

# **Related Advertising Links**

What's This?

Russia, Australia and Sweden have killed this unfair levy. But if the death tax cannot be killed, it should be reduced to the lowest possible rate. Sens. Jon Kyl, R-Ariz., and Blanche Lincoln, D-Ark., have

While this would be just a small step in the right direction, it certainly would be better than the spiteful 45% rate proposed by the Obama

proposed a 35% rate.

Dan Mitchell is a senior economist at the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank

Posted at 12:21 AW/ET, April 23, 2009 in USA TODAY editorial | Permalink

Limited Time: \$559 Dell Biz Desktop 2GB memory\*, 160GB\* hard drive, DVD player and... www.dell.com/smb

1 Rule of a Flat Stomach..... I Cut Down 2 lbs of Stomach Fat Per Week by Obeying.. www.SarasNewBody.com

USA TODAY welcomes your views and encourages lively -- but civil -- discussions. Comments are unedited, but submissions reported as abusive may be removed. By posting a comment, you affirm that you are 13 years of age or older.

4/27/2009 5:19 PM 1 of 6

#### On Religion

A weekly series explores the issues of faith that are shaping our world.

Abolish the 'death tax' - Opinion - USATODAY.com

Read columns

### **Common Ground**

In Washington today, politicians too often just stand their ground. Liberal strategist Bob Beckel and conservative columnist Cal Thomas provide a better model.

Read columns

### Window on the Web

An at-a-glance look at online conversations selected for the newspaper.

Read comments

# Voices of Immigration

Readers discuss their personal experiences.

Read letters

#### Voices of Katrina

Readers share the impact Hurricane Katrina has had on their lives.

Read letters

### Opinionline

What people are saying about the news of the week.

Read columns

### Al Neuharth

Read columns

#### DeWayne Wickham

Read columns

# You must be logged in to leave a comment. Log in | Register



Comments: (34)

Showing: Oldest first

dest first New: Most recommended!



Forget clouding the issue with facts Mr. Mitchell, them's folks is the "greedy rich" and we need to make em bleed! After all the "honorable". Murtha, Reid, Byrd and Pelosi (among many) have their own pork,er stimulus, projects that need feeding.

RJeremy (2 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 15h ago

Recommend

2 | Report Abuse



MoniqueDanaPoint (18 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 14h ago

"Punishes success"?

The whole argument is a crock. That is unless you consider Paris Hilton successful by her own achievement.

To suggest that an estate tax makes people save less is a joke. People (who think ahead) will continue to save what they can. What's left over when they die, they won't care about - because they will be dead.

That being said, I could go along with the 35% rate. Maybe less.

Recommend

5 | Report Abuse

# Opinions by subject

# Education

Editorials, Debates | Columns | Letters

# Election '08

Editorials, Debates | Columns | Letters

# Immigration

Editorials, Debates | Columns | Letters

# Iraq

Editorials, Debates | Columns | Letters

# **Reforming Washington**

Editorials, Debates | Columns | Letters

# Terrorism

Editorials, Debates | Columns | Letters

# **Your Freedoms**

Editorials, Debates | Columns | Letters

# View all opinions

# Editorials, Debates

Read all editorials, debates

Columns

# Martin Dessures (0 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 10h ago

Whenever you hear someone refer to the inheritance tax as the "Death Tax" that term alone should always tip you that you're being snookered because a tax on inheritances is not a tax on death and it's also not, as they also lie, an attempt to eliminate double-taxation. Most of the income at issue here has never been taxed even once, and the super-rich have mounted this campaign to try and keep it that way.

The lies — and make no mistake about it; these are lies — include appealing to the dreams of the non-wealthy; to tell them that if they did someday inherit great wealth, as per their fantasies, the evil Death Tax would swoop in and take it all away from them, leaving them as poor as they were before...or poorer. Ergo, to protect that dream, they'd better throw their support behind the elimination of that tax. But in fact, taxes on inheritances under \$7 million have already been eliminated. This is just about the Rupert Murdochs of the world trying to make certain that much of their wealth is never taxed at all. Remember the very wealthy, very villainous Leona Helmsley? Caught cheating on her taxes, she was quoted by an associate as saying, "We [wealthy people] don't pay taxes...little people pay taxes."

Every buck the Helmsleys of the world didn't pay was a buck more that their gardener had to cough up. Don't let them pass the tax burden on to others.

Recommend

6 | Report Abuse



AlsoNewman (0 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 9h ago

2 of 6 4/27/2009 5:19 PM

Read all columns

#### Letters

Read all letters

Homepage



Ah yes ... the buzz words (since mushroom cloud has lost its cache) - Death Tax! Marxism! (would that be Groucho or Harpo?) Punative Double Taxation! Spiteful Rate of

Remember that the Obama estate would also be paying the same tax rate ... so I doubt there is very little spite involved

Then, let's just make up a number that most people can't prove "the death tax is a job killer, reducing employment by 1.5 million!"

Just exactly what did Caroline Kennedy do to earn the millions left to her by her parents ... who inherited it from their parents ...

Good topic for discussion but Dan Mitchell's rant isn't the place to start ,,,, too much emotion - too little real information ... you don't add weight to your argument with hot-button adjectives.

Recommend

3 | Report Abuse

### Commitment to accuracy

Other USA TODAY content

USATODAY.com - News & Information

To report corrections and clarifications, contact Reader Editor Brent Jones at 1 800 872 7073 or e-mail



Please indicate whether you're responding to content online or in the newspaper

# Share your views

If you're interested in joining other conversations about topics in USA TODAY or subjects important to you, email letters@usatoday.com. Letters for print consideration are edited for accuracy, clarity and length, and comments of 250 words or fewer have the best chance of being published. Letters that include a name, address, day and evening phone numbers, and that are verified by USA TODAY, are considered for publication

You may also submit commentaries to The Forum, USA TODAY's op-ed page, by emailing theforum@ usatoday.com. Please consult our guidelines.

Any submission to USA TODAY may be published or distributed in print, electronic or other forms.

**Archives** 

- April 2009
- March 2009
- February 2009
- January 2009 December 2008
- November 2008
- October 2008 September 2008
- August 2008 July 2008
- More blogs about news Technorati



criticalthought (25 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 9h ago Legit Qs here.

Is there any normal transfer of money which isn't taxed regardless of whether that money was 'already taxed'?

Also, for what reason did the nations listed abolish their estate tax and was it replaced with a different tax structure? For other nations which presumably have an estate tax, what changes have they made to increase or decrease the rate or actually originate their estate tax?

Finally, what distinction if any is made between various forms of inheritance? Is it on the value of items inherited, cash or tangible value or other?

Needless to say I'm not in the strata to worry about these things....yet. It's best to be prepared, no?

Recommend

| Report Abuse



bady1 (0 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 8h ago

Do super rich people actually NEED to get even richer? Does it make them more happy? Does it really contribute anything to society except greed

The answers to these questions are obvious. But those who worship money have lost their souls.

Recommend

3 | Report Abuse



Glycine (0 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 8h ago

Monique, 'envy' green is not a color that becomes you, it's discordant!

The 'crock-st' of this issue is IMAGINE .

... if "the state" stands to inherit much of your estate, AND

... if "the state" also has authority over medical/health care for you, THEN.

... I hope that "the state" loves you very very much (and not just you for your money).

The unintented consequences of 'the state' lusting over what remains of my estate when I'm old is frightnning!

Glycine

Recommend

| Report Abuse

4/27/2009 5:19 PM 3 of 6



knaug60 (5 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 8h ago

It's always fun to propose eliminating this tax or that tax. I would only support eliminating the estate tax if it was balanced by an equivalent tax somewhere else. Any takers? How about increasing the income tax to compensate?

Also, calling this tax an "inheritance tax" is not quite correct either because what is taxed is the total value of the estate above, currently, \$2 million, and after funeral expenses and other claims (debts) against the estate.

Personally, I project that my estate will be worth less than this cutoff when I die, so I do not have a dog in this fight. But if we abolish this tax, my own taxes must surely increase. So I ask again, which of my taxes do you propose to increase so that people with multi-million dollar estates can be relieved of this burden?

Recommend

3 | Report Abuse



knaug60 (5 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 7h ago

Let me calm your "frightened" mind. Before you fall hook, line, and sinker for the half-truths of those who would abolish this tax, you would do well to read up on it.

http://en.wikipedia.org  $/wiki/Estate\_tax\_in\_the\_United\_States$ http://www.cbpp.org/files/estatetaxmyths.pdf

First neither you, nor Monique, nor me will likely pay a dime of estate tax because 99.7% of estates don't pay any. Why? Because the tax is only imposed on what's left in the estate after funeral expenses and paying off outstanding debts. If you die after a long illness, likely the medical community will get all of your estate, not the government.

But like I said, if we abolish this tax, I guarantee that the 99.7% of people who pay no estate tax will see their taxes go up, yours included. That should be what frightens you.

Recommend

5 | Report Abuse



knaug60 (5 friends, send message) wrote: 4d 7h ago

As to RJeremy's idea that Cato Economist Mitchell was clouding the issue with facts. That couldn't be farther from the truth.

- 1. He conveniently omitted that virtually nobody pays this tax
- 2. He clearly overstates the level at which this tax discourages investment.
- 3. I suspect that his estimate of the impact on jobs is more opinion than fact.

So, no Mr. Mitchell is not clouding the issue with facts, but simply confusing it to make a political point.

Recommend 7 | Report Abuse

More comments on this story: 1 2 3 4 Next

4/27/2009 5:19 PM 4 of 6

Advertisement

Subscribe Today: Home Delivery of USA TODAY - Save 35%

5 of 6 4/27/2009 5:19 PM

Sponsored Links

# Limited Time: \$559 Dell Biz Desktop

2GB memory\*, 160GB\* hard drive, DVD player and 22" flat panel monitor www.dell.com/smb

### 2 Rules To Stomach Fat

Obey 2 Simple Rules And Lose 9 Lbs of Stomach Fat A Week Guaranteed. www.SarasNewBody.com

# "Mom Makes \$5K / Month (from Home)"

Read how I make \$5,300.04 every month from home. DianesBusiness.com

Get listed here

USATODAY.com partners: <u>USA WEEKEND</u> • <u>Sports Weekly</u> • <u>Education</u> • <u>Space.com</u>

 $\underline{\mathsf{Home}} \bullet \underline{\mathsf{Travel}} \bullet \underline{\mathsf{News}} \bullet \underline{\mathsf{Money}} \bullet \underline{\mathsf{Sports}} \bullet \underline{\mathsf{Life}} \bullet \underline{\mathsf{Tech}} \bullet \underline{\mathsf{Weather}}$ 

Resources: Mobile news • Site map • FAQ • Contact us • E-mail news

Jobs with us • Internships • Terms of service • Privacy policy/Your California Privacy Right

Advertise • Press Room • Media Lounge • Electronic print edition • Reprints and Permissions

Add USATODAY.com RSS feeds XML

The Nation's Homepage

© Copyright 2007 USA TODAY, a division of Gannett Co. Inc.

4/27/2009 5:19 PM 6 of 6