
Subject: Re: Free Needles in Ukraine to Drug Users
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2007 00:21:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 12:21Dovercheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 11:21Yes, go right ahead and ignore my point. Everybody else does, so I can't imagine why I would expect anything different.
Disagreeing with your points does not consistute ignoring.
I understand people disagreeing, but you ignored what I was saying to nitpick.

- 1) I didn't ignore, I addressed.
- 2) Nitpicking is not ignoring.

[quote title=cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 12:21]DoverDovercheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 11:21My example of natural disasters is just that... an example, and a visible example, at that. It wasn't to say that charity is or should be limited to disasters, rather to show that when it's required (such as people living on the streets), there are people helping them get off their feet. That's something people and private organizations do... help people get off their feet, not just throw checks at them like our government does.
And how, pray tell, do private organizations do that, if not "throwing checks"?
They dedicate their time and effort to making sure people get what they need? They don't just do hand-outs like the government does.

Funny. I thought that's what government social workers did.

[quote title=cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 12:21]DoverDovercheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 11:21When I mention government, I mean legislating actions. A group of people making decisions can be seen as a government, but they can't legislate things and use law to enforce it.
I fail to see why not.
Because they don't have the force to enforce it?

Neither do governments, in some cases.
In any case, nothing stops our hypothetical group of citizens from being able to enforce, either.
Perhaps they have big sticks to hit people with.

[quote title=cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 12:21]DoverDovercheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 11:21I already addressed the idea how to help the people who need our help. Private organizations and charities. Like interfaith shelters and churches, and they're not regulated by the government.

And I already addressed the problem with having "Private organizations" in charge of helping the needy. If I'm poor and on the street, I want someone I can hold accountable in charge of helping me out.

And churches?! Bleh! I'm agnostic, and if I'm ever in a position where I might require aid, I don't want to have to change my faith to receive it. FUCK THAT.
Who better to trust than someone with actual compassion and desire to go above and beyond

their moral obligations to see that you have a meal that night?

Fuck you and your insinuations that churches only have one selfish goal in mind to gain more mindless drones. Most churches operate as soup kitchens and other outreach programs and have no silly objective to convert someone before they can give them assistance. Plus, if you're not willing to converse with them about your and their faith in order to get food and shelter, then you didn't really need it. Plus, you'd be awfully greedy to think that you should receive help without respecting their desires to talk to you.

Funny, because when you say "private organization", I think "large multinational corporation with ulterior motives", or "charity group of people that has to break even at the end of the day". The latter being only slightly more comforting than the former. Government suffers neither of these constraints.

Not all churches are so selfish, perhaps, but enough (even a few is enough) so that I wouldn't want them being my first, last, and only hope.

[quote title=cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 12:21]DoverDovercheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 11:21The fact that I can afford to pay my taxes is irrelevant. I can afford to have my CDs stolen from me, but that doesn't make the theft any less wrong. "It's okay that they entered my house and stole my jewelry because I can live without it." If you're saying that my explanation of greed was laughable, then so is the justification of theft because I can afford to lose that money.

Oh, and you never did address the principle of the fact that it is stealing. I don't want you or my government reprising the fucking role of Robin Hood and his homosexual sidekicks. Stealing from the rich and giving to the poor is still stealing, regardless of what "good" you're doing with the money stolen. I don't care to reach into your pocketbook, so I'd appreciate that you respect mine.

I'm sorry you feel this way. I'm also sorry there's no nicer way to say it, but too fucking bad. Everyone else pays taxes, you're paying taxes. If you don't like it, pack up and start your own country.

What a nice way to dodge my point. That way of justifying taxes is terrifyingly mindless and toolish.

What can I say? We've reached an impasse. You clearly value your hard earned dollar much more than I, so go enjoy it. See how long the government you form lasts before "stealing".

[quote title=cheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 12:21]DoverDovercheesesoda wrote on Mon, 10 December 2007 11:21I trust Capitalism. Plus, private, non-profit organizations helping out their communities are never going to get corrupted. It's hard to hoard money when you're not allowed to profit from it.

Which is fine and dandy for you, but I don't trust capitalism as far as I can throw it, and capitalism is very, very fat.

Oh, and non-profit organizations != capitalism.

Yes, I realized this after I said it, but I was too lazy to change it.

Either way, Capitalism promotes high quality even in high quantity in an effort for businesses to make profit. It's a Hell of a lot better of a system than no competition and no desire to produce services and goods in a high quality and efficient way because the government regulates everything. Neal Boortz tells a story that's a perfect example of when he visited Soviet Russia a couple decades ago.

Which system is more efficient is arguable. I doubt Boortz's objectiveness when writing his report. But really, at the end of the day, if I can know that a nation has achieved equality, I'd be jumping for joy, even if it meant there aren't enough iPods to go around.
