

# Re: Question about President's Social Security plan

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/4805.html>

---

**From:** Les Cargill ([INOCargill\\_at\\_cfl.Arr.com](mailto:INOCargill_at_cfl.Arr.com))

**Date:** 01/17/05

Date: Mon, 17 Jan 2005 03:19:38 GMT

royls@telus.net wrote:

<snip>

>>Spend a zillion dollars on an aircraft  
>>carrier and you provide some jobs while she is being built aftwer which she is  
>>a drain on the economy returning nothing. Spend the same on a fleet of  
>>freighters or ocean liners or cruise ships -- or Lear jets -- and you provide  
>>jobs and income generation for the life of those vessels.  
>  
>  
> Garbage. Freighters, OK, they are transporting goods. Cruise ships  
> are productive capital for the entertainment/hospitality/tourism  
> industry. But private jets are a pretty much pure consumption item, a  
> status symbol that provides no more return on investment than typical  
> military expenditures.  
>

There exist people for whom private jets are more sensible than flying coach. For some people, the time spent waiting for flights can be a very real sunk cost over and above their time. Blackberries and cellphones help, but are not the whole story.

Wal-Mart uses 'em, and they have the very least status symbol intensive corporate culture of any company, ever. General aviation was an early and significant part of that particular corporate culture. If you'd driven in and around Bentonville, you'd know why.

Timeshared corporate jets can be an improvement in raw cost over business class, if they're properly utilized and financed. There's an auction type service for this on the Web. Prop planes, so long as the range is right, are a downright bargain.

Rental and fuel on a Cessna 172 used to be less than

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

Southwest from Dallas to Houston, if you didn't have  
to pay the pilot.

> -- *Roy L*

--  
Les Cargill