

So our old friend Tom wrote me out of the blue:

Date: Feb 15, 2014 8:27 PM

Rich,

It's interesting that the Obama regime is following the advice from their economic consultants on the Trans Pacific Partnership - and why not. There's little debate that it will (like all free trade deals) boost our economic growth, lure high-paying jobs to our shores, boost exports, and potentially put some pressure on China to adopt fairer trade policies - all net/net wins for our nation. The only perceivable downside being the loss of non-knowledge-based, low-paying jobs, to countries such as Vietnam (no great loss for the U.S., or it's citizens).

Of course, the Harry Reid's, Nancy Pelosi's, and Ron Wyden's of the left wing political class, will join with the environmental and union wackos in an attempt to demagogue the deal - purely to keep their economically-ignorant, low-information voting base in the cocoon for the next election. What a disgrace, huh?

I suppose it's true that ignorance is the tool the Left exploits so well. And education is the enemy of the Left.

Keep drinking the Kool-Aid!

Regards,

Tom

Sent from my iPad

Now, this is not what we would call, in primary and middle school, a "paper." That would involve having more than one source. This is clearly instead what we would call a "book report," a single-source piece involving no other research.

Date: Feb 15, 2014 10:44 PM

Tom,

Miss Manners said that she wasn't into mind-reading. She didn't like it when people presumed to know the minds and presume to know why Harry Reid and Nancy Pelosi oppose "free" trade agreements?

1994 to 2010, NAFTA cost the US nearly 700,000 jobs (That's net, or minus the jobs gained during the same period on American wages. From 2001 to 2012, the US lost 2.7 million jobs to China via China's membership in the WTO. American families with two wage-earners an average of \$2,500 a year.

Is this good? Well yeah, for the people who were already wealthy beforehand. For the rest of us, not so much. By the way, it's about trade. Mostly, it's about the rights of investors.

Oh, and also, congratulations to Fox News for finally admitting that Susan Rice was telling the truth all along about the points. The CIA initially thought that the attack was a spontaneous response to a video and so that's what she, accurately insisting, inaccurately, that Rice just made it all up for some nefarious political purpose.

Rich

>Sent: Feb 16, 2014 7:15 AM

>

>Rich,

>

>Well, to start, the far left wingers I mentioned stated their opposition, and it doesn't take a degree in nuclear physics to understand they're playing to their low-information base - people such as the Rich Gardner's of the world.

>

>It's also good to see that you still get your "facts" from the biased left wing news sources. I almost spit my coffee out laughing at your (let me guess - Huffington Post?) "facts" about NAFTA! Funny stuff, Rich, funny indeed! Wow!

>

>And yeah, Rich, TPP is probably a "vast right wing conspiracy" by the Jewish-run Wall Street cabal to defraud the middle class, huh? Wow, you really are more delusional than I thought!

>I'm starting to think you are slightly left of Lenin & Trotsky. And I'm guessing that your "new" Benghazi information was from MSNBC - that little-viewed, far-left wing media outlet?

>

>Keep drinking the Kool-Aid Rich, keep your mind firmly shut! Talk about myopic and parochial....

>

>

This is why I didn't bother giving the source of my information, because then the conversation would have been about how unreliable such sources were. Not that Tom or any other right-winger ever gives actual examples. They think my sources are just plain wrong by definition.

Date: Feb 16, 2014 9:36 PM

Tom,

As I said several messages ago, if you're going to contest my facts with nothing but mindless cynicism, then please bring better and more well-researched, truer facts, then sure, let's hear yours. But you obviously trust your own preferred sources completely meaningless, so it's clearly a complete waste of time to even try to communicate anything to you.

Rich

Sent: Feb 17, 2014 8:18 AM

Because I'm sure you're an ObamaCare supporter.....

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

[Really lengthy piece, heavy on figures and calculations, showing that the ACA causes some people to lose money]

Date: Feb 18, 2014 12:41 AM

Tom,

Yes, we've known from the beginning that the ACA/ Obamacare wouldn't result in a better deal for everybody. An MIT economist and health insurance expert crunched the numbers and came up with 97% of Americans paying the same or less and 3% paying more than they would otherwise <http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2013/10/obamacares-three-per-cent.html?mobify=0> We could fix that through adopting a single-payer system of course, but it was hard enough getting through an enhanced Romneycare plan.
Rich

Date: Feb 18, 2014 2:33 PM

Rich,

Again, pointing to a left wing economist, from the far left wing newspaper - the NYT, as a proof source, when he gi
AND FIGURES, is just not being balanced or objective. Would you like me to send you some sources that state the

Sent: Feb 17, 2014 8:26 AM

>To: Rich Gardner <rlg3526@ix.netcom.com>

>Subject: Re: Democrat hypocrisy on trade pacts

>

>So Rich, would you consider the cost savings from goods manufactured overseas as a net gain, or loss, to American consumers? So if your wages were reduced by \$2,500/year, but your outlays for goods were also reduced by, say \$3,500, what would the net effect be on the average American consumer (maybe we could say "the middle class" to mime a Democrat Party favorite talking point)?

>

>Sent from my iPad

>

Date: Feb 18, 2014 12:44 AM

Tom,

Well, again, the benefits of NAFTA are real, but as the economist Dean Baker points out

<http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/11/24/what-weve-learned-from-nafta/nafta-lowered-wages-as-it-was-supposed-to-do>

This can produce economic gains; they just don't go to ordinary workers. The lower cost of labor translates to some extent into lower prices and to some extent into higher corporate profits. The latter might be good news for shareholders and top management, but is not

beneficial to most workers.

Lower prices are helpful to workers as consumers, but are not likely to offset the impact on wages. To see this point, imagine that Nafta was about reducing the wages of doctors by eliminating the barriers that made it difficult for Mexican school children to train to U.S. standards and practice medicine in the United States.

If we got an additional 200,000 doctors from Mexico over the last 20 years then it would likely go far toward bringing the pay of doctors in the United States more in line with the pay of doctors in other wealthy countries. This would lead to tens of billions of years in savings in health care costs to patients and the government.

Even doctors would share in these savings, since they too would have to pay less for their health care. However no one would try to tell doctors that they were better off from this trade deal because of their reduced health care costs. The hit to their wages would have swamped the savings on their health care bill. This is the same story with ordinary workers and the impact of Nafta.

So yes, it could help a bit, but factory workers haven't noticed much benefit, nor are they likely to notice any with TPP.

Rich

Date: Feb 18, 2014 2:29 PM

Well, I guess the loss of the equivalent 2.5 million jobs from ObamaCare doesn't concern liberals (since they are the laziest members of society anyway), huh Rich?

His data is flawed also. We are now seeing many small companies (my neighbor was recently telling me what his firm did) stop providing insurance, and send their employees to the exchanges - at markedly higher cost.

Of course liberals want single-payer - they always want others paying their way. No surprises there!

Sent from my iPad

>Sent: Feb 18, 2014 3:42 PM

>To: Rich Gardner <rlg3526@ix.netcom.com>

>Subject: Facts and Figures around the 1% ers

>

>Rich,

>

>I wanted to rebut the nonsense you've spouted recently about the 99% vs the 1%. The facts bear out that the shift in incomes in favor of the wealthy has been due to several large world-wide forces, among them the rise of global markets (globalization), technological innovation that has increased the earning power of the well educated (a theme I will continue to point out to you), and a world-wide boom in asset prices. All of these have been positive forces for the majority of Americans, and indeed have elevated living standards for those around the globe as well! (You may want to read NYT liberal Tom Friedman's book: "The World is Flat" for a more thorough understanding of these forces).

>

>From 1980 to 2010 the top 1% (income of approx \$307,000 in 2010 according to IRS data) increased their share of total before-tax income to 15% from 9%, however their share of total income tax soared to 39% of the total paid, up from 17%. Their share of total income taxes paid climbed dramatically even as marginal rates were cut almost in half! Not exactly "not paying their fair share", huh Rich? Imagine that! Does MSDNC or Congresswoman Schwartz ever inform you like this?

>

>Those, like you, who want to "tax the rich" to redistribute it to the bottom 60% simply don't realize how foolish that is, and how there simply isn't enough money to confiscate to make that liberal pipe dream ever come true. It's simply more divide-and-conquer speech from the left to get the low-information lemming (or sheople) to vote Democrat.

>

>To quote Emanuel Saez of the University of California at Berkeley (not exactly a conservative hot bed of academia) as he has shown in a series of papers: "the top earners today are not "rentiers" deriving their incomes from past wealth but rather are the "working rich", highly paid employees or new entrepreneurs who have not yet accumulated fortunes comparable to those accumulated during the Gilded Age." Now, I know the MSDNC watchers, living in the liberal bubble - being spoon-fed the left wing/Democrat talking points on a daily basis may find that difficult to believe, but those are government-based data facts, not NYT innuendo! In fact, most 1%'ers are executives of non-financial businesses (30%), or doctors (14%), (yes even) finance workers (13%) and lastly lawyers (8%). The Gilded Age you lefties love to mention has been dead for 90-plus years! C'mon Rich, it's 2014, not 1914, I thought you were a history major?

>

>Can't we agree that the only reason the left wing/Democrat Party, and their controlled media outlets (MSDNC, NYT to name two (2)) is focusing on non-issues such as "income inequality", "minimum wage" and "global warming" is to distract the voting public from the utter disaster and failure of ObamaCare, their lack of a coherent energy policy, the record number of un/underemployed workers, an economy that isn't bouncing back jobs-wise ("jobless recovery") due to bad government policy (central planning/poor tax policy/focus on regulatory vs growth agenda) not business policy, and lack of this administration's trust in our 200 year old free market-based economy that has lifted more people out of poverty and increased our standard of living better than any government or country in the history of mankind?

>

>C'mon Rich, stop drinking the blue Kool-Aid, you know these facts are immutable. I've presented government-based IRS data, not liberal innuendo. Why don't you try doing the same so we can have a real debate? Time's yours buddy!

>

>Sent from my iPad

Date: Feb 19, 2014 1:10 AM

Tom,

The "loss of 2.5 million jobs" was debunked very quickly. I'm not surprised you never heard about that. As I said, you only hear what you want to hear.

Tom Tom, Tom, facts are facts are facts. It doesn't matter who cites the facts. If Rush Limbaugh or Sean Hannity say make what they say false. If a liberal guy states a true and accurate fact, that he's liberal doesn't make his cited fact an ideological identity of the person who's speaking, you can't focus on what they're actually saying.

I reproduced what answered the immediate question at hand and I gave you the source. You're free to go and read the source. I feel the excerpt contains enough facts for you. I've read plenty of what the other side says on free trade, thanks.

I don't think Emanuel Saez defines "rentiers" in the same way that I and fellow liberals do. We talk of "rentier capitalism" as something that people need and then charging them for access to it. Such people are enormously wealthy, but unlike capitalists, they don't contribute much to society at large. At least those fellows left behind many valuable things that the rest of our society considers a "centrist." Don't know how he defines himself, but no one on the liberal side considers him a liberal and he knows nothing about economics.

No, we can't agree on your right-wing view of the world. Income inequality and global warming are very real and serious problems, fine, thank you. The reason we haven't recovered from the Great Recession is that the problem is one of insufficient demand. We've been fighting bitterly, tooth and nail, in a scorched-earth manner, to prevent the government from getting any money. We immediately spend it and who would get the economy moving again. Again of course, your right-wing sources never agree.

Heh! I just now read your comment on my view of the Gilded Age. You don't appear to have understood why I cited it. It appears to be the ideal that the wealthy are aiming for. If the wealthy have an ultimate goal, I think it would be to return to the Gilded Age when the wealthy were respected, when there were very few taxes and even fewer commercial regulations. I think that's why they put the book on their laps and sigh "Ah, the good old days!"

Rich

>

Date: Feb 19, 2014 6:20 PM

Rich,

Any thoughts on how the 500,000 people who will lose their jobs - due to the Obama administration's need to "centrally plan" the economy by manipulating the minimum wage, will help the Obama economy's slowest recovery on record? At least give me a conservative spin on the recent CBO report. I'm sure Paul Krudman....err....Krugman can spin something to fool...err....keep all the sheep in the herd!

You just can't make this stuff up! Centrally planned economies have been proven to fail everywhere on God's green earth. Why do the socialist/communist/liberal Democrat crowd still believe in a failed system? Perhaps they're afraid of h competition and competition?

Sent from my iPad

Sent: Feb 19, 2014 6:39 PM

>To: Rich Gardner <rlg3526@ix.netcom.com>

>Subject: Re: Facts and Figures around the 1% ers

>

>So Rich, according to your definition of "rentier capitalism" wouldn't banks fit the bill? They have something people need (capital) and they charge for access to it (interest). Are you now positing that the government should confiscate banks? Isn't that called communism or socialism?

>In fact, why don't you just admit that you are a socialist/communist and anti-capitalist. Be straight with your hatred of our free market-based capitalist society - that allows winners (and losers) to be

identified based on hard work and ingenuity vs government hand-picking like some left wing teacher's union that reviles performance measures. C'mon Rich, man up and admit it!

>

>Sent from my iPad

Date: Feb 20, 2014 12:31 AM

Tom,

The debunking was done by reading the CBO report far more carefully than various right-wingers did. If you read the http://www.philly.com/philly/opinion/20140217_Obamacare_s_war_on_jobs.html you'll see that he's fully aware of the debunking and carefully skirts around it to try and come up with some complaint.

“People that have their mind made up before doing the research - are called narrow-minded.”

I agree, but what do you call these statements?

“I wanted to rebut the nonsense you've spouted recently...”

“It's simply more divide-and-conquer speech from the left to get the low-information lemming (or sheople) to follow.”

Is that really your idea of a person whose mind is open enough to respect and seriously consider the ideas of others, or is your mind made up? You seriously lack any sense of self-awareness.

I'm aware of far more than you think. I just quote lefties a lot because they make the most sense. Your second message is just pure ranting and raving.

Banks are certainly part of the problem. Nah, communism was tried. Capitalism is hardly a one-size-fits-all, omni-currency free market is basically a good system, but it needs tight regulation and there's plenty of room for utilities, non-profit organizations, etc.

Rich

Date: Feb 20, 2014 1:50 PM

Rich,

You can't skirt around the fact that ObamaCare is going to cost jobs (as the non-partisan CBO report clearly spells out (along with many other economic reports), increase costs for many working class people (except the lower-income traditional Democrat voters who receive large subsidies) and not even come close to giving the "45 million uninsured (a figure manufactured by the left wing) health care coverage.

Rich, open-mindedness or liberal thought is being open to reading, listening to, or debating other points of view. You have confirmed that you do neither, while I admitted to reading, listening to and watching the left wing-control media outlets (MSNBC, PBS, NYT, WP, ABC, CBS, NBC, etc). I also have friends and colleagues who are liberals who enjoy debating politics with. I highly doubt you found any right wingers in the school where you taught or the Jewish non-profit where you worked - proving that it is you who only consorts with, hears, and are open to one side of the debate. If that is erroneous, prove me wrong.

I've formed my opinions based on facts about which systems have failed miserably to improve the condition of mankind (liberalism/socialism/communism) and which have done more to help mankind than any other.

(conservatism/capitalism/individual freedom). (Think of Lincoln's Republican Party eradicating slavery, and the 1960's GOP passing the Civil Rights Act over the objections of the Southern Democrats). But then, I understand liberals don't look at objective outcomes - because they're ruled by their emotion rather than rational, objective thought processes. What feels good isn't always best, otherwise we wouldn't discipline children, right?

Regarding your comments on capitalism etc - I believe it needs less regulation, as the stagnant Obamaeconomy is certainly proving, and there already are plenty of non-profits, utilities etc. in our economy. Again, your anti-corporate bias comes through loud and clear. Why don't you simply admit to being a socialist?

To: Rich Gardner <rlg3526@ix.netcom.com>

Subject: Climate change

Date: Feb 20, 2014 7:15 PM

Speaking of "having one's mind made up before doing the research", your line "and the ACA is doing just fine, thank you" is about as delusional and contradictory to what 99% of the informed public believes. Even your Democrat Party is trying to distance themselves from that disaster of a policy! Explain yourself on that one Rich, if you're the "liberal" thinker? You lefties sure are a funny lot!

>Sent: Feb 20, 2014 8:12 PM

>To: Rich Gardner <rlg3526@ix.netcom.com>

>Subject: Climate change

>

>Rich,

>

>Google "Kerry & climate change". A couple of good articles were written today about the folly of the "climate change" "consensus scientists" crowd (and their cohorts in the left wing political class) in the Washington Post and Wall Street Journal. I doubt you'll read anything that doesn't conform to the left wing view in your NYT.

>

>I'm simply trying to broaden your horizons!

>

>Sent from my iPad

Date: Feb 21, 2014 12:19 AM

Tom,

You're hopelessly lost to a completely delusional right-wing point of view. So much so that you can't even recognize your own lack of knowledge about my side of the road, I'd take your claims of knowing what you're talking about seriously, but you've got nothing but right-wing talking points. I'm not even going to bother to respond to anything further you might have to say, Rich.

Date: Feb 21, 2014 1:42 PM

Rich,

Sorry, you're so closed-minded to anything but the liberal, left wing DNC talking points, despite a mountain of empirical evidence that your questionable point-of-view is, I don't see why we should continue debating. Enjoy your life in the MSNBC co-

Sent from my iPad