

## Re: Question about President's Social Security plan

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-01/1089.html>

---

**From:** The Trucker (*mikcob\_at\_verizon.net*)

**Date:** 01/17/05

Date: Sun, 16 Jan 2005 17:23:15 -0800

tonyp wrote:

>  
> <royls@telus.net> wrote  
>  
>> > tonyp says...  
>> >> *Private Learjets are of course \_much\_ better for "the economy" :-)*  
>>  
>> *Gogarty writes:*  
>> > *Actually, that's true.*  
>>  
>> *Actually, it's false.*  
>  
>  
> *Actually, it was ironic.*  
>  
>  
>> > *Private investment is much better for the economy than*  
>> > *military investment.*  
>  
>  
> *As Timothy Little said, military expenditure can be considered a form of*  
> *insurance. But insurance premiums are an expense, not an investment.*  
>  
>  
>> *For one thing, that is a \_general\_ rule that has many exceptions, and*  
>> *for another, private Learjets are more an investment in conspicuous*  
>> *consumption than in productive capital.*  
>  
>  
> *Roy, if you \_travel\_ by Learjet you are indeed making an "investment in*  
> *extravagance". When you buy a Learjet to rent out to conspicuous*  
> *consumers, I'd say you are making an actual investment.*

But you are "investing" in extravagance as opposed to "investing" in anything *\_new\_*. It is the *\_new\_* stuff that will solve the

demographics problem. Not the old extravagant stuff.

- >> *The most expensive military of all is one that is*
- >> *not strong enough to deter aggression.*
- >
- >
- > *The above sentence applies literally to the US military: in September*
- > *2001 it was (as it still is) the most expensive military in the world, but*
- > *it demonstrably was too weak to deter aggression.*

I think this is incorrect: What happened was not an act of aggression by any other nation or military power. It was an act of striking out (in the only way that such striking out could be done) at those who had defiled the sanctuary of Islam. Such is the Achilles heel of being the world's strongest nation and then proceeding to tell the people of other sovereignties how they should run their lives and what they should believe in and what their morals should be. Please note that the IRA acted similarly. The solution to terrorism is not to cause it. Bring all the troops home and line them up along the Mexican border and then deport all the illegals. THAT, boys and girls, is defense against aggression.

- > *Now, back to Learjets. Or big-screen TVs, or cosmetic surgery, or live*
- > *opera. They all give pleasure to their consumers, and employment to their*
- > *producers. None of them may be to your taste or mine, but the joy of the*
- > *free market is that it caters to all appetites. Well, not all: I value*
- > *quiet conversation with congenial friends more than I value opera, but*
- > *having a nice chat adds nothing to GDP, whereas buying an opera ticket*
- > *does. Life is more than "the economy".*

It is rent that creates a society where people beg for the opportunity to clean bathrooms and build learjets.

- > *Still, employing people to produce stuff that other people are willing to*
- > *pay for is what "the economy" is all about. CEOs and movie stars are*
- > *willing to pay for Learjets, taxpayers are willing to pay for F16s.*

The F16's are not being paid for with taxes. And the taxpayers obviously do not want to pay for them with taxes.

- > *Producing either plane employs people and thus adds to GDP.*

So does breaking windows and burning barns.

- > *Buying either*
- > *plane can seem like a misguided investment or a frivolous expense, to some*
- > *people. It's a matter of taste: if "taxpayers" as a group are willing to*
- > *pay for F16s, I cannot condemn their taste any more than I can condemn*
- > *that of "CEOs and rock stars".*

But what if a sleazbag cuts taxes and then builds his F16's anyway?  
While constantly lying to all and being supported by his bought and paid for "economists".

- > *Our current problem is along a different axis: we have a president who*
- > *thinks taxpayers should not \_pay\_ for F16s, but \_finance\_ them. Borrow,*
- > *don't tax, is the Bush line. Borrowing money from rich people, rather*
- > *than taxing rich people, is of course very good for the rich people.*

The light comes on, at last.

- > *You'd think the same would apply to not-rich people. Social Security (a*
- > *pool of not-rich people's money) has been lending to the Treasury for*
- > *about*
- > *20 years. The government has been borrowing from the not-rich, but Bush*
- > *now wants to convince us that \_those\_ government IOUs are worthless, and*
- > *our*
- > *only hope for retirement security is "private accounts". (As if \_that\_*
- > *will*
- > *somehow change the 2:1 worker:retiree ratio.) Of course, the \_rich\_ must*
- > *never be allowed to think that \_their\_ government IOUs are worthless. So*
- > *far Bush's tightrope act is working.*

Let us hope that the not so rich will finally wake up and smell the coffee, and that some organization, somewhere, will offer them an alternative to thieving, lying, fascist pig, Republicans.

- > *As Bush stirs the SS pot, however, the not-rich might wake up and see the*
- > *double standard he's trying to pass off as the natural order of things.*
- > *Or*
- > *they might not. You never know, in a democracy.*
- >
- > -- *Tony P.*

Oh but that we actually had a representative democracy in which the representatives could be held accountable by the people. At present we get to choose between bought and paid for candidate "A" or bought and paid for candidate "B". There is NO treat to the established order. The constituency sizes from which the members of the House of Representatives are chosen are far too large and thus too easily bought by mass media advertising. If a well intentioned and reasonably learned candidates for the office of US Representatives could go door to door and have town hall meetings to discuss real issues then we would not have the crap we currently have. Thievery and dishonesty could not survive such a challenge no matter how much money was involved. Political parties would still exist but their power would be cut substantially.

--

"I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy

sci.econ: Re: Question about President's Social Security plan

is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by  
education." - Thomas Jefferson. <http://GreaterVoice.org>