

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

# Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2007-10/msg00064.html>

---

- *From:* "Paul Thomas, CPA" <[paulthomascpapc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paulthomascpapc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 9 Oct 2007 14:08:16 -0400
- 

<royls@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:470b000f.11777947@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:470b000f.11777947@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

On Mon, 8 Oct 2007 09:24:52 -0400, "Paul Thomas, CPA"  
<[paulthomascpapc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:paulthomascpapc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

<royls@xxxxxxxx> wrote

It's  
more  
evil  
to  
be  
a  
slave-owner  
than  
to  
be  
a  
slave,  
and  
yes  
there  
are  
those  
who  
would  
opt  
not  
to  
be  
more  
evil.

Very,  
very

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

few

Care  
to  
try  
to  
prove  
yourself?

Care  
to  
prove  
your  
assertion  
that  
"very,  
very  
few"  
people  
would  
opt  
"more  
evil"  
than  
"less  
evil"?

Inevitably,  
you  
just  
baldly  
lie  
about  
what  
I  
said.

Well,  
Richard  
said that  
"there are  
those who  
would opt  
NOT to be  
more  
evil"  
and you  
said "very

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

very few"

And then  
you assert  
that I lied  
about what  
you said.

Of course you lied, as you  
know very well. You  
snipped the context of  
Richard's statement of the  
options: "more evil because  
slave owner" or  
"less evil because slave,"  
changing it to just, "more  
evil" or "less  
evil."

Here is his quote in its entirety:  
"It's more evil to be a slave-owner than to  
be a slave, and  
yes there are those who would opt not to be  
more evil."

You – just above – added: "more evil  
because slave owner" or "less evil  
because slave,"

Why did you feel the need to add those  
words to his statement?

To restore the original meaning of his statement

Hey dufus. When you \*add\* words to someone's post, it \*changes\* what was  
written, and by default it changes the meaning of what was written.

Hey lying garbage, when you \*delete\* words from someone's post, it  
\*changes\* what was written,

I did not delete anything from his post. But you did add to his words and  
that addition changed them.

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

and by default, restoring the meaning  
requires those words to be restored.

But they were not there initially. You added them.

You DELETED the words, "slave" and "slave owner"  
from what Richard wrote,

Nope, I did not delete anything.

Here: These are Richards own words:

From: "Richard Eich" <richard.eich@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Subject: Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

Date: Wednesday, October 03, 2007 7:56 AM

"It's more evil to be a slave-owner than to be a slave, and  
yes there are those who would opt not to be more evil."

And I followed up with:

"Well, Richard said that "there are those who would opt NOT to be more  
evil"

I have not dropped the "not" from his post – nor have I added anything to  
his post....

As you seem to have the need to do.

<yawn> Here are the first 9 quoted lines of the previous post:

It's  
more

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

evil  
to  
be  
a  
slave-owner  
than  
to  
be  
a  
slave,  
and  
yes  
there  
are  
those  
who  
would  
opt  
not  
to  
be  
more  
evil.

Very,  
very  
few

Care to try  
to prove  
yourself?

Care to  
prove your  
assertion  
that "very,  
very few"  
people  
would opt  
"more evil"  
than "less  
evil"?

<sigh> Notice, stupid garbage: Richard said, "there are those who would opt NOT to be more evil" (emphasis added, because you are clearly too stupid and dishonest to admit the word 'not' is there).

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

You've got to be desperate, because for anyone who gives a shit, they can easily go back and look it up.

Why you have to change the words of others is beyond me.

I replied, "Very, very few."

You then said, "Care to prove your assertion that "very, very few" people would opt "more evil" than "less evil"?"

And I'm still waiting – on you to prove that "very very few" people would "opt not to be more evil".

That is the context of his post, and you've done everything under your power to sidestep answering.

Can you really still pretend you don't see? I stated that very, very few would opt \*NOT\* to be more evil,

Waiting on that proof that I have been asking for for weeks now.

and you then claimed my assertion was that very, very few \*WOULD\_OPT\* for "more evil."

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

Nope, it's clear that you believe that "very very few" would opt not to be more evil.

In plain-speak, you assert that the majority of people, "very very many" in fact, would opt TO be more evil.

I asked you to prove your assertion.

You removed the "not" from my statement.

And how I worded it would not change the end results.

Your claim is that "very very few" people "who would opt not to be more evil".

It carries forward that you believe that many many people WOULD opt to BE more evil.

I've been consistent in my tense. You however, have evaded answering the question.

How many people do you believe would opt to be more evil?

I did not remove a negation from your statement.

Clearly you are pretending that it has a different meaning than what it always had.

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

You removed a negation from mine.

Nope, you only claim that. And you are doing so to detract from your non-answer about how many people would opt to be more evil.

You've already boxed yourself in a corner by claiming that "very very few" (that's you) "who would opt not to be more evil" (that's Richard).

Ergo, you believe that many many people would opt TO be more evil.

That makes you the lying garbage. Not me.

No, it makes me right, and....well, it would make you look like a fool, but you looked that way long before you came over to the tax newsgroup.

You lied about what he wrote.

Sorry, but anyone can look it up for themselves.

<yawn> Why did you deliberately change the meaning of what he wrote by DELETING the words, "slave" and "slave owner"?

You seem to be a very tired person. >pun not intended, but it fits so nicely<

Your "very very few" applies to the second part of his post: "and yes there are those who would opt not to be more evil."

And you said "very very few", which can only be read as that you believe that very very many would opt TO be more evil.

Re: Are the Filthy Rich Necessary?

And then I asked you to prove out that claim, of which you have done everything in your power (which isn't enough) to distract from that issue.

So what DO you believe? Would "very very few" people opt NOT to be more evil, or would "very very many" opt TO be more evil?

It's your choice.

Either way you prove yourself wrong, or you prove me right.

--

Have no fear of perfection – you'll never reach it.

-----  
Paul A. Thomas, CPA

.