

New Money. Reps. Jim Kolbe (R-AZ) and Esteban E. Torres (D-CA) are calling for the federal government to issue a new one-dollar coin to replace the dollar bill. The ostensible reason is to save money, since coins have a longer life than bills. And to aid acceptance—showing the continuing power of real money—the new coin will be gold colored.

In support of their position, they cite a just-out General Accounting Office study calling for the same. The Federal Reserve has endorsed the report and its proposals.

What does the GAO study say? In addition to recommending this new fool's gold coin, it cautions that the idea will only be successful so long as the regular dollar bill is removed from circulation. They further ask the Congress and the Clinton administration to exercise "leadership" in insuring this takes place. In addition, they suggest that the Treasury print new two-dollar bills.

It's easy to dispense with the idea that this proposal will save money. Printing two-dollar bills would be just as expensive. Furthermore, if changing the color from silver to gold will ensure public acceptance, what's the point of withdrawing one dollar bills?

The whole thing smells. For well over fifteen years, high level government employees have worked for a massive currency withdrawal and reissue program as part of a crackdown on cash held by private individuals. They also see it as part of a revenue-raising strategy, as in: if the feds catch anyone with unauthorized cash, they "raise the revenue" of the government by confiscating it.

Seen in this context, the proposal to issue a one-dollar coin no longer looks so benign. The Clinton administration, as we've seen, seems to thrive off trickery, new uses of state power, and nationalizing ever more private wealth. There is no program more suited to these ends than the totalitarian trick of withdrawing cash. This plan also shows us what will happen to the value of a dollar—it will be about the same as a quarter now.

The New York Bombing

It was only a few days after the World Trade Center bombing before Mohammed A. Salameh was arrested. Is he guilty? Who knows? Some people think this is a frameup by anti-Arab interests. Recall that shortly after the Kennedy assassination, Lee Harvey Oswald was apprehended and accusations were made. We're still sorting that one out. From my point of view, it's hard to believe the perpetrators could be as stupid as the authorities maintain.

We now know what one homemade bomb can do to

a large city—one billion dollars of damage. Whether it was a setup by the Israeli Mossad, as a Jewish friend of mine suspects, or was truly a retaliation by the Islamic fundamentalists, matters little. The cities have become centers of violence, whether through the daily and routine terrorism of crime, political bomb terrorism, or the terrorism of mob behavior as in Los Angeles.

Never before in this nation's history has there been such a push for the banning of guns by federal law. The elite want the population disarmed, so only the government and the criminals have guns. If crime is related to the availability of weapons, why does Switzerland, where every house has a fully automatic weapon, not have a high crime rate?

If you are not armed now, buy a gun and learn how to use it safely and effectively. The National Rifle Association is a big help in this. Also, do your very best to keep your family away from inner cities. If you can't, have a haven remote from the metropolitan areas.

Rush to Gold

Rush Limbaugh, who is doing a fine job taking on the Clinton administration, praised gold on his radio show recently. He pointed out that when the Federal Reserve begins to print dollars, it causes businessmen to make bad decisions and prices to go up. When you see the price of gold beginning to go up, "look out," he said. "You had better start buying it, because gold is the ultimate store of value."

What Is Income?

As the state discovers ever more creative ways to confiscate the nation's private wealth, it is dramatically expanding the definition of what is income. The Treasury Department, in a trend that began in the mid-1980s, wants to replace adjusted gross income with something called "Family Economic Income."

When President Clinton used this new accounting trick to calculate the effects of his tax increases, there was an uproar, largely in response to the publicity Rush Limbaugh gave it on his program. But once it became clear that families wouldn't be taxed on the new definition of income, the outcry subsided.

This represents a false calm. The Treasury does indeed plan to expand the definition of income a little at a time, until the new statistic of "Family Economic Income" can be used. It's a way of dramatically raising taxes without having to admit doing so.