

# Jeb Bush: “People Need to Work Longer Hours.” Media Soften It.

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, July 10, 2015

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

*Reuters & CNBC, Etc.: “Bush says Americans should have chance to work longer hours in improved economy.”*

Jeb Bush, on July 8th:

“My aspiration for the country, and I believe we can achieve it, is 4 percent growth as far as the eye can see. Which means we have to be a lot more productive, workforce participation has to rise from its all-time modern lows. It means that people need to work longer hours, and, through their productivity, gain more income for their families. That’s the only way we’re going to get out of this rut that we’re in.”

Here is his statement in a youtube video of just that 30-second passage (+ 8 seconds):

Republican U.S. Presidential candidate Jeb Bush was interviewed in a grainy video on 8 July 2015, by New Hampshire’s far-right (i.e., authoritarian) newspaper, *Manchester Union-Leader*, which interview they buried on their website, but the newsworthy comment in it (cited just above) is at [16:11-16:40 on their buried and muddy-sounding 54-minute-long boring interview video here](#), where Bush had been asked about his plan for the U.S. economy.

In what follows, you will see the openings of the media reports about this statement by Bush. You will see ‘news’ media trying to soften the candidate’s statement, by adding their own commentary to it, some of which commentary is outright false [and my own commentaries about the ‘news’ reports about Bush’s comment will be in brackets, like here]:

REUTERS:

<http://uk.reuters.com/article/2015/07/09/us-usa-election-bush-idUKKCN0PJ04T20150709>

Bush says Americans should have chance to work longer hours in improved economy

[That headline is false. Bush did not say “chance to work longer hours.” Furthermore, instead of “in improved economy,” he said “to get out of this rut that we’re in,” so a euphemistic paraphrase was used instead of simply an honest quotation, which is only a few

words longer than the paraphrase. Reuters apparently wants to provide its own softened interpretation, perhaps fearing that to provide an actual quotation instead would generate in the reader an interpretation that's less accepting of the basic aristocratic system, which the media are being paid to propagandize for.]

Thu Jul 9, 2015 3:23am BST. HUDSON, NEW HAMPSHIRE | BY STEVE HOLLAND  
— Republican presidential candidate Jeb Bush said Americans should have the chance to work longer hours, a remark that drew criticism from Democrats but which he said was intended to highlight that an improved U.S. economy could create more full-time jobs. ...

[That lead sentence is false. Bush did not say that “Americans should have the chance to work longer hours.”]

GUARDIAN:

<http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jul/09/jeb-bush-says-americans-need-to-work--longer-hours-to-earn-more-for-their-families>

Jeb Bush says Americans ‘need to work longer hours’ to earn more

Reuters, Thursday 9 July 2015

Jeb Bush has said Americans should have the chance to work longer hours. ...

[That lead sentence is false. Guardian failed to verify the ‘news’ report from Reuters.]

---

POLITICO:

<http://www.politico.com/story/2015/07/jeb-bush-people-should-work-longer-hours--119884.html>

Jeb Bush: ‘People should work longer hours’

[That headline is false. Bush did not say “People should work longer hours.”]

By HANNA TRUDO 7/8/15 10:05 PM EDT Updated 7/9/15 12:56 PM EDT

Former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush on Wednesday seemed to propose a bold solution for economic troubles: “People should work longer hours.” ...

[That lead sentence is false. Bush proposed no “bold solution for economic troubles.” And — as noted about the headline — he did not say “People should work longer hours.”]

---

WASHINGTON POST:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2015/07/08/jeb-bush-people-need-to-work-longer-hours-means-they-need-full-time-not-part-time-work/>

Jeb Bush: 'People need to work longer hours' means they need full-time, not part-time work

By Ed O'Keefe, July 8 at 8:45 PM. HUDSON, N.H. — Jeb Bush raised eyebrows on Wednesday by suggesting that "people need to work longer hours" in order to grow the economy.

But he later clarified the comment, moving quickly to quell a fresh assault by Democrats eager to characterize the Republican presidential front-runner as out of touch. ...

---

NEW YORK TIMES:

<http://www.nytimes.com/politics/first-draft/2015/07/09/jeb-bush-and-hillary--clinton-spar-over-worker-hours/>

Jeb Bush and Hillary Clinton Spar Over Worker Hours

Alan Rappeport, Jul. 9, 2015, 8:44 AM ET — The sparring between the presidential candidates Jeb Bush and Hillary Rodham Clinton has started early, and in this case the fight is over who better understands the plight of the American worker.

Mr. Bush caused a stir on Wednesday when he appeared to suggest in New Hampshire that Americans needed to start putting in more hours.

"We have to be a lot more productive," Mr. Bush said, referring to how to 4 percent economic growth could be achieved. "Work force participation has to rise from its all time modern lows, it means that people need to work longer hours and through their productivity gain more income for their families."

Democrats seized on the notion that Americans were not working hard enough. ... The former Florida governor, a Republican, later clarified his remarks, explaining that he was referring to the glut of part-time workers who have not been able to find full-time employment in the aftermath of the recession. ...

---

OTHERS:

The general news coverage on Bush's remark was like the *Post* and the *Times*: it emphasized the criticisms that Hillary Clinton and some other Democrats had of Bush's statement, but buried and truncated Bush's statement itself, so that the predominant impression was: Democrats are lunging at Bush. The 'coverage' was of the game, not of the policy-prescription itself, as if the public are too stupid to care about a Presidential candidate's policy-prescription.

## CONCLUSION

The 'news' media treat well-financed political candidates as if they are fragile creatures who need to be protected from the stupid public, by 'clarifying' what they 'really meant to say.' And, then, when the 'opposite' political party attacks, the 'news' reporting is about the battle between the two parties, not about the battle between both of those parties (both wings of the U.S. aristocracy) versus the public.

Unlike the many other 'news' reports about Bush's statement, the present one will not pollute Bush's statement with any commentary about it. His comment stinks enough on its own. As usual, the more important, and far more interesting, news is actually the corruptness of the 'news' media, and the resulting difficulty for voters to make accurately informed electoral choices between the various candidates that the aristocracy offer us, which accurately informed choices might terrify the 'news' media, if that were ever to happen. However, when the choice is between candidates such as the Bushes and the Clintons, or the Obamas and the Romneys, etc., the aristocracy have nothing whatsoever to worry about. And, if somehow an anti-aristocratic candidate were to win one of the two parties' nomination, the aristocracy would probably still win, because they own the 'news' media too. There are many things, such as Obama's 'trade' deals, that the public don't like but that get 'democratically' rammed through no matter what. What the public want [doesn't make any real difference](#) in America.

Any Presidential candidate who insults voters by asserting that the solution to the nation's economic problems is "People need to work longer hours," shouldn't even be in the race: he's not only a callous aristocrat; he's stupid, if not outright bigoted, and overflowing with blatant self-righteous arrogance.

And any 'news' reporting of such a comment, that consists of either the political game-play, or else interpretation of the comment on the part of 'news' media, isn't worthy of being printed onto even toilet paper. It should have less attention paid to it than that, and it stinks as bad. It simply shouldn't be touched. But the comment itself should receive lots of public attention, because it blatantly displays the candidate's callous trashiness, which the 'news' media are trying to hide from the public, as best they can.

So: don't expect to see this news-article and commentary published in many 'news' media, though it has been submitted to virtually all of them. The 'news' media always refuse to publish anything that exposes the fraudulence of 'our' 'democratic' 'free' 'press.' Exposing that is an absolute no-no, in the 'press.'

"Freedom of the press?" What's that? And where can one read about it? You just did — here (and maybe it's available noplacelse).

*Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).*

---

[\*\*Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page\*\*](#)

[\*\*Become a Member of Global Research\*\*](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

#### About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)