

HST 203: History of the United States Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238)

Home ► My courses ► Spring 2014 ► HST 203 Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238) ► April 21 - April 27

► Forum 2 ► Taxation by the Federal Government

Search forums

Forum 2

Display replies in nested form Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (The Role of the United...)

(The Role of the United...) Next >



Taxation by the Federal Government

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, April 19, 2014, 5:53 PM

This forum thread is for Taxation by the Federal Government posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the questions in your posts.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Taxation by the Federal Government

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Cutting Government Expense

by Linh Tran - Monday, April 21, 2014, 5:48 PM

Personally, I find my position on government taxation similar to Collidge's. Putting myself in a position of a tax payer, I would love to have more money that I work for in my pocket. Collidge made two clear points that I found the most compelling. First, he wants Americans to be able to work less for the government and more for themselves. Second, he sees having rewards of one's own industry as a meaning of freedom. In order to achieve that freedom, Collidge seeks for cutting down public expense. This totally makes sense, mostly, when the debate whether or not too much money is being spent on elections and voting campaigns that calls for government expense. Collidge provides a statistical example that in the year of 1924, if the government adds expense of 100 million dollars, total of 5 million wage earners would have to work an extra 4 days. It would be interesting to see a similar today's statistic analysis of 7-billion-dollar 2012 government expenses only on elections. If the number presented, it would be likely to anger lots of taxpayers. Cutting down public expense also means a decrease in foreign debts, which is also one of the hot topics today.

However, increasing expense as to serves the population's interest raises some very interesting points. As our instructor's example in class, I would be happy for me and other people to pay higher tax when the tax money goes to improving public schools where my kids happened to go to, or be thankful for taxpayers of other states to pay their money to build the Willamette River Bridge on I-5 in Eugene-Springfield area. It would be a different story if I do not live in Oregon or do not have kids.

<https://www.opensecrets.org/bigpicture/>

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Cutting Government Expense

by Destaney Jefferson - Friday, April 25, 2014, 8:52 PM

As student's we get tax breaks, I don't know your particular money stance but if you weren't already aware of this then i would like to share this bit of information with you see the link i posted for further information www.irs.gov/publications/p970/ch02.html. I to would love to see tax money going into improving our schools and the arts but i'm also biased being an oregon resident.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply




Is Cuts in Taxation An Improvement in Economic Growth?

by Linh Tran - Monday, April 21, 2014, 7:47 PM

Looking back at Bush tax cuts of 2001, economists who are for economic growth from tax cut also used a similar argument to what Collidge made. It is the fact that in a short run, people will have more money to their own benefits, while in the long run people are likely to work harder for more hours or expand small business. The economic, therefore, is boosted. This particular argument seems to be the most popular one that was made in debates for tax cuts. However, there are other effects of an economic decline that were not as much noticed: that people who have an income target will be likely to work less due to tax cut. With all other taxes or expense remain, the cut in tax would produce more deficit, which it did actually.

Do Tax Cuts Increase Revenues?




Source: Congressional Budget Office

The graph above is a little out of date but we can still clearly see surplus of 2001 declined rapidly with the tax cuts and deficit of the particular year exceeds the surplus. This is a situation of an unhealthy economy and it will continue to worsen with the second graph:

Tax Policy and the Shrinking Pie

Each point on this graph represents average United States economic growth over a five-year period starting at that point.

For example, the last data point — the second quarter of 2007 — shows an **average annual growth rate of 0.6 percent** for the period starting then and running through the second quarter of 2012.



<http://rricketts.ba.ttu.edu/Tax%20Rates%20and%20Revenues.htm>

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/16/opinion/sunday/do-tax-cuts-lead-to-economic->

Sum of ratings:3 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Blah, Blah...It all comes down to more taxes.**

by Morgan Swallow - Monday, April 21, 2014, 8:29 PM

Even though Coolidge says that he wants the amount that the public pays to the government to come down, he also goes on to say that the government needs more money so it is kind of a catch 22. On one hand he wants the public to have more for themselves, yet the government needs the money from the taxes to keep running smoothly. Yes there were times when the amount that people paid to the government fluctuated, sometimes drastically and sometimes not, but in the end usually everyone with a normal seven to five or whatever job still had to pay. Whereas the people making more money had to give less. Realistically shouldn't it have been or should be the less you make the less you should give up? And vice versa? Wouldn't that get more money into the governments pockets like taxes are supposed to do? Honestly I find that our government lacks common sense on most levels. How to spend money being a big one.

Sum of ratings: (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Blah, Blah...It all comes down to more taxes.**

by Destaney Jefferson - Friday, April 25, 2014, 8:59 PM

With so many things to spend "their" money on, i bet it is a very hard decision. I think they also could spend less money on certain expenditures but alas being so far down in the "food chain" we don't have that luxury of telling our Government officials how to spend "their" money so much.

Sum of ratings: (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Blah, Blah...It all comes down to more taxes.**

by Mitchell West - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 8:10 PM

i disagree that it is a hard decision. going back to our imperilism and being the world's police i think the government can easily cut costs by reduces our hidden bases, bases that serve no point other than being there, and bases that are there to protect "their" interests. while reducing bases we can still have a strong military and still be the world's police if they want us to.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Blah, Blah...It all comes down to more taxes.**



by Kylie Stiglbauer - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:01 PM

I feel like this idea of the government proposing something that leads to this so called catch 22 comes up more often than not. Telling the public that something will benefit them without mentioning the benefits the government will also gain seems to be common for the government nowadays. This goes to show that although the government and the policies that it has change, the way the government behaves with the people, does not.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Tax and Freedom

by Hao Nguyen - Tuesday, April 22, 2014, 1:27 AM

I find myself agreeing with President Coolidge on the government taxation issue as his persuasive speech over taxation which he made his point from the taxpayers' perspective. He brilliantly spoke out against the heavy taxation and expressed his desire toward Americans:

"I want the people of America to be able to work less for the government -- and more for themselves.

I want them to have the rewards of their own industry. This is the chief meaning of freedom."

His idea of freedom is compelling to me since freedom has been always considered as the right to speak up, the right to receive fair treatments, etc., the right to reward themselves plays a huge impact on human life even though it doesn't sound as "academic" and "grandiose" as others.

"Where does the tax go? What is it actually used for?" are always in the concern of taxpayers. As Linh states in her post, if the government uses tax in order to maintain and develop community's environment which benefits for the citizens instead of spending too much just for elections, everybody, including me, would love to contribute to build my society by paying tax.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Tax and Freedom

by Ren Rasmussen - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 9:38 PM

When Coolidge stated freedom in the video what I got from it was that the government was oppressing it citizens through heavy taxation. We are essential losing some of or freedom in order to pay our government. He talks about the government personally reaching in everyones pockets to collect taxes from them. When I think of people working for the government I see government job works like the post office, public education workers, or protective services not every individual in the United States.

Taxes are never going to go away so the best thing we can do is to be aware of things being passed by our government that would increase tax rates. The government will try to get as much as they can.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Tax and Freedom

by Kylie Stiglbauer - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:13 PM

The right of the people to reward themselves is definitely something that is not discussed often. Like you said, many people see the right to speak up and to fair treatment as much more substantial things, which often leads to them being up more in the center of discussion. This right to reward oneself is some what foreign, especially since selfish behavior or taking time out for one's self is often frowned upon. The tax cuts that President Coolidge discussed in this issue seemed beneficial to the people in this are, however there is always another side to the story. One must also consider the taxes benefit for the government, and how all of that will tie in together.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Taxation inevitable

by Jesse Flannery - Thursday, April 24, 2014, 9:05 PM

I have always agreed with taxation. I have never been a close follower as to what they pay for, other than the basics, public roads, government organizations, public schools, and other public services. This is why I have always agreed with the fact that taxes are an inevitable fee. I do agree with Coolidge on some points, but at the same time I question where we would be without some of the public services we were offered. Coolidge states, "Until we can reestablish a condition under which the earnings of the people can be kept by the people we are bound to suffer a very severe and distinct curtailment of our liberty". I don't see how we could ever live without taxes based on my liberties being protected by services, like police, and military. Looking at the first chart this is where me and Coolidge definitely agree. Why are we paying so much extra in taxes for things the government has no control over. The inheritance tax for instance. Paying a tax on money, or things that have already been taxed. If my parents pay taxes on all the money they've earned, then why am I paying taxes when they give it to me. I feel like I am getting ripped off in this case. I just want to know where my money is going, and have some choice in what I am getting taxed on.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Taxation inevitable

by Destaney Jefferson - Friday, April 25, 2014, 9:12 PM

I to am confused as to why they would tax money that someone in our family had prior to us and we got given as a "gift" I think it is very selfish and just trying to keep the rich

rich and the poor poor.... I am sure we are not the only ones who feel this way. There are states that do not collect such tax though.

<http://wills.about.com/od/stateestatetaxes/qt/2013-states-without-estate-tax-inheritance-tax.htm>

<http://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/state-inheritance-taxes.html>

I found it interesting in this second article i sent you that if you do not live in for example PA and you inherited land/property from PA from say your aunt you will still owe the tax. I also found it interesting that it said it matters how closely related you are in order to decide if you owe or not.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Taxation inevitable

by Kylie Stiglbauer - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 10:18 PM

This idea of keeping "people in their place" is one that has swirled around this nation and many others, for quite some time now. The rich see how the poor live and want to keep themselves as far away from their standing as they can. Unfortunately, it is the rich who are controlling the government that those poor individuals are apart of. Since this is the case, it is a lot more like for taxes and laws to be beneficial to those making them(or those of similar standing). The idea of taxing a gift or a similar acquiring of money is one that also confuses me. I understand that the people need to be taxed, but I also think that their should be limitations on what should not be taxed(in circumstances such as this one). This type of taxation never goes over well with the public and will always produce negative opinions.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



inheritance tax

by Mitchell West - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 8:19 PM

i think the inheritance tax was originally to tax the wealth when they hand down their wealth but i think it became like the Mann Act and was abused and changed to tax the less wealthy

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply




Coolidge had the right idea

by Destaney Jefferson - Friday, April 25, 2014, 10:15 PM

A man can die but you can not say that his idea will die with him. I agree with Coolidge when he states "I want them to have the rewards of their own industry. This is the chief meaning of freedom". I would like to add that this is what the American dream is built on.

Starting your own company living for yourself being self-sufficient.

He also speaks of suffering i believe us going into a "depression" and our economy going down drastically has proven true to what he stated. About how until we can reestablish a condition where the earnings made by the people can be kept by the people. we are bound to suffer a very sever and distinct curtailment of our liberty. He goes on later to say that we pay taxes because we are required to. I agree with a lot of what he is saying if not everything he said. He seemed to be a pretty wise man after reading this article....



Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Efficiency

by Jesse Flannery - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 11:24 AM

Yes Coolidge was definitely a smart man. I like the fact that he understood there needs to be a balance on taxes. It sounds like to me that he wanted to streamline the government spending, so we could be taxed less. Correct me if I'm wrong. I definitely agree that taxes are necessary, and required. Although if we can maximize efficiency of government spending, and lower or eliminate unnecessary taxes I would be ecstatic. I do want to give back to the country that gave me the opportunity, and freedom to make the money in the first place. I just don't find it fair to pay taxes on goods, or services not offered by the government (e.g., gas, inheritance).

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply




Who's piggy bank holds our taxes?

by Alexis Adair - Friday, April 25, 2014, 10:55 PM

While listening to Coolidge's speech, the main thing that stuck with me throughout, along with many others posting, was Coolidge stating that we need to "work less for the

government and more for ourselves." He says "I want them to have the rewards of their own industry." This sounds great when you hear it being said. I however, don't mind paying taxes when they are going to benefit the taxpayers.

In the graph below is a basic breakdown of how our tax dollars are spent. One blaring thing that I noticed was the unnecessarily large amount of money going to the military compared to the unjustifiably low amount going to our country's education. How can we expect our future generations to continue to thrive if our education is being funded 13 times less than our military. I believe that education is the foundation of our country's future leaders.



Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Who's piggy bank holds our taxes?



by Michael Brown - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 1:04 PM

I could not agree with you more. We need bright future generations that can solve some of the problems that we got them into. I think paying taxes for legitimate services is well worth it, but I have a hard time with military expenses being so high, and education expenses being a pathetic 2%.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Who's piggy bank holds our taxes?



by Linh Tran - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 8:55 PM



Definitely agree with you that there is such an imbalanced distribution of the money to spend on. It is still quite shocking seeing the statistics and knowing the 27% vs. 2% spending on military and education. Both of these categories are important and needed funding but 25% is too much of a difference. Also, a large portion of 13.9% got spent on paying the federal debt. This is another unreasonable spending here because, in short, if the government was smarter in spending money which comes straight from "the reward of industry" of millions of taxpayers, we would not be that deep into spending more than what we have, therefore would not have to spend that much trying to pay debt and its interest. It would be so much nicer to see that 13.9% to serve benefit of taxpayers, such as education.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Taxation by the Federal Government



by Jaalen Johnson - Saturday, April 26, 2014, 11:04 PM

Taxation is always a touchy subject. It's a constant balancing act between the government needing funds to improve our nation, and on the other hand, the people wanting to keep as much money as possible. Cries of unfair and excess tax arise whenever anything new is imposed primarily due to a mistrust in the use of government funds. The dislike of taxation started in our countries foundlings when the British unfairly and excessively taxed American citizens and the hate has never stopped. Many policies about who to tax and what to tax have been tried and any plan will have its flaws. There ought to be one flat rate of taxation for people of all wealth classes and in addition equal taxation on all estates, winning, etc. You shouldn't over privilege the rich or enable the poor with ta, the best solution is to treat everyone the same and be consistent so we American's know what to expect.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

[< Previous \(The Role of the United...\)](#)

[\(The Role of the United...\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

