

All political parties want wealth transfer

Continued from Page 8

little was said about the fact that by firing Americans and hiring STEM workers from overseas, corporate profits were increased. Additional savings arise, as employers do not have to pay for certain programs when hiring H1-Bs that are required when hiring American workers.

There have been many studies on the alleged STEM shortage. Not one peer-reviewed study has found any evidence at all for a STEM worker shortage since at least the 1990s. Further proof of this is that STEM wages have remained stagnant since at least 1998.

There is one widely publicized study that claims it is good for American workers when more H1-Bs are admitted to the country. It claims that every time an H1-B worker is hired additional jobs are created, and that “some of those jobs are highly desirable STEM” positions.

The reality is that those “newly created jobs” are primarily babysitters, maids, janitors, cleaners, waiters and other low-wage service workers. The study cleverly omits that these jobs are also created when an American is hired for a STEM position.

The study seems to believe that providing the best jobs to foreign nationals and relegating Americans to the lowest paying sector of the economy is to our benefit. Perhaps those writing the study should ask their employers to replace them with

H1-Bs so they can enjoy one of those “newly created jobs” that follows the hiring of foreign workers.

Where are the unions? The unions want more imported cheap labor, since unions no longer put American workers first.

Instead, unions drive endless nonsense about being charitable to the Third World and electing Democrats. The same politicians who displace American workers with cheap labor at the behest of Nickie Hanauer and Bill Gates are sold to the American public as their “saviors.”

The unions and the politicians also indulge in long, boring rants about the alleged “need” to tax the rich while the politicians work overtime at assisting their large donors in finding new ways to hide money in family foundations and other devices that permit political pressure groups designed to improve conditions for the super-rich to masquerade as charities. And the evils of billionaire donors – unless the billionaire is surnamed Bloomberg, Soros, Gates or Hanauer. Our media lies, is corrupt, and has as its sole agenda increasing the wealth of its corporate masters.

Forget the “evil Republi-

cans” – all parties, including the Greens, are focused on a massive wealth transfer from those who work for a living to those who don’t – including billionaires. It is no mistake that those “green subsidies” for hiring landscapers and installing solar panels and other such entities are most available to the rich.

It is also no accident that in the name of urban renewal, redevelopment and the green movement, established neighborhoods – including old single-room-housing buildings

then sold at a deep discount or even given away for free – to favored developers. Homeowners are reduced to renters in “subsidized” low-income housing – instant slums – and small businesses fail and are replaced by chain stores given deep taxpayer-funded subsidies.

Locally, a car dealer was allowed to retain a share of the sales tax that should have gone to the city – while the billionaires who own the a local mall also are being permitted to keep millions of tax dollars that would otherwise go to the city. Local residents pay a “utility tax,” one of the most regressive forms of taxation known, to help subsidize bil-

lionaires, enabling the city to continue to offer services while the very wealthy evade taxation.

Note that the very politicians demanding “taxing the rich” somehow wind up taxing the poor while exempting the rich.

Understand money in politics: Bloomberg and Hanauer spending millions each to disarm the American worker (little Nickie has a great terror of the peasants coming after him and his fellow zillionaires – he even wrote an article about it) is considered good by corporate skills. Thousands of regular Americans making donations of \$25 – a few thousand to the NRA-PVF –

are so low that if one producer uses them, the others must follow suit or fail. Some farmers enter niche markets, such as heritage breeds or pastured poultry – but most consumers cannot afford to pay \$8 per pound or more for a whole chicken.

Ironically, the man who founded and owned Arbor Acres and won the contest later became deeply concerned and attempted to breed and sell hardier chicks that were capable of exercise, highly productive, and could be raised well without as intensive a raising regime. These birds were unable to penetrate the market.

It is possible to market a less intensively reared, slightly older, economical bird. This means that consumer tastes would have to adapt to tolerate the higher level of dark meat and tougher carcass muscle that result from a more active bird that is capable of foraging for some of its sustenance.



NOTE THAT THE VERY POLITICIANS DEMANDING ‘TAXING THE RICH’ SOMEHOW WIND UP TAXING THE POOR

that rented cheaply – are being torn down and replaced by new single room housing buildings, known as “micro apartments” that rent for \$2,000 to \$3,000 per month.

The media extols the virtues of American workers moving into “tiny houses” and converted shipping containers, just like Third World workers in China and Mexico, where the “tiny house” is called a “hut” and the shipping container, equipped with water and power, is considered an atrocity by Chinese activists. Homeowners and small-business owners are forcibly evicted, paid low prices for their property – which is

1940s damage control leads to ‘Chicken of Tomorrow’

NADJA ADOLF
Contributing writer

In the 1940s Americans didn’t eat much chicken. Roast chicken was a luxury meat; the usual chicken on the plate showed up as chicken and dumplings, the eventual fate of laying hens who had ceased being productive.

Today we eat an average of 80 pounds of chicken per capita, and chickens are so efficient that they produce 1 pound of meat for every 2 pounds or less of feed. How did this happen?

In the 1940s there was a company known as The Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co., then the largest retailer in the world and by far the largest retailer of poultry products.

The A&P, as it was known, had received a significant amount of bad publicity during the 1940s after a conviction for criminal restraint of trade. A&P launched into full damage control positive PR mode, and one of the damage con-

trol operations was seen as having as an added benefit the distinct possibility of improving the bottom line at A&P.

This PR plan? A national contest, “The Chicken of Tomorrow Contest.” Farmers from all over the country would send eggs to special facilities where the chicks would be hatched, raised, and all slaughtered at 12 weeks of age. The poultry were judged on feed efficiency, health and appearance, growth and size, and edible carcass proportion.

The contest began with two years of state and regional competitions; from these contests 40 national finalist chick strains were selected. In the national finals, the purebred winners were the Arbor Acres White Plymouth Rocks and the crossbred category was won by higher performing, dark colored Vantress Hatchery Cornish crosses which had a less attractive carcass than the white birds. Eventually the strains were crossed, leading to a

higher performing white bird that became the standard of market poultry.

Other breeders developed similar strains, and in the decades since the age of slaughter has declined from what was then seen as an incredibly early 12 weeks to the modern birds of today that are slaughtered at six to eight weeks of age.

The Chicken of Tomorrow was a technological development that had both good and bad effects. Prior to the development of the fast maturing, highly efficient modern meat bird, male chickens were “neutered” either by caaponizing – a painful, sometimes fatal operation since chickens testicles are inside their bodies – or by the use of hormone capsules. Both techniques have essentially vanished with the modern meat bird, and hormones have been illegal for years. The modern meat bird grows as it does not because of artificial manipulation, but because of genetic selection.

Faster, more efficient

meat birds have led to more affordable, higher quality protein being available to lower income Americans. The downside is that the fastest growing strains must be heavily monitored to avoid leg breakdowns or heart attacks before reaching market weight. Many of these strains are so focused on eating – for physiological reasons – that they are unwilling to exercise. Some cannot be raised at altitudes above 5,000 feet due to the high probability of heart failure.

Ascribing antibiotic use in livestock to the genetics of the “Chicken of Tomorrow” is misleading at best, and dishonest at worst. Antibiotics are known to increase growth in animals in dosages that are not adequate to control or reduce disease. The Chicken of Tomorrow, like any other chicken, can live to market age without the use of these drugs. The reason for the use of these drugs is profitability, not disease prevention. Farm profit margins