

## Re: If Kerry is elected...

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004-10/5202.html>

---

**From:** Robert Monsen (*rcsurname\_at\_comcast.net*)

**Date:** 10/18/04

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 19:22:51 GMT

Jim Yanik wrote:

> *Robert Monsen <rcsurname@comcast.net> wrote in*

> *news:faHcd.259202\$MQ5.39637@attbi\_s52:*

>

>

>>*Jim Yanik wrote:*

>><*drivel*>

>>

>>*You can't refute anything I say, so you resort to name calling. Fine. I*

>>*wasn't talking to you anyway, and could care less what you think.*

>>

>

>

> *Excuse me, but in this post you neglected to include what "names" I am*

> *alleged to have called you.*

>

You are right, you didn't call me names. I was mistaken. You were calling progressive tax policy 'marxist', which is simply wrong.

You then snipped the gist of my argument, calling it 'utopian speech' (apparently you didn't bother to read it), and started biting at my ankles by calling me a marxist for my admittedly somewhat poetic conclusion.

The point of my argument to Mr Seim was that republicans believe they have a policy, but it's not a policy, it's a strategy. Their strategy is designed to take power, by fooling the bible belt and the south into believing that the republican party is on their side, when it's really working for big business. They vote for Bush, thinking he is a Robertson republican, and what they really get is a policy designed by Goldwater.

He was also saying that liberals don't have a real vision.

The liberal vision, however, is obvious, as the part you snipped pointed out. It's that everybody should benefit from the advances of society. The reason that 'conservatives' think 'liberal' is a dirty word is that they don't really understand that they are, at heart, already liberal. The 'republican strategists' have tried to change the meaning of the

word to be 'elitist snob' for political reasons.

However, the liberal idea has won so completely that, really, \*everybody\* is a liberal, \*everybody\* in America believes that we should take care of the sick and the aged; that we should help people in need; and, that we should work toward 'the common good'. That's the goal, and whether some of us are willing to admit it or not, we all believe it. Bush seems to believe it; listen to his speeches. The only real disagreement is how to make this goal happen.

The Goldwater 'program' is to dismantle government, or at least to cripple it. These guys believe that corporations, not governments, should get to say what happens, and should drive policy for economic good. They believe that government is an impediment to a completely free market, and that a totally free market is the path towards this liberal utopia where nobody starves, and everybody enjoys the benefits of society. They quote Adam Smith. Their main idea can be summarised as this statement: a rising tide carries all boats.

Well, this is where I disagree. It's obvious to anyone who looks that there are some boats that simply don't rise with the tide. In the last 20 years, wealth has concentrated into the hands of a tiny minority. Tax policy has been carefully restructured to ensure that this disparity of wealth continues, and even increases. More people fall into poverty each year. Real wages are falling. People can't afford health care. The middle class is being eroded. Without progressive tax policy, this erosion simply continues unchecked.

Also, these days, this free market dream amounts to 'rule by corporation'. However, most of us don't vote for the board of directors of most corporations, and thus they generally aren't accountable to anyone or anything except the need for profits. Further, they aren't good stewards of the 'common good', in the form of the global environment, or even the economic infrastructure. They are social machines, created to extract and process the environment for the good of their owners. Any good they do for the public is a byproduct of this primary activity. Adam Smith could never have conceived of their sheer power to do this when he wrote "The Wealth of Nations". Adam Smith, who was a social progressive, would have been a Democrat had he lived today.

Democrats believe that everyone should benefit when society advances, not just the few. A majority of those bible-belt Robertson republicans would agree with this, I think. This view is, basically, the Christian ethic.

Regressive tax policy, and unchecked corporate power, despite the best intentions of those who are working towards them, is \*not\* a way to bring us closer to the goal. It simply does not work. Strong government control of corporations, and progressive tax policy is what leads to a better environment, a healthy infrastructure, and a swelling middle class, which is, in my mind anyway, the right thing to be working towards.

sci.electronics.design: Re: If Kerry is elected...

--

Regards,  
Bob Monsen