

Re: Making less than dad did

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2007-05/msg00378.html>

- *From:* "Sgt.Sausage" <nobody@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 30 May 2007 18:53:53 -0400
-

"Nospam" <nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:Zqydnen4QPqdEMXbnZ2dnUVZ_vGinZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxx

[snip]

That being said I do not believe that socialism it is a good idea either.
The classical socialism it is doomed to fail because there is not going to
be any non coercive way to motivate the individual.

Hmmmm ... what could it be????

What could we possibly come up with that is both
non coercive *and* motivational to the individual ...

Hmmm ... let's think about it a bit more.

....
....

They have interest motivated by profit.

BINGO!

You nailed it right there!

Profits.

They are both necessary, and sufficient as a motivation for
both the common man, and the wealthy individual.

Re: Making less than dad did

I find quite disturbing to find in all these newsgroups people incapable to think about a balance solution. A solution in the middle.

Sorry. Doesn't work that way.

Do we really live into a world where the last drop of decency and brain has been lost ?

Yes.

In the United States, wealth is highly concentrated in a relatively few hands.

Talk about brains. Use yours, for once, will ya please?

The smartest folks usually get the best grades.
The fastest folks usually win the race.
The strongest folks usually win the weight lifting competition.
The most popular folks usually win the election.
The most qualified folks usually get the job.
The best salesmen usually close the deal.

What's so hard to understand about the statement: The folks that are good at making money and putting it to good use, these folks usually accumulate the most wealth?

Sorry, but it's a natural law.

I lump you with the same sort of non-thinking, "let's all be friends", "competition is evil" sort of folks that want all students to get straight A's