

2-1-1967

Ersatz Cream Anyone?

Follow this and additional works at: <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/greenrevolution>

Recommended Citation

(1967) "Ersatz Cream Anyone?," *Green Revolution*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 2 , Article 13.
Available at: <https://research.library.kutztown.edu/greenrevolution/vol5/iss2/13>

This News is brought to you for free and open access by Research Commons at Kutztown University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Green Revolution by an authorized editor of Research Commons at Kutztown University. For more information, please contact czerny@kutztown.edu.

Flight From The City

By Ralph Borsodi

(continued from last month)

My voyage of discovery into the realm of advertising economics led to a deeper search for the truth. Three years later, in 1926, I published the results of several years of study in a book (for which Lew Hahn wrote the introduction), which I called *The Distribution Age*.

Here I came much nearer to a satisfactory explanation of the curious results of our cost studies of home canning. Factory production costs had, it is true, decreased year after year as industry had developed. Nothing had developed to stop the factory in its successful competition with handicraft industry, so far as costs of production were concerned. Our economists, therefore, took it for granted that the superiority of the factory in competition with the home would continue indefinitely into the future. What they overlooked, however, was that while production costs decrease year after year, distribution costs increase. The tendency of distribution and transportation to absorb more and more of the economies made possible by factory production was ignored. Transportation, warehousing, advertising, salesmanship, wholesaling, retailing—all these aspects of distribution cost more than the whole cost of fabricating the goods themselves. Less than one-third of what the consumer pays when actually buying goods at retail is paid for the raw materials and costs of manufacturing finished commodities; over two-thirds is paid for distribution. While we were busy reducing the amount of labor needed to produce things—as the technocrats recently discovered—we were busily engaged in increasing the numbers employed to transport, and sell, and deliver the products which we were consuming. That a time might come when all the economies of factory production would be lost in the cost of getting the product from the points of production to the points of consumption had been generally ignored.

Eventually I stumbled on an economic law which still seems to me the only satisfactory explanation of our adventure with the canned tomatoes: *Distribution costs tend to move in inverse relationship to production costs*. The more production costs are reduced in our factories, the higher distribution costs on factory products become. At some point in the case of most products a time comes when it is cheaper to produce them individually than to buy them factory made. Nothing that we can do to lower distribution costs by increasing the efficiency of our railroads, and nothing that we can do to eliminate competition as socialists propose, upsets this law. As long as we stick to the industrial production of goods this law is operative.

A simple illustration makes this clear. With factory production, large quantities of one product are made in one spot. To use automatic machinery, to divide labor most efficiently, to transport raw materials inexpensively, it is necessary to manufacture in quantity. Raw materials and fuel must therefore be assembled from long distances before the process of fabrication can begin. After the raw materials have been fabricated into finished goods—a process which may require movement of the semi-manufactured goods back and forth among several plants located at different points of the country—the finished goods must be transported and stored at the points of consumption until the public is ready to use them. The larger factories are made in order to lower production costs, the greater become the distances and the more intricate the problems involved in assembling the raw materials and distributing the finished goods. Thus the lower we make the factory costs, the higher become the distribution costs.

It cost the Campbell Soup Co. much less to produce a can of tomatoes in their great factories than it cost Mrs. Borsodi to produce one in her kitchen. But after they had produced theirs, all the costs of getting it from their factory to the ultimate consumer had to be added. In Mrs. Borsodi's case the first cost was the final cost. No distribution costs had to be added because the point of production and the point of consumption was the same.

All the orthodox economic teachings to which I had subscribed underwent a complete transformation as soon as I fully digested the implications of this discovery.

I discovered that more than two-thirds of the things which the average family now buys could be produced more economically at home than they could be bought factory made;

—that the average man and woman could earn more by producing at home than by working for money in an office or factory and that, therefore, the less time they spent working away from home and the more time they spent working at home, the better off they would be;

—finally, that the home itself was still capable of being made into a productive and creative institution and that an investment in a homestead equipped with efficient domestic machinery would yield larger returns per dollar of investment than investments in insurance, in mortgages, in stocks and bonds.

The most modern and expensive domestic machinery need not, therefore, be a luxury. It can be a productive investment, in spite of the fact that most manufacturers of appliances still sell their machines on the basis of a luxury appeal. Even appliances like vacuum cleaners can be made paying investments, if the time they save is used productively in the garden, the kitchen, the sewing and loom room.

These discoveries led to our experimenting year after year with domestic appliances and machines. We began to experiment with the problem of bringing back into the home, and thus under our own direct control, the various machines which the textile-mill, the cannery and packinghouse, the flour-mill, the clothing and garment factory, had taken over from the home during the past 200 years. Needless to say, we have thus far only begun to explore the possibilities of domestic production.

In the main the economies of factory production, which are so obvious and which have led economists so far astray, consist of three things: (1) quantity buying of materials and supplies; (2) the division of labor with each worker in industry confined to the performance of a single operation; and (3) the use of power to eliminate labor and permit the operation of automatic machinery. Of these, the use of power is unquestionably the most important. Today, however, power is something which the home can use to reduce costs of production just as well as can the factory. The situation which prevailed in the days when water power and steam-engines furnished the only forms of power is at an end. As long as the only available form of power was *centralized power*, the transfer of machinery and production from the home and the individual, to the factory and the group, was inevitable. But with the development of the gas-engine and the electric motor, power became available in *decentralized* forms. The home, so far as power was concerned, had

been put in position to compete with the factory.

With this advantage of the factory nullified, its other advantages are in themselves insufficient to offset the burden of distribution costs on most products. Furthermore, even these advantages are not as great as they seem. What is saved through minute division and subdivision of labor tends often to be nullified by the higher costs of supervision and management. And the savings in the factory made possible by quantity buying become more and more minute when the home begins to produce raw materials itself.

The average factory, no doubt, does produce food and clothing cheaper than we produce them even with our power-driven machinery on the Borsodi homestead. But factory costs, because of the problem of distribution, are only first costs. They cannot, therefore, be compared with home costs, which are final costs. The final cost of factory products after distribution costs have been added, make the great bulk of consumer goods actually more expensive than homemade products of the same quality.

This is what we learned from Mrs. Borsodi's adventure with the tomatoes.

Immunity vs. Hygiene

By M. J. Loomis

Readers have, in the main, expressed one of three positions in commenting on the refusal of the Sprague family (Heathcote Center, Freeland, Md.; see January *Green Revolution* and continuing information in this issue) to comply with compulsory vaccination of their children, 8, 14 and 16 years old. Some readers believe that such refusal is uncalled for and absurd; others question vaccination but would not fight with the law about it (accept it and take some counter-protective measure, or use a subterfuge); still others stand strongly with the Spragues, and look upon vaccination as both unnecessary and dangerous.

Those in the first camp, accept the idea that many diseases are caused by germs or bacteria; that the human body can become immune by once having the disease or by having injected into it controlled doses of the bacteria in question. If small amounts, say, of smallpox bacteria, are injected, the cells of the body develop antibodies that help render the body immune to further attack.

Such a method, object those who prefer to be called hygienists, is the exact opposite of the process of health. All disease, they say, is an effort of a human body to expel toxins or poisons which have developed through violation of some simple body need.* To introduce bacteria, poison, or pus from a diseased animal (as in the case of smallpox vaccination) is not to assist, but to harden, the body in its health processes. All fever, all rash and skin eruptions are signs of the body throwing off excesses of toxins that regular elimination organs could not handle. Such symptoms should not be checked (by drugs or vaccines) but assisted, by rest, fasting, pure air and water. The body always does its own healing. Observation of eight simple life habits (the positive of the violations given in the starred footnote) will aid the body in maintaining its own balance, or health. Drugs are deterrents, not aids, to health. Vaccines are toxins or drugs, and not constructive in the body. So say the hygienists. (See *Hygienic Review*, and books by Dr. Herbert M. Shelton, leading hygienic practitioner, Box 1277, San Antonio, Tex.)

Nutrition and Sanitation Better

The hygienists agree that the incidence of infectious diseases has dropped. But this is because of improved nutrition and sanitation. Says Dr. Shelton, "No vaccine rid Europe of the bubonic plague. They got rid of rats. No vaccine rid Europe and America of malaria. Entomologists taught us how to get rid of the mosquito that carried it. Vaccines and serum have been successful in those regions where hygiene and sanitation have been advanced; they have been

*Hygienists hold that all disease is a result of an initial loss of nerve energy (enervation). Enervation is caused from one, several or all of these violations of healthful habits: improper food, in wrong combinations, too much food; inadequate elimination; negative emotions and wrong sex habits; lack of rest, exercise, pure air and water.

total failures where people live in poverty, squalor and filth. . . . Had we not relied on drugs and vaccines, had we adhered more strictly to simple rules of right living and community cleanliness, we would have eliminated these diseases at a much earlier date.

"Vaccination and inoculation detract from really effective prevention. Though commercially very profitable, they hinder any genuine advance in preventive practice. It is now freely admitted that the Salk vaccine was both a failure and a disaster. So long as reliance was placed in its effectiveness, no rational approach to preventing polio could be made."

Negative Results

Eleanor McBean, Ph.D., has published 20 years of research on the history and results of vaccination. Some of her findings include the following:

"Before vaccination was begun in 1775, the highest smallpox death rate (even during epidemics) was only 1,000 a year on the average in Britain. England passed a compulsory vaccination law in 1853, and smallpox kept increasing rapidly each year until 20 years later (1871) the most devastating scourge of smallpox of all time swept the country and took 23,062 lives in England and Wales alone.

"In Germany during that same epidemic, 124,948 people died of smallpox—all of them had been vaccinated and revaccinated, according to carefully kept records. Serious epidemics occurred only in countries where vaccination had been the rule. . . . Smallpox declined rapidly when vaccination was abandoned, and improvements in sanitation and nutrition increased. In 1958 they abolished compulsory vaccination in the English army after many expensive damage suits against the government.

"There was an 87% decline in diphtheria after inoculation was discontinued in England, and a similar decline in France. But when the German armies occupied France and enforced inoculation again, diphtheria rose from 60 cases a year to 13,795 in 1941. Two years later with more intensive inoculation, diphtheria rate increased to 26,750. Under rigid Nazi vaccination laws there were 150,000 cases of diphtheria, while in unvaccinated Norway there were only 51 during the same period."

There is no legal compulsory vaccination for U. S. army soldiers. At end of World War I, vaccination was "forced" on our soldiers for the first time, followed by a devastating outbreak of infantile paralysis, typhoid and influenza. All the men were healthy when inducted (otherwise they wouldn't have been accepted). The record shows that disease was four times higher among "protected" men than among 4-Fs and unvaccinated civilians.

Medical Testimony

"Vaccination is the father of a multitude of skin diseases such as erysipelas, impetigo, psoriasis, roseola, eczema, dermatitis, morbilliform rashes, and some forms of gangrene." — Dr. J. H. Allen in *The Chronic Miasma*

"The post-vaccinal encephalitis (brain damage) with which we are dealing has become a problem in itself." — World Health Organization, 1928

THE GREEN REVOLUTION — 3
February, 1967

"Fifty cases of cerebral disease developed during the first week after vaccination." — *New International Year Book*, 1926

"Cancer was practically unknown until cowpox vaccination began to be introduced. I have had to do with 200 cases of cancer and I never saw a case of cancer in an unvaccinated person." — W. B. Clark, in *New York Times*

"I have removed cancers from vaccinated arms exactly where the poison was injected." — Dr. E. J. Post, Berlmont, Mich.

"I have studied the question of vaccination conscientiously for 45 years. Injection of virus into the pure blood stream of the people does not prevent smallpox. Rather it tends to increase its epidemics and make the disease more deadly. In our country, cancer mortality has increased 900% in the past 50 years." — Dr. Charles E. Post, Boston.

"Vaccination certainly is a prolific cause of both external and internal cancer. Vaccine poisons the lymphatic system, impairs its function and lays the foundation for internal cancer." — Dr. J. Morrison, former professor of chemistry and toxicology.

From official reports from Camp Merrit (San Francisco) and Camp Mulntauk (Manilla), *The Boston Herald* listed names and addresses of 47 soldiers killed by vaccination after one month in army life.

In early September, 1966, over WBBM, on the Jerry Williams Show, a panel of doctors and laymen were discussing modern health. A dentist called in and read from the June 1966 *Illinois Medical Journal* the following: "Universal smallpox vaccination for small children is both outdated and dangerous. The last official case of small pox reported in Illinois was in 1947."

Economic Aspects

In 1954 (first year of Salk vaccine) the Eli Lilly drug company reported \$11,343,662 in profits; in 1957, \$32,296,593.

"Prevention (vaccination) practiced to its utmost will create work for the physician. . . . I am informed that epidemics and infections cause 12% of all deaths, and that this percentage is declining. Only 15% would ever get diphtheria even under epidemic conditions, while 100% are prospects for antitoxin. The percentage for smallpox is even less; but 100% are prospects for vaccination. Typhoid fever is disappearing, due to sanitation, but vaccination should be used. . . ." — Dr. Pfeifferbarger, a former president of Illinois State Medical Society

"With 100,000 babies born every year, the increase in the physicians' income for diphtheria antitoxin would be from a quarter to three-quarters of a million dollars a year if we could immunize all children for this disease soon after they are six months old. There would be an additional \$200,000 if we could immunize them for smallpox. Immunizations against other diseases would help increase the earnings of the physicians who actively sponsor this modern type of practice." — Dr. Guy L. Kiefer in *Michigan Medical Journal*

ERSATZ CREAM ANYONE?

"At a restaurant counter the other day," a subscriber to Consumer Reports wrote in its Letters column, "I happened to notice the waitress filling the small, individual cream containers that are served with coffee. The printing on the half-gallon carton announced it to be *Instantblend* (Perfect blend for coffee). Down below it read: 'A non-dairy product.' Rather. The list of ingredients: 'Pasteurized blend of water, hydrogenated vegetable oils, dextrose, sucrose, enzyme modified casein, mono- and di-glycerides, protein stabilizers, salt, artificial color and flavor.'"

A Way Out
Supplement No. 3