

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2006-04/msg00494.html>

- *From:* nospam <nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 23 Apr 2006 11:45:12 -0400
-

Peter Bjørn Perlsø wrote:

So yeah, I am confident that at that time the ideology was still strongly believed and hopes fueled motivation.

With all that hope, nothing, not even genocide in the millions can stop you!

Of course. The human are motivated to do something either by a immediate reward either in the hope of a later reward.
And yes, sometimes people react late to a problem.

Ever heard of a tautology?

No, it is not a tautology at all. It is just the reality.
People act on a hope. It is enough to look at Wall Street to see people acting on pure hopes, and something even delaying some obviously decisions due to a hope. Just look around and understand.

In the end it is again about motivation. Free market in itself have absolutely no value at all. Zero.

Strongly disagree.

And your argumentation for this are ?

About the same as yours – none.

Re: Definition of "rich"?

I presented you with logical proof. The fact that you refuse to go back in thread and read the postings does not discredit anybody else but you.

You make empty statements, I make logical deductions but you refuse to read them. I looked up one of them, for you:

<http://groups.google.com/group/sci.econ/msg/c47019f88f355a08>

Please don't be as lazy as a radical right winger and refuse to read it :-)

Look on this thread, I already wrote 2 postings about mass discounts. Ancient word of wisdom: "The priest do not sing twice for a deaf old lady".

So, if the free market would naturally form monopolies, isn't this to be expected in, say the utilities businesses (electricity, gas, water)?

Why in the world do you think they are regulated ? To prevent that to happen. Look what did Enron in California when the idiots deregulated the energy market. Comcast is in my county a local monopoly (it killed 2 smaller competitors) and the service quality sucks, but prices keep rising for less and less quality every year.

I showed you a logical demonstration about the advantages of democracy as a motivation booster. And again, you reply with senseless propaganda without a basis. Talibans did the same. Man

You've showed me only your personal bias and confidence in democracy.

Let look at the differences and see the reality:

=====

MY STATEMENT: ""

A democracy rule as the majority wants. A majority identify their goals with the goal of government. A majority is motivated to achieve that goal. Any other form of government will produce a minority of motivated people. Since motivation is important into achieving the goals it is obvious that a democracy will always achieve the goal faster/better since they have a majority of motivated people.
""

Starting statement:

=====

"A democracy rule as the majority wants. "

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Conclusion:

=====

"democracy will always achieve the goal faster/better since they have a majority of motivated people"

What is between is a sequence of logical assertion, each deriving from the previous one to reach the conclusion. This is a logical argumentation.

YOUR STATEMENTS:

"Strongly disagree."

"No, because the reality IS that it is tyranny by the many. The american founding fathers agreed with me."

"You've showed me only your personal bias and confidence in democracy."

And so on. Stuff without any backing but your broken ideology you believe in it like a fanatic.

Kid, go get more education, please. Is not going to hurt.

It is only a lack of exercise in thinking the factor driving people to believe in libertarian mythologies. Once you learn more and get more exercise, unavoidable you won't support them anymore. And you will laugh later at how naive you were.

When it comes to organised looting of wealth in absolute terms, the democratic welfare state is fucking worse than North Korea!

Of course a libertarian will claim that this baseless assertion it is a logical proof :-)

Let think a bit more. Wealth is created in the process of production as a direct result of work.

The biggest form of welfare it is grabbing the wealth from creator and give it to a lazy unproductive capital owner. Do you propose eliminating this form of welfare ?

By the fact that people able to create wealth are denied access to enough wealth to become their own capital owners, the current capital owners actively prevent creators to create wealth for themself.

Some of the workers are prevented to create wealth so badly than they does not have enough to live decently. Here is where the second form of welfare gov. mandated from capital owners (who grabbed the wealth created by others) to workers which were prevented (by denying access to capital) to create wealth to support themself. Do you propose eliminating this form of

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Re: Definition of "rich"?

welfare ?

Well, if you propose eliminating both then there is no problem. The balance will be restored. However, as far as I seen, libertarians want to eliminate only the second one. Possibly because in their primitive mind they like to watch their own victims how they die by starvation. Again, a primitive mindset no better or worst than the fans of the gladiators fights in ancient Rome.

Have you ever heard of "minority protection"?

Yes. Minority have to be protected when they are hurt by the majority.

But this is different from tyranny of the minority over the majority. What libertarians want to achive.

Even the Weimar republic has checks and balance, which even Hitler managed to bypass. You can't make an idiot proof political system., the idiots (politicians) will inevitable find a way around it.

Not enough, obviously. Learning from history we now see that we need more.

So, say, the Green political agenda, which calls for a maximum wage, with associated 100% marginal taxes, is the result of corruption?

Well, it is an interesting concept thou. I did not thought very much but here are some arguments.

Wealth is a direct result of work. Betwen people there are differences. A worker can work 50%, 100% ... 500% more than the average. Others will work 50%, 100% ... 500% less than the average. If one refuse to work at all it is going to be fired.

Anyhow, based on limits imposed on us by nature (and the fact that a lazy who is defiant with team get fired), even if the best worker is 25 times more productive than the laziest one there is that much one can do.

Based on these facts to have a CEO getting payed 20,000 % the average wage in company it is completely a defiance of natures laws and any common sense. The fact that a shareholder (who does not create any wealth) get more wealth that 100,000 workers it is also a defiance of common sense. Especially while you have hard working people starving with minimum wage.

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Re: Definition of "rich"?

So why not. A certain limit to obey nature's goals is not bad at all.

How
about Hillary Clinton's claim that she would tke Bush's tax cuts away
from people "on behalf of the common good"?

Well, tax cuts are a fraud. Due to trade deficit, tax cuts are actually
hurting the economy:

http://www.angelfire.com/planet/dragonomics/laffer_ruminations.pdf

The fake 4% growth is just a result of deficit spending. So yes. Rolling
back the tax cuts is going to save US from a new depression. Well, I think
this common good is highly justified.

Lobby it is a direct violation of the democratic rules.

How? t's a part of democracy. You get what you want.

Lobby is NOT part of the democracy. It is part of a disfunctional system
called corruption. An attempt from people with money to influence the
politics more than their vote would allow to.

Lobby = bribery. And it have to be punished with jail time for both the
politicians, for lobbyist and the client.

How long US allow
payed political lobby, the US economy will be disfunctional and people
like Bush can get their way.

Money power isn't limited to Republicans, like a lot of people like to
think. Take a look at this:

<http://www.opensecrets.org/presidential/index.asp>

BOTH of your dominant political parties or up to their ears in campaign
contributions. It's your whole fucking political systems, only excluding
the Libertarians and Greens.

I used the republicans as a posterboy just because they are the most corrupt
party in the history of US. I fully agree that democrats are corrupted too.

Re: Definition of "rich"?

Re: Definition of "rich"?

This is the reason we need laws to criminalize lobby. Jail time a must.

Nope, I am just interested into a better society.

So am I.

I do not deny that. Your intents may be noble. The problem is that you are a victim of a cheap right wingers propaganda. Think more and you will figure out that libertarians ideology is broken by default.

Think not believe. This is the key.

Who's to decide what those common goals are? You?

The majority !!!!