

[#1 Tax Resolution Firm](#) Taxpayers Choice to Reduce Tax Debt Tons of Client Reviews. Call Now. www.BlueTax.com
[RightNetwork Talk Shows](#) Television with the Right POV. All That's Right With the World. www.rightnetwork.com
[Earn 15-25% Annually](#) Producing Oil & Gas Properties, IRA 401K Qualified, \$25K Min, Dividends USEnergyAssets.com

Get **FREE** NRO Newsletters
 Your E-Mail Here!

Subscribe to NR
 And **Save 70%!**



Log In | Register
 Follow Us Everywhere

NATIONAL REVIEW ONLINE

October 4 Issue
 Subscribe to NR
 Renew

Home The Corner The Agenda Bench Memos The Feed Campaign Spot Battle '10 **NEW** Planet Gore On the News Critical Condition

Kudlow's Money Politic\$ Phi Beta Cons Pryce-Jones Media Blog Exchequer Uncommon Knowledge Between the Covers Radio Derb

NR Digital Login Subscribe: NR Print Edition Subscribe: NR Digital Edition Shop! Donate Media Kit Contact Search NRO Tweet Tracker



ALAN REYNOLDS

ARCHIVE | LATEST | [LOG IN](#)

SEPTEMBER 21, 2010 4:00 A.M. **Foolhardy Tax Hikes**

Overtaxing the top 2 percent can't cover even nine days' worth of deficit.

PAGE TOOLS

TEXT RESIZE **+** **-**

RSS FEED

PRINT VERSION

SHARE

Like **10**

Listen to the [Audio Version](#)

Raising taxes on the top 2% of households, as Mr. Obama proposes, would bring in \$34 billion next year: enough to cover nine days' worth of the deficit," notes *The Economist*. So that is what all the political fuss about extending the Bush tax cuts for another year is all about. Does this make any sense? After all, errors in estimating next year's revenues are typically much larger than \$34 billion.

The arithmetic is even more absurd than it appears, because the alleged \$34 billion of extra revenue is a "static" estimate: It's based on the assumption that higher tax rates do no damage at all to the affected taxpayers, and therefore no damage to consumer spending, business [investment](#), employment, [stock prices](#), housing prices, new-car sales, etc.

ADVERTISEMENT

In an economy producing a GDP of \$15 trillion a year, even the slightest ill effect from Obama's punitive tax hikes would quickly turn that hypothetical \$34 billion revenue gain into a big revenue loss. Even if one could somehow believe there would be no harmful effects on small businesses' hiring, or on decisions of second earners to cut back or retire early, upper-[income](#) families in the president's target zone are nevertheless very important prospective buyers of big-ticket items such as homes and cars. They [account for 25 percent of consumer spending](#), as Mark Zandi points out.

And even if we assume the proposed tax hikes would have no harmful effects on the economy, the \$34 billion estimate would still

brownbailout.com

Shhh.
 Don't tell anyone!

NEW!

Schick

HYDRO

Schick HYDRO 5

CLEAR/BREAK

CLICK TO JOIN THE ADVENTURE

BEST SHAVE FOR YOUR SKIN

NRO LINKS

SUBSCRIBE TO NR
 Subscribe to NATIONAL REVIEW magazine today and save **70 percent** off the newsstand price!

CRUISE WITH NRO
 Join Karl Rove, Victor Davis Hanson, Andrew Breitbart, Jonah Goldberg, and more conservative all-stars on the NATIONAL REVIEW 2010 Post-Election Cruise.

GET NRO NEWSLETTERS
 Sign up for free NRO Newsletters, including Morning Jolt by Jim Geraghty and The Goldberg File by Jonah Goldberg.

MOST-READ CONTENT

- John Bolton:** Obama's U.N. Record
- Jim Geraghty:** Twenty Candidates Who Need Help
- Andrew C. McCarthy:** There Oughtn't Be a Law
- Brian Bolduc:** The Forgotten Man Raises His Brush
- Stephen Spruiell:** Harry Reid's 'Pet'
- The Editors:** A

Monumental Contest

Anne Bayefsky :
Soros's Anti-Human-Rights Agenda

Michael Barone:
Democrats at War:
Public-Employee Unions
vs. Gentry Liberals

Larry Kudlow: A Bullish
Tea-Party Revolt

Robert Costa: Top
Guns

Kathryn Jean Lopez:
Christine, Sarah, and the
Flavors of Right Winning
Women

Charles Krauthammer:
The Buckley Rule

Rich Lowry: Enough

Jonah Goldberg: A
Convenient Excuse

Victor Davis Hanson:
Rethinking George
Bush?

Victor Davis Hanson:
Obama's Washington
Animal Farm

Kyle O. Peterson:
Charlie Crist Is No Joe
Lieberman

The Editors: An
Electoral Loss — for
D.C. Schoolkids

Robert Costa: Senator
Buckley Speaks

Ibn Warraq: The Two
Faces of Feisal Rauf

be wildly optimistic. Why? Because it's also based on the assumption that high-income taxpayers would make no effort to avoid the added burden. Evidence from past changes in the highest tax rates suggests that affected taxpayers would be able to conceal almost enough incremental income (above the \$250,000 threshold) to offset the added taxes on such income, leaving even the IRS no better off.

For example: More professional and small-business income would be sheltered as retained earnings inside new corporations. More managerial income would be deferred, or received as perks. More investors would maximize contributions to tax-favored savings plans, or switch to tax-exempt bonds. The academic evidence is especially clear that a higher tax rate on dividends would dampen investors' appetite for dividend-paying stocks, and that a higher tax rate on capital gains would reduce the frequency with which investors sell assets and therefore have to pay the tax.

As puny as it is, the official \$34 billion estimate of the revenue from Obama's crusade against high [incomes](#) is wildly optimistic. To begin with, it fails to take into account how taxpayers would react. To make matters much worse, if there are any adverse effects on the economy at all, the net effect would be to reduce, rather than increase, federal, state, and local tax receipts in 2011. Are these risks worth taking in the foolhardy hope of paying for nine days' worth of deficit?

— Alan Reynolds is a senior fellow with the Cato Institute, and author of [Income and Wealth](#).



Not a subscriber to NATIONAL REVIEW? Sign up today!
[PRINT EDITION](#) | [DIGITAL EDITION](#)

© National Review Online 2010. All Rights Reserved.

[Home](#) | [Search](#) | [NR / Digital](#) | [Donate](#) | [Media Kit](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Log In](#)