

Re: OT – "lie" vs "error"

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Cobol/comp.lang.cobol/2005-03/1264.html>

docdwarf_at_panix.com

Date: 03/25/05

Date: 25 Mar 2005 05:23:09 -0500

In article <joe_zitzelberger-411CBB.22372124032005@ispnews.usenetserver.com>, Joe Zitzelberger <joe_zitzelberger@nospam.com> wrote:

>In article <d1uob4\$1nk\$1@panix5.panix.com>, docdwarf@panix.com wrote:

>

>> In article <joe_zitzelberger-F9D03B.08572724032005@ispnews.usenetserver.com>,

>> Joe Zitzelberger <joe_zitzelberger@nospam.com> wrote:

>> >In article <d1u4uk\$hcc\$1@panix5.panix.com>, docdwarf@panix.com wrote:

[snip]

>> >> *This has been going on a few days, now... fascinating that saying 'social*

>> >> *security is not a tax, but an investment' is so very common that it is*

>> >> *easy to find citations of it.*

>> >

>> >I know what it was from the start -- a tax. But there are many that

>> >have long claimed that it was not. The oft cited canard about

>> >'contributions' financing ones 'insurance' is an obvious

>> >misrepresentation -- or more accurately a 'lie'.

>>

>> This 'canard' has been mentioned here repeatedly and yet nobody seems to

>> be able to bring up a cite for it.

>>

>> [snip]

>>

>> >However, the two times I googled the topic I quite quickly found two

>> >cites that indicate there was gross misrepresentation of the program as

>> >'insurance-not-taxes' from the beginning.

>>

>> It should be easy enough to bring them forward, then. Would you be so

>> kind as to do so?

>>

>> DD

>

>If it is not enough to have FDR's statement from 70-odd years ago where

>he said *_publically_*:

Already addressed, and it has been pointed out that this was specifically changed by the 1939 revisions.

[snip]

>*However, if 70 year old cites are not good, how about the current Senate
>Minority Leader, Democrat Harry Reid of Nevada. His website at
>"<http://reid.senate.gov/socialsecurity/index.cfm>" repeatedly refers to
>the "insurance" myth, for example:
>
>"It is much more than just another financial investment and I am
>committed to ensuring that it remains a stable and secure insurance
>policy"*

Finally! Well, that's at least half... the 'an insurance policy'. The assertion was, as stated originally and above, 'not a tax, an investment'... and from the same page:

—begin quoted text:

Diverting current payroll taxes into personal accounts would mean the loss of revenues that pay the benefits of today's retirees. In order to make privatization work, benefits would need to be cut, the retirement age would need to be raised, or taxes would need to be increased.

—end quoted text

... clearly and unambiguously showing that the funds result from taxation.

Now if you wish to say this fellow is asserting that the funds result from taxation and are not a tax... then I would be interested in learning how you come to that conclusion.

As for this 'guaranteed benefit' matter you raise... please, one factual matter at a time. Mr Brazee's assertion of 'not a tax, an investment' seems to be as unsupported as when it was originally made... and notice how the originator has abandoned it?

DD