

TAXATION

Have you considered how Government spends the money it acquires via taxation?

Do you think it's appropriate?



Not so long ago tax payer's money was used to bail out the banks after the 2008 financial crash. The bankster state had a tremendous laugh at our expense.

Yet people continue to trust the state with their money - assuming that politicians are both competent to manage it and will use it in ways that are in the public interest.

Is this trust deserved?

This leaflet poses a series of questions inviting people to think about the issue of taxation, and how government spends our money.

It suggests that - at least under the current Government or system of Governance - we might be better off holding on to our money and - where appropriate - using it to help each other *directly*. Then we could deal with issues such as housing, infrastructure and social security locally and via voluntary agreements and regional collaboration.¹

¹ This leaflet is not associated with, and does not endorse, any particular political party.

Reasons for taxation

Housing. We are told that taxation is necessary for the provision of housing, but - via oppressive land-use policies and building regulations, and placing 'conservation' and 'environmental' goals before human welfare - the Government is directly fueling the housing crisis.²



Roads and infrastructure. Although road-building is one of the main arguments for levying taxes, our present Government has allocated very little - generally less than 1.5 % of its annual budget - for this purpose over the past decade.³

Health care. We are told that taxes are essential for health care, but many people are wary of state-provided 'health care'.



With the fanatical emphasis on vaccination, and promotion of an almost cult-like belief in the HSE's value and importance, some would question how much of the HSE's work relates to actual health care.



Education. We are told that taxation is necessary for education and public schools, but many would argue that the schools have become either glorified childcare centres or places of indoctrination.

Others would argue that children's education should not be delegated to the state in the first place.

Social security. We are told that taxation is necessary for the provision of social security - and a safety net - for the vulnerable, the disabled, and people struggling to find their feet. But very little tax money is actually allocated to this end in a sensible way.



We are entitled to ask: *would it make more sense to devise our own programmes for this purpose, rather than handing the responsibility to the state?*

² To the best of my knowledge all political parties and candidates have failed to identify this as the root cause of our housing shortage.

³ To check for yourself visit <https://whereyourmoneygoes.gov.ie/>. Then click on 'Transport' and 'Road Networks' or 'Land transport'

Government spending and policy

A moral obligation

We have a moral obligation - when giving someone money - to consider how they will spend it. And, if we conclude that the intended use of our money is morally unacceptable and irreconcilable with our ethical beliefs and values - we are justified in withholding it.

This applies in the case of paying taxes to Government just as it would in giving money to a friend, a child or an addict.

Housing, immigration and development. *Why is the Government extending an invitation to citizens of foreign nations to make Ireland their home - to house them and grant them a weekly allowance - when it can not or refuses to do the same for thousands of Irish people?*

Why are certain land developers and builders - when building homes for IPAs - allowed to bypass the planning and building regulations that others are subject to?

The environment. *Why has the Government adopted a 'sustainable development' plan that is based on highly questionable scientific claims, and that will dramatically limit the opportunities of current and future generations (to, e.g., ever have their own home)?*

Why have they embraced fanatical environmental policies which prioritize 'conservation' and wilderness protection over human habitats and well-being?

Health care. *How is it that, despite approx. 20% of the annual budget (> 20 billion EUR per annum) being allocated to health care, the service is still (apparently) not 'good enough'?⁴*

Can the Government demonstrate - without manipulating statistics - that health outcomes really improve in proportion to spending (on health care)?⁵

If not, then why do people think that throwing more and more money down the black hole that is the 'health care' system will yield the desired outcomes?

Accountability. *Should we be expected to pay or subsidize the pensions and salaries of politicians, civil servants and media pundits who respond to these grievances with derision and slander?⁶*

All in all, some of us observe that enormous sums of money are being allocated to various ends that we regard as unethical or nonsensical - while relatively little is being allocated to actually alleviate the most serious issue this country is facing: *homelessness*.⁷

⁴ See <https://whereyourmoneygoes.gov.ie/en/> . Spending on health care has consistently been approx. 20% of annual spending over the last ten years.

⁵ And why is so little attention given to prevention of illness? E.g. despite the continuously high rates of cancer, very little attention is given (by Government at least) to identifying and limiting exposure to carcinogens in our air, food, water and workplaces.

⁶ A recent trend is to label anyone who disagrees with Government policy as 'far right'. This would be funny if it was not so dangerous or tragic.

⁷ ... or more accurately, lack of access to land, and the inability (due to zoning decisions and planning regulations) to actually build on the land that one already has access to or could reasonably afford.

Questions and alternatives

The important questions are:

1. *Is it morally justifiable for Government to forcefully take a large portion of people's wealth and earnings, when these people have effectively no say in how this money and wealth are used or allocated?*⁸
2. *Is it beyond the imagination and ability of reasonable adults (i.e. us) to pursue and achieve positive social goals, without resorting to taxation and coercion?*

In other words ...

Are we incapable of providing shelter for the homeless, a place for the sick to convalesce, of providing care for the elderly and disabled etc.? Are we really incapable of taking on and solving these challenges ourselves?

Are we so helpless that we need Government to hold our hand in everything?

This author suggests the answer to these questions might be *No*.

The questions are all the more urgent considering that

1. many Government policies and programmes are hugely *detrimental* to the general well-being, and
2. the forced confiscation of large parts of our income (i.e. taxation) greatly *diminishes* our ability to pursue positive social goals and projects *directly*.

There is a world of difference between a compassionate society which allows people to pursue societal goals based on voluntary association, and one which employs duress and coercion to promote the goals of a certain *subset* of that society (even if those goals are ostensibly 'altruistic' and oriented towards the 'common good').

Giving to the Government vs. giving to the poor

Giving to or sharing your possessions with the poor is not the same as giving them to Government. The Government is not 'poor', nor 'in need', nor (on the whole) concerned with those who are.

Summary

We are made to believe or accept that coercive taxation schemes are the only way to address large-scale social issues and 'keep society running', but it's worth pausing to think on this.

Tax money is not necessarily spent in the way that you think or hope it is spent. A lot of it is simply *wasted*, but - what's worse - some of it is used in ways that are potentially *harmful* to society.

Further reading

<https://tinyurl.com/green-banker-alliance> [Whitney Webb, unlimitedhangout.com] - in-depth reporting on the so-called 'environmental movement' and how it has been essentially taken over by corporate and financial interests

⁸ We're talking average working people here - people who need their income for their own sustenance and well-being - not 'greedy capitalists'.