

# Re: Question about President's Social Security plan

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/4766.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

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

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*