

---

Subject: Welcome to the Republican Party  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 24 Sep 2008 06:13:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Can't take credit for this, but I had to share.....Let me give you an analogy of our upcoming brain trust coming out of college: Father/Daughter Talk: A young woman was about to finish her first year of college Like so many others her age, she considered herself to be a very liberal Democrat, and among other liberal ideals, was very much in favor of higher taxes to support more government programs, in other words redistribution of wealth..She was deeply ashamed that her father was a rather staunch Republican, a feeling she openly expressed. Based on the lectures that she had participated in, and the occasional chat with a professor, she felt that her father had for years harbored an evil, selfish desire to keep what he thought should be his. One day she was challenging her father on his opposition to higher taxes on the rich and the need for more government programs. The self-professed objectivity proclaimed by her professors had to be the truth and she indicated so to her father. He responded by asking how she was doing in school. Taken aback, she answered rather haughtily that she had a 4.0 GPA, and let him know that it was tough to maintain, insisting that she was taking a very difficult course load and was constantly studying, which left her no time to go out and party like other people she knew. She didn't even have time for a boyfriend, and didn't really have many college friends because she spent all her time studying. Her father listened and then asked, 'How is your friend Audrey doing?' She replied, 'Audrey is barely getting by. All she takes are easy classes, she never studies, and she barely has a 2.0 GPA. She is so popular on campus; college for her is a blast. She's always invited to all the parties and lots of times she doesn't even show up for classes because she's too hung over.' Her wise father asked his daughter, 'Why don't you go to the Dean's office and ask him to deduct 1.0 off your GPA and give it to your friend who only has a 2.0. That way you will both have a 3.0 GPA and certainly that would be a fair and equal distribution of GPA.' The daughter, visibly shocked by her father's suggestion, angrily fired back, 'That's a crazy idea, and how would that be fair! I've worked really hard for my grades! I've invested a lot of time, and a lot of hard work! Audrey has done next to nothing toward her degree. She played while I worked my tail off!' The father slowly smiled, winked and said gently, 'Welcome to the Republican party'. THIS explains politics in simple terms that even a Democrat can understand.

<http://news.bostonherald.com/news/regional/general/view.bg?articleid=1120853&format=comments#cnum389674>

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party  
Posted by [FredT](#) on Thu, 25 Sep 2008 15:36:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

To me this would have been a good explanation of what the Republican and Democratic parties stood for immediately before and during the years of the "Great Society", but not now. It is greatly oversimplified Republican propaganda, just as so many of the Democrats' messages are half-truth propaganda designed to divide Americans rather than to provide them a balanced view. During my early adult life both parties could be categorized as "centrist", with the Republicans leaning more

toward the conservative side and the Democrats leaning more toward the populist side. There were moderate republicans and there were conservative Democrats. The Republican focus was on creating a political and business environment that was friendly to individual initiative and business development. Under this scenario businesses, especially small businesses which employ most American workers, could prosper without the burdens of excess taxation, bureaucratic regulation, and labor union "featherbedding" that stifled productivity. Everybody, from the lowest paid worker to the highest paid executive, was able to keep more of the money they had worked so hard to earn. Some people did find themselves in a desperate financial situation, and there were few government sponsored safety nets, but the system was intended to encourage and reward individual responsibility, and for the most part it accomplished this very successfully. Many baby boomers, myself included, achieved great success in this environment. Then the Kennedy/Johnson Democrats gained power. The focus was shifted to government regulation and the redistribution of wealth. During this period we saw the growth of civil rights legislation, environmental regulations, greater regulation of employment, OSHA, and massively expanded federal welfare programs of all types. This did result in some positive outcomes for the most needy, but only at a great cost to productive Americans. During this time I was experiencing my greatest earnings growth, and I found my taxes increasing exponentially to fund somebody else's laziness. And to add insult to injury we were seeing significant cost-of-living inflation related largely to the federal government's deficit spending. It was during this period that the Republicans very successfully exploited the segregation issue in the South to win over many formerly Democratic populist working class voters whose fear of integration trumped their hatred and distrust of the greedy "fat cat" businessmen whom they believed were exploiting them. I was converted to Republicanism during this period and have remained a registered Republican. Then we had the first Bush administration followed by the Clinton administration. Although Bush Sr presented himself as a conservative, and Clinton was viewed as a liberal, both were in fact moderates who seemed able to work effectively with both sides. Who remembers that "Read my lips - no new taxes" Bush raised taxes, or that Clinton, working with a Republican congress, signed the welfare reform act? All those welfare moms had to go to work for McDonalds to make ends meet (no pun intended). How unfair:) Bush Sr was defeated by Clinton mostly because of one of the best decisions he made while in office, to get out of Iraq once we have accomplished our goal of driving them back across the Kuwait border. Clinton was a good leader except for two things: 1) They had to reinforce the floor of the oval office to support his enormous ego, and 2) he couldn't keep his dick in his pants. Finally, W was elected, and I'm now ashamed to say I voted for him the first time around. The Republican party became the party of Neo-conservatives and Evangelical Christians. Federal regulatory agencies were neutered, and wherever there was a conflict between science and the bible, the bible won (intelligent design taught as science, stem cell research, etc.) Under Bush I we had Desert Storm, a well thought out, morally justified, and honestly presented war. Under Bush II we got the Iraq war. Anybody see a difference? Republicans became very close to big business interests, and when you combine this with lax oversight we got Enron, and now the big meltdown. What used to be more than 20 major oil companies is now three megagiants. Of course, the Democrats aren't entirely blameless either. So now we find ourselves with our way of life threatened for the first time since the Great Depression by greedy people who flew just under the regulatory radar. We find ourselves in another year of a war we can't win, yet we dare not cut and run. The typical western european hates us, and their leaders must respond accordingly. We're inching toward another cold war with Russia. We have no viable energy policy. Our healthcare system is broken. What did I miss? So this election I'm supporting Obama as the lesser of two evils, simply because he is more likely to develop and implement an energy policy that makes some sense, at least in the long run with its greater focus

on non renewable supplies, he will get us out of Iraq sooner, he will at least attempt to fix the broken healthcare system instead of just talking about it, etc. But realistically, after all the "bailout" money is spent neither candidate will have many good options. However, if McCain wins I'm consoled that he will not be as incompetent as Bush and that he will have a more pragmatic, less ideologically driven approach to solving our problems. The things I like the most about McCain are the things that the neocons and the evangelicals dislike the most. Which, I suppose, explains why I so fear and dislike Palin so much as his VP candidate. What's needed for the future is neither of the current leading parties. I would change my allegiance in a heartbeat to a new "centrist" party whose members understand our heritage and our values, but vote for more pragmatic solutions rather than a blind allegiance to religious biases, conservative principles, liberal principles, etc. That's just my two cents.

---

---

Subject: Boy, you got that right!

Posted by [The Irishman](#) on Mon, 29 Sep 2008 01:58:24 GMT

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

---

Compared to the damn Democrats the \$1,300,000,000,000.00 this Republican administration has given to Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, the Big 3 and Wall Street since July is peanuts. Oh, yeah, and the \$2,500,000,000 per day in the Middle East, but who's counting?

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 29 Sep 2008 22:00:32 GMT

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Boy, you got that right!

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 29 Sep 2008 22:09:32 GMT

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

---

If I am to believe what I hear, the banks were encouraged to lower their lending standards in the 1990's. They were giving loans to bad risk borrowers under pressure of a liberal administration during this period. This carried forward for the years that followed, coerced by pressures from Democrats in Congress. Now, maybe "what I hear" isn't accurate, but then again, it comes from interviews with Clinton and others. Maybe those were sound bites and there is a larger context, but it does stand to reason that a liberal agenda to promote spreading the wealth would do this. It doesn't stand to reason that a bank operating solely on free market principles would extend loans to dangerously high risk borrowers. Banks, as a general rule, are pretty conservative institutions

---

with a fairly low tolerance for risk.

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Mon, 29 Sep 2008 22:37:05 GMT

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

---

I agree with you in many aspects, certainly in your characterization of the historical perspective. But I do not think Obama would use his influence to effect good choices in the areas of energy, economy or security. That pretty much rules him out in my opinion. I see Republicans as being basically three different types. There are Libertarians that don't want to throw away their vote, so vote Republican for fiscal reasons. These are people that perceive Republicans to want limited government. They are sort of fiscally conservative, but not so much socially. I think that is a big group, growing all the time. Maybe after a while, this group will actually be able to vote Libertarian. Then there are people that are socially conservative, but maybe not so much fiscally. Those are the ones that vote for right to life, gay marriage bans, etc. Bush is probably of this type, both father and son. Then there are the ones that are really pretty moderate, centerists as you say. They are not really all that conservative. McCain seems to be this way to me. Democrats seem to have more different "flavors". There are the college kids and idealists. They seem to vote strictly by emotion. Make a movie like "the China Syndrome" and you have a decade of "no nukes" types. (Then two decades later they'll change their mind) One step up from that, and you have the ones that want socialized medicine, increased assistance programs and stuff like that. They're sort of idealists too, but they tend to think through the problems and look for solutions a little more. Of course, they haven't thought it through far enough to see how truly socialized medicine works, how it provides mediocre care, things like giving nitro pills to elderly with bad hearts and lets them die because it cannot afford angioplasty and bypass surgery. Then you have the union workers and those types. They seem to me to be the closest to the WWII-era Democrats, in that they just want representation for the middle class. Then there are the plethora of single position Dems, the trial lawyers that resist tort reform, the right to choose people, the minorities, etc. I don't particularly like any of these except the Libertarian approach. I wish that party would reach critical mass. But in the meantime, I'm voting McCain/Palin. Obama scares me, he's so liberal I'm afraid of an economic crash and I think he is unlikely to provide a good influence in our energy policy.

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party

Posted by [FredT](#) on Tue, 30 Sep 2008 14:30:17 GMT

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

---

Your characterization of the types of people who align themselves with the Republican and Democratic parties makes a lot of sense to me. It's very helpful in understanding who's voting for whom and why.

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party  
Posted by [FredT](#) on Tue, 30 Sep 2008 18:38:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

One group you left out is all the lifelong Republicans who have become so disenched with the Republican party, especially under Bush's leadership, that they have defected to the Democrats. That would include me.

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party  
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Tue, 30 Sep 2008 22:19:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ahh, the makings of a true Libertarian. But don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. We're in trouble now, but I think the more we socialize things, the worse shape we'll be in.  
Burning Down The House: What Caused Our Economic Crisis?

---

Subject: That's What Rush Has Been Saying  
Posted by [FredT](#) on Wed, 01 Oct 2008 11:09:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That's a real eye-opener. Who would have thought a law passed in 1977, more than 30 years ago, requiring banks to lend in low income neighborhoods where they take deposits, would result in today's credit crisis? The video suggests I google everything, and I did. See what I found at the link below. Once again, all trails lead back to Bush's cutback on reinforcement of existing laws. "...the Bush administration has been weakening CRA enforcement and the law's reach since the day it took office. The CRA was at its strongest in the 1990s, under the Clinton administration, a period when subprime loans performed quite well. It was only after the Bush administration cut back on CRA enforcement that problems arose, a timing issue which should stop those blaming the law dead in their tracks..." This video might become the swift boat of the current campaign except it's too long to be used as a tv ad. The message everybody should learn from the current crisis is to never underestimate the ability of the average American to make irresponsible choices, or the ability of the typical business executive to help him make those bad choices. Which is why we need a candidate with at least some integrity, like Obama, who is willing to regulate business.  
Community Reinvestment Act

---

Subject: Re: That's What Rush Has Been Saying  
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 01 Oct 2008 16:53:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I am not convinced that either party is without blame in the current financial situation. Nor am I fully certain that either party was completely responsible. I don't think there is 100% fault to be found on one side of the aisle and none on the other side, nor do I think the private sector banks were helpless, without influence. Each of them must have been partially responsible. But I do think there are some more responsible than others. I think the banks could have fought back harder, and that, in fact, it was their responsibility to do so. However, I do think that the low income loans are things that only Democrats would have an agenda to promote, so I think it is unreasonable to place blame on Republicans for them. It just stands to reason. If the loans had gone out to large corporations, it might make more sense to think Republicans had their hands in it. Their policy tends towards trickle down economics. But that wasn't the case. The high-risk loans that caused problems were made to low and lower-middle income individuals trying to buy homes they couldn't afford. I just don't see this as being something Republicans would get behind, but I can definitely see it as being something squarely in a liberal agenda. It's sometimes hard to know what to believe. But looking at results and motives, I think probably this was more a Democrat thing. Are you going to watch the VP debate? Have you heard about the moderator?  
Gwen Ifill

---

---

Subject: The "moderator"  
Posted by [colinhester](#) on Wed, 01 Oct 2008 19:09:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

This is complete bullshit. Think Biden has been given the questions already?

---

---

Subject: Re: The "moderator"  
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Wed, 01 Oct 2008 22:48:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I agree with you, it was a really bad choice. I wonder how that got setup in the first place. But in the end, if you cheat, you lose. So if Mrs. Ifill isn't completely fair and honest, it may backfire on her.

---

---

Subject: It's maybe a bit more complicated than that?  
Posted by [The Irishman](#) on Thu, 02 Oct 2008 01:54:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The little video is the best amalgam of lies and distortion the people trying to cover their tracks could have come up with. The guys causing all the trouble? Lehman, Morgan Stanley? They're

---

INVESTMENT banks. The CRA only applies to depository institutions, i.e., COMMERCIAL banks. The lenders involved in the subprime mortgage process now crisis were not even covered by the CRA. Indeed, the vast majority of nontraditional and subprime loans are issued outside the federally regulated banking system. Those mortgages aren't backed by Freddie or Fannie because they're NON-CONFORMING loans - inadequate documentation, inadequate down payments, they're commonly known as LIAR loans and nobody gets liar loans under the CRA - they get FHA CONFORMING LOANS. Just as importantly, many of the investors who were buying mortgages in the secondary market from mortgage companies were not covered by the CRA either. These bad loans were the result of jumbo mortgages (over \$250K) with no equity and ARM terms that went belly up. And those properties were in southern California, on the Florida coasts, and in NYC - not some rundown Cleveland suburb. But it really all comes out the same - facts mean nothing anymore - only what Rush says is true now.

---

---

Subject: Re: It's maybe a bit more complicated than that?  
Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Thu, 02 Oct 2008 16:31:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, I can tell you this for certain because I just purchased a home last month. During the mortgage shopping process, I got to talk to several of them, both lenders and brokers, and I was able to learn some of the issues they face today. FHA policies have changed radically in the last six months. They were handing out the so called "liar loans" via brokers - stated income loans - just a few short months ago. Just about anyone could get a loan by stating income that was not verified, and it would be approved by the Federal Housing Administration. So this wasn't just outside lenders, it was government approved lenders too. In fact, now the only loans you'll get are from outside lenders. They're the ones that take reasonable risks, the ones that live and die by their decisions. I got a conventional loan by a lender that checked me out. It is as it should be. But apparently it hasn't been that way for quite some time. Anyone with a heartbeat could get a loan, and that's why we're in the trouble we're in.

---

---

Subject: Re: That's What Rush Has Been Saying  
Posted by [FredT](#) on Sat, 04 Oct 2008 01:08:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Something we're all guilty of to a much greater extent than we would like to admit is filtering out information that contradicts our beliefs. A Republican is far more likely to filter out any suggestion that Republican policies and actions are responsible for the mortgage crisis, and a Democrat is far more likely to filter out any suggestions of Democrat culpability. Something else we do is to accept without skepticism messages that reinforce our point of view. Example: Anybody ever watch a Michael Moore documentary? Am I the only one that sees them as extremely one-sided? And this guy has actually received awards and standing ovations! It's helpful to me to seek a more balanced explanation of any public issue that I'm concerned about. In the case of the subprime

mortgage crisis, the explanation in the Wikipedia appears to be a balanced and comprehensive summary. For example, it does mention the Community Reinvestment Act, and it summarizes the positions of detractors and supporters. This is very different from the one-sided comments of politicians about the causes of the crisis.

Subprime Mortgage Crisis

---

---

Subject: Re: That's What Rush Has Been Saying

Posted by [Wayne Parham](#) on Sun, 05 Oct 2008 16:32:10 GMT

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

---

Good link, thanks Fred. I don't know why I didn't think of looking there. That website has turned into a really good source of information, in most cases. Honestly, it only increases my feelings that we should not have done the bailout. I had worried in the back of my mind that the "sky is falling" reports might have been real, that maybe if the bailout didn't happen, unemployment would go to 25% and other bad things like that. But really, I don't think this bailout will help much, it just directs funds to organizations that shouldn't get it. If we're headed for a deep cavern economically, this probably won't help it. Only true protection of our workers and industries will work, in my opinion. I think no job should be exported or allowed H1B status without a prohibitive tax applied, nor should any import be allowed without a high tax. I used to not believe in protectionism, but now I really do. Lower income tax, lower corporate tax, lower all internal taxes but juice up the import tax and impose a tax on any work that is exported, whether by outsourcing overseas or by bringing in H1B workers. That's what I think should be done. It will increase prices of things, but at least Americans will have jobs to pay for them. As for the credit crunch and the "sky is falling" guys, it still looks to me like the problem started when the door was opened by liberal policies that forced commercial and mortgage banks to lend to high-risk borrowers. Liberal congressmen pushed the impossible situation where people that couldn't afford homes were given unnatural opportunities. Once that door was open, the housing market grew artificially. Banks that were originally forced to make bad loans then adapted themselves to take advantage of the situation. After a while, you had these weird situations where "loans" were given to just about anyone, and they weren't even looking at the ability of the borrowers to pay back the loans. Then, when the leaks in the system started showing, they began to offer even weirder loan types, those "Ninja" loans and "payment option" loans in addition to ARM loans. In my mind, this is all a progression of the initial attempts at wealth redistribution by the liberals, starting decades ago. It looks like they have gotten what they wanted, millions of homes in the hands of people that can't afford them, and a bailout of the banks that lended the money on the taxpayers tab. This is socialism, forced on us all by crisis. It came in the form of subsidizing homes, millions were living in homes that weren't paid for for months or years. But worse even than taking the money from taxpayers and giving it to the poor in the form of subsidized housing, it looks like lots of mortgage bankers were allowed to profit from the situation. They aren't paying the consequences of their bad actions, instead, their bad loans are being paid for via bailout. Some have said what caused the problem was the lack of regulation. Perhaps that is true. But if you're going to regulate the banks, the first thing you should do is absolutely prohibit it from being an avenue for the redistribution of wealth. So that pretty much means the liberals need to leave their opinions at the door. They're the ones that pushed that direction in the first place. The second thing is probably the banking games that arose as a result of opening the door to subprime lending should be



stopped. But then again, that takes me back to the first point that if you don't allow (encourage, even force) subprime lending in the first place, then the games will stop. The dominoes started falling when the subprime loans were being forced on the banks. That's the root cause, in my opinion. If we vote in Obama and have a Democrat executive in addition to the Democrat majority in Congress, my fear is we in America will have a real "sky is falling" economy. I'm not sure we can avoid a pretty serious correction, but I am downright afraid of a Obama win. I think America will see 1930's style depression if that happens. I hope I'm wrong.

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party  
Posted by [Marlboro](#) on Sat, 19 Sep 2009 19:49:40 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

And if that was the essential Republican party, I would be a republican.

But I don't see the participation in all kinds of foreign wars, the destruction of public education, and the failure to properly monitor our financial institutions, meddling in the woman's right to choose, or life styles of people, as something that I can support

I actually voted for the second GB over Gore, with the assumption that he would turn to typical republican financial ideals and he did not.

So yeah, I agree with that part, but not the idiocy of putting someone as green or of limited ability (mental or managerial) in an office. And though I voted for Obama, I'm still not happy with him on Iraq, Afghanistan, or public education. I still think he's for this idiocy of believing that CO2 caused the global warming that we aren't actually having now (don't confuse me with facts). But he did manage a huge national campaign that beat the pants off the rest of the democratic field and then the republican too.

And I believe that most of the disagreements with him are just disagreements, except for those that use pictures or slogans that are most clearly racist.

So there!!

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party  
Posted by [AudioAJ](#) on Tue, 04 May 2010 02:16:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

My son and I were talking about socialism one day (he's an 8th grader) and I used the same analogy about the grades. He said the idea of equal distribution is crazy.

---

---

Subject: Re: Welcome to the Republican Party  
Posted by [badman](#) on Tue, 12 Oct 2010 16:41:43 GMT

---

Except that if you used your friend's back to write your test on, while they had to forego taking their own while serving you, it would be a more apt analogy. Fortunes are made with the assistance of many, and would not happen without government infrastructure and regulation, and laborers to achieve the ends. Capital investment income is not EARNED income, and people at the top end are paying less now than they did under Reagan or in any other modernized nation.

And, nobody is proposing fully equal distribution. And grades are different than basic living needs.

---