

---

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock  
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 13:02:35 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 05:41spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13so now you think that government should be allowed to decide how we can/should/will spend the money that we make? if i have money, i should be able to decide what i will do with it. whether i earn it, win it, have it given to me whatever. if i want a solid gold bath tub, then that is what i should be able to spend my money on.

This is already the case in some (Admittedly common-sense) cases, like assault weapons. You can't spend your hard earned money on machine guns. Why? Because it does the public more harm than it does you good. Such laws are in effect because, at times, people have differing (Dare I say wrong?) views on what is acceptable use of their funds, which whether you like it or not, affects people beyond you and your immediate friends/family. For example, I WOULD be in support of a law that forbids people from buying houses they can't afford the payments on, because like buying a machine gun, you're causing a lot of potential harm to a lot of people while exercising your "freedom to choose".

not really relevant to our conversation to compare dangerous weapons to luxury items. as for laws regarding not allowing people to buy a house they can't afford, that - for the most part- should be dealt with in the private sector. if someone gets a loan they can't afford, then they should suffer the consequences(usually foreclosure). at the same time, if a company gives a loan they shouldn't give then that company should suffer the consequences(meaning they should lose out on their investment ie. not get bailed out by taxpayers)Quote:

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13imagine a government where you're not allowed to decide what you get to spend your money on.

imagine some government worker in washington deciding that you don't need a PC that can run games. afterall, games like renegade are a luxury. why should you get to buy one when there are levees breaking in new orleans? or how bout that steak dinner you want to take your girl friend to? steak is a bit over priced and luxurious, isnt' it? i think maybe you should take her to burger king instead. or, better yet, eating out in general is wrong whenn there are starving children! make her peanut butter sandwich ( no jelly, that's over the top)

I'm just going to write off this entire paragraph as silly ConserviFag scare tactics. In fact, I'm going to do you a favor, spot, and pretend you didn't write it. You're better than that, I know you are. don't write it off. it's a very valid point. at what point do you stop allowing government to decide what is and what is not luxury? is it just gold bathtubs? that's easy enough to fix - outlaw gold bathtubs! there will always be something that someone else thinks is luxurious. you probably think my GMC Envoy is luxury. perhaps you think i should drive my 4 kids around in a toyota prius? if we let you say "no gold bath tubs while kids are starving in inner chicago!" then what's to keep you from saying "no steak dinners while there's still crime in duluth!"

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13it may sound stupid, but there is no difference between that and telling bill gates he can't have a solid gold bath tub. he earned his money, it's his to spend. not the government's

One of the reasons I respect Bill Gates as much as I do is because, even though he has (Had?) the highest , he doesn't (Didn't?) buy things like solid gold hot tubs. not that it matters, but he spends his money just like everyone else does. he travels first class, he goes on 2000 mile trips to go shopping, i don't know what type of tub he has (do you?) but then i can't name a person with a gold bathtub(can you?)

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13as for government healthcare, there are so many things wrong with that! not the least of which is the fact that government can't run anything well!Quote:

inb4iraqwar.

I'm going to forgive you for spouting that same retarded Regan mantra that republicans seem to be wet for. Government not sure what this means. can you tell me 3 things that government runs well?

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13in america every single person has the chance to do what they want with their life. no one is stuck being poor, no one is stuck at the bottom.Quote:

And in a perfect world, you'd be right, but reality begs to differ with you. The rich are only getting richer, and the poor are only getting poorer. not all rich are getting richer and not all poor are getting poorer. but it makes sense that once you hve money it's easier to keep/grow it. it also makes sense that often the bad decisions that made the poor poor will keep them in poverty. i can tell you that without being taxed, fined and fee'd to death the poor would have an easier time getting out of poverty. tell me - how many times have you heard a story of a person getting out of poverty by using government assistance(legally) sure, people have been on government assistance at tough times in their life, but it is their hard work and or luck that got them out of it - not the small government check that comes in the mail.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13there are many ways to become successful - whether you consider rich as successful, family man as successful, a good artist or a lowly priest serving god. what ever your definition of success is, you have the opportunity to be that in america.Quote:

While what you're saying here is true, it has nothing to do with anything we're discussing. How do higher government taxes stop you from being artistic or being a priest? If anything you're only proving my point for me. higher government taxes make it so that you have to work harder to afford even the basic necessities in life. it is harder to spend time doing what you love (painting for example) when you are spending so much time trying to put food on the table.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13and if you want to be rich and you work hard enough and smart enough and have the right amount of luck, you can be rich and when you are - there shouldnt' be an oppressive intrusive government telling you that you can't buy a solid gold bathtub!

Quote:

"Oppressive" and "intrusive" aren't words I would use to describe a 3% tax hike on the wealthiest 1% of Americans. As evidence, I point to the Scandinavian countries which have higher taxes, yet

outclass America in just about every way imaginable except maybe average weight of their citizens.

the richest americans pay over 90% of the taxes in this country. i'd have to look up the exact numbers ( and i will later ) but once the bush tax cuts expire over 30% of the money the top earners make will go to federal taxes. that's just federal income tax - not including local and state taxes. once the proposed obama taxes go into effect, it's estimated that somem americans will pay over 50% in taxes. that means over half of what they make in wages will be handed over to the government. how'd you like it if you worked over 70 hours a week(most ceo's do so) and had to pay over half of what you make to the government?

Quote:

Governments are formed for a reason. Citizens pay taxes to a collective and in return they receive some kind of services in return. They know if a foreign nation invades there will be a military to stop them, they know there's a police to call if they see a crime being committed, and they know there's a fire department to call if their house is on fire (Why they shouldn't know there's a hospital to go to, I don't know). I could go as far as to say that the size of government is a measurement of civilization. Less taxes and smaller government mean less services being provided, and everyone is out for themselves in a vicious world. You might call it fair, but I call it barbaric. We're better than that.

most philosophers say - and i agree - that government is by definition an entity that restricts its citizens freedom. smaller government means more freedom. less taxes = MORE REVENUE FOR THE GOVERNMENT! this is because when the people keep more of their money they get more innovative and create more jobs which means more revenue to the government.

i hope i got the quotes right this time, i keep trying but i keep messing up. i have to go to bed soon. but i'll try to post facts with sources regarding tax rates and such later.