



**Jeff Janssen**

Tuesday at 11:15am ·

It appears to me that in the struggle between the Conservatives and the Liberals, the term "compromise" seems to get thrown around a lot. I'd like to address what I see as a problem with that concept as it applies to politics.

The nature of conservatism is to be conservative about changing things, while the liberal stand is "we want change now." That means that from the conservative viewpoint, "compromising" means liberals get part of what they want, and conservatives give up part of what they want to retain. That's a one-way transaction. At some point, a line has to be drawn; a give and take must happen on both sides. What do liberals give up? Nothing. That's the nature of demanding change; there's nothing to give up but demands for more change - i.e demands that their opponents give up something more. That's not compromising.

Like · Comment · Unfollow Post

8 people like this.



**Ron Kobayashi** Hi Jeff! Yes, by definition Liberals call for change and Conservatives want the status quo. This is the reason I believe Liberals have always been proven right by history: It is Liberals who fought for women's rights to work outside of the home. It is conservatives who denied that, wanting "Traditional family roles" to be maintained. Now, most would agree that the Liberals were correct. It is Liberals who said we needed change for racial equality and civil rights for African Americans. It is Conservatives who denied that saying we should keep segregation because that was the status quo. Now, most would agree that Liberals were correct.

Tuesday at 11:25am · [Like](#) · 3



**Jeff Dening** Liberals give up the "right now" aspect that you seem to think is so important to them. In your analogy you lay the foundation for the errant assumption that conservatives don't want any change at all. I would suggest that the goal of most in this nation is to see the country continue to advance and remain competitive. How this is "best" accomplished is where the real debate lies.

A better description (from a liberal perspective) is we want equal justice now. Often that does involve change.

Tuesday at 11:30am · [Like](#)



**Jeff Janssen** The thread I continued this from was about the fact that both sides have something to contribute - a Ying-Yang kind of thing. I don't argue with either of you over the value of being able to change things; however, the benefits of any change must be balanced with the costs of that change, and liberals tend to be very bad at estimating, or even considering, all of the costs that proposed changes might incur.

Tuesday at 11:33am · [Like](#)



**Ron Kobayashi** It is Liberals who said that workers needed to be respected (through unions) with overtime pay, vacations, 8 hour work days, and no child labor. It is conservatives who denied that and said let the big business status quo remain. Now, most would agree the Liberals were correct. It is Liberals who said our senior citizens should not be left to die in the streets if their retirement plans run out, so government should institute Social Security and Medicare for our seniors. Conservatives denied that saying, it was drastic socialist change that we didn't need. Now most would agree that Liberals were correct...who now would deny senior citizens Social Security or Medicare? You see, time and time again, Liberals are proven correct...

Tuesday at 11:34am · [Like](#) · 2



**Ian Ellison** I've certainly never met a liberal that thought they were wrong. About anything. At all. I've also never met a liberal that wasn't astounded at all the things they could accomplish, with other peoples money. Not meant to be insulting, more an observation.

Tuesday at 11:45am · [Like](#)



**Jeff Dening** hehe while we are broad brushing... Conservatives tend to have a very all-or-nothing mentality which blinds them to real world consequences of their decisions. I cite the recent Norquist-brand governors who refused (certain) federal money for their states under the guise of opposing "big government". Without that federal money they were able cry poverty to enact draconian policies costing hundreds of thousands of jobs in the public sector. These unemployed are no longer contributing to the state treasury through income taxes, nor are they fueling the consumer driven economy. The downward economic cycle continues. The result is skilled labor and people with advanced degrees standing in line for a job at walmart for \$8/hr.

Wait...maybe they are exactly what they intended...

Tuesday at 11:46am · [Like](#)



**Ron Kobayashi** So many things that people take for granted these days, were actually started by Liberals who wanted to change the status quo: from women's rights; to racial civil rights; to 8 hour work days and overtime pay; to public education where every boy and girl could be educated without having to be rich to pay for it; to public police and fire services paid for with tax dollars so not only those who could afford it, got the protection; to social security and medicare for our seniors...these are all things we all take for granted today and use. But we wouldn't have it if Liberals didn't fight for it.

Tuesday at 11:46am · [Like](#) · 1



**Ian Ellison** How does one get equal justice, by creating unequal laws?

Tuesday at 11:46am · [Like](#)



**Jeff Dening** <raise hand> I am a liberal who has been wrong. There. Now remove that cliché from your rolodex :)

Tuesday at 11:47am · [Like](#)



**Jeff Dening** Please provide and example of "unequal laws" and we can examine

Tuesday at 11:49am · [Like](#)



**Ron Kobayashi** Ian, did you receive your education through public primary education, community colleges or state universities? Have you used public police or fire services? Have you driven on public built roads and bridges? Do your parents receive social security or medicare? If you have, thank Liberals...

Tuesday at 11:50am · [Like](#) · 2



**Ian Ellison** Just a "for instance"... hate crimes. if a group of black teens beat the tar out of a white person, someone "might" get arrested for aggravated assault. If a group of white teens beat the tar out of a black person, they will be convicted of a hate crime, and receive a far worse sentence. However, aren't both aggravated assault? And shouldn't both carry the same sentence?

Tuesday at 11:51am · [Like](#)

People To Subscribe To

What's This?



**Ann-Marie Murrell**

Politichicks.tv, Conservative columnist/reporter at Writer/Video Producer

17,460 subscribers

[Subscribe](#)

Recommended Pages

See All



**Star Trek II: The Wrath of Khan**

Jeff Janssen likes this.

[Like](#)



**Dropkick Murphys**

Jeff Janssen and 6 other friends like this.

[Like](#)

Sponsored

Create an Ad

**Gout Study**



We're looking for people suffering Gout Attacks. To take part in a research study which is enrolling now.

[Like](#) · 43,879 people like this.

**Download a Free Audiobook**  
audible.com



Download the NEW RICHARD MARCINKO audiobook free with a 14-day trial. Listen on your iPod or smartphone. Choose from 100,000 titles.

**TARDIS License Frame**



\$8.99. MY OTHER CAR IS A TARDIS! This standard-size license plate frame will compliment any vehicle!

6,135 people like Entertainment Earth, Inc. · [Like](#)

**Duck Dynasty on A&E**



Money. Family. Ducks. Watch the Robertson Family this Wednesday on A&E.

[Like](#) · Julia Wilson likes this.

**Ballistic Fabrication**





Manufacturers of precision off-road fabrication parts - 100% made in the USA

[Like](#) · Travis W. Proudft likes this.


Facebook © 2012

[English \(US\)](#) · [Privacy](#) · [Terms](#) · [More](#)


 **Ian Ellison** I've also never met a liberal who didn't think they were to thank for all that is good in the world. ;) )  
Tuesday at 11:52am · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian, can you answer my question above? Also, your example of a Black person beating up a White person is totally nonsensical. Here's why: If it can be proven that the Black person beat up the White person for racial reasons, that Black person can be charged with a hate crime too. Any crime that has a racial component to it is a hate crime.  
Tuesday at 11:54am · [Like](#)


 **Ian Ellison** How can you prove intent? A liberal jedi mind trick?  
Tuesday at 11:54am · [Like](#)


 **Jeff Dening** You may be confusing the language of the law itself and the application of the law on a per case basis, and further, shoddy reporting or commentary on the law. The federal hate crime laws have very strict definitions of circumstances that must be met for them to be enacted. Very often prosecutors will explore the avenue of hate crimes in the grand jury and arraignment phase of a trial but not follow through on it if it is not perfectly clear.  
Tuesday at 11:55am · [Like](#)


 **Jeff Dening** These are not the white boys you are looking for  
Tuesday at 11:55am · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian, you don't mean to tell me that if a Ku Klux Klan member calls a Black person a derogatory name that proceeds to beat him to a pulp with a baseball bat...that isn't a hate crime? Is that ok with you?  
Tuesday at 11:56am · [Like](#)

 **Ron Kobayashi** If that's not intent, I don't know what is...  
Tuesday at 11:57am · [Like](#)

 **Ian Ellison** You are making an assumption. I asked you how you can PROVE intent.  
Tuesday at 11:57am · [Like](#)

 **Ron Kobayashi** Is that ok with you Ian?  
Tuesday at 11:57am · [Like](#)

 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian, you haven't answered any of my questions...  
Tuesday at 11:58am · [Like](#)

 **Matthew Singer** @Ron So what you saying is that liberals fight to get government to change things and conservatives fight to keep government from changing things.


Women had the right to work out side the home, it was just frowned upon. Government didn't need to do anything but get out of the way in the few states where there where laws about it. If they had just cleared the way it would have been a great example of equal protection.


Racial problems where caused again by government, the first holder of full slaves (not indentured servants) in America was a black man. Government decided that he had the right to keep the person who failed to complete their term of service. Later on it was government trying to make things up to people that caused the racial strife that caused jim crow laws and segregation. When you try and force together people who don't like each other you end up causing more problems. Equal protection can't be maintained when you make one group special over the other.


Why is it the governments job to help you negotiate your employment contract? You don't need overtime pay, you don't need vacations, you don't need work days to be limited to 8 hours by law. Negotiate for yourself and if you don't like what they want you to do, vote with your feet. As for child labor, having had a part time job since I was 8 and a full time since I was 12, we could use more kids who have some work ethic and you aren't born with it. Please cite for me where in the constitution the government has the authority to regulate private transactions?


Show me evidence of old people dieing in the street en mass. And cite for me the constitutional authority to plunder from one group to distribute to another group. Even Robin Hood only took back from the government what had been unjustly plundered from the populous.


Tuesday at 11:58am · [Like](#)


 **Ian Ellison** Ron, I've answered your questions I believe... most of what you have said are statements, or rhetorical questions. No, I will not entertain rhetoric. I'm still waiting for you to explain how you can prove intent? You haven't made it though "unequal law" #1 yet...  
Tuesday at 12:00pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Matthew no. Read what I said! I said the conservative status quo in society was to keep women at home in the kitchen and not in the workplace. It is Liberals who faught the traditions of society and allowed women to work outside of the home. Nothing to do with government.  
Tuesday at 12:00pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian. Scroll up. I asked you if you have used any of those government services you so despise?  
Tuesday at 12:01pm · [Like](#)


 **Ian Ellison** I'm trying to remember where I said I despised paying taxes for roads or schools?  
Tuesday at 12:02pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Matthew: In terms of racial equality it was Southern conservative governments that kept segregation...it was the FEDERAL government that intervned and desegregated the South.  
Tuesday at 12:02pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian, you say you dislike big government, yet you use big government all the time.  
Tuesday at 12:03pm · [Like](#)

 **Ian Ellison** Yes, I don't like big government. We don't need "Big Government" to maintain schools and roads Ron. You are making many, many, assumptions.  
Tuesday at 12:04pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** If you drive on public highways, use police and fire services, go to public schools, use social security or medicare, use FDIC insurance on your bank accounts, eat at restaurants that are protected by government health inspectors...etc.  
Tuesday at 12:04pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** YOU use government programs...  
Tuesday at 12:05pm · [Like](#)


 **Ian Ellison** Ron, you have completely sidestepped "the point". Pat yourself on the back, you've saved the planet. Peace.  
Tuesday at 12:05pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian, what do you think is one of the biggest budget items for any government? Education, infrastructure (roads and bridges), Social Security, Medicare. Those are all big government items.  
Tuesday at 12:06pm · [Like](#)


 **Ian Ellison** I never said I supported the Federal Dept of Education. You think highway management is a "big


 ticket" item? Lord have mercy...  
Tuesday at 12:06pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian is a bit inconsistent, I must say...rails against big government, but uses a ton of it himself...  
Tuesday at 12:06pm · [Like](#)


 **Jeff Janssen** ...and all are issues that should be dealt with locally.  
Tuesday at 12:06pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Ian, do your parents receive social security or medicare?  
Tuesday at 12:07pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Or were they veterans? Do they go to the VA hospital?  
Tuesday at 12:07pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** All government programs...  
Tuesday at 12:07pm · [Like](#)


 **Ian Ellison** by your logic Ron, if X is good, and X is a government program, then ALL government programs are good. Thats really all I hear you saying. Have a great day :)  
Tuesday at 12:09pm · [Like](#)


 **Jeff Dening** As a liberal I would like to take full credit for the existence of rainbows and pictures of sleeping baby animals  
Tuesday at 12:12pm · [Like](#)


 **Matthew Singer** Ron you must be using a different definition than I am. Conservatives read the Constitution (state or federal) for what it says. Liberals read the Constitution for what they can make it say.  
Tuesday at 12:12pm · [Like](#)


 **David Steele** Yes, because something in the past changed, it \*must\* have been liberals that caused the change. Very convenient for liberalism..they get to claim every single advance in human history.  
Tuesday at 12:13pm · [Like](#)


 **David Steele** ...and then use the "evidence" that they were responsible for all good changes to "prove" that whatever harebrained scheme they are currently proposing must also be good, because they, liberals, the source of all positive progress in human history, are proposing it.  
Tuesday at 12:15pm · [Like](#)


 **Jeff Dening** OMG everyone get your heads out of your collective partisan butts and look at how big of a brush you are using. This is the root of the problems with discourse. TRY to embrace some semblance of nuance and specificity  
Tuesday at 12:16pm · [Like](#) · [❤️](#) 1


 **Ron Kobayashi** David... just going by the Websters definition of Liberalism and Conservatism. Liberalism is changing the status quo. Conservatism is keeping the status quo.  
Tuesday at 12:18pm · [Like](#)


 **Ian Ellison** LOL, Jeff Dening, who is using the broad brush? "Thank a Liberal for everything that is good". LMAO  
Tuesday at 12:18pm · [Like](#)


 **David Steele** So when Social Security crashes and burns and someone has to completely revamp the system to save it from the ruinous catastrophe that it is...you'll give liberals the credit, right? Via Webster's.  
Tuesday at 12:19pm · [Like](#)


 **Jeff Dening** Well, yes for rainbows and fuzzy critters of course--I was specific (I believe the thank a liberal comment came from someone else?)  
Tuesday at 12:19pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** No one can deny that Liberals fought for women's rights, civil rights and workers rights when at that time, conservatives fought to keep the status quo. My point is if we kept the conservative status quo at that time...we would have women unable to be in the workplace, we'd have segregated lunch counters and we'd have child labor, no overtime pay and 20 hour work days. Liberals brought about the change we now benefit from...  
Tuesday at 12:20pm · [Like](#)


 **Matthew Singer** @Jeff Dening who's being partisan. Liberal, Conservative, and Progressive exist in all parties.  
Tuesday at 12:21pm · [Like](#)

 **Ian Ellison** and don't forget us libertarians ;) )  
Tuesday at 12:21pm · [Like](#)


 **Ron Kobayashi** Nice conversation everyone...have a great day!  
Tuesday at 12:21pm · [Like](#)

 **David Steele** I would argue that a capitalist would demand rights for every individual, whether they are man, woman, or child, so that each is free to dispose of his or her labor as he sees fit. Without individual rights there can be no capitalism, yet most liberals decry capitalism as unfair to the masses.  
Tuesday at 12:22pm · [Like](#) · [❤️](#) 1

 **Matthew Singer** That's because they believe in central planning. And since they are always the smartest person in they room, they are going to be the planner, the chief, not an Indian. Socialism is for the people, not the socialist.  
Tuesday at 12:23pm · [Like](#) · [❤️](#) 1


 **Jeff Dening** Ron you have to carefully choose how to address large topics in such a crowd. You say "child labor" and we think of 7 yr old miners and kids working in textile mills where those who support it as ok likely think farm labor or paper routes.  
Tuesday at 12:24pm · [Like](#)

 **Bob Ogren** Jeff certainly opened a warm juicy can of worms with this one....  
Tuesday at 12:25pm · [Like](#) · [❤️](#) 2

 **Jeff Dening** Lots of "they are" "they do" "they think" which drives me nuts. Tell me what you think without assuming what I think. If i have to chase people around trying to correct their errors about me then I don't have energy or interest left to learn about them.

Just because someone read The Fountainhead and found the character of Ellsworth Twohey (sp?) to be a believable villain doesn't make them an authority on the "hidden" goals of socially minded liberals. (for the Rand readers--liberals generally find the diabolical socialist characters in her books to be very humorous in a Monty Python satirical sort of way)

Tuesday at 12:36pm · [Like](#)

 **Ian Ellison** lol, Atlas Shrugged should be prepended with "The following is based on true events. The names and places have been changed for privacy reasons".  
Tuesday at 12:51pm · [Like](#)



**David Steele** Of course, as a raving liberal (according to Webster's) I am in 100% in favor of changing the status quo and will therefore be voting for whoever is running against the current President. I'm sure all my liberal friends will join me for CHANGE, HOPE, and any other one-word slogan we liberals embrace.

Tuesday at 12:53pm · Like



**Matthew Singer** Now who's assuming. My arguments are based on Heyek, not Rand. Although Rand did make some good points she isn't my favorite author in the economics area.

But one thing she did get right is the idea that leads to this bumper sticker slogan; Liberalism, ideas so good they have to be mandatory.

Tuesday at 1:03pm · Like



**Jeff Janssen** Wow... I go off to exercise, and the thread explodes! I'll get back to this later; I'm still working out.

Tuesday at 1:03pm · Like



**Jeff Janssen** Don't let it turn into an anti-lib hate-fest.

Tuesday at 1:04pm · Like



**Jeff Dening** Matt--assuming the presence of an assumption? Although you did have clumsy use of "they are always", that sentiment has abounded in this run on thread (perhaps your sarcasm font was broken--mine frequently is). Your assumption that I may have been referring to you in that regard was partially correct, but I put a clear separation before adding my obliquely related Rand commentary.

Tuesday at 1:16pm · Like



**Jeff Dening** And remember--if you like rainbows or fuzzy critters you could be a little bit liberal.

Or as Sean Hannity says about those who enjoy rainbows and fuzzy critters, "Why do you hate America?"

Tuesday at 1:18pm · Like



**Matthew Singer** But lets not forget that another fox host, Greg Gutfeld (my personal favorite), loves rainbows and unicorns. LOL

I can assume to assume that assuming is the assumption to assume. :P I didn't assume it was a personal attack, but I was the one talking about that type of topic so I ran with it. I'm not hatin'

Tuesday at 1:32pm · Like



**Ian Ellison** the problem with both liberals and conservatives, especially of the more partisan nature, is that they generally speaking, only want to discuss the failures of the other, and will protect the failures of their own at all cost. There are so many bad laws in this country that need to be rolled back and eliminated, but instead, in order to not admit how bad the laws were, they will always try and patch it with more bad legislation. after it goes on for enough time, we get where we are today... entrenched in a system where neither "big party" can put a candidate in front of the people that they really "want", and are really only concerned about the marketing efforts for "winning the game". Its all about who wins the ability to reward their donors.

Tuesday at 1:38pm · Like · 1



**Jackie Britton Lopatin** Wow, Jeff, this thread really DID explode! I've been busy getting Lenny ready to head off for Spain and so have missed all the fun!

The topic is the concept of compromising between "liberals" who want something to change, and "conservatives" who are reluctant to change. This reminds me of a story...(have I mentioned I'm a storyteller?)

Apparently, fairly soon after the State of Israel was founded post-WWII, different groups of immigrating Jews organized themselves into kibbutz's. When someone had a good idea or wanted to introduce something new (like a television set) into one particular kibbutz, the group would talk it over and as usual there would be people in favor of trying the new idea and others who would just as heatedly argue against it, oftentimes getting so worked up about it that they would declare "This will destroy the kibbutz!" But, finally, all or a portion of the idea would get tried or the new product introduced, and lo and behold, the kibbutz was not destroyed, and some people would even wonder later what all the big fuss was about. Those ideas which didn't work so well died a natural death and other things turned out to be a boon to the whole work force. The main thing is that sometimes you don't know if something will work if you don't give it a try.

Someone earlier in this thread was screaming that Social Security is failing...well, if you notice the biggest compromise between the people who insisted that everyone had to contribute toward this "keep our elderly from starving to death in the gutters" fund (remember, it was never intended to be a total pension plan) was that \$90,000 cap. If you take that cap off (remember when most people couldn't even dream of making \$90,000 a year?), then all of a sudden SS is in no danger of running short, even with the baby boomers reaching retirement age as we are now.

I honestly, really and truly believe that Universal Health care is a necessary and vital step forward. You can't say that we don't currently have a national health care plan...it's just such a patchwork system right now. You could say that Medicaid, Medicare and the Veterans' Administration are the weft on the national loom, needing one last string to be the warp to weave it all together into a program that doesn't require means testing (how much money is absolutely wasted each year judging each person who asks for and needs help, and how many people hold off on less expensive preventative care because they think they can't afford it?) and simply helps those who ask for help because one way or another they've both paid into the system and will be more able to pay into the system in the future if they're helped back onto their feet right now, in the most cost-effective way possible.

"Conservatives" keep screaming about all the money being spent...how much could be saved if something is done right the first time? Is it better to have a highway cost more at the construction end or is it better to "save" money by doing it on the cheap and then have to spend money every single year thereafter fixing pot holes? Is it better to pay for a Head Start program or build another prison?

Tuesday at 5:58pm · Like



**Jackie Britton Lopatin** <<There are so many bad laws in this country that need to be rolled back and eliminated>> I agree, Ian. Getting people to agree on what doesn't work and what should be eliminated...now there's the trick!

Tuesday at 6:01pm · Like



**Jackie Britton Lopatin** What gets me about this whole topic of conservatives vs liberals and the Social Security/Medicare administrations is that you could easily argue for it from a conservative viewpoint as well; the conversation going rather like this:

"What? How dare you want to both work in America but evade paying into the Social Security and Medicare Insurance systems! Do you expect all the rest of us hard-working, law-abiding Americans to pay for your medical treatment when you're laid up and can't work? Do you expect us to take care of your children if you should die before they graduate from high school? You want to work in America and have the benefits of driving on taxpayer funded roads but you don't think you need a driver's license or need to pay regular taxes like everyone else? Who the hell do you think you are? Even if you're planning to never collect on your Social Security benefits, if you're working here, that's part of the whole package, and you'll be covered if something DOES happen. It's not only for YOUR protection, but for all the rest of us, too!"

Yesterday at 6:14am · Like



**Jeff Dening** Haha Jackie you fell into the trap of a liberal assuming to know how the conservative mind works just as so many conservatives in this thread were assuming how the liberal mind works. It is easy to do. I often ask my conservative friends if they care anything for the common good and they respond by asking me why I want to give away everything. It is a circular argument with no end other than trying to appreciate and empathize with how the opposing view thinks.

Yesterday at 8:06am · Like



**Jeff Janssen** The problem there is in defining "the common good." Just like the term you used early on - "equal justice" (which I would argue is a related issue), mistaken assumptions about the definitions can lead to a breakdown in communication.

For instance, "equal justice" to my way of thinking includes the necessity to own your mistakes and their negative consequences, while my assumption is that to the liberal mind, only the beneficial aspects are considered. It's that need to own your mistakes that I see the liberal ideology trying to circumvent.

In the term "equal justice," I emphasize "justice," while I assume that you emphasize "equal." I think it is in the interests of the "common good" for people to be aware of the fact that there can be long-ranging negative consequences to their decisions.

Yesterday at 8:37am · [Like](#)



**Bob Webb** I sit here in the for once, sunny uk and think..

There is always change. There will at least be new context even if the circumstances have not much changed. Conservatism relies on repeating past methods and mechanisms that have been proven to work, which is relevant, however only in suited circumstances.

Liberalism relies on some ability to predict the future and mankind has not been very successful at divining this.

What I don't much like though is that both the us and european economies are known to be based on flawed principles and yet if we wait around they will start working reliably again for some abstruse reason. We also know that the competition for oil reserves is now completely altered now china and similar eastern nations have many established technologies and manufacturing. We should also have learned by now that stamping around expecting to control and police other nations is going to bring hatred and not completely unjustified terrorism in reply.

Inside the scope of these unrealistic unquestionable policies we now debate the values of do we try the same again or do something a little different.

The presidential candidate Ron Paul points to these things but people do not like him because he is telling us where the real problems are, and we really have got some major issues to resolve, and not in other parts of the world.

Yesterday at 9:30am · [Like](#)



**Jeff Dening** I put equal emphasis on both words in the phrase--without one the other is lessened. Your point about responsibility for "mistakes" could be valid if it were to apply across the spectrum. The problem is with the people who are driving the "conservative" agenda (call them what you will). Their mode of operation for 30+ years has been to privatize the profits and to socialize the losses.

As far as the common good, it comes down to how you evaluate a society. Here is another stark difference between liberals and conservatives. Many on the left view the functioning of a healthy society to be like a team effort, where many on the right view society simply as the arena for their own personal foot race. If you follow the conservative analogy of a personal competition then if someone trips they need to get up on their own and get back in the game on their own etc. With the "all in it together" liberal mind set we try to help the fallen team member up, admittedly, sometimes to the supposed detriment of the faster/stronger/whatever members of the team. (as with any analogy you can shoot all sorts of holes in it but this one seems to encapsulate the viewpoints for me)

Obviously there when you offer societal help to those who have tripped along the way there is the lead a horse to water cliché that applies. There will always be those who, despite your best efforts to provide a good foundation so they can pick themselves up, will take advantage of or spurn such offerings. On the other hand if you expect the horse to find water on its own but keep it in a confined area it will not be a good outcome either.

Yesterday at 9:31am · [Like](#)



**Jeff Janssen** IIRC, there are just as many "rich" people on the other side of the aisle. ;-)

We have enabled an entire sub-culture of horses that refuse to drink unless you open their mouths and put it there. The liberal solution appears to be accept that situation, and to pour in more water from a limited source, while the conservative solution is to create a larger source and then incentivise the horse to go there.

As long as business are strangled by regulations, "fees," and taxes, and investors are spooked by the uncertainties of changing financial rules and penalties, that pool will remain stagnant. That's where the whole "common good" thing comes in. The left doesn't want the wealthy to make money, but they want the taxes that such income will generate. It seems to me to be counter-productive to the common good for them to take such a stance. The more profit you take, the less incentive there is to make profit. That's why there is some much money being held close to the vest right now.

Yesterday at 9:52am · [Like](#)



**Bob Webb** No Jeff, the reason that money is withheld from investment currently is that there would only be minimal return on the investment and there is a high risk of failure even in the very viable businesses in the current economic scenario. Whilst I agree that it may be possible to kickstart the original western economy it will be back in the same situation again very soon. There ARE changes in other parts of the world. The banking idiots have also wasted the capital reserves that could have been used to restructure things ..because they are idiots.; excellent example of where conservatism breaks down when methods are used just because they did in previous decades.

Yesterday at 10:14am · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** @Jeff Dening You are right that for too long people in both parties got away with corporate protectionism and it needs to stop. It's not healthy for the economy (solyndra) nor does it breed a culture of trust.

One flaw in your argument about the racers is that conservatives want the other racers to choose to stop and give the fallen racer a hand back up of their own free will. Progressives want there to be an off side official who stops the race and then takes time off of the other racers laps for the fallen racer to make up for the time he was on the ground.

@Bob Webb It's not conservatives that run those banks. Most of if not all of them are students that came from liberal colleges and subscribe to the London school of economics. There Fabian Socialist ideas and beliefs lead them to partner with government to keep out competition and to save themselves.

Yesterday at 10:20am · [Like](#)



**Bob Webb** Nooooo Jeff.. their job remit was to show a return on investment. AFTER they fucked up they ran for self-interested cover. They were able to show a return before and continued to use the same methods without evaluating the outcome. That is conservatism. In the same way if a liberal policy does not monitor and evaluate the outcome of the intended changes ..that is also (shorter term)conservatism in that ..'but it must work?!! O( '.

Yesterday at 10:42am · [Like](#)



**Bob Webb** My point here is that things need to be driven by information from outside situations and not based on perochial internal established conventions and traditional policies.

Yesterday at 10:47am · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** Bob, you seem to be confusing conservative business practices with conservative governance. Both of which are exclusive and have very little to do with what those big companies did. Now if you wanted to debate them dealing with mandates placed upon them by government (toxic home loans) then we would have an issue.

Yesterday at 10:53am · [Like](#)



**Bob Webb** Matthew, if you read my initial post on this thread you may well find that this is not the case. The other two are there in an attempt to open up the themes at the time in the discussion thread.

Yesterday at 11:13am · Like



**Matthew Singer** Bob I hear a lot of what you are saying but I don't fall for the "it's our fault" line. There is nothing new from liberalism. All of their tricks have been talked about since before Plato wrote The Republic.

The fact is that humanity can never be perfected, that's why socialism, communism, fascism, democracy are all prone to failure as governing techniques.

Yesterday at 11:21am · Like



**Bob Webb** Matthew, we did however create and have sustained our political systems and thus each carry personal responsibility. We are also very happy to benefit from a flawed economic system when it suits our purposes.

There is an arrogance in the west that we know better than elsewhere and thus can impose military might at our political discretion. Well then, we can't sort out Darfur or Congo, but we know how to promote our interests in Libya at short notice.

The gulf war from an Arabic perspectives occurred because Saddam Hussein came from a minority tribe and wanted the population of Kuwait to give a majority to his ethnic clan; the guy was an ally of the us for most of his life. Looked like incoming democratic elections then. The west fought for oil because the next target could well have been Saudi as the Arabic nations do not like their interpretation of Islam.

Interesting what you find when you have freinds who have worked in international diplomacy.

Yesterday at 12:16pm · Like



**Jeff Dening** That is the problem I see with the modern breed of "conservatives". They seem to treat a presumed altruistic nature of people as a constant.

The trite drone about regulations hampering businesses is a load of bunk. Yes there are some stupid regulations, but most of them are there for a reason. The rights of corporations are not enshrined in the constitution. Corporate taxation encourages reinvestment into the economy rather than squirreling away the cash in dubious tax havens. Funny how the "stop printing money" crowd doesn't seem to have a problem with the economy sucking a dry well with help from the percentage of our GDP sitting off shore doing nothing for the society that made it possible.

Give me a freaking break with solyndra. How quickly we forget George Bush's "Under our proposal the Federal Government will put up to \$700 billion tax payer dollars on the line..." and Hank Paulson's one page proposal to congress that said no you have no oversight and no we do not have to tell you where the money is going-- basically just trust us. I believe the much maligned government auto loans have been paid back with interest but not a dime yet from AIG.

Thanks for the commentary on my analogies. As I said, holes can be poked in any analogy. I only wish there was more effort from those on the right to correct any of my possible misperceptions of the conservative side of the analogy than once again trying to assume to know how things are on the left.

Yesterday at 12:28pm · Like



**Josh Jones** No doubt regulations are there for "a reason" as someone sees it. The argument against them isn't whether there is a reason behind them, the argument against them is whether they are necessary, economically feasible, and in any way fulfilling their stated purpose.

The auto company taxpayer debt interest has been paid off... with taxpayer-dollar-infused equity interest. In other words, they put our money into one kitty in order to pay it off from the other kitty. We still have billions of dollars tied up in the auto industry that we'll likely never see again.

And last I checked TARP was a very bipartisan measure. Goldman Sachs still loves Democrats.

Yesterday at 3:27pm · Like



**Matthew Singer** @Bob Webb Real capitalists don't feel right about the system. Corporatists and others of the like that love government in their business do favor the system we have. A system brought to you by...liberals. Or who was it that controlled congress for 40 years?

Now we are arguing international politics? Because I seem to recall that it was the British that caused most of those problems when they divided up the middle east.

@Jeff Dening What is modern about the thought that was are altruistic. The American person has been the most giving and generous person in the history of the world. We give less government aid as a percent of GDP than some countries but we give way more personal charity than any other nation.

If you think that corporations are are going to repatriate funds to be double taxed on them, you are just wrong. There is no reason under the current tax code to bring them back. Change that and we have something to talk about.

Did I say I was for either of the bailouts? Nope, the market is a harsh mistress when you mistreat your capital. GM managed to pay back 6.7 billion of the \$52 billion we invested. By only calling 6.7 a loan, it was easier to pay back from the slush fund that was set up with part of the other money. The government still owns 60%+ of GM.

<http://money.cnn.com/news/storysupplement/economy/bailouttracker/index.html>



**Follow the money: Bailout tracker - CNNMoney.com**

money.cnn.com

CNNMoney.com's bailout tracker keeps tabs on the government's far-reaching - and expensive - effort to rescue the economy.

Yesterday at 4:17pm · Like · 1 · Remove Preview



**Matthew Singer** Oh and I'm still looking for any one who can provide me with the social contract and a text book on how to do math with feelings.

Yesterday at 4:21pm · Like



**Jeff Dening** Re: regulations & necessary/economically feasible

For whom? I grew up not far from Love Canal and remember well the fluorescent green and orange mud on the river banks and two headed turtles from the unregulated chemical dumping into the Niagara watershed. My area is also flanked by the #2 and #7 dirtiest coal fired power plants in the country. The power plant problem has been a local health issue in the Buffalo area for decades despite "over-regulation". Lobbyists and corporate lawyers find loopholes and end-arounds on the rules--their favorite on this is looking at air quality on a national level and playing the average game.

Without knowing more more specifics of what you mean I will simply state that I put the physical health of human beings over the economic inconvenience of a business any day of the week. I have been impacted by regulation changes directly. I work in an industry where long-use chemicals could have been purchased pre-regulation and now that the 10-15-20 yr old chemicals need to be changed it costs thousands of dollars for the disposal. They found that these chemicals (aside from being carcinogenic to the technicians) cannot be removed through municipal water treatment plants and are a major problem with ground water. It's the rules of the road. Suck it up, deal with it, and stop carrying the water for the poor whiny corporations.

Yesterday at 4:30pm · Like · 1



**Jeff Dening** Matt--as in "A^2 + B^2 = C^2 -- No! Once more with feeling!" ?

Yesterday at 4:31pm · Like



**Jeff Dening** The double taxation line is a bunch of bunk too. Most of these multinational companies have mechanisms set up where the "division" that handles an actual transaction is already off shore. They avoided the

vast majority of tax up front so any repatriation taxes (at a whopping 5-10%?) would be a gift. It's a big shell game and far too many americans are happy to plunk another buck on the table just to watch the cups slide around and continue to lose.

Yesterday at 4:46pm · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** Who's carrying water for corporations. Having been grossly affected by do gooders many times in my short life, I can carry my own water. Your own examples prove my point about corporatism and the threat it poses to people. No one wins when the government picks winners and losers.

Government should be in the business of maintaining environmental regulations. But it should not be in the business of faking spotted owl reports (know people who did), spraying agent orange on the forests (know people who did), taking water from farmers in favor of non-native fish (Kallamath basin / Central Valley), writing regs that no one can follow and are based on 'science' from people who have never even been in the field.

And no, I mean math that says that person A has a need that person B feels bad about so they get person A and person B to make person C pay for person A's need.

Yesterday at 4:46pm · [Like](#) · [1](#)



**Matthew Singer** Repatriated funds that where already taxed in the country they where made in are taxed at 35% when brought back

Yesterday at 4:52pm · [Like](#)



**Jeff Dening** Yes and corporations making more than a million are getting taxed at 34% when they file their quarterly or annual return, right? Wishful thinking.

I won't be an apologist for any people doing illegal or unethical things (like the spotted owl hoax--hope you reported them) but when dealing with the "necessity" of regulations one has to examine what sort of circumstances led to the ultimate point of contention and what the perceived problem actually is.

Stick with the owl for a moment for an easy example. First, who is directly effected? Most likely the lumber companies and those who are employed by them (we'll leave real estate out for simplicity) There are real people whose livelihoods depend on the success of the company. Stupid Owl ruining people's lives.

But wait--how does the timber industry operate? They are dealing with a finite commodity and they know about the endangered species act and how destructive their operation is to habitat. So obviously, someone whipped out a slide rule and did some risk assessment. They factored in where the profitable areas are, timelines for harvesting, timelines for any court injunctions, additional labor required to harvest the timber, and of course sent their sales force out to sell the timber they have not harvested yet. So local workers who had few other options were hired, mills were built, etc etc etc all on the idea that they could get this timber fast and easy. In short they saw an opportunity and committed themselves on a gamble that they wouldn't run into an endangered species. And for whatever reason, there was enough evidence of an owl in residence (it takes far more than one report) to halt production.

The company owners have all the revenue from preorders of lumber but no lumber. They decide to declare bankruptcy which allows them to keep the revenue present and keep operating but also allows them to cut all the of the worker's salaries by 40% and run the mills on a skeleton crew.

So who is really to blame here in this fictional situation? People have lost their jobs or had pay cut severely. Livelihoods are at stake. Is it the fault of the draconian regulation or the overzealous business practices? I contest the made-up logging company made a mistake, which was probably a small mistake in the broad scheme of the company but a huge problem for the workers of that company. Following conservative thinking the company should pull itself up by its bootstraps and all will be right with the world. The market will provide.

Unfortunately the way these things usually go is the owners sell the company and walk away with \$6.5M and another \$15M in stock options in the purchased company and the lowly workers are left holding the bag when the new owners decide the area is indeed too environmentally sensitive and pack up operation altogether, moving to greener forests 400 miles away.

Stupid Owl.

Yesterday at 5:46pm · [Like](#) · [1](#)



**Matthew Singer** First off is the science on the owl right? The government says that owls need to be protected because they are dieing because they live in old growth. Owls don't live in old growth, they live in second growth near their food source. So why are we protecting them again? Oh yeah, cause it's some groups agenda.

Now since we have more acres of trees growing (thanks to private companies and that awful profit motive) you would think we wouldn't have these arguments about timber being a finite resource but we do because apparently to some people trees don't regrow. No industry seeks to put itself out of work so why would they just cut the last tree down?

Since the number of mills would naturally decrease with automation and advances in processing, you can't blame all job losses just on the boogy man at the top trying to strangle the life out of the poor hard working man at the bottom.

But your solution is correct, the company if run as badly as the you made up should go bankrupt, be allowed to reorganize or fold. Same thing that should have happened to the auto companies and the banks. If you don't let things work themselves out all you do is shift the burden.

Yesterday at 6:06pm · [Like](#)



**Jeff Dening** good comments. thanks for sticking to the points :)

I think the situation with the owl is a little more complex than just some group's agenda but we'll leave it as it is.

Yesterday at 6:17pm · [Like](#) · [1](#)



**Matthew Singer** Good enough. :)

Yesterday at 6:19pm · [Like](#) · [1](#)



**Joe Butkevicius** Jeff (Janssen), after reading through all this, I think all of this discussion is deeply moot because I do not agree with your premise. We have neither true Conservatives nor true Liberals. What we have are people pushing a socialist agenda and another group simply saying no. Liberal and Conservative monikers have been devalued to no meaning and are now simply a means of indentifying with either side. Politics unfortunately has become irrational on both sides and its battles are waged on agenda that have no bearing on liberal or conservative values as opposed to agenda driven processes which is about all that has been discussed here.

It is a fallacy to propose that conservatives are merely for preservation and liberals for change. This discussion is only a commentary (and perhaps a good example ) of the current irrational state of affairs of both sides which will result in nothing except division (and division itself will be used as a tool by either side to further foster an irrational agenda on either side.) As a result you have a battle for opinions and a people aligning themselves with agendas rather than principles. When we can return to rationality on principles that define them then we might have a chance. Of course, rationality is gone and without rationality how can one actually discern principles???? The problem we face is much larger than I think anyone suspects. Unless rationality can be restored, you will continue to merely have agenda based arguments outside of any discussion of rational principles.

Yesterday at 7:08pm · [Like](#) · [3](#)



**Bob Webb** Matthew - My intention initially was to raise things from the context of international policy and trade, the reason being that if there are not sane and relevant steps made to establish a workable economy in the world as it currently is, then the entire us and much of developed europe is going to financially collapse. The us needs overseas currency and they have to trade to get this. They have two things of significance to trade,

easily mined minerals (from open cast mining, and this is what is currently propping up the economy) and some areas of cutting edge technology and manufacturing, the most lucrative and significant of which is the military aerospace industry. We in the UK have a similar situation with oil and gas reserves to sell and a similarly focussed aerospace industry that too has no substantial orders.

Thus we go treading around in other parts of the world where there is wealth, producing destabilisation and hostilities so folk want to buy our 'goodies'. Not ethically sound and what is happening is kept hidden from the populace with contrived justifications for interference.

I have some agreement with Jeff. Industry and manufacturing are not the main beneficiaries of the income they bring. It is milked out by speculative sharetrading and when times get tough the shareholders dump them, rather than supporting by suited reinvestment.

Another problem for manufacturing is that inflated share values require them to produce an income to shareholders in proportion. They are forced to expand or contract by imaginary parameters and not by any practical realism.

The other aspect I wished to raise was that the principles of conservatism imply only making change in circumstances when things have changed and only then if it appears essential. The principles behind liberalism are to predict what will happen and to design changes accordingly. As a dynamicist and control theoretician then the liberal approach is the one that could work best. You have to understand what is happening well though and design carefully.

As a result of the problems of designing good predictive control a more recent approach has been to design robust systems. These perform well even when outside influences substantially change. These are the type of systems that we should put into place in government.

What I presently see though is that both conservative and liberal policies are being irrationally conservative. They are ignoring the fundamental problem of resolving and redesigning the economy and approaching the fundamental issue behind their national security. It is far easier just to distract people to the detail and minutiae of national affairs.

I totally agree, British history has little to be proud of. You will find some of my closest friends on my fb list and all bridge or have lived in at least two world cultures.

20 hours ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** What is a more sane an workable economy? Because last time I checked there where only a few systems, Capitalism, Corporatism (crony capitalism), State Capitalist (China), Fascist (state controlled private industry), Socialist, Communist.

There aren't a whole lot of those that I would like to live under. The engineer we work with left Hong Kong before it reverted to China and now goes back from time to time. He rails against what the state is doing to the country to make it look like they are doing a good job.

The only place more control leads is to tyranny. F.A. Hayek met this out in his seminal work "The road to serfdom" and even the much cited but never correctly John Maynard Keynes didn't call for massive redistribution of wealth.

So unless you are calling for a drastic drop in world population and a return to some kind of idyllic agrarian society what are you calling for?

13 hours ago · Like



**Bob Webb** The present system of western economy that had given us the privilege of better wealth than elsewhere is based around low cost energy/oil, cheap labour and manufacturing from overseas, endless unnecessary renewal, wastage of natural resourc...

[See More](#)

6 hours ago · Like



**Jeff Janssen** I just wanted to say that I am thoroughly enjoying this conversation. I think it's been very constructive for a political/economics debate. I'm not participating because I know when I've gotten in over my head, so I'm leaving it for the people who seem to know what they're talking about to continue the conversation. A big thanks to everyone that is participating. :-)

6 hours ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** You're perspective fails to take into account how jobs moved to those lower paying countries pull them up out of poverty. And please show me this waist in resources? I don't see us running out of anything, it just gets harder to get. I've seen the propaganda films about how mining ruins places, but I've also heard from the people there that are overjoyed to have work. It's again government stepping in and playing in the market that lets them get away with the occasional mess. Show me some numbers on this so I can have data, no your opinion to look at.

Oil from developing nations? I didn't know Canada was a developing nation. I'm sure they would like to know that too. Countries with oil and modern governments are all doing well. It's countries with backwards or cultures that aren't up to speed that have problems. Where are our stockpiles dwindling? In 1949 they said we had 20b barrels of oil in proven oil. We've pumped 6 times that much and we keep finding more. It's people who argue to stop production in places like North Dakota that shift consumption to places like Venezuela.

You say that there is no text book solution while arguing nothing new. You're entire argument is base on the same thought that brought about Plato's "Republic", More's "Utopia", and Hobbes' "Leviathan". The past it old and out of date so we must forget the past and move forward into a new perfect existence with none of the cultural or societal norms of the past. Every one will be equal and free and it will be so lovely.

Your personal experiences with individual Iranians aside, Iran is a country run by a group of people who believe that their way to bring heaven to earth is to cleans the world of those that don't agree. We would be much better off to put Israel in charge of the entire middle east, then people would be free to worship, conduct business, gays wouldn't be killed, women could drive, learn, work, and they wouldn't have a religious over government.

6 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** Conservative vs Liberal?? Every successful person in the world KNOWS that change is required to attain and maintain success. EVERY self help book will tell you that. Every business class will tell you that. Copmanies are only successful when they embrace change as the need arises. So where does a conservatist even come from? This is ONLY my opinion but with the change=success speech above why would ANYONE be a conservative at all? Well simply put it is a phenominon that only exists in a grumpy old mans house and politics. It exists in politics because basically you have a real smooth talker that bullshit his way into a job he doesn't know how to do. So the only thing he/she CAN do is fight for whats already been accomplished by someone that might now whats going on. If he wins he's done his best. If he loses then maybe we as a country make some progress and in a decade the bullshitters get to fight for the change that was made 10 years earlier. Apple never invented a single product. Ever. All they did was take something, change it and make it better.

4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** And I'm coming to the convo a little late but whoever said we don't need labor laws or child labor laws and that we should negotiate with our feet should move to China and let us all know how that works out for him. Fuckers are dying over ...

[See More](#)

4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** And one last thing sorry...but I'm not saying that ALL change is good. No way. But without it we wouldn't even have this country in the first place. Conservatives said we should line up and fire muskets at the English. That's a war we lost. We WON because someone said "That's a dumbass way to win a war" and changed the way we do business i.e. hiding behind cover and shit. Change got us here. Imagine where here would be if there wasn't a bunch of idiots crying "Why change at all!!!" We would rule the world.

4 hours ago · Like





**Matthew Singer** Wow, that's some genius. I've changed my mind. \*Snort\*  
4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** Lol was that a conservatist NOT changing his mind?  
4 hours ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** Nope, just not changing my mind based on weak sauce and non truths  
4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** Wow whats not true?  
4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** Nothing? That's kinda what I thought  
4 hours ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** Lets start at the beginning and I'll try and keep this brief.  
Comparing self help books to reality is like baking bread with no flour. Sure it can be done but is it really the thing you want to build a sammich on? Embracing change in the market has nothing to do with change in the nature of governance or the cultural Marxism that "social justice" entails. Change doesn't equal success, never has never will, unless you embrace the "social justice" tenant of equality of outcome. This is still only on a personal level.

Your point about apple is crap, and speaking of crap, not one person invented toilet either. So what's the point? Is it that you think innovation is something that happens in a vacuum?

Voting with your feet and moving to china is just stupid....unless you are looking to make money. I think you are thinking of other S.E. Asian countries when you are talking about them. Show me evidence of people dieing in china to make an Ipad? You defeat your own argument by saying people would work for less if it wasn't for labor laws. You don't have a right to a job. Your employment is optional to your employer or cite the constitution to prove other wise. I work at my boss' discretion and at the pay I negotiate for, I don't seem to be suffering.

Now we get to the real gem. The revolutionary war. None of your arguments have anything to do with being a liberal or a conservative. Or reality of combat...unless you count small groups of militia or rangers. The army lost engagements until we got foreign officers to train us to fight like the English. Not differently, like them. Then with funds, units, ships and the help of the french we where able to keep the English from resupplying their primary army. Our tactics did not turn into some Hollywood action movie at any point during the war.

Almost nothing you said here has anything to do with liberal vs. conservative. But it does have a lot of Marxist thought laced in it. Good work!

4 hours ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** should have waited for it like a good troll  
4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/07/apple-foxconn-scandal\\_n\\_1325930.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/03/07/apple-foxconn-scandal_n_1325930.html)  
4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** There is your china evidence... watch the effin news  
4 hours ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** Ummm...where are any of those deaths my fault? Or apple's for that matter? Third party supplier from Taiwan seem to be the one killing people. I would get mad at China if you are going to blame a government, and the corporation that's causing it, not apple who seems to be dealing with it pretty well since they don't own the company where this happened.  
4 hours ago · Like · 1



**Daniel Phillips** And as far as your other comments...the guerilla tactics used during the revolutionary war is mostly what allowed us to buy the time to accomplish all the things you mentioned. It is also the way our modern military is trained. You know, like, hide behind shit while you shoot. Its actually why we have a 2nd ammendment right to bear arms. For the purposes of forming a very untrained militia very quickly to hold shit down until the trained army shows up. And in case you don't keep up with current events (and it saounds like you don't) the National Guard has taken over those peticular duties. And to even IMPLY that even ONE successful company exists that hasn't changed the way they do business over the years to keep up or make themselves more successful as a COMPANY (not as an individual) means your probably VERY low on a totum pole. But as far as labor laws and your lack of suffering...yeah, cuz you have labor laws. Do you have medical insurance from your employer? You do? Oh good then your a full time employee and your employer is REQUIRED BY LAW to provide you with medical benefits. FYI...you only pay 25% of that. So if you spend 250 a month then your employer is spending 750...a month. Cuz the government says they have to. And if you think someone won't do your job minuse the insurance then you are blind to reality. If a dude with a MBA is applying at mdicks for 8 bucks an hour i'm sure he'd love to go work full time behind a desk for the same pay.  
4 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** So funny. "Voting with your feet and moving to china is just stupid....unless you are looking to make money. I think you are thinking of other S.E. Asian countries when you are talking about them. Show me evidence of people dieing in china to make an Ipad?" Now its "where are any of those deaths my fault? Or apple's for that matter? Third party supplier from Taiwan seem to be the one killing people." Yeah exactly. That's what it looks like in a country with no labor laws. That was my point. But somehow in some desperate attempt to defend whatever opinion you even have all you care about is we know its not your fault. It ain't about you dude! Its about the country you THINK you want to live in! There is the picture. THATS what you want?? C'mon get serious.  
3 hours ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** Why or how is any of your rant about health insurance that your job pays for any of the governments business? It's all well and good to want something but you don't need it nor, does want equal right there to. Where does some one have the right to demand that they get something? Nowhere that I can find. If you don't like what you are being payed, work for some one else. That's voting with your feet.

And no, that gorilla tactic stuff was what bought us time. Room to fall back was. What history book did you get this stuff from cause I would love to read it. Oh and sitting still in combat gets you killed.

The second ammendment was not added in for the use of militia. It was a guaranty that the people would not be disarmed and would have the ability to rise up against a tyrannical government. Please read some Madison.

Again you start with the idea that conservative means doesn't change, but conservative means slow to change, not no change. The system of governance we have here, this constitutional republic, allows for change, either through ammendment or for an article 5 convention. That's not a system that isn't meant to change, it's just not meant to change though statute or executive fiat.

Your point about counties with no labor laws should also be extended to include the fact that they are almost all socialist governments. Places where you have no option to work some place else or to move to a different state if you don't like something in this one, or speak out against an employer who is doing something wrong. These things are brought to you by choice and liberty, not government and control.

3 hours ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** You need to stop reading Madison and read the actual ammendment "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." It makes no mention of a tyrannical government. It is very specific about a militia which was later turned into the National Guard. That's fact. And if you don't need it and its soooo unfair and none of the government's business it only seems fair that you cancel your employer paid health insurance and find your own private insurance for about 1k a month and THEN you can cry foul about it. But since you love the free shit the

government gives you then waah stfu if your using it. And yes conservatives ARE slow to change. But how much slower would they be if Liberals weren't working so hard to make changes. My entire point about Labor Laws was in response to someone else (maybe you idk) that said we didn't need them and the government needed to stay out of them so I referenced an environment where they don't exist. But it don't count I guess cuz its in China? C'mon. People here can site positive influences that Liberals have impacted throughout this thread and NOT ONE person can site something positive a conservatist has done except slow down the liberals. Thats not progress. Thats not even helpful. Maybe the Liberals could invest more time making better more sensical changes if they didn't have to spend all their time fighting with the conservatives. But thats just MY opinion. I didn't get that out of a text book from my community college and treat it like information from the bible.

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** Dude, do you know who Madison is?

I don't have employer paid insurance and I'm not crying about it. So who's assuming?

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** And really, where are you getting this information cause I apparently have been missing out by going to original sources. I need to know.

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Jeff Janssen** Daniel, reading the arguments and discussions going on between the founding fathers concerning the proposed amendments before and after ratification might give you a greater understanding of what it was they were trying to accomplish with said amendments. Just sayin'. ;-)

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Daniel Phillips** Lol ok so on the piece of paper that has the constitution on it it says "It was a guaranty that the people would not be disarmed and would have the ability to rise up against a tyrannical government." Or anything close to that? No. Was it a concern for soon to be citizens? Yes. It was one of 6 concerns. So really it was a little over 16% of the reason for the amendment. @Jeff deterring tyrannical government; repelling invasion; suppressing insurrection; facilitating a natural right of self-defense; participating in law enforcement; enabling the people to organize a militia system.

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Daniel Phillips** The word militia is actually IN the amendment

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** Do know what the commas and the word "People" mean in the constitution?

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Daniel Phillips** Oh please educate me

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** Commas are used to separte clauses and thoughts. While the word people always refers to individuals, not the group known as the militia. Also when did the militia become the national guard? Because that would require an amendment since militias are state organizations and the army is federal.

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** oh and good job using wikipedia as a cite

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Daniel Phillips** National Guard units are and have always been assigned to states. The governor has the power to call on them and has done so on many occasions. Like The Texas National Guard, The California National Guard. There is one in every state. So anyway...what source do you have that told you the 2nd amendment has nothing to do with militia? Seriously

about an hour ago · [Like](#)



**Matthew Singer** The National Guard wasn't created until 1903. Mixing up modern militia term with what was meant by the founders in dangerous and just a way of re-branding terms rather than real debating.

"And that the said Constitution be never construed to authorize Congress to infringe the just liberty of the Press, or the rights of Conscience; or to prevent the people of the United States, who are peaceable citizens, from keeping their own arms;..." Philadelphia Independent Gazetteer, August 20, 1789 quoting Propositions submitted to the Convention of this State by the Honorable Samuel Adams, Esquire.

"The constitutions of most of our States assert that all power is inherent in the people; that... it is their right and duty to be at all times armed;..." Thomas Jefferson letter to Justice John Cartwright, June 5, 1824. 1824. ME 16:45.

"The congress of the United States possesses no power to regulate, or interfere with the domestic concerns, or police of any state: it belongs not to them to establish any rules respecting the rights of property; nor will the constitution permit any prohibition of arms to the people;..." Saint George Tucker, Blackstone's Commentaries (1803), Volume 1, Appendix, Note D [Section 13: Restraints on Powers of Congress con't]. Whole Book.

"A free people ought not only to be armed..." George Washington, speech of January 8, 1790 in the Boston Independent Chronicle, January 14, 1790. Complete text of the First Annual Message to Congress.

"To disarm the people [is] the best and most effectual way to enslave them ..." George Mason, 3 Elliot, Debates at 380 (June 14, 1788).

"Besides the advantage of being armed, which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation,... in the several kingdoms of Europe,... the governments are afraid to trust the people with arms." James Madison, The Federalist Papers # 46.

"They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house?" Patrick Henry, "Give Me Liberty Or Give Me Death" speech delivered on March 23, 1775.

"God forbid we should ever be 20 years without such a rebellion. The people cannot be all, & always, well informed... what country can preserve it's liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms... The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots & tyrants. It is it's natural manure." Thomas Jefferson to William S. Smith on Nov. 13, 1787. The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, ed. Julian P. Boyd, vol. 12, p. 356 (1955).

"The importance of this article [Second Amendment] will scarcely be doubted by any persons, who have duly reflected upon the subject. The militia is the natural defence of a free country against sudden foreign invasions, domestic insurrections, and domestic usurpations of power by rulers." Joseph Story, Dane Professor of Law in Harvard University, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States (1833), Book III at 746, § 1858. Chapter. Whole Book.

"The right of the citizens to keep and bear arms has justly been considered, as the palladium of the liberties of a republic; since it offers a strong moral check against the usurpation and arbitrary power of rulers; and will generally, even if these are successful in the first instance, enable the people to resist and triumph over them." Joseph Story, Dane Professor of Law in Harvard University, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States (1833), Book III at 746, § 1858. Chapter. Whole Book.

"Whenever a people are so enervated by luxury as to intrust the defence of their country to a regular, standing army, composed of mercenaries, the power of that country will remain under the direction and influence of the most wealthy citizens." Signed "A Farmer," in the Philadelphia Independent Gazetteer, Letter XIV, January 29, 1791.

"The great object is that every man be armed ... Everyone who is able may have a gun." Patrick Henry, 3 Elliot, Debates at 386

"Little more can reasonably be aimed at, with respect to the people at large, than to have them properly armed and equipped;..." Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist Papers # 29.

"The great object is that every man be armed ... Everyone who is able may have a gun." Patrick Henry, 3 Elliot, Debates at 386

"Little more can reasonably be aimed at, with respect to the people at large, than to have them properly armed and equipped;..." Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist Papers # 29.

"Among the natural rights of the Colonists are these: First, a right to life; Secondly, to liberty; Thirdly, to property; together with the right to support and defend them in the best manner they can. These are evident branches of, rather than deductions from, the duty of self-preservation, commonly called the first law of nature." Samuel Adams, The Rights of the Colonists, The Report of the Committee of Correspondence to the Boston Town Meeting, Nov. 20, 1772.

"...one loves to possess arms, tho[ugh] they hope never to have occasion for them." Thomas Jefferson in a letter to George Washington, June 19, 1796. ME 9:341 Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Memorial Edition (Lipscomb and Bergh, editors) 20 Vols., Washington, D.C., 1903-04.

"A strong body makes the mind strong. As to the species of exercises, I advise the gun. While this gives moderate exercise to the body, it gives boldness, enterprise and independence to the mind. Games played with the ball and others of that nature, are too violent for the body and stamp no character on the mind. Let your gun therefore be the constant companion of your walks." Thomas Jefferson, Encyclopedia of T. Jefferson, 318 (Foley, Ed., reissued 1967). (Letter to Peter Carr, his 15-year-old nephew, August 19, 1785)

"I enclose you a list of the killed, wounded, and captives of the enemy from the commencement of hostilities at Lexington in April, 1775, until November, 1777, since which there has been no event of any consequence... I think that upon the whole it has been about one half the number lost by them, in some instances more, but in others less. This difference is ascribed to our superiority in taking aim when we fire; every soldier in our army having been intimate with his gun from his infancy." Thomas Jefferson in a letter to Giovanni Fabbroni, June 8, 1778.

"If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates, but let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed." George Washington, Farewell Address, September 17, 1796.

"False is the idea of utility that sacrifices a thousand real advantages for one imaginary or trifling inconvenience; that would take fire from men because it burns, and water because one may drown in it; that has no remedy for evils, except destruction.

"The laws that forbid the carrying of arms are laws of such a nature. They disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes....Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man. Thomas Jefferson's "Commonplace Book," 1774-1776, quoting 18th century criminologist Cesare Beccaria in Chapter 40 of "On Crimes and Punishment", 1764. Chapter. Whole Book.

"Arms in the hands of citizens [may] be used at individual discretion... in private self-defense ..." John Adams, A Defense of the Constitutions of the Government of the USA, 471 (1788)

48 minutes ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** Article 1 Section 8 specifically states congress authority over state militia's. And half those quotes state that the right to bear arms refers to militia's and foreign threats to the country and states. Yes some mention th tyrannical government which I have already agreed was an issue when creating the second amendment. My issue is your stance that it has NOTHING to do with militia. It's really insane.

40 minutes ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** National Guard members are a subset of the Militia as defined by 10 USC 311

39 minutes ago · Like



**Daniel Phillips** (a)The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age and, except as provided in section 313 of title 32, under 45 years of age who are, or who have made a declaration of intention to become, citizens of the United States and of female citizens of the United States who are members of the National Guard.

(b)The classes of the militia are—

(1)the organized militia, which consists of the National Guard and the Naval Militia; and

(2)the unorganized militia, which consists of the members of the militia who are not members of the National Guard or the Naval Militia.

38 minutes ago · Like



**Matthew Singer** Article 1 section 8 says: "To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;"

I don't see anything in there about being part of the army and being sent abroad. And when did the states start

[http://armsandthelaw.com/archives/2005/04/is\\_the\\_national.php](http://armsandthelaw.com/archives/2005/04/is_the_national.php)

10 U.S.C. §311 dates from the Dick Act of 1903, which repealed the Militia Law of 1792, and first wrote the term "National Guard" into law. The Guard as we now know it (dual enlistment: members of State National Guard units required to enlist in the U.S. Reserves) dates from the Army Act of 1940. (Why dual enlistment? In 1912 the Attorney General ruled that NG units could not be sent outside the US, because they were part of (note "part of") the militia, and the Constitution allows the militia to be called up only for domestic purposes -- to repel invasion, suppress insurrection, and execute the laws of the Union. As a result in WWI Guard units were broken up and members drafted into regular Army units as individuals, an inefficient operation and one displeasing to the Guard).

So let's take a look at the legislative history of those statutes....

Debates over the 1903 Dick Act: Original proposal was to have National Guard and also two classes of volunteer reserves, consisting of NG units that had volunteered as federal reserves and whose officers would be approved in advance by the Army, and who would be available for service overseas (that is, the Guard itself would be more like the modern State National Guards, and the volunteer reserves would be more like the modern National Guard).

House debates (35 Cong. Rec., (1902)

Rep. Wiley (p.7111) "In my remarks on this occasion it is not my purpose to discuss the militia in its widest sense, as including the whole military force of the nation. I shall confine myself to the great body of the citizens in the different states and territories of the Union who, actuated by patriotic impulses, have enrolled for instruction and discipline as a reserve force ..."

Rep. Stark (Appendix p. 387): "To my mind our institutions are best served by having a small regular army as nucleus, garrison duty, and the first line of defense; then for the support to be first called out, the organized militias commonly known as the "National Guard;" then for the third line, the national volunteer reserve ... Then comes the reserve militia, which includes all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 45."

Sen. Proctor (36 Cong. Rec. 125 (Dec. 9 1902): "The old law makes every able-bodied man in the country a member of the militia, and provides no further organization. This bill separates and makes a class which can be called into active service."

Proctor, at p. 305: "The National Guard is in full organization; it is already created and would naturally be first called upon if wanted for a limited time, and then the militia would be called upon."

At p. 299-300, Sen. Pettus objects that creating the volunteer reserves might exceed Congressional powers over the militia, since their officers are approved by federal authorities and the States have no control over use of these units. [The Constitution provides that the States shall appoint officers of the militia] Sen. Proctor responds "The troops provided for in section 24 are not militia. They are volunteers. They are called the national volunteer reserve, as the Senator will see. They are not called militia."

At p. 303, Sen. Foraker backs Proctor: "[W]hile this reserve is part of the militia, in the sense that all men are a part of the militia who are between the ages of 18 and 45, it is not a part of the militia in any other sense.."

P. 354, Sen. Bacon, in opposition, says that if this volunteer force were the militia, it would clearly violate the letter of the Constitution. He continues, "There is no possible question about the fact that it is not part of the militia, so far as the letter goes. But I think it is violative of the spirit and intent of the Constitution in that it makes a part of the regular establishment that which the Constitution intended should be the militia."

Debates on the 1940 Army Act (86 Cong. Record, Aug. 1940)

Sen. Gillette: (p. 9914) "The militia of the United States are citizens between certain ages capable of performing military service. That is the militia of the United States. It consists of all citizens of that type, and is divided into the unorganized militia, the organized militia, and certain naval units. The National Guard of the States and Territories are organizations composed of these militiamen, members of the unorganized militia, who voluntarily have enlisted in specific organizations for a specific purpose with a specific limitation. That is the National Guard of the Nation. There is a third category, the National Guard of the United States. That organization is set up under a specific act of the Congress ..."

Sen. Sheppard (p. 9985) cites a 1916 statute paralleling 10 USC 311, and also defining the army of the US as the regular army, the National Guard, etc. He explains, "Every National Guard man who takes the oath takes it with the understanding that he is part of the Regular Army ...."



**Of Arms and the Law: Is the National Guard the "militia?"**

[www.armsandthelaw.com](http://www.armsandthelaw.com)

I've released my documentary film on the history of the right to arms, "In Search...

[See More](#)

25 minutes ago · Like · Remove Preview



**Matthew Singer** This is also a good read:  
<http://www.thenewamerican.com/history/american/855>



**The Militia: In History and Today**

[www.thenewamerican.com](http://www.thenewamerican.com)

The Founders envisioned the militia as a guardian of states' rights and the peop...

[See More](#)

16 minutes ago · Like · Remove Preview



Write a comment...

Chat (4)