

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-12/msg00082.html>

- *From:* "The Trucker" <mikcob@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 7 Dec 2005 10:24:00 -0800
-

"Jim Blair" <jeb@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:dn4nh8\\$1rb\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dn4nh8$1rb$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>
> "The Trucker" <mikcob@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> news:dmqjtt01m5f@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> "Jim Blair" <jeb@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> [news:dmqbik\\$rgk\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dmqbikrgk1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>>>
>>> "The Trucker" <mikcob@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>>> news:dmfekc01u9r@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>>> "Jim Blair" <jeb@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
>
>>> Hi,
>>>
>>> The demographic problem for Social Security is clear to ME. It was
> clear to
>>> me and Barry Goldwater 40 years ago. Maybe you will see it by 2020 when
>>> FICA no longer collects enough to pay Social Security benefits. Or
> maybe in
>>> 2050 when the "trust fund" runs out.
>>>
>>> (Just kidding—before 2050 they will "fix" Social Security the way they
> have
>>> in the past. Cut the benefits relative to wages, raise the FICA rate and
> the
>>> age to collect)
>>>
>>>>
>>>> The rightarded bean counters seem to WANT to believe that
>>>> there will be no advance of the society in the future,
>>>>
>>>> Er, the demographic problem for SS is the result of "advances in
> society".
>>>> People living longer plus the "pill".
>>>> And people living ever longer won't solve the SS problem.
>>>>
>>>>
> Trucker:
>> (sigh)

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

> jeb:
> Ditto.
>>
>> >>.....and
>> >> of course they are all working quite diligently to insure
>> >> that this is so.
>> >
>> > ???? For example?
>>
>> Wars, rent, rent, rent. No real investing. Just continually
>> flushing the surplus down an aristocratic toilet.
>
> If there has been no "real investing" in the US economy since—when? BushII?
> BushI, Reagan?— then why is the productivity of US workers rising? Rising
> even faster now than in the past and faster than had been predicted?
>
> Or do you assume that because you don't believe, them those BLS productivity
> numbers are just made up ?

Repugnican definition of productivity: Wages sagging or lagging
and rich people getting richer.

>
>> >> > On Trade and Immigration:
>> >> >
>> >> > jeb:
>> >> >
>> >> >> > That has been happening for decades. But a question— which do
> you
>> >> >> prefer:
>> >> >> > jobs move to Mexico? Or the Mexicans move here for those jobs?
>> >> >> > And isn't that the choice? (I mean in the real world).
>> >> >
>> >> > "Chas":
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Jobs are moving to Mexico and China and India.
>> >> >
>> >> > Yes. Isn't that a good thing? Equalizing the wealth world wide. And
>> > more
>> >> > jobs there mean fewer of them move here for those jobs.
>> >>
>> >> Total horse manure. It do not care to "equalize" the wealth
>> >> of the world by making Gates even richer and me poorer.
>> >> And the fence between here and Mexico and a decrease in
>> >> H1B visas are in order. So too very large fines for
>> >> chicken shit cheaters that hire illegals. All of this non
>> >> enforcement of immigration law and increasing H1B
>> >> visas is Republican pandering to the rich and destruction
>> >> of the well being of the middle class of the USA.
>> >
>> > Does more and better jobs in Mexico or China make Bill Gates richer?

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

>>
>> Yes.
>>
>> > How
>> > about the workers in Mexico?
>>
>> Yes.
>>
>> > And note that it is a lot of that "middle class of the USA" that is
> hiring
>> > those Mexicans that come here. Gardeners, babysitters, home repair,
> etc.
>>
>> Most are hired by the "business" people who profit quite handsomely
>> from the wage reductions.
>
> I was thinking about looking for some data on just who hires illegal (excuse
> me, undocumented ;-) workers. But then I thought of the landscapers I see
> in Boston. Unlike in Madison where most people seem to mow their own yards,
> when I visit the Boston suburbs, I see lots of teams of mostly Spanish
> speaking workers mowing grass and trimming bushes on private "middle class"
> house yards. They wear the tee-shirt uniform of their company with the
> same logo on their truck. I suppose you would say they are working for
> "business people who profit", and they do. But the work they do is for the
> middle class homeowner. Same with the crews of Spanish speaking house
> cleaning maids.

The middle class homeowner cuts his own grass, Blair.

> Is there really an important distinction to be made between who pays the
> worker and who benefits from the work?

The beneficiaries are the guy the hires the illegal and the
illegal. The losers in the deal are American working
poor and the _REAL_ middle class.

>>
>> >> >>.....But, this is an issue of
>> >> >> national sovereignty. Mexico wants a de facto take over of the
> American
>> >> >> Southwest and we as Americans cannot allow that.
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > And I agree. Start by making everyone living in the USA learn English
>> > before
>> >> > they can hold a job or vote.
>> >>
>> >> Start by building a fence and enforcing current law.
>> >
>> > Trucker's Fence would cost a lot and not be very effective.
>>

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

- >> It is symbolic more than anything else. And it would need to
- >> be patrolled only until we started very serious penalties for
- >> those who hire illegals.
- >
- > And also those who do business with those that hire them?

No penalty.

- > But I'll add this. On September 10, 2001 your idea of a border fence to
- > keep out illegals would not have had a chance. But today, and with the
- > example of the one in Israel,maybe. And especially if (when?) the
- > relatively open border is used to launch a terrorist attack.

Typical Repugnican fear mongering.

- > Finally a question: did you see that Howard Dean is accusing Bush of
- > wanting to "crack down on undocumented worker"? And he seems to consider
- > that to be a BAD thing that the Democrats can use against the Republicans in
- > the next election.

I never accuse Dean of being rational or intelligent and you have this one right as rain. The Pugs are going to make a big issue of illegal immigration and already are doing so. That will probably work very much in their favor in the coming elections. While the Pugs build a fence the Dems should be on Pinocchio's case for not enforcing current laws and working for a more reliable way to "document" LEGAL workers. It is fine to suggest and to work toward more LEGAL immigration (though the amount of immigration we currently have is too much). But acceptance of a system that makes Republicans richer while enslaving more and more immigrants under the yoke of illegality is just, well, uh, very Repugnican.

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

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.

◆ **Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.**

◇ From: Jim Blair

• **References:**

◆ **Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.**

◇ From: Jim Blair

- Prev by Date: **Instead of focusing on revenues imbalance,**
- Next by Date: **Re: Instead of focusing on revenues imbalance,**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.**
- Next by thread: **Re: Bush and O'Reilly, in denial.**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**