
Subject: Mr Vinyl and Mr Martinelli

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 21:43:42 GMT

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

This tax post is getting too skinny. We have to bring it back up here and re-start. I need to ask a question here. What level of income would you guys consider wealthy? According to the IRS the top wealthiest tax-payers in the 5% bracket have average incomes of 132k annum. The top 1% start at 317k Per Annum. I need some feedback here at this point in the discussion as to what the opinions are concerning what constitutes wealth and whether those figures mean you are wealthy. Also a good site that explains some of my position is called: [ASK QUESTIONS.ORG](#) under Tax liability=who pays. That is a non-political site that explains much of the truth behind the numbers. It is very helpful in determining what the whole tax debate is all about. Those figures MR Vinyl shows on the site he uses has the 128k yearly salary as the top bracket; which of course is ridiculous to use in describing what makes someone rich. We need the info for the smallest group after the 317k yr income and what they pay percentage wise. It's on the IRS site but has to be dug out. To be continued.

Subject: Re: Mr Vinyl and Mr Martinelli

Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 22:53:09 GMT

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

Hey hey! Mr. Block... good goin on the new thread. Look, I don't see why 132K is out of reach. I know it's more than the norm and it's not a far reach for a husband/wife to have a combined income in that range. If the government has all the facts and figure of who files and they also have all the records of what companies pay out. Do you think it's safe to say 132k + is a good place to start a conversation over? I sure would not call that number "wealthy". Of course it's all been hashed over everywhere else, taxes is largely what folks talk about. So then do you think it's fair that a household earning between 125 and 200 to paying with the group 53%? now, back to my turntable... I almost have this crazy unipivot tone arm dialed in. bill

Subject: Re: Mr Vinyl and Mr Martinelli

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Tue, 11 Oct 2005 23:16:10 GMT

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

Well that's the beginning of the slice. It goes up ad infinitum as you progress from 5% up to 1%. Remember that numbers here are what percentage of folks who claim that income pay what percentage of the total tax. But our discussion began as whether the rich pay their fair share of taxes; not whether they pay more than the poor or middle class. So we have to look at the whole picture. To be continued. What unitrack arm; Mayware?

Subject: Re: Mr Vinyl and Mr Martinelli
Posted by [Bill Martinelli](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 00:16:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The arm is a Bohsei AC-300C with a Grado reference cart. Finicky little bugger. It's playing a nice image but I'm not happy with the dynamics yet. I have some old Empire tables and with a Shure cart installed I find them hard to beat. Not very pretty, not very hi-tech, not even cutting edge. but they can sound damn good.

Subject: Re: Mr Vinyl and Mr Martinelli
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 00:32:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Amazing but more and more the concept that the older designers without all this high tech wizardry nailed down a humbler and more enjoyable sound. It cannot be explained away by the usual caveat's such as your exposure goes back further or it has rolled off highs or whatever. the truth is it just sounds better. Ask all the techies to explain that.

Subject: So in other words...
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 10:53:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You can't get anything to prove your point from the US Treasury site. So now you have to start messing with other sites.. Again you make unsubstantiated claims. Show me where on the US Treasury site that I referenced, that they are using \$128,000 as the top bracket. The site I reference claims "all" income taken in by the IRS. The form I showed doesn't mention tax brackets at all. I must assume it means "all" income taken in. So, you may be right but prove your statements don't just spew out numbers.

Subject: The site clearly mentions the top 1%....
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 10:59:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here it is the quote. "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." This kills two birds with one stone. It not only shows that the top 1% are paying a ridicules

percentage of the income. It also shows that they are paying more and more....

Subject: Re: The site clearly mentions the top 1%....
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 12:05:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Where is this from??

Subject: Re: So in other words...
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 12:06:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

IRS.GOV. The Ask questions site gets all their info from that site just like every other tax site does. They just tell the whole story.

Subject: From the site we have been discussing for the past week....
Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2005 12:42:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

second paragraph.
<http://www.treas.gov/press/releases/js1287.htm>
