
Subject: Taxation

Posted by [Quackpunk](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 02:22:12 GMT

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

In my government class today, I heard that in the UK there is a tax for each television in a household, because the broadcasting is government owned. I find that ridiculous.

I am from the United States, and there is a statistic that the average employed American gives taxes equivalent to 3 months of work every year. The governments job is to protect the rights of citizens, not to get involved in the financial economy. The tax plan from Obama is basically to put a high tax on anyone making over 250k a year. Excessive taxing is ridiculous, let alone robbing high income families and companies of their financial success. Do not get me started on government taxes such as 80 cent tax on cigarettes, and social security. In my eyes the less governing, the better the government

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 02:37:33 GMT

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

Obama's plan is basically to increase taxation for the rich, and decrease for the poor. Which is cool and all, but here's the thing.

Most rich people own businesses. What happens when a business (Which, by the way, normally have employees) has less money? This means less benefits for the employees. Shittier insurance, shittier payrolls, and so on are some examples of things they'd need to do to keep their business afloat. What's this mean?

Well gee, what are most employees? Oh, that's right. Lower to middle class.

Let's not forget, some businesses simply won't stay afloat. They'll collapse. Which means less employees. Which means people getting no money whatsoever.

OBAMA '08: HELPING THE MIDDLE AND LOW CLASS, BY FUCKING THE MIDDLE AND LOW CLASS RIGHT IN THE ASS.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 02:45:55 GMT

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

Can we also note that this is all ILLEGAL (not that it ever stops the government...). Any revenue-based legislation must be universally applied. Giving tax breaks to one group and raising taxes for another seems to not be applied equally. Oh, and then there's just the whole idea that the income tax is not a legal direct tax, anyway.

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [Rocko](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 04:51:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

what our black asses need is a consumption tax rather than income

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [Quackpunk](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 05:03:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rocko wrote on Wed, 22 October 2008 23:51 what our black asses need is a consumption tax rather than income
Is that supposed to be sexual?

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [u6795](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 18:53:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, isn't there some deal about income taxation being against the constitution? I'm not all sure really.

Also, I sort of agree with Rocko. People should be charged only for what they buy and use, not for what they get/are paid.

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 19:19:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, it's illegal. If you want to understand why, you might want to watch the first half of Aaron Russo's America: Freedom to Fascism. It's kind of boring, but I think it explains it well.

As for the consumption tax, there is an effort called the FairTax.

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [futura83](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 22:15:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quackpunk wrote on Thu, 23 October 2008 03:22 In my government class today, I heard that in the UK there is a tax for each television in a household, because the broadcasting is government owned. I find that ridiculous.

I am from the United States, and there is a statistic that the average employed American gives taxes equivalent to 3 months of work every year. The governments job is to protect the rights of

citizens, not to get involved in the financial economy. The tax plan from Obama is basically to put a high tax on anyone making over 250k a year. Excessive taxing is ridiculous, let alone robbing high income families and companies of their financial success. Do not get me started on government taxes such as 80 cent tax on cigarettes, and social security. In my eyes the less governing, the better the government

The TV Liscence fee is paid once per year per household (which can have as many TVs as it wants then) and this fee covers everything the BBC does; TV, radio and the website, on which you can listen to radio and watch TV shows (that have aired within the past 7 days and are BBC own) for free*. Not to mention, that the channels can have good programs on (depends on taste really) which are uninterrupted by annoying adverts.

* When i say for free, i obviously mean covered by the liscence fee.

edit: According to wikipedia:

Quote: The principal means of funding the BBC is through the television licence, costing £139.50 a year (as of May 2008) for a colour television.

Which puts it in the region of £12-£14 per month...very cheap for what you get.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 03:25:24 GMT

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

Cabal8616 wrote on Wed, 22 October 2008 21:37Obama's plan is basically to increase taxation for the rich, and decrease for the poor. Which is cool and all, but here's the thing.

Most rich people own businesses. What happens when a business (Which, by the way, normally have employees) has less money? This means less benefits for the employees. Shittier insurance, shittier payrolls, and so on are some examples of things they'd need to do to keep their business afloat. What's this mean?

Well gee, what are most employees? Oh, that's right. Lower to middle class.

Let's not forget, some businesses simply won't stay afloat. They'll collapse. Which means less employees. Which means people getting no money whatsoever.

OBAMA '08: HELPING THE MIDDLE AND LOW CLASS, BY FUCKING THE MIDDLE AND LOW CLASS RIGHT IN THE ASS.

Drat, you discovered the flaw in Obama's tax plan! Thank heavens!

Actually, this has already been addressed. Obama's plan is to give a TAX CREDIT to businesses that provide health insurance benefits to their employees. So that gives them a considerable monetary incentive to maintain decent health care coverage despite the insufferable tax increase.

...Except that the tax increase isn't so "insufferable." The tax increase for businesses immediately around the \$250,000/year range is approximately 3%; the same tax rates they paid under Reagan! So hey, we're back to the old-school "trickle down" territory, if that's what everyone here seems to get off on.

Also, I realize that everyone fucking hates taxes. So do I. But we have a monstrous deficit that we need to address in some way. It's gotten so bad that simply cutting government programs alone, which McCain proposes, isn't going to do it. I don't know if Obama will adequately address the national debt problem, but he seems like the better alternative to me. McCain's not going to be able to cut pork-barrel spending with a Democratic congress, anyway.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 03:30:18 GMT

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

I just want the government to fuck off. I don't want incentives given to corporations or to individuals. I don't want tax hikes. I don't want to pay for useless social programs. I don't want to pay for national security that's absolutely worthless.

Also, Obama's plan is to increase government spending by \$292 billion, and McCain isn't going to cut spending, he's going to increase spending by about \$90 billion.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 03:32:02 GMT

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

It'd probably be more prudent to go after the companies that don't even pay taxes to the government, while still operating in the country.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/newsOn/idUSN1249465620080812?sp=true>

Quote:The Government Accountability Office said 72 percent of all foreign corporations and about 57 percent of U.S. companies doing business in the United States paid no federal income taxes for at least one year between 1998 and 2005.

Quote:More than half of foreign companies and about 42 percent of U.S. companies paid no U.S. income taxes for two or more years in that period, the report said.

Quote:The study showed about 28 percent of large foreign corporations, those with more than \$250 million in assets, doing business in the United States paid no federal income taxes in 2005 despite \$372 billion in gross receipts, the senators said. About 25 percent of the largest U.S. companies paid no federal income taxes in 2005 despite \$1.1 trillion in gross sales that year, they said.

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [u6795](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 10:37:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, the way I see it McCain isn't going to be able to do much. It'll just be him vs congress all four years, nothing is going to be done. Unfortunately, that's a very good reason that Obama will probably win. They'll cooperate, mostly.

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [GoArmy44](#) on Sun, 26 Oct 2008 07:45:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

u6795 wrote on Thu, 23 October 2008 13:53 Yeah, isn't there some deal about income taxation being against the constitution? I'm not all sure really.

Also, I sort of agree with Rocko. People should be charged only for what they buy and use, not for what they get/are paid.

16th Amendment

To the original constitution, it was probably illegal but amendments tend to change things.

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 26 Oct 2008 14:54:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

16th Amendment was never ratified legally... I urge people to actually take a look at America: Freedom to Fascism.

Subject: Re: Taxation
Posted by [w0dka](#) on Sun, 02 Nov 2008 09:19:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 23 October 2008 22:30 I just want the government to fuck off. I don't want incentives given to corporations or to individuals. I don't want tax hikes. I don't want to pay for useless social programs. I don't want to pay for national security that's absolutely worthless.

You could always life in tax-free countries.

And those social problems. Think of it that way, now you don't need it, but if you need it, then you're glad its there.

Oh and the german Tax Freedom Day was this year at 08.07.08 so up o dis date we worked for the government. (Yes we can get pretty much things back)

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 02 Nov 2008 13:44:22 GMT

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

I have no problem with legal taxes. I support taxation because it's essential for government to function, but what I don't support is paying illegal taxes to fund illegal laws.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 02 Nov 2008 13:46:39 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Sun, 02 November 2008 07:44I have no problem with legal taxes. I support taxation because it's essential for government to function, but what I don't support is paying illegal taxes to fund illegal laws.which taxation ist legal and which isnt in america?

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 02 Nov 2008 13:54:53 GMT

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

Income taxes are illegal because the 16th Amendment was never legally ratified, and thus making it only legal for there to be indirect and direct taxes. Yes, income tax is a direct tax, but it is U.S. Constitutional law that all direct taxes be apportioned... taxed at the same rate. The income tax does not do this. It's a graduated tax, thus it's illegal.

As for the illegal legislation... all revenue based legislation must be equally divided amongst the people. Obviously, welfare programs and the like are, once again, illegal because of such uneven distribution. America was never intended to be a welfare state, and there are safeguards in the Constitution to prevent it from becoming one... not that it has stopped the government at all.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 04 Nov 2008 04:25:37 GMT

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

I hate how this election has turned into who can do the most for people without health care at the expense of those WITH health care.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 04 Nov 2008 12:54:42 GMT

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

Quote:

As for the illegal legislation... all revenue based legislation must be equally divided amongst the people. Obviously, welfare programs and the like are, once again, illegal because of such uneven distribution. America was never intended to be a welfare state, and there are safeguards in the Constitution to prevent it from becoming one... not that it has stopped the government at all. Maybe America wasn't intended to be one, but 100 years ago was 100 years ago and now is now.

I agree that some people abuse welfare - not trying to get work, people whose business idea was obviously stupid and they "deserved" to land at the bottom - but you also have to see that some people never had the chance to fulfill the American dream because they were born in poverty and had NO way of coming out.

Liberty is nice, but before having a liberty you need to ensure everyone has it - that everybody has the education and standard to fulfill his life with whatever he wants. When he fucks up *then* - no welfare.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 04 Nov 2008 14:20:27 GMT

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

Privatize welfare. Organizations are a fuckload better at it than the government is. Plus, I never said take away education. In fact, I want to better education by making schools compete for students.

Again, shall I point out that America is a REPUBLIC which means we're ruled by law. Thus, we have to ADHERE to the law, especially our government needs to. It doesn't like to, as we can see. My voting against welfare programs is also a vote to make our government follow the written law that states revenue based legislation must be distributed uniformly... welfare doesn't exactly do that.

Oh, and refusing to give people money is hardly preventing them from having the same opportunities. Parents don't pay for their kids' educations. Well, my parents did, but that's because I went to a private school, so not only did they pay taxes for other kids to go to school, they paid \$3000-4000/yr EACH for my brother and me to have private education.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 04 Nov 2008 18:44:56 GMT

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

Public High school at least where I live is about 700\$ a child. More when they take driver's ed and Senior year for graduation costs.

Subject: Re: Taxation

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 11 Nov 2008 18:02:47 GMT

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

Quackpunk wrote on Wed, 22 October 2008 21:22: In my government class today, I heard that in the UK there is a tax for each television in a household, because the broadcasting is government owned. I find that ridiculous.

this is broadly true but the statement the broadcasting is government owned is slightly misleading.

insert_name_here's post is misleading too, because it doesn't point out that if you want to use a TV for something but haven't the slightest interest in anything the BBC puts out, you still have to pay the licence fee. other channels like Channel 4 are funded by advertising (which is as it should be) but if the only channel you want to watch is Channel 4, you still have to pay the licence fee... so both you and channel 4 are basically getting screwed.

thankfully the money's being wisely spent on seven-figure salaries. for what is effectively a government job...
