
Subject: Ok Manual I will answer the questions you asked me here...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2005 16:23:58 GMT

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

I only wish you would have the courtesy to do the same. You asked me these questions and comments:1)"I ask you give a response to the facts of the top 400 and what they pay in taxes. If you do that I can continue; but as of now it seems you ain't listening to anything I say."ANSWER - First off now you have gotten so ridicules as to narrow this down to the top 400 people. Do you have any idea how small a group this is? Silly. I will respond to the top 1%. I don't know how many people that actually is but it does include your 400 people. I answer the same way as I have before. This from the US Treasury web site (link below):"The top 1 percent of taxpayers paid 33.9 percent of all individual income taxes in 2001. This group of taxpayers has paid more than 30 percent of individual income taxes since 1995. Moreover, since 1990 this group's tax share has grown faster than their income share."That's pretty clear to me. Are you saying they are lying? Look at the last chart on the web page. It shows everyone over 50% actually paying a higher percentage in taxes. If you would like another web site that says basically the same thing than you can read this. http://taxesandgrowth.ncpa.org/hot_issue/share/2)"Under Bush we the middle class are paying in total of all taxes more than ever and the rich pay less; the rich being those whose income; as I showed exceeds the top 1% of earners."ANSWER - Not exactly sure what you are saying here. Are you narrowing down the rich to the top 400 income earners in the country? Nobody else is rich to you? As far as the upper class paying less under Bush. This from the US Treasury web site:"The President's tax cuts have shifted a larger share of the individual income taxes paid to higher income taxpayers. In 2004, when most of the tax cut provisions are fully in effect (e.g., lower tax rates, the \$1,000 child credit, marriage penalty relief), the projected tax share for lower-income taxpayers will fall, while the tax share for higher-income taxpayers will rise."Now this doesn't specifically mention the middle class. But the middle class got the same tax cut as the lower class. What you seem to be saying is "yes, overall the middle class is paying less taxes under Bush in actual dollars but it works out to be a higher percentage now." The Bush tax cuts effected everyone. A tax cut that is equal across the board cannot screw any particular group. In other words if the president cuts every tax paying persons income tax by 5% of course the rich will get more money back. They are paying more. But everyone got a 5% cut. Getting more money back than before cannot screw any one. Especially if every tax payer gets the same tax cut. I'm in the middle class and I got two very nice size checks from the presidents cuts. I don't remember any Democrat Presidents cutting taxes. Even if you don't think the Bush tax cuts helped the middle class at least Bush gave one. More than one in fact. Making upper tax payers pay more and the poor pay less. So you should be happy Bush is at least taking a step in the right direction. 3)"Can you explain the 10% of earned income VS the 70% of capital gains and how lowering the capital gains rate has resulted in the rich getting much better return on their money than the middle class; thats an easy one and we both agree on the rate so what gives?"As I said before (you're the one who appears not to be listening) The paragraph that addresses this question from the US Treasury is clear that you have to take into account all of the Bush tax cuts. See quote below. Also you have not shown me that the rich (say top 25%) get 70% of their money from capital gains. Show me this. Cut and paste. And we are not talking about the top 400 people. It is ridicules to narrow down to only 400 people. You asked me below at what point I would consider some one is rich. Well if you have more income than 50% of the country then that would be a good starting point I would think. But being more on the fair side I would say that if you make more money than 70% of the country you certainly must be considered part of the rich. But to now

narrow this down to the top 400 people (what's that the top .005% of income earners?) Is just ludicrous. So I have answered your questions now you answer mine. I will make it simple for you and narrow it down to a few. 1)Can we agree that the top 25% of wage earners in this country are paying 83% of the tax burden of running the country? Do you think this is fair?2)The chart on the US Treasury web site clearly show that Bush's tax cuts when all taken into account actually increases the tax burden on every tax payer from the top 50% to the top 1% in income earners. It does skip over the middle class but can we agree on the fact that the Bush tax cuts hurt the rich and helped the poor? Look at the last chart on the page given. It takes into account the capital gains cuts as well as per child tax cuts etc. If you don't agree then show me specifically how it's not true. In other words don't just pick the top 400 people. Don't just pick the capital gains tax cut. Show me how the rich are paying a lower percentage of their income under Bush's tax cuts. And how the poor are paying more. Remember don't just tell me show me.
<http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/js1287.htm>
