do not raise enough hogs to offer them on the futures market. However, if the family farm confinements did raise enough to lock in sale prices on the futures market, then they were speculating on better market prices at the time of sale and lost: not as farmers but as speculators. As for those who contracted to feed the hogs of others: all manner of businesses in the real world get caught in unfair situations all the time. For them, the small business owners of the private sector, the choices are not nearly so "Choice". They can sue. But there is no guarantee that they will win in light of our judicial system. There is no guarantee that if they win, those who they contracted with will pay, or even have the ability to pay. These are the rules of Capitalism. If they became involved with speculators who failed, then they did not do their homework to begin with. These are the rules and the consequences of Capitalism.

3a. If your first answer was the family farmer, then you have not become cynical enough to look for the truth. I have told you about environmental subsidies. It is not hard to see that the large confinements, no matter who owns them, are being allowed to infringe upon their community. Even if the fecal ponds do not leach into the water table, then they infringe because of the methane gas which is often present in the air which everyone nearby must breath. The heath of entire communities is at risk. But I have also told you about FEMA and the way it is used to prop up mismanaged banks. When the government money is finally distributed to family farms to save them from their own circumstance, it is likely that it will be enough to keep the loans at the bank afloat, but it will not be the blank check that the press would have the town folks think. It will, more than likely, leave the farm on the ropes, but still paying as best it can, with taxpayers making up the difference with reduced interest rates. Those who own the farm that their father owned and his father before him, will go right on in the tradition of the Danes. The land prices will be propped up to keep the house of cards from tumbling down in order to insure that the son of the banker becomes the banker. Those who were not born to the small business which is farming will be barred from participation by over inflated land prices which must be propped up to insure that those who were not born bankers will not get involved in that small business [area banks]. The consumer will pay a fair rate for pork, but as tax payers; they will be overcharged. Feed suppliers will be subsidized by propping up family confinement operations against the traditional hog farm which grew large percentages of its feed. The political party of the Governor is more than likely a subsidy recipient as well. The large pork producers undoubtedly supported the Governor and his party with campaign contributions in order to get the environmental considerations over looked. The value of homes within a close

*George Bailey*

proximity of a confinement operation will be devalued. This too, then, is a subsidy paid by individual property owners. But these people do not constitute a voting block as powerful as farmers, nor a campaign contributor as large as the BIG BOYS.

4a. When considering the circumstance of today's farmers, we discussed their declining contribution as it had to do with labor and how that adversely affected their ability to make a living off of the family farm. We also discussed Rob Roy's problem of not being able to provide the land for the cattle venture and still raise the money to buy the cattle. That is, he could sell the land to raise the money, but then he would not have the land necessary to the endeavor. But as I have explained, "SOME" of those who "GAMBLED" the family farm, did so by putting confinements on adjacent properties to satisfy bankers. Had they sold the adjacent properties and built the new confinements next to existing ones using those monies from the sale, they could have avoided the cost of borrowing the money. Presumably, because the BIG BOYS were investors, they had put up their own capital. Those who had not, were more than likely the same ones who would back out of their contracts with area farmers. This disparity in interest rates would be the trump card for investment over borrowed money. At the same time, it is entirely possible that the amount of equity in a given parcel would not cover the expense of building a new confinement; while at the same time, banks would lend in spite of this fact if the confinement were put on the parcel in question. It is the Communistic nature of today's banking system which allocates resources based on political considerations within the banking system rather than Capitalistic realities. Communistic by virtue of the fact that banks are assured of a safe investment because they know farmers will be protected politically from falling, regardless of their poor choices as a group.

5a. The corporate confinements are being subsidized through wages. Because it is not likely that those who own stock in the large operations are the same ones performing the chores; and because farmers have always been able to avoid paying minimum wage levels to agricultural workers, the corporations competing with family farms are allowed to hire workers for less if they can find them. This devalues the cost of what labor the family farm brings to the equation. The health standards as they relate to septic waste, which must be met by individuals homes within the community, are waved for confinement operations, on the historical principle that whatever farmers wish to do with their land is their business and no one else's: even when water and air are fowled and noise levels are unreasonable as a result. Because of this, confinements are then forced by Capitalism, to fall to the lowest common denominator. That is to say, if your competition doesn't spend the capital to dispose of their fecal waste in an environmentally sound and socially conscience way, you can't do it and compete. It may even be that if waste management were included in the equation, the small



traditional operations could use their advantage of home grown feed and no need of septic system expense, and self supplied labor to compete head on with large confinement corporations. Finally, as I have explained, no one in the private sector, who had failed to show a profit through the 1970's and 80's would ever be allowed to borrow money from a bank because banks don't want to end up with the collateral. Contrary to what most people think when being foreclosed against, banks hate to get your collateral. They want your payment. They are not set up to fix and sell assets. They are out of their element when they have to sell things and those who sell for them must be paid. This tradition within the farm community and its relationship with banks, that says that farmers may borrow against the equity in their land regardless of market realities, is a privilege the private sector would never be afforded. But at the same time, as seen here, it is often a snare that allows the ill prepared to get in over their head.

6a. When the Feminists tell you that God is a She, they are telling you that the world is a place where the old never die and beauty never fades. When those principles are brought to bear in the real world, we get a society in which the status quo is held in place at the expense of those who are disfranchised because for those who once had, to lose what it was that they had, is too sad to bear: while the lost aspirations of those who never got a chance are invisible to those too self absorbed to see the world as it is.

When I was a young man starting out in the world, I worked construction as a laborer. Within the ranks of those who worked along side me, there would be those who would have the natural abilities required to become machine operators or foremen or Journeymen in what ever the field was and they would someday get the opportunity to use those talents. There would also be those who did not possess these talents but they did have their youth, their strength and their stamina. Within the spectrum of jobs to be performed within any given group involved in construction, there will also be a job description known as the "Gofer". It is the odd man out and the one who does all the odd jobs, including to "Go For" this or that. They sweep, they deliver messages, they run back to the office, they wait for someone to show up on the job to pass on instructions or they hold a sign. It was a job that usually came as a reward to those who had given their youth, their strength, their stamina and their loyalty to a company until all but their loyalty had faded away. When the Women's movement began, it would be their job that Feminists got. Capitalism demanded it, because in order to compete, most businesses could only afford one Gofer, and because in the real world, those outside the union's apprentice programs could not learn to run equipment while the job at hand stood waiting, nor could they become foremen or a journeyman on their first day out, nor did they have the strength and stamina the old man had used up: because of these things the young women who entered the work force in the seventies took the job titled Gofer. They never saw those

*George Bailey*

that they would disfranchise because on the day they arrived the dirty work had already been done. They never saw the faces of those who missed their turn in line to start at the bottom in traditional ways, nor did they see the faces of those individual's families as they struggled to get by on lower incomes. Thirty years later, Affirmative Action has produced a hand full of machine "Operators" who are women. It has found a few women who can, to some degree, contribute as laborers; I have even seen a foreman and a contractor: but the job most often filled is Gofer. Not because there is a glass ceiling, but because Gofer is not the position from which one learns the other positions, but it is the only one most of those women in the field come qualified to perform. So we see that the double standard of the Feminist movement extends itself to preserving all things as they are regardless of consequence, unless the steamroller of change is operated by a woman.

You can not point to family farms which lose money, as a way of life that must be preserved in a system which professes opportunity for all. You can not take the tools and the furniture of the masses away from the masses, so that the farmers can use them to make steel, when the farmers do not know how to make steel: and when steel can not be made using those ingredients; just because public opinion wills it to be so. Some of the best and most innovative farmers of my generation were never given the opportunity to farm because the nostalgia for a way of life that is no more, is perpetuated by those who do not wish to give it up and a press that panders to them.

7a. I have no way of knowing the motives or intentions of the Governor of Iowa. I only know that he supported a change in the economic landscape that was doomed from the beginning as it related to family farm hog operations, and the taxpayers; as it is taxpayers who have historically had to pay for the mistakes of farmers. I know that when he allowed confinements, under any ownership, to operate without concern or consideration of those around them, that he failed to look at the big picture and how it would affect farmers and non-farmers alike. I know that he retired. But it is unlikely that I will ever hear whether or not he profited directly from the confinement situation because the press will not concern itself with the accountability of retired politicians. I am inclined to believe however, that because he supported the confinement approach, that he was helped politically by members of that group. I believe this because that is the way our current system works. So even if it is true, it does not make him a criminal, any more than a lawyer who keeps a confidentiality of an illegal activity. He is operating to the best of his ability within a situation which is not of his making. Still, if that is ultimately the case, one is not morally exonerated by the system when they have participated. If he receives only the retirement package of a Governor, he will receive it as a result of campaign contributions made on his behalf that got him the job. If some of those contributions came as a

result of confinement owners, then they helped him secure his retirement by helping to get him elected. I also know that when his replacement came to office, the new Governor would leave the Hog Confinement problem to be decided on by individual localities. What that would mean was that those Confinements located near metropolitan areas and larger cities would probably be run out of business by a majority vote in those areas while individuals who were not in the Confinement business would be likewise, lorded over in rural areas. Those Confinements allowed to dominate will not be forced to make improvements which insures, economically, that those near population centers will not be able to afford to. The quality of life for farmers will continue downward. Consumers will not profit that much, but they will pay the environmental costs. The Republic will fail to be served. But the Governor will be able to please the majority in both rural Iowa and metropolitan Iowa in the game of democratic self government called Hurray for Me and to Heck with You.

8a. To begin with, look at the length of this discussion so far. The press as it has evolved today, is not equipped to dispense this much information. The world is complicated and its problems complex. It will not do to inform by “Sound Bite” and expect the masses to understand. Even if the press understood what was going on, when you get back to farm country and watch a little TV, you will soon see that the advertising dollar is in no small part directed at that large group of “Supposed” small business men called the farmer. If you go around throwing the truth in peoples faces, you will soon lose your advertising revenue. The press is in the sales business, not the news business. They do not pick their anchors for their insight or their willingness to expose themselves to risk or even danger. They are chosen by “Demographic”. They are actors who tell us what we want to hear and what they want us to believe. Stirring up the mud against those who you make your money from is bad business. Stirring up those from who you gain power is good politics. Looking into the finances of any public official that you have not targeted for some other reason, risks the exposure of those you hold in your pocket if you are among those who wield power through ownership of the press.

9a. Were their any Communists involved? That would depend on which capacity of the farm operation you are referring to. None of the pork producers probably qualify as a Communist. As we discussed, Communism as it is referred to today, began as the concept which was originally called Socialism. In that system, government allocates resources, collects profits and distributes those profits along political lines. If we look at the family farm in which some land is held in soil conservation and plowing techniques are dictated by Government; and economic stability is guaranteed by Government for those who play along, it is easy to draw parallels. In the hog confinements described as belonging to the BIG BOYS, we can see elements of Socialism as it has come to be known; the

*George Bailey*

bastard child of Capitalism and Communism. Because it is subsidized at the cost of the private sector in the form of lowered standards of living for area inhabitants, lowered property values and possibly, farm labor prices, the BIG BOYS are the Socialist recipients of a subverted economy. Because the family farm hog confinement operation is held up through Government bail outs when bad business decisions should have bankrupted the business in question, we would have to call that Socialism as it is defined today as well. The banks, that lent the money to so many at the same time, and for the same purpose, should be held accountable in the market place under Capitalism. They should have been forced to foreclose on operations that had become insolvent. If it happened to enough of them, prices would fall on area property and assets would adjust to see which banks had adequate collateral and which didn't. But by bailing out the farms, Government bailed out the banks. Money went from the hands of those who showed a profit as taxes, and into the hands of those held up by the Government: Socialism.

If you are looking for elements of Capitalist, you can find two groups. The first is the group who currently prevails: the BIG BOYS. The other is the little family farm operation that raises his own young pigs, all the way from tending to their mother, to the time when the little piggies are grown and ready to go to market. But the only true Capitalists were the laborers who were allowed to work for sub-minimum wages at the confinements owned by the Big Boys, and who's taxes helped to prop up the whole house of cards.

10. The irony of the hog confinement is that the stench which flows out from these places is methane. It is a fuel spill that no one has bothered to address. It is a liability waiting to be converted into an asset. Had the Government insisted on the same environmental standards for confinements as it does for households, the incentives and the money would have been in place to put the fecal material into receptacles that captured the gas and burned it to create electricity. Then rather than spread it on fields while it was still giving off gas and stink, it would be retained until the gas was all gathered and then spread. It is a win/win situation never initiated. While hog confinements are producing hogs, gas and fertilizer, only the hogs themselves are being used to their full potential. It is bad leadership.

11. The old bakery, that made fresh bread and cakes on Main Street, was a way of life for the baker and his family. The shoe repair shop was a way of life for the cobbler and his. From the typewriter manufacturer, to telegraph operator, time marches on. It is understandable to feel empathy for those who are displaced by progress. But it is the people who never get their chance to participate that suffer when we try to prop up those who had their day and failed. I have been striping away at the facades that are the armor worn by those who stand in their lines. The Farmers will tell you the rationalizations of their lines, not because

they conspire with each other, but because they spend their lives in the company of farmers. Those farmers see the world from the same perspective and explain the world with the same mythologies. They are just trying to feel good about themselves and what they do to survive in a world which was not of their own making. Some of those farmers went into the hog confinement game and lost; and because people are sympathetic, they believe that they have a right to be protected by the Government.

The large confinement owners are Capitalists who have seen an opportunity to make a profit in the hog market. This is good for consumers so long as they do not subvert the system. But because the system was subverted by farmers who have resisted environmental considerations and politicians who believe in leadership for those who can afford it, the Capitalists rationalize that this was the game: and like the farmer, they must survive within the rules of the game.

Out in the farm communities, farming is the business that most people are in. The banks are run by bankers, who know very little about what it takes to make it in an unprotected economic environment, and who see things through the lens of a banker. They know that if they back farmers the Government will keep them solvent because farmers have political clout and a lot of public support as well. If a banker lends money to a small business which is not protected, and that individual fails, the bank will lose. Because they can not see out side their circle of influence, they are unable to see that the pie which is the wealth of the nation is getting smaller and smaller as a result of their timidity and ignorance. They rationalize that because they did not lose money when farmers failed, that money was not lost. But in fact it was lost twice. Once when the farmer failed and once when a business was turned away for not being a "Safe" bet. So in the end, the taxpayer, who will bear the burden of these choices, will bear it with the help of fewer assets: because while it is said that the first computer was invented in Iowa in 1937, it is California which is the computer capital and it is Iowa where welders labor on factory assembly lines for \$9.00 an hour.

It would not fall to me to explain these things to you were it not for the rationalizations of the press. The journalists who do not seek the truth, but rather regurgitate the mythologies of the lines that they entertain, are at the epicenter of our problems. I do not know whether farmers will be bailed out with a blank check or a debt around their neck. The reason I do not know is because a sound bite which gives too much information does not tantalize. I am not directed to the truth, but rather to the broadcast coming up in the future. The questions which would lead to the truth might offend the mythologies. More importantly, they would call for journalism, when what is offered is showmanship. The press rationalizes itself to be journalistic in nature, but in fact it is Entertainment. The market forces brought to bear in broadcast news are the same as in Hollywood. In both cases, it is a quirk in the marketing mechanism that allows fortunes to fall

*George Bailey*

into the laps of those fortunate enough to be chosen. Actors and Broadcast journalists do not market them selves in a Capitalistic manner the way one might telemarketer a commodity. Actors and their like are the commodity. When the whole thing started, actors and actresses were under contract with the old Hollywood Studios. Once marketed, they were obliged to work under that indenturement. They were owned. As the studio system collapsed, actors became free agents so to speak. They could be built up and marketed, but now they could retain the glitter created in the marketing process and market it themselves. The disparity in wages between the stars of the stage and the stares of the screen is not due to ability but marketing: marketing which they do not do for themselves. So it is easy to see how their rationalizations cause them to have blinders on when dealing with problems such as the “Bad Boys” of sports who are cut from the same cloth, and even Politicians. However this common thread between movies and broadcast media is not their only link. They also share, in great percentages, the notion that the world is unfair to those who do not live as equitably as “they”, and “they” are forever trying to elevate the standards for those at the bottom in order to rationalize the fact that they are overcompensated by circumstance. Unfortunately, they have never come to grips with the fact that it is the masses who pay for their charities. This Socialism for the sake of guilt is understandable in Hollywood, where entertainment is the bar by which all is measured. But it is unforgivable in the press, where knowledge and insight, courage, honor and humility have been discarded as necessities and replaced with the “Talking Head”.

In the end, the story of the hog confinements is the story of how our nation doesn't work any more. It also brings up questions which we as a nation are not yet ready to deal with. I have often thought that cattle must wonder what it is they have done to deserve a farmer. I mean, if someone showed up to feed you and your family twice a day, took care of your medical needs and made sure you didn't freeze to death by leaving their warm house to come out and see over you in bad whether, you would have to wonder why. Most cattle are born in a pasture in the company of their own. They live in that heard until the day when they are transported to another heard. Out west they will graze unencumbered. In the Midwest they will live in closer quarters but their food will be the best there is. The farmer or rancher will ask nothing of them except that they remain healthy, safe and in good feed. Then one day they will find themselves in situation that is new and probably frightening. A short time later, the only discomfort they have ever known will be over. It is a life that is not all that bad. More importantly, it is a life that would never have existed at all, if not for the farmer and the meat eaters who pay the farmers. If we say that we will not allow cattle to be slaughtered, then we have said that their life was better not lived at all and under the circumstances I have just described. I doubt even the cattle would agree with you.

At the other end of the spectrum, I have heard that in some large egg operations, hens are confined to a cage for the entire span of their lives. When they die, their legs must be cut from the floor of the cage because their feet have grown entangled as part of the cage itself.

When my grandfather raised hogs in a shed a hundred yards from the house, the hogs spent time in the shed and in the lot. They wallowed and they rooted [dug with their nose]. They were pigs. In a hog confinement, they will see the sun, but they will never know what it is to have it shine on them. Whether that matters to a pig has more to do with whether it matters to us I suspect. But I will tell you this. In California, there was a proposition which passed concerning the sale of horses for human consumption. It was one of those “touchy feely” issues that couldn’t fail out west. So, at a time when horses were finding a market as meat for humans in other parts of the world, California made it a crime to sell horses in California, for that purpose. Since most meat headed over seas would logically be bought on the coast, the amount of horse meat leaving to be served up on foreign tableware, probably fell dramatically. But the law did not address selling horses for glue or dog food. Now it is entirely possible that I misinterpreted the sound bite which explained the proposition. But if I didn’t, then it is my scenical nature to assume that it was just as likely that it was the dog food manufacturers who sponsored the proposition and the press never raised the issue.

When the whole hog confinement issue unfolded, it would be the rationalization of all those who stood in the line of “politician” who would stand by and let the BIG BOYS move in without allowing for competition. No one entrusted to look out for consumers or small farms would champion the notion of setting up a brokerage that could consolidate the small numbers from small farms, so that they could use the commodities market to make sound investment strategies. No one in charge of looking out for the citizens would watch out for their environment or their property values. No one would be opposed to Monsanto, Dupont and other chemical giants as they began to buy up seed producing companies. No one would challenge the mega-banks as they merged and then merged again. If my memory serves, Teddy Roosevelt took a bullet in the middle of a speech, a speech that he completed, rather than give into terrorism. He was a man of courage. Not because he killed men on foreign soil, but because he stood up to the Capitalists and their trusts. The bullet was more than likely a message. But he broke the monopolies and the world was better for it. He did it because he was moral and he understood that Capitalism, unchecked, hurt people. He served his country. Today, to paraphrase Lincoln, there are too many pigs and still not enough teats.

The problems that confront us are not simple. If you insist on simple answers and abridged versions, so that you can run this country as a democracy, then we

*George Bailey*

will have more of the same. When you are ready to analyze the situation so that you can question those you have chosen to represent you in a republic, we will be ready to fulfill the promise of democracy. When you demand the truth from the press and call it down when it fails to serve those who entrusted it with the freedom to seek out and then to speak the truth, then we will be the America of legend.

As I have told you, this book is for the children. So it is at this point that I will close my thoughts on the Feminist women of America with what I believe to be their greatest cruelty. Because women have been lead to abandoned Motherhood, they have found it necessary to devalue, even trivialize, Fatherhood and men themselves. Archie Bunker has been replaced with “The Tool Man” who is in need of constant instruction and improvement with respect to his role in society. This is not to say that the involvement of men within the family unit was not improved by making men more able to show affection and more empathetic. But those who wish to promote the Feminist view have belittled men in a way that removes respect from the equation. The male contribution is seen as a given. It is often reduced to a pay check, which will be received from the father even if that father is forced to leave. You may think that I speak only to the adverse affects this has on the male children of our society and their sense of self worth: but it extends to girls as well. No one would think to challenge the importance of a mother to her son, but the role of Father to his daughters is of no less importance.

In the game preserves of Africa it had become time to limit the number of elephants. The encroachment of man and the geographical constraints of the reserves demanded it. Since elephants live in a Matriarchal society, the most likely candidates for extermination were the old bull elephants. As a result, once young male elephants grew too old to remain members of the matriarchal herds, the young bulls were banished and left to the company of other young bull elephants. Within the game preserves there were, of course, other wild creatures. Among them were the endangered Black Rhinos. And while the elephant population was stable, Black Rhinos were decreasing in number. When the cause of their decline was determined it was not from poaching as you might suspect. The Black Rhinos were being killed by the young bull elephants who ran in “gangs” and killed for sport. Young male elephants were mating with female elephants while still in the juvenile years and asserting themselves within their territory. The whole problem was alleviated by bringing in a few old Bull Elephants from neighboring areas and the violent aggression against the rhinos ceased.

Today, the media in all its forms, from news to entertainment, professes that a family unit is complete when a child is bound to a loving mother. When we look around our country it is not difficult to see that young men sense that they



are not respected in a culture which is all about the choices of women. They do not revere women who neither show them respect nor revere themselves. This strategy will not perpetuate a culture nor sustain a nation. There are probably those within the feminist movement who would advocate that, given that we can now propagate the species without men, that males should be aborted. But I am not here to promote Feminism. If they could see beyond themselves they would understand that Alexander The Great came to dominate most of the known world through savage aggression and found his sexual gratification through the Homosexual acts that Feminists champion for the Gay community: and with the advent of cloning we no longer require women to perpetuate the species. What I am here for, is to explain to you women who love your fathers and your grandfathers and your husbands, and your brothers and your sons, that you must change the way in which you deal with the world. With that in mind, I will try to address the male dilemma as it exists today in America, with regard to masculinity and violence.

There was a time when I was growing up, that when two men had a disagreement that came to blows; when one of those two men was down or said they had had enough, the fight was over. Those who took cheap shots could win the fight and still be seen as the loser. That is no longer the case. The code of ethics has been lost to the mean streets of our nation and the revolving doors of our criminal justice system. But it is from a complex set of standards that we draw the mixed and unworkable situation, in which we find ourselves today. The first is the concept of the "Fair" fight. When a big man and a small man fight: if the big man wins, sympathy may well still go out to the small man, even if he started the fight or took a cheap shot. It is often a lose, lose situation for the big man. Along these same lines, the old line about the stupid Mexican who brought a knife to a gun fight says more about the unwillingness of the guy with the gun to fight a fair fight, than it does about the intelligence of the Mexican. The American courts have said that if someone uses a weapon; be it a club, or a knife or a gun, which is a step up from what the other person has, that they have used excessive force.

So what is a fair fight? Back when the kings of Europe sent their soldiers out on the battle to die like pawns on a chessboard, they lined up and shot at the opposing force; one line and then the next. When the British sent their soldiers over to the American colonies, the Americans wouldn't fight fair. They shot from behind trees. They were not willing to play by some "code" of honor dreamed up by some King. They had probably learned the techniques from Native American "Indians". They were trying to survive.

In Africa, the Zulu tribe and its rivals had evolved to a form of warfare that was more ceremonial in nature. They all went out and lined up just out of range and threw spears at each other. Those who got hit were the exception. That is,

*George Bailey*

until a man by the name of Shocka Zulu came along to unite the tribes by teaching them to kill without mercy.

The soldiers who had come to fight the “Savages” in the American West had come from the savagery of a Civil War in which a fair fight included improved armaments that lay men down like shafts of wheat before a sickle. They would now be turned on a People who thought that a fair fight was counting “coup”. The settlers caught in the middle were dealing with lawlessness from Whites as well as from some Native Americans. Hollywood would sell America the idea of the gun fight as the fair fight, but in the real west people mostly just “blasted” each other. If it was called self defense or if the other guy was “drawing”, then it was a “Fair” fight. But if you just blasted someone you got hung if they caught you. It should also be said that if someone had a history of hurting people, they were very likely to just be found [or not found] dead. No one was going to look very hard into such an incident.

By the turn of the century people wanted law and order; and they got it. They gave up their guns because people who had guns at arm’s length tended to use them. They settled into one of the most prosperous periods in the history of mankind and then came WWI. In WWI they used things like “Mustard” gas on one another and it was considered fair. They introduced mechanization and hundreds of thousands died, and it was considered fair. At the same time, if you put a Red Cross on a vehicle and drove it down the road, it wouldn’t be fair to shoot at it.

I would grow up in the wake of WWII and I would be spoon fed the mythologies of the Nation victorious. But the war hadn’t started that way. The people who had believed that war was fair and noble in 1917 had changed their mind. A Black friend of mine once chastised that the celebrated “Sergeant York” of WWI had not killed any more of the enemy than a Black soldier who was not nearly so acclaimed. But York had been a Conscientious Objector who had been “turned” and that was why he was promoted for the sake of WWII. It was about the “fair” fight. It was about the notion that, while “Thou shalt not Kill”; when one is sanctioned by Government, for the good of the people, then killing becomes “fair”. But within the code remained the limitations. The moral constraints against shooting those in an ambulance; against shooting civilians; against torturing prisoners; remained.

My generation was raised with a disdain for those responsible in “The Batan Death March”; and it was probably at the core of our understanding when we later learned of “The Trail of Tears”. We were abhorred at the inhumane occupation of Europe, and it probably helped us understand the plight of Vietnam. We were raised to honor a “code” of conduct as it applied to going out back and settling an agreement with a fist fight; but the “fair” fight is an illusion.

I was sitting in a bar one time not too long ago, when a crowd of people breezed in, buying shots of liquor and trying to have a good time. But something was amiss, and two of the men headed for the door, followed by members of their party; presumably to head outside for a “Fair” fight. A few minutes later everyone was back inside as if the whole thing had been smoothed over. It was only a short time later when I happened to glance around the room and notice that the bigger one, of the two that had been at odds, was having a problem with another guy; a third party. And while I was not close enough to hear, nor involved enough to stare, it was obvious that this third man was trying to back out of a bad situation. I was turned away when the big guy swung on the third man, and I really can’t say if he went down or if he simply melted into the crowd, because when the clatter of the crowd turned the room’s attention back to the big man, he was half way to the guy who had stepped outside with him. Before that smaller guy had a chance to react, he was down and out. As is often the case in such an event, the big guy was separated from the man down and swept back by the crowd almost instantly. Just as swiftly, another man, of even larger stature, ran up to “stomp” the guy who was down. He got one kick in, and might have done it again as the crowd watched in disbelief, had it not been for the girl friend of the guy who was in trouble and unconscious on the ground. It would be she who appeared from nowhere and backed the big man out the door, with nothing but her body and her mouth.

When the young men of my generation headed off to make war in South East Asia, they went with the backing of one of the best trained and best equipped armies ever assembled. What they wanted was a fair fight in which the armies of the North came out and faced that overwhelming force. It may sound like I am ridiculing our young men, but I am not. We, as Americans, were indignant that the armies of Communist, North Vietnam would hide by day in civilian clothing and strike by night. We thought them cowardly for retreating into adjoining countries to regroup and fight again. We expected them to face our superior armaments and honor our codes of war, but instead they set “booby traps” and attacked our soldiers with women and children and they tortured our Prisoners of War. At the same time, it would be our government who would hamstring our troops. The politics of Vietnam, would prevent our army from crossing a line drawn on a map. In the same way it had in Korea, our politicians would deny our soldiers the sanctions given Sergeant York. In the same way that they would come to say that if a man attacks another man with a knife, that one is limited to self defense with a knife: as if all men a proficient with knives. The courts would say [of that bar fight] that because this big guy had hit but not killed the smaller man; and had then been separated from the smaller man, that, once back on his feet, the small man should now adhere to the “Marquis of Queensbury Rules” or something. He should wait and let the big guy take another cheap shot somewhere down the road. One that he didn’t get up from. Then society would

*George Bailey*

deal with the situation. We've all seen enough bar fights to know that the cheap shot is usually the only shot.

When those two bar fighters first went outside, they had gone to engage in a conflict; and while the larger of the two seemed to have an advantage by size, he had opted to withdraw into the DMZ [the Demilitarized Zone] until the other guy was asleep. Because I would later learn the bigger man's identity, I would come to understand that the "Surprise attack without mercy" [as Custer said in "Little Big Man"] was his standard method of operation. What's more, his backup man was never far away.

There is a song out there which asks "Where is my John Wayne? Where is my prairie sun? Where is my happy ending? Where have all the cowboys gone?". Oddly enough, my first recollection of the end of the "Code" as portrayed in the "Western" movie, was in a John Wayne film called "The Sons Of Katie Elder". In the movie, the eldest "Elder", played by Wayne, hit a man in the face without warning, using a pick handle. The old idea of the fair fight was challenged further in a movie which happens to be one of our family favorites. I probably don't even need to describe the scene if I tell you that the movie is "Raiders Of The Lost Ark". But if you don't know; the hero is challenged by a Arabian swordsman. At the first viewing of the movie Americans would wonder how in the world the hero would escape this obviously superior foe in a sword fight. Of course the answer was that the stupid Arab had brought a sword to a fight which the hero had determined was a gun fight; and he was unceremoniously shot to death. Those watching the movie would actually find themselves laughing at the outcome. Why? Because it made so much sense, and was so obvious and yet it had never occurred to us in the light of our up bringing. It went against the code, just as what John "Elder" had done had gone against the code. But as the heroes we could see their justification: in the same way that we could see the justification of the soldiers of the American Revolution and miss it altogether in Vietnam. It's why the courts have been forced to limit our level of retaliation; because at the same time that the American POWs were being tortured, American soldiers were throwing North Vietnamese soldiers out of helicopters while in flight. That is to say, violence will always escalate if people abandon codes for retaliation.

Today in the big cities of our nation many of the men who are out in society have come out of prison, but they have never really left it. They still show the tattoos that identify them as dangerous men. They walk with an attitude. Their faces are stern. Their posture is aggressive. They come from a world where you either fight or you become a victim; a "Punk". It is not the Gentlemen's fist fight of the Western. It's not "The Big Country" where men whale on each other until they can no longer stand up and then go to dinner and no one knows they fought, because they don't have a mark on them. It is not the "Good" fight that the early

westerns portrayed, were guys punch on each other without reaching for the gun on their hip. Those were tales of fantasy. They taught moral precepts and an admirable code of ethics, but they did not teach reality. The fight fought on our streets today is the fight for survival. It is the fight which is part of the method used by our corrections systems to keep prisoners [what is professed to be], "Under Control". So that by allowing our own sense of vengeance to be perpetrated on these individuals sent to prison, we find it visited upon ourselves. In response to this mind set in which one either stands up or punks out, the young men of the city have tried to stand up to a code which is none existent. Men no longer live by the code which existed in my youth. Why should they? The courts have said that the man who brings a gun to a knife fight will suffer the consequences in court. The "Street" has demonstrated that the loser may well be dead and the court holds the death of those on the street as worth only five to seven years in the corrections system. It is the reality of Vietnam visited on us in our streets in which the rules that protected us as part of the Geneva Convention have been cast off and nullified.

Oddly enough, those who swagger around intimidating those around them, may appear to be prevailing as a result of the laws of the jungle and survival of the fittest: but in fact, they prevail, they survive, as a result of society and its codes. The 6'4", 270 pound male is the swordsman unceremoniously blown away by the 5'2" 120 pound Mexican who brought a gun to the fist fight. And why should we expect any less. If it were you, would you allow others to oppress you because of their size, out of respect for some kind of code which did not protect you? If you were large, would you let the smaller man snap your knee cap before the fight is proclaimed as begun? Down in Texas one young man drove a car over another in a use of excessive force that society decided did not warrant prison on the grounds that the intimidation and fear perpetrated against the driver of the car by the young man who died, had left him unable to defend himself without bringing a car to a fist fight. Right or wrong, true or false, society is afraid and reacting out of fear. We are moving away from a society which teaches moral precepts and self imposed restraint for a world in which we behave out of fear of retribution from the State. We are becoming a nation under surveillance as feared in George Orwell's book "1984". It is a system of fear and punishment that was abandoned with the Reformation. Because it is not based on the understanding that we are loved by God and therefore obliged to love and honor Him in return, it does not teach a society love and tolerance. Instead it teaches hate and distrust.

So, therein lies the male dilemma. It is no longer the size of the man in the fight; or even the fight in the man, as they used to say. It is the degree to which one man is willing to hurt the other. Where have all the cowboys gone, They have been sucker punched. They have been invited outside to settle a

*George Bailey*

disagreement like men and been ambushed or shot, because the guy who tries to live by a code of conduct is bringing his bare knuckles to a gun fight. The cowboys have turned in their guns in support of a legal system which does not support their code. A guy who can not bring himself to beat his foe unconscious may not be allowed to leave alive; and he who does not kill his foe may find himself unceremoniously shot at some time in the future.

Why have we come to this? Because our courts have said that we may not defend ourselves, and at the same time they have refused to defend us. When Gary Cooper fought it out in "High Noon" he was allowed to bring a gun to the gun fight. He had Sergeant York's government sanction to shoot on sight and shoot to kill. The movie "Tomb Stone" alleged that, in the real West, Wyatt Earp over reached his legal authority to bring his gun to the gun fight and it was a good thing. Oddly enough there was another version of the story told in that same year that didn't love the man nearly as much as "Tomb Stone" [the movie] had. This will always be the case when justice is dealt with on the streets by law enforcement. They will see themselves as the hero. Some of society will see them as the hero. But the families of those who die without their day in court will not see it that way. That is why we have courts. But when the courts don't protect society, society will turn to the Wyatt Earps and with good reason. Still, he was not law enforcement, he had become the vigilante.

As I have repeatedly told you, no one sees themselves as the bad guy. Sometime in the 1990's, they interviewed an old woman who had been one of the girls who ran with some of the most notorious gangsters from the days of prohibition. She referred lovingly to her group as "Our little mob". The two guys who ambushed that fellow in the bar, were no doubt, able to rationalize their point of view. They will go through life, dealing with conflict in this manner until someday, somewhere, one of them runs into someone who doesn't mind serving five to seven, and he unceremoniously does them in. If it plays out like other examples I have witnessed in my life time; at that point, the partner will slip out of town, never to be heard from again. It's a waste all round.

If we are to return to any type of code in which men can face man without involving the courts, then the courts will have to remove those who will not honor the code from our midst and the corrections system will have to teach them the code rather than manipulate them through the denial of it. When someone is sucker punched or is accosted without warning, that should be considered a felony. When someone is beaten when they are down; again it should be a felony, because so long as such behavior is allowed within a society, only those who are willing to bring a gun to the fight dare speak up or defend themselves. Society has an obligation to protect its members from internal threats as well as external threats. If it can not do that, it will eventually lose the support of its members.

They will gather instead around warlords. They will become segmented, factionated, and violent. They will seek the protection of their little mob.

But if this revolution should come to pass, we will have a court system in which a jury of one's peers can decide. Like the small communities of the isolated west, they can deal with those who make a habit of hurting people. We can then return to the "fair" fight. And what will it look like? In the day of the "Duel", the choice of weapon went to the one challenged. After all, the courts have said that someone versed in the martial arts must "License" their hands and feet so that they may not be used except in self defense. But if they only know enough to cripple you in a couple of different ways, then they still come to the fist fight armed. If they are accomplished "Street" fighters, it is not a "fair" fight unless you too are accomplished. If they come willing to kill or cripple you when all you are sanctioned to do by your code is to fight the good fight, then it is not a fair fight. In the end, fighting is almost always going to be a rigged game in which the best fighter is allowed to goat another into a "duel" using fists and that person must accept the challenge or face the ridicule of our society. The truly fair fight must then be, when the one challenged, gets to choose the means of the competition. Like when the guy picks a fight with you because he intends to use his superior ability to inflict pain on you and you get to choose a game of chess and the loser has to go three minutes of bare knuckles with, say, Mike Tyson. Everyone despises the guy who uses his attorney to drag people into court to have the courts beat up on them financially. It goes against the code of the middle class because they have been disfranchised in the courts and it is a tool used by the financially powerful to hurt the financially weak. It is a rigged game that uses the code of the legal system, because the judges are not the judges of the Old Testament who refer back to God's codes. They are the enforcers of the law of the "Crown", and the Nobles it serves. They use "Precedent" and those who can find the most, win. But in the end, both those who use lawyers to intimidate and those who bully with violence are just as wrong as the guy [or gal] who hires violence done: and the codes that foster the thinking that condones any of these methods are used by those who are served best by them.

When Sammy "The Bull" went out to do business by his "Code", he did not call his enemy out to see who could draw the fastest. He hit them with a "Sucker Punch" from a hand gun. He walked right up when they least expected it and "Whacked" them. The code that he lived by served those who used it to keep everyone else playing the game which served them, [Sammy and his associates]. But in the end, the code was non-existent. And when he denounced that code, many in the middle class would denounce him; not as the killer he was, but as one who broke a code that was, in reality, a sham. In the inner city, even the code of the "Sucker Punch" would be abandoned by those who would "Drive By" and indiscriminately shoot in the direction of anyone they had a problem with.

*George Bailey*

I have also lived to see a time when the power that the women of the middle class strive for would manifest itself in the form of violence in young women. We have traded our old society for one in which wealthy and influential women buy their power and domination in the courts. The middle class women squander the fruits of their marital unions toward the same end, and the poor now “Duke” it out in the streets for theirs. I looked on as two young women did each other physical harm and I heard a man laughing as if it were a sporting event put on for his pleasure. But he should have been crying. In the same way we should have cried when we saw ourselves laugh at the scene from “Raiders Of The Lost Ark”, he should have recognized that it was now our reverence for women that was being lost. We would all like to be the undisputed hero. It would have made any man present in that bar I told you about, proud, to be able to step it and save that young man who was down. If the beating had continued I hope that people would have gathered together to intervene. But the rules of engagement are unclear. Any force by an individual would have been met with force. There were no Gary Coopers present because no one was empowered by act of war, or civil authority, to use deadly force or even excessive force. Because his instrument of assault was his foot, anyone working within the guidelines of the code, would have to fight fair or deal with the courts. Fight fair, as the other member, or members, of the tag team returned to gang up on any aggressor. The only way to deal with the situation then, was to possess superior force, which is, by law, illegal. As for the cowboys: Which cowboys? Most of the ones that Clint Eastwood has portrayed would not have stepped in. They were the independent types that turned out to be “Lethal Weapons” when they themselves were confronted. But they were not prone to intervention. In the end, the best hope for the guy on the ground, in the quagmire we have created for ourselves, was the moral authority of womanhood. While the rest of the bar was assessing the situation, his girl friend dashed in with an emotional response and our reverence for woman saved the day. It was fortunate for everyone there, that some of that is still around. But as women join the military and engage in bar fights, one wonders for how much longer. One wonders how long it will be before the big guy knocks the girl down and out and the crowd laughs at how obvious his solution was.

We teeter on the brink. Whether it is by design or by ignorance I can not say, nor does it matter. But just as important as what the courts do, is the attitude of America’s women. If women embrace the notion that those who are not stand up guys are punks, then it is you women who force your men to either become violent enough to succeed in a violent world which you help to perpetuate: or to be humiliated for not doing so. Oddly enough, from Joey the Bull’s telling of his own story, we hear that it was not that he was a gangster, or even a murderer, that offended his wife, so much as the fact that in the end he failed to honor the



supposed code. And as you foster violence in your men you force it on your sisters and your daughters.

I told you that I would learn the identity of the guy who threw the sucker punch after the fight was over and all those involved had left. I knew because I had been told that this same guy had “set upon” {for lack of a better term} another man in the past. Had charges been filed at that time, this second situation may never have taken place as it did. I have no idea why charges were not filed. But I know that in our society today, filing charges can often be as big a “Sucker’s Bet” as a “Fair Fight”; because the system revolves. And because it revolves, a simple assault charge carries little deterrent weight. I also know that Society, as it exists today, has little respect for those who break the code and “Snitch”. It is considered “Punking Out”. But this too is a code which serves those who use it to abuse others. The next time you hear a news commentator use the word “snitch” to describe some body who comes forward with the truth , you should have them fired, and I will tell you why. If we are to have change, we will have to change our legal system. It will not be the one we have today where prosecutors “BUY” false witness in exchange for reduced sentences because that will be illegal. We will build a judicial system in which truth is our goal. And when we have done that, then we will have to be able to use that system; all of us, equally; if we are to move forward as a people. The society which endures is not the society in which the Cowboy saves the day because in the end, the guy who threw the Sucker Punch sees himself as the Good Guy. It is not the society in which the Emotional Response of Women with Moral Authority rushes in. It is the Society in which those who stand up through the legal process are acknowledged as Stand Up Guys and not snitches. In that society, not only does the guy in the bar not get sucker punched and stomped but the two bad guys are dealt with by society early enough in their lives that they do not end up a threat to society. Hopefully that means they are taught how to live among us.

There must be a place in between the two extremes of “Stand Up Guy” and “Punk”, in which a man can stand and still be considered a man. A place which says that “As you are a gunman and I am bare handed, I concede that you are better equipped to do me harm”. For if there is not such a place, then only those who pick up a gun and are willing to use it, will prevail; and anyone who challenges them will be a fool. Unless the women of our society can come to understand that the “Happy Ending” they seek must include changes in the way they perceive the world, then we will falter, because in the end, most “Cowboys” did not embrace home and hearth and family. That is why they lived out with the cattle. The image you seek is an illusion created to sell you a fantasy. The society that men built for you can only function so long as men embrace it. If you tell men who stand up for the systems which attempt to find justice for all of us as equals “endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights” that they have

*George Bailey*

“Punked out” by “Snitching”, then it is you who heap straw upon the camel’s back.

There will always be fights. Sometime the guy who gets hit is asking for it. Some times he knows he was. When he was asking for it and he doesn’t file charges, then justice was served. When he was asking for it and he files charges, then it will be up to a “Jury of his peers” to decide whether he asked for it or not. If he was hurt permanently, then the aggressor will have to compensate him as the jury sees fit. This, then, is the purpose of the jury. But when someone is hit without warning; when someone is not allowed to back down; when someone is beaten on after they have been bested: then it is time to remove that aggressor from society and retrain them in the corrections system. And if it comes to pass that they can not or will not change, then they must be removed from society in a manner which is humane but final.

As for you young men out there, I do not envy your situation. I was fortunate enough to grow up in a time were women embraced men who advocated peace and love. It seems ridiculous in the world we have created for you; but I can tell you this: There have always been those who were eager to fight. There have always been those who thought that to be a man they must be “On the fight”. You will, no doubt, meet many of them in the course of your lifetime. If you go looking for a fight you will always find one. If, on the other hand, you try to smile, you may find yourself better served. The Bible does not promise that the meek will not suffer; but it does promise that they will inherit the earth. I will also tell you, that I am not a small man. Consequently, people have always expected me capable of violence, but in fact, that has never been the case. I like to think that I could defend my family, but I have never been put to that test. It is not in my nature to be able to do harm to anyone for sport or for pride, or even for code. As a result, those who come to the match prepared to do me bodily damage are at an advantage. For that reason I do not pick fights. By the same token, I will decline a fight if allowed to. This constitutes cowardice in many codes, including the ones I was brought up with. But still, I would venture to say that many of you face the same dilemma. If you are reading this, then it has come to pass that I have stood up for what I feel to be right. Like the old Indian in Centennial, I have staked myself out, so that you will not be alone. I have not done it because I am unafraid, for I do fear those whom I have challenged. Nor have I done it for sport or for pride: but for a code. This is the code of the Christian. It is true and it is consistent. Be content with it. And when the time comes for our revolution, show your courage then, not as a Apostle with his sword drawn, but as a Christian resolved to do good and stand for what is right.

I would also tell you young men what I have come to know of women. I believe its Peter Gabriel who sings “In your eyes”. He sings that in her eyes he sees the Light and the Heat. He sees the doors of a thousand churches. He wants

“to feel that complete” as what he sees in her eyes. I know that feeling, to thirst for someone with whom you can feel complete. It is the reason that couples come before God to be united; one. But God is not in the eyes of a woman. And while, more and more, I see women who want to be worshiped, you will never complete yourself without Him: no more than if you practice self worship. I have tried to express to you in the most inoffensive ways, what happens to a people who look for fulfillment through sex. Women who try to fulfill men, will ultimately fail the men. And when they try to fulfill those men who have found fulfillment elsewhere, they will fail themselves by being considered unworthy.

The apostle Paul wrote that, while men may marry and still seek after God, it would be easier for them to find their way if they did not. When I first read that, I was still a relatively young man, and I was so relieved to be given the option. Now that I have moved past my youth I will tell you that the companionship of a mate is still something that I deem valuable. But not as valuable. I have learned that, in our society, a man who leaves his wife for a young and beautiful woman has broken the code, but a woman who leaves her husband to fulfill her fantasies has not. The code of marriage has become as much of an illusion as the code of honor. A male lion will copulate as often as every twenty five minutes and for days at a time, during the mating process, but he is not likely to grow old and die a peaceful death in the presents of his grandchildren. It will do you no good, in the end, the seek out the temptress for she will never become as one with you. If you listen to the rhetoric of the women’s movement and what it has evolved to today, you will hear them preaching that women are autonomous. That women are one, complete, without a man. Nor will you prosper if you seek out the institution of marriage in a society which makes it a farce. Just as a nation can not dive in and save a nation bent on self annihilation: Men can not dive in emotionally to save a society in which women are a democratic majority, bent on fantasy and the destruction of that society. Statistically speaking, it is likely that if you enter into a marriage today, it will end in divorce. And because the emotional response has been that those who have once lived according to a certain standard should not have to give up that standard and because a feminine majority has determined that women shall be held up to that former standard without regard for the realities for the man, you have been disfranchised. It therefore falls to you to demonstrate that the third option is to be strong in the face of adversity by standing up for change. And once that change has come to pass, to stand up for those systems which are the core and the fabric of society, which men first envisioned so that they might provide a safe haven for themselves and their families. If you do not, then your status in society will be that of the serf. Your own children may be used as pawns against you. The code by which you are asked to live is another illusion. It is a contract which you are asked to enter into in good faith; from which your partner may withdraw, taking all assets, present and future. The sirens will sing you onto the rocky shores upon

*George Bailey*

which are heaped the dreams of the Dead Beat Dad, and there you will lie, among the wreckage of a once great nation, until the tide finally reaches up to pull you both back out to sea. And if people tell you that I make these things up, then ask them to explain the divorce rate and how your future is not reflected in its numbers. And if people, likewise, tell you that I hate women, then tell them that the three people I love most in this world are little women. It is for them that I began writing this book. It is the society which protects them that I endeavor to preserve. But I would not set them up as absolute in power and train them to be abusive. I have told them to look at the world and find their place in it, and once found, to revel in it. I have done my best to teach them to love others as they love themselves, and first and foremost to love their God in whom all things are possible.

I have told you about the company I worked at where it took years to make the top scale wage. I have told you about some of the men who worked there. But there was another. He was an older man, probably not too far from retirement. One day, while looking at my payroll check stub, it occurred to me that my contribution to Social Security was on the rise, and I made a statement which inferred that I wasn't sure that this was going to be such a good deal for me down the road. This older man was immediately on the fight. "My sister's on Social Security" he said; and then he questioned me in a way that asked if I was insulting his sister. Of course it was probably the fact that he was about to retire which set him off. It's like when you call somebody a "Son of a Bitch" and he insists that he beat on you for the sake of his mother's honor. If you go to a bar and tell somebody that the "49er's" are second to your team, your not going to offend anybody. But if you go into a bar and say that the unions serve only those in the unions, your going to have to fight your way out of most bars. When I hear a guy quoting statistics from 1964 sports or the line up of a 1939 base ball team, I always wonder if I'm witnessing a guy who is showing off his mental agility without offending anyone.

In the system we live in now, no one, no matter how mentally agile, is going to read, let alone understand, the "bills" that pass through congress. If we can have this revolution, then the Statement of Intent attached to each "bill" will change that. But unless we adopt a Christian ethic in which we are concerned for how the laws affect everyone, rather than just ourselves, we will always have men on the fight for the sake of Mom's virtue. I would like to stand in a Colonial Inn in the year 1776. I would venture to say that those who had been Tories and had not fled the country, were quite. I would also venture a guess that sports would not be the object of the discussion. This idea of freedom of speech owes everything to Christianity. When "The Satanic Verses" was published its author found that Muslims had put a price on his head for blasphemy against their church. When people are called down for being politically incorrect in this

country today it is because their opinions challenge precepts that are tentative. In the case of race relations, the “truths” of those who once held slaves are not the truths which we hold today. But because we understand that these truths can be transitory, are subject to the possibility of change, we tolerate the freedom of such speak but we denounce it. But Christianity [independent of the churches of man] has managed to endure in the face of a perpetual threat and denunciation without reprisal. Why is that? It is, of course, because its truths are not transitory in nature. It is this stability which leads us back to the correctness of the argument against slavery. But it should also lead us back in the direction that patterned this book.

If a man can draw you into a fight for speaking out, then he has won the argument and preserved the code. Likewise, if a government can get us to recite sports statistics rather than voting records, because you may not speak without offending and challenging the rationalizations of the line; then those who rule through politics have won by the code which serves them. If they can teach you the “Code” which defends the “Line” through sports, where we wear the colors and root for the team of affiliation based on home town or name recognition, or because they are the most often victorious: then we have learned the lessons which lead men and women away from freedom, and toward blind allegiance. If we can drop the lessons of cooperation and team spirit, and exchange them for a belief that winning is everything and winners are the only ones who matter; then we can teach our children the codes of the lines. If they can be drawn away from Christianity, We can teach them to embrace the illusion that we are being served by the line, when in fact it is we who serve. We can keep them from the truth.

There is a small island not too far off the coast of Florida who’s culture would have been referred to as Latin in my youth. Within that culture there were the wealthy and there were also the impoverished. It was a haven for a lifestyle which was, at the time, illegal in the US. In its night clubs, the strong lorded over the weak and the visitors from our mainland lived a fanciful experience, while the impoverished dreamed of revolution. I was a child when first I heard the name, Castro. And as I recall, the American press did not hate the leader of Cuba’s revolution until he turned to Communist Russia, rather than embracing the forces of Capitalism within the US. He would become a thorn in the side of United States of America and nearly bring on a nuclear war. But we lacked the Moral Authority to do anything about it. We had not helped the people of Cuba when they were oppressed. In fact we had courted their oppressors. So we could do little except to try to reinstall that same ruling class.

Those who had had the upper hand in Cuba, had been bested in a “Fare Fight”. They had been ejected by the little guy. So they came to our country, from where they have threatened the victorious from relative safety of our powerful nation. But they lack Moral Authority, because, a governing body

*George Bailey*

which governs so poorly that its people revolt, has no right to govern. And because our government lacked Moral Authority in the face of this truth, it would place the children of the Cuban exiles in a line. That line would be a line of entitlement based on their right to reclaim their property in Cuba. So that instead of reveling in their time, they have become the pawns of our government. They are the symbols of a code which is a sham. They give license to the notion that We, the people of the United States have a right to punish a people who fought and died to be free, on the basis that they became communists as a result of their free choice. This at a time when we not only do business with Communist China, but we court them with the technologies that can be used to create weapons of mass destruction.

Today, in its frustration, Congress has abandoned non-engagement in favor of Trade Sanctions against any country who would do business with Cuba. It lacks any moral authority. It is irrational by virtue of the fact that We would dare to sanction sovereign nations for doing business with a sovereign nation on the basis that Cuba has no legal claim to Cuba. This, as our government collects taxes on American soil which was taken from the English, the French, the Spanish, Mexico, and others; who had, in their time, seized it from Native Americans. We have picked a fight with the whole world on the Feminine logic that those who have, should keep. That failure should be propped up because loss is sad. In the end, what is really sad, is all the wasted opportunities. While the sons and daughters of the Cuban exiles were standing in their lines, thinking that they were being served, Ricky Ricardo married an American blonde. She dyed her hair red and together they changed the nation, while making a place for themselves in history that they had a moral right to.

In January of the year 2000 I mailed 59 copies of this work to 59 various individuals; all of whom, either professed to be distributors of information for the organizations with which they were affiliated or were in some other way a candidate to both, get the word out and safeguard the content of this text. Two of the copies I mailed were returned because the parties were no longer at that address. One was returned for an improper address, which I corrected. One was returned with a letter stating their unwillingness to participate. All of these individuals were asked to monitor that the copy of the work published at the web sight FATBRAIN.COM was not altered. I never received any reply, in any form, from the remaining 56 individuals. It may be that this work has found it's way into the world without my knowledge, and nothing would please me more. But should there ever become such a thing as a student of this work, they will note that the passage I am about to add, along with the POST SCRIPT and the ten short essays at the end of the book, are not contained within the those original mailings. Because what I am about to impart to you is of a philosophical nature, its addition will not alter the demands of the revolution. Never the less, as this

work is about a philosophical change in direction within this country, it is germane to the issue.

The focal point of this book has been to try and make clear the world as it is and to show how the forces which are brought to bare on us, as members of the community of man, cause us to react. For that reason, any insight I can give you into the workings of society, further the cause of this work. To that end, I am making this addition to the original document.

I spoke earlier on about the differences between men and women as they related to emotion. At this point, as part of the discussion of masculinity, I would like to add a realization I have come to since the original publication of this book. I would like you to consider the “Hunter/Gatherer” culture [which is the original model of all cultures] and imagine yourself as one of its members. This is not a Christian culture: and while it might well worship a god, or gods, it will be Darwinian in nature. That is to say that, the survival of the gene pool of the group is the focal point of the society. As a result of this, a well-defined Masculine and Feminine model will develop.

Imagine, if you will, the members of the hunting party as they leave the encampment to struggle against the wild beast. They are a unit, which must, of necessity, put aside old grievances in order to achieve their goal. They must communicate their intentions with a glance and be honest in those communications. They are at risk, and in harm’s way; and it is the nature of their endeavor that sometimes individuals will perish. The group, or genetic pool which will succeed, has within its membership, those who will give, even their lives, so that the group will succeed.

With the beast slain and brought back to camp, the interaction between masculine and feminine begins. Within the Hunter /Gatherer models, it is often the females who did the heavy work of skinning and butchering the carcass of the beast. At first glance it is a social condition which makes the Hunters appear arrogant and lazy. But upon reflection, it becomes clear that it is a function of the riff between Masculine and Feminine; between Hunter and Gatherer. At the core of the Feminine model, lies the vessel. It is the womb which is the focal point of the energy of the successful society and the source of the mindset of the Feminine model. It is not the number of males, nor even the number of offspring within the Hunter/Gatherer society, which determines that societies odds of success. It is the number of child bearing vessels at its disposal which is the deciding factor.

I once saw a nature program in which a mouse and her litter were trapped in her nest by a predator. Unable to escape her situation or feed her young under the circumstances, she ate her litter. This is, of course, horrific in the context of the loss of those offspring as we humans relate to the mouse’s situation. But in a world where there is no such thing as a Soul or a Creator, the mouse has not

*George Bailey*

destroyed her offspring; she has simply converted them back to the energy within her body; the body from which they came. By increasing her chances of survival as a result of feeding herself, the same "Genetics" may once again be passed on in new offspring at a latter date. So that it is not souls or individuals which are born in the Darwinian model, it is genetic "Carbon Copies" or "Replicants" of the vessel which have been produced and then reproduced. These are the dynamics and the rationalizations of the Darwinian Feminine Model. All the resources of the society flow to the vessel and as the embodiment of that vessel the gatherer is entitled to those resources. This includes the protection of the collective against aggression from outside and from within. When the carcass of the beast is returned to camp from the hunt, it is inappropriate for the Hunters to make their case for the finest bits of flesh and bone and hide. To speak their own case would only endanger their ability to work together as a team during the next hunt. At this point it becomes the place of the worlds first advocates [the original Lawyers, if you will] to make the case for their mates, or sons or fathers. The rationalizations used within the Female model to make their case as to their right to their portion, ran so deep in the culture of some of the Native American cultures, that when the women lost their Hunter, the same rationalizations which had allowed them, perhaps the finest cuts, now dictated that they were no longer entitled to food or even shelter. A functioning vessel, with an operational womb, would almost certainly find a new Hunter, but those beyond that stage in life were most likely doomed. Within the Darwinian Feminine model, the rationale that all things should flow to, and be Gathered together for the enrichment of "The Vessel" reins supreme. It is an autonomous mindset in which outsiders such as children may be adopted. Even mates may be adopted [even pets], but they will be coveted possessions which are secondary to the needs of the vessel. As with the mother mouse, the singularity of purpose and the rationalizations surrounding that singularity of purpose remain constant. The male finds self-esteem in his contribution, but in reality, his role is subservient. His possessions are the possessions of the vessel. She is caretaker of them in his absence and recipient of them should he not return [provided she is not disenfranchised by not finding a new hunter]. His allegiance is to the collective. His model is Christian at its core. Those individual males who do not put vessel ahead of self do not pass on their genetics.

If we look at the roles of men and women in this light, it is easy to see how older cultures allowed for the paring of older men and younger women. As society evolved, the Hunter now hunted buy different means. The role of provider could still be fulfilled by a male past his prime. Perhaps, fulfilled even better. Motherhood, however, still required youth. So we find that while men choose a mate by a more physical criteria, women choose by virtue of the male's ability to provide. In nature this means a genetic soup made of strong physical components on the part of the female and strong mental components on the part



of the male. What you end up with is good-looking women paring off with not necessarily so good looking men; men marrying for love, or adoration and women looking for security. As with so many rules of nature, none of these rules I have just described are steadfast and all are a mix found somewhere between the two extremes. So before you accuse me of debasing women, I ask you to keep an open mind.

In languages such as the German language, words such as “THE” may be used as any one of three different words, depending upon the word it describes. For example, if it is used in conjunction with a feminine word, the German word for “the” will be “die” [pronounced dee]. If it is used in conjunction with a Masculine word, such as boat, it will be das, as in “Das Boat”. Of course, boats are neither male nor female. The word used to describe this difference in word selection as male and female [or neuter] is called “Gender”. In that same way, I would suggest to you that as Human culture has evolved, Hunters and Gatherers are no longer Masculine, nor Feminine, in nature. That is to say that, while society still trains young men to learn to live together and work together from the time their told to work it out on their own on the play ground; even as it teaches young women that they should run to society and state their case, even their rationalizations: there is nothing inherently male or female about those who choose the role of Hunter or the role of Gatherer. Even though men who lose their spouse are still more likely to die soon after without someone to provide for, while women are just as likely to live on to die of old age after their mates have died young: whether we are Hunters or Gatherers today is not about gender. It is not about whether we are born male or female. It is about whether we live by a giving Christian ethic or we live by a selfish Darwinian ethic.

This country was born of the Hunter mentality. The Pilgrims made their way to a new land where there was freedom of expression and freedom of religion so that they would not have to grovel over power with the churches of Europe. They brought with them the Christian ethic and defined the term “American”. Today, We have become a Gatherer culture. From the Tobacco industry lawsuits, to inflated interest rates, we do not hunt, but we only grovel over the carcass. This is the “Socialist” model which failed in Russia and which we have embraced without ever intending to, because we have given over power to the rationalizations of the Gatherers. When those who work for the phone company or the city or the air lines or the parcel service have their case stated politically so that they maintain their standard of living within a shrinking economy, they are Gathering an ever larger portion of the carcass as a whole and leaving those without a voice to go without all together. And when the portion they have gained in this manner has been taken away from them by a graduated tax system and given over to Government, they have been defeated at their own game in the struggle over the carcass. It is a society of “Hurry for Me, and to Heck with you”

*George Bailey*

and “What have you done for me lately”. I grew up in a time when every commercial enterprise and every public place had a public rest room and I have watched as, one by one, those rest rooms were closed as members of our society shrunk from their obligations to that society and heaped that burden on their fellows until almost all of the public restrooms are gone. And I have seen the same kind of selfishness grow and spread across the land in a thousand different ways. And it is the decline of the Hunter and the decline of the Christian ethic which is at the heart of it. We embrace the rationalizations of the rich who skim profits in the form of high interest and create poverty only to create poor paying jobs for those impoverished, in a show of false ambivalence. We do not see the irony that when we embrace women in the armed forces we have seined from society the most selfish of the Gatherers to contribute to a masculine endeavor which requires the most selflessness. Of course, that observation is contingent upon how we intend to use our armed forces. That is, if we intend to defend our nation and those who we have hope of defending, then it is the function of the Hunter. But the history of War, whose blame has been laid at the feet of men, has been an attempt to Gather together the coveted positions of others, and is a mindset which finds its roots in the Gatherer culture. I have watched since the 1970’s, as the facial expressions of female manikins have change from smiles, to expressions which can best be described as “Bitchy”, and it has fostered the autonomous rationalizations of the Gatherer in our young women. I have watched as grocery prices at union grocers have risen disproportionately to wages as a result of the rationalizations of both the unions and the thieves who “Gather” [shop-lift] groceries. I have watched the rules of the road be discarded in favor of a mindset which says that working together is for suckers. I have watched as the Media has encouraged the notion of a Gatherer society in which those who come to this country and do not embrace a classless society, but preach a philosophy of “Self”, may not be publicly corrected: in which women flock to divorce courts to divide the family carcass with their attorney: and in cases where there is a family business, they will more than likely take the cash and leave the burden of the family business behind, where it struggles to continue hunting without the assets of capital. I have seen medical costs increase ten and twenty fold since my youth while the minimum wage has doubled two, maybe three times; and I have seen Doctors argue that patents need a “Bill Of Rights” in order to get good medical attention while those who pay the cost of medicine, pay an ever increasing PERCENTAGE of the country’s shrinking economic pie to the effort and get less care, or no care; and I have come to understand that it is the rationalizations of Doctors who are Gatherers that defeats us. I have listened for years to the pleas for money from the medical research community. They hope to find cures for a myriad of diseases, and sometimes they do. But they increase their standard of living at rates which keep up with inflation at medical levels in the face of a shrinking economy, at the expense of the research, and it is more of the same: a

groveling. I have seen the promise of Specialization fail because when the plumber comes to do plumbing for the carpenter he must charge double what the carpenter would charge in return because the government has set itself up as full partner in every business, taking fifty cents on the dollar from each transaction: Gathering money at every turn and contributing nothing in return. I have seen generations enslaved because high interest rates have turned those with money into Gatherers who will not gamble on the Hunt. I have lived to see police who do not Hunt; who do not join together to slay the beast, but who, instead, fight over turf as Gatherers. They overlook corruption at the top and anarchy at the bottom and Gather bits of bone and hide from those they prune in the middle. They convict people of crimes that those people never committed because these police are too lazy or too incompetent to do their jobs, and they rationalize their deeds with the belief that everyone is guilty of something. I have lived to see Blacks so disenfranchised of their self respect that they must slow in the cross walk to make middle aged white men wait on them, in order to feel respected. It is a groveling for power; any power, no matter how small. I have seen celebrities promote the smoking of pot even though they know that those who emulate them may well pay a heavy price, because their celebrity affords them power from prosecution. So rather than use their celebrity to change the law and gain power over our own lives for everyone, they grovel over the little power their celebrity affords them. I have watched middle class America grovel over power with government and lose; as a two party system of Government has seized power by aligning itself with wealth on the one side and those who profit from government in the form of a check [be it a paycheck, a Social Security check, or a Welfare check] on the other. I have watched a generation of fathers and mothers who did not heed the words of Ecclesiastes, which taught that one should work and find fulfillment in that work: and instead they went to Government for money; money which would be taken from their sons and daughters and even their grandchildren. I have lived to see American business embrace the notion that selling to a few for more is better than selling to many for less. It is the Gatherer fighting over a small carcass because the Hunters no longer Hunt. When Airlines are allowed to charge you more because you did not buy your ticket in advance it would make one believe that had their been enough advance purchases to warrant another flight you might have avoided the penalty. But the number of flights is predetermined and does not change with demand. Instead we grovel over the carcass and we suffer the consequences. I have seen the monetary system deal with shortages in goods and services by tightening money supplies rather than easing money supplies to create more production, and, in so doing, the Fed. has downsized the productivity of the Hunt; leaving us to grovel over the carcass. I have seen young C.E.O.'s of "Tech" companies brag that they have given stock options to secretaries. They have alleged that in this way they will change the world by including everyone in the success. But, in fact, it would be necessary to

### *George Bailey*

lower their prices and allow for more people to participate rather than to add another millionaire to the battle over the spoils, in order to improve the world. In the movie "It's A Wonderful Life", George Bailey is offered a job by Old Man Potter. It pays over eight times his current salary at the Bailey Building and Loan. If he takes the job he is able to buy a house on the hill and all its trappings for his wife and children. But he will be a prisoner on that hill, because the hill will not overlook Bedford Falls. It will overlook Pottersville. So are his wife and children better off as members of the Bedford Falls community or as members of the "Gated" community on the hill in Pottersville? The American dream is not to become wealthy. The American dream is to attain financial independence. By that yardstick, a \$250,000.00 a year job is a prison if it dare not be lost for fear of ending up in a soup kitchen.

When today's male model flashes across the movie screen, he is alone against the world. He is often vengeful; and when his work is done he leaves. Now compare that male model to the male model in "On The Water Front". If you will think about this for a moment I think you would find that the heroes of our time are actually not of the Hunter cast at all, but of the Gatherer, or feminine, gender. I came to see the world in this light as the result of a kid I was working with. He was a bright enough kid [when I say kid, he was in his twenties]. He was operating a piece of "Heavy Equipment". Within the setting of such heavy equipment, it is customary for those involved to make eye contact. In this way, one can assess the intentions and even the mood of those one is working with. After all, big machines are dangerous. Communication is key. But this kid was not part of the crew. Often times he ate alone. He never made eye contact in the field. He borrowed tools and forgot to return them. He made light of that fact when reminded and still did not return them. He didn't keep them or steal them. He simply left them where they lay when he had no further use for them. He broke down one night after work. I got his car fixed enough to get him home with parts I asked him to replace. He never said thank you. He never replaced the parts. Yet, he was a nice enough guy. He just didn't get it. He didn't get the training the other guys were trying to give him either: and why? I'm betting he had been raised in a broken home in the absence of a male model. His mother was more than likely on Welfare. He lived in a world where everything flowed to his mother as a result of the rationalizations of entitlement and no thanks was required in return. He is autonomous and distrustful of others motives. This young man, while certainly able to defend himself, and almost certainly a gang member, had been raised as a Gatherer. He is absolutely capable of violence. He is a believer in the rationales of today's male hero model, and a man's man by today's standards. But he is not a member of the male society I grew up in. He is not a Hunter. He is not a Christian, and within the society we have created today, his numbers are growing.

When the women of WWII went to the production lines of industry to fight for their country they came as members of a generation that was, for the most part, Hunters. When they returned to motherhood after the war, they returned as members of a Hunter society. But that would change; and as the women of my generation gained economic and political power they gave into the rationalizations of the Gatherer. And while no woman in a Hunter/Gather society would challenge the right of the Hunter to his portion, because the Gatherer we call Government has replaced men as Hunter/Provider, the Male or Masculine model has been disfranchised. Today's Gatherers did not consider the needs of the generations to come or the needs of the Hunters, but only the needs of the keeper of the vessel. They speak of empowerment, but they have given over power to Government and in exchange they have been given some of the power that is left to hold over men. It is a groveling over power and a groveling over the carcass.

The men of the WWII generation, who fought, and certainly those who died, were Hunters defending the society of which they were members. But increasingly, those who survived would buy into the gatherer mentality as veterans, entitled. The Male model would be replaced by the overpaid sports figure who does not work as a member of a male group but is instead supported by subservient members of the group, paid at subservient rates. As a result of the high compensation the price of tickets to such sporting events is out of range of the young who emulate these same people [but now for all the wrong reasons]. They put on "Game Faces" which are the mask of the warrior in a war of aggression which is not the Christian model of Masculinity. It is not the face that communicates honesty of intention and emotion. It is the face that would likely fail, at some point, to return from the Hunt.

When Government Creates regulations that are unnecessary and cumbersome, it is the equivalent of making four right hand turns in order to go straight, when we try to comply. When the mountains of rules and regulations are used as an excuse to justify the training of Government employees, which in turn justifies the increase in wages for those employees: we have created a system in which those who have been trained to make the most right hand turns [in groups of four], justify their right to increased wages at the expense of the collective. Even this is a reflection of a society that has given over the decision making powers to the Gatherers. From traffic jams caused by those who can not grasp the advantages that working together afford the collective, to those who failed to stand up to Hitler and his thugs in Germany's highest government seat, the common thread is a willingness to give of one's self as opposed to the rationalizations which allow us to put ourselves ahead of others. We have become a well which no one is willing to prime. If women gain financial equality and opt not to invest in the Hunt; if they use wealth and power to

*George Bailey*

further their own agenda at the expense of children and society as a whole, then society collapses. When old men take young wives then the marriage of the Vessel and the Hunter is still completed. When an older woman takes a young husband it is not a contribution to the continuation of the gene pool. And while the moral aspects between the two pairings is arguable, the difference in their contribution to society is not. When the Hunter/Gatherer society crowned its first king, the focus of the collective shifted to the gene pool which was the King himself. In the West, Christian philosophy would see the birth of Democracy and equality for all. It was a shift in values from a philosophy based on the continuation of the Genetic Pool to one that embraced worthiness based on one's soul and our link to God Almighty. In the East, the philosophy of Self would retain the notion of class. The overwhelming numbers of humanity, which is China, would find itself impotent against the world. And why? For the same reason they think nothing of cutting each other off in traffic. And our best defense against them? It is not nuclear weapons, but Christianity. Not to use Christianity against them, but to share it with them, while the male model still clings to the skirt of Lady Liberty.

From cleaning lady to manufacturer, from truck driver to fruit picker, it is still the Hunter who returns to the encampment with the bounty of the Hunt that makes America what it is. This is the Male Model. This is masculinity. When women cause men to fight over them for the sake of the women's ego then those men serve a Gatherer culture in which women grovel over power rather than consolidate power for the sake of society. It is counterproductive to the goals of society. It is for the amusement and power of the Harlot. When you look to marriage, only for what you can get out of it, you are bound to fail. When you look to your country, only for what you can get out of it, it is doomed to fail. So what is masculine? It is the Hunter, not the Gatherer: the builder of cultures not the usurper of cultures: the provider of society not he who grovels over what has been provided, it is the peacemaker not the warrior, the Christian not the Darwinian.

In the end, it is those who stand by a code we have abandoned, who serve society at large. The Christian ethic of looking out for the other guy as we would look out for ourselves makes valid our right to speak the truth. It makes valid our obligation to "Press Charges" so that the next guy, or gal is not set upon when they speak the truth, or just simply voice their opinion. The code that was taught in the early west was valid in the time of my youth because all the things which we have abandoned were still in place. But as we abandoned the idea that there could be a Donna Reed in real life, or that "Father" could in deed "Know Best" we stopped standing up for the precepts which allowed that old code to function. It then falls to you to stand down. Furthermore I call to you to change.

When I was very young, it was the “style” to be uniform. Hair was cut in a militaristic fashion. Children wore uniform [similar] attire to school; and the country did what the government said and didn’t try to fight “City Hall” [government]. It would be my generation that resisted a “one size fits all” world and its blind obedience. We didn’t grow our hair so much as we stopped cutting it. We greeted each other with a smile and with tolerance. Today the dress is not anti-government. It is anti-society. It resembles, more than any other look, the pirate or the renegade; the inmate. I urge you to change the way you wish to be perceived so that you will change the way you greet the world around you. I implore you to attire yourself in a way that says you are happy to revel in your time such as it is. If you will do that, I can promise you that you will see a change in the way people interact with you in return. The cowboys may have been forced to lay down their guns by an encroaching civilization; but the rest of the society of the time was glad to have order. I suspect that most of you would like to feel more at ease yourselves. To move forward will take an attempt on your part; stand up by standing down.

If we are to have true Capitalism, then we will be pitted against each other in the market place. But it must be a fair fight; and at the end of day, we see that we compete over who will lead and who will make our economic decisions, not over who will survive. If we are to have true freedom, then it will fall to you to be moral. For that is the strength that is correct. That is the character trait of the cowboy which is missing most of all. It has been obscured by the violence in our society, and it has created a void. It is in the nature of advertising to create an artificial need if no need exists. Its aim is, as often as not, to make us dissatisfied with our positions and even our lives in order to create a false need: a supposed void, that they alone can fill. It is the nature of the mating dance that women are more prone to feel this supposed void when they are not surrounded by those things which adorn. As men are attracted by beauty which is a function of symmetry but not perceived as such, it is part of the female experience to try to attract through appearance. If the cosmetics and fashion industries can convince women that they can not attract without buying from those industries, advertising has prevailed. If they can lower self esteem through advertising while promising to provide that self esteem through a product or service, they triumph. By the same standard, the woman who is loved now judges that love by those things which advertising can convince her are the bench marks of that love. If you would dispute this, then you need to look to advertising and see how we are told men should fulfill women and compare that to how women are counseled to fulfill men. From the first time a man ever returned to the cave with what he had found or made or killed, men have been judged as providers. But the other side of the coin sees women encouraged to spend on themselves in order to improve themselves, thereby contributing to her mate’s fulfillment. Women will, no doubt, call me down for saying so: but if you look at the advertising in this

*George Bailey*

country today with an objective eye, it is not hard to see who is most often the target. Just as the promise of the Atomic age has manifest itself in toxic waste and destruction; the knowledge gathered by those in the field of Psychology has been harnessed to manipulate with far greater success than it has to cure.

In the end, most women will seek security. It is essential to their mental well being. If men are replaced within a society, as the provider of that security, then men cease to retain a place within that society. The gatherers of the Generation that Could, along with the politics of the last thirty years, have disenfranchised the males of the Baby Boom generation and the result is reflected in modern day divorce rates. The tendency of women to be "Hard Wired" with this need for physical security is mirrored by men's tendency to need emotional security and it is the tie that binds. So long as these needs do not consume us as individuals, they are positive influences in maintaining the continuity of culture. They are the glue which holds the fabric together. But it will be necessary for you young men to insist that you are reinstated to a place of prominence within this society if we are to prevail as a people. The principles and methods laid out here within are the only way I know to accomplish this goal.

If you young men can change, If you can become men of character, If you young women can learn to look to God and to family to fill that void, If you can aspire to command respect through virtue, If you can see past the day dream of the "Soap Opera", If you can dismiss the illusion of the commercial, If you can choose a man of character and morality, and honor his morality and character when your emotional response is rebuffed for lack of moral authority: If you young men can like wise honor moral authority when it is presented to you; if you can once again become the Hunter: If these things can come to pass, then we can make a place for our children, and our children's children.

I began this book by calling you to a revelation. It should be obvious to you that much has been revealed which was not revealed until now. But I fear that, that explanation, in and of itself, does not free me from the obligation to speak to the Book of Revelations. The timing, of course, suggests that my plan has been to spring these ideas on a people poised for change. But in fact, while I had always intended that July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2000 would be the day to begin [for reasons which will remain my own] I had intended to try and get the word out long before I knew all of the things that would make this work a book of secrets revealed. It had always been my intention to give you years to debate these ideas. But, while I have devoted years of my life to this effort, I have only now been able to complete it. All that time would allow me, not only to learn what you now know, but it would build a world in which I could pass on the information in ways impossible only a few months ago. Still, here we are on the verge of the third millennium and here am I with a plan for the future at a time when Churches speak of the end of the earth. Let me repeat for anyone who missed it before, I am no Bible scholar, but I



have read the book. And because I have read it, I can tell you that it promises that NO MAN shall know the time of the end of the world. So that anyone who tells you they know the time, is stepping on the toes of the Bible itself.

In December of 1999 the news media converged on the old city of Jerusalem to report on the effects of the end of the century and promote it as the end of the millennium. In one documentary, I heard a reporter say that the three religions [Christianity, Judaism, and Islam], all worshipped different gods in this one singularly, Holy place. Of course that is not true. All three religions worship the same God. The Jews believe that they remain the chosen people and that anyone who converts to Judaism can find forgiveness for their sins by atoning and making the offerings required to God. The Muslims of Islam [the Islamic faith who call God Ala] believe that the Jews have lied about some of their beliefs and their privileges and that the same God who the Jews worship, sent Mohamed, some four hundred years after Jesus with the teachings that would correct for those lies. Mohamed's words would be chanted around the campfires for centuries until they were written down as the Koran. The "Wailing Wall" in Jerusalem is all that remains of the Temple in which the Jewish Ark of the Covenant was housed. Over the same grounds which made up the temple's floor [the same floor which is the floor of the old Hebrew temple in which the Ark of the Covenant was housed], is now built one of the Holiest of Islamic shrines, a great domed Mosque, which houses [inlaid in its floor] a great rock which is Islam's Holiest artifact. This is the very same earth which made up the floor of the Jewish Temple. Muslims, too, see their future in Heaven as contingent upon repentance and the paying of the "Alms". The Alms being the offering made to God for forgiveness. They see themselves as the "Creed" of their father Abraham. This is the same Abraham who carried the "Y" chromosome of the twelve tribes of Israel. The modern definition of the word Creed is "A statement of Belief". So that while Jews are "Chosen" by blood line, Mohamed taught that it is through advocacy of God that Muslims are worthy. Christians find their historical reference in the history is the Hebrews, who are the Jewish people. They diverge, they split, from Judaism with the death of Christ, where Christians thereafter embrace Jesus as "The Christ", their intercessor and savior and offering within the framework of the New Covenant of prophecy; while Judaism denounces him as not being "The Christ": proclaiming Jesus to be a fraud. Never the less, Christian prophecy, as it is related to the book of Revelation, requires that Jesus the Christ's church be rebuilt before Christ returns. This parallels the Jewish belief that the church must be rebuilt before the true Christ will come for the first time. And because the Mosque is built on this, one of the most Holy of places to Islam, if the Jews or the Christians try to remove the Mosque in order to fulfill their prophecies, it will unleash a whirlwind.

*George Bailey*

I have refrained from Quoting more than a few phrases from the Scriptures and for good reason. But if I am to address the Book Of Revelations I will have to be given some latitude. In the Book of Revelations, John wept in Heaven because no one could be found who was worthy to open the sacred scroll, which was sealed with the seven seals. He wept because without such a worthy soul, God's plan to defeat Satan could not be revealed. But John is consoled by one of the elders [the elders who worship God upon His throne in Heaven], who told him that the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, had conquered and so could open the scroll and its seven seals. He refers, of course, to Jesus, the Lamb. In Revelations 6 you can read for your self as the first six seals are opened. At that point, in Revelations 7, we learn that the four angels who were poised to "harm" the earth are stopped by God's authority until the 144 thousand, who are the sons of the twelve tribes of Israel can be given God's seal upon their forehead. Now, surely it is obvious to you by this, as this is the New Testament, which glorifies Christ and not Judaism, that Christianity teaches that God is glorified by the return of these sons of the chosen people. And as, at least some, if not all of that number referred to, have not been marked by the time of John's Revelation, those who did not receive God's mark under the Old Covenant must receive that mark through their Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to be in accordance with the Christian religion. Surely you can understand that either there have already existed in the world [since the time of the crucifixion] the appropriate number of Christian servants of God who were Sons of Israel, or had Hitler's intentions been realized, it would have prevented the fulfillment of the Christian scriptures.

Along with the sons of Israel, John finds a great multitude in Heaven who are the Christians of the ages. Among them are the Christians who will come out of the great "Tribulation". They are the Christians who were not born of the sons of Israel. You are free to believe what you want to believe. For myself; as I read Revelations 19, I see that it is THE WORD OF GOD that does battle. It is the sharp sword that issues from the mouth of he who is called THE WORD OF GOD with which the nations are smitten. Jesus came and died to teach us that love of others is the way to change the world and enter the Kingdom of Heaven. I have attempted to show you how those precepts that he taught, protect us from the greed and hate of the world, if only we will apply them to our lives. If greed and hate and immorality are the Beast that Long Shanks served, then we can see its defeat by bringing Christ into our hearts. If the systems laid out within this book embrace the Christian ethics laid out in the Bible and we embrace them, and the world is led to embrace them, then Christ may indeed rule the earth within the hearts of men and women for a thousand years, while Satan lies chained in the bottomless pit as promised in Revelations 20. I can not argue the merits of this book as they apply to the Book Of Revelations. I only know that I can not look to the last two thousand years and point to a time in which it appears

that the beast was cast away from the earth and Satan was removed from control of it for a period of a thousand years. But that is what is promised before Satan is “lossed” once more and the battle of Armageddon comes to pass and the earth passes away. The Bible is THE WORD OF GOD, and within the New Testament are the teachings which literally issued from the mouth of the Lamb with regard to THE WORD. And it is really only in this last century that this message has finally covered the entire globe.

It is the churches of man who draw us to buildings where we might make atonement for sins only to return to the world outside to live outside “The Way”. It is to the churches of man that we pay the percentage, the contribution, the alms. We are not the first to sit in anticipation of an end to the world. And if it does not end at the millennium, then we will not be the first to have lived past our expectations. There are those in the world who are busy trying to rebuild a church of stone in Israel that they may fulfill the prophecies that will pave the way to the return of Christ. All too often they seem focused on the wrath of God rather than the return of a loving Christ. They are eager to leave behind this old world and all its troubles, rather than focus on the promise to come. But it is not a building of stone that we await, for Jesus is the foundation of the church of Israel and it is in the hearts of those make up the 144 thousand sons of Israel, that his church must be built before the scriptures are fulfilled to God’s is glory. It is in the hearts of Christians that Jesus and his teachings must be harbored. So while those who build the temple in the State of Israel make copies of the artifacts that allowed them penance under a covenant which they can no longer produce, I urge you, who ever you are, to build a temple in your heart in which your offering will be excepted: a perfect lamb and his name is Jesus. If we can do that, then his church will govern our lives and not our hour of penance in church.

The Koran teaches that God’s work is visible to those who have eyes to see. If three religions, who all do their best to honor the Word of God, have come to a point in time when in order to honor God they find themselves at an impasse, is it God who has brought them to this place? If it is necessary for Christians and Jews to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem in order to glorify God and bring The Christ to earth to the glory of God, how can it be that we must kill and be killed by those who worship the same God in the way that they have been taught? If it is this small piece of ground from among all the pieces of ground on the earth and the heavens which must be the alter for God, why has he not given us a way to peacefully fulfill our obligation to him? Why did the Crusades fail if the Church that sent them was teaching the will of God? Why is Israel unable to rebuild the Temple if their church teaches them the will of God? Why does Islam, who has built it’s temple, find itself impotent against its enemies if they follow the will of God? Why does this place divide the world rather than bring it

*George Bailey*

together in the name of the one true God who is the focus of our worship? So I must ask, is it God who these churches serve?

I am unworthy by my mortal nature. But I pray that God in his mercy will forgive me and so I have built up a temple to His Name in my heart and as its foundation I have placed the teachings and the love of his son Jesus and I have placed upon the alter of the Temple in my heart, the blood of the lamb, my savior, in whose debt I am forever humbled, so that I may be atoned. And as I go through that time I am allowed, I will do my best to revel in that time, and I will carry his alter in my heart and I will never be apart from it so that I will be counseled against my transgressions as I am in the presence of Christ's church and the alter of my God: not just on the appointed days but in all my hours of all my days. And if I am considered worthy at the end of my days I will enter God's Holy Kingdom. I will not sit before the throne for I am not of the twelve tribes. I will not set ahead of others because of my works. But if I am allowed to be the lowliest of the multitude, then I shall have more than I could hope for, and surely in that there is a lesson for those who have wisdom. If you will join with me and build an alter in your heart as well, then we can reinstate the Church of Christ on earth without the shedding of blood. We will require no leaders, no institutions of man, and no patch of ground on this earth and He will rule through us, as His church. So that if every mother and every mother's child is led to live in the Way, Satan may indeed, be thrown in the pit for a thousand years. Within Christ's church can be found all those who carry the seal of God: those who would not deny Him, and those who would not deny his Son. There is also a place for those who follow in the way of the Lord and there remains a place set aside for all of you who do not know that way but would seek it out. If you will turn away from temples of stone and the churches of man and build a temple in the quiet of your heart, and ask Him in, and follow in the Way, then you will find yourself in the church of Christ. When you fall He will pick you up. And when you fail He will intercede for you, and your heart will be filled.

I have written this book because the time had come for change. Whether that change is connected with the Book of Revelations or not, I can not say. I can only say that when I began to work on it, I had never contemplated it as a fulfillment of prophecy. I didn't even know what the prophecy was. I knew only that you would be in anticipation of change with the coming of the new millennium and I hoped to have a plan waiting. My search for answers would ultimately lead me to the Bible and its teachings. In the end, the only real question that remains, is it the right thing to do? If it is not, then I urge you not to participate. But, if it is, how can you decline?

In closing, I would like to thank you for reading this through. I would also like to apologize to anyone I may have hurt unnecessarily. If I have said anything that is untrue, again, I am truly sorry. If I have been arrogant, please forgive me.

The most difficult aspect of completing this work is that, with its completion, I lose the ability to correct the errors I have made and wrongs I may have committed. When inconsistencies are found which come in conflict with other aspects of the book that I have over looked, the Law of Intent will negate those inconsistencies. For example, Insurance has been set up regionally. For those who do business Nationally, or Internationally, separate "Bids" will have to be held. Likewise, it may be that few, if any, Native Americans receive a "Government check": in which case the rules as they apply to the Statement of Intent would render that portion of what I have outlined, null and void. If things need to be altered in the future, We will have put in place a governing body up to the task. No law can be all encompassing. But as We begin to be true to the intent of our laws rather than their "letter", We shall enter a new era of truth and fairness. If wrongs are found, I can ask only that you forgive me my trespasses. I have told you that I embarked of this work for the children. It has become a work for God and country. With the advent of the Law of Intent; the Declaration Of Independence, which proclaims that this country was born of the belief that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights: declares the intent of the separation of Church and State to be independent of removing God and Christianity from public places, as He is present in our most public of documents. This is only fitting for reasons I have labored long to explain to you. I would also like to say that I have asked that We forgive each other many things. Forgiveness, in many cases, is contingent on the acceptance of responsibility and an apology from the offending party. For every group in this country who pushed another or retaliated with political or financial influence, let this work be your apology. Let the assumption of responsibility on the part of those, from all those offending groups, who support this endeavor, be assumed. Let the guilt be relieved. Let the debt be forgiven.

"The Time has come, the Walrus said, to talk of many things". On the other side of the looking glass there stands a world in which those forces which rule men and women today are not exerted on members of a Society which first proclaimed to the world that God created us as equals. It is a world I have been looking at for some time now and I would gladly step through with you if you so choose. It seems a long time ago now, that Paul Simon and Art Garfunkel gave us an "American Tune". It is a tune I have carried with me all these many years. This, then, is my American tune. I can tell you with all sincerity that I have no hint of how it will be received. It has been a burden that I am glad to lay down. Please accept it with my best wishes, and my sincerest humility: and may God bless you.

This book was first published on 1/29/2000. It was self published as “E-Matter” at Fatbrain.com. In my haste to complete this work and release the ideas within it into the world according to a schedule I have felt compelled to follow, I have made some errors. I was so busy trying to double check the my statistics and the consistency of the body of the work as a whole, that I failed to go back to the Bible to check on the specifics of comments and suppositions I have made in connection with it. For example, it was not the Apostles that Christ was answering when he replied to the question of which of the Ten Commandments is the most important. He was in fact being questioned by a Scribe, who asked, “Which Commandment is the first of all?”. And His response was not that they are all equally important. To quote him exactly, he said [according to Mark] “The first is, ‘Hear O Israel: The Lord our God, the lord is one; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.’ The second is this, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ It would be Paul in his letter to the Galatians who would boil down the New Covenant to the sentence, “For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ “ So that when I introduced the word “equal” into His words I made of poor choice. While sin is sin and all sin is judged against us, the truth that is conveyed in His answer is not as simple as the word “equally” implies.

I also said that it was the ear of a soldier that was severed when they came with Judas to take Christ to stand accused before the Church of man, prior to handing Jesus over to Rome. It was, in fact, the ear of a slave that was cut by the sword. He was a slave of the high priest. And some of you will say that I tried to exonerate the Jews for their part in the death of Christ by saying that it was the Romans who actually put him to death, when they in fact accepted that His death be on their head. But that was not my intension.

I also said that Christ said that it would be better for those who hurt children that they had never been born. Upon seeing, once again, that this is the warning that Christ gave to Judas concerning his betrayal, I must now question if he used that language with regard to the children.

I was also in error when I said that Franklin Roosevelt was commander and chief when the veterans of WWI were fired on. It was his predecessor, Hoover who was President, and it was just prior to the elections that would put Roosevelt in office. I also referred to Desi Arnez by his stage name in I Love Lucy, which was Ricky Ricardo. I referred to Donna Reed as though she was not a real person, when in fact I was eluding to her persona as a member of her television show cast.

Students of the Bible will note that I have said within this text that I am not my brother's keeper, when in fact, Christ tells us that I am. Students of the Koran will, I'm told, refer you to Abraham's first born son, as the blood line which is their birth right and their source of contention with the Jews. I have stated in correctly that it is their creed.

These are errors that I can not correct within the text. It is the nature of this work that nothing can be changed without opening the door to the nullification of its unique potential. That potential being, to achieve a consensus. Therefore, my errors will stand as a testament to my own frailties and misgivings. This is as it should be. It is not my way in which I have endeavored to lead you. At the same time, these mistakes stand as testimony to the difference between serving the letter of the law and the intent of the law; which coincidentally, was part of the theme of Paul's letter to the Galatians. Those who wish to find fault with this book may well point to my mistakes to discredit me. It then falls to you to judge if these errors have spoiled the intent and the validity of what I have tried to teach, or if the truth has in fact been served.

### 3% Money

This being an election year, there will be a lot of talk about who has done what for the economy. The Democrats will point to the stock market and the unemployment rate and tell you that we owe our fantastic economic growth to the Clinton White House. The Republicans are going to take credit for it, based on changes they have made since taking control of the Congress. But when all is said and done, it is the Federal Reserve that decides how dynamic and durable our economy is. In the end it will also decide who reaps the rewards of that economy. Because most small businesses must work within a confined profit margin in order to compete in the market place, by raising or lowering the interest rate, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve decides to what extent we will be free men and women and to what extent we will be serfs.

If you want to see who should take credit for the economy, you need to seek the truth in the statistics of these United States. The Discount Rate, set by the Federal Reserve, which sets the tone for all interest rates here and around the world, reached a 14.5% in the spring of 1981. If you are old enough to remember, that is when the bottom fell out of the working class economy. The rich began to get richer at the expense of US business, big and small, and the value of private sector paychecks, relative to inflation, began to decline. They are still in decline. The interest rate would decline steadily until it reached the lowest

*George Bailey*

point in the last thirty some years, at 3% in 1992; which is when the economic recovery took off in the private sector.

If you want to see how it came to be that a free economy became enslaved by a small group of technocrats, you need to read a book by William Greider entitled “The Secrets of the Temple”. It was published by Simon & Schuster Inc. as a Touchstone first addition in 1989. If you want 3% money you will either have to wait for the Federal Reserve to decide it is time to stimulate the economy, or you will have to change the system. If you want change, you will need a plan. There is such a plan. It is entitled “Revolution Number Ten” and it was self published as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com on Jan. 29, 2000.

### Big Money small campaign

The campaign of the year 2000 election began with a lot of rhetoric about the amount of money that George W. Bush had gathered up and how it was going to effect the election. But there are two reasons why real reform is not likely. The first is that, it seems to be human nature that the masses can be influenced by the elements brought to bear in advertising. The second is that, because money can win an election, those with money win. That being the case, they are the least likely to actually follow through on reform once elected.

There is another element in this quagmire of big money versus open elections, which doesn't get a lot of press coverage because it involves the press itself. When you look at where all the money in a one hundred million dollar campaign ends up, it isn't difficult to imagine the dynamics at work. The press, and especially the press of media of television, is very often a propaganda machine. It is also, very much, big business. If campaign spending between the candidates reaches levels of fifty million dollars in the first dozen or so states, those selling the advertising space are prospering regardless of who wins and weather the money spent was “Hard” or “Soft”. That is, they win so long as there is no campaign finance reform, and the press is in the employ of those same businesses. You can see the same dynamic at work in the spreading popularity of State lotteries that advertise heavily on radio and television, pumping money into that same propaganda machine.

We have a corrupted electoral system in this country. It is corrupted by money, but it is also corrupted by a two party system that decides who will run and thereby chooses our elected officials long before the election process parades them in front of us. It is not going to change, because those who are chosen are not part of the solution, they are part of the problem. That means that if true change is to come it will be from outside the two political parties. It must come



from a “Grass Roots” movement. In order for that to happen there will have to be a consensus concerning what changes to make and a plan to implement those changes. Such a plan does exist. It is called “Revolution Number Ten”. It was self published as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com on 1/29/00.

### Can Your Business Afford To Pay A Living Wage?

There is a movement afoot across this nation to implement laws that demand on behalf of workers, what some have referred to as a “Living Wage”. It is a noble idea that those who work for a living should be paid a wage which allows them to live with dignity. It is a concept that should find champions from a cross section of Americans as well as American Business. But the idea of a “Living Wage” is a smoke screen. It is an attempt to lay blame for yet one more of our society’s ills at the feet of America’s whipping boy, private enterprise.

For as long as I have been working [over thirty five years] there has been a minimum wage in force. It has always been a subsistence wage at best. It has certainly never afforded individuals the opportunity to participate in our society in a meaningful way. What’s more it has always been riddled with holes. Farm industries have always been able to avoid paying even this minimal minimum wage. In recent years inflation has reduced the true minimum wage by substantial percentages. In an effort to offset some of these losses, the wage has been raised but more loopholes have been added. My niece worked in a shopping mall, selling ice cream for a nationally recognized chain that escaped its minimum wage obligation because it did not gross enough money in a shopping mall to be forced to comply. Because of these realities concerning the minimum wage we have built a society in which it has often been more profitable not to participate: Welfare being the most notable example. The minimum wage has also been an kind of “Example”, so that we can all see and understand what happens to those who jeopardize their position within society by standing up or stepping out of line. But none of the problems, which plague America’s working poor, should be laid at the feet of American Business.

Anyone in business, who has ever given consideration to providing a job for an American worker, already knows that by the time the true cost of any employee is tabulated, even at minimum wage, it will approach a “Living Wage”. That is to say that, by the time an employer pays matching Social Security, Unemployment Compensation, Workman’s Compensation; pays all the fees and meets all the regulatory requirements associated with providing individuals the opportunity to support themselves, the money allocated to pay the cost of maintaining those individuals as Employees probably surpasses what will

*George Bailey*

ultimately become the “Living Wage”. It will not do to through stones against the house of American business so long as the American Bureaucratic Institutions feed off the American worker under the guise of “Omnipotent Benefactor”. Capitalism functions within a Global Economy, which is not always Capitalistic and certainly not always concerned with providing it’s employees with a “Living Wage”. Therefore, regardless of productivity, there will be constraints and limitations on the ability of American Business to provide for its employees. If that percentage of profit, which is allocated to labor, has to be shared with those who make a “GOOD LIVING” pushing papers, there will be a gap between minimum wages and living wages. This problem is only aggravated when it is public employees who demand a “Living Wage” for themselves without insisting that such safeguards be extended to the private sector. Why? Because when the cost of maintaining public employees rises, taxes and fees rise: and those increases must come from the profits of the private sector. Ultimately they will be squeezed from the earnings of the working class within the private sector as inflation [due to increases bureaucratic costs] devalue wages outside government: wages that do not rise by government mandate.

Capitalism is not a kind system of economics. It hurts people by disfranchising them, or displacing them. Therefore it is necessary to have safeguards in place within a society which bases its economy on Capitalistic principles. But wishing things better does not make things better. If we want change we will have to have a plan. If we want to help each other we must decide in what form that help should be administered. And when we have arrived at a solution we will have to have a consensus of opinion concerning that solution and a way to force the implementation of that plan on all those who currently live well as result of a bad system. There is a plan in existence. It attempts to build a consensus of opinion and it comes with a way to force the implementation of that plan. It is entitled “Revolution Number Ten” and it was self published as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com on 1/29/2000.

### Healthcare, Your Business And You

If you are a small business owner who understands the difference between Communism, Socialism and Capitalism, then you are probably already painfully aware that you are among the last of those Americans who is a Capitalist. In one form or another, virtually every other individual who is not scraping by at the poverty level or below, works in a job that has either figured out a way to be protected by government or subsidized directly by government. As Capitalists, you more than any other group, understand that Capitalism is a cruel and

unforgiving Mistress. You also understand market dynamics and the implications and consequences of those dynamics on you and your business. Therefore, if you stop and think about what I am about to tell you, it should make perfect sense to you.

In the world of construction, there is no position more enviable than that of a contractor working for time and material: T&M. It is a situation in which the uncertainties of performing the task at hand, create a situation in which, in order to get someone to do the work, the contractor is given “Carte Blanche”, or a sort of blank check. The contractor is allowed to bill for all their costs plus profit as a percentage against those costs. Therefore the incentive is to incur cost, rather than cut costs. At the same time, applying the principles of Capitalism to Healthcare assumes that informed consumers will make rational decisions about which types of health choices they will make and in what amounts. Both of these assumptions are, of course, ludicrous. No one is going to bargain with their Healthcare giver about what is acceptable medical treatment. They want to be healed and nothing less. Nor will they quibble about price: especially if their insurer is footing the bill. Therefore, the only mediating factor will be how much care they can afford.

When We, as a nation, decide that we will allow Carte Blanche for the medical needs of the elderly, the poor, the government worker, and the pseudo-government worker, in a Healthcare industry that functions on Capitalistic principles, it is Small Business owners who pay the cost of the competition. They are both excluded from participation in Healthcare programs, and outbid in the Healthcare market place by those who are supported by those same small businesses [as small business employs 60% of American workers]. The only segment of the population who is more disfranchised by this state of affairs is the salt of the earth working class core, who falls just above the poverty level.

In a Capitalistic system of economics, those who wish to receive goods and services must be able to afford the price of those goods and services. When there is a shortage of a good or a service, those who can most afford that good or service will be the ones who receive that good or service. Healthcare should NEVER be allowed to be in short supply. If we allow it to be in short supply, and We, as a nation, continue to insure coverage to everyone other than the private sector, then costs will continue to rise just out of reach of those most deserving of coverage, due to market forces. This, regardless of how much money we lavish upon Healthcare providers.

At the same time we are a nation in economic decline. If you are in business you know what I say to be true. Each time a fortune is made on paper in the stock market, the Federal Reserve balances the increase in wealth by increasing the wealth bled from private business in the form of higher interest rates. In order to

*George Bailey*

escape the realities of this decline, health care providers function under a different set of rules. IE:

I suspected I might have a termite problem, so I called a local termite man. He came out at a time that was convenient for both of us. He inspected my home and found it to be undamaged. He also counseled me on what to look for in the future. He then bid me good day at no charge. This guy was the exception. Normally, I would have expected to pay, either for the inspection or the treatment. But in Capitalism, the consultation is generally given away as a promotion for the work.

Recently, I had occasion to make an appointment with a dermatologist. I sat in a waiting room so that the Doctor's time would not be wasted waiting on me, because in this scenario, I am not the customer even though I am paying, I am the patient. I am to be subservient. I asked him about a condition on my face caused from sun exposure over the years and he counseled me that there was nothing to be done at this time and what to look for in the future. I also asked three more questions. One was about a thing he called a skin "Tag". It was an odd little piece of skin that had formed under my arm. He removed it by freezing it. The procedure took three or four minutes. I was out of his presence in less than fifteen minutes: perhaps as little as ten.

Before making my appointment I had asked how much a consultation was. They didn't want to be pinned down, but the doctor's staff had guessed that the consultation would be \$60 to \$65 and the removal of a mole [which I thought the "Tag" was] would run about \$35 to \$40 [mole removal is a surgical procedure]. When I got the bill, I was charged \$78 for the visit and \$80 for the "Tag" [This, in a part of the country where \$15.00 an hour is considered very good wages].

I don't have a problem with waiting to see the doctor in order to help doctors be more efficient. I don't have a problem with paying a small increase in the consultation fee for each question I ask on different problems I face. I don't have a problem with being charged for procedures that the doctor performs. I don't even have a problem with allowing doctors some latitude in increasing my charges when increases are warranted. I do have a problem with every aspect of my doctor appointment being dissected and compartmentalized and the advantage, in every single compartment given to the Doctor. If the time I spend waiting in the Waiting Room is not compensated, then why, as a consumer, a customer, am I the one waiting? If you tell me that Capitalistic principles have no place in Medicine, why am I charged for both his knowledge and his work? The diagnosis from a Doctor is their stock and trade. We must recognize their right to receive compensation for that knowledge. So, unlike the Termite inspector, we will allow for charges: even increases for more questions. But should we then allow for additional charges for procedures that are performed within the time frame of the office visit we have paid for; performed during time that the Doctor

is already “On our Clock” so to speak. We will even allow for latitude in charging for those procedures when difficulties arise. But when a non-surgical procedure is substituted for a surgical procedure, should we also be charged more arbitrarily? If we, as consumers, bend over backwards because Capitalism has no place in Medicine, should Capitalism have a place in the billing for medicine? Any other business that tried to “Double Dip” in this manner would be hauled into court. A roofing contractor would never be allowed to refuse a consumer an estimate and then charge a bid rate for the work performed, only to tack on an hourly rate for the job as well and in addition. But Doctors have no problem with such practices because they are not considered Capitalists.

Ironically, when I called the Doctor to question the bill his billing company sent me, he said that no one in his office had a right to give quotes: that the \$40 dollar procedure price I was given was ten years behind the times and that “The Buck stops here”, with him, and I would pay the full rate. I say ironically because while he will no doubt make a couple of hundred thousand dollars or more this year, he will only pay self employment taxes on the first \$70,600 to prop up Social Security [at 1999 rates]. I will pay on all my earnings, as I never seem to exceed the cut off point. But we will both pay the 2.9%, which goes to health care, on all our earnings. So while the rates my business charges have only increased around 15% to 20% over the last ten years, his costs have increased over 100% by his assessment. Furthermore, his increases can be traced to the fact that he and I both pump money into his field of BUSINESS as a government mandate. So that, while the working poor, of what used to be the middle class, will bear the burden of supporting the elderly, health care PROFESSIONALS will contribute equally to the inflationary slush fund known as Medicare. So the irony would seem to me to be that the BUCK stops at my feet; it is the “BUCKS” that stop at his. His rates are not an assessment of his Capitalistic value within society, but rather a reflection of what his peer group feels it is entitled to and gains through political manipulation. If this were not true, then no doctor could charge the equivalent of a week’s minimum wage earnings for a ten minute office business. And now we find Pharmaceutical companies about to board the same “Gravy Train”.

Today, in America, minorities want recognition of their minority status, while being protected by laws that make it illegal to discriminate. While we as a nation recognize the immorality of discrimination, we never want for minorities who will champion their right to be treated differently. Women have made it a crime against the state to bar women from anything Male, while building monuments and shrines of all manner which are exclusively female. Government workers and pseudo-government workers want to receive parody in real wages, while discounting everything from healthcare to early retirement as compensation above and beyond what the private sector can expect. The elderly,

*George Bailey*

who road the crest of the greatest economy the world has ever known, while leaving behind depleted natural resources and ecological debt, insist on being given a retirement check that rivals the earning of those working for minimum wage and now they want it to be tax free in addition to their earnings. Doctors want to be compensated as Gods and held harmless for mistakes made as they “Practice” their art on those who compensate them in a Capitalistic manner for services which are not held to a Capitalistic standard in any other manner. We are a nation of the selfish. We want it both ways, and both ways are our ways.

If we are to have affordable Healthcare coverage, that includes all Americans, we will have to have change in way we approach healthcare and life in general. We will have to have a consensus of opinion on what those changes should be and we will have to have a plan for implementing those changes. There is a plan, which outlines a set of changes that allows for just such a Healthcare system and it comes with a plan for the implementation of those changes. It is entitled “Revolution Number Ten”, and it was self published on 1/29/2000 as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com.

#### Oil, Oil Prices And Your Business

If you aren't old enough to remember the Arab Oil Embargo of 1973, then you may want to do some serious research on it before you make any long-term business commitments. Example: many of the trucking companies around in the early 1970's had good contracts with good customers and were making good profits just prior to going bankrupt when oil prices rose out of sight. Shippers who were locked into rates with customers in long term scenarios began to lose money as oil prices increased. Because they were contractually obligated to ship freight at the contracted rate they stayed in business, hoping the price of diesel fuel would fall, until they had nothing left to lose and went under.

The oil embargo was a big deal a quarter of a century ago. It caused a terrified American public to waffle on a lot of environmental issues. It demonstrated what happens to a Capitalistic nation when the Good Old Boys of industry are allowed to stave off competition through innovation by using political tactics to kill competition. You end up with an industrial base that can't compete with foreign competitors when push comes to shove. In order to accommodate the need for fuel efficient vehicles back in the 1970's, Detroit tried to exploit the situation by putting their name on foreign built automobiles. They were inferior and those same Detroit companies lost their credibility with an entire generation, while the foreign companies who had actually built the cars used the profits to upgrade and innovate and they took our markets by storm.

The battle cry of the day was to bash the Arabs and bash the Japanese. But the Japanese were just playing by the rules of a game we had taught them. The Arabs were trying to find a way to hold the value of their liquid assets constant. Since their assets were in the form of US dollars traded for oil and since inflation had been steady and relatively constant from the late 1940's to 1973, eroding the value of those dollars, something had to give. Jimmy Carter came on television to ask the American public to turn down their thermostats to save energy until a national "Energy Policy" could be developed. The need for such a policy would be an election issue for years to come. But none would ever be developed. None could be developed without destabilizing the economic power structure of the US. So the only avenue of recourse in the fight for stability would be to hold inflation and kill the economy with higher interest rates. This strategy would collide head long into Reaganomics through the 1980's. For a better insight into the dynamics of the period, I suggest you seek out "The Secrets Of The Temple" by William Greider. It was published in 1989 as a Touchstone Book by Simon and Schuster.

A book I read years ago entitled Oil Politics Of The 80's listed the known oil reserves of the time. Saudi Arabia was said to have had something like fifty years of oil reserves. All the rest of the oil producing nations of the world had considerably less: as low as ten or twenty years. That was at the current rate of consumption. There have been some new reserves of oil located since that time. But through the 1990's the American economy has been in resurgence. That created higher demands for oil. At the same time, American consumers saw steady oil prices as a constant in a way that was reminiscent of the late 1960's. They began to be less concerned about conservation and more concerned about comfort and style. We now find ourselves in a situation very similar to that of 1973, except that it is not an embargo driving the shortage, it is the vibrance of the economy itself. Once again, interest rates seem to be the weapon of choice. As oil prices rise, inflation will inevitably follow. Inflation fears may well cause OPEC [the oil producing nations of the middle east] to cut production and the spiral downward will be all too familiar to the Baby Boom generation.

Regardless of how we come out of this situation in the year 2000, it is a problem that will be reoccurring and growing in severity until the day the lights finally go out for good. Without a National Energy Policy we are driving head long into the fog at full speed. If we are to change things we will have to do it ourselves, because those who are entrenched in the old systems and industries are the same people who were at the helm when we failed to respond to a growing need for more fuel efficient automobiles. In order for us to make changes we will have to join together with a consensus of opinion and common cause. We will have to have a plan and a method for implementing such a plan. There is a plan

*George Bailey*

which attempts to do just that. It is entitled "Revolution Number Ten". It was self published as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com on 1/29/00.

### Prenuptials In The Twenty First Century

By the end of the Twentieth Century the "Prenuptial" agreement had become a document that most Americans had at least heard of. By the beginning of the Twenty First Century it was being championed as a prerequisite to any marital arrangement. The idea was being promoted that, regardless of the financial situation of those entering into the state of matrimony, a contingency plan involving lawyers for both sides should be drawn up at least six months in advance of the wedding. This, in order to assure that if one of the parties involved in the union should become financially unstable, the other could escape the arrangement with their credit in good standing.

I suspect that even in the midst of the feminist dogma which rules today's America, there are few young women who do not dream of a church wedding and at least some of the trappings and the ceremony of a union made before God. But we as a nation seldom ever look to the Bible anymore when we are choosing the precepts that will govern our lives. This is especially sad as it relates to the institution of marriage and the prenuptial agreement. The Bible teaches that when a man and a woman are joined together in marriage, that it is a union of two into one. It is not a merger of assets or even an acquisition to a team. It is a fusion of two into one.

In a society which is obsessed with self, and self-fulfillment and self-gratification it is easy to see how we have lost our way. It is easy to see why over half of our marriages end in failure. The key to understanding the nature of marriage is to understand that until you are joined as ONE, you are unwed. No sane individual beats them self. No sane individual cheats them self, nor distrusts them self. No sane individual can ignore their own needs, or wants or desires, or pain. Nor is one exempt from their own joys and triumphs. So that when two people become one, these same truths apply.

It should be obvious that there can be no union such as the one I have just described in the presents of a prenuptial agreement. In the truest sense, such an agreement nullifies the intent of the institution of marriage before God and replaces it with the institution of marriage before the State. This is only one of the many ramifications of a system of laws and institutions that no longer work because they are no longer grounded in the fairness of the Bible. If we as a nation are to turn things around, we will have to change our selves and we will have to change how we deal with each other both in and out of the courts. In order to



have change we must have a plan. You can find such a plan listed in Fatbrain's E-Matter. It is called "Revolution Number Ten". It was self published on 1/29/2000.

### Racism In Campaign 2000

If you have chosen to spend two dollars of your hard earned money to find out what faction of the "White" community threatens you, then you have revealed yourself as one of the prejudiced individuals who is the subject of the brief editorial. This being an election year, there will be a lot of talk about the needs of individual groups and what each candidate intends to do to improve the lot of those individual groups. There will be many who come forward to champion the causes of their individual groups and those who champion the cause will find themselves rewarded with power and influence. But the people they claim to represent will receive lip service until the elections are over and then they will be forgotten. It is the age old axiom of divide and conquer.

Those of you who expected the bigots of this dissertation to be White need to contemplate a simple fact. All around the world there have been grievous injustices perpetrated against individuals, as well as governments, in the name of American National Security. Some of it has been done for political self-interest. There were atrocities committed in Vietnam. We have backed murderous dictators around the globe. If you intend to hold the Whites of America accountable for injustices against any group, rather than excepting the reality that the majority of whites have denounced racism, you are hiding from the truth. If you call yourself an American, and if you wish to assign blame for the transgressions of America as a White nation that abused Native Americans and Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans and Black Americans; then you must accept responsibility for the outrages I have just described as having been committed during your watch . You can not say with one breath that those who were governed by a Government were responsible for their Governments actions and then say in the next breath that in your case you are not responsible for your government's outrages because you were powerless. We are all powerless unless we stand together. If we are not a nation indivisible, then we are a nation divided and conquered. You can not be protected by this Government or take money from this Government and say that you are not responsible.

It seems that everyone wants to have it both ways. Feminists want us to understand that it is necessary for them to have organizations which exclude men but demand laws which prevent men from having exclusive organizations. They want us to understand the economic realities that make "Ladies Night" and

*George Bailey*

special incentives to women a good thing for bar owners who want to draw a male crowd. But unless it is women or the elderly or the minority who is being allowed special considerations, such incentives will be legally challenged regardless of the economic considerations or viabilities. We find the same “Double Speak” in the political campaigns that champion the idea that we can unite the people of this nation through coalitions. We can not be united so long as we are divided in to groups.

Politicians do not want a nation unified. They want to be able to gather together enough groups to allow them to retain power while leaving the individual groups powerless outside their position in the collective of the coalition. And since it is a coalition of groups who do not have a common interest, none will find support within the coalition from other members, rendering them all impotent to demand that campaign pledges be honored.

Change is not accomplished through coalition. Change is accomplished through economics and common cause. If you want to end racism in America it will have to begin with you. It will also take an advancement in the situation of all Americans so that we will not be pitted against each other in order to survive. To accomplish this we will have to become a nation indivisible with a plan for change and consensus of opinion on what those changes should be and how to proceed to accomplish those changes. There is such a plan. It was self-published at Fatbrain.com on 1/29/2000. Copies of it were sent out on compact disc to numerous organizations, requesting them to distribute it without charge. If you have not heard of it, and you belong to a politically organized faction, then you might ask yourself why you haven't. You may also want to check it out for yourself.

### Social Security And Your Chances Of Receiving It

One night when I was very young, perhaps eight, my father pulled up to a house I had never seen before and left me setting in the car as he ran up to the door. In his hand he held a fifth of whiskey rapped in a brown paper bag. When a man opened the door of the house, my father gave him the bag with its contents and then trotted back to the car. When I asked him who that man was he told me that he was somebody from a list. The list, he explained to me, was a group of ten individuals to whom he had obliged himself to give a bottle of liquor. Having done this, he would then recruit some number of individuals to give a bottle of liquor to people on the list. Bottles would be given to those who were vested in the program before him and, sometime in the future, bottles would begin to flow to my father as he moved up the list. In this way, everyone who entered the program would begin

with a loss, but so long as the game continued, each would reap rewards, and those rewards would accumulate exponentially. Of course, even at age eight, it was obvious to me that for every bottle given to someone up the ladder, someone at the bottom would eventually have to lose one. That is why the practice was called a “Pyramid Scheme” and why it was illegal in the moral context of the 1950’s American landscape.

The only way that a Pyramid Scheme can remain solvent is for there to be continued participation at the bottom. In order to insure participation, it is necessary to be able to both, force that participation, and to continue to increase the supply of individuals at the bottom. Mandatory participation in the Social Security system, either by contributions from wages [which are matched by employers], or through self employment taxes, coupled with the emergence of the Baby Boom Generation, and substantial immigration volumes, has allowed the Scheme known a Social Security to appear to be solvent for the last fifty years.

If you want to understand the frailties of a system such as Social Security then you must be a student of Capitalism. The concept of supply and demand states that goods and services shall go to those who can afford them, so that when there is a shortage in those goods and services, the market place will allocate those goods and services to those who bid the most. Those who can bid the most shall prevail. When Social Security began, it was in reaction to the poverty and starvation which was prevalent in the Great Depression. It was the elderly, worn out and disfranchised who often suffered the most. Unfortunately, over time, the idea that those who lived long enough to receive Social Security had a right to survive; would evolve into the notion that they had a right to a pension which would allow them financial independence. This would have serious economic implications for the members of the Baby Boom generation and those behind them in the Pyramid.

Imagine, if you will, that Social Security were 100% solvent. Suppose further, that all the money paid into Social Security had been invested wisely and the returns it had made allowed everyone age forty five or older to have an equivalent of a million dollars vested in the program. Let us imagine that because of this phenomenal success, everyone over forty five retired and began living like a millionaire. What would happen? They would all square off in a capitalistic arena and compete for goods and services. So that, regardless of the economy’s ability to prevent shortages of goods [which would raise prices]; because they competed for a limited number of services, prices would inflate to levels which would devalue their money to something closely equivalent to what they have today as buying power. Because it is necessary for a given percentage of a population to work in order to provide for a given number of individuals who do not: either the number of individuals who do not work must be lowered or the living standards of either the workers, or the non-workers, or both, must be lowered. In order for Baby Boomers to be able to retire using Social Security it will be necessary for enough of them to

*George Bailey*

die so that the burden of those who remain can be born by the number of workers in society. What's more, without the political clout and the political rhetoric of today's elderly class, Boomers will once again move to the back of the line. In order to strike a balance, Boomers will work longer. The age of retirement will, of necessity, be raised just out of reach until the number of those left is in balance with what will be allocated. In 1999, it was announced that the age of retirement would soon have to be raised to sixty seven. It was the first step toward the inevitable.

This is the reality of Social Security today. If We, as a nation, set around and wait for the inevitable to happen, then we will pay a dear price for our inaction. But if we address the problem realistically, then all manner of things are possible. If we want to change things we will have to decide what those changes should be. We will have to have a consensus of opinion. We will have to have a plan and a way to implement that plan. There is a plan waiting. It includes a way to implement change. It is entitled "Revolution Number Ten", and it was self published as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com on 1/29/2000.

#### Teachers And Campaign 2000

The election campaign of 2000 put the teachers of Nebraska and their bargaining agents in the news, as they tried to increase their share of the State's economic pie. A press core, sympathetic to teachers, informed Nebraska residents that the teachers of their state are compensated at a rate which is forty-second in the nation. Voters were informed that the teachers are performing at a A+ level and are being compensated at a D- level. But the news of how much teachers are actually paid in dollars was not widely publicized until much later in the campaign.

During this same time frame, people listening to Omaha radio could hear a local company advertising to recruit specialized personnel for its company's operations. This company was looking for technicians with grade level three engineering credentials in the field of refrigeration. These technicians were being offered entrée level positions on swing and night shifts only. This same company, that found itself competing in the relatively hot Omaha economy, for a relatively skilled labor force, was boasting that the people filling these positions would receive as compensation for their education and their bad work schedule, a whopping \$15.00 and hour. That's under \$32,000.00 a year.

When the teachers look at their pay as compared to the private sector they will take the "Perks" of three months of time off, tenure protection and the general security of a job that will never be eliminated or moved out of town by a

foreign competitor, as inconsequential. They will discount medical benefits and a retirement plan as compensation. They will ignore that, while Nebraska's cost of living index may not be forty-second, it is far from the top ten. They will insist on parody dollar for dollar and ask voters to consider that they are the teachers of their children as if it entitled them to more money, when in fact, the privilege of being those who mold the minds of the future is another one of the perks they do not begin to appreciate. In the end, because it is an election year, and because we have become a nation of coalitions rather than a nation indivisible, the teachers will probably prevail: to some degree anyway. The government, who is left as the only opposing view in light of the biased news coverage, will not speak out against wage increases. They dare not, as the increases will likely be parroted within government itself. As a result, the residents of Nebraska's private sector find themselves with neither voice nor champion.

This is not a new approach. This is the method employed and the direction we have been heading for the last thirty years. It is a way of thinking that existed in Medieval Europe. Back in Feudal Europe, when an outside aggressor threatened the Kingdom, the Nobles would don their armor and mount their war horses in the defense of the lowly serfs. But win or lose, the serfs would be enslaved by the victor. From public servants who get early retirement, to doctors who save our miserable lives so that we may spend the remainder of them in their debt, to retired military who never seem to get enough in return for their service; we have been saved, not as free men and women, but as indentured servants to those who profess to serve us.

If you want to change our direction, you're going to have to have a plan for change. You can find such a plan listed as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com. It is called "Revolution Number Ten" and it was self published on 1/29/2000.

### Venture Capital In The Non-Cyber World

If you have a solid business plan for a computer related product that you would like to get off the ground in the US today, you have a reasonable chance at finding someone who will listen. And because the Cyber-World is such a hot commodity on the stock exchange, you can have realistic expectations of being allowed to participate in sharing the wealth that you generated: even if that wealth is only a reflection of stock prices arbitrarily evaluated in the face of the reality that your enterprise is losing money hand over fist.

If, on the other hand, you have an idea for a project or item, which exists in the Real World, you are very likely to run up against a whole other set of obstacles, and at a very high rate of speed. If you saw the movie "Fargo", you

*George Bailey*

may remember the dilemma that set the whole sad affair in motion. The movie claimed to be based on a true story. From my own experiences, I can vouch for the fact that the way in which the Venture Capitalist “father in law” viewed the world in the movie, was “on the mark” for the group in general. Venture Capitalists, as a whole, see the world from the perspective of money. That is to say that they give little or no importance to innovation or inspiration. It has been my experience that the amount of compensation Venture Capitalists are likely to offer those who develop products and ideas is little more than wages in return for their opportunity to reap a windfall. What’s more, you will be obliged to be both subservient and grateful in the face of your humiliation or you will likely not even receive that much from the relationship.

This may sound like sour grapes to you. It’s not. Before you invest too much of yourself into a project, you need to investigate what I have just told you. The individual who builds a better mouse trap in the economic climate which is the American institution of Capital, will find them self without a path of their own and no one knocking. It has always been necessary, in a Capitalistic economy, to seek out those control money. What has changed over the last thirty years is the willingness of Capital to participate in a Capitalistic economy when the economic rewards of the Economic System of Capitalism have been siphoned off to pay artificially inflated interest rates.

If you would like to understand the obstacles you face with more clarity, I would highly recommend a book written by William Greider entitled “The Secrets Of The Temple”, published by Simon & Schuster in 1989. If you want to change the economic situation, I suggest that you read “Revolution Number Ten” which was self published as E-Matter at Fatbrain.com in 2000.



