

Saturday, November 25, 2006

Is America's Purchasing Power REALLY In The Toilet?

We keep hearing from politicians how the "average American" is doing more poorly than at any time other, and how "unfair" it is that the wealthy are doing great - but nobody else is.

Is it true?

In a word, no.

Let's examine some facts, comparing today's average family with 1967 - when I was all of four years old. While I do not remember being four, I do remember being 10, and what life was like then.

Ok, so here we go!

The median income this year is \$46,325, which is some 32% more than in the mid 60s, after adjusting for inflation. It is also 13% more than the median during the economic boom of 1985, again, after adjusting for inflation.

The typical American Household has a net worth of \$465,970, up 93% from 1965, 60% from 1985 and 35% from 1995. Most of this has been fueled by the rise in home values.

Throw in low inflation for the last 20 years, advances in technology and cheap travel (VERY cheap if one is comparing airline travel!) and you have a middle class that is living what amounts to a MIDAS lifestyle compared to 1967. For example, in the 1970s most homes had one telephone, and it had a rotary dial. It was **illegal** to connect your own answering machine to the telephone network, there was no call waiting, and many people still had party lines (including my Grandmother.) Cell phones weren't even dreamed of, nor were personal computers. In the mid 1970s my father (he was a CPA) purchased an electronic calculator. It performed 4 function math plus percentages, weighed about the same as an ordinary household brick and ran for a couple of hours on a charge. It also cost \$500.00. Today a basic four-function calculator can be had for \$2.00 at WalMart and it runs on solar energy gained from an ordinary kitchen light bulb so long as its turned on!

Our (single) television was black and white. The neighbors across the street had a color console, but we did not - they were far more wealthy than we were. There was no cable - we had rabbit ears and got **six** channels - 2, 4, 7, 9, 50 and 56. One (9) was in Canada, one (56) was PBS. 50 was the only "independent"; the others were all major networks. Neither CNN or FOX existed at all. On a good day we could also receive 11 and 13 from a city almost 100 miles away, but they were usually so snowy as to be unwatchable. None of these televisions - not even the color ones - had screens larger than 21-23" diagonally. Remote controls were unheard of, as were VCRs.

Records were played on a big console stereo and rotated at 33-1/3 or 45 RPM, with a few 78s still around. MP3 and CD players were the stuff of dreams; they hadn't even made the science fiction books yet.

Our home was approximately 1100 square feet; we were decidedly middle class. It had no air conditioning and was heated with an oil-fired furnace. In the summer it was hotter than hell and you went outside and played in the sprinkler to cool off. At night the best you could do was to run a fan, or sleep on a bed with no covers over you in an attempt to stay reasonably comfortable. Today, the median home is 2330 square feet (as of 2004), more than double the size of the home I grew up in, and nearly double the median from 1970 (1400 square feet.) It has air conditioning to keep the inside cool even on the hottest days in August.

Yet 66% of people say "The Good Old Days" were better.

Statistics say otherwise.

So where's the disparity?

I believe we can find it in a number of places, specifically:

- The media LOVES to play off the difference between the "average worker" and the "high paid executive." And indeed, it is true that a CEO makes far more (as a percentage of an average worker's income) than he did in 1970. However, consider this - as a percentage of an average workers income, *The President of the United States makes far LESS today than HE did in 1970!*
- There is a "permanent wealth effect". That is, we tend to consider ourselves "poor" if we see other people who are richer near us. When we see a lot of \$60,000 cars on the road, if **we** don't have one we feel "poor." Yet we are still driving a car that gets 2x the fuel mileage of the one we had in 1970, has power locks and windows (neither of which were on the 1970 model) and also has air conditioning and an entertainment system (again, missing on the '70s car). By any rational measure we're **far** better off in terms of automobiles - but the fact that our neighbor has a Porsche and we don't still bugs us.

The fact is, The Medians are doing great. Family Median makes 25% more than his father did 25 years ago, after adjusting for inflation. He enjoys a house nearly double the size of the one he grew up in and has creature comforts that he could only dream of as a child. Ms. Median is far more likely to be professionally employed than her mother, and is paid three times as much as her Mom was. While she still only earns 77% of the Median Man, adjusted for specific jobs her salary is nearly equal, and in any event her mother only made 33% of the Median Male in '65 - that's a hell of a lot of progress forward! The Medians still have two children, but they waited longer to have them, until both parents had careers underway.

They both pay less tax to the federal government (as a percentage of income) and have eight percent more real purchasing power, even after their far more lavish lifestyles are accounted for, than their parents in 1965.

The Democrats would have you believe that The Medians have a horrible life, and that things were better back when they were in control of the country - in the 1960s and 70s.

To be blunt - they're lying.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 02:22

Is America's Purchasing Power REALLY In The Toilet?

We keep hearing from politicians how the "average American" is doing more poorly than at any time other, and how "unfair" it is that the wealthy are doing great - but nobody else is.

Is it true?

In a word, no.

Let's examine some facts, comparing today's average family with 1967 - when I was all of four years old. While I do not remember being four, I do remember being 10, and what life was like then.

Ok, so here we go!

The median income this year is \$46,325, which is some 32% more than in the mid 60s, after adjusting for inflation. It is also 13% more than the median during the economic boom of 1985, again, after adjusting for

inflation.

The typical American Household has a net worth of \$465,970, up 93% from 1965, 60% from 1985 and 35% from 1995. Most of this has been fueled by the rise in home values.

Throw in low inflation for the last 20 years, advances in technology and cheap travel (VERY cheap if one is comparing airline travel!) and you have a middle class that is living what amounts to a MIDAS lifestyle compared to 1967. For example, in the 1970s most homes had one telephone, and it had a rotary dial. It was **illegal** to connect your own answering machine to the telephone network, there was no call waiting, and many people still had party lines (including my Grandmother.) Cell phones weren't even dreamed of, nor were personal computers. In the mid 1970s my father (he was a CPA) purchased an electronic calculator. It performed 4 function math plus percentages, weighed about the same as an ordinary household brick and ran for a couple of hours on a charge. It also cost \$500.00. Today a basic four-function calculator can be had for \$2.00 at WalMart and it runs on solar energy gained from an ordinary kitchen light bulb so long as its turned on!

Our (single) television was black and white. The neighbors across the street had a color console, but we did not - they were far more wealthy than we were. There was no cable - we had rabbit ears and got **six** channels - 2, 4, 7, 9, 50 and 56. One (9) was in Canada, one (56) was PBS. 50 was the only "independent"; the others were all major networks. Neither CNN or FOX existed at all. On a good day we could also receive 11 and 13 from a city almost 100 miles away, but they were usually so snowy as to be unwatchable. None of these televisions - not even the color ones - had screens larger than 21-23" diagonally. Remote controls were unheard of, as were VCRs.

Records were played on a big console stereo and rotated at 33-1/3 or 45 RPM, with a few 78s still around. MP3 and CD players were the stuff of dreams; they hadn't even made the science fiction books yet.

Our home was approximately 1100 square feet; we were decidedly middle class. It had no air conditioning and was heated with an oil-fired furnace. In the summer it was hotter than hell and you went outside and played in the sprinkler to cool off. At night the best you could do was to run a fan, or sleep on a bed with no covers over you in an attempt to stay reasonably comfortable. Today, the median home is 2330 square feet (as of 2004), more than double the size of the home I grew up in, and nearly double the median from 1970 (1400 square feet.) It has air conditioning to keep the inside cool even on the hottest days in August.

Yet 66% of people say "The Good Old Days" were better.

Statistics say otherwise.

So where's the disparity?

I believe we can find it in a number of places, specifically:

- The media LOVES to play off the difference between the "average worker" and the "high paid executive." And indeed, it is true that a CEO makes far more (as a percentage of an average worker's income) than he did in 1970. However, consider this - as a percentage of an average workers income, *The President of the United States makes far LESS today than HE did in 1970!*
- There is a "permanent wealth effect". That is, we tend to consider ourselves "poor" if we see other people who are richer near us. When we see a lot of \$60,000 cars on the road, if **we** don't have one we feel "poor." Yet we are still driving a car that gets 2x the fuel mileage of the one we had in 1970, has power locks and windows (neither of which were on the 1970 model) and also has air conditioning and an entertainment system (again, missing on the '70s car). By any rational measure we're **far** better off in terms of automobiles - but the fact that our neighbor has a Porsche and we don't still bugs us.

The fact is, The Medians are doing great. Family Median makes 25% more than his father did 25 years ago, after adjusting for inflation. He enjoys a house nearly double the size of the one he grew up in and has creature comforts that he could only dream of as a child. Ms. Median is far more likely to be professionally employed than her mother, and is paid three times as much as her Mom was. While she still only earns 77% of the Median Man, adjusted for specific jobs her salary is nearly equal, and in any event her mother only made 33% of the Median Male in '65 - that's a hell of a lot of progress forward! The Medians still have two children, but they waited longer to have them, until both parents had careers underway.

They both pay less tax to the federal government (as a percentage of income) and have eight percent more real purchasing power, even after their far more lavish lifestyles are accounted for, than their parents in 1965.

The Democrats would have you believe that The Medians have a horrible life, and that things were better back when they were in control of the country - in the 1960s and 70s.

To be blunt - they're lying.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 02:22

The True Story of Thanksgiving - what you won't hear in Government Schools

Ok folks, in commemoration of Thanksgiving, while I sit here trying to figure out how eating a plate full of turkey has suddenly made me feel like I gained 10lbs (it couldn't have been the stuffing, fixings and cookies, could it?) I thought I'd put this out there to dispel some of the myths surrounding this holiday.

As we are told, the first settlers to this country (from Europe, natch) faced a horrible first winter, lost many of their people, and the native Americans (aka "Indians") that were here helped them the following year and thus they were able to survive and ultimately prosper. They gave thanks for their harvest and invited their Indian friends to dinner.

Well, ok, that's part of the story.

Now let's talk about the rest.

The colonists did not have money, of course. Merchants in London paid for their journey, but this put each of the colonists heavily into debt - a debt which they intended to pay off through their fruits in the New World and, they hoped, through the discovery of gold.

There was no gold (well, not on the east coast anyway.) Before the colonists arrived in Cape Cod they penned the Mayflower Compact, which you can find at [The Mayflower Compact](#)

You might recognize some of the language in that document - it is strikingly similar to the writings of Carl Marx many years later!

In part, it read: *"....And by Virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions and Offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the General good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience."*

The first winter was disasterous - nearly half of the Pilgrims died of starvation, pneumonia and tuberculosis. Many claim that Bradford's first wife perished that first winter, but that is not quite true - she actually fell off the Mayflower quite close to land and drowned, never making it to Plymouth (he later remarried.)

During the first two years the colony lived under what could only be called Communism, enshrined in the Mayflower Compact. Each person was accorded a "share" of the totality of what was produced at the colony, and each person was expected to do their part in working toward the common good. The land, and that upon it, was owned by the colony as a collective.

It not only did not work out, it nearly killed them all.

William Bradford wrote in his diary *"For in this instance, community of property (so far as it went) was found to breed much confusion and discontent, and retard much employment which would have been to the general benefit and comfort. For the young men who were most able and fit for service objected to being forced to spend their time and strength in working for other men's wives and children, without any recompense. The strong man or the resourceful man had no more share of food, clothes, etc., than the weak man who was not able to do a quarter the other could. This was thought injustice."*

After the second winter, realizing that the colony had survived only through the friendship and largesse of the native Americans, and would soon perish if changes were not made, Bradford tore up the Mayflower

Compact. He instead assigned each family a plot of land to be their property, to be worked as the family saw fit, and with the fruits of that land to be their own. It was the beginning of private property rights in the New World.

The result? Again, from his diary: *"It made all hands very industrious, so that much more corn was planted than otherwise would have been by any means the Governor or any other could devise, and saved him a great deal of trouble, and gave far better satisfaction."*•

From the very day that Bradford tore up the Mayflower Compact, Plymouth began to prosper. Within a year the colonists found themselves with more food than they could eat. Flush with a bountiful harvest far in excess of their need for food and having bartered for all the goods they needed to get through the winter, they had a feast of thanks with their Indian trading partners.

Within a couple of years the colonists paid off their debt to the London Merchants and became, in fact, free men.

The story - and reason - for their success is not told in our government schools, for were every American child to be made aware of precisely why we have this nation today, and to understand just how close this country came to extinction 150 years before the Revolution, they would grow up understanding exactly how dangerous liberal and socialist thought - and the punishment of industry and capital through punitive tax policies - truly is.

Today, we live in a society that is increasingly suspect of private property rights. We no longer own our property, we effectively lease it through ad-valorem property taxes. Our right to keep to ourselves or consume as we see fit the fruits of our labor is increasingly taxed away and given to others, who do not work for their rewards at all. Nearly half of all in the United States today can in fact "vote for a living", in that they pay no federal income taxes at all, and a good percentage are actually paid to exist through the Earned Income Credit.

When Plymouth Colony was founded, the population was small and the effects of such foolishness immediately apparent. When you only have 150 people, half of them dying is by no stretch catastrophic, and immediately obvious.

This evening as we eat our feasts, let us not forget what Thanksgiving is truly for giving thanks for. It is not that the Indians saved the colonists from certain starvation.

No, it is that one man - William Bradford - saw the wisdom of private property and free enterprise, and the folly of socialist society, and through his wisdom - far before the Founding Fathers - he took action to save his people and lay the groundwork for what would become America.

As we loll around the house this evening, plump with our turkey feast, let us hold in our hearts that much of what we have in this nation does not comport with this very basic, fundamental principle. Our Constitution, written by men far wiser than us, has been twisted, contorted and tortured to permit all manner of socialism and communist action in the guise of "the greater good", whether it be Social Security, Medicare, Welfare, government schools or prescription drug cards - and that it is our duty, as citizens of this great land, to do that which is necessary - and possible - to turn away from that which has, in the course of human events, been proven never to succeed.

Finally, make sure you tell your children the truth about Thanksgiving, for they are the future, and without the truth about the past, cannot be expected to make good decisions as they grow up in the world.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 21:19

The True Story of Thanksgiving - what you won't hear in Government Schools

Ok folks, in commemoration of Thanksgiving, while I sit here trying to figure out how eating a plate full of turkey has suddenly made me feel like I gained 10lbs (it couldn't have been the stuffing, fixings and cookies, could it?) I thought I'd put this out there to dispel some of the myths surrounding this holiday.

As we are told, the first settlers to this country (from Europe, natch) faced a horrible first winter, lost many of their people, and the native Americans (aka "Indians") that were here helped them the following year and thus they were able to survive and ultimately prosper. They gave thanks for their harvest and invited their Indian friends to dinner.

Well, ok, that's part of the story.

Now let's talk about the rest.

The colonists did not have money, of course. Merchants in London paid for their journey, but this put each of the colonists heavily into debt - a debt which they intended to pay off through their fruits in the New World and, they hoped, through the discovery of gold.

There was no gold (well, not on the east coast anyway.) Before the colonists arrived in Cape Cod they penned the Mayflower Compact, which you can find at [The Mayflower Compact](#)

You might recognize some of the language in that document - it is strikingly similar to the writings of Carl Marx many years later!

In part, it read: *"....And by Virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame, such just and equal Laws, Ordinances, Acts, Constitutions and Offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the General good of the Colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience."*

The first winter was disasterous - nearly half of the Pilgrims died of starvation, pneumonia and tuberculosis. Many claim that Bradford's first wife perished that first winter, but that is not quite true - she actually fell off the Mayflower quite close to land and drowned, never making it to Plymouth (he later remarried.)

During the first two years the colony lived under what could only be called Communism, enshrined in the Mayflower Compact. Each person was accorded a "share" of the totality of what was produced at the colony, and each person was expected to do their part in working toward the common good. The land, and that upon it, was owned by the colony as a collective.

It not only did not work out, it nearly killed them all.

William Bradford wrote in his diary *"For in this instance, community of property (so far as it went) was found to breed much confusion and discontent, and retard much employment which would have been to the general benefit and comfort. For the young men who were most able and fit for service objected to being forced to spend their time and strength in working for other men's wives and children, without any recompense. The strong man or the resourceful man had no more share of food, clothes, etc., than the weak man who was not able to do a quarter the other could. This was thought injustice."*

After the second winter, realizing that the colony had survived only through the friendship and largesse of the native Americans, and would soon perish if changes were not made, Bradford tore up the Mayflower Compact. He instead assigned each family a plot of land to be their property, to be worked as the family saw fit, and with the fruits of that land to be their own. It was the beginning of private property rights in the New World.

The result? Again, from his diary: *"It made all hands very industrious, so that much more corn was planted than otherwise would have been by any means the Governor or any other could devise, and saved him a great deal of trouble, and gave far better satisfaction."*•

From the very day that Bradford tore up the Mayflower Compact, Plymouth began to prosper. Within a year the colonists found themselves with more food than they could eat. Flush with a bountiful harvest far in excess of their need for food and having bartered for all the goods they needed to get through the winter, they had a feast of thanks with their Indian trading partners.

Within a couple of years the colonists paid off their debt to the London Merchants and became, in fact, free men.

The story - and reason - for their success is not told in our government schools, for were every American child to be made aware of precisely why we have this nation today, and to understand just how close this country came to extinction 150 years before the Revolution, they would grow up understanding exactly how dangerous liberal and socialist thought - and the punishment of industry and capital through punitive tax policies - truly is.

Today, we live in a society that is increasingly suspect of private property rights. We no longer own our property, we effectively lease it through ad-valorem property taxes. Our right to keep to ourselves or consume as we see fit the fruits of our labor is increasingly taxed away and given to others, who do not work for their rewards at all. Nearly half of all in the United States today can in fact "vote for a living", in that they pay no federal income taxes at all, and a good percentage are actually paid to exist through the Earned Income Credit.

When Plymouth Colony was founded, the population was small and the effects of such foolishness immediately apparent. When you only have 150 people, half of them dying is by no stretch catastrophic, and immediately obvious.

This evening as we eat our feasts, let us not forget what Thanksgiving is truly for giving thanks for. It is not that the Indians saved the colonists from certain starvation.

No, it is that one man - William Bradford - saw the wisdom of private property and free enterprise, and the folly of socialist society, and through his wisdom - far before the Founding Fathers - he took action to save his people and lay the groundwork for what would become America.

As we loll around the house this evening, plump with our turkey feast, let us hold in our hearts that much of what we have in this nation does not comport with this very basic, fundamental principle. Our Constitution, written by men far wiser than us, has been twisted, contorted and tortured to permit all manner of socialism and communist action in the guise of "the greater good", whether it be Social Security, Medicare, Welfare, government schools or prescription drug cards - and that it is our duty, as citizens of this great land, to do that which is necessary - and possible - to turn away from that which has, in the course of human events, been proven never to succeed.

Finally, make sure you tell your children the truth about Thanksgiving, for they are the future, and without the truth about the past, cannot be expected to make good decisions as they grow up in the world.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 21:19

Sunday, November 19, 2006

The Feminist Infestation Rides Again - Adoption

In an article this weekend at <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/15801325> the AP has once again documented the sort of rape that goes on when children are adopted.

This is not a new problem, but, as usual, the prescriptions are one-sided "unsupportable" and wrong.

There is a hue and cry for women who are birth mothers to be able to revoke consent, and to be able to enforce open adoption agreements. Good.

Why do fathers keep being treated as anonymous sperm-donors?

Today, in Florida, a father doesn't even have to be told if the mother of a child takes that kid to a fire station and "legally abandons" the baby in the first hours of birth. He has no means of tracing that infant, nor does he have any right to choose to raise that kid on his own.

How come? If Mommy decides to keep that little bundle of joy, you can bet he's going to get an 18 year child support bill!

Isn't it time that we stopped this stupidity?

Years ago I penned an essay called "In a Perfect World", which can be found at <http://childrens-justice.org/papers/perfect-world.htm>. It touches on many other issues regarding adoption and legal parenthood, but among them is the adoption mess and the damage it does to birth parents "both men and women.

Now many will ask "where do you get the right to pontificate on this sort of thing."

I'll tell you where "I'm an adopted child, and to this day, at 43, I have ZERO respect for the legal system that allowed this to occur in the form that it did. I have, as an adopted person, no rights of any kind of to know who my birth parents are, nor do they have any rights to know who and where I am. By a stroke of mistake in record-keeping I know my birth name, and thus could trace my birth mother if I wanted to (I don't) " but I have no such record of who my father was available to me in any way, shape or form, nor do I know if he voluntarily relinquished custody of me or whether he simply never even knew I existed.

Both men and women are 50% participants in creating children. If the law is going to hold men accountable for at least half of the costs of raising said children (and it does) then the law must also afford them equal rights to go with the responsibilities.

No child should ever be able to be given to an "adoptive" family without the written consent of the father, and under no circumstances should adoptive records be sealed.

Of course you'll never see the mainstream media take this position "doing so would require that they stop pandering to the feminist movement and instead look at what's best for THE KIDS.

Labels: [adoption](#), [fathers rights](#), [feminist stupidity](#), [kids rights](#)

Posted by Karl Denninger at 12:31

The Feminist Infestation Rides Again - Adoption

In an article this weekend at <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/15801325> the AP has once again documented the sort of rape that goes on when children are adopted.

This is not a new problem, but, as usual, the prescriptions are one-sided “unsupportable” and wrong.

There is a hue and cry for women who are birth mothers to be able to revoke consent, and to be able to enforce open adoption agreements. Good.

Why do fathers keep being treated as anonymous sperm-donors?

Today, in Florida, a father doesn't even have to be told if the mother of a child takes that kid to a fire station and “legally abandons” the baby in the first hours of birth. He has no means of tracing that infant, nor does he have any right to choose to raise that kid on his own.

How come? If Mommy decides to keep that little bundle of joy, you can bet he's going to get an 18 year child support bill!

Isn't it time that we stopped this stupidity?

Years ago I penned an essay called “In a Perfect World”, which can be found at <http://childrens-justice.org/papers/perfect-world.htm>. It touches on many other issues regarding adoption and legal parenthood, but among them is the adoption mess and the damage it does to birth parents “both men and women.

Now many will ask “where do you get the right to pontificate on this sort of thing.”

I'll tell you where “ I'm an adopted child, and to this day, at 43, I have ZERO respect for the legal system that allowed this to occur in the form that it did. I have, as an adopted person, no rights of any kind of to know who my birth parents are, nor do they have any rights to know who and where I am. By a stroke of mistake in record-keeping I know my birth name, and thus could trace my birth mother if I wanted to (I don't) “ but I have no such record of who my father was available to me in any way, shape or form, nor do I know if he voluntarily relinquished custody of me or whether he simply never even knew I existed.

Both men and women are 50% participants in creating children. If the law is going to hold men accountable for at least half of the costs of raising said children (and it does) then the law must also afford them equal rights to go with the responsibilities.

No child should ever be able to be given to an “adoptive” family without the written consent of the father, and under no circumstances should adoptive records be sealed.

Of course you'll never see the mainstream media take this position “ doing so would require that they stop pandering to the feminist movement and instead look at what's best for THE KIDS.

Labels: [adoption](#), [fathers rights](#), [feminist stupidity](#), [kids rights](#)

Posted by Karl Denninger at 12:31

Monday, November 13, 2006

Here comes "Cut and Run"!

Despite claims by Pelosi and Company during the campaign that they had no intention of "pulling out" from Iraq, this Sunday we were treated to multiple Democrats "including those who are in line to be committee chairs" saying that we needed to execute a "phased redeployment" from Iraq within the next few months.

That, of course, would be another word for "withdrawal", or, if you prefer, "surrender."

The Democrats would be wise to remember what happened the last time they got full of themselves, or, for that matter, what happened to the Republicans the last time THEY did (said lesson was just delivered.)

The Democrats were not handed a blank check on Iraq, nor any other matter of policy. In fact, they did not win on their ideas, because they have put forward almost NO policy initiatives of any kind. Instead, they campaigned on "Bush Sucks", as noted before, and won.

But WHY did they win?

Well, let's look at what Republicans promised when they were elected in 1994 "look at it [RIGHT HERE](#)

Now, what was actually accomplished? That's a much shorter list:

Did we get all laws applying to the rest of the nation applying to Congress? YES "the Shays Act passed and was signed.

What else? Of the eight original principles, ONLY THE FIRST ever made it into law in its entirety. Most of the rest either were cast aside or forgotten about. Certainly, fiscal restraint never made the first page, although tax cuts did. Score ½ point there.

Does anyone remember the vow to eliminate The Department of Education from the federal government? What happened? It instead DOUBLED IN SIZE AND COST.

So "why did Republicans lose?

Its simple "they made a lot of promises and of them, delivered on only TWO "to cut taxes and apply the same laws to themselves as to the rest of the nation.

On each and every remaining promise, from term limits to fiscal restraint to legal reform (e.g. "closer pays") the Republicans failed to deliver. Indeed, by any score card you wish to use they got a big fat "F" on the performance of their contract.

So "now that Pelosi has her speaker's gavel, to be handed to her in January, exactly what did THEY campaign on?

"Bush Sucks." Ok, ok, Bush Sucks. We heard you. We elected you kind of by default, because the American People couldn't find anyone on the ballot that would IMPLEMENT what we were sold in 1994, and many of us just plain old stayed home, figuring that a vote for one crook or another was simply not worth casting.

But “ now that you have power, you need an agenda, and it has to be one that the majority of Americans ACTUALLY AGREE WITH.

It can’t be “cut and run in Iraq”, because most Americans don’t want to pull our troops and watch Iraq spiral into civil war “ which it WILL if we just up and leave.

It can’t be “tax the rich”, because, well, when was the last time a poor person gave you a job? And we’ve got a lot of jobs here right now “ indeed, unemployment is at a near record low. Do you really want to “tax the rich” and perhaps have them hire FEWER people? That wouldn’t be so good, would it?

It can’t be “impeach the President”, because even if many people do think Bush sucks, they watched the last time a President was impeached and didn’t like it. And here, we do not have a Nixonian moment to pin on him. Tread there at your peril.

It can’t be “socialized health care” or “tax the evil oil companies”, and beware indirect attempts to do either. Ethanol, for example is actually a tax INCREASE, because it costs more to make the ethanol than it does to produce the gasoline! So if you want to see gas prices go UP, mandate more Ethanol (and refuse to eliminate the tariff on foreign supply.) And oh, by the way, an energy policy does not consist of doing nothing about or dependence of foreign supply while allowing our DOMESTIC resources, which amount to more than FIVE TIMES that held by Saudi Arabia, sit in the ground!

It will be interesting to watch the political landscape in the coming months and weeks, that is for certain. If the Democrats come to their senses and put forward an actual legislative agenda that conforms more-or-less with “get the government out of our back pocket and out of our face”, while defending the nation against the Islamo-nut-beards, they have a good shot at holding power through ‘08 and even winning the Presidency.

But if not! if they “cut and run” and we have another 9/11-style attack “ perhaps even a nuclear one this time “ before the ‘08 elections “ they’re finished as a party.

Does anyone remember the Whigs?

The nation is watching boys and girls!.. now go get to work.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 17:12

Here comes "Cut and Run"!

Despite claims by Pelosi and Company during the campaign that they had no intention of “pulling out” from Iraq, this Sunday we were treated to multiple Democrats “ including those who are in line to be committee chairs “ saying that we needed to execute a “phased redeployment” from Iraq within the next few months.

That, of course, would be another word for “withdrawal”, or, if you prefer, “surrender.”

The Democrats would be wise to remember what happened the last time they got full of themselves, or, for that matter, what happened to the Republicans the last time THEY did (said lesson was just delivered.)

The Democrats were not handed a blank check on Iraq, nor any other matter of policy. In fact, they did not win on their ideas, because they have put forward almost NO policy initiatives of any kind. Instead, they campaigned on “Bush Sucks”, as noted before, and won.

But WHY did they win?

Well, let's look at what Republicans promised when they were elected in 1994 – look at it [RIGHT HERE](#)

Now, what was actually accomplished? That's a much shorter list:

Did we get all laws applying to the rest of the nation applying to Congress? YES – the Shays Act passed and was signed.

What else? Of the eight original principles, ONLY THE FIRST ever made it into law in its entirety. Most of the rest either were cast aside or forgotten about. Certainly, fiscal restraint never made the first page, although tax cuts did. Score ½ point there.

Does anyone remember the vow to eliminate The Department of Education from the federal government? What happened? It instead DOUBLED IN SIZE AND COST.

So – why did Republicans lose?

Its simple – they made a lot of promises and of them, delivered on only TWO – to cut taxes and apply the same laws to themselves as to the rest of the nation.

On each and every remaining promise, from term limits to fiscal restraint to legal reform (e.g. – closer pay) the Republicans failed to deliver. Indeed, by any score card you wish to use they got a big fat F on the performance of their contract.

So – now that Pelosi has her speaker's gavel, to be handed to her in January, exactly what did THEY campaign on?

– Bush Sucks. Ok, ok, Bush Sucks. We heard you. We elected you kind of by default, because the American People couldn't find anyone on the ballot that would IMPLEMENT what we were sold in 1994, and many of us just plain old stayed home, figuring that a vote for one crook or another was simply not worth casting.

But – now that you have power, you need an agenda, and it has to be one that the majority of Americans ACTUALLY AGREE WITH.

It can't be – cut and run in Iraq, because most Americans don't want to pull our troops and watch Iraq spiral into civil war – which it WILL if we just up and leave.

It can't be – tax the rich, because, well, when was the last time a poor person gave you a job? And we've got a lot of jobs here right now – indeed, unemployment is at a near record low. Do you really want to – tax the rich and perhaps have them hire FEWER people? That wouldn't be so good, would it?

It can't be – impeach the President, because even if many people do think Bush sucks, they watched the last time a President was impeached and didn't like it. And here, we do not have a Nixonian moment to pin on him. Tread there at your peril.

It can't be – socialized health care or – tax the evil oil companies, and beware indirect attempts to do either. Ethanol, for example is actually a tax INCREASE, because it costs more to make the ethanol than it does to produce the gasoline! So if you want to see gas prices go UP, mandate more Ethanol (and refuse to eliminate the tariff on foreign supply.) And oh, by the way, an energy policy does not consist of doing nothing about or dependence of foreign supply while allowing our DOMESTIC resources, which amount to more than FIVE TIMES that held by Saudi Arabia, sit in the ground!

It will be interesting to watch the political landscape in the coming months and weeks, that is for certain. If the Democrats come to their senses and put forward an actual legislative agenda that conforms more-or-less with "get the government out of our back pocket and out of our face", while defending the nation against the Islamo-nut-beards, they have a good shot at holding power through 2008 and even winning the Presidency.

But if not! if they "cut and run" and we have another 9/11-style attack "perhaps even a nuclear one this time" before the 2008 elections "they're finished as a party."

Does anyone remember the Whigs?

The nation is watching boys and girls!.. now go get to work.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 17:12

The Bums Are Going Home

Last night we got "Throw The Bums Out" in spades.

The bums are packing, and Speaker Pelosi's measuring the drapes has proven to be worthwhile.

But the Democrats had better be careful about gloating. The easy part was convincing the American People that they didn't like the Iraq War. After all, it's not hard to do when the media puts the war on the front page every day and counts up the dead like so much cordwood. Not even Saddam's conviction and sentence "for the same crime that Hitler committed" was enough to sway things, and honestly, I'm not surprised.

America lost its will to fight after WWII, and we've never really regained it. During the campaign there were parallels drawn to the Tet Offensive in Vietnam, as if this was some watershed loss for America.

It was not, of course. Tet was a pure military victory for America and the South. The North Vietnamese, who launched the offensive, failed to gain any of their objectives, and suffered catastrophic losses. But politically, Tet was a loss for America "it galvanized the anti-war movement in American and ultimately was responsible for our abandonment of a war" and thus our loss of - that we had "in the bag".

Now add to this the complete and total abandonment of conservative principles in the Republican Party.

Spending on pork barrel and entitlements has skyrocketed under Bush/Cheney "the exact opposite of what they were elected to do. "Responsible government" does not mean "whatever we can find to spend money on, we'll use to buy votes." That's a Democrat policy, but the Republicans, drunk on power, decided to try that recipe themselves "with disastrous results.

So now, Speaker Pelosi, what is your plan? Let's look at what she's said she will do in her "first 100 hours":

1. Implement the recommendations of the 9/11 commission in full. Uh, what recommendations would those be (that haven't been implemented already)? Full inspection of all cargo coming into US ports? Are you prepared to double the transport cost and triple the delays in shipping material into the US? Hope so. The TSA? We already have it. Tearing down the Chinese Wall? We already did. Eavesdropping and heightened surveillance on suspected terrorists and those here who aren't citizens, so that they don't overstay their welcome? I thought the Democrats were AGAINST those things?
2. Raise the minimum wage. By 40%? For most workers this means nothing. But for those who work at minimum wage, raising the cost of employing them by 40% will result in some of them being unemployed.
3. Pelosi says that they'll work "in cooperation, not partisanship". Ok, we'll see about that. Conyers has promised to push for impeachment! That's not partisanship?
4. The Iraq War. You know, why you got elected? Yeah. What's your plan? I've yet to see it, and Pelosi has been strangely silent on what she intends to do.

Today we keep hearing "A New Direction" for America. What do the Democrats want to change?

The economy? How do you improve unemployment under 4%, inflation under control, consumer spending healthy, tax revenues growing explosively despite tax rate cuts, and the equities markets booming, with the Dow at new record highs.

Let's see your plan, and what you think needs to be changed in this country.....

If the Democrats do not deliver, there is another terrorist attack on US soil, or the Democrats use their majority to "investigate, investigate and investigate again", it is unlikely that this majority will hold

beyond 2008.

The Republicans certainly deserved to be spanked - and they were. Now we'll see if the Democrats can do something constructive.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 10:16

The Bums Are Going Home

Last night we got "Throw The Bums Out" in spades.

The bums are packing, and Speaker Pelosi's measuring the drapes has proven to be worthwhile.

But the Democrats had better be careful about gloating. The easy part was convincing the American People that they didn't like the Iraq War. After all, it's not hard to do when the media puts the war on the front page every day and counts up the dead like so much cordwood. Not even Saddam's conviction and sentence "for the same crime that Hitler committed" was enough to sway things, and honestly, I'm not surprised.

America lost its will to fight after WWII, and we've never really regained it. During the campaign there were parallels drawn to the Tet Offensive in Vietnam, as if this was some watershed loss for America.

It was not, of course. Tet was a pure military victory for America and the South. The North Vietnamese, who launched the offensive, failed to gain any of their objectives, and suffered catastrophic losses. But politically, Tet was a loss for America "it galvanized the anti-war movement in American and ultimately was responsible for our abandonment of a war" and thus our loss of - that we had "in the bag".

Now add to this the complete and total abandonment of conservative principles in the Republican Party. Spending on pork barrel and entitlements has skyrocketed under Bush/Cheney "the exact opposite of what they were elected to do. "Responsible government" does not mean "whatever we can find to spend money on, we'll use to buy votes." That's a Democrat policy, but the Republicans, drunk on power, decided to try that recipe themselves "with disastrous results.

So now, Speaker Pelosi, what is your plan? Let's look at what she's said she will do in her "first 100 hours":

1. Implement the recommendations of the 9/11 commission in full. Uh, what recommendations would those be (that haven't been implemented already)? Full inspection of all cargo coming into US ports? Are you prepared to double the transport cost and triple the delays in shipping material into the US? Hope so. The TSA? We already have it. Tearing down the Chinese Wall? We already did. Eavesdropping and heightened surveillance on suspected terrorists and those here who aren't citizens, so that they don't overstay their welcome? I thought the Democrats were AGAINST those things?
2. Raise the minimum wage. By 40%? For most workers this means nothing. But for those who work at minimum wage, raising the cost of employing them by 40% will result in some of them being unemployed.
3. Pelosi says that they'll work "in cooperation, not partisanship". Ok, we'll see about that. Conyers has promised to push for impeachment! That's not partisanship?
4. The Iraq War. You know, why you got elected? Yeah. What's your plan? I've yet to see it, and Pelosi has been strangely silent on what she intends to do.

Today we keep hearing "A New Direction" for America. What do the Democrats want to change?

The economy? How do you improve unemployment under 4%, inflation under control, consumer spending healthy, tax revenues growing explosively despite tax rate cuts, and the equities markets booming, with the Dow at new record highs.

Let's see your plan, and what you think needs to be changed in this country.....

If the Democrats do not deliver, there is another terrorist attack on US soil, or the Democrats use their majority to "investigate, investigate and investigate again", it is unlikely that this majority will hold beyond 2008.

The Republicans certainly deserved to be spanked - and they were. Now we'll see if the Democrats can do something constructive.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 10:16

Saturday, November 4, 2006

Here we go again with the "gay marriage" nonsense

As the elections roll around both sides are trotting out the same old tired - and fraudulent - arguments about gay marriage and how gay people are "entitled" to marry.

Why don't we cut the crap?

Marriage is a church institution. If you want a civil union, go see a judge. If you want a marriage, go see a priest!

Go find me a legal code which says that you must have a state marriage license to have a sacramental marriage performed in a church.

You can't - because such a law would be presumptively unconstitutional (interfering with the separation of church and state)

Now if you want the trappings of a state civil union, along with its benefits and privileges, you must buy a state civil license. That the state has stolen the word "marriage" and redefined it does not make what they license marriage. It is no such thing. The very definition of marriage is found in the holy books of various religions, and predates our government by 5,000 years or more.

Indeed, not that long ago when you wanted to get married - even in this country - you posted your banns on the church door. There was no "license", there was no state involvement, there was none of that claptrap. You went and talked to a priest, who made his inquiries as to whether your union was in concordance with the faith's rules, and if so, he performed the ceremony. If you had a dispute that you felt justified terminating that marriage you likewise went and saw a priest - THE CHURCH determined if you were released from your obligation - or not.

State marriage laws were first passed in this country as a means of controlling "miscogeneration" - that is, prevention of the inter-marriage of white and black people. *The very institution of state marriage was formed for the purpose of enforcing racism!*

The correct fix is not to talk about whether or not the state should endorse "marriage" for gay people. That is an artifice - a fraud - perpetrated upon the public by people who are seeking to misuse and abuse the Constitution.

The correct fix is to enforce the Constitution, which prohibits the state from meddling in the affairs of religion, and leaving the definition of marriage to the various faiths which wish to sanction it. If a faith has a particular set of strictures they wish to enforce (e.g. fidelity, opposite-gender participants, etc) then let them draw standardized contracts under their rules and have the celebrants to their sacramental marriage sign them as a matter of civil law. Such contract could provide that binding arbitration to be conducted under Church Law be used to resolve all disputes, as just one example of how this would differ from what we have now.

You probably have such an agreement in your mortgage, you have one in your brokerage agreement, hell, you have one in your cell phone service agreement! These binding civil agreements are all throughout your life and they are enforceable.

There is no reason whatsoever not to contract your "marriage" on terms SOLELY between yourself, your intended spouse and your church.

If you want a civil union then go get a "license" from the state. By doing so you are agreeing that the state may change the terms any time they'd like - your "license" specifically states (and so says the case law) that this "union" is actually between **THREE** people - you, your spouse **AND THE STATE**, and the state has the right to meedle in it any time it would like!

If the want a marriage, and not a "civil union", go see a priest.

If you want BOTH then go see them SEPARATELY, ***but do not defile your religion nor your faith by bringing a sworn document that directly contradicts your faith into a house of worship.***

If a priest tells you that you must have a state license, ask him under what law he is required to demand that of you. He will be unable to do so, because no such law exists in any state of this nation.

If your Church will not perform a sacramental marriage without requiring that you defile its place of worship, you need to seek out a different Church. The one you are attending now is almost certainly interested in your money and your fealty but does not actually practice whatever faith they - and you - claim to hold dear.

If you go get a state "marriage license" - a document that on its face evidences something that either party can dissolve for no cause whatsoever, other than deciding they'd like to end it, and you then take that document into a place of worship and ask the priest/pastor/minister to perform a ceremony in which you make pledges before God that contradict what you just signed at the clerk of the court's office then it is YOU who are the hypocrite and you deserve what you get.

You have willfully and knowingly sworn falsely before God.

If you are a person of faith, then you understand and believe that such an intentional, premeditated act is one of the ways that you can damn yourself.

If you're not a person of faith then what you really want is a civil union - not a marriage - so have at it.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 13:38

Here we go again with the "gay marriage" nonsense

As the elections roll around both sides are trotting out the same old tired - and fraudulent - arguments about gay marriage and how gay people are "entitled" to marry.

Why don't we cut the crap?

Marriage is a church institution. If you want a civil union, go see a judge. If you want a marriage, go see a priest!

Go find me a legal code which says that you must have a state marriage license to have a sacramental marriage performed in a church.

You can't - because such a law would be presumptively unconstitutional (interfering with the separation of church and state)

Now if you want the trappings of a state civil union, along with its benefits and privileges, you must buy a state civil license. That the state has stolen the word "marriage" and redefined it does not make what they license marriage. It is no such thing. The very definition of marriage is found in the holy books of various religions, and predates our government by 5,000 years or more.

Indeed, not that long ago when you wanted to get married - even in this country - you posted your banns on

the church door. There was no "license", there was no state involvement, there was none of that claptrap. You went and talked to a priest, who made his inquiries as to whether your union was in concordance with the faith's rules, and if so, he performed the ceremony. If you had a dispute that you felt justified terminating that marriage you likewise went and saw a priest - THE CHURCH determined if you were released from your obligation - or not.

State marriage laws were first passed in this country as a means of controlling "miscogeneration" - that is, prevention of the inter-marriage of white and black people. *The very institution of state marriage was formed for the purpose of enforcing racism!*

The correct fix is not to talk about whether or not the state should endorse "marriage" for gay people. That is an artifice - a fraud - perpetrated upon the public by people who are seeking to misuse and abuse the Constitution.

The correct fix is to enforce the Constitution, which prohibits the state from meddling in the affairs of religion, and leaving the definition of marriage to the various faiths which wish to sanction it. If a faith has a particular set of strictures they wish to enforce (e.g. fidelity, opposite-gender participants, etc) then let them draw standardized contracts under their rules and have the celebrants to their sacramental marriage sign them as a matter of civil law. Such contract could provide that binding arbitration to be conducted under Church Law be used to resolve all disputes, as just one example of how this would differ from what we have now.

You probably have such an agreement in your mortgage, you have one in your brokerage agreement, hell, you have one in your cell phone service agreement! These binding civil agreements are all throughout your life and they are enforceable.

There is no reason whatsoever not to contract your "marriage" on terms SOLELY between yourself, your intended spouse and your church.

If you want a civil union then go get a "license" from the state. By doing so you are agreeing that the state may change the terms any time they'd like - your "license" specifically states (and so says the case law) that this "union" is actually between **THREE** people - you, your spouse **AND THE STATE**, and the state has the right to meedle in it any time it would like!

If the want a marriage, and not a "civil union", go see a priest.

If you want BOTH then go see them SEPARATELY, ***but do not defile your religion nor your faith by bringing a sworn document that directly contradicts your faith into a house of worship.***

If a priest tells you that you must have a state license, ask him under what law he is required to demand that of you. He will be unable to do so, because no such law exists in any state of this nation.

If your Church will not perform a sacramental marriage without requiring that you defile its place of worship, you need to seek out a different Church. The one you are attending now is almost certainly interested in your money and your fealty but does not actually practice whatever faith they - and you - claim to hold dear.

If you go get a state "marriage license" - a document that on its face evidences something that either party can dissolve for no cause whatsoever, other than deciding they'd like to end it, and you then take that document into a place of worship and ask the priest/pastor/minister to perform a ceremony in which you make pledges before God that contradict what you just signed at the clerk of the court's office then it is YOU who are the hypocrite and you deserve what you get.

You have willfully and knowingly sworn falsely before God.

If you are a person of faith, then you understand and believe that such an intentional, premeditated act is one of the ways that you can damn yourself.

If you're not a person of faith then what you really want is a civil union - not a marriage - so have at it.

Posted by Karl Denninger at 13:38