

Negotiating a Price

Politicians arguing over whether to send “taxpayers” \$600 or \$2000? Stupid, dishonest, or both? Political, so the correct answer is “both”.

It’s too late to take a stand for the lower amount on “principle”.

I’m reminded of a rude joke. A rich man asks a beautiful woman if she’d have sex with him for a million dollars. She blushes and says she would. So he asks if she’d have sex with him for \$10. She says *“What kind of woman do you think I am?”* He says *“We’ve already settled the question of what kind of woman you are. Now we are just negotiating a price.”*

At this point refusing to send the larger amount is like refusing to drill another hole in the Titanic’s hull. The fatal damage has been done. It’s going down regardless. Those who aren’t already on a lifeboat are doomed.

The difference \$2000 would make to the integrity of the sinking ship compared to \$600 is minuscule. Even when multiplied by millions in the current situation. Compared to the multi-trillion dollar hole the feds have dug for themselves, it’s almost nothing.

Might as well send each “taxpayer” a million dollars. At least that would buy the politicians some political loyalty for a few weeks.

One choice is not more responsible than the other. They are both equally irresponsible and unethical. Acting as though this is some principled argument is just dishonest beyond words. It’s politics for the sake of politics, no matter which side of the argument they take. Just do it, or don’t, and drop the subject.

I won’t be getting any of the magic money this time, either. Just like I didn’t last time. Unless someone chooses to make a donation from their share- which I’m not counting on. But, even if I were, I understand the implications of making “money” out of thin air. Many people can’t see beyond the temporary boost to their bank account to notice the long-term effects that can’t be avoided forever. Maybe that’s the more comforting path.