

I've got a deal for you. Well, actually, I don't have the deal, the House of Representatives has the deal, and most likely, it is not for you.

In the poker of politics, there is always a piece cut for the table. For arguments sake, let's say that if you get a good deal on your taxes, you are willing to contribute 10% of your winnings to the people who give you the good deal.

Now, in the United States, the IRS [reports](#) * that in 2015 there were a little under 440,000 people with an adjusted gross income over a million dollars a year. This is the top third of the top 1%. What if Congress gets into its head to raise their taxes 2% on that income? Even if the millionaires were only making one million, and some of them have made billions in a single year, 2% of this million dollars is \$20,000, which, when multiplied by the 440,000 returns equals 8.8 billion dollars. Well, that can't be allowed to happen. In fact, these stalwart citizens would be well advised to make sure that their taxes are reduced. Now, that would be something to make a contribution towards, by making a contribution to those who made it possible.

There are 435 seats in the House of Representatives, but many of the them are uncontested, or controlled by secure incumbents. Gerrymandering works. About fifty are truly in play each year, and a respectable contribution is a tithe, 10% of the winnings. 880 million dollars, spread amount fifty congressional races means that each candidate in these races who favors tax relief for the rich, could well expect to receive, from these rich people, almost \$10 Million dollars apiece. I mean, \$2,000 is not that much when your adjusted gross income is over a million. And there would still be \$330 million left over to spread around those already your friends, loyal supporters of plutocrats united, to the tune of over a million a piece.

The contribution for "tax relief" is called a pretty healthy return investment, and notice the way the math is being done. Incomes are minimized, as if all 235,000 people made merely \$1 million dollars. The tax increase proposed is only 2%, and the tithing proposed was only on the tax increase. That was just to prevent a tax increase. What would cutting the plutocrat's taxes be worth?

*:<https://www.irs.gov/statistics/soi-tax-stats-individual-statistical-tables-by-size-of-adjusted-gross-income>

Just to be clear, the return on investment is a dollar out for each dime put in.

Another way to look at these kinds of numbers is to understand that most people in Congress are lawyers, a profession whose ethic is based on serving the needs of one's clients. Who are their clients? Those that can fund winning elections, the wealthy, who, as I have argued, get a fantastic return on their investment – tithing gets back 100%, not exactly what is written in scripture, but a really wise choice.

But wait, there is more! Elections for Congress are every two years, so the tithed contribution this year, does not have to be done next year, saving all you millionaires even more, or, perhaps, you want to invest in some super PAC, whose advertisements will smear any

candidate inclined to point out why the millionaire tax break is so important to the Republicans.

Or maybe to influence the Senate elections. About half the Senate is elected from states whose total population is 20% of the total population of the country. An average of 16 of these states have Senate elections every two years, so, one year, the other alternate years, the plutocrats could contribute, from this pot of tax savings, almost \$30 million to each race. No wonder Grover Norquist, MBA Harvard, 1981, is doing so well.

Simply a wise investment, and safer than government bonds.

But to the rest of us, this just seems like legalized robbery, so our task is to make sure that people understand that when they are voting for the backers of the tax reform for the wealthy bill, they are voting against their economic interests, and get them out to vote.

My thanks to Ian! For his helpful comments on this piece.