
Subject: An interesting quote about income taxes. Food for thought.

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 14:58:33 GMT

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

"Congress went beyond merely enacting an income tax law and repealed Article IV of the Bill of Rights, by empowering the tax collector to do the very things from which that article says we were to be secure. It opened up our homes, our papers and our effects to the prying eyes of government agents and set the stage for searches of our books and vaults and for inquiries into our private affairs whenever the tax men might decide, even though there might not be any justification beyond mere cynical suspicion. The income tax is bad because it has robbed you and me of the guarantee of privacy and the respect for our property that were given to us in Article IV of the Bill of Rights. This invasion is absolute and complete as far as the amount of tax that can be assessed is concerned. Please remember that under the Sixteenth Amendment, Congress can take 100% of our income anytime it wants to. As a matter of fact, right now it is imposing a tax as high as 91%. This is downright confiscation and cannot be defended on any other grounds. The income tax is bad because it was conceived in class hatred, is an instrument of vengeance and plays right into the hands of the communists. It employs the vicious communist principle of taking from each according to his accumulation of the fruits of his labor and giving to others according to their needs, regardless of whether those needs are the result of indolence or lack of pride, self-respect, personal dignity or other attributes of men. The income tax is fulfilling the Marxist prophecy that the surest way to destroy a capitalist society is by steeply graduated taxes on income and heavy levies upon the estates of people when they die. As matters now stand, if our children make the most of their capabilities and training, they will have to give most of it to the tax collector and so become slaves of the government. People cannot pull themselves up by the bootstraps anymore because the tax collector gets the boots and the straps as well. The income tax is bad because it is oppressive to all and discriminates particularly against those people who prove themselves most adept at keeping the wheels of business turning and creating maximum employment and a high standard of living for their fellow men. I believe that a better way to raise revenue not only can be found but must be found because I am convinced that the present system is leading us right back to the very tyranny from which those, who established this land of freedom, risked their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to forever free themselves..." T. Coleman Andrews. Andrews was the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service for three years, from 1953 until 1955.

Subject: Re: An interesting quote about income taxes. Food for thought.

Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 15:43:25 GMT

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

What do you think about a flat tax? Maybe a use tax like 30% on everything you buy. local, state, and fed would get their cuts from that.

Subject: Re: An interesting quote about income taxes. Food for thought.

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 17:24:17 GMT

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

Yeah but the tax is supposed to be progressive which would mean the greatest burden would be placed on those able to pay and on whom the least pain would be inflicted. However due to the Republicans passing the Alternative Minimum Tax bill we now have the privilege of paying the same tax as someone with twice the income. I have no problem paying an income tax except the wealthy skate by with tax incentives and by shifting their income to dividend status. If they paid their fair share then taxes would not be so bad. But then they could not own five ten million dollar homes. Don't tell me how they earned it they should have it. Read Eric Barbour's essay in Vacume Tube Valley about how the rich screw the rest of us. It's a good one. How come you terminated the Iraq discussion?

Subject: I think it's a great idea...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 17:27:59 GMT

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

And I have read it would only have to be 15-18% to equal the money taken in today. Unfortunately I don't think it will ever happen. People have no idea how much money they actually pay in taxes. I had a girl I work with tell me that she didn't pay any taxes at all last year. I said how could this be? She makes a good amount of money. She says "well it's true. In fact I got money back last year"! Of course I tried to educate her.

Subject: Re: An interesting quote about income taxes. Food for thought.

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 17:35:37 GMT

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

Manual, I terminated our Iraq discussion because it was going nowhere. You make baseless comments like the ones here. Totally untrue. The top 5% of wage earners in this country pay 95% of all the taxes taken in. This is as you would say "a fact and non-debatable." The wealthy get screwed by taxes in this country. So I am not going to have this discussion with you either. It's fruitless.

Subject: Re: An interesting quote about income taxes. Food for thought.

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 17:43:40 GMT

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

Too bad it might have been instructive. Pushing someone else's agenda does nothing for your independence of thought. Try looking at things from your perspective instead of some ideologues. And you are very mistaken regarding the tax statement. Look it up in the reports of the Internal Revenue System; not some right wing blog.

Subject: Ok here you go...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 17:59:08 GMT

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

from the US Treasury. Or is that a right wing blog too? Why do I always have to prove my points and you never prove yours? I was a little off in my numbers but my point is valid. Most of the taxes are paid by the top earners in the country. In fact if you read the information below you will see that the bottom 50% of tax payers pay almost nothing. That almost all of the tax revenue comes from the top 50% of wage earners. Also mentioned is the Bush tax cuts and how the top earners actually pay "MORE" money than before. To make things a little easier for you here are some excerpts. "Taxpayers who rank in the top 50 percent of taxpayers by income pay virtually all individual income taxes. In all years since 1990, taxpayers in this group have paid over 90 percent of all individual income taxes. In 2000 and 2001, this group paid over 96 percent of the total." "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." <http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/js1287.htm>

Subject: Re: Ok here you go...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 18:26:13 GMT

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

This is good; now we can get somewhere towards some understanding of the political forces that shape our lives without the useless ideological rhetoric. I have my work cut out for me here; let's see what we have in the document. First; The top 5% of Individual wage earners filing income tax returns paid 50% of the income taxes on earned income. They claimed according to this document to have earned over 1/3rd of the total income claimed by wage earners for that year. Therefore each percentage of the top 5% earned over 6% of the total income claimed. The bottom 95% therefore earned a total of 57% of the total income claimed for that year. That means for each 1% of individual income tax returns filed in the lower half of the total population of individual taxpayers they earned 57%/95% which equals 6/10ths of a percent. That's each 1% of population in the upper 5% earns over 100 times the amount of each 1% of the lower 95%. Now we have to go to the Internal Revenue Site for the dollar figures of all tax revenue broken down by percentage. This then is when the important part comes. We figure the amount of income excluded from taxation such as trust endowments/dividend returns/non-taxable sales of real estate/ some other tax

free give-aways that apply only to the rich. Then we can come up with a figure that tells us what individuals by percentage carry the highest tax burden. Would you say that is a fair way to judge what tax burden falls on what part of the population? If you agree I will look all of this up. And we can see if the rich indeed do pay their fair share. If this is not acceptable then come up with something agreeable to you and I will do the leg work for that. Just to clarify we are attempting here to see who pays the most money out of all the groups towards funding our countries bills. Right?

Subject: Re: Ok here you go...
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 18:36:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry it's not 6/10ths of a percent it is 6/100ths; my mistake.

Subject: Re: Ok here you go...
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 18:40:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have given you the information you requested and it shows you that I am correct. You can play with the numbers all you want. Tax breaks and shelters have absolutely nothing to do with our discussion. Even with all of these breaks and shelters (Which by the way "do not apply only to the rich") the bottom line is that the top wage earners in the country pay most of the taxes taken in. A ridiculous amount in fact. By the way, you forgot to discuss the fact that the tax burden on the rich, with Bush's tax cuts actually grows and not falls according to the US treasury.

Subject: Re: Ok here you go...
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 19:00:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well now we have a disagreement that can be resolved. I say the wealthy pay much less in taxes as a percentage of their earnings through all means not just individual income tax filings. See a middle-class guy who earns a wage must pay taxes on all of his income. A wealthy guy whose income is derived from investments/real estate sales and endowments and entitlements only pays on a small portion of his income. So how can you say that they pay their fair share. If after all of the accounting is done the top 10% earn 90% of the money; but pay only 50% of the taxes what is fair about that? Why should I pay 30% of my income while they pay 5% of their income?

Subject: Now you change the subject when proven to be incorrect...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 20:46:02 GMT

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

I never said percentage of income. I said the top 5% of income earners pay most of the taxes taken in. Now you change to percentage of income. BTW I do not believe your numbers that the wealthiest pay only 5% of their income in taxes. This is a fabrication. You're still not talking about Bush's tax cuts and how the tax burden for the wealthiest people increases under them. Why not? Hmm? This is why it is a waste of time to debate with you. If proven wrong you either don't answer that part of the post or you change the subject.

Subject: Re: Now you change the subject when proven to be incorrect...

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 08 Oct 2005 22:41:30 GMT

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

Sorry but I have to defend myself here. As I understood our discussion it was a question about who does or doesn't pay their fair share of taxes. After re-reading the thread it still sounds like that to me. I think if we decided to drop trying to prove a point and instead searched for the real numbers it might be different. I insist that the wealthy pay much less than their share compared to other groups. Is that a better statement of the discussion? I mean why would I care if the top 5% pay 53% of the taxes when they pay a much lower percentage of their income than I do? Since the top 10% of the income earners make over 60% of the money then why is it fair they pay only 50% of the taxes. I am just asking here; not trying to prove anything. Again; why should I pay 30% of my income to taxes while the richest 10% pay 8% of their income to the govt? That is my point; the unfairness of it. You are in the same boat; you should be angry also.

Subject: Re: Now you change the subject when proven to be incorrect...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sun, 09 Oct 2005 00:49:36 GMT

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

You still have not responded to Bush's tax cuts and that the rich are paying more under them. So I must assume you agree with Bush's tax cuts. After all they are achieving the very thing you are complaining about. A simple, "I was wrong about Bush's tax cuts" would be the appropriate thing for you to post now. And yes, you have changed the subject. The only thing I am angry about is that the rich pay most of the taxes. They are being hosed. And no I am not even close to being rich. Why is it fair that most of the people in the country only contribute 4 or 5 percent of the money it costs to run the country? I do not believe your numbers. Prove to me that the richest in the country only pay 8% of their income to taxes. If you can't prove this point then it's only your opinion and not fact.

Subject: Re: Now you change the subject when proven to be incorrect...
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 09 Oct 2005 05:51:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

O'Kay but it will take me a day to provide the numbers and the Bush tax cuts favored the wealthy. We shall see. But don't bail on me if I go to this trouble to get the figures. Thats all I ask. And reading the thread again all I see is you pushing the Bush thing; I don't care about that since I already knew what those cuts did. So by tomorrow evening the figures will be available.

Subject: Re: Now you change the subject when proven to be incorrect...
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sun, 09 Oct 2005 13:26:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The document from the treasury clearly states and shows that with the Bush tax cuts the wealthy will pay more taxes. Do you deny this? Do you have other evidence to the contrary?

Subject: Re: Now you change the subject when proven to be incorrect...
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 09 Oct 2005 15:38:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm working on it. You can follow my progress at IRS.Gov they have all the statistics there can possibly be all laid out. There is a section that breaks down all revenue collected through personal income tax by percentage of wealth and income per capita. Then it breaks down who has the most wealth and what percentage of that wealth is taxed. But it is time consuming to wade through it all. I had to do it in Taxes and Finance class in Business school and it sucked then and sucks now. But the truth is in the tables.

Subject: You have to be realistic..
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Sun, 09 Oct 2005 17:26:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The income tax fact sheet from the US treasury web site was compiled by the U.S. Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis using the Internal Revenue Services as a source. I would have to believe that the professionals at the U.S. Treasury who work in the Office of Tax Analysis would know how to compile the numbers properly. So what makes you think that you would know better than these profession tax analyzers? Or are you saying they are lying?

Subject: Re: You have to be realistic..
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 09 Oct 2005 18:46:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The part you don't see is that the top 10% of the population pays tax as a percentage much less than the middle 30% does. You have to examine the data to see that. That's what I tried to show in the last post. While the top 5% pay 50% of the taxes the IRS takes in; they make almost 40% of the income as a whole. Since the income as a whole is only a small percentage of GNP the reality is they pay much less for much more. So in simple math they pay as a percentage much less per person than all of the members of the middle class does per person. That's wrong. You look beyond the numbers on your site to see the real amounts involved; because the numbers are misleading. Since the bottom 30% pay no taxes because they make no money that leaves the largest part of the burden on the middle 30%. While the site you show is accurate in terms of the actual percentage numbers it does not reflect the amounts of money and percentages of tax each slice of the pie pays.

Subject: Re: You have to be realistic..
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Mon, 10 Oct 2005 17:41:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Again you just state numbers with no back up. But assuming what you are saying is true (a huge leap of faith here) let's look at it closely. If the top 5% of wage earners pay 50% of the taxes taken in. And they make 40% of the income. That would mean that the remaining 95% of wage earners make 60% of the income and pay only 50% of the taxes taken in. So using your numbers, the top 5% of wage earners are paying more than the bottom 95% of wage earners. Thus even using your numbers you are proving my point. And let's not forget the fact that much of the taxes that the rich are paying are funneled back out to the poor through entitlements, which results in the poor paying even less tax. Again I don't agree with your numbers. But let's stay on point! The thing you are supposed to be showing me is that the wealthiest people only pay 5%-8% in income taxes. This is what you stated and what you are supposed to be proving. On top of this you are also supposed to be disproving the fact that the Bush tax cuts actually resulted in the rich paying more taxes and not less as you complain about, the "so called" tax cuts for the rich. So I will be waiting for your responses.

Subject: Re: You have to be realistic..
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 00:50:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah; allow me to apologise for my tardiness; the Sunday was an affair with the family and today I had class for 4 1/5 hours plus travel so I am pooped at this point. I will produce don't worry but you are missing the point that the middle third pay most of the taxes; even by your analogy and

another thing; the rich get more entitlements than the poor do. Look at what you wrote. The lower 95% pay 60% of the taxes but make only 50% of the money. That's 95%. So figure on an individual basis how much each member of that 95% group pays at a 60% total compared to the 5% and what they pay at a 50% total. I.e.; one guy paying income tax on 1.5 million earned income (which by the way would not happen since he would shelter all of that), pays less than twenty guys pay making 75k\$ per year. That you can find in the charts pretty easy yourself while you wait. Give me a little more time and I will post a good summary of the facts as reported in the IRS documents.

Subject: This is 180 degrees wrong....

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 11:15:40 GMT

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

You said ; "The lower 95% pay 60% of the taxes but make only 50% of the money. That's 95%. So figure on an individual basis how much each member of that 95% group pays at a 60% total compared to the 5% and what they pay at a 50% total. I.e.; one guy paying income tax on 1.5 million earned income (which by the way would not happen since he would shelter all of that), pays less than twenty guys pay making 75k\$ per year." Your numbers are wrong to start with. The top 95% pay 50% of the taxes while making 60% of the income. The top 5% (a small minority) is paying as much as 95% (a large majority) in taxes. In other words a small handful of people who only make 40% of the income is paying the same as 95% of the people who make 60% of the income. Just using simple numbers ok. If the top 5% make 40% of the income, they should pay 40% of the taxes. Not 50%. Again this is assuming your numbers are correct which you haven't been able to prove. And I don't believe.

Subject: Re: This is 180 degrees wrong....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 12:44:44 GMT

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

I was quoting the numbers you gave on your site. That is where the top 5% are shown to make 40% of the money. Check it out above. I think you are confusing the amount of total taxes that come from the top 5% with the total amount in dollars that people earn. The taxes paid on income is a reflection of what is down on your 1040 as what you owe the government. It doesn't say anything about how much total money the top 5% make; just the proportion of what they pay into taxes. Don't worry I'm coming this is a good thing to do but takes a little time.

Subject: Geez!

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 13:41:20 GMT

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

Getting frustrated here. Try to understand Manual ok? Give it your best shot. Here is the quote from the site. Ready? Read carefully now. Here we go..."the top 5 percent of taxpayers paid more than one-half (53.3 percent) of all individual income taxes, but reported roughly one-third (32.0 percent) of income." Now if the top 5% paid 53.3% of all individual income taxes (a small minority of people paying over 50% of the taxes taken in.) And only made 32% of the income (not the 40% you stated) then that means 95% (a vast majority of the people.) Paid only 46.7% of all individual income taxes taken in at the same time making 68% of the income. So let me try to simplify this as much as possible for you. Ready? Here we go.... Top 5% made 32% of the income - Paid 53.3% of all taxes Bottom 95% made 68% of the income - Paid 46.7% of all taxes Ok? Get it? Not fair see? If it were fair the people making 68% of income would pay 68% of the taxes. Do you think it's fair that a group of people who make only 32% of the income should pay 53.3% of the taxes? But let's stay on point! The thing you are supposed to be showing me is that the wealthiest people only pay 5%-8% in income taxes. This is what you stated and what you are supposed to be proving. On top of this you are also supposed to be disproving the fact that the Bush tax cuts actually resulted in the rich paying more taxes and not less as you complain about, the "so called" tax cuts for the rich.

Subject: Re: Geez!

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 15:01:42 GMT

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

O'Kay here we go. The wealthiest 5% pay taxes on their adjusted gross income. That is the same for us in the middle class. When you decide the total wealth of an individual you look at the total wealth of all assets and income. When you say the top 5% paid over 50% of the income taxes that means they paid a dollar figure. It is a fraction of what their worth; it is not some amount that reflects their total worth it is only what they pay. If you as a middle class guy pay say 22% of your income after deductions then that is the portion of your wealth you give to the govt. Now with the Alternative Minimum Tax the least you can pay is a percentage of your wealth but with tax shelters they can skate. My point is this; the Tax System is progressive; the more you make the more you pay. If you pay 2.2K out of a salary of 100k and the wealthy guy pays 250k out of asset driven income of 23 million which puts him in the 5% bracket of taxpayers then you by percentage paid much more than he did. Even though he paid a lot more than you in real numbers. I am working on IRS.Gov 02inrate.pdf (application) on their site. It breaks down all monies paid versus wealth accumulated. You can see it on the irs.gov site under current stats for income vs tax paid. I will finish up soon but you can see it also; all of the numbers are there. It tells what percentage of total wealth a taxpayer holds and how much he pays.

Subject: I will be patient...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 15:27:59 GMT

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

As an aside, We don't have to get into this much right now because I want to stay on task but...The Alternative Minimum Tax was created in 1978 when Carter was President and the Democrats controlled congress. So how is it something the Republicans pushed through?

Subject: Re: out of curiosity
Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 16:31:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What is a persons annual income level to be considered the top 5%?And why should a person have to pay a higher tax rate because they earn more? Shouldn't everyone just pay the same rate, and stop some of the money sheltering.

Subject: Re: out of curiosity
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 16:39:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't know what someone has to make to be in the top 5%. Sorry. I'm sure it's millions. But I do know that it is unfair for them to pay 53.3% of all the taxes taken in by the gov. I agree we should all pay the same amount. A progressive tax is completely unfair. As we talked about above. A flat tax would be ideal.

Subject: Re: out of curiosity
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 20:13:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The wealthy do not want the flat tax; they are the people responsible for defeating that concept everytime it comes up in the debate. They control the congressmen and that is who votes on the budget.The reason for a progressive tax is the simple fact that by definition the wealthier people consume more of the resources of the state and therefor should pay more.This is all old hat and has been discussed to death on thousands of websites.I have finally gotten my Adobe reader up to working. The IRS files were so big I needed to upgrade to the next level of Adobe to access them. It is finally working right.

Subject: Wasn't it Forbes that was pushing the flat tax recently?

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 11:00:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But your right. He doesn't have much money.
