

# 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?

your money

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 we might be better off holding on to our money and - where appropriate - using it to help each other *directly*.<sup>1</sup>

"Recently, the lie of 'taxes' serving the common good has become more and more transparent as 'governments' have spent astronomical amounts of money on things which obviously serve the elite at the expense of society and humanity. This would include perpetual war-mongering, direct multibillion-dollar redistribution schemes benefiting the richest people in the world ('bailouts'), and 'government' takeovers of various segments of the economy (e.g. the health-care industry), among other things."<sup>2</sup> - Larken Rose

The Most Dangerous Superstition

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This leaflet is not associated with, and does not endorse, any particular political party.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ireland is a neutral country, but some people are worried that our neutrality is under threat.

# **Reasons for taxation**

**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?

**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.<sup>3</sup>

**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.

**Take-away.** We could analyze each sector one by one, but the point is this: the state only ever *impersonates* righteousness and virtue<sup>4</sup>. It always has an ulterior motive, whether ideological or commercial.

"Just as mafia dons and drug lords are known to spend on social projects for the benefit of the poor, governments use money to fabricate enemies and impersonate righteousness. They spend lavishly with other people's money on public works and welfare. In so doing they pretend to be the saviors of the people."

- Jeremy Locke The End of All Evil

#### 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.







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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> This is not to imply that there are not genuinely altruistic and caring people working within state institutions. There undoubtedly are, but they are generally hamstrung by the policies and rigidity of the institutions.

#### The real issues

**Housing.** We don't need the Government to build houses for us; we need to remove the red tape and barriers they have erected which prevent us from doing so ourselves - barriers such as land-use policies, planning permission, building regulations, *etc.* 

Once this is done the cost of buying a home will fall dramatically, and people will be able to afford one without ever entering in to debt.

**Environment.** We need people to speak out about *genuine* environmental issues - such as pesticides, air and water pollution, *etc.* - rather than obsess over the single issue of  $CO_2$  emissions'.

We also need people to understand the domination of the environmental movement by corporate and financial interests. See, for example, <u>https://tinyurl.com/green-banker-alliance</u>.

This is very important, because the neo-feudal land-use policies that are largely responsible for the housing crisis are a direct outcome of the anti-human policies that this 'environmental movement' has embraced.

**Real issues. Ignored causes.** Many of the issues that Government allocates funding to - such as road-building, social security, health care, *etc.* - are real. But there are several problems with forcibly taking people's money for these purposes.

Firstly, Government policies are (at least to a large extent) actually *responsible* for some of these problems - e.g. the housing shortage. (See above.)

Secondly, the proper remedy for some of these issues - such as 'health care' - first and foremost demands *personal* responsibility. And giving money to Government to solve these problems is an abdication of that responsibility.

Thirdly, once we give our money to Government we have *no control* over how they spend it. We might wish them to spend it on, e.g., road-building and housing, but they will inevitably spend (at least part of) it on causes that we find morally objectionable.

## Digging our own graves?

When we hand our money, time and resources over to this system of counterfeit 'solutions' we are, in a sense, digging our own graves.

"In addition to the waste, corruption, and destructive things which government does with the wealth it confiscates, there is also the less obvious issue of what the people would have done with their money otherwise. As government takes the wealth of the producers to serve its own purposes, it also deprives the producers of the ability to further their own goals."

- Larken Rose

The author of the above quote alludes only to personal goals, but his point applies equally to societal goals - which we could pursue far more effectively without Government interference.

#### **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?<sup>5</sup>

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?

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').

"No one has the right, without your consent, to provide you some item or service - when you didn't ask for it and didn't want to buy it - and then forcibly take from you whatever he declares the item or service to be worth." - Larken Rose

The Most Dangerous Superstition

## 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.

#### More information

Nideog Ireland - https://nideog.ie/ - Gift economy, Natural Law

Mark Passio - https://whatonearthishappening.com/ - Natural Law, voluntarism, liberty, etc.

Ammon Hennacy - <u>https://tinyurl.com/ammon-hennacy</u> - Christian radical, anti-war activist and tax-resister

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> We're talking average working people here - people who need their income for their own sustenance and well-being - not 'greedy capitalists'.