

01/15/05

## A New Chicken Little

by  
Tom Holbrook

**AARP**... a non-profit group founded in 1958 for the sole purpose of finding affordable health care for older Americans, should be changing its name to "**Chicken Little**," since its attitude is now one of telling us the sky is falling in **Social Security Land**. This past week the **AARP** spent **\$5 - \$7 Million of my money** (*and yours if you're a member as I am*,) to purchase TV time to play an ad designed to scare all of us mature citizens to the point that we will contact our Representatives in Congress and tell them not to pass a bill that would allow younger members of our society to voluntarily invest a *small* part of their social security taxes into variable stocks and/or other instruments. Apparently trying to make up with the Democratic side of the House and Senate for standing with President Bush on the Medicare Reform Bill, the **AARP** is utilizing the left's message of doom, gloom and fear to get everyone over the age of 50 to push the panic button.

Seniors please understand there *are* difficulties associated with the Social Security program but keeping it as it is will only acerbate the problem. The **AARP**, whose sole purpose should be to look out for what's best for us, is indeed acting like a greedy grinch-like, power hungry entity with an agenda I can't understand. They've made statements that our **Social Security benefits** will be lost, or tremendously downsized if partial "*privatization*" is allowed for those of a younger age but have given nothing but rhetoric when asked to show their proof. Why don't they show their proof... because they have none.

I heard a representative of **AARP** recently on talk radio advising us that President Bush and his "*cronies*" are only trying to help their rich stock broker friends by diverting all that Social Security money into their pockets. My first answer to that ridiculous statement is *bull caca*, and my second answer is it sounded awfully politically motivated, to my sensitive ears. It seems the leaders of **AARP** have allowed themselves to become enamored with their lobbying power in Congress and are trying to wield their mighty stick in a battle that is not theirs to enjoy.

I have read that over **45,000 of the 35.5 Million members** of AARP burnt their membership cards and dropped their association when it backed the Bush sponsored Medicare Bill. Could they just be disgruntled Democrats? I'm not sure, but maybe this needless and ill advised stand against a change in Social Security is meant to assuage those malcontents back into the fold with a show of power against the re-elected president.

Those who speak against the change to allow younger taxpayers to *voluntarily* direct a miniscule amount of their Social Security contribution into private accounts really can't give valid reasons for vetoing the idea other than the projected potentially high transitional costs, \$2+ *Trillion*, or the erroneous suggestion present day retirees will suffer greatly.

Of course the Democrats are rabidly against the idea, even though one of their own, respected Senator **Daniel Patrick Moynihan** was co-chair of the bi-partisan **President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security** in August , 2001. One of their proposed options to cure the problem was voluntary privatization ability for younger taxpayers. Also, in 1999, President Clinton proposed . . . transferring 62 percent of projected budget surpluses to Social Security, to put more than \$2.7 billion into the system over the next 15 years. He also said about \$700 billion of the Social Security system should be invested in the stock market for increased returns. Vice President Al Gore supported the administration plan. **The only reason I see why Democrats are against the plan today is... the Republicans are for it.**

As stated before, there will be a high cost to transition from the current plan to the proposed new one. Saying that, we must also agree that those of us currently retired or those waiting in the wings to retire *will not be asked to bear that cost* either in loss, or reduction, of current benefits. As far as the high cost is concerned, my experience has shown that delaying repairs on anything usually results in higher costs in the future.

We will bring you more facts but we must wait for a future article to do so. In the meantime, don't allow those "*Chicken Littles*" among us to cause needless worry about something that will not happen. If you examine those who are against the idea you will most likely find they are the ones who always see the glass as half empty rather than half full.

#