

Date: Saturday, January 28, 2012, 7:35 PM

Subject: FW: Father-Daughter Talk - read to the end

A rather gentle explanation of the difference in thinking between people with opposite outlooks.

A young woman was about to finish her first year of college. Like so many others her age, she considered herself to be very liberal, 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 conservative, 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, 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 conservative side of the fence."

If you ever wondered what side of the fence you sit on, this is a great test!

If a conservative doesn't like guns, he doesn't buy one.

If a liberal doesn't like guns, he wants all guns outlawed.

If a conservative is a vegetarian, he

doesn't eat meat.

If a liberal is a vegetarian, he wants all meat products banned for everyone.

If a conservative is down-and-out, he thinks about how to better his situation.

A liberal wonders who is going to take care of him.

If a conservative doesn't like a talk show host, he switches channels. Liberals demand that those they don't like be shut down.

If a conservative is a non-believer, he doesn't go to church.

A liberal non-believer wants any mention of God and Jesus silenced.

If a conservative decides he needs health care, he goes about shopping for it or may choose a

shopping for it, or may choose a job that provides it.

A liberal demands that the rest of us pay for his.

If a conservative reads this, he'll forward it so his friends can have a good laugh.

A liberal will delete it because he's "offended."

Well, I forwarded it to you.

The malicious mischaracterizations in this piece make me mad.

As a liberal, I can say with authority, this author has a prejudiced and biased view of liberals and poor people.

Liberals don't wish to take from the hard working and give to the profligate, rather liberals want to establish rules in the market that create fair playing field for all.

When one needs to come from money to make any money, something is wrong.

When the wealth has been monopolized by an elite, then some redistribution is necessary to prevent a regression to a feudal economy without a middle class.

The difference between liberals and conservatives is that conservatives over generalize about groups of people, enabling them to blame the poor for being poor and ascribe beliefs to liberals that do not reflect the vast majority of self described liberals. As evidenced by this fable, conservatives tend to want to project their authoritarian impulses onto liberals.

Few liberals want all guns outlawed, but keeping them out of the hands of criminals and mentally unstable people is a priority. Banning military weapons and weapons of mass destruction does make sense to us liberals, but that has nothing to do with self defense, unless the criminals all have them. If you value life, you don't elevate guns as the answer to liberty. That is anti-social.

Few liberals want to ban meat, but many do encourage education about food production sustainability, animal rights, and health related meat issues, so everyone can make more informed choices

Everyone can make more informed choices.

Few liberals are looking for hand outs, but they do value community and believe in a social safety net, as opposed to conservatives blaming the victim and letting the downtrodden die in the streets.

Few liberals favor blanket censorship, that has been a social conservative issue all along and everyone else but this author seems to know it.

Few liberals favor silencing religious expression, but most are adamant that the separation of church and state be honored, so that one religion does not dominate the affairs of the state, as the founders made clear.

Few liberals are as concerned about their own health insurance being paid for as much as others who can't afford it. We believe life is so precious that the market place is too capricious to make decisions about who does or does not receive health care. If only the rich can afford health care, then the poor are left to die early. That is the moral issue.

The main thrust of this piece is that the poor deserve their fate. It is based not on the facts, but on a prejudice that rationalizes selfishness, with the presumption that our market is a level playing field. That presumption is demonstratively wrong. The market has become a winner take all economy in which the government has been captured by wealth to weigh the scales of justice and tax policy in their favor.

[Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer--and Turned Its Back on the Middle Class](#)

"The word *prejudice* is most often used to refer to preconceived judgments toward people or a person because of [race](#), [social class](#), [ethnicity](#), [age](#), [disability](#), [obesity](#), [religion](#), [sexual orientation](#), or other personal characteristics.

Prejudice also means beliefs without knowledge of the facts^[1] and may include "any unreasonable attitude that is unusually resistant to rational influence."^[2] Prejudice can be described as unfavourable attitude towards a social group and its members."

Dale

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prejudice>