
Subject: To Manual and Bill...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 14 Oct 2005 14:00:39 GMT

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

I'll bow out of the discussion now. I believe we have gone as far as we can with it. I have spent way too much time as it is. Got to get back to family. The way I see it is this. We have two arguments here. ManualBlock if I am off base on your part I'm sure you'll let me know.1) (Mr Vinyl) The rich are paying all the taxes to run the country. The top 25% pay 83% of all taxes taken in. Doesn't matter to me what percentages of income this is. The number speaks for itself. I believe the rich are paying more than their fair share. Much more. I believe saying that the rich don't pay their fair share is nothing more than class warfare at best or Communism at worst. I believe that the tax system in this country is nothing more than an attempt at the redistribution of wealth. It's easy to hate the rich, but this is America. Everyone should be treated the same under the law. Making a small handful of people pay a vast majority of the taxes is not fair.2)

(ManualBlock) Even though the rich are paying most of the taxes they aren't paying their fair share. They are paying a less percentage of their total income than the middle class. They should pay more than 83% of the total tax burden because they make more than they are reporting because of tax shelters etc. Since we have agreed that it would be almost impossible to prove Manual's theory, and because he refuses to link to any numbers whatsoever, or even answer any of my questions, then what's the point? Furthermore I could care less if what he is saying is true. Regardless of the percentages, making the top 25% of the people in the US bare 83% of the tax burden is grossly unfair and probably unconstitutional IMO. How much more should they pay Manual? 100%? Regarding Bush and tax cuts. Keep in mind that any across the board income tax cut at all would be unfair to the liberals. I believe that the government is wasting more and more money. I don't believe congress will ever stop spending. The only way to stop spending is not give them the money to begin with. The only way this can be done is through tax cuts. If your daughter was running her credit card to the max repeatedly and just wasting money, you would take the credit card away. The liberals bitch about unfair tax cuts but they never cut taxes when in office. In fact they raise taxes. Why don't they pass a tax cut plan that they think is fair then? One that only targets the middle class? They had control of congress for 40 years. They don't because they have no desire to cut taxes at all. They want the money. The Republicans and Bush at least gave tax cuts. Any tax cut is a good tax cut at this point IMO. So I did my best. I can't argue with numbers when I can't read where they came from, what years are being taken into account, what the source for those numbers are, etc. I have repeatedly asked Manual to supply a link to the pages he is talking about. The IRS.gov site is huge. I can't find any of the information that Manual is talking about on it. Most of the charts on the site only go up to 1999 and don't take into account the Bush years. So saying here are some numbers that I found on IRS.gov and refusing to supply a link or at the very least a cut and paste of the chart then how can I respond. If you can't supply a source for your numbers then the numbers are not to be considered IMO. I like to go on fact, not opinion, estimation, guesses or theories. I guess this is what separates the conservatives from the liberals. I'll leave with this analogy. I think it applies to our conversation and I think it is right on target. Please read it carefully. This has been bounced around on the internet for some time. So forgive me if it's old and you have read it already. Tax Cuts - A Simple Lesson In Economics Let's put tax cuts in terms everyone can understand. Suppose that every day, ten men go out for dinner. The bill for all ten comes to \$100. If they paid their bill the way we pay our taxes, it would go something like this: The first four men (the poorest) would pay nothing. The fifth would pay \$1. The sixth would pay \$3. The seventh \$7. The eighth \$12. The ninth \$18. The tenth man (the

richest) would pay \$59. So, that's what they decided to do. The ten men ate dinner in the restaurant every day and seemed quite happy with the arrangement, until one day, the owner threw them a curve. "Since you are all such good customers," he said, "I'm going to reduce the cost of your daily meal by \$20." So, now dinner for the ten only cost \$80. The group still wanted to pay their bill the way we pay our taxes. So, the first four men were unaffected. They would still eat for free. But what about the other six, the paying customers? How could they divvy up the \$20 windfall so that everyone would get his 'fair share'? The six men realized that \$20 divided by six is \$3.33. But if they subtracted that from everybody's share, then the fifth man and the sixth man would each end up being 'PAID' to eat their meal. So, the restaurant owner suggested that it would be fair to reduce each man's bill by roughly the same amount, and he proceeded to work out the amounts each should pay. And so: The fifth man, like the first four, now paid nothing (100% savings). The sixth now paid \$2 instead of \$3 (33% savings). The seventh now paid \$5 instead of \$7 (28% savings). The eighth now paid \$9 instead of \$12 (25% savings). The ninth now paid \$14 instead of \$18 (22% savings). The tenth now paid \$49 instead of \$59 (16% savings). Each of the six was better off than before. And the first four continued to eat for free. But once outside the restaurant, the men began to compare their savings. "I only got a dollar out of the \$20," declared the sixth man. He pointed to the tenth man "but he got \$10!" "Yeah, that's right," exclaimed the fifth man. "I only saved a dollar, too. It's unfair that he got ten times more than me!" "That's true!!" shouted the seventh man. "Why should he get \$10 back when I got only \$2? The wealthy get all the breaks!" "Wait a minute," yelled the first four men in unison. "We didn't get anything at all. The system exploits the poor!" The nine men surrounded the tenth and beat him up. The next night the tenth man didn't show up for dinner, so the nine sat down and ate without him. But when it came time to pay the bill, they discovered something important. They didn't have enough money between all of them for even half of the bill! And that, boys and girls, journalists and college professors, is how our tax system works. The people who pay the highest taxes get the most benefit from a tax reduction. Tax them too much, attack them for being wealthy, and they just may not show up at the table anymore. There are lots of good restaurants in Europe and the Caribbean. David R. Kamerschen, Ph.D. Distinguished Professor of Economics 536 Brooks Hall University of Georgia

Subject: Re: The Numbers You quote do not include state and local as well as excise taxes

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Fri, 14 Oct 2005 16:49:01 GMT

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

When the Federal Govt cuts taxes the state and locals as well as Property Taxes to fund the schools since the fed cut their funding; repairs of roads and infrastructure because the Feds cut the funding etc etc; must take up the slack. The money must come from somewhere. If the Fed doesn't pay the locals must. Your figures do not include that so they are meaningless. The records are easy to find; the tax rate's for income top off at 35% which for the privldge of living here is not unreasonable. The top 25% pay 85% of the taxes is indoubt for now. Why should Capital Gains; which I showed you what percentage of the population make most of their money from, be taxed at the 15% rate while the working mans income is taxed at the 35% rate? And please; those analogies are very tedious to read thats why I stay away from anologous debate. Number's will do. The numbers

Subject: As they shouldn't. We are talking about Federal Income tax. Period.

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 14 Oct 2005 19:47:15 GMT

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

I see you're trying to change the subject of the debate again. I understand, it's hard to debate something when you are wrong. So here's a tip. When you find you are wrong about something, admit it. Then you can progress to being wrong on the next subject. But lets stick to one at a time ok? You don't like the analogy because it's true. It shows the holes in your theory. I will also repeat "If you can't supply a source for your numbers then the numbers are not to be considered IMO"
