
Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 21:14:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 05:26 It was the government regulations that allowed them to get the loans... When ever the government gets in the private sector it goes bad.

I believe you're mistaken. It's the lack of government regulations that allowed them to get loans. Regulations tend to be restrictive (And with good reason). If it allows more than it restricts, it isn't a regulation.

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 05:26 PS Dover get over your wealth envy...it's disturbing.

HAR HAR

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 not really relevant to our conversation to compare dangerous weapons to luxury items. as for laws regarding not allowing people to buy a house they can't afford, that - for the most part- should be dealt with in the private sector. if someone gets a loan they can't afford, then they should suffer the consequences(usually foreclosure). at the same time, if a company gives a loan they shouldn't give then that company should suffer the consequences(meaning they should lose out on their investment ie. not get bailed out by taxpayers)

And again, in a perfect world, you'd be right, but clearly it's not just them that bears the consequences of their actions. To some extent we all do. This is what I'm trying to get across. We're not just a collection of isolated individuals. We're a society, and we need to behave accordingly.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 don't write it off. it's a very valid point. at what point do you stop allowing government to decide what is and what is not luxury? is it just gold bathtubs? that's easy enough to fix - outlaw gold bathtubs! there will always be something that someone else thinks is luxurious. you probably think my GMC Envoy is luxury. perhaps you think i should drive my 4 kids around in a toyota prius? if we let you say "no gold bath tubs while kids are starving in inner chicago!" then what's to keep you from saying "no steak dinners while there's still crime in duluth!"

Since we're having this discussion in the context of the size of government (and the amount of taxes that should be payed, accordingly), I'll assume that the point you're making is that the current amount is the best amount, and even if

If that is, indeed, what you're trying to say, then all I have to do is point the the multitude of more successful states, in particular (again) the Scandonavian nations.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 not that it matters, but he spends his money just like everyone else does. he travels first class, he goes on 2000 mile trips to go shopping,

Perhaps, but not at the level he could, or more accurately at the level he's expected to in the consumer culture the United States in which he holds (Held?) the position of "Richest man". By

and large most of his money goes to charity and other worthy causes, which is the case with some of the wealthier class, but sadly not many.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02i don't know what type of tub he has (do you?)

I don't know what kind of tub he has either. I do know, however, that he does not have a solid gold bath tub.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02but then i can't name a person with a gold bathtub(can you?)

And I can name someone with a solid gold bath tub. She is the CEO and owner of a "small business" that employs about seven people.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13as for government healthcare, there are so many things wrong with that! not the least of which is the fact that government can't run anything well!
Quote:

inb4iraqwar.

I'm going to forgive you for spouting that same retarded Regan mantra that republicans seem to be wet for. Government not sure what this means.

My bad. I was distracted in the process of writing my response and I coincidentally moved on to the next point without ever finishing my thought.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02can you tell me 3 things that government runs well?

Admittedly, it would be easier for me to tell you three things that foreign governments run well than to name three things that the US government runs well. The only relevant difference I can point out is that most foreign governments (The one's I'm talking about, anyway) are better funded because of a higher tax rate. It can't be anything else. Aren't we the self-proclaimed greatest country in the world?

It's curious, really. Republicans want a small, feeble government because government supposedly can't do anything right, and in the process of creating small government they only further limit it's ability to do things right. A self-fulfilling prophecy if there ever was one.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02not all rich are getting richer and not all poor are getting poorer.

Not all, of course, but a large enough percentage to produce a very noticeable trend. Isn't that enough? It would be a true disaster if it was ALL rich getting richer and ALL poor getting poorer

but it makes sense that once you hve money it's easier to keep/grow it. it also makes sense that often the bad decisions that made the poor poor will keep them in poverty.[/quote]

You're assuming that all (Or most. Whatever word you want to use. I don't care) rich make good

decisions and all (Or most. Whatever) poor make bad decisions.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02i can tell you that without being taxed, fined and fee'd to death the poor would have an easier time getting out of poverty.

So we shouldn't tax the poor, and the rich should pick up the slack for them. I'm glad we're on the same page.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02tell me - how many times have you heard a story of a person getting out of poverty by using government assistance(legally) sure, people have been on government assistance at tough times in their life, but it is their hard work and or luck that got them out of it - not the small government check that comes in the mail.

That's absurd. Using that logic, since it's the engine of a car that makes it go, you could operate a car without any seats in it. You might be technically right, but have you ever tried it? Every bit helps, and none of it should be written off.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02higher government taxes make it so that you have to work harder to afford even the basic necessities in life. it is harder to spend time doing what you love (painting for example) when you are spending so much time trying to put food on the table.

You seem to have this concept of tax money disappearing into some kind of void or something. This isn't the case at all. It's put to use providing services and subsidizing goods that consumers use. For example, with a single-payer system of health care (Paid for by tax dollars), a citizen wouldn't have to worry about some kind of unforeseen hospital bill interfering with his ability to put food on the table. Also, because of heavy government subsidies on corn, the average American can buy a huge tub of Coke (With free refills!) for an absurdly cheap price, since Coke is mostly water and High Fructose Corn Syrup. Without such subsidies, it wouldn't be practical to super-size a meal.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02the richest americans pay over 90% of the taxes in this country.

Bullshit.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02i'd have to look up the exact numbers (and i will later) but once the bush tax cuts expire over 30% of the money the top earners make will go to federal taxes.

33%, if I'm not mistaken. Or was it 36%? I can't remember, so please do look it up. In any case, it's by far the lowest tax rate of any developed nation, so don't even begin to bitch about that being a high number.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02that's just federal income tax - not including local and state taxes.

State and local income taxes (Where they exist, because they don't exist everywhere) are typically a lot lower than federal income taxes. This is mostly because state and local governments tend to

rely more on taxes like sales tax which fall a lot harder on the lower and middle class, or flat taxes and revenues collected through things like parking tickets, which fall on the poor even harder.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 once the proposed obama taxes go into effect, it's estimated that some americans will pay over 50% in taxes. that means over half of what they make in wages will be handed over to the government.

More bullshit. Who made this "estimate"?

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 how'd you like it if you worked over 70 hours a week (most ceo's do so) and had to pay over half of what you make to the government?

There's a stark difference between the kind of work a CEO does--like taking the occasional phone call while golfing--and (for lack of a better word) real work. It is neither physically nor especially mentally exhausting

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 most philosophers say - and i agree - that government is by definition an entity that restricts its citizens freedom. smaller government means more freedom. less taxes = MORE REVENUE FOR THE GOVERNMENT! this is because when the people keep more of their money they get more innovative and create more jobs which means more revenue to the government.

This might be hard for you to wrap your mind around, but there is such a thing as too much freedom. Most philosophers say - and I agree (And I'm sure you do too) - that freedoms should end at the moment they infringe upon the freedoms and rights of others. This very much applies to the current financial crisis. The freedom of some to spend their money what they want (In this case, homes they couldn't afford) brought down the economy. Dare I say that's too much freedom?

History teaches this lesson over and over; In times of great hardship people often readily give their intangible, insubstantial "freedom" in return for material security and well being. What good does freedom do you if you're dying of starvation?

tl;dr -- More freedom isn't necessarily always a good thing.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 i hope i got the quotes right this time, i keep trying but i keep messing up. i have to go to bed soon. but i'll try to post facts with sources regarding tax rates and such later.

Please do. I find a lot of your numbers hard to believe.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:32
i gotta agree here!

the democrat party should be very proud of themselves, the lessons taught by karl marx have finally worked for them. they've been preaching this class warfare since the end of Clinton's term. it didn't work for gore, didn't work for kerry, definitely didn't work for edwards, but it's working very

well for obama.

the scary thing is, those who are participating in this class envy crap don't even recognize they're doing it or that it's a bad thing. makes you wonder when as americans we started teaching our kids this in the home.

Clearly it's the Democrats' fault for pointing out the huge inequalities (And they ARE a bad thing, according to economists), and not the Republicans' fault for creating the problem in the first place.

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 10:27So basically you are saying that Successful people should be punished for being successful

If you call having enough money to buy a solid gold hot tub a punishment. I hear this point over and over again, yet I've never met a rich person who has lost incentive in being rich because of the "high" taxes on them and their income; And I've met quite a few rich people.

Edit: Fixed some quotes.
