

## The 47 Percenters' Fair Share

A few days ago Obama presented his 2014 budget proposal and 10-year budget projection. Let's set aside the fact that it was released more than two months after the date required by law. Instead, let's ask why he even bothered to present a document that spends \$160 billion *more* in fiscal year 2014 than the current budget he shamelessly claims to be cutting! We would have been better off if he had spent the time on his NCAA brackets and ignored the budget altogether. Of course, the odds of Obama's budget getting passed are about as likely as Hollywood plastic surgeons going out of business or teenagers figuring out that their Che Guevara t-shirts celebrate a murderous, racist communist thug. Still, it is worth examining his budget as an exercise in how his Marxist mind works.

There are essentially no spending cuts in the Obama proposal. As usual, Obama joins the rest of the D.C. politicians in calling a reduction in the rate of spending a "cut." But his cuts are not cuts. If a family spends \$30,000 in 2013, initially wants to spend \$33,000 in 2014, but instead decides to spend "only" \$32,000, that is a year-to-year spending *increase* of \$2,000—in the real world. But in the nation's capitol it is a spending "cut" of \$1,000. That logic is, of course, one of the reasons why we have a national debt in excess of \$16 trillion.

So the ever-shameless Barry claims to cut spending in his budget, using the distorted logic just described. But even that is meaningless because the document also calls for a full reversal of all the reductions in spending required by the "sequester" of the last budget agreement. Any savings from what Obama claims to cut will be completely offset by reversing the sequester cuts completely offsets their savings. Thus, there are no spending cuts in the Obama budget proposal. If a family cuts its electricity usage by \$10 per month but spends \$10 more per month on cell phone service, it can hardly claim to be cutting its budget. But that is what Obama is doing.

Although there are no real spending cuts, there certainly are tax increases in the Obama plan: about \$1.1 trillion over 10 years. Who will pay those higher taxes? Mostly the people who already pay taxes. Who avoids the increases? Mostly the people in the "bottom 47 percent" who currently pay no income taxes. (They will, however, get nicked by Obama with higher cigarette taxes.) Obama calls his budget proposal "fair."

I would argue that the 47 percent of Americans at the "bottom" who do not pay any income taxes actually have a *lot* of money with which to start paying their "fair share." If one assumes that tattoos, guns, ammunition, liquor, prostitutes, cell phones, rap CDs, and drugs are not essential items, the money spent on them could instead go to the U.S. Treasury to help reduce the budget deficit. (I am not arguing that Americans do not have the right to waste their hard-earned cash on the aforementioned items; I am saying that Americans do not have the right to use cash given to them by the taxpayers via welfare programs on those items. Do what you wish with your own money, but I'd like you to be

a little more careful with the cash you take from me. Buy rice and beans with food stamps, not caviar and lobster.)

I would like a leftist to come forward and explain to the rest of us how *zero taxes* can be *anyone's* "fair share." After all, Obama and Elizabeth "Wampum" Warren have both claimed, "You didn't build that," and that everyone owes everyone else for everything they have. If one accepts that premise, *then the bottom 47 percent did not build anything on their own either*, and far more than most people they owe whatever they have to others. Their "fair share" should most certainly be substantially greater than zero.

What is the amount of the "fair share" for someone who lies about a bad back or depression in order to collect Social Security Disability Insurance benefits?

What is the "fair share" of someone who cheats the system by working for cash under the table while collecting welfare checks?

What is the "fair share" of an illegal immigrant who has a baby at U.S. taxpayer expense at the nearest hospital she can find immediately after crossing the border?

What is the "fair share" of a leftist environmentalist for whom the taxpayers shelled out \$7,500 in tax subsidies for his Chevy Volt just so he could look down his "green" nose at the rest of us?

*After* the leftists have insured that people like that pay their fair share, *then* I'd be willing to talk with them about higher taxes on the successful people who are already in the 39.6 percent bracket. Until then, they should shut their subsidized pie holes—and stop wearing Che Guevara t-shirts.

Don Fredrick  
April 13, 2013