
Subject: Politics - double split
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Thu, 27 Aug 2009 20:54:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 07:40 However, it doesn't change the fact that 2 people just repeating the same arguments over and over is a waste of effort and resources.

i think the democratic party in America would disagree with you. they spouted the same crap for over a year and got their idiot elected to the White House

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [RadioactiveHell](#) on Thu, 27 Aug 2009 21:03:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 15:54Goztow wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 07:40
However, it doesn't change the fact that 2 people just repeating the same arguments over and over is a waste of effort and resources.

i think the democratic party in America would disagree with you. they spouted the same crap for over a year and got their idiot elected to the White House

Tbh, the same could be said for both party's. And I think it is very easy to make the case that the two political partys continuing to spout the same half truths over and over again in order to get the publics approval is incredibly unhealthy for the US.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Thu, 27 Aug 2009 21:18:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

except it didn't work for the Republicans

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Thu, 27 Aug 2009 23:43:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

why thats how Bush was in the office for 2 terms... it just didnt work THIS TIME lol

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 04:26:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)


spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 13:54i think the democratic party in America would

disagree with you. they spouted the same crap for over a year and got their idiot elected to the White House

In all seriousness, I think it's kind of hard to accuse the democrats of spouting the same crap over and over when the Republican solution to everything is introduce a tax cut, and if that doesn't work say it's because God is angry over gays getting married.

File Attachments

1) [Incorrect.jpg](#), downloaded 1090 times



Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 04:59:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

wow here comes another split
the democrat answer is always "spend more" and "big government"
and "if you don't like our guy you must be racist"

you'd think there would be a better answer coming from one of the two sides considering they both think they're smarter than everyone else on the planet.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 05:01:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 23:59wow here comes another split
the democrat answer is always "spend more" and "big government"
and "if you don't like our guy you must be racist"

you'd think there would be a better answer coming from one of the two sides considering they both think they're smarter than everyone else on the planet.

those are the same answers republicans have

we have a right leaning party and an even further right party

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 05:02:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 21:59wow here comes another split
the democrat answer is always "spend more" and "big government"

Because -- get this -- government DOES THINGS, and provides services, while tax cuts are just free handjobs to people who already have money and are living comfortably.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 05:10:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 01:02spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 21:59wow here comes another split
the democrat answer is always "spend more" and "big government"

Because -- get this -- government DOES THINGS, and provides services, while tax cuts are just free handjobs to people who already have money and are living comfortably.

wow. what exactly does government do? what is it you think they're SUPPOSED to do? who do

you think PAYS for what the government does? who do you think provides jobs to people?
tax cuts to businesses provides capital for businesses to expand and provide more jobs to people.
tax cuts to individuals allows them to keep more of their own money in their own pockets so that they can decide how they will spend their own money. when they spend that money, it creates more jobs for more people who will in turn spend more money the ultimate goal being - get this- getting more people OFF government welfare!

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 05:22:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 00:10Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 01:02spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 21:59wow here comes another split
the democrat answer is always "spend more" and "big government"

Because -- get this -- government DOES THINGS, and provides services, while tax cuts are just free handjobs to people who already have money and are living comfortably.

wow. what exactly does government do? what is it you think they're SUPPOSED to do? who do you think PAYS for what the government does? who do you think provides jobs to people?
tax cuts to businesses provides capital for businesses to expand and provide more jobs to people.
tax cuts to individuals allows them to keep more of their own money in their own pockets so that they can decide how they will spend their own money. when they spend that money, it creates more jobs for more people who will in turn spend more money the ultimate goal being - get this- getting more people OFF government welfare!

Not like I don't agree 75% of what our government does is unconstitutional. lets get this straight your preaching trickle down economics. Do you relies what that richest 1% do with all that money they make NOTHING it sit in their bank account earning interest. I don't know how the hell you bought into the greed is good line of bull but greed is why our economy is in the shitter greed is bad for everyone but the individual.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 05:26:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10wow. what exactly does government do?

Quite a few things. Government provides services which would be unweildy or unwise to allow the private sector to deal with, like most things relating to the construction or maintenance of roads. They provide regulation in areas where it would be foolhardy not to have regulation (Like in most utility sectors, airlines, (ideally speaking) the banking/finacial sector, and many others. On a local level, they provide public-safety services like a police force and fire department (To this day I'm baffled as to why healthcare isn't included here), and otherwise ensure that society functions the way it should.

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10what is it you think they're SUPPOSED to do?

See above.

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10who do you think PAYS for what the government does?

Taxpayers. The people receiving the services the government provides. Also, China.

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10who do you think provides jobs to people?

Lots of entities, including, but not limited to, the government.

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10tax cuts to businesses provides capital for businesses to expand and provide more jobs to people.

In theory. In reality it just gives the wealthy owners of said business more "capital" to buy that fourth solid-gold hot tub.

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10tax cuts to individuals allows them to keep more of their own money in their own pockets so that they can decide how they will spend their own money.

At the cost of a smaller safety net in the form of less services to take advantage of. Also, this point assumes that whatever the individual decides to spend his money on is the right choice (Like all the people who bought houses they couldn't afford. Capitalism at it's finest!)

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10when they spend that money, it creates more jobs for more people who will in turn spend more money the ultimate goal being

Or more solid gold hot tubs.

spotelmo wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 22:10- get this- getting more people OFF government welfare!

I lol'd.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 06:27:32 GMT

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

Yeah, but who MAKES the solid gold hot tub? Now you've just created a job for the guys who mine the gold, the guys who refine the gold, the guys who make the tub, the guys who install the tub. Not the mention the guys who do the marketing for the tub manufacturer, the guys who sell the gold to the tub maker, the landlord of the property that the tub makers rent to make tubs, the

guys who laid the utility lines so that the tub makers could have water, electricity, phones, the guys who make the roads that the above people drive on to get to work... need I continue?

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 06:45:02 GMT

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

Not to mention the taxes incurred from making the gold tub and from the incomes funding schools to bring up students that will get well paying jobs so they can buy more gold tubs.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 06:47:13 GMT

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

Crimson wrote on Thu, 27 August 2009 23:27 Yeah, but who MAKES the solid gold hot tub? Now you've just created a job for the guys who mine the gold, the guys who refine the gold, the guys who make the tub, the guys who install the tub. Not the mention the guys who do the marketing for the tub manufacturer, the guys who sell the gold to the tub maker, the landlord of the property that the tub makers rent to make tubs, the guys who laid the utility lines so that the tub makers could have water, electricity, phones, the guys who make the roads that the above people drive on to get to work... need I continue?

That's great, but the end result is a solid gold hot tub. That money and those jobs could easily be put to a better use, like making sure people don't go bankrupt because they can't afford health insurance, let's say, or building new roads (And widening current ones that need it), or fixing levees in New Orleans, or making sure people don't get murdered in Chicago. The list goes on and on.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 06:49:02 GMT

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

I like where this is going .

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 09:13:22 GMT

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

so 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.

imagine 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)
it 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

as 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!

in 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. there 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. and 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!

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 09:18:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: (Like all the people who bought houses they couldn't afford. Capitalism at it's finest!)

hmm now that isn't the fat cats buying gold bath tubs you're talking about here. that would be the lower paid working class who got a loan
#1 that they coulnd't afford
#2 without reading all the paper work
#3 that they didn't understand
#4 that they LIED to get

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 09:41:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo 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 beacause, 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".

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.

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.

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!

inb4iraqwar.

I'm going to forgive you for spouting that same retarded Regan mantra that republicans seem to be wet for. Government

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.

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.

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.

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.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13 and 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 shouldn't be an oppressive intrusive government telling you that you can't buy a solid gold bathtub!

"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.

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.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 09:46:12 GMT

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

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:18 Quote: (Like all the people who bought houses they couldn't afford. Capitalism at it's finest!)

hmm now that isn't the fat cats buying gold bath tubs you're talking about here. that would be the lower paid working class who got a loan

#1 that they couldn't afford

#2 without reading all the paper work

#3 that they didn't understand

#4 that they LIED to get

I was referring to the need for government regulation in the financial sector. Certain things, like giving loans to people that they shouldn't qualify for, shouldn't be allowed.

It's very easy to put all the blame on the home buyers (And, I'll admit, a good portion of the blame does rest with them), but when it's an administration's policy to "encourage" people into becoming home buyers and when it's lucrative for banks to give such loans regardless of the secondary

effects down the line, there really isn't much the individual can do. There are higher powers beyond their perception or ability to influence at work.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [kadoosh](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 12:26:07 GMT

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

Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 05:46spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:18Quote:
(Like all the people who bought houses they couldn't afford. Capitalism at it's finest!)

hmm now that isn't the fat cats buying gold bath tubs you're talking about here. that would be the lower paid working class who got a loan

#1 that they couldn't afford

#2 without reading all the paper work

#3 that they didn't understand

#4 that they LIED to get

I was referring to the need for government regulation in the financial sector. Certain things, like giving loans to people that they shouldn't qualify for, shouldn't be allowed.

It's very easy to put all the blame on the home buyers (And, I'll admit, a good portion of the blame does rest with them), but when it's an administration's policy to "encourage" people into becoming home buyers and when it's lucrative for banks to give such loans regardless of the secondary effects down the line, there really isn't much the individual can do. There are higher powers beyond their perception or ability to influence at work.

It was the government regulations that allowed them to get the loans... When ever the government gets in the private sector it goes bad.

PS Dover get over your wealth envy...it's disturbing.

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.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 13:32:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 08:26Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 05:46spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:18Quote: (Like all the people who bought houses they couldn't afford. Capitalism at it's finest!)

hmm now that isn't the fat cats buying gold bath tubs you're talking about here. that would be the lower paid working class who got a loan

#1 that they coulnd't afford

#2 without reading all the paper work

#3 that they didn't understand

#4 that they LIED to get

I was referring to the need for government regulation in the financial sector. Certain things, like giving loans to people that they shouldn't qualify for, shouldn't be allowed.

It's very easy to put all the blame on the home buyers (And, I'll admit, a good portion of the blame does rest with them), but when it's an administration's policy to "encourage" people into becoming home buyers and when it's lucrative for banks to give such loans regardless of the secondary effects down the line, there really isn't much the individual can do. There are higher powers beyond their perception or ability to influence at work.

It was the government regulations that allowed them to get the loans... When ever the government gets in the private sector it goes bad.

PS Dover get over your wealth envy...it's disturbing.
i gotta agree here!

the democrat party should be very proud of themselves, the lessons taught by karl marx have finally worked for them. they've been preaching this class warfare since the end of Clinton's term. it didn't work for gore, didn't work for kerry, definitely didn't work for edwards, but it's working very well for obama.

the scary thing is, those who are participating in this class envy crap don't even recognize they're doing it or that it's a bad thing. makes you wonder when as americans we started teaching our kids this in the home.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 15:49:00 GMT

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

Imao this is soon to be a topic split from a split topic.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 16:43:22 GMT

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

Spot do you know why those people pay so much more income tax then the poor bastards who don't have any income?

It's because they earn 90% of the money earned in this country. Even if it was a flat % tax they'd be paying billions more in taxes because they make that much more.

It's not like paying those taxes hurts someone whos average yearly income could feed a family of 4 for life.

By the way you forget to mentioned all the tax breaks and loop hole that allow those people who you say pay such high taxes to pay next to no taxes in reality.

Their is a reason our government is run by the corporations. The people like you who truly think it's good for everybody to let the rich get as rich as they want no matter who suffers because of it.

You know where all that money in the rich peoples bank accounts come from the poor. If the working class decided they had enough of working their asses off for nothing the rich fuckers would come falling down pretty fast but guess what never gonna happen because the working class needs that money.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [kadoosh](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 17:27:40 GMT

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

So basically you are saying that Successful people should be punished for being successful

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 17:33:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 12:27 So basically you are saying that Successful people should be punished for being successful

No I'm saying they should pay their fair share spot says they should pay less because they are successful. How is them paying more taxes when they have more money to pay said taxes is a punishment? at the end of the day it doesn't really effect them in any negative way.

whats good for the economy is not whats good for the individual it's whats good for the hole. Is long as we are doing simply whats good for "me" whats good for everybody goes by the way side if you can't see that your a blind fool.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 18:51:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

dragon, your argument would hold some merit if we weren't talking about percentages of income or if we were talking about theoretical dollars. you say the rich don't pay taxes because of loopholes but the fact remains that they pay 90% of the dollars going into the government. you say the poor pay more in taxes but the truth is, the poor pay nothing in taxes while the rich pay 30% of their income in taxes.

the rich are already paying more than their "fair share" in taxes.

your marxist statements about how the rich would crumble if the poor decided not to take it any more is for the most part true. however the poor would suffer sooner, longer and worse than the rich because it is the rich who are giving the poor their money.

what i don't get, is how you guys are preaching about how government is good but rich people are bad. you do realize that the government is made up of rich people, right? government isn't some magical entity that just exists in a magic kingdom. you're basically saying that all this money and power should be given over to a bunch of middleaged (mostly) white guys so that they can decide what to do to your life. you don't like rich guys, you don't like corporations because their evil and take all your money and leave you with nothing yet somehow you think the government is any different. how many government officials can you name that aren't rich? hell, the hero of the left ted kennedy just died. he's been in office for almost 50 years. his salary as a senator is less than \$200k yet he was a millionaire. it would seem that he'd only end up as middle class with that small salary yet he had millions.

i still haven't seen anyone list 3 things that the government does well and efficiently.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 19:01:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

aaaa putting words in my mouth there spot. When have I ever said I liked or even trusted the government? They don't give a shit about the country as a hole either.

The poor don't pay much in taxes it's the middle class that gets raped in the ass. They get no governmental help at all unlike the poor and no breaks like the rich. Soon enough their will be no middle class so that argument wont mean anything.

By the way my family is in the shitter because of the bureaucratic bullshit in the country where the corporations are basically above the law.

look up the Dana cooperation and what they did to their retired employees.

I'd like you to tell me how they earned that money in any way shape or form when they were more then likely born rich in the first place.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 19:36:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's awesome, this thread reunited spot and darkdrag again!

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 21:04:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

darkdragon wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 15:01

I'd like you to tell me how they earned that money in any way shape or form when they were more then likely born rich in the first place.

by "they" do you mean all the rich? if so, it looks to me like you're making assumptions without any facts to back them up. there are thousands of millionaires in this country. do you think they were all born rich? there are millions of people who are considered "wealthy" by the obama administration (earn over \$250k per year) do you really think they're actually "rich"? do you think they were born making that money? do you think they should be paying such a large percentage of their income in taxes? i agree the middleclass get screwed more than anyone in this country. they often don't have the power of the rich or even the power of the poor and they are too busy working to put food on the table to take the time to educate themselves about what the government is doing to their lives and then act upon it. that still doesn't mean that we need more government or that the rich should pay more taxes to the government. what it means is that we need to elect officials who will actually have our interests in mind when making decisions that affect our lives.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 21:07:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i'd appreciate you sending me a link to what you'd like me to read about dana corporation. from a quick browsing, it seems their a parts supplier that went into bankruptcy and reorganized things including retirement plans.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 21:14:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 05:26It was the government regulations that allowed them to get the loans... When ever the government gets in the private sector it goes bad.

I believe you're mistaken. It's the lack of government regulations that allowed them to get loans. Regulations tend to be restrictive (And with good reason). If it allows more than it restricts, it isn't a regulation.

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 05:26PS Dover get over your wealth envy...it's disturbing.

HAR HAR

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02not 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)

And again, in a perfect world, you'd be right, but clearly it's not just them that bears the consequences of their actions. To some extent we all do. This is what I'm trying to get across. We're not just a collection of isolated individuals. We're a society, and we need to behave accordingling.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02don'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!"

Since we're having this discussion in the context of the size of government (and the amount of taxes that should be payed, accordingling), I'll assume that the point you're making is that the current amount is the best amount, and even if

If that is, indeed, what you're trying to say, then all I have to do is point to the multitude of more successful states, in particular (again) the Scandinavian nations.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 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,

Perhaps, but not at the level he could, or more accurately at the level he's expected to in the consumer culture the United States in which he holds (Held?) the position of "Richest man". By and large most of his money goes to charity and other worthy causes, which is the case with some of the wealthier class, but sadly not many.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 i don't know what type of tub he has (do you?)

I don't know what kind of tub he has either. I do know, however, that he does not have a solid gold bath tub.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 but then i can't name a person with a gold bathtub (can you?)

And I can name someone with a solid gold bath tub. She is the CEO and owner of a "small business" that employs about seven people.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 02:13 as 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.

My bad. I was distracted in the process of writing my response and I coincidentally moved on to the next point without ever finishing my thought.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 can you tell me 3 things that government runs well?

Admittedly, it would be easier for me to tell you three things that foreign governments run well than to name three things that the US government runs well. The only relevant difference I can point out is that most foreign governments (The one's I'm talking about, anyway) are better funded because of a higher tax rate. It can't be anything else. Aren't we the self-proclaimed greatest country in the world?

It's curious, really. Republicans want a small, feeble government because government supposedly can't do anything right, and in the process of creating small government they only further limit it's ability to do things right. A self-fulfilling prophecy if there ever was one.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02 not all rich are getting richer and not all poor are

getting poorer.

Not all, of course, but a large enough percentage to produce a very noticeable trend. Isn't that enough? It would be a true disaster if it was ALL rich getting richer and ALL poor 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.[/quote]

You're assuming that all (Or most. Whatever word you want to use. I don't care) rich make good decisions and all (Or most. Whatever) poor make bad decisions.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02i can tell you that without being taxed, fined and fee'd to death the poor would have an easier time getting out of poverty.

So we shouldn't tax the poor, and the rich should pick up the slack for them. I'm glad we're on the same page.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02tell 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.

That's absurd. Using that logic, since it's the engine of a car that makes it go, you could operate a car without any seats in it. You might be technically right, but have you ever tried it? Every bit helps, and none of it should be written off.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02higher 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.

You seem to have this concept of tax money disappearing into some kind of void or something. This isn't the case at all. It's put to use providing services and subsidizing goods that consumers use. For example, with a single-payer system of health care (Paid for by tax dollars), a citizen wouldn't have to worry about some kind of unforeseen hospital bill interfering with his ability to put food on the table. Also, because of heavy government subsidies on corn, the average American can buy a huge tub of Coke (With free refills!) for an absurdly cheap price, since Coke is mostly water and High Fructose Corn Syrup. Without such subsidies, it wouldn't be practical to super-size a meal.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02the richest americans pay over 90% of the taxes in this country.

Bullshit.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02i'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.

33%, if I'm not mistaken. Or was it 36%? I can't remember, so please do look it up. In any case, it's by far the lowest tax rate of any developed nation, so don't even begin to bitch about that being a high number.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02that's just federal income tax - not including local and state taxes.

State and local income taxes (Where they exist, because they don't exist everywhere) are typically a lot lower than federal income taxes. This is mostly because state and local governments tend to rely more on taxes like sales tax which fall a lot harder on the lower and middle class, or flat taxes and revenues collected through things like parking tickets, which fall on the poor even harder.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02once the proposed obama taxes go into effect, it's estimated that some americans will pay over 50% in taxes. that means over half of what they make in wages will be handed over to the government.

More bullshit. Who made this "estimate"?

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02how'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?

There's a stark difference between the kind of work a CEO does--like taking the occasional phone call while golfing--and (for lack of a better word) real work. It is neither physically nor especially mentally exhausting

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02most 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.

This might be hard for you to wrap your mind around, but there is such a thing as too much freedom. Most philosophers say - and I agree (And I'm sure you do too) - that freedoms should end at the moment they infringe upon the freedoms and rights of others. This very much applies to the current financial crisis. The freedom of some to spend their money what they want (In this case, homes they couldn't afford) brought down the economy. Dare I say that's too much freedom?

History teaches this lesson over and over; In times of great hardship people often readily give their intangible, insubstantial "freedom" in return for material security and well being. What good does freedom do you if you're dying of starvation?

tl;dr -- More freedom isn't necessarily always a good thing.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:02i 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.

Please do. I find a lot of your numbers hard to believe.

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 06:32

i gotta agree here!

the democrat party should be very proud of themselves, the lessons taught by karl marx have finally worked for them. they've been preaching this class warfare since the end of Clinton's term. it didn't work for gore, didn't work for kerry, definitely didn't work for edwards, but it's working very well for obama.

the scary thing is, those who are participating in this class envy crap don't even recognize they're doing it or that it's a bad thing. makes you wonder when as americans we started teaching our kids this in the home.

Clearly it's the Democrats' fault for pointing out the huge inequalities (And they ARE a bad thing, according to economists), and not the Republicans' fault for creating the problem in the first place.

kadoosh wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 10:27So basically you are saying that Successful people should be punished for being successful

If you call having enough money to buy a solid gold hot tub a punishment. I hear this point over and over again, yet I've never met a rich person who has lost incentive in being rich because of the "high" taxes on them and their income; And I've met quite a few rich people.

Edit: Fixed some quotes.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Fri, 28 Aug 2009 22:31:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 14:07i'd appreciate you sending me a link to what you'd like me to read about dana corporation. from a quick browsing, it seems their a parts supplier that went into bankruptcy and reorganized things including retirement plans.

Well most of what they did isn't exactly documented anywhere where I can find anyway. Mainly what they did was cut their dam pensions and take away their health insurance. here's the thing that pisses me off the most. They moved all their assets overseas before they went bankrupt went bankrupt brought the shit back and went on operating like nothing ever happened.

how do I know this my grandpa worked their my Father worked there my uncle worked their and so on. I would have more then likely have gotten a job there if it wasn't for my personal problems and the shit they pulled afew years ago.

Personally I don't prescribe to the class war that you seem to think I do I want to abandon the whole concept of classes and have everyone be = like our country was founded to be.

Dover I suggest you read our constitution and figure out what our government is allowed to do and what they aren't it doesn't give us rights it limits the governments power.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Prulez](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 07:51:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 23:14words

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 08:14:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Prulez wrote on Sat, 29 August 2009 00:51Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 23:14words

Lol.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 08:15:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...

at the speciallllll olympiiiiicccccssssssssss...

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FBpJ4DYNaXg>

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [c4onyou8](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 08:21:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

fuck vegetables.

discuss.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 08:24:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you would fuck vegetables wouldn't you
i'm glad you didn't post the rest of your pictures from what you did in india

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 14:56:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

darkdragon wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 18:31spotelmo wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 14:07i'd appreciate you sending me a link to what you'd like me to read about dana corporation. from a quick browsing, it seems their a parts supplier that went into bankruptcy and reorganized things including retirement plans.

Well most of what they did isn't exactly documented anywhere where I can find anyway. Mainly what they did was cut their dam pensions and take away their health insurance. here's the thing that pisses me off the most. They moved all their assets overseas before they went bankrupt went bankrupt brought the shit back and went on operating like nothing ever happened.

how do I know this my grandpa worked their my Father worked there my uncle worked their and so on. I would have more then likely have gotten a job there if it wasn't for my personal problems and the shit they pulled afew years ago.

Personally I don't prescribe to the class war that you seem to think I do I want to abandon the hole concept of classes and have everyone be = like our country was founded to be.

Dover I suggest you read our constitution and figure out what our government is allowed to do and what they aren't it doesn't give us rights it limits the governments power.
if you had proof of any of that, i'm sure the courts and regulators would have loved to see it.
i know it sucks "knowing" something but not being able to prove it. for example, i "know" that the former CEO and senior vice president of the company i work for worked a shady underhanded deal to split up and then sell off the company in order to make themselves millions of dollars out of the deal. i can't prove it, but it was quite obvious in my opinion. you'll never catch me saying that people in corporations are all good people. people are people. whether they be in government, business or wherever. they are nearly always looking out for how they can gain something for themselves or make more money or position themself into more power. that's why SOME government regulation is necessary. however, there is a difference between government regulating things out of necessity and government taking over things that it has no business taking over. it is excessive government regulation and the reaching of government into aspects of our life that it has no business being in that i have a problem with.

as for your statment Quote:Personally I don't prescribe to the class war that you seem to think I do I want to abandon the hole concept of classes and have everyone be = like our country was founded to be.

our country wasn't founded for everyone to be equal, it was founded with the idea that everyone is equal under the law. people aren't equal, some are smarter, some are luckier, some are prettier, some have messed up psychological problems, some are born with more than others. we aren't equal, but under the law we're supposed to be treated equally. most of us know that it often doesn't seem like we're treated equally under the law. a rich white man who steals millions of dollars from his company's pension plan may get 5 years in a minimum security prison while a poor black man who steals a car might get 12 years in a med - max security prison. but the thing is, that has nothing really to do with the law or the constitution that has to do with PEOPLE. it is people (judges, lawyers, jurors, probation office workers, correction officials) who decided to put one in a minimum security country club while putting the other away for hard time. when the PEOPLE start educating themselves about what is going on and start holding those in charge responsible for their actions, that is when we'll see the country being run the way it's supposed to be.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 15:40:59 GMT

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

Prulez wrote on Sat, 29 August 2009 02:51Dover wrote on Fri, 28 August 2009 23:14words

no copying me plx

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 29 Aug 2009 20:45:17 GMT

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

Spot doesn't love me.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 11:51:59 GMT

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

You mean the government being in places they aren's suppose to be like oh telling you what you can do in your own home. IE gay married drug prohibition and so on.

Now where the government is suppose to be one of the things the Constitution gives our government the power for is. The general welfare of the people healthcare would fall under that I believe so anyway. By the way I do in fact believe that welfare doesn't fall under that. Universal healthcare would help everybody unlike every other form of welfare we have .

I simple want our government to stop doing the shit that helps the few and start doing the stuff that helps the whole. That and stop doing the shit that helps NO ONE .

I don't want more government I want less government in whole.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 12:51:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

darkdragon wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 07:51 You mean the government being in places they aren't suppose to be like oh telling you what you can do in your own home. IE gay married drug prohibition and so on.

i agree they shouldn't be allowed to decide who can get married. but drug use hurts more than just the person using the drugs so that is something the government should be involved in.

Quote:

Now where the government is suppose to be one of the things the Constitution gives our government the power for is. The general welfare of the people healthcare would fall under that I believe so anyway. By the way I do in fact believe that welfare doesn't fall under that. Universal healthcare would help everybody unlike every other form of welfare we have .

i disagree. it wouldn't help those who work in the health care industry, it wouldn't help those who currently enjoy the standard of care that they have, it wouldn't help those who have to pay for it.

Quote:

I simple want our government to stop doing the shit that helps the few and start doing the stuff that helps the whole. That and stop doing the shit that helps NO ONE .

I don't want more government I want less government in whole.
gotta agree with you there

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 14:07:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

umm you do relies the USA murder rate is mostly drug dealers killing other drug dealers and people getting caught in the crossfire . It's the law that caused that problem not the other way around . look up what happened the last prohibition and why we stopped it. If you find we stopped it for any other reason then it doesn't work and it caused far more problems then it solved let me know.

yes it would hurt the health industry no more 500 dollar bandages boo fucking hoo. No more price gouging because it's something people can't go without oh I'm so in tears over that.

By the way I have governmental health insurgence right now. I have just as good standard of care as you do shit compared to 75 other industrialized nations.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 14:16:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AMERICANS DEBATING TAXES ARE FUNNEH

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 14:25:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

liquidv2 wrote on Sat, 29 August 2009 03:24you would fuck vegetables wouldn't you
i'm glad you didn't post the rest of your pictures from what you did in india

holy damn I lol'ed!!!!111

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 17:13:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i think crimson should just delete this debate forum just like we did over at apathbeyond. i've never seen more overly-opinionated teenagers on issues they know nothing about than in the renegade community.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 18:13:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryan3k wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 12:13i think crimson should just delete this debate forum just like we did over at apathbeyond. i've never seen more overly-opinionated teenagers on issues they know nothing about than in the renegade community.
I'm 21 teenager I think not.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 18:27:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryan3k wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 12:13i think crimson should just delete this debate forum just like we did over at apathbeyond. i've never seen more overly-opinionated teenagers on issues they know nothing about than in the renegade community.
AND WHO WOULD YOU BE TO JUDGE THAT

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 30 Aug 2009 19:31:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryan3k wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 12:13i think crimson should just delete this debate forum just like we did over at apathbeyond. i've never seen more overly-opinionated teenagers on issues they know nothing about than in the renegade community.

K SHEEP

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 03:18:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ryan3k wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 13:13i think crimson should just delete this debate forum just like we did over at apathbeyond. i've never seen more overly-opinionated teenagers on issues they know nothing about than in the renegade community.

40 is "teenager"?

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 04:06:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

darkdragon wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 10:07umm you do relies the USA murder rate is mostly drug dealers killing other drug dealers and people getting caught in the crossfire . It's the law that caused that problem not the other way around . look up what happened the last prohibition and why we stopped it. If you find we stopped it for any other reason then it doesn't work and it caused far more problems then it solved let me know.

that logic is hugely flawed. by your logic, if we made stealing legal, there'd be no one in prison for theft. maybe we should make unwilling sex legal to clear the prison of all those rapists? there are plenty of us law abiding citizens who would rather not be subject to the behaviour of dumbasses legally walking around the city while high on crack.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 04:34:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spot hates me.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 04:53:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 00:34Spot hates me.

i really don't hate you. i respect your opinions and enjoy the conversation. so far, i've disagreed with most of your opinions, but please don't mistake our disagreement for hate.
i am by the way working on the resources i said i'd look for. i don't usually have much time on weekends for stuff like this and for the next couple days work is going to be very much like work. so it's coming, just please be patient with me.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 10:39:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 21:53Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 00:34Spot hates me.

i really don't hate you. i respect your opinions and enjoy the conversation. so far, i've disagreed with most of your opinions, but please don't mistake our disagreement for hate.
i am by the way working on the resources i said i'd look for. i don't usually have much time on weekends for stuff like this and for the next couple days work is going to be very much like work. so it's coming, just please be patient with me.

I meant that because you hadn't responded to me yet, not because you disagreed with me. Being ignored sucks.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 13:28:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 23:06darkdragon wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 10:07umm you do relies the USA murder rate is mostly drug dealers killing other drug dealers and people getting caught in the crossfire . It's the law that caused that problem not the other way around . look up what happened the last prohibition and why we stopped it. If you find we stopped it for any other reason then it doesn't work and it caused far more problems then it solved let me know.

that logic is hugely flawed. by your logic, if we made stealing legal, there'd be no one in prison for theft. maybe we should make unwilling sex legal to clear the prison of all those rapists?
there are plenty of us law abiding citizens who would rather not be subject to the behaviour of dumbasses legally walking around the city while high on crack.

no by that logic if we made cigarettes illegal it would one raise the murder rate and two clog the court and prison systems with non violent victimless criminals.

Somethings cause more crime when made illegal like when we banned alcohol.

I suggest you read up before claiming any prohibition makes us safer in any way shape or form.

<http://www.drugwarfaq.com/>

http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=1017&full=1

prohibition feed the black market which raises the crime rate in every way which in turns makes the streets less safe. Our gang problem is caused by the war on drugs it is not caused by the drugs themselves. I'd rather have afew crack heads walking around peacefully then thousands of gang members pushing said crack and shooting people who are wearing the wrong color.

that's the problem with people too stupid to learn from the past. If something didn't work the first time and it's not working the secant time maybe it's time to try something else.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [kadoosh](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 16:36:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

darkdragon wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 09:28If something didn't work the first time and it's not working the secant time maybe it's time to try something else.

I'm not even kidding on this comment. Bring back Public Executions. All executions will be carried out the friday following the 1 and only apeal allowed by new law. You murder someone, get convicted at your trial, apeal and lose, die. None of this "Life in prison" shit.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 18:17:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

kadoosh wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 11:36darkdragon wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 09:28If something didn't work the first time and it's not working the secant time maybe it's time to try something else.

I'm not even kidding on this comment. Bring back Public Executions. All executions will be carried out the friday following the 1 and only apeal allowed by new law. You murder someone, get convicted at your trial, apeal and lose, die. None of this "Life in prison" shit.

That wouldn't work much better then the normal death penalty. personally I say it's wrong to kill a person no matter what .

You say it's a deterrent to crime prove it all the statistics say the death penalty doesn't do shit to deter anything.

By the way read a fucking history book sometime that shits been tried and it didn't really work.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 19:25:03 GMT

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

kadoosh!m not even kidding on this comment. Bring back Public Executions. All executions will be carried out the friday following the 1 and only apeal allowed by new law. You murder someone, get convicted at your trial, apeal and lose, die. None of this "Life in prison" shit.

Ryan3k wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 12:13i think crimson should just delete this debate forum just like we did over at apathbeyond. i've never seen more overly-opinionated teenagers on issues they know nothing about than in the renegade community.

i rest my case. why dont you move to iran you psychopathic prick? (**NWS**...but hey, in kadoosh's world it would be!)

oh, and i don't care if your actual age is 14 or 15, an alarming number of people here seem to have that level of mental maturity, regardless of their age. and, as always, the people who get most defensive about this are the ones who know it's true.

in other words, if i'm referring to you, you'll know it.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 21:42:12 GMT

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

darkdragon wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 09:28spotelmo wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 23:06darkdragon wrote on Sun, 30 August 2009 10:07umm you do relies the USA murder rate is mostly drug dealers killing other drug dealers and people getting caught in the crossfire . It's the law that caused that problem not the other way around . look up what happened the last prohibition and why we stopped it. If you find we stopped it for any other reason then it doesn't work and it caused far more problems then it solved let me know.

that logic is hugely flawed. by your logic, if we made stealing legal, there'd be no one in prison for theft. maybe we should make unwilling sex legal to clear the prison of all those rapists? there are plenty of us law abiding citizens who would rather not be subject to the behaviour of dumbasses legally walking around the city while high on crack.

no by that logic if we made cigarettes illegal it would one raise the murder rate and two clog the court and prison systems with non violent victimless criminals.

Some things cause more crime when made illegal like when we banned alcohol.

I suggest you read up before claiming any prohibition makes us safer in any way shape or form.

<http://www.drugwarfaq.com/>

http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=1017&full=1

prohibition feeds the black market which raises the crime rate in every way which in turn makes the streets less safe. Our gang problem is caused by the war on drugs it is not caused by the drugs themselves. I'd rather have a few crack heads walking around peacefully than thousands of gang members pushing said crack and shooting people who are wearing the wrong color.

that's the problem with people too stupid to learn from the past. If something didn't work the first time and it's not working the second time maybe it's time to try something else.

there are some things that are extremely addictive and alter personalities enough that they are illegal because it is in the public good to not have people using them. most illegal drugs fall in this category. i would probably be willing to accept the argument that pot is no different than alcohol and can be made legal. but other drugs like crack, powder cocaine, meth are hugely addictive and alter personalities to the point of making addicts a danger to society. therefore, those should remain illegal.

as for crime rates. people would continue to kill and steal because the drugs are addictive and when a person can't hold a job due to his habit, he will still commit crime to get his drugs.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 00:51:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wait alcohol isn't addictive and doesn't change people's personalities. What world do you live in?

Pot is lesser than even caffeine in danger and far lesser than alcohol. Alcohol kills more people each year than all illegal drugs combined. Hell Advil kills more people than most illegal drugs.

There is a reason I don't drink pot.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [kadoosh](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:31:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I had a nice thought out response to Ryan3k, but I'm not going to post it due to me being a "psychopathic prick". Congrats on taking what I said and massively blowing it out of context.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [IAmFenix](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:32:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Most people disagree with the government health care because they see that as another thing people can abuse. The last I've heard of the policy is that they will require you to either pay for the health care from the government OR GET A PRIVATE BUSINESS HEALTH CARE. This isn't like welfare when people can just SIT AROUND ALL DAY ON THEIR ASS AND GET MONEY FROM THE GOVERNMENT WHO GET IT FROM PEOPLE WHO WORK THEIR ASSES OFF. I have a good idea, LOOK AT THE PAST. HOW DID WE GET OUT OF THE GREAT DEPRESSION AND HAVE PEOPLE EMPLOYED?!? We had acts set up TO GET THE PUBLIC DOING SOMETHING. Be it building dams, fixing roads or cutting trees for more houses so people COULD BUILD THEM, there was something for them to do. So instead of people sitting around watching tv and sitting around when they really SHOULD BE WORKING, we'd have something that has the potential TO STIMULATE THE FUCKING ECONOMY. Don't tell anyone but there's no hidden joke, you've read the part I wanted people to read. Stimulating the economy would be a great idea for the US because, as you all probably already know, we're headed for another large depression.

Hidden joke in this post. Go ahead, read it.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:40:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

kadoosh wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:31 I had a nice thought out response to Ryan3k, but I'm not going to post it due to me being a "psychopathic prick". Congrats on taking what I said and massively blowing it out of context.

There are only so many ways to interpret what you posted.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 03:31:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the funny thing is it's not just the American economy that is fucked right now it's the global economy. just wait in 15 to 20 years from now oil will be on a down hill slide and the economy will collapse completely after all it is based on oil.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 03:42:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

darkdragon wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:51 Wait alcohol isn't addictive and doesn't change people's personalities. What world do you live in?

Pot is lesser then even caffeine in danger and far lesser then alcohol. Alcohol kills more people each year then all illegal drugs combined . Hell Advil kills more people then most illegal drugs.

There is a reason I don't drink spot.

alcohol doesn't change everyone's personalities and isn't addictive to everyone. for example, i can have an occasional drink and not get addicted, not drive drunk, not steal to support my drinking habit. some people can't do that. as for alcohol killing more people than all illegal drugs combined, i would say that is a misleading statistic. you'd have to know the underlying cause of all deaths to be able to prove that. for example, do you count all deaths related to drunk driving as an alcohol death? do you count all people killed in drive by shootings due to drug gang activity as a "other" illegal drug death?

i would also suggest that another reason alcohol is legal(here) but other drugs are not is because of

#1 big business - many people from bar owners to waitresses to distillers would be out of business.

#2 taxes - government makes big cash off of alcohol(same to be said for cigarettes)

#3 the guys in charge don't want to stop drinking - can you imagine telling people like ted kennedy(when alive), tip oneill and joe biden that they can't drink anymore?

#4 the relative ease of regulating and taxing alcohol over other illegal drugs

just a few reasons why alcohol and cigarettes are legal while meth is not.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split

Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 03:47:02 GMT

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

darkdragon wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 23:31the funny thing is it's not just the American economy that is fucked right now it's the global economy. just wait in 15 to 20 years from now oil will be on a down hill slide and the economy will collapse completely after all it is based on oil. funny you should mention that. do you know that according to our government inflation is currently flat? supposedly, there is no inflation currently. the main reason for that is because a big chunk of the data used to determine that is energy costs. since oil prices have been stable lately, they determine that there is no inflation.

i have a wife and four kids. the biggest cost i have right now is groceries. i'm currently spending approximately \$350 per week in groceries. just 1 year ago, it was about \$200 - \$250 per week. a year before that, it was maybe \$150 - \$200 per week.

NO INFLATION MY ASS!

just goes to show that the numbers show whatever our friends in washington want them to show.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 03:49:38 GMT

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

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 22:42darkdragon wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:51Wait alcohol isn't addictive and doesn't change peoples personalities. What world do you live in?

Pot is lesser then even caffeine in danger and far lesser then alcohol. Alcohol kills more people each year then all illegal drugs combined . Hell Advil kills more people then most illegal drugs.

There is a reason I don't drink spot.

alcohol doesn't change everyone's personalities and isn't addictive to everyone. for example, i can have an occasional drink and not get addicted, not drive drunk, not steal to support my drinking habit. some people can't do that. as for alcohol killing more people than all illegal drugs combined, i would say that is a misleading statistic. you'd have to know the underlying cause of all deaths to be able to prove that. for example, do you count all deaths related to drunk driving as an alcohol death? do you count all people killed in drive by shootings due to drug gang activity as a "other" illegal drug death?

i would also suggest that another reason alcohol is legal(here) but other drugs are not is because of

#1 big business - many people from bar owners to waitresses to distillers would be out of business.

#2 taxes - government makes big cash off of alcohol(same to be said for cigarettes)

#3 the guys in charge don't want to stop drinking - can you imagine telling people like ted kennedy(when alive), tip oneill and joe biden that they can't drink anymore?

#4 the relative ease of regulating and taxing alcohol over other illegal drugs

just a few reasons why alcohol and cigarettes are legal while meth is not.

yeah and some people can do crack and not be addictive to it and not go off killing people.

By the way drunk driving gang driveby comparison is flawed. The drunk driver is under the influence of alcohol and the gang members doing the shooting more then likely not under the influence of the drug they are selling . most of them don't in fact use the drugs they are peddling . Also the problem of the fact the drugs are illegal in the first place causing said drive by shootings .

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 03:59:27 GMT

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

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42alcohol doesn't change everyone's personalities and isn't addictive to everyone. for example, i can have an occasional drink and not get addicted, not drive drunk, not steal to support my drinking habit. some people can't do that.

The same could be said for pot.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#1 big business - many people from bar owners to waitresses to distillers would be out of business.

The potential is there for pot, too, as nations that have it legalized have shown.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#2 taxes - government makes big cash off of alcohol(same to be said for cigarettes)

See above.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#3 the guys in charge don't want to stop drinking - can you imagine telling people like ted kennedy(when alive), tip oneill and joe biden that they can't drink anymore?

I'll ignore the snipe at democrats, there. Can't you leave Ted Kennedy alone even after his death?

In any case, the people in charge speak for their constituents. There (Rightly) isn't the public will to try prohibition again, as history has proven that it just doesn't work. This applies for Republicans, too; I don't see any of them pushing for heavily alcohol regulation.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#4 the relative ease of regulating and taxing alcohol over other illegal drugs

Care to expand on this?

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 04:32:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 23:59spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42alcohol doesn't change everyone's personalities and isn't addictive to everyone. for example, i can have an occasional drink and not get addicted, not drive drunk, not steal to support my drinking habit. some people can't do that.

The same could be said for pot.

which is why i said above that the case for pot can be made without much objection from me
Quote:

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#1 big business - many people from bar owners to waitresses to distillers would be out of business.

The potential is there for pot, too, as nations that have it legalized have shown. see above
Quote:

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#2 taxes - government makes big cash off of alcohol(same to be said for cigarettes)

See above.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#3 the guys in charge don't want to stop drinking -

can you imagine telling people like ted kennedy(when alive), tip oneill and joe biden that they can't drink anymore?

I'll ignore the snipe at democrats, there. Can't you leave Ted Kennedy alone even after his death?

no, i can't leave ted alone. not after the crap he tried to pull right before his death. trying to ensure that a democrat takes over his seat when just a few years ago he got the law changed because he was worried a then-republican governor would appoint a republican.

as for the fact that the three i mentioned are all democrats, probably a sub conscious thing. same can be said for newt gingrich, mike steele, lee terry and other republicans

Quote:

In any case, the people in charge speak for their constitutants. There (Rightly) isn't the public will to try prohibition again, as history has proven that it just doesn't work. This applies for Republicans, too; I don't see any of them pushing for heavily alcohol regulation.

gotta disagree there. tarp, stimulus package and health care debate all show that this isn't true.

Quote:

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:42#4 the relative ease of regulating and taxing alcohol over other illegal drugs

Care to expand on this?

it's easier to regulate cigarettes and alcohol because it's easy to put a tax stamp on both and put them in a convenience store. we know who's producing/importing them, and it's pretty much world wide legal to sell them.

meth on the other hand is produced in the trunk of some moron's car. likely won't be sold on the shelves of your local grocery store, and isn't legal anywhere that i know of.

cocaine and heroin is mostly produced by drug lords in south america and afghanistan and even if America made them legal, other countries won't and the drug wars would continue.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 04:49:57 GMT

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

[quote title=spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:32]spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:32no, i can't leave ted alone. not after the crap he tried to pull right before his death. trying to ensure that a democrat takes over his seat when just a few years ago he got the law changed because he was worried a then-republican governor would appoint a republican.

Welcome to politics. He is neither the first nor will he be the last to pull stunts like that. If you hold grudges against politicians for something so relatively petty, you're going to have to hate almost every politician in the world on a personal level. I don't know about you, but I don't have the energy for that.

By the way, trying to influence who gets your seat after you seems so small and insignificant compared to preemptive wars, lying to the public about WMDs, breaking the Geneva convention, etc etc, yet most Republicans wouldn't dare call Bush out on any of these much more serious

offenses. Be honest with me. It's not about Ted Kennedy; it's about what he represents (Represented?). It's just more partisan bullshit rather than any specific grievance.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:32as for the fact that the three i mentioned are all democrats, probably a sub conscious thing. same can be said for newt gingrich, mike steele, lee terry and other republicans

At least I'm glad you can admit it. Now you need to work on fixing it.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:32
gotta disagree there. tarp, stimulus package and health care debate all show that this isn't true.

I'm not sure what you're getting at here. What does that have to do with prohibition?

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:32
it's easier to regulate cigarettes and alcohol because it's easy to put a tax stamp on both and put them in a convenience store. we know who's producing/importing them, and it's pretty much world wide legal to sell them.
meth on the other hand is produced in the trunk of some moron's car. likely won't be sold on the shelves of your local grocery store, and isn't legal anywhere that i know of.

You're stating facts but you're not stating WHY. Meth is made in some moron's car precisely because it's illegal. History shows that it's the same with alcohol. In fact, you could point to alchcohol that's still illegal (Moonshine) and see that people are still making in home-made since they can't purchase it legally. There's nothing special about Meth in this sense.

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:32cocaine and heroin is mostly produced by drug lords in south america and afghanistan and even if America made them legal, other countries won't and the drug wars would continue.

What? The US is the only country that allocates resources on the "War on drugs". Without the US, there is no Drug War.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 04:49:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 23:32

Care to expand on this?
it's easier to regulate cigarettes and alcohol because it's easy to put a tax stamp on both and put them in a convenience store. we know who's producing/importing them, and it's pretty much world wide legal to sell them.
meth on the other hand is produced in the trunk of some moron's car. likely won't be sold on the shelves of your local grocery store, and isn't legal anywhere that i know of.
cocaine and heroin is mostly produced by drug lords in south america and afghanistan and even if America made them legal, other countries won't and the drug wars would continue.

yeah but without our money and our blood. By the way why is it those drugs are made that way ?

You bitch about how much people pay in taxes the war on drugs dumps 40 billion <(fed and state combined) a year down a rat hole where we'll never see it again.

That is money that could be used for far better things for the American people like oh healthcare.

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 05:02:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i would prefer they keep spending the money on the drug war instead of spending it on healthcare - or anything else.

meth will never be made in a factory and packaged in little boxes like cigarettes or alcohol. doesn't matter if it's legal or not.

kennedy's little thing of trying to keep his seat in his party's control is - like you said - one of many things our politicians do. and it's because we let them do it that they keep doing it. it's time to hold our politicians to a better standard than what we've historically held them to. this goes the same for both sides.

i'm going to ignore the liberal party line about crap about bush that isn't even close to accurate for now. we can always start another thread about that bull if you'd like but i'm kinda busy right now doing work related stuff.

the tarp, stimulus, health care debate has nothing to do with prohibition, it has to do with the conversation about our politicians working for their constituents.

working now, gnite(probably)

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [darkdragon](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 05:08:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ok i'm bowing out of this for one dover is far better at making my points on this matter anyway and for two it doesn't matter how many facts we show you you'll never accept them because you truly do believe that drugs are illegal because they are dangerous and not dangerous because they are illegal

Subject: Re: Politics - double split
Posted by [spotelmo](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 09:06:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

you're absolutely right. i believe drugs are illegal because they are dangerous. you can argue that not as many people would be shooting each otehr if drugs were legal, but that doesn't change the fact that the use of the drugs is dangerous to the person taking them and to the rest of society. if drugs were legal, there would be more people using them and more people addicted to them and more cost to the rest of society as we deal with the addicts. also consider that it isn't likely that drugs would be made legal for children even if they were made legal for adults so there would still be illegal drug sales and there would still be gangs and there would still be killing.

Subject: Re: Splitting the record - about the virtual lock
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 16:19:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

spotelmo wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 22:42
#3 the guys in charge don't want to stop drinking - can you imagine telling people like ted kennedy(when alive), tip oneill and joe biden that they can't drink anymore?
it's funny that you say that shit about joe biden, who is actually a teetotaler

as dover pointed out, you were just cherry-picking random dems that you have some impotent rage against
