
Subject: Taxes.....

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Fri, 05 May 2006 14:25:12 GMT

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

I received this in an e-mail. Interesting, Food for thought. Tax his land, tax his wage, Tax his bed in which he lays. Tax his tractor, tax his mule, Teach him taxes is the rule. Tax his cow, tax his goat, Tax his pants, tax his coat. Tax his ties, tax his shirts, Tax his work, tax his dirt. Tax his tobacco, tax his drink, Tax him if he tries to think. Tax his booze, tax his beers, If he cries, tax his tears. Tax his bills, tax his gas, Tax his notes, tax his cash. Tax him good and let him know That after taxes, he has no dough. If he hollers, tax him more, Tax him until he's good and sore. Tax his coffin, tax his grave, Tax the sod in which he lays. Put these words upon his tomb, "Taxes drove me to my doom!" And when he's gone, we won't relax, We'll still be after the inheritance TAX Hey maybe you'll get a refund!! Accounts Receivable Tax Building Permit Tax CDL license Tax Cigarette Tax Corporate Income Tax Dog License Tax Federal Income Tax Federal Unemployment Tax (FUTA) Fishing License Tax Food License Tax Fuel permit tax Gasoline Tax (??? cents per gallon) Hunting License Tax Inheritance Tax Interest expense (tax on the money) Inventory tax IRS Interest Charges (tax on top of tax) IRS Penalties (tax on top of tax) Liquor Tax Luxury Taxes Marriage License Tax Medicare Tax Property Tax Real Estate Tax Service charge taxes Social Security Tax Road usage taxes (Truckers) Sales Taxes Recreational Vehicle Tax School Tax State Income Tax Social Security Tax State Unemployment Tax (SUTA) Telephone federal excise tax Telephone federal universal service fee tax Telephone federal, state and local surcharge taxes Telephone minimum usage surcharge tax Telephone recurring and non-recurring charges tax Telephone state and local tax Telephone usage charge tax Utility Taxes Vehicle License Registration Tax Vehicle Sales Tax Watercraft registration Tax Well Permit Tax Workers Compensation Tax Not one of these taxes existed 100 years ago and our nation was the most prosperous in the world, had absolutely no national debt, had the largest middle class in the world and Mom stayed home to raise the kids. What the heck happened?

Subject: Re: Taxes.....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 06 May 2006 01:24:41 GMT

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

100 yrs ago the life expectancy was 51 and 65% of the population grew their own food. 50% of the population was illiterate. More people died in WWI from food poisoning than from the enemy. The slaughterhouses in Chicago were so dangerous and full of pathogens that the workers lasted less than ten yrs on the job. If you went to a hospital chances were you died from sepsis faster than you did from your original complaint. There were no roads to speak of and the ports were run by gangsters. There were very few places with clean water or electricity and most piping was joined with lead solder. The paint also. There is lots more but the nutshell is if you want civilisation you have to pay for it. The difference is where in the hierarchy the benefits go; to the very rich in this administration or to the majority of the population in a sane administration. As far as mom staying home to raise the kids; maybe thats why most of the kids left home before their 15th birthday.

Subject: Re: Taxes.....

Posted by [Leland Crooks](#) on Sat, 06 May 2006 12:39:11 GMT

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

I believe part of it lies with the "Greatest Generation". They lived through the depression, won WW2, and built this country into a powerhouse. They felt, deservedly so, that they were owed something from the government. Surpluses, strong working middle class, vibrant economy all contributed to their creating legislation, programs and expectations that cannot be sustained anymore. The spoiled baby boom generation must take this bull by the horns and wrestle it to the ground. Social safety nets must be in place, and I'm not advocating rolling back the new deal. Entitlement should be struck from the government vernacular. You ain't entitled to squat. Why is the federal gov paying for a new museum/trail/tourist attraction in (insert your town, state here)? It's all about getting elected. The more money to your district, the better off your reelection chances are. Tax and spend, borrow and spend, just spend.

Subject: Re: Taxes.....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 06 May 2006 22:23:54 GMT

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

Well; entitlement is a very loaded word. How about the fact that every small business owner can amortise all of their expenses against taxes due? Say you are a salaried employee; you pay taxes on all of your income. A business owner writes off the expenses of doing business against their tax liability. Now does that mean they are receiving an entitlement? My point is entitlement is a word that can have many multiple meanings. During WW II a worker shortage forced companies to compete for workers. Wage controls at that time prevented employers from offering higher salaries. Health and pension benefits were not covered by the regulations; so instead of raises companies would offer these incentives to retain and keep workers. The advantage was even though the workers made less money they could use the benefits and those were not taxable. So that became a fair and equitable deal. The worker took a lower salary and in return they had health coverage and a pension. The business then paid less in wages then they would have had to. Less pay but more benefits. It evened out. So my question is are those entitlements if you take less salary in return for them?

Subject: Re: Taxes.....

Posted by [Leland Crooks](#) on Sun, 07 May 2006 21:35:18 GMT

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

Definition arguments are always the foundation of a debate. The business owner writeoff is really an enticement to encourage investment. And it works. Depreciation is a real cost which we incur. The fact that the government allows it to be written off could be called an entitlement. Mortgage interest is the same concept. Encouraging investment. But I really don't want to debate the

intricacies of the tax system. To answer your question, the benefits received by the workers were earned by them. Supply and demand drove that equation. So the question to your question is: Are government entitlements the same practice through taxes? Less wages, more taxes for more entitlements?

Subject: Re: Taxes.....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Mon, 08 May 2006 01:26:59 GMT

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

Well; If I read your question correctly it seems to address this issue. Government employees traditionally were paid less than private sector workers and in return they had guarantees of job security and benefits. Many public employees; and you can confirm this, make significantly less in terms of job descriptions and the requirements of the work than what they would receive from private jobs. They must be compensated somehow. But in the larger sense workers are entitled to what their labor brings on the open market according to the laws of economics; yet very few public or private labor is compensated accordingly. This supposedly is addressed with the notion that we as citizens can participate in the wealth by investing and also by sharing in what wealth brings to the community in terms of schools and roads and hospitals. It remains to see if that is in fact working according to plan. Looking at how wealth distribution curves have steepened I would say entitlements are not keeping pace with the re-distribution of wealth that is occurring in the recent history. So this eventuality seems to beg the question of how exactly entitlements are behaving in the current economic climate. What is the issue in terms of how to distribute wealth and in what form that brings you to dispute the concept of entitlements and how you define them?
