

2023

NATIONAL DEBATE CLINIC

NEGATIVE BRIEFS

**THE CASE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SUBSTANTIALLY
INCREASING FISCAL REDISTRIBUTION IN THE
UNITED STATES BY ADOPTING A FEDERAL JOBS
GUARANTEE, EXPANDING SOCIAL SECURITY,
AND/OR PROVIDING A BASIC INCOME**

CONTENTS

CASE RESPONSE BRIEFS ON THE ECONOMIC INEQUALITY TOPIC

ADOPTING A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE

| | |
|--|----|
| Unemployment in the U.S. Is Not a Significant Problem | 1 |
| Unemployment Levels Are at Historic Lows for Minority Workers | 3 |
| A Sub-5 Percent Unemployment Rate Ought to Be Regarded as Full Employment | 5 |
| Artificially Forcing an Unemployment Rate Lower than 3.5% Harms the Economy | 6 |
| Mild Recessions Are Not Harmful | 7 |
| A Federal Jobs Guarantee Is Administratively Unworkable | 9 |
| A Federal Jobs Guarantee Would Promote Fraud | 12 |
| The Cost of a Federal Jobs Guarantee Would Be Massive | 13 |
| A Federal Jobs Guarantee Would Harm the U.S. Economy | 14 |
| A Federal Jobs Guarantee Would Destroy the Dignity of Work | 15 |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions Are Decreasing in the U.S. | 16 |
| The Inflation Reduction Act Has the U.S. on Track for Further Decreases in Emissions | 17 |
| Solar Power Can Now Compete in the Marketplace Without Artificial Measures | 21 |
| Wind Power Is Increasing Rapidly in the Present System | 24 |
| China's Greenhouse Emissions Increases Outweigh U.S. Reductions | 25 |
| The Green New Deal Is Ruinously Expensive | 26 |
| The National Investment Employment Corps Jobs Program Is a Waste of Money | 27 |
| Numerous Programs Already Target Depressed Areas | 30 |
| True Volunteerism Is Alive and Well in the Present System | 32 |
| Mandatory National Service Is a Bad Idea | 33 |
| National Service Will Not Solve Societal Problems | 34 |

EXPANDING SOCIAL SECURITY

| | |
|--|----|
| The Social Security System Is Meeting the Retirement Needs of Seniors | 35 |
| Social Security Is Supplemented by Private Retirement Savings Programs | 37 |
| U.S. Workers Should Be Encouraged to Work Longer, Rather Than Retire Earlier | 38 |
| Promoting Early Retirement Harms the U.S. Economy | 42 |
| The Cost of Expanding Retirement Programs Is Unacceptably Large | 44 |
| The Quality of U.S. Health Care Is Good | 46 |
| Health Care Should Not Be Considered a Basic Right | 48 |
| The U.S. Does Not Have a Major Problem With Access to Health Care | 49 |
| Medicare Does Not Provide a Good Model For Expanding Health Insurance | 50 |
| Medicare For All Costs Would Be Massive | 53 |
| Adopting Medicare For All Would Exacerbate the Shortage of Health Care Workers | 55 |
| Medicare For All Would Violate the "Takings Clause" of the Fifth Amendment | 57 |
| Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Is Not Social Security | 60 |
| The Asset Limit in SSI Is Not a Significant Problem | 62 |
| Medicaid Expansion Is Not Necessary for People to Receive Care | 63 |
| Medicaid Expansion Does Not Improve Public Health | 64 |
| Immigrant Children Have Adequate Access to Health Care | 66 |
| Medicare Provides Appropriate Care for Mental Illness | 67 |
| SSI Should Not Apply in the U.S. Territories | 70 |
| Medicaid in the U.S. Territories Is Now Funded at the Same Level as the States | 71 |
| Unemployment Insurance Is Primarily a State-Run Enterprise | 72 |

PROVIDING A BASIC INCOME

| | |
|---|----|
| Unemployment Is Not a Major Problem at Present | 73 |
| Minority Unemployment Is Not a Significant Problem | 74 |
| Income Inequality Is Inevitable and Beneficial | 75 |
| Income Inequality Does Not Come at the Expense of the Poor | 78 |
| Official Poverty Statistics Are Misleading | 81 |
| In the U.S., Income Disparities Are Not a Major Source of Concern | 84 |
| The Earned Income Tax Credit Offers the Superior Means for Addressing Poverty | 90 |
| The Claim That AI Worsens Unemployment Is False | 91 |

PROVIDING A BASIC INCOME (Continued)

| | |
|---|-----|
| A Universal Basic Income Will Not Solve Income Inequality Problems | 95 |
| The Universal Basic Income Would Be Ruinously Expensive | 97 |
| Suggested Funding Mechanisms for the UBI Are Problematic | 99 |
| The U.S. Budget Deficit Is Too Large to Simply Continue More Deficit Spending | 100 |
| The Universal Basic Income Creates an Opening for Authoritarianism | 101 |
| Current Welfare Programs Best Meet the Needs of Persons in Poverty | 103 |
| Reparations Creates More Problems Than It Solves | 104 |

DISADVANTAGE BRIEFS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Spending Trade-Off Disadvantage | 106 |
| Business Confidence Disadvantage | 109 |
| Inflation Disadvantage | 112 |
| Innovation Disadvantage | 117 |
| Interest Rates Disadvantage | 133 |

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE U.S. IS NOT A SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM

1. UNEMPLOYMENT IS AT AN ALL-TIME LOW.

Augusta Saraiva and Katia Dmitrieva, (Staff, Bloomberg News), **JOBLESS RATE HITS 53-YEAR LOW**, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved May 24, 2023 from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-02-03/us-job-gains-post-surprise-surge-jobless-rate-hits-53-year-low - xj4y7vzkg>

The US labor market burned red-hot in January as hiring unexpectedly surged and unemployment fell to a 53-year low, defying recession forecasts and adding pressure on the Federal Reserve to keep raising interest rates.

Lydia DePillis, (Staff, New York Times), **IF THE JOB MARKET IS SO GOOD, WHY IS GIG WORK THRIVING?**, Aug. 15, 2022. Retrieved Mar. 29, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/08/15/business/economy/gig-work.html>

American workers are experiencing, by many measures, one of the best job markets ever. The unemployment rate has matched a 53-year low. Job listings per available worker are at historic highs. Wages, while not quite keeping up with inflation, are rising at their fastest pace in decades.

Charlotte Weaver, (Staff, RealPage Analytics), **BOSTON BOASTS THE NATION'S LOWEST UNEMPLOYMENT RATE**, July 3, 2023. Retrieved Sept. 5, 2023 from <https://www.realpage.com/analytics/us-unemployment-historically-low/>

Unemployment across the U.S. continues to register at historically low levels thanks to an improved job market. As of May, the nation's unemployment rate averaged 3.4%, according to non-seasonally adjusted data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

2. JOB GROWTH IS ACCELERATING.

David Harrison, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), **UNEMPLOYMENT FALLS TO 3.4%, LOWEST IN 53 YEARS, JOBS REPORT SHOWS**, Feb. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/january-jobs-report-unemployment-rate-economy-growth-2023-11675374490>

U.S. job growth accelerated at the start of the year as employers added a robust 517,000 jobs and pushed the unemployment rate to a 53-year low.

Gili Malinsky, (Staff, CNBC), **U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT JUST HIT ITS LOWEST RATE SINCE 1969—ECONOMISTS AREN'T OPTIMISTIC IT'LL LAST**, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved Mar. 29, 2023 from <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/02/03/us-unemployment-hit-a-historic-low-economists-arent-sure-itll-stick.html>

The U.S. labor market started 2023 on a high note. The economy added 517,000 jobs, according to the Labor Department, far exceeding the 187,000 jobs the Dow Jones had anticipated. Among the Bureau of Labor Statistics' findings for the month was also the market's historically low unemployment rate of 3.4% or 5.7 million people. That's the lowest it's been since 1969. The rate "continues to show the we have an especially tight labor market," says Ben Zipperer, economist at the Economic Policy Institute, meaning one in which workers have a lot of opportunities.

3. THE CURRENT RECOVERY IS CREATING GOOD JOBS.

Josh Bersin, (Financial Analyst, Bersin & Associates), THE ECONOMY THAT JUST WON'T QUIT: WHY JOBS KEEP GETTING CREATED, Oct. 11, 2022. Retrieved Sept. 5, 2023 from <https://joshbersin.com/2022/10/the-economy-that-just-wont-quit-why-jobs-keep-getting-created/>

These “new jobs” are not only due to increased demand and economic growth: they’re created by industry transformation. Healthcare, which has become the largest employer in the US, is growing at twice the rate of the economy. So are electric vehicles. Rivian, for example, went from 800 employees to 16,000 employees in only four years. These kinds of industry changes are everywhere, creating demand for “new jobs” and “new skills” regardless of GDP fluctuations. And as I discuss in our research on PowerSkills, these new jobs are higher paying and more demanding of our human, social, analytic, and creative skills. So this new economy of work is getting better for everyone.

Eric Levitz, (Staff, New York Intelligencer), AMERICA’S LABOR SHORTAGES ARE GOOD, ACTUALLY, Feb. 6, 2023. Retrieved Sept. 5, 2023 from <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2023/02/americas-labor-shortages-are-good-actually.html>

Now that consumer demand is robust and unemployment is at a half-century low, many former service-sector workers no longer have to settle for jobs at firms whose business models hinge on low wages. Instead, they’ve managed to find roles in more profitable (and therefore higher paying) parts of the economy.

Scott Horsley, (Staff, NPR), UNEMPLOYMENT HAS FALLEN TO 3.5%, MATCHING THE LOWEST LEVEL IN HALF A CENTURY, Jan. 6, 2023. Retrieved Mar. 29, 2023 from <https://www.npr.org/2023/01/06/1147547807/unemployment-has-fallen-to-3-5-matching-the-lowest-level-in-half-a-century>

Today we learned that U.S. employers added 223,000 jobs last month as the unemployment rate fell to just 3.5%, matching its lowest level in half a century. And at the same time, hundreds of thousands of new workers entered the job market in December, which helped take some of the pressure off rising wages and inflation.

4. EVEN FAST FOOD WORKERS ARE MAKING TWICE THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE.

Michelle Cheng, (Staff, Quartz), FAST FOOD WAGES ARE WAY PAS THE “FIGHT FOR \$15,” Sept. 2, 2022. Retrieved Sept. 5, 2023 from <https://qz.com/fast-food-wages-are-way-past-the-fight-for-15-1849484884>

At the same time, the average wages of restaurant workers have also surpassed \$15 an hour, according to US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data. Inflation and a labor shortage throughout the pandemic have triggered the wage gains.

5. MORE THAN TWO JOBS ARE AVAILABLE FOR EVERY WORKER SEEKING WORK.

Eric Levitz, (Staff, New York Intelligencer), AMERICA’S LABOR SHORTAGES ARE GOOD, ACTUALLY, Feb. 6, 2023. Retrieved Sept. 5, 2023 from <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2023/02/americas-labor-shortages-are-good-actually.html>

Throughout the United States, “Help Wanted” signs are becoming nearly as ubiquitous as the stars and stripes. The number of job openings in the U.S. hit 11 million in December, which means that there are now roughly two unfilled positions for every involuntarily unemployed American.

UNEMPLOYMENT LEVELS ARE AT HISTORIC LOWS FOR MINORITY WORKERS

1. UNEMPLOYMENT RATES FOR MINORITIES ARE NOW AT THE LOWEST RATE EVER RECORDED.

Joelle Gamble, (Chief Economist, U.S. Department of Labor), SEPTEMBER JOBS REPORT: HISPANIC UNEMPLOYMENT REACHES RECORD LOW, Oct. 14, 2022. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://blog.dol.gov/2022/10/14/september-jobs-report-hispanic-unemployment-reaches-record-low>

There has been significant progress on labor market outcomes for Hispanic and Latino workers. In January 2021, their unemployment rate was 8.6%. In September, the unemployment rate for Hispanic and Latino workers fell to 3.8% – the lowest rate since 1973, the year the Bureau of Labor Statistics began recording it.

2. HISPANIC UNEMPLOYMENT RATES ARE AT HISTORIC LOWS.

Joseph Lawler, (Policy Editor, Washington Examiner), UNEMPLOYMENT RATE FOR HISPANIC WORKERS HIT RECORD LOW IN JULY, Aug. 5, 2022. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/restoring-america/courage-strength-optimism/unemployment-rate-for-hispanic-workers-hit-record-low-in-july>

The unemployment rate for Hispanic workers hit a record low of 3.9% in July, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported Friday morning. The jobless rate narrowly eclipsed the previous record low of 4% set in September 2019 and is just one of several labor market indicators that is now as good as or better than just before the pandemic struck.

3. AFRICAN-AMERICAN UNEMPLOYMENT RATES ARE AT HISTORIC LOWS.

Paul Krugman, (Columnist, New York Times), THE GOOD NEWS ON UNEMPLOYMENT FOR BLACK AMERICANS, May 23, 2023. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from www.nytimes.com/2023/05/23/opinion/unemployment-black-americans.html

As you can see from the chart above, the unemployment rate for Black men is at its lowest level since the government began recording it. This is in part because we have low unemployment overall — more on that in a bit. But it's also because the racial gap in unemployment has drastically narrowed.

Stephanie Whiteside, (Staff, NewsNation), BLACK UNEMPLOYMENT HITS HISTORIC LOW, May 5, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.newsnationnow.com/business/black-unemployment-hits-historic-low/>

The latest unemployment numbers show a surprisingly strong labor market, with unemployment for Black Americans hitting a record low. The latest round of unemployment numbers defied predictions, with the rate continuing to drop even as inflation continues to soar. Overall unemployment hit 3.4%, a number that is as low or lower than anything seen since 1969. For Black Americans, unemployment rates hit historic lows. Black men ages 20 and older had an unemployment rate of 4.5%, which is the lowest on record and the first time the unemployment rate for that group has been under 5% since the government began using the current unemployment tracking system in 1972.

4. WAGE LEVELS FOR MINORITIES ARE INCREASING SIGNIFICANTLY.

Sarah Chaney Cambon and Gwynn Guilford, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), JOB PROSPECTS FOR BLACK WORKERS HAVE NEVER BEEN BETTER—IN WAYS THAT MIGHT LAST, May 18, 2023. Retrieved May 24, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/black-unemployment-rate-job-market-ebd93614>

Black Americans were 11.6% of financial industry workers in the quarter, up from 10.4% four years earlier. Finance workers, including at jobs in banking and insurance, make an average \$43 an hour. Black workers made up 7.5% of the construction industry in the first quarter, which also pays above-average wages, compared with 6.3% in the same period in 2019. Across the economy, Black workers moved in recent years to better-paying fields than the ones they left, a White House report found. And last year, Black workers saw faster wage growth overall than other Americans.

5. THE GAP BETWEEN WHITE AND MINORITY UNEMPLOYMENT RATES HAVE DRAMATICALLY NARROWED.

Paul Krugman, (Columnist, New York Times), THE GOOD NEWS ON UNEMPLOYMENT FOR BLACK AMERICANS, May 23, 2023. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from www.nytimes.com/2023/05/23/opinion/unemployment-black-americans.html

In the late Reagan economy — which, as I said, Americans thought was pretty good at the time — Black men generally had an unemployment rate six to seven percentage points higher than that of white men. As of April 2023, that gap was down to 1.6 percentage points.

Sarah Chaney Cambon and Gwynn Guilford, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), JOB PROSPECTS FOR BLACK WORKERS HAVE NEVER BEEN BETTER—IN WAYS THAT MIGHT LAST, May 18, 2023. Retrieved May 24, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/black-unemployment-rate-job-market-ebd93614>

The gap between the unemployment rate for white Americans, which was 3.1%, and the higher rate for Black Americans was 1.6 percentage points in April, the narrowest on record.

6. EMPLOYMENT GAINS FOR MINORITIES ARE LIKELY TO BE ENDURING.

Sarah Chaney Cambon and Gwynn Guilford, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), JOB PROSPECTS FOR BLACK WORKERS HAVE NEVER BEEN BETTER—IN WAYS THAT MIGHT LAST, May 18, 2023. Retrieved May 24, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/black-unemployment-rate-job-market-ebd93614>

Long-running forces are reshaping the U.S. labor market and could mean the growth of the Black workforce will endure beyond short-term ups and downs in the economy. Black workers are growing as a share of the overall U.S. workforce, making up 13.1% of the civilian labor force in April, up from 12.7% in December 2019, before the pandemic.

Sarah Chaney Cambon and Gwynn Guilford, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), JOB PROSPECTS FOR BLACK WORKERS HAVE NEVER BEEN BETTER—IN WAYS THAT MIGHT LAST, May 18, 2023. Retrieved May 24, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/black-unemployment-rate-job-market-ebd93614>

The hiring surge and wage gains raise the prospect that Black workers are better positioned to weather the next downturn. That could break the cycle where Black Americans typically suffer disproportionate economic pain during recessions and are among the last to enjoy the fruits of expansion.

A SUB-5 PERCENT UNEMPLOYMENT RATE OUGHT TO BE REGARDED AS FULL EMPLOYMENT FOR THE U.S. ECONOMY

1. A ZERO RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT IS ECONOMICALLY IMPOSSIBLE.

Glenn Barklie, (Staff, Investment Monitor), WHY LOW UNEMPLOYMENT RATES ARE A BAD THING, Nov. 17, 2022. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://www.investmentmonitor.ai/features/why-low-unemployment-rates-are-a-bad-thing/>

One may argue low unemployment is better than high unemployment. If so, then perhaps the most desirable outcome would be no unemployment at all, or a 0% unemployment rate. This is not sought by governments. First, it would be an almost impossible situation. It would require no movement in job seeking. Employees would need to remain in their existing jobs, with no workforce leavers or entrants. It would also constrain company growth. Governments will therefore speak more about full employment. Although there is no exact target for unemployment, most economists argue a rate between 3% and 5% is acceptable.

2. AN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE BELOW 5% MEANS THE ECONOMY IS A FULL CAPACITY.

Aaron Hankin, (Staff, Investopedia.com), THE DOWNSIDE OF LOW UNEMPLOYMENT, Sept. 29, 2020. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://www.investopedia.com/insights/downside-low-unemployment/>

The level at which unemployment equals positive output is highly debated. However, economists suggest that as the U.S. unemployment rate gets below 5%, the economy is very close to or at full capacity. So at 3.5% one could argue the level of unemployment is too low, and the U.S. economy is becoming inefficient.

3. A MARKET ECONOMY CANNOT FUNCTION WITH A ZERO RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

Guy Standing, (Research Associate, University of London), BASIC INCOME, AND HOW WE CAN MAKE IT HAPPEN, 2017, 203.

Most 'job guarantee' advocates also ignore the fact that market economies need some unemployment to function. A seminal article by A. W. Phillips in 1958 posited an inverse relationship between the level of unemployment and the rate of inflation. And although the exact nature of the relationship has been a matter of controversy ever since, most economists accept that there is a 'natural' rate of unemployment at which inflation is broadly stable. (This is often referred to as the NAIRU or non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment). In a market economy, therefore, no government can guarantee a job to everybody who wants one.

4. ONCE THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE FALLS TOO LOW, INFLATION RESULTS.

Algernon Austin, (Sr. Researcher, Thurgood Marshall Institute), LAW & INEQUALITY, Summer 2021, 261.

The theoretical approach would use the non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment (NAIRU) which is similar to the "natural rate of unemployment." Economic theory predicts that if the unemployment rate falls below the NAIRU rate, inflation will accelerate and harm the economy. The Federal Reserve has used NAIRU to determine when the unemployment rate is too low. When the unemployment rate falls below the NAIRU level, the Federal Reserve has felt pressure to increase interest rates to slow the economy and increase unemployment.

ARTIFICIALLY FORCING AN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE LOWER THAN 3.5% HARMS THE U.S. ECONOMY AND U.S. WORKERS

1. FRICTIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWS WORKERS TO MOVE FROM JOB TO JOB.

Lida Weinstock, (Analyst in Macroeconomic Policy, U.S. Congressional Research Service), INTRODUCTION TO U.S. ECONOMY: UNEMPLOYMENT, July 12, 2022. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/IF10443.pdf>

Frictional unemployment refers to short-term unemployment due to job searching or transition. After an individual leaves a job, it generally takes some period of time to find a new position. Frictional unemployment tends to be present in the economy at all times because there is a certain amount of churn in the labor force as individuals move from one employer to another.

2. FRICTIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS U.S. BUSINESSES.

Julia Kagan, (Senior Editor, Investopedia), FRICTIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT: DEFINITION, CAUSES, AND QUIT RATE EXPLAINED, Dec. 18, 2022. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/f/frictionalunemployment.asp>

Frictional unemployment always exists in an economy with a free-moving labor force and is beneficial because it's an indicator that individuals are seeking better positions by choice. It also helps businesses because it gives them a wider selection of potentially highly qualified candidates applying for positions.

3. FRICTIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS U.S. WORKERS.

Abha Bhattarai & Maggie Penman, (Staff, Washington Post), RESTAURANTS CAN'T FIND WORKERS BECAUSE THEY'VE FOUND BETTER JOBS, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved Sept. 5, 2023 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/02/03/worker-shortage-restaurants-hotels-economy/>

Indeed, federal data shows that any worker who switches jobs generally gets higher pay increases — an annual increase of about 7.7 percent, as of December — compared to 5.5 percent for employees who stay put.

4. FORCING UNEMPLOYMENT BELOW THE LEVEL OF FRICTIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT CAUSES INFLATION.

Lucia Mutikani, (Staff, Reuters News Service), U.S. REPORTS BLOWOUT JOB GROWTH; UNEMPLOYMENT LOWEST SINCE 1969, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved Mar. 29, 2023 from <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-job-growth-accelerates-january-wage-gains-moderate-2023-02-03/>

U.S. job growth accelerated sharply in January while the unemployment rate hit more than a 53-1/2-year low of 3.4%, pointing to a stubbornly tight labor market, and a potential headache for Federal Reserve officials as they fight inflation. The Labor Department's closely watched employment report on Friday also showed job creation in the past year was much stronger than previously estimated, suggesting the economy was nowhere near a recession. Though wage inflation cooled further in January, average hourly earnings increased faster in 2022 than previously estimated.

MILD RECESSIONS ARE NOT HARMFUL

1. RECESSIONS ARE OVER QUICKLY.

The Nielsen Company, *MARKETING DURING A RECESSION: FINDING THE UPSIDE OF AN ECONOMIC DOWNTURN*, Sept. 2022. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from <https://www.nielsen.com/insights/2022/marketing-during-a-recession-finding-the-upside-of-an-economic-downturn/>

The good news for marketers dreading a protracted downturn is that many recessions are short lived—historically, 75% of recessions end within a year, and a full 30% only last two quarters. So, any cut in spending will likely only be short-term and result in nominal savings, while putting brands at a disadvantage heading into the bounce-back period that is likely just around the corner.

2. RECESSIONS ARE CLEANSING EVENTS FOR THE ECONOMY.

Allison Morrow, (Staff, CNN Business), *WHY SOME PEOPLE ACTUALLY WANT A RECESSION (AND OTHERS SAY THAT'S CRAZY)*, July 30, 2022. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from <https://www.cnn.com/2022/07/30/economy/inflation-or-recession-economy/index.html>

But can a recession ever really be a good thing? Sometimes, says Lakshman Achuthan, co-founder of the Economic Cycle Research Institute, which determines recession dates for 22 economies around the world. “Recessions can be cleansing events for the economy as a whole, forcing inefficient behemoths out of business and making room for more nimble competitors who can better satisfy customer needs,” he said in an email to CNN Business.

Ronald-Peter Stöferle, (Austrian Economist, Mises Institute), *A RECESSION IS HEALTHY AND NECESSARY*, Jan. 21, 2016. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from <https://www.businessinsider.com/a-recession-is-healthy-and-necessary-2016-1>

Public opinion is generally quite simple in regard to recession: upswings are generally welcomed, recessions are to be avoided. The “Austrians” are however at odds with this general consensus — we regard recessions as healthy and necessary. Economic downturns only correct the aberrations and excesses of a boom.

3. RECESSIONS BENEFIT BUSINESSES – ESPECIALLY SMALL BUSINESSES.

Gene Marks, (Founder, The Marks Group), *COULD A RECESSION BE GOOD FOR AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES?*, May 18, 2022. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/3492923-could-a-recession-be-good-for-americas-small-businesses/>

You can expect much more as the economy continues to soften. When that happens, more employees will be looking for jobs, and that's a potential benefit to the millions of small firms that are desperately looking to fill positions. Some worry that wages will be negatively impacted, but I don't see that. Some 11.5 million jobs remain unfilled, and even amid such low confidence, the National Federation of Independent Businesses reports that almost half of the small business owners they surveyed are looking for talent.

Gene Marks, (Founder, The Marks Group), *COULD A RECESSION BE GOOD FOR AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES?*, May 18, 2022. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/3492923-could-a-recession-be-good-for-americas-small-businesses/>

Smart small business owners who have been through economic cycles before know that a downturn won't last forever. They also know that the difference between their long-term success and failure rests on the shoulders of the employees they have. And they'll snap up any available workers that were shed by big brands and pay them whatever's necessary to join their firms.

4. RECESSIONS BENEFIT HUMAN HEALTH – THE EMPIRICAL RECORD IS CLEAR.

Lynne Peeples, (Seattle-based journalist), SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, Feb. 13, 2019. Retrieved May 5, 2023 from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-the-next-recession-could-save-lives/>

Christopher Ruhm has spent the past two decades investigating the links between downturns and health. When he started his research, he wasn't aware of the early 20th-century literature. That work had been generally forgotten, he says, because it "didn't fit the obvious narrative." He began by plugging data from more than a century of U.S. history into a complex statistical model. Then, like his pre-Depression counterparts, he thought he had made an error. "So, I started looking at the raw data," says Ruhm, an economist at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. "But it wasn't some programming mistake; it was real." In fact, he and others replicated the finding—in different situations, in different time periods, in different countries. In every case, Ruhm notes, the health of a majority of people improved, while the health of a minority declined.

Lynne Peeples, (Seattle-based journalist), SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, Feb. 13, 2019. Retrieved May 5, 2023 from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-the-next-recession-could-save-lives/>

The most-experienced workers are the ones most likely to keep their jobs during a recession, and slower production can allow for more attention to safety. People also tend to drive less, which translates to fewer traffic accidents. And fewer vehicles on the road might also help to explain why air quality is better. "When employment pops up, so do things related to pollution—commerce, industry, trucks on the road," says Mary Davis, an environmental-policy specialist at Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts. The air-quality connection might also help explain why studies have also linked recessions to reduced cardiovascular and respiratory problems, as well as infant mortality.

5. RECESSIONS HAPPEN INEVITABLY IN A FREE MARKET ECONOMY.

Adam Hayes, (Staff, Investopedia), ARE ECONOMIC RECESSIONS INEVITABLE?, Dec. 1, 2022. Retrieved Sept. 6, 2023 from <https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/032015/are-economic-recessions-inevitable.asp>

Recessions are periods of negative economic performance, usually following a period of above-average growth. The popular sentiment of financial analysts and many economists is that recessions are the inevitable result of the business cycle in a capitalist economy. The empirical evidence, at least on the surface, appears to strongly back up this theory. Recessions seem to occur every decade or so in modern economies and, more specifically, they seem to regularly follow periods of strong growth.

Gene Marks, (Founder, The Marks Group), COULD A RECESSION BE GOOD FOR AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES?, May 18, 2022. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/3492923-could-a-recession-be-good-for-americas-small-businesses/>

Warren Buffett once said, "I think the most important factor in getting out of the recession actually is just the regenerative capacity of American capitalism." This is true. A recession is coming. Maybe it's already started. But the smartest small business owners aren't panicking. They've been to this rodeo before. And, assuming they've got the capital, they see opportunities to use this downturn to their advantage.

A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE IS ADMINISTRATIVELY UNWORKABLE

1. THE SCOPE OF THE PROPOSAL IS BREATHTAKINGLY HUGE.

Peter Earle, (Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY, Nov. 19, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/federal-jobs-guarantee-democrats/>

In terms of potential enrollees, estimates start at roughly 10 million. According to LEI's high-end estimate of 17.5 million enrollees, the program would have more employees than the combined head count of the U.S. Department of Defense, the Chinese People's Liberation Army, Walmart, McDonalds, the U.K.'s National Health Service, the China National Petroleum Corporation, the State Grid Corporation of China, the Indian Railways, and the Indian Armed forces. A government organization of that size — 17.5 million job guaranteed individuals, with an untold number of administrators, managers, and other employees to attend to them nationwide — would become the largest public or private organization in history. It would also be the largest experiment in organizational efficiency in history, with the livelihoods of millions of newly government-dependent citizens hanging in the balance.

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), PROPOSED FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE IS TOO BIG TO EXIST, May 4, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.aier.org/article/proposed-federal-jobs-guarantee-is-too-big-to-exist/>

The federal jobs guarantee, as spelled out in Democratic policy circles, would arguably be the largest public intervention in the economy in American history. The Levy Institute, one of the chief proponents of the plan, estimates that 12 to 17 million Americans would participate if the program were offered today. That's about 8 to 10 percent of our labor force. Some perspective is in order. We're talking about an organization that is projected to employ more people than the current federal government (2 million), the entire U.S. military (1.3 million), Walmart (2.3 million), and the rest of the top 10 private sector employers in the country combined. I respectfully ask anyone on the left who supports the jobs guarantee think about why they would be concerned if a private corporation came along and hired nearly 10 percent of our eligible workers.

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), THE JOB GUARANTEE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS, Oct. 18, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.aier.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/JobGuarantee.pdf>

Any of the estimates presented in the two reports would result in an enterprise of staggering, unprecedented size. As chart 1 shows, the Levy report's upper-bound estimate of 17.5 million enrollees would exceed employment at the world's nine largest employers combined. The CBPP's lower estimate would be just shy of employment at the world's five largest employers combined. This list of employers contains private firms, state enterprises, militaries, and public utilities, none of which individually have attained even a third of the size of the lowest projected job-guarantee participation rate. Economists have long written about the managerial, informational, and incentive-related issues that arise as firms get bigger. We are aware of no organization of any structure that has prospered or even existed with anywhere near these numbers of employees.

Robert Samuelson, (Columnist, Washington Post), BERNIE SANDER'S JOB GUARANTEE: IS IT A BOONDOGGLE?, May 6, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/bernie-sanders-job-guarantee-is-it-a-boondoggle/2018/05/06/29b28f7c-4fcf-11e8-84a0-458a1aa9ac0a_story.html

When fully deployed, the program would create 15 million public-service jobs, estimate the economists. This would be huge: about five times the number of existing federal jobs (2.8 million) and triple the number of state government jobs (5 million).

2. FEDERAL SUPERVISION OF MILLIONS OF WORKERS IS UNMANAGEABLE.

Timothy Taylor, (Prof., Economics, Macalester College), THE JOB GUARANTEE CONTROVERSY, Apr. 30, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis Uni.

Here's a comment from Josh Bivins from the Economic Policy Institute in "How do our job creation recommendations stack up against a job guarantee?": "I don't think we have the public sector managerial capacity right now to oversee the work of 11 million people—who will be coming from varying backgrounds and labor qualifications—and ensure that they will be perceived as undertaking socially useful tasks. This is essentially three times as many people as there are K-12 public school teachers in this country today. These 11 million workers will not have a shared mission (like school teachers) or overwhelmingly have advanced education (again, like teachers). We will need to slot them into a system of management and oversight that has yet to be created or defined (unlike public education, where at least the goals and population to be served are clear enough). Further, if the private sector contracts in a recession, this number could swell within 18 months to 22 million. This would require careful management of a workforce more than 10 times as large as Wal-Mart's global labor force. Building anything like this much public sector management capacity strikes me as a project that will be years, if not decades, in the making. And attempts to do this all at once will lead inevitably, I think, to stories about how these are disorganized make-work programs and the stigma will follow."

3. TRAINING WOULD BE AN IMPOSSIBLE BURDEN.

Ryan Bhandari, (Former Sr. Policy Adviser, Third Way), WHAT IS THE "FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE" AND WHAT ARE PEOPLE SAYING ABOUT IT?, Mar. 25, 2019. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.thirdway.org/memo/what-is-the-federal-jobs-guarantee-and-what-are-people-saying-about-it>

It would be an administrative nightmare. Finally, matching millions of workers to the jobs envisioned under a jobs guarantee would be an administrative nightmare to implement. State and local governments will be tasked with finding the productive work to do, but how do we train millions of people to do these jobs? How does the Department of Labor oversee the millions of new jobs to make sure they're legitimate? What are the qualifiers for the kind of work that's eligible? What if a right-leaning state wants jobs done that a left-leaning federal government deems unproductive or socially unacceptable like building an oil pipeline or opening up a coal mine?

4. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED ANY ABILITY TO SUPERVISE SUCH A MASSIVE WORKFORCE.

Brian Riedl, (Sr. Fellow, Manhattan Institute), FANTASYLAND ECONOMICS: BERNIE SANDERS AND OTHERS PROPOSE GUARANTEED FEDERAL JOBS FOR ALL, May 1, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.city-journal.org/html/fantasyland-economics-15877.html>

Expecting the government that brought us the DMV, Post Office, and an unusable Obamacare website to operate competently a jobs program for more than 20 million workers is fantasyland economics. The scale of the program would require the largest federal bureaucratic structure in American history, outside of World War II. Massive incompetence, corruption, and mismanagement would be inevitable.

5. THE JOBS CREATED BY A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD NOT BE MEANINGFUL WORK.

Guy Standing, (Research Associate, University of London), BASIC INCOME, AND HOW WE CAN MAKE IT HAPPEN, 2017, 201-202.

A job guarantee would be a deception. What sort of jobs would be guaranteed? At what rate of pay would they be provided? What would be the consequence for declining the specific job being 'guaranteed'? Since it is completely unrealistic to guarantee everyone a job that suits them, makes use of their skills and pays well, in practice the job would be low-level, low-paid, short-term and 'make-work', or at best low-productivity, labour. Cleaning the streets, filling shelves in supermarkets and similar menial activities are an unlikely road to happiness. Those arguing for a job guarantee would certainly not want those jobs for themselves or their children.

Peter Earle, (Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY, Nov. 19, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/federal-jobs-guarantee-democrats/>

Simply finding work for tens of millions of job guarantee enrollees would be a formidable task; finding productive, impactful work catering to an individual's skills, in a given locality and in a timely manner, would be staggeringly difficult — if possible at all.

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), THE JOB GUARANTEE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS, Oct. 18, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.aier.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/JobGuarantee.pdf>

An employer normally pays an employee because the latter is doing something of value. Under a federal job guarantee, that logic is reversed: the government must find something for ten million or more workers to do because they are being paid. The difference is of great importance.

6. A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD DISPLACE JOBS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

Brian Riedl, (Sr. Fellow, Manhattan Institute), FANTASYLAND ECONOMICS: BERNIE SANDERS AND OTHERS PROPOSE GUARANTEED FEDERAL JOBS FOR ALL, May 1, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.city-journal.org/html/fantasyland-economics-15877.html>

The compensation level for these guaranteed jobs, meantime, would destroy many private businesses. If any worker can take a government job with a \$15 wage, full-time hours, and full benefits, then many industries operating on tight margins will not be able to compete for workers. Retail would likely shift further to the Internet, and fast-food restaurants would accelerate their shift to automation. Restaurants, landscapers, and industries dependent on cashiers and manual labor would survive on a limited basis, with notably higher prices.

Anne Kim, (Sr. Fellow, Progressive Policy Institute), GUARANTEED JOBS: TOO BIG TO SUCCEED, May 4, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis Uni.

A second set of practical concerns involves the role of the private sector and the effect these new federal workers would have on labor markets. While job guarantee advocates seek to create a new 'floor' in the labor market and prompt the private sector to raise its own wages to compete for workers, it's not clear that this is, in fact, what would happen. What could occur, however, is the displacement of private sector providers of child care, elder care and other services if the federal government ends up competing directly with existing employers. While some may not find this outcome objectionable if big companies were the ones to face the most pressure, the reality is that small businesses — such as home-based day care centers — are the least likely to survive in the face of government competition.

A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD PROMOTE FRAUD

1. A JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD BE A MAGNET FOR CORRUPTION.

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), THE JOB GUARANTEE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS, Oct. 18, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.aier.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/JobGuarantee.pdf>

A federal job guarantee, no matter how well intentioned, would also serve as a magnet for corruption and corporate influence peddling. Especially when administered on a local level, the opportunities for corruption become vast and difficult to monitor. For example, one need not be particularly imaginative to see opportunities for a local building contractor to get free labor by giving kickbacks to officials in charge of placing enrollees in jobs.

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), THE DANGEROUS FANTASY OF A JOBS GUARANTEE, Nov. 14, 2018. Retrieved Sept. 7, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-dangerous-fantasy-of-a-jobs-guarantee-1542239737>

The program's administration, virtually ignored by the authors, would present numerous opportunities for corruption, such as businesses bribing officials for free labor. Monitoring such a colossal program would be difficult and expensive. Companies also would seek to influence the program's public works. A big-box retail chain, for instance, might want a community to prioritize the clearing of a vacant lot next to one of its stores.

2. LOCAL POLITICIANS WOULD BE CORRUPTED.

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), THE JOB GUARANTEE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS, Oct. 18, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.aier.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/JobGuarantee.pdf>

Corporations and other interest groups do not have to resort to corruption per se to gain control of the millions of subsidized laborers in a job guarantee. Rent-seeking, where corporations or other incumbent interests compete for influence over government to further their own objectives, is a well-known phenomenon. For example, the regional manager for Walmart might get in touch with a local government about the condition of its store's parking lot and the grounds around it. Sales have been falling, and this expense might tip the decision to move to a new location in the next town. Couldn't the town provide some of its laborers to improve the look of the store's grounds? Where there is free labor to be had, private businesses come knocking. Both with and without breaking the law, influence peddling would be an inevitable consequence of a job guarantee.

3. PORK BARREL PROJECTS WOULD ABOUND.

Ryan Bourne, (Fellow, Cato Institute), A JOBS GUARANTEED ECONOMIC DISASTER, Apr. 24, 2018. Retrieved Sept. 7, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/blog/jobs-guaranteed-economic-disaster>

NGOs and local public bodies themselves will have incentives to apply for federal funds for projects that would otherwise have occurred anyway, and to maximize the number of applications. Pork barrel projects would proliferate. What is more, at the individual level, the guarantee coupled with the purported unwillingness to judge worker performance on a commercial basis will incentivize low levels of work effort on the margin.

THE COST OF A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD BE MASSIVE

1. A JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD COST \$60,000 PER WORKER WHEN ALL CAPITAL AND SUPERVISION COSTS ARE ADDED.

Lawrence Summers, (Former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury & President of Harvard U.), JOBS FOR ALL? IT'S NOT SO SIMPLE, July 3, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis

Suppose a \$15 per hour guaranteed job drew 4 million additional people into the workforce and also attracted 10 million existing employees, just one quarter of those for whom it would represent a wage increase. The cost, once benefits, materials and supervisory needs are included, would, conservatively, be \$60,000 per worker.

Brian Riedl, (Sr. Fellow, Manhattan Institute), FANTASYLAND ECONOMICS: BERNIE SANDERS AND OTHERS PROPOSE GUARANTEED FEDERAL JOBS FOR ALL, May 1, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.city-journal.org/html/fantasyland-economics-15877.html>

If participation rises to 20 to 35 million—which seems likely—the annual cost would swell to between \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion.

2. A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD REQUIRE CRIPPLING TAX INCREASES.

Brian Riedl, (Sr. Fellow, Manhattan Institute), FANTASYLAND ECONOMICS: BERNIE SANDERS AND OTHERS PROPOSE GUARANTEED FEDERAL JOBS FOR ALL, May 1, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.city-journal.org/html/fantasyland-economics-15877.html>

Even the low-end estimate of \$1 trillion would create the largest federal program, exceeding even Social Security. It would be five times as expensive as the recent tax cuts and 12 times costlier than the recent defense-spending boost. Raising \$1 trillion annually would require 70-to-80 percent federal income tax rates for single adults earning over \$80,000 and couples earning more than \$160,000. State and payroll taxes would leave these families paying total tax rates in the 80 to 90 percent range.

3. A JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD CROWD OUT OTHER WELFARE SPENDING.

Timothy Taylor, (Prof., Economics, Macalester College), THE JOB GUARANTEE CONTROVERSY, Apr. 30, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis Uni.

What happens to the existing anti-poverty programs? The working assumption in these proposal seems to be that with a federal job guarantee in place, all the existing anti-poverty programs will stay in place – although they won't be needed as much. If there is a federal job guarantee, then there will be enormous political pressure to cut these programs.

Anne Kim, (Sr. Fellow, Progressive Policy Institute), GUARANTEED JOBS: TOO BIG TO SUCCEED, May 4, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis Uni.

At the height of the recession in 2010, the total share of workers unemployed and underemployed was 17.1 percent, meaning that the cost of a federal jobs program could expect to double in a downturn, to more than \$1 trillion a year. Spending of this magnitude would crowd out spending on a host of other priorities that might be better suited to building human and social capital, such as improving early childhood and K-12 education, expanding health care or making college and occupational training more affordable.

Anne Kim, (Sr. Fellow, Progressive Policy Institute), GUARANTEED JOBS: TOO BIG TO SUCCEED, May 4, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis Uni.

Worse yet, funding for a federal jobs program could come at the expense of other safety net programs supporting children, disabled Americans and others who cannot work. As Ernie Tedeschi, an economist who served under President Barack Obama recently told The Washington Post, 'It would be extremely expensive, and I wonder if this is the best, most targeted use of the amount of money it would cost.'

A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD HARM THE U.S. ECONOMY

1. A JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD INCREASE INFLATION.

Ryan Bhandari, (Former Sr. Policy Adviser, Third Way), WHAT IS THE “FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE” AND WHAT ARE PEOPLE SAYING ABOUT IT?, Mar. 25, 2019. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.thirdway.org/memo/what-is-the-federal-jobs-guarantee-and-what-are-people-saying-about-it>

Inflation would rise. A sudden increase in the cost of labor for businesses will lead to inflation throughout the economy because of higher business costs that will need to be passed on to consumers. In addition, when only those at the bottom of the income distribution get a defacto raise to \$15, there are upstream consequences. Workers who were making \$15 an hour may demand \$20 an hour now. Workers making \$20 an hour might want \$25 an hour and so on. This may seem like a benefit, but “this is a story of serious wage-price spiral, unless we introduce other measures,” warns progressive economist Dean Baker. We have been very fortunate that inflation has been well under control for the last few decades. A federal jobs guarantee could change that pretty quickly.

2. A JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD SLOW ECONOMIC GROWTH.

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), THE JOB GUARANTEE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS, Oct. 18, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.aier.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/JobGuarantee.pdf>

A federal job guarantee, no matter how well intentioned, would be the largest government intervention in the history of the US economy and would likely be disastrous. Measured by employees, proponents’ own estimates imagine an organization that would dwarf the largest employers in the world, and the program would constitute our largest or second-largest category of discretionary spending, about the size of the Department of Defense. Millions would be siphoned into a bureaucratic system that eschewed market signals essential to allocating labor to its greatest social benefit. The resulting system would likely slow economic growth and squash workers’ incentives to invest in themselves.

3. A JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD DESTROY UPWARD MOBILITY FOR WORKERS.

Anne Kim, (Sr. Fellow, Progressive Policy Institute), GUARANTEED JOBS: TOO BIG TO SUCCEED, May 4, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis Uni.

At the same time that a federal jobs guarantee program is too big, it paradoxically also aims too low. Federally provided jobs are unlikely to be the kind of jobs that people want, nor would there necessarily be a path to upward mobility for those relegated to this work. While a federal jobs program might promise the dignity of work for all, what is delivered could still be work without dignity. As envisioned by its advocates, the kinds of jobs the federal government could provide include such tasks as 'the repair, maintenance, and expansion of the nation's infrastructure, housing stock, and public buildings,' 'assistance with ecological restoration,' 'engagement in community development projects,' as well as jobs in child care, education and senior care. Compared to the private sector, the federal government is relatively ill-suited to the task of creating jobs that demand workers' creativity, innovation and commitment. While there is value in all of this work, the ranks of America's unemployed and underemployed deserve better. Compared to the private sector, the federal government is relatively ill-suited to the task of creating jobs that demand workers' creativity, innovation and commitment, that best fit the needs of the local and national economy at any given time and, importantly, are self-sustaining.

A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD DESTROY THE DIGNITY OF WORK

1. GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT ELIMINATES THE INCENTIVE TO WORK HARD.

Brian Riedl, (Sr. Fellow, Manhattan Institute), FANTASYLAND ECONOMICS: BERNIE SANDERS AND OTHERS PROPOSE GUARANTEED FEDERAL JOBS FOR ALL, May 1, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.city-journal.org/html/fantasyland-economics-15877.html>

There is a moral hazard to the proposal, as well. If everyone is guaranteed a \$15 per hour government job with full benefits, can they never be fired? If so, then there will be little incentive to work hard. A guaranteed government jobs program would also attract those who cannot keep a private-sector job due to behavioral issues such as harassment, threats, and abuse. Perhaps these workers would simply be transferred from project to project, or segregated from others—essentially collecting a \$30,000 salary, plus benefits, without adding any real value. The families paying enormous taxes to support such individuals may not be amused.

2. A JOBS GUARANTEE DESTROYS THE INCENTIVE FOR SKILLS IMPROVEMENT.

Cynthia Estlund, (Prof., Law, NYU School of Law), AUTOMATION ANXIETY: WHY AND HOW TO SAVE WORK, 2021. 95.

A jobs guarantee also raises another nagging concern: If young people know the government will guarantee them a job with good wages and benefits—no matter how little they do to acquire useful skills—how will that affect their motivation to invest in training and education?

Max Gulker, (Sr. Research Fellow, American Institute for Economic Research), THE JOB GUARANTEE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS, Oct. 18, 2018. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.aier.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/JobGuarantee.pdf>

The immediate result of more pay and benefits for the working poor is something everyone would like to see, all else equal. But the process would divert workers from the places in the economy where they are most productive to a labyrinthine bureaucracy, where even finding enough work to assign would be a challenge. This could greatly weaken the productivity of the overall economy, potentially leading to declines in output and even greater job loss.

3. MAKE-WORK JOBS CREATED UNDERMINE THE ABILITY TO ESCAPE POVERTY.

Guy Standing, (Research Associate, University of London), BASIC INCOME, AND HOW WE CAN MAKE IT HAPPEN, 2017, 205.

Pushing people into dead-end short-term jobs disrupts their own job searching, studying or training, potentially reducing their ability to escape from poverty and economic insecurity. There is even evidence that participation in workfare leads to lower lifetime earnings by giving people a history of low-level temporary jobs that do not match their qualifications or experience.

4. GUARANTEED JOBS UNDERMINE THE DIGNITY OF WORK.

Pilippe Van Parijs & Yannick Vanderborght, (Prof., Economic and Social Ethics, U. Louvain/Prof., Political Science, U. St. Louis, Brussels), BASIC INCOME: A RADICAL PROPOSAL FOR A FREE SOCIETY AND A SANE ECONOMY, 2019, 47.

The second consideration was well expressed by philosopher Jon Elster. One important reason and often the chief reason why access to a paid job matters to people over and above the income it yields is the recognition it gives to the incumbent. It provides evidence that her time, effort, and skills are valuable to society. If the job is given to people as a matter of legal right within the framework of a guaranteed employment scheme, however, this function is lost. There is thus something self-defeating in making the government the employer of last resort.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS ARE DECREASING IN THE U.S.

1. ELECTRIC POWER GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS HAVE BEEN CUT BY ONE-THIRD OVER THE PAST TWO DECADES.

Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, U.S. EMISSIONS, Mar. 27, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from <https://www.c2es.org/content/u-s-emissions/>

Electric power sector emissions have fallen nearly 36 percent (2005 – 2021) as a result of a shift from coal to natural gas, increased use of renewable energy, and a leveling of electricity demand. Transportation sector emissions fell almost 9 percent, while industrial sector emissions fell by a little more than 4 percent over the same period.

2. TOTAL U.S. EMISSIONS PEAKED IN 2005 AND HAVE STEADILY DECLINED SINCE.

Ciara Nugent & Emily Barone, (Staff, Time Magazine), ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CARBON EMISSIONS USED TO GO TOGETHER. IN SOME COUNTRIES, THAT'S CHANGING, Oct. 29, 2021. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from <https://time.com/6110774/carbon-emissions-economy/>

With the exception of economic crises, U.S. emissions rose steadily for most of the 20th century. But they peaked in 2005, and have declined 14% since then.

3. GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS IN THE TRANSPORTATION SECTOR HAVE STEADILY DECLINED.

Congressional Budget Office, Dec. 2022. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/58861>

In 2021, CO2 emissions in the transportation sector were 6 percent less than they were in 2005. The decline in emissions from transportation has contributed to a drop of about 20 percent in total CO2 emissions in the United States since 2005; most of that overall reduction has come from the electric power sector.

3. METHANE EMISSIONS ARE DECREASING SIGNIFICANTLY.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, CLIMATE CHANGE INDICATORS: U.S. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, July 2022. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions>

For the United States, during the period from 1990 to 2020: Emissions of carbon dioxide, the primary greenhouse gas emitted by human activities, decreased by 8 percent. Methane emissions decreased by 17 percent, as reduced emissions from landfills, coal mines, and natural gas systems more than offset increases in emissions from activities such as livestock production.

4. THE U.S. IS ON TRACK TO CUT GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS IN HALF.

Kyle Bagenstose, (Staff), USA TODAY ONLINE, Aug. 12, 2022. Retrieved Apr. 10, 2023 from Nexis Uni.

That means in less than a 25-year period, the U.S. could very nearly halve emissions that it took 150 years to ramp up. And it aligns with a plan Energy Innovation created showing a pathway to net zero emissions by 2050.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, CLIMATE CHANGE INDICATORS: U.S. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, July 2022. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions

From 1990 to 2020, greenhouse gas emissions per dollar of goods and services produced by the U.S. economy (the gross domestic product or GDP) declined by 53 percent. This change may reflect a combination of increased energy efficiency and structural changes in the economy.

THE INFLATION REDUCTION ACT (IRA) HAS THE U.S. ON TRACK FOR FURTHER DECREASES IN GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS

1. THE IRA HAS NOW BEEN SIGNED INTO LAW.

John Podesta, (Sr. Adviser to the President for Clean Energy Innovation and Implementation), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT GUIDEBOOK, Jan. 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Inflation-Reduction-Act-Guidebook.pdf>

On August 16, 2022, President Biden signed the Inflation Reduction Act into law, marking the most significant action Congress has taken on clean energy and climate change in the nation's history. With the stroke of his pen, the President redefined American leadership in confronting the existential threat of the climate crisis and set forth a new era of American innovation and ingenuity to lower consumer costs and drive the global clean energy economy forward.

Kevin Pearson, (Partner at Stoel Rives LLP), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT AND RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT: ITS ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS, September 23, 2022. Retrieved May 15, 2023 from <https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/inflation-reduction-act-renewable-energy-development-its-advantages-limitations-2022-09-23/>

The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 ("IRA") was signed into law by President Joe Biden on Aug. 16. The IRA represents a significant investment by the federal government in renewable energy and related technologies and provides welcome relief to developers of and investors in renewable energy projects.

2. THE IRA WILL CUT U.S. GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS IN HALF.

Daniel Esposito, (Senior Policy Analyst, Power Sector Transformation), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT BENEFITS: CLEAN ENERGY TAX CREDITS COULD DOUBLE DEPLOYMENT, Aug. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 15, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/energyinnovation/2022/08/23/inflation-reduction-act-benefits-clean-energy-tax-credits-could-double-deployment/?sh=24eb3fd56727>

Combined with state action and forthcoming federal regulations, the IRA puts the U.S. within reach of its Paris Agreement commitment to cut emissions 50% to 52% by 2030. The IRA will strengthen the U.S. economy by creating 1.3 million new jobs, and avoid nearly 4,500 premature deaths annually by reducing air pollution, both in 2030.

3. THE IRA PROMOTES A SPEEDY TRANSITION TO ELECTRIC VEHICLES.

Elena Shao, (Climate Reporter, New York Times), U.S. CARBON EMISSIONS GREW IN 2022, Jan. 10, 2023. Retrieved May 15, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/10/climate/us-carbon-emissions-2022.html>

Some experts are hopeful that provisions in the Inflation Reduction Act can provide money to help speed decarbonization at industrial plants and reduce fossil fuel emissions from heavy industry, including cement and steel production. The legislation also expanded consumer tax credits for electric vehicles, which typically create fewer emissions than gasoline-powered cars.

4. THE IRA PROMOTES THE RENEWABLE ENERGY TRANSITION.

Network News Wire, INFLATION REDUCTION ACT FANS RED-HOT TREND IN RENEWABLE ENERGY MARKET, Jan. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/inflation-reduction-act-fans-red-hot-trend-in-renewable-energy-market-301734065.html>

The tailwinds turned into a tempest late in 2022 when the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) was signed into law. The IRA is the largest investment ever by the U.S. government in renewable energies, earmarking \$369 billion to accelerate efforts to reduce dependence on fossil fuels. According to some experts, the IRA is expected to more than triple America's clean-energy production by 2030, resulting in about 40% of the nation's energy coming from sources such as wind, solar and renewable natural gas (RNG).

Daniel Esposito, (Senior Policy Analyst, Power Sector Transformation), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT BENEFITS: CLEAN ENERGY TAX CREDITS COULD DOUBLE DEPLOYMENT, Aug. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 15, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/energyinnovation/2022/08/23/inflation-reduction-act-benefits-clean-energy-tax-credits-could-double-deployment/?sh=24eb3fd56727>

The IRA's clean energy tax credits are a game changer. Stable, long-term policy will unlock clean energy for utilities and developers, accelerating renewable energy and battery storage deployment. Government funds will be spent more efficiently, and millions of Americans will enjoy cleaner air and cheaper electricity.

Jeff St. John, (Staff, Canary Media), US CARBON EMISSIONS ROSE IN 2022. CAN CLEAN ENERGY GET THEM ON TRACK?, Jan. 10, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.canarymedia.com/articles/climate-crisis/us-carbon-emissions-rose-in-2022-can-clean-energy-get-them-on-track>

The unprecedented clean-energy incentives and investments offered by the Inflation Reduction Act are expected to supercharge the cost advantages of renewable energy. Recent analysis shows that wind and solar, used in tandem with lithium-ion batteries and energy efficiency and demand flexibility, will be a more cost-effective option than new gas plants in almost all circumstances in future years.

Ryan Kennedy, (Staff, Photovoltaics Magazine), SOLAR IN THE U.S. IS FORECAST TO TRIPLE IN FIVE YEARS, Sept. 9, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://pv-magazine-usa.com/2022/09/09/solar-energy-in-the-u-s-may-triple-in-five-years/>

Now that the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) has been passed, the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA) and Wood Mackenzie have lifted the forecast for solar deployment by 40% above prior projections through 2027. According to the two organizations in the U.S. Solar Market Insight Q3 2022, installed and operational solar capacity may increase threefold in five short years, skyrocketing from 129 GW today to 335 GW by 2027.

Ryan Kennedy, (Staff, Photovoltaics Magazine), SOLAR IN THE U.S. IS FORECAST TO TRIPLE IN FIVE YEARS, Sept. 9, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://pv-magazine-usa.com/2022/09/09/solar-energy-in-the-u-s-may-triple-in-five-years/>

"The Inflation Reduction Act has given the solar industry the most long-term certainty it has ever had," said Michelle Davis, principal analyst at Wood Mackenzie and lead author of the report. "Ten years of investment tax credits stands in stark contrast to the one-, two-, or five-year extensions that the industry has experienced in the last decade. It's not an overstatement to say that the IRA will lead to a new era for the U.S. solar industry."

5. THE IRA CREATE HIGH QUALITY GREEN JOBS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

Ed Markey & Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, (Sen. Massachusetts & Rep. from New York), DELIVERING A GREEN NEW DEAL, Apr. 2023. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from https://ocasio-cortez.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/ocasio-cortez.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/delivering_a_green_new_deal-sm.pdf

Through expanded and new tax credits, increased funding for existing programs, and brand new grant programs, the IRA will deliver key resources to individuals, communities, schools, small businesses, and local and state governments looking to enact Green New Deal solutions. The IRA contains \$369 billion in public spending for clean energy and climate justice, which is expected to unleash hundreds of billions more in private investments. As of April 2023, since the enactment of the IRA, clean energy companies have already announced projects representing \$150 billion in investments, 18,000 new jobs, and \$4.4 billion in customer savings.

Ed Markey & Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, (Sen. Massachusetts & Rep. from New York), DELIVERING A GREEN NEW DEAL, Apr. 2023. Retrieved May 4, 2023 from https://ocasio-cortez.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/ocasio-cortez.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/delivering_a_green_new_deal-sm.pdf

Since 2019, when the Green New Deal Resolution was first introduced, there has been monumental progress on clean energy, climate, and environmental justice. The passage of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) provide an historic opportunity to deliver on the most significant climate and clean energy investments in our nation's history, putting us on a path to take on the climate crisis, repair historic harms to low-income and disadvantaged communities, and create good, union jobs.

Stefan Ellerbeck, (Senior Writer, Forum Agenda), HERE'S HOW THE INFLATION REDUCTION ACT IS IMPACTING GREEN JOB CREATION, Mar. 14, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/03/us-climate-bill-green-jobs/>

More than 100,000 'green jobs' were created in the US in less than six months after the IRA was signed into law, according to new research. Non-profit Climate Power says, as of the end of January 2023, 94 clean energy projects were ongoing, representing almost \$90 billion in new private-sector investments. The wind, solar and electric vehicle (EV) sectors are creating new jobs for electricians, technicians, mechanics, construction workers and many others. The report says more than nine million green jobs could be created over the next decade.

Stefan Ellerbeck, (Senior Writer, Forum Agenda), HERE'S HOW THE INFLATION REDUCTION ACT IS IMPACTING GREEN JOB CREATION, Mar. 14, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/03/us-climate-bill-green-jobs/>

US President Joe Biden's 2022 Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) promised \$370 billion in tax credits to the renewable energy industry. In the six months since the IRA came into law, more than 100,000 clean energy jobs have been created in the US as a result of almost \$90 billion invested. The International Renewable Energy Agency predicts the sector could employ 38 million people globally by the end of the decade.

6. THE IRA WILL MORE THAN DOUBLE WIND AND SOLAR POWER CAPACITY.

Daniel Esposito, (Senior Policy Analyst, Power Sector Transformation), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT BENEFITS: CLEAN ENERGY TAX CREDITS COULD DOUBLE DEPLOYMENT, Aug. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 15, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/energyinnovation/2022/08/23/inflation-reduction-act-benefits-clean-energy-tax-credits-could-double-deployment/?sh=24eb3fd56727>

Together with its reinvestment financing program, Energy Innovation finds the IRA's power sector provisions will drive about two thirds of its GHG emissions reductions, expanding 2030 wind and solar capacity by 2 to 2.5 times pre-IRA projections.

7. THE IRA LOWERS ENERGY COSTS FOR CONSUMERS.

John Podesta, (Sr. Adviser to the President for Clean Energy Innovation and Implementation), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT GUIDEBOOK, Jan. 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Inflation-Reduction-Act-Guidebook.pdf>

The Inflation Reduction Act's \$370 billion in investments will lower energy costs for families and small businesses, accelerate private investment in clean energy solutions in every sector of the economy and every corner of the country, strengthen supply chains for everything from critical minerals to efficient electric appliances, and create good-paying jobs and new economic opportunities for workers.

8. THE IRA MAKES THE U.S. A WORLD LEADER IN CLIMATE ACTION.

Pilita Clark, (Staff, Financial Times), WHY 2023 MIGHT JUST BE A TURNING POINT FOR CLIMATE ACTION, Feb. 26, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from <https://www.ft.com/content/07976045-983e-4df3-b2dd-30c264fbe928>

Last year's US Inflation Reduction Act is the most important climate action in American history. It contains billions of dollars of tax credits for clean energy and low-carbon technologies over the next decade and — crucially — it is spurring action elsewhere. The European Union this year unveiled a “green deal industrial plan” that includes a “net zero industry act” and other measures aimed at incentivizing and fast-tracking clean energy projects across the bloc.

**GND602 *Stefan Ellerbeck, (Senior Writer, Forum Agenda), HERE'S HOW THE INFLATION REDUCTION ACT IS IMPACTING GREEN JOB CREATION, Mar. 14, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/03/us-climate-bill-green-jobs/> When US President Joe Biden signed the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) into law in August 2022 it immediately released \$370 billion worth of funding to provide tax credits for clean energy projects. The aim is to cut US greenhouse gas emissions by 40% below 2005 levels by the end of the decade, but what kind of impact has it had so far?

SOLAR POWER CAN NOW COMPETE IN THE MARKETPLACE WITHOUT ARTIFICIAL MEASURES

1. SOLAR POWER IS NOW THE FASTEST GROWING SOURCE OF ENERGY IN THE U.S.

Leonardo David, (Electromechanical Engineer, MBA, Energy Consultant), TOP SOLAR ENERGY FACTS AND STATISTICS OF 2023, May 11, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.marketwatch.com/guides/home-improvement/solar-energy-statistics/>

Solar power has become the fastest-growing electricity source in the U.S., representing 54% of generation projects planned for 2023. The global outlook for solar power is also promising: the International Energy Agency forecasts that worldwide solar generation could surpass natural gas by 2026 and coal by 2027.

2. SOLAR POWER ACCOUNTS FOR HALF OF ALL NEW ELECTRICAL GENERATING CAPACITY IN THE U.S.

Clarisa Diaz, (Analyst, Quartz), SOLAR CAN NOW POWER ONE IN FIVE U.S. HOMES, Mar. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://qz.com/solar-can-now-power-one-in-five-us-homes-1850283703>

Solar accounted for 50% of all new electricity-generating capacity added in the US in 2022, according to a new report by the Solar Energy Industries Association. Federal policies like the Solar Investment Tax Credit lowered costs for solar panel installations, and increased demand across the private and public sectors. The result is that there are now more than 140 gigawatts of solar capacity installed in the US, enough to power 25 million homes.

3. RESIDENTIAL SOLAR POWER INSTALLATIONS ARE INCREASING EXPONENTIALLY.

Leonardo David, (Electromechanical Engineer, MBA, Energy Consultant), TOP SOLAR ENERGY FACTS AND STATISTICS OF 2023, May 11, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.marketwatch.com/guides/home-improvement/solar-energy-statistics/>

Residential solar installations grew exponentially in recent years, and SEIA quarterly reports reflect this. Between June and September 2022, for the first time on record, the U.S. installed over 1,500 MW of capacity through home solar systems during a single quarter. According to SEIA forecasts, home solar power will grow by around 6,000 to 7,000 MW per year between 2023 and 2027.

Oliva Rosane, (Analyst, EcoWatch), U.S. HOME SOLAR MARKET IS GROWING, Oct. 24, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.ecowatch.com/u-s-home-solar-market-growth.html>

As of December 2021, there were more than three million solar installations in the U.S. market, most of them residential photovoltaic (PV) panels, as PV Magazine reported at the time. Residential SolarReviews noted in 2021 that requests for quotes for solar installation had gone up by 130 percent during that year. In a survey published in January, the Pew Research Center found that eight percent of U.S. homeowners have installed home solar panels, which is double the four percent with solar panels in 2016 and up from the six percent who had installed solar panels in 2019. A further 39 percent said they had seriously considered installing them in 2021, which was a seven-point decrease from 2019.

Solar Power Industries Association, U.S. SOLAR MARKET INSIGHT REPORT: 2022 YEAR IN REVIEW, Mar. 9, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.seia.org/research-resources/solar-market-insight-report-2022-year-review>

Nationwide, the residential segment installed just shy of 6 GWdc in 2022, growing by a staggering 40% over 2021. A record 700,000 homeowners installed solar in 2022.

4. SOLAR POWER IS NOW THE CHEAPEST FORM OF ENERGY GENERATION.

Enel Green Power, SOLAR ENERGY FACTS, MAR. 10, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.enelgreenpower.com/learning-hub/renewable-energies/solar-energy/facts-solar-energy-usa>

Solar is one of the cheapest energy sources available and, since it is harnessed using technology not fuel, its costs will automatically decrease as technology advances. According to the financial advisory firm Lazard, the cost of producing 1 MWh of solar fell by 86% from 2009 to 2017. Even without subsidies, in some places solar is the cheapest source of electricity in history, according to a 2020 report by the International Energy Agency.

Jeremy Rifkin, (Prof., Wharton School, U. of Pennsylvania), THE GREEN NEW DEAL, 2020, 55.

Given that solar and wind are now cheaper than coal and head-to-head with oil and natural gas, and within just a few years will be far cheaper, and with the marginal cost of generating solar and wind near zero, the upfront financial commitment to decouple from fossil fuels and reinvest in renewable energies is, simply speaking, a smart business decision.

5. RENEWABLE ENERGY IS NOW CHEAPER THAN FOSSIL FUELS.

Joel Jaeger, (Research Associate, World Resources Institute), EXPLAINING THE EXPONENTIAL GROWTH OF RENEWABLE ENERGY, Dec. 6, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.greenbiz.com/article/explaining-exponential-growth-renewable-energy>

Falling costs have been the biggest factor in the explosion of renewable energy. Since 2010, the cost of solar photovoltaic electricity has fallen 85 percent, and the costs of both onshore and offshore wind electricity have been cut by about half. Both of these renewable sources are cost-competitive with fossil fuel electricity. Costs have fallen so dramatically due to positive feedback loops. The more that renewable energy technologies are deployed, the cheaper they become due to economies of scale and competitive supply chains, among other factors. These falling costs in turn spur more deployment.

Max Roser, (Founder and Director of Our World in Data), WHY DID RENEWABLES BECOME SO CHEAP SO FAST?, Dec.1, 2020. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://ourworldindata.org/cheap-renewables-growth>

Fossil fuels dominate the global power supply because until very recently electricity from fossil fuels was the cheapest. This has changed dramatically. In most places power from new renewables is now cheaper than new fossil fuels.

Tibi Puiu, (Staff, ZME Science), SOLAR IS NOW THE CHEAPEST ENERGY IN HISTORY, Oct. 9, 2022. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.zmescience.com/science/solar-is-now-the-cheapest-energy-in-history/>

Thanks to incrementally better technology, panel design, and manufacturing of scale, solar panels have become incredibly cheap. In the past decade alone, their price per unit of generated energy has fallen by 85%, so much so that multiple reports consider solar to be the cheapest energy ever. According to the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), two-thirds of all wind, solar, and other renewable energy projects that came online in 2020 were cheaper than the cheapest new fossil fuel power plants. That's double the equivalent share for 2019. This trend is only to continue in the future, with the cost of renewables expected to drop significantly.

6. SOLAR POWER CAN MEET ALL U.S. ENERGY DEMANDS.

Environment America, SOLAR ENERGY ON THE RISE, July 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from environmentamerica.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/EA-Solar-on-the-Rise-3.pdf

The U.S. has the technical potential to meet its current electricity needs more than 75 times over with solar energy, and every state in the country has enough solar energy potential to supply all of its electricity needs.

Leonardo David, (Electromechanical Engineer, MBA, Energy Consultant), TOP SOLAR ENERGY FACTS AND STATISTICS OF 2023, May 11, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.marketwatch.com/guides/home-improvement/solar-energy-statistics/>

22,000 square miles of solar panels could provide enough energy to power the entire U.S. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, a 22,000-square-mile area (roughly the size of Lake Michigan) of solar panels could generate enough electricity for the entire country.

7. SOLAR JOBS ARE BEING CREATED IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

Enel Green Power, SOLAR ENERGY FACTS, MAR. 10, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.enelgreenpower.com/learning-hub/renewable-energies/solar-energy/facts-solar-energy-usa>

Solar power has created well-paying jobs for almost 250,000 people in the US alone and, according to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, “solar photovoltaic installer” is one of the fastest-growing professional roles in America. As solar costs decline, the demand for solar energy will increase, and solar job growth is expected to continue. According to The Solar Foundation, 25% of solar jobs in the US are filled by minorities, over 25% by women and nearly 10% by veterans. Each of our solar projects employs several full-time, permanent, local workers, along with hundreds of tradespeople during construction.

Leonardo David, (Electromechanical Engineer, MBA, Energy Consultant), TOP SOLAR ENERGY FACTS AND STATISTICS OF 2023, May 11, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.marketwatch.com/guides/home-improvement/solar-energy-statistics/>

The U.S. solar industry has created thousands of jobs in areas like manufacturing, installation and sales. There are more than 255,000 workers in the U.S. solar industry, according to the 12th annual National Solar Jobs Census. The growth rate of solar jobs is also five times faster than the overall job growth rate in the U.S. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics lists “solar photovoltaic installer” among the projected fastest-growing occupations between 2021 and 2031, with an expected growth rate of 27%.

8. STORAGE SOLUTIONS ARE INCREASINGLY AVAILABLE.

Elesia Fasching, (Staff, U.S. Energy Information Administration), SOLAR POWER WILL ACCOUNT FOR NEARLY HALF OF NEW U.S. ELECTRIC GENERATING CAPACITY IN 2022, Jan. 10, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=50818>

We expect U.S. utility-scale battery storage capacity to grow by 5.1 GW, or 84%, in 2022. Several factors have helped expand U.S. battery storage, including declining costs of battery storage, deploying battery storage with renewable generation, and adding value through regional transmission organization (RTO) markets.

Leonardo David, (Electromechanical Engineer, MBA, Energy Consultant), TOP SOLAR ENERGY FACTS AND STATISTICS OF 2023, May 11, 2023. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.marketwatch.com/guides/home-improvement/solar-energy-statistics/>

Solar battery storage is an important component of making the transition to 100% renewable energy. In our March 2023 online survey of 1,000 homeowners who had gone solar, 66% of respondents said they had paired an energy storage system with their solar panels.

WIND POWER IS INCREASING RAPIDLY IN THE PRESENT SYSTEM

1. WIND POWER IS ONE OF AMERICA'S FASTEST GROWING ENERGY SOURCES.

U.S. Department of Energy, DOE FINDS RECORD PRODUCTION GROWTH IN U.S. WIND POWER, Aug. 16, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.energy.gov/articles/doe-finds-record-production-and-job-growth-us-wind-power-sector>

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) today released three reports showing that wind power remains one of America's fastest growing energy sources and a generator of high-quality jobs. Wind power accounted for 32% of U.S. energy capacity growth in 2021, employs 120,000 Americans, and now provides enough energy to power 40 million American homes.

Elesia Fasching, (Staff, U.S. Energy Information Administration), SOLAR POWER WILL ACCOUNT FOR NEARLY HALF OF NEW U.S. ELECTRIC GENERATING CAPACITY IN 2022, Jan. 10, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=50818>

In 2021, a record-high 17.1 GW of wind capacity came online in the United States. We based this estimate on reported additions through October (9.9 GW) and planned additions in November and December (7.2 GW). Another 7.6 GW of wind capacity is scheduled to come online in 2022. About half (51%) of the 2022 wind capacity additions are located in Texas. The 999 MW Traverse Wind Energy Center in Oklahoma, the largest wind project expected to come online in 2022, is scheduled to begin commercial operations in April.

Nick Ferris, (Contributor, Energy Monitor), WHY GROWTH IN SOLAR AND WIND IS TRULY UNPRECEDENTED, Apr. 11, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.energymonitor.ai/tech/renewables/weekly-data-why-growth-in-solar-and-wind-is-truly-unprecedented/>

The growth of wind and solar power's adoption is truly unprecedented, as highlighted in a recent energy security scenarios report produced by oil major Shell.

2. THE PRIVATE SECTOR JOB GROWTH IN WIND ENERGY IS BOOMING.

U.S. Department of Energy, DOE FINDS RECORD PRODUCTION GROWTH IN U.S. WIND POWER, Aug. 16, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.energy.gov/articles/doe-finds-record-production-and-job-growth-us-wind-power-sector>

"These reports show U.S. wind energy deployment and generating capacity are booming—delivering cheap, reliable, and clean energy to power even more American homes and businesses," said U.S. Secretary of Energy Jennifer M. Granholm. "The rapid technological and industrial advances in the domestic wind sector are creating new jobs for the clean energy workforce and assuring wind power's critical role in achieving President Biden's climate and decarbonization goals."

3. PRIVATE COMPANIES ARE POURING BILLIONS INTO WIND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT.

U.S. Department of Energy, DOE FINDS RECORD PRODUCTION GROWTH IN U.S. WIND POWER, Aug. 16, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.energy.gov/articles/doe-finds-record-production-and-job-growth-us-wind-power-sector>

The 2022 edition of the Land-Based Wind Market Report, prepared by DOE's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, detailed 13,413 MW of new utility-scale land-based wind generation capacity added in 2021 -- the equivalent of powering more than 4 million American homes and representing \$20 billion investment in new wind power investment.

CHINA'S GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS INCREASES OUTWEIGH U.S. REDUCTIONS

1. CHINA'S GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS ARE RISING RAPIDLY.

Kyle Bagenstose, (Staff), USA TODAY ONLINE, Aug. 12, 2022. Retrieved Apr. 10, 2023 from Nexis Uni.

In a game of economic catch-up, China's emissions have risen as those in the U.S. have fallen. The country's greenhouse gas emissions tripled over the past three decades, now accounting for 27% of global emissions, more than double the U.S. and quadruple the European Union, according to analysis from the Rhodium Group.

Jerome Corsi, (Ph.D., Investigative Journalist), THE TRUTH ABOUT ENERGY, GLOBAL WARMING, AND CLIMATE CHANGE, 2022, 324.

China is the world's leading country in CO₂ emissions. In 2020, China's coal-intensive economy emitted more CO₂ than the United States, the European Union, and other developed nations combined. In that year, China emitted 27 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions worldwide.

2. CHINA CONTINUES TO BUILD COAL PLANTS AT A RAPID RATE.

Jessie Yeung, (CNN), CHINA APPROVED EQUIVALENT OF TWO NEW COAL PLANTS A WEEK IN 2022, REPORT FINDS, Feb. 27, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from www.cnn.com/2023/02/27/energy/china-new-coal-plants-climate-report-intl-hnk/index.html

China is surging ahead with coal, a new report shows, rapidly approving and building new power plants despite its own promises to cut back on carbon as the world plunges ever deeper into the climate crisis. Last year, the country approved the highest number of new coal-fired power plants since 2015, according to the report, released Monday by the Center for Research on Energy and Clean Air (CREA) and the Global Energy Monitor (GEM).

Laura Paddison, (Staff, CNN), THE CLIMATE TIME-BOMB IS TICKING, Mar. 20, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from <https://www.cnn.com/2023/03/20/world/ipcc-synthesis-report-climate-intl/index.html>

China is planning a huge expansion of coal – the dirtiest of fossil fuels. In 2022, it granted permits for coal production across 82 sites, equal to starting two large coal power plants each week, according to a report last month.

3. CHINA'S GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS ARE TWICE U.S. LEVELS.

Jessie Yeung, (CNN), CHINA APPROVED EQUIVALENT OF TWO NEW COAL PLANTS A WEEK IN 2022, REPORT FINDS, Feb. 27, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from www.cnn.com/2023/02/27/energy/china-new-coal-plants-climate-report-intl-hnk/index.html

China's emissions are more than double those of the United States, and though the country's leaders have previously vowed to cut back on carbon, its reliance on coal poses a significant challenge. Throughout 2022, China granted permits for 106 gigawatts of capacity across 82 sites, quadruple the capacity approved in 2021 and equal to starting two large coal power plants each week, said the report.

4. CHINA'S INVESTMENT IN RENEWABLE ENERGY DOESN'T OUTWEIGH COAL.

Jessie Yeung, (CNN), CHINA APPROVED EQUIVALENT OF TWO NEW COAL PLANTS A WEEK IN 2022, REPORT FINDS, Feb. 27, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 8, 2023 from www.cnn.com/2023/02/27/energy/china-new-coal-plants-climate-report-intl-hnk/index.html

Though Beijing had initially shut down hundreds of coal mines and pushed the remaining ones to curtail production, nationwide power shortages led the government to order mines to "produce as much coal as possible." That push doesn't appear to be ending anytime soon, with the report authors warning that even China's simultaneous expansion in renewable energy won't be enough to offset the impact.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL IS RUINOUSLY EXPENSIVE

1. THE GREEN NEW DEAL WILL COST TENS OF TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

Francesca Chambers, (Sr. White House Correspondent, the MailOnline), GREEN NEW DEAL COULD COST \$93 TRILLION OVER A DECADE STUDY FINDS - IF GUARANTEED EMPLOYMENT AND UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE MAKE THE FINAL CUT, Feb. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from Nexis Uni.

The Green New Deal could cost taxpayers as much as \$93 trillion over a decade. That's assuming that provisions to tackle unemployment and healthcare make the cut - study also admits it is impossible to make true cost estimates. Conservative nonprofit led by the former head of the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office conducted the study. It found that the ambitious climate change plan's federal jobs guarantee alone would cost an estimated \$6.8 trillion at best and as much as \$44.6 trillion.

Marc Morano, (Analyst, Heartland Institute), GREEN FRAUD: WHY THE GREEN NEW DEAL IS EVEN WORSE THAN YOU THINK, 2021, 158.

Bloomberg News reported, "Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's Green New Deal Could Cost \$93 Trillion, Group Says": "The so-called Green New Deal may tally between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years, concludes American Action Forum, which is run by Douglas Holtz-Eakin, who directed the non-partisan CBO from 2003 to 2005. That includes between \$8.3 trillion and \$12.3 trillion to meet the plan's call to eliminate carbon emissions from the power and transportation sectors and between \$42.8 trillion and \$80.6 trillion for its economic agenda including providing jobs and health care for all."

Lisa Murkowski, (U.S. Senator, Alaska), VOTING AGAINST COSTLY, IMPRACTICAL GREEN NEW DEAL, Mar. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from Nexis Uni.

So aspirations are good. Goals are good. But again, when you look at what has been specifically laid down in this Green New deal, it's more than just transitioning to renewables or electric vehicles or greater energy efficiency. It calls for a federal jobs guarantee. It focuses on healthcare, education, wages, trade a lot more. Let's be honest with where we are and recognize the potential costs of this Green New Deal, whether you want to peg it in the price range of \$50 trillion to \$90 trillion over the next ten years.

2. THE GREEN NEW DEAL WOULD COST THE AVERAGE FAMILY \$165,000.

Marc Morano, (Analyst, Heartland Institute), GREEN FRAUD: WHY THE GREEN NEW DEAL IS EVEN WORSE THAN YOU THINK, 2021, 159-160.

A 2019 Heritage Foundation study by Kevin Dayaratna and Nicolas Loris concluded that the "Green New Deal would be incredibly costly for American families and businesses—for no meaningful climate benefit." The authors found that "under the most modest estimates, just one part of this new deal costs an average family \$165,000 and wipes out 5.2 million jobs with negligible climate benefit."

3. THE EXPENSE OF THE GREEN NEW DEAL WOULD CRASH THE U.S. ECONOMY.

Christopher Talgo, (Staff, Heartland Institute), GREEN NEW DEAL GUARANTEES MORE RED TAPE AND RED INK, Feb. 18, 2019. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from Nexis Uni.

Like most things in life, if something sounds too good to be true, it probably is. In reality, the Green New Deal is a pipe dream that would crash the U.S. economy and usher in a new "green" Great Depression. Even if Ocasio-Cortez could somehow raise taxes to the insane level she desires — 70% on Americans making more than \$10 million — this would not come even close to the whopping price tag of her Green New Deal.

THE NATIONAL INVESTMENT EMPLOYMENT CORPS JOBS PROGRAM IS A WASTE OF MONEY

1. THE NIEC OFFERS A VERY INEFFICIENT WAY OF CREATING JOBS.

Stuart Rosenblatt, (Analyst, American System Now), SEN. BOOKER'S FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE ACT—A GLASS HALF FULL, May 30, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://americansystemnow.com/sen-bookers-federal-jobs-guarantee-act-a-glass-half-full/>

The authors [of the NIEC proposal] also admit that, because of the mooted technological composition of the jobs to be created, the multiplier effect in the private sector will be relatively low. For every direct job created by the program, only .26 jobs will be created in the private sector, according to the CBPP study. This compares unfavorably to a pure infrastructure program, where the multiplier effect is 1.8%, as outlined in a report prepared by Josh Bivens at the Economic Policy Institute in 2014. The potential of an infrastructure program was further underscored by recent testimony of the Electrical Contractors Association at an April 25 hearing of the House Small Business Committee, where the witness stated that for every \$1 billion invested in infrastructure programs, 28,000 new jobs would be created in related industries and suppliers.

2. ADOPTING THE NIEC PROPOSAL WOULD CAUSE THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD TO SLOW DOWN THE ECONOMY.

Stuart Rosenblatt, (Analyst, American System Now), SEN. BOOKER'S FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE ACT—A GLASS HALF FULL, May 30, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://americansystemnow.com/sen-bookers-federal-jobs-guarantee-act-a-glass-half-full/>

The NIEC program summary also raises several red flags. First is the relationship of the NIEC to the Federal Reserve. The authors note that the Fed has historically been concerned with monetary policy, not unemployment, and will always come down on the side of the former, irrespective of the consequences. Yet the authors argue that the Fed's control over monetary policy will never do serious harm, and that its historical bias will be ameliorated by the existence of the NIEC as a counterweight. That is certainly a pipedream, especially in light of the Fed's role in facilitating the massive financial crash of 2008, and the looming crash straight ahead.

3. THE NIEC PROPOSAL WOULD BE RUINOUSLY EXPENSIVE.

Stuart Rosenblatt, (Analyst, American System Now), SEN. BOOKER'S FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE ACT—A GLASS HALF FULL, May 30, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://americansystemnow.com/sen-bookers-federal-jobs-guarantee-act-a-glass-half-full/>

As for financing such a bold policy, the Federal Job Guarantee program falls short. It correctly notes that many social safety net programs will see significant savings, as good, high paying jobs are created. But the total cost of \$543 billion annually for the NIEC nearly rivals the defense budget (\$629 billion) and Medicare (\$590 billion). To cover it, we must not only ensure that the government money is going into funding productive activity, but we must have a source of credit.

4. INEFFICIENT WORKERS COULD NOT BE FIRED UNDER A JOBS GUARANTEE.

Scott Alexander, (Analyst, Slate Star Codex), BASIC INCOME, NOT BASIC JOBS: AGAINST HIJACKING UTOPIA, May 16, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://slatestarcodex.com/2018/05/16/basic-income-not-basic-jobs-against-hijacking-utopia/>

Suppose someone does accidentally leave a stove on and burn down the soup kitchen. You transfer them to an agricultural commune and they crash the tractor into a tree. You transfer them to some kind of low-risk paper-pushing job, but they're late to work every day and skip it entirely once or twice a week, and important papers end up tragically un-pushed. After a while, you decide they are too incompetent to add non-negative value to any of the programs on offer. What do you do with them? If you fire them, then you're not a basic jobs guarantee. You're a basic-jobs-for-skilled-workers-whom-bosses-like guarantee. We already have one of those – it's called capitalism, maybe you've heard of it. But a real solution to poverty would have to encompass everybody, not just people who are good at working within the system. And if you don't fire them, what's your plan? Accept a certain level of burning-things-down, customer complaints, coworker complaints, and unexcused absences? Let them make everybody around them miserable? Turn your soup kitchen into some kind of federal disaster area because you're absolutely committed to letting every single human being in the United States work there?

Scott Alexander, (Analyst, Slate Star Codex), BASIC INCOME, NOT BASIC JOBS: AGAINST HIJACKING UTOPIA, May 16, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://slatestarcodex.com/2018/05/16/basic-income-not-basic-jobs-against-hijacking-utopia/>

Probably somebody will set up some system to let you quit one basic job and go to a different one in the same city. But probably it will end up being much more complicated than that. How do you deal with the guy who quits every job after a week or two, looking for the perfect cushy position? How do you deal with the case where there's only one basic job available within a hundred miles? How do you deal with the case where everyone wants the same few really good jobs, and nobody wants to work at the awful abusive soup kitchen down the road?

5. THE NIEC WOULD CROWD OUT PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS.

Greg Ip, (Chief Economics Commentator, The Wall Street Journal), THE PROBLEM WITH A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE, May 2, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-problem-with-a-federal-jobs-guarantee-hint-its-not-the-price-tag-1525267192>

A federal make-work program would crowd out many of those private services. Crowding out is fine when the government is providing something more valuable, Roger Farmer and Dmitry Plotnikov, economists at the University of California at Los Angeles, wrote in 2010. For example, military spending crowded out private consumption during World War II, when the U.S. “was fighting for its survival.” In ordinary times, that is a harder case to make. A 2011 study by Lauren Cohen, Joshua Coval and Christopher Malloy of Harvard Business School found that when a member of Congress takes over an important committee, his state often enjoys an influx of federal spending. But that benefit is offset by a contraction in private investment and employment, evidence of crowding out.

Ryan Bourne, (Analyst, Cato Institute), A JOBS GUARANTEED ECONOMIC DISASTER, Apr. 24, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/blog/jobs-guaranteed-economic-disaster>

In reality, the fiscal costs are likely to be much, much higher, and the economic welfare losses even more significant, because in the labor market and broader economy, a public jobs guarantee program would significantly crowd out productive private sector activity. This type of policy will radically alter behavior of both workers and businesses, and so the supply and demand for labor.

Adam Ozimek, (Economist at Moody's Analytics), YES, THE JOBS GUARANTEE IS ABSURD, Apr. 24, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/modeledbehavior/2018/04/24/yes-the-jobs-guarantee-is-absurd/?sh=14b2acf9afd0>

The second problem is what this will do to the size of government. Right now there are about 21 million federal, state, and local government workers in the U.S. By the authors' calculations, the 10 million more jobs would increase government employment by a whopping 50%. If only 10 million private sector jobs are crowded out it would double the size of government. We are going to put to work 50% to 100% more government workers than we already do, and we should expect that the bill will approximately double as well.

6. FREE MARKET SOLUTIONS TO JOB CREATION ARE SUPERIOR OPTIONS.

House Committee on the Budget, GUARANTEED FEDERAL JOBS, Sept. 22, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from Nexis Uni.

To quote a recent Progressive Policy Institute article, "A national jobs guarantee program isn't just too big a hammer, but the wrong tool altogether." Republican Solutions for America's Workforce Republicans in Congress have focused on removing the barriers that slow the economy and keep Americans from working. In fact, wage gains in 2017 were the best since the Great Recession. Getting government out of the way and allowing the real engine of prosperity – the free market – to lift all Americans has and will continue to pay dividends that no federal jobs guarantee could possibly achieve. And it is through pro-growth policies like tax reform that lasting economic benefits and opportunities will be returned to America's workforce.

Scott Sumner, (Chair Emeritus of Monetary Policy at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University), HOW RELIABLE IS MODERN MONETARY THEORY AS A GUIDE TO POLICY?, Mar. 11, 2019. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.mercatus.org/research/policy-briefs/how-reliable-modern-monetary-theory-guide-policy>

Government spending involves an opportunity cost: the diversion of resources that could have been used by the private sector for either investment or consumption. When a government borrows, it diverts funds away from private sector borrowers, a process called "crowding out." Furthermore, it must pay back its debt, including the principal and accrued interest. This imposes a burden on future taxpayers, especially if the interest rate rises over time. Some economists argue that the debt burden is currently not a problem, as the economy's growth rate exceeds the interest rate on debt. However, this may no longer be true in the future, as increasing budget deficits put upward pressure on interest rates.

Dean Baker, (Sr. Economist, Center for Economic and Policy Research), DEMS' JOB GUARANTEE ISN'T NEARLY AS EASY AS IT SOUNDS, Apr. 27, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://cepr.net/dems-job-guarantee-isn-t-nearly-as-easy-as-it-sounds/>

A guaranteed job would radically transform the labor market in a way that could put tens of millions of workers on the public payroll. This would almost certainly put many low-wage employers out of business and raise the costs to consumers of services like restaurants, haircuts, and house cleaning. It also effectively gives the government direct responsibility for allocating workers across regions.

Lawrence Summers, (Prof., Economics, Harvard U.), A JOBS GUARANTEE – PROGRESSIVES' LATEST BIG IDEA, July 3, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.ft.com/content/8ee839aa-7dce-11e8-bc55-50daf11b720d>

The US has large needs for infrastructure and taking care of the aged, for example. They are met through federal contracting, not direct hiring. Using the employment guarantees to address these national problems would require significant restructuring of the way services are provided, probably with an efficiency cost.

NUMEROUS PROGRAMS ALREADY TARGET DEPRESSED AREAS

1. OPPORTUNITY ZONES ASSIST THE MOST DISTRESSED AREAS.

Bre Jordan, (Attorney, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, LLP), COLUMBIA JOURNAL OF RACE AND LAW, Feb. Reb. 27, 2020. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://journals.library.columbia.edu/index.php/cjrl/article/view/4840/2185>

The program is aimed at encouraging private investment in certain low-income areas designated as “Opportunity Zones.” The Opportunity Zone Program provides investors with favorable capital gains treatment for investing in qualified opportunity funds. Although similar to previous legislation, Opportunity Zones are on a larger scale and focus on capital gains tax subsidies to incentivize investor development with fewer restrictions and requirements than the Empowerment Zones program or the NMTC.

Josh Goodman, (Analyst, Pew Charitable Trusts), DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES AND THE ROLE OF ECONOMIC AND TAX INCENTIVES, Feb. 22, 2021. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/taxnotes/2021/02/22/distressed-communities-and-the-role-of-economic-and-tax-incentives/?sh=79c713502f4d>

Low-income housing tax credits are the largest source of federal funding of the construction or renovation of affordable rental housing in the U.S. Opportunity Zones obviously have been the biggest initiative along these lines perhaps in a generation. And at least in terms of the aspirations of these programs, they’re really large and the money involved is really large.

2. DISTRESSED CITIES AND PERSISTENT POVERTY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (DCTA) IS A FEDERAL PROGRAM TARGETING DEPRESSED REGIONS.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, DISTRESSED CITIES AND PERSISTENT POVERTY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, Mar. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/comm_planning/cpdta/dcta

The Distressed Cities and Persistent Poverty Technical Assistance (DCTA) program is designed to build capacity of local governments experiencing economic distress and assist local governments and their nonprofit partners in alleviating persistent poverty in specific areas (census tracts). Through DCTA, HUD provides technical assistance (TA) directly to entities serving smaller communities with populations under 50,000.

3. THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT OF 2017 TARGETS JOB CREATION IN DEPRESSED REGIONS.

Alliant Strategic, NOW IS THE TIME TO INVEST IN DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES ACROSS AMERICA, June 28, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://alliantstrategicdev.com/now-is-the-time-to-invest-in-distressed-communities-across-america/>

Through the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, the U.S. government will be offering taxpayers certain incentives designed to encourage long-term investments in distressed communities and government partitioned low-income areas across the country. These areas, called Opportunity Zones, are designated by the governor of each state and could literally be right in your surrounding area or next door to where you live. If done correctly, investments in Opportunity Zones have the potential to pull millions of Americans out of poverty and generate both financial and social returns for investors.

Stephen Rosenthal, (Analyst, Tax Policy Center), OPPORTUNITY ZONES MAY CREATE MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVESTORS AND SYNDICATORS THAN DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES, Aug., 2, 2018. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from www.taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/opportunity-zones-may-create-more-opportunities-investors-and-syndicators-distressed

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) created a new tax-advantaged Opportunity Zone program to encourage investments in economically-distressed communities that are nominated by governors and certified by the Treasury Department.

4. U.S. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (EDA) PROGRAMS TARGET DEPRESSED REGIONS.

Kentucky League of Cities, GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED REGIONS, July 23, 2021. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.klc.org/News/9820/grants-to-strengthen-economically-distressed-regions---ongoing>

U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) programs provide economically distressed communities and regions with comprehensive and flexible resources to address a wide variety of economic needs, and are designed to lead to the creation and retention of jobs and increased private investment. EDA's programs fund and promote local and regional economic development capacity-building efforts that result in or are instrumental in establishing vibrant economies throughout the United States. Through these programs, EDA supports locally-driven strategies that build on regional assets to spur economic prosperity and resiliency. EDA encourages initiatives that present new ideas and creative approaches to advance economic prosperity in distressed communities.

5. THE RECENTLY PASSED INFLATION REDUCTION ACT TARGETS JOB CREATION IN DEPRESSED AREAS.

**CAP606 *John Podesta, (Sr. Adviser to the President for Clean Energy Innovation and Implementation), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT GUIDEBOOK, Jan. 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Inflation-Reduction-Act-Guidebook.pdf>

The Inflation Reduction Act includes billions of dollars in grants and loans to spur financing and deployment of new clean energy projects that cut greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants, with a focus on projects in disadvantaged communities, energy communities, and other communities in need.

John Podesta, (Sr. Adviser to the President for Clean Energy Innovation and Implementation), INFLATION REDUCTION ACT GUIDEBOOK, Jan. 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Inflation-Reduction-Act-Guidebook.pdf>

The Inflation Reduction Act provides the Environmental Protection Agency with \$27 billion to award competitive grants to mobilize financing and leverage private capital for clean energy and climate projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, with an emphasis on projects that benefit low-income and disadvantaged communities. This significant new program will meet the requirements of the President's Justice40 Initiative, which commits to delivering 40 percent of the benefits of certain federal investments to disadvantaged communities.

White House White Paper, INFLATION REDUCTION ACT GUIDEBOOK, Apr. 29, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/cleanenergy/inflation-reduction-act-guidebook/> For several of the clean energy tax incentives, for example, the law offers bonus credits for

projects that are located in economically distressed communities or traditional energy communities and for projects that meet requirements to pay the prevailing wage and hire qualified registered apprentices.

TRUE VOLUNTEERISM IS ALIVE AND WELL IN THE PRESENT SYSTEM

1. THERE ARE PLENTY OF VOLUNTEERISM OPPORTUNITIES.

Alice Turnbull, (Staff, Rosterfy.com), VOLUNTEERISM IN AMERICA: HISTORY AND TRENDS, Feb. 17, 2022. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.rosterfy.com/blog/volunteerism-in-america-history-and-trends>

Several of the largest volunteer and charitable organizations still in existence today were founded in the early decades of the 20th century to connect the army of volunteers with social projects that improved the lives of fellow citizens. These include Rotary International, Lions Clubs International, Kiwanis International and Association of Junior Leagues International.

Alia E. Dastagir, (Staff, USA Today), PETE BUTTIGIEG WANTS A NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAM. COULD IT HEAL A DIVIDED COUNTRY?, APR. 17, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2019/04/17/pete-buttigieg-national-service-program-civil-service-military-community-2020-mandatory-amicorps/3495306002/>

There are already government programs that give people the option to serve outside the military, such as AmeriCorps, the Peace Corps and FEMA Corps.

Doug Bandow, (Sr. Fellow, Cato Institute), MANDATORY UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE: A DYSTOPIAN VISION FOR A FREE SOCIETY, Feb. 21, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/testimony/mandatory-universal-national-service-dystopian-vision-free-society>

Americans have worked in their communities since the nation's founding, and opportunities for similar kinds of service today abound. Businesses, churches, and schools all actively help organize service by staff, members, and students. A number of years ago Newsweek reported that "many of the old stereotypes are gone. Forget the garden club: today working women are more likely than housewives to give time to good works, and many organizations are creating night and weekend programs for the busy schedules of dual-paycheck couples. Men, too, are volunteering almost as often as women."

2. VOLUNTEERISM NUMBERS ARE HIGH AT PRESENT.

Alice Turnbull, (Staff, Rosterfy.com), VOLUNTEERISM IN AMERICA: HISTORY AND TRENDS, Feb. 17, 2022. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.rosterfy.com/blog/volunteerism-in-america-history-and-trends>

American volunteerism as a means to improve society has continued through to the present day. American volunteer statistics from the US Bureau of Labor in 2015 showed that: 62.6 million Americans volunteered; 24.9% of Americans over 16 volunteered; Volunteers give 52 hours per year on average; 33% volunteered with religious organizations, followed by 25% in educational or youth service organizations.

3. SELECTIVITY IN ACCEPTANCE IS PREFERABLE TO ACCEPTING ALL APPLICANTS.

Joseph Heck, et al., (Chair, National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service), INSPIRED TO SERVE, Mar. 2020. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.volckeralliance.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Final%20Report%20-%20National%20Commission.pdf>

Even if American youth are aware of and interested in service, in order to access military opportunities, they must be able to show that they are qualified. Today 71 percent of youth ages 17 to 24 cannot join the All-Volunteer Force without a waiver, as they fail to meet eligibility criteria in areas including physical and mental health, grooming standards, criminal records, education and aptitude, and drug use.

MANDATORY NATIONAL SERVICE IS A BAD IDEA

1. MANDATORY NATIONAL SERVICE UNDERMINES TRUE VOLUNTEERISM.

Doug Bandow, (Sr. Fellow, Cato Institute), MANDATORY UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE: A DYSTOPIAN VISION FOR A FREE SOCIETY, Feb. 21, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/testimony/mandatory-universal-national-service-dystopian-vision-free-society>

Mandatory universal national service is a solution in search of a problem. People serving people benefits everyone. Aiding others ennoble the giver and enriches the recipient. However, the essential core of service is voluntariness, the fact that it is an outgrowth of human compassion, not legal compulsion. Mandatory universal national service would conflict with deeply held American values, violate the Constitution, create an administrative nightmare, and undermine its own objective of creating a more caring America. Such an approach is a bad idea whose time has not come.

2. AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY IS SUPERIOR TO REINSTITUTION OF THE DRAFT.

Doug Bandow, (Sr. Fellow, Cato Institute), MANDATORY UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE: A DYSTOPIAN VISION FOR A FREE SOCIETY, Feb. 21, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/testimony/mandatory-universal-national-service-dystopian-vision-free-society>

Indeed, America's volunteer military is much better motivated than its conscript predecessor because all those serving want to be there. Having a force dedicated to staying in rather than getting out affects individual motivation, unit cohesion, education and training, reenlistment rates, NCO numbers, and much more. Career officers almost uniformly prefer to lead a military of volunteers than of conscripts for this reason. All told, MUNS likely would result in a less effective military.

3. YOUNG PEOPLE DO NOT BELONG TO THE STATE.

Bonnie Kristian, (Deputy Editor, TheWeek.com), MANDATORY NATIONAL SERVICE IS A TERRIBLE IDEA, Apr. 19, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://theweek.com/articles/835755/mandatory-national-service-terrible-idea> |

don't often find myself quoting former President Ronald Reagan, but he was entirely correct in condemning compulsory national service for its "assumption that your kids belong to the state. If we buy that assumption then it is for the state — not for parents, the community, the religious institutions, or teachers — to decide who shall have what values and who shall do what work, when, where, and how in our society."

4. MANDATORY SERVICE WOULD CONSTITUTE INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE.

Doug Bandow, (Sr. Fellow, Cato Institute), MANDATORY UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE: A DYSTOPIAN VISION FOR A FREE SOCIETY, Feb. 21, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/testimony/mandatory-universal-national-service-dystopian-vision-free-society>

An even more important question is the constitutionality of a mandatory universal program. The Thirteenth Amendment was passed to eliminate slavery, but its reach is broader: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Mandatory universal national service, at least if legally required and backed by civil or criminal penalties, would fit the definition of involuntary servitude.

NATIONAL SERVICE WILL NOT SOLVE SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

1. NATIONAL SERVICE PROGRAMS WOULD NOT CURE THE PARTISAN DIVIDE.

Doug Bandow, (Sr. Fellow, Cato Institute), MANDATORY UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE: A DYSTOPIAN VISION FOR A FREE SOCIETY, Feb. 21, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/testimony/mandatory-universal-national-service-dystopian-vision-free-society>

However, a program offering such groups the free services of millions of young people would create a massive honey pot, attracting the profit-minded and encouraging the worst sort of political infighting. Moreover, local and state officials would demand that “their” groups receive a “fair” share of the benefits. Members of Congress would press to enrich their districts, interest groups would lobby to twist MUNS programs to their own benefit, and labor unions would mobilize to protect their members from competition. Organizations formally dedicated to helping others would become lobbyists for creating a new class of indentured servants: in Germany private social service organizations, which benefited from providing “alternative” service to those opting out of the military, argued against proposals to end military conscription.

Bonnie Kristian, (Staff, The Week), MANDATORY NATIONAL SERVICE IS A TERRIBLE IDEA, Apr. 19, 2019. Retrieved May 13, 2023 from <https://theweek.com/articles/835755/mandatory-national-service-terrible-idea>

That question of what work should be done by our youthful conscripts is equally worth consideration. It does not take much imagination to realize what national service kids would be doing right now if such a program existed. In our present state of so-called national emergency, they would almost certainly be sent to southern Texas for construction work, and President Trump’s border wall construction would be proceeding at a rather faster pace than it is now.

2. NATIONAL SERVICE WOULD NOT BENEFIT THE U.S. ECONOMY.

Doug Bandow, (Sr. Fellow, Cato Institute), MANDATORY UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE: A DYSTOPIAN VISION FOR A FREE SOCIETY, Feb. 21, 2019. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/testimony/mandatory-universal-national-service-dystopian-vision-free-society>

Being a civilian “service” conscript would not necessarily generate more social benefits than working for a private charity or hospital. Indeed, a mandatory universal program would delay the entry of millions of people into the workforce every year, losing the benefit of their labor for the rest of us. Thus, the opportunity cost of diverting young people into extraneous educational pursuits and dubious social projects would be high.

3. NATIONAL SERVICE IS NOT A SIGNIFICANT RESUME BUILDER FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, DOES NATIONAL SERVICE EXPERIENCE IMPROVE A YOUNG PERSON'S JOB PROSPECTS?, Mar. 16, 2021. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://circle.tufts.edu/latest-research/study-does-national-service-experience-improve-young-persons-job-prospects>

Overall, in our primary field experiment study, there was not a significant difference in the rate of callbacks between resumes that included national service experience and those that did not. (We defined callbacks as either an interview request, an employer showing “high interest,” or an employer showing “low interest,” but 80% of callbacks were interview requests.) Of the 2,010 applications submitted, 409 (or 20%) received callbacks, evenly split between resumes with and without service experience. Eight percent received a rejection, and 72% got no response.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM IS MEETING THE RETIREMENT NEEDS OF SENIORS

1. SOCIAL SECURITY RAISES SENIORS OUT OF POVERTY.

Adam Schiff, (U.S. Representative from California), SENIORS AND SOCIAL SECURITY, May 2, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://schiff.house.gov/issues/seniors-and-social-security>

Social Security is the most successful anti-poverty program in our nation's history and has helped millions of seniors achieve financial security in their golden years. For some, Social Security is a steady supplement to their pension plans and private investments. For many others, it is their only source of retirement income and a lifeline.

Kathleen Romig, (Analyst, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), SOCIAL SECURITY LIFTS MORE PEOPLE ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE THAN ANY OTHER PROGRAM, Apr. 19, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/social-security/social-security-lifts-more-people-above-the-poverty-line-than-any-other>

Social Security benefits play a vital role in reducing poverty in every state, and they lift more people above the poverty line than any other program in the United States. Without Social Security, 22.5 million more adults and children would be poor, according to analysis using the March 2021 Current Population Survey.

2. THE RETIREMENT NEEDS OF MINORITY WORKERS ARE BEING MET.

Kathleen Romig, (Analyst, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), SOCIAL SECURITY LIFTS MORE PEOPLE ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE THAN ANY OTHER PROGRAM, Apr. 19, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/social-security/social-security-lifts-more-people-above-the-poverty-line-than-any-other>

Black and Latino workers benefit substantially from Social Security because they have higher disability rates and lower lifetime earnings than white workers, on average. In addition, Black workers have higher rates of premature death than white workers, and so are more likely to be eligible for Social Security survivor benefits.

Kathleen Romig, (Analyst, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), SOCIAL SECURITY LIFTS MORE PEOPLE ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE THAN ANY OTHER PROGRAM, Apr. 19, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/social-security/social-security-lifts-more-people-above-the-poverty-line-than-any-other>

Latino workers have longer average life expectancies than white workers, which means they have more years to collect retirement benefits. Without Social Security, the poverty rate among older Latino adults would be 45 percent, and the poverty rate among older Black adults would be 48 percent.

3. LOW-WAGE WORKERS ARE ALREADY ADVANTAGED IN SOCIAL SECURITY.

Zhe Li, (Analyst in Social Policy, U.S. Congressional Research Service), SOCIAL SECURITY: MINIMUM BENEFITS, June 15, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R43615/35>

Social Security's special minimum benefit provision, also known as the Special Minimum Primary Insurance Amount (PIA), is an alternative benefit formula that increases benefits paid to workers who had low earnings for many years, and to their dependents and survivors.

4. RETIREMENT AGE AMERICANS ARE DOING WELL – MUCH BETTER COMPARATIVELY THAN YOUNGER GENERATIONS.

Andrew Biggs, (Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE U.S. RETIREMENT CRISIS IS A MEDIA MYTH, /Dec. 13, 2021. Retrieved May 26, 2023 from <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/the-us-retirement-crisis-is-a-media-myth/>

The result of broader retirement plan participation and higher contributions has been rising retirement incomes. Congressional Budget Office data show that, since 1979, the inflation-adjusted average household income of Americans 65 and older has risen by 119%, more than doubling. By contrast, incomes for working-age households increased by only 75%. Census Bureau research shows that retirement incomes have risen not just for the rich but across income distribution and have brought old-age poverty to record lows. Every media story on the nation's supposed "retirement crisis" can find someone for whom things have gone poorly, which isn't a challenge in a country of 330 million people. But surveys that ask large numbers of actual Americans tell a story that mimics the hard data. Eight in 10 retirees tell Gallup they have sufficient money, not merely to survive, but to "live comfortably." Less than 5% of retirees tell a Federal Reserve survey they are "finding it hard to get by." Likewise, in a survey from Vanguard, only 5% of U.S. retirees describe their own financial situation as a retirement crisis.

5. INCREASING PAYMENTS TO RETIREMENT-AGE AMERICANS WILL CRUSH YOUNGER GENERATIONS.

Ken Dychtwald, (President, AgeWave), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from https://www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

If [life expectancy] continues to climb without adjustments in the eligibility for "old age" entitlements, the cost of programs like Social Security and Medicare could crush the younger generations that must support them.

Palumbo Wealth Management, SOCIAL SECURITY BURDENS ON YOUNGER WORKERS, Sept. 27, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://palumbowm.com/social-security-burdens-fall-on-younger-workers/>

Younger employees, those currently battling personal and student loan debt, mortgage payments and high rent and caring for aging parents, will feel these outcomes at a significant level. "More than likely, a big part of the fix will include higher taxes and less benefits," Soltow adds. "The cost of these fixes will undoubtedly be shouldered by both the younger and next generation workforces."

David Runciman, (Prof., Politics, U. Cambridge), WHAT IS GENERATIONAL FAIRNESS?, Oct. 21, 2019. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/comment/what-is-generational-fairness/>

It used to be the case that governments paid attention to older people's interests because they were more likely to turn up to the polls and vote. A lack of engagement led to little incentive for politicians to offer the young policies that might appeal to them. Today the incentive for politicians to favor older voters is doubly strong: the young would be outvoted by the old even if everyone turned up to the polls.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS SUPPLEMENTED BY PRIVATE RETIREMENT PROGRAM SAVINGS

1. A MAJORITY OF U.S. WORKERS HAVE PRIVATE RETIREMENT PROGRAMS.

Andrew Biggs, (Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE U.S. RETIREMENT CRISIS IS A MEDIA MYTH, /Dec. 13, 2021. Retrieved May 26, 2023 from <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/the-us-retirement-crisis-is-a-media-myth/>

The SSA analysts found that 72% of private-sector employees were actually offered a retirement plan, and 58% were participating. IRS data show that, among married couples filing jointly, 81% have at least one spouse participating in a retirement plan.

2. PRIVATE RETIREMENT SAVINGS ARE IN THE TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

David Pratt, (Prof., Law, Albany Law School), ELDER LAW JOURNAL, 2020, 327.

The U.S. retirement system is huge. According to the Investment Company Institute, total U.S. retirement assets (excluding Social Security) were \$ 29.1 trillion as of March 31, 2019, almost three times the amount accumulated at the end of 2000. The U.S. is the largest retirement plan market among twenty-two countries analyzed in Willis Towers Watson's Thinking Ahead Institute's Global Pension Assets Study, which showed that total U.S. retirement assets were then 61.5% of the global retirement plan market. The second largest was Japan, at 7.7%.

3. PRIVATE RETIREMENT SAVINGS ARE INCREASING SIGNIFICANTLY.

David Pratt, (Prof., Law, Albany Law School), ELDER LAW JOURNAL, 2020, 327.

The U.S. retirement system is huge. According to the Investment Company Institute, total U.S. retirement assets (excluding Social Security) were \$ 29.1 trillion as of March 31, 2019, almost three times the amount accumulated at the end of 2000. The U.S. is the largest retirement plan market among twenty-two countries analyzed in Willis Towers Watson's Thinking Ahead Institute's Global Pension Assets Study, which showed that total U.S. retirement assets were then 61.5% of the global retirement plan market. The second largest was Japan, at 7.7%.

4. AN INCREASING SHARE OF U.S. WORKERS HAVE PRIVATE SAVINGS AND INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS (IRAS) TO ASSIST IN RETIREMENT.

Principles for Responsible Investment, PRIVATE RETIREMENT SYSTEMS AND SUSTAINABILITY, Jan. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 27, 2023 from <https://www.unpri.org/private-retirement-systems-and-sustainability/private-retirement-systems-and-sustainability-united-states/5990.article>

The US is the world's biggest funded pension market. More than 700,000 private sector workplace retirement plans cover 136 million participants – active members and retirees - and roughly 6,000 state and local public sector plans serve 14.5 million active (working) members and 10.3 million retirees. More than 5 million people are covered by the federal employees' retirement system, and just over half of members are active. Some 46 million US households own at least one personal retirement savings account in the form of an Individual Retirement Account (IRA) and total US retirement system assets are estimated at over \$30 trillion.

U.S. WORKERS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO WORK LONGER, RATHER THAN TO RETIRE EARLIER

1. THE RETIREMENT AGE OUGHT TO BE HIGHER, RATHER THAN LOWER.

Dana Smith, (Staff, New York Times), WHAT IS THE IDEAL RETIREMENT AGE FOR YOUR HEALTH?, Apr. 13, 2023. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/04/03/well/live/retirement-age-health.html>

Dr. Pinchas Cohen, dean of the Leonard Davis School of Gerontology at the University of Southern California, agreed that, from a health standpoint for people in these fields, a retirement age under 65 “makes no sense.” “Even 65 is a 20th century number,” he said. For people working in knowledge-based jobs, a retirement age in the 70s is reasonable from a cognitive perspective, too, said Lisa Renzi-Hammond, director of the Institute of Gerontology at the University of Georgia. “Our cognitive faculties we’re able to maintain, usually, pretty well into our 70s,” she said. “If retirement age is set based on the capabilities or competence of employees, there’s absolutely no reason to have a retirement age in the 60s.”

2. WORKING LONGER BENEFITS THE HEALTH OF OLDER AMERICANS.

Robby Brumberg, (Staff, Forbes), RETIREMENT IS ONE OF LIFE’S MAJOR TRANSITIONS—MAINTAINING COGNITIVE HEALTH CAN MAKE IT EASIER, Jan. 23, 2023. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/health/healthy-aging/cognitive-health-in-early-retirement/>

In fact, some studies have linked retirement to a decline in health. One ongoing study found that retired people, especially those in the first year of retirement, are about 40 percent more likely to experience a heart attack or stroke than those who keep working.

Josh Bersin, (Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP), HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, Sept. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://hbr.org/2019/09/the-case-for-hiring-older-workers>

The myth propagated by the retirement industry is that people over the age of 65 should retire. Despite the billions of dollars spent convincing us that our “golden years” should involve travel, golf, and sitting around the pool, research actually shows that people who stop working and retire often suffer from depression, heart attacks, and a general malaise of not having as much purpose in their lives.

AARP, WHAT DOES INCREASING LIFE EXPECTANCY MEAN FOR THE FUTURE OF WORK?, Feb. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://www.aarpinternational.org/initiatives/future-of-work/megatrends/longevity>

Increasing longevity can enable people to work longer, and working longer has benefits such as keeping people mentally engaged with work they value and/or enjoy, having a sense of purpose, preventing or reducing loneliness and providing more time to build financial security that will support longer lifespans.

Dana Smith, (Staff, New York Times), WHAT IS THE IDEAL RETIREMENT AGE FOR YOUR HEALTH?, Apr. 13, 2023. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/04/03/well/live/retirement-age-health.html>

Many of these cognitive processes are maintained and strengthened by staying in the work force. Consequently, some people decline mentally and physically when they stop working. One study even found that delaying retirement was associated with a decreased risk of death, regardless of health before retirement. Experts speculate that the losses of job-related physical activity and social interactions that come with leaving work are largely to blame for post-retirement declines.

3. WORKERS ARE LIVING LONGER NOW THAN IN THE PAST.

Henry Cisneros, (Former Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

Americans are enjoying longer, healthier lives than at any time in our nation's history. It's not idle speculation to say that reaching the age of 100 will become the norm in the not-so-distant future. When that occurs, 80 will truly become the "new 60."

Josh Bersin, (Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP), HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, Sept. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://hbr.org/2019/09/the-case-for-hiring-older-workers>

We face two clear demographic trends. First, and this is of course something we should celebrate, we are living longer. The average longevity of a human life goes up three months each year. In the U.S., life expectancy was 47 years at the beginning of the 20th century. It is now 79 years, and by the end of the century, it should reach 100. Second, young people are having fewer children, and fertility rates are declining throughout the industrialized world.

Laura Quinby, (Sr. Research Economists, Center for Retirement Research at Boston College), ARE OLDER WORKERS CAPABLE OF WORKING LONGER?, Retrieved May 10, 2023 from https://crr.bc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/IB_21-12.pdf

In 2018, on average, 50-year-old men could expect to live an additional 29.8 years, and in 21.8 of those years they would be capable of work. For women, the corresponding numbers are 33.6 years of life and 23.9 years of work capability.

4. WORKERS ARE REMAINING HEALTHIER FOR LONGER PERIODS THAN IN THE PAST.

Paul Irving, (Chair, Milken Center for the Future of Aging), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from https://www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

Today's older adults are generally healthier and more vibrant than those of generations past. They are changing retirement norms as they seek to learn, work and contribute. They are driving growth and opportunity in entrepreneurial ventures and bolstering economic vitality as creators and consumers.

Catherine Collinson, (Director, Aegon Center for Longevity and Retirement), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from https://www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

Once upon a time, the physical aspects of aging, such as changes in vision and hearing, may have limited our ability to work. Today, thanks to technology and improvements in health care, we can remain in the workforce much longer.

Henry Cisneros, (Former Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

Americans are also living a greater number of years without suffering from a debilitating disease. This "longevity dividend"—the result of better nutrition, technological advances and safety improvements—is empowering older adults to continue making significant contributions to their families and communities well into their senior years.

5. OLDER WORKERS ARE CAPABLE.

Jose Mandi, (Analyst, Diversity for Social Impact), 16 REASONS WHY OLDER WORKERS AND SENIOR TALENT WORKFORCE ARE ASSETS TO YOUR COMPANY, Dec. 22, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://diversity.social/senior-older-workers-are-assets/>

Older workers have a strong work ethic and are less likely to take sick leaves or complain of health problems as they are more concerned about their work. On average, they are more productive than younger employees and considerably safer in the workplace.

Josh Bersin, (Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP), HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, Sept. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://hbr.org/2019/09/the-case-for-hiring-older-workers>

All this suggests that age does correspond with workplace wisdom, and research proves it. Contrary to popular belief, older, more tenured people are more successful entrepreneurs. Those over the age of 40 are three times more likely to create successful companies as a result of their patient, collaborative natures, and their lack of a “need to prove myself” attitude that tends to accompany youth.

Josh Bersin, (Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP), HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, Sept. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://hbr.org/2019/09/the-case-for-hiring-older-workers>

For most people, raw mental horsepower declines after the age of 30, but knowledge and expertise — the main predictors of job performance — keep increasing even beyond the age of 80. There is also ample evidence to assume that traits like drive and curiosity are catalysts for new skill acquisition, even during late adulthood. When it comes to learning new things, there is just no age limit, and the more intellectually engaged people remain when they are older, the more they will contribute to the labor market.

6. FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS ALLOW PEOPLE TO WORK LONGER.

Andrew Sieg, (Managing Director and Head of Global Wealth & Retirement Solutions, Bank of America Merrill Lynch), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from https://www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

Seventy-two percent of pre-retirees want to work past 65, and nearly half of current retirees either have worked in retirement or plan to. The baby boomers are taking the lead in creating an entirely new life stage. They’re using flexible work arrangements, part-time responsibilities, entrepreneurship and the growing digital economy to transform later-life work into an engine for financial sustainability and personal fulfillment.

7. TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS PEOPLE TO WORK LONGER.

Joseph Coughlin, (Director, Massachusetts Institute of Technology AgeLab), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from https://www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

Previous waves of technology are subsumed within everyday items, and future innovations serve all ages. Consider the driverless car in its full realization: Whether you’re 10 or 100 years old, your robotic driver will transport you safely and seamlessly wherever you wish to go. In the fifth wave, age is similarly irrelevant and capability invisible.

8. WORKERS ARE CHOOSING TO WORK LONGER, DELAYING RETIREMENT.

Henry Cisneros, (Former Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

Not surprisingly, more and more older adults are choosing to remain in the workforce, not because they have to but because they enjoy the stimulation that work provides. These working seniors are generating income and paying taxes.

Jose Mandi, (Analyst, Diversity for Social Impact), 16 REASONS WHY OLDER WORKERS AND SENIOR TALENT WORKFORCE ARE ASSETS TO YOUR COMPANY, Dec. 22, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://diversity.social/senior-older-workers-are-assets/>

In both the US and Europe, older workers are staying in their jobs longer. In addition, they take fewer sick days than their younger colleagues do. In the US, 16.6% of all employees are absent from work due to illness or disability on any given day, but for older workers, this percentage is lower at 14.5%.

Josh Bersin, (Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP), HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, Sept. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://hbr.org/2019/09/the-case-for-hiring-older-workers>

Many people, particularly those who have enjoyed long and meaningful careers, do like to work. In the wise words of Stephen Hawking: “Work gives you meaning and purpose, and life is empty without it.” It represents an opportunity to give value to others and the community; it gives you a network of friends and associates to be with; and it gives you something to do with your intellectual and physical energy. Why would we want to retire if we love our work?

9. THE ECONOMY BENEFITS WHEN WORKERS DELAY RETIREMENT.

American Society of Actuaries, RAISING THE SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE, Feb. 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.actuary.org/sites/default/files/2022-03/SocialSecurityRetirementAge.pdf>

Making greater use of older workers increases the nation’s economic capacity, thus raising overall living standards for both active workers and retirees.

AARP, WHAT DOES INCREASING LIFE EXPECTANCY MEAN FOR THE FUTURE OF WORK?, Feb. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://www.aarpinternational.org/initiatives/future-of-work/megatrends/longevity>

Older workers add significant value to the economy by increasing productivity and contributing to innovation. By enabling workers to remain in the workforce for as long as they can and want to work, we will see increased consumer spending as well.

Andrew Sieg, (Managing Director and Head of Global Wealth & Retirement Solutions, Bank of America Merrill Lynch), A NEW MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF AGING, May 2016. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from https://www.giaging.org/documents/Milken_Future_of_Aging_report_May_2016.pdf

If we can successfully encourage individuals, employers and national leaders to think and act in new ways, we have an opportunity to seize the advantages of longevity and drive unprecedented growth. First, the baby boomer generation will “retire retirement.” The concept of formally ending work at age 65 applies to a previous century. Today, people in their 60s are taking on new leadership roles, starting businesses, even competing in triathlons.

PROMOTING EARLY RETIREMENT HARMS THE U.S. ECONOMY

1. UNEMPLOYMENT IS NOW AT A RECORD LOW.

Roy Maurer, (Editor, Talent Acquisition), LABOR SHORTAGES FORECAST TO CONTINUE FOR YEARS, Jan. 23, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/labor-shortages-forecast-to-persist-2023.aspx>

"Unemployment can't get much lower," [Mallory] Vachon [senior economist at LaborIQ] said. "The national unemployment rate is at historic lows, but in many sectors, unemployment is even lower, making it harder for businesses to find talent. There's almost never been a time where the supply has been so low, and the demand has been so high."

2. RETIREMENT IS CREATING SHORTAGES IN KEY INDUSTRIES.

Emily Peck, (Editor, Axios Markets), WHY LABOR SHORTAGES COULD BE HERE TO STAY, May 8, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.axios.com/2023/05/08/us-labor-shortage-older-workers>

The percentage of Americans age 55 and over has doubled over the last 20 years, as this 2020 paper notes, and that population (the baby boomers) is expected to grow. And while certainly many older Americans are working longer than ever before, they still do retire at some point. This was a demographic trend in place long before COVID-19 but was accelerated by the pandemic, which pushed many older workers into retirement. Moody's estimates that 70% of the decline in labor force participation since the end of 2019 was due to aging workers — about 1.4 million additional Americans retired.

Josh Bersin, (Founder, Deloitte Consulting LLP), HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, Sept. 26, 2019. Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://hbr.org/2019/09/the-case-for-hiring-older-workers>

In the U.S., job vacancies have outnumbered job applicants since 2018. This is largely a result of baby boomers reaching retirement at a rate faster than millennials are able to step into their place.

Justin Lahart, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), DON'T BLAME COVID FOR THE WORKER SHORTAGE, Jan. 27, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/labor-participation-factors-economy-11674780877>

The ranks of American workers are thinning—often because people aged out of the workforce, or never entered it. Their absence could impede the economy's ability to grow, and make for a less prosperous future.

Justin Lahart, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), DON'T BLAME COVID FOR THE WORKER SHORTAGE, Jan. 27, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/labor-participation-factors-economy-11674780877>

One important factor behind the trend lower in participation, which will keep exerting downward pressure on participation in the years to come, is that more baby boomers are entering retirement age. With the median Boomer turning 66 last year, they "are now in an age bracket where there is a huge drop in participation," points out Dr. Şahin. Indeed, in December the participation rate among 66-year-olds (unadjusted for seasonal swings) was about 38%. Compare that with 64-year-olds, who, despite being just two years younger, had about a 46% participation rate.

Stephanie Ferguson, (Dir. Global Employment Policy, U.S. Chamber of Commerce), UNDERSTANDING AMERICA'S LABOR SHORTAGE, May 2, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.uschamber.com/workforce/understanding-americas-labor-shortage>

As of October 2021, the pandemic drove more than 3 million adults into early retirement. In all, the number of adults 55 and older being detached from the labor force due to retirement grew from 48.1% in Q3 of 2019 to 50.3% in Q3 2021.

3. JOB SHORTAGES IN THE U.S. ECONOMY ARE SIGNIFICANTLY HARMFUL.

Abha Bhattarai, (Staff, Washington Post), WORKER SHORTAGES ARE FUELING AMERICA'S BIGGEST LABOR CRISES, Sept. 16, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2022/09/16/worker-shortage-strikes-economy/>

With more than 11 million job openings and only 6 million unemployed workers, employers have struggled for more than a year to hire enough people to fill their ranks. That mismatch has left employees frustrated and burnt out, and is fueling a new round of power struggles on the job.

Anneken Tappe, (Staff, CNN Business), NO END TO THE WORKER SHORTAGE: AMERICA HAD 11.3 MILLION JOBS AVAILABLE IN JANUARY, Mar. 9, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cnn.com/2022/03/09/economy/us-job-openings-quits-january/index.html>

America's worker shortage is far from over: In January, the nation had 11.3 million jobs to fill and not enough workers to do so, according to new data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

JD Farrugia, (Analyst, WorkForce.com), A LOOK AT THE LATEST LABOR SHORTAGE STATISTICS (AND HOW TO RESPOND), Oct. 27, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://workforce.com/news/a-look-at-the-latest-labor-shortage-statistics-and-how-to-respond>

Even if all unemployed people in the United States were to find a job today, there would still be over 4 million jobs to fill. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce highlighted that there are currently 10 million unfilled jobs but only 5.8 million people unemployed.

Justin Lahart, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), DON'T BLAME COVID FOR THE WORKER SHORTAGE, Jan. 27, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/labor-participation-factors-economy-11674780877>

At the end of November, the Labor Department recorded a seasonally adjusted 10.5 million job openings, or 1.7 unfilled jobs for each person counted as unemployed. The highest that ratio got in the 20 years of available data before the pandemic was 1.2.

Stephanie Ferguson, (Dir. Global Employment Policy, U.S. Chamber of Commerce), UNDERSTANDING AMERICA'S LABOR SHORTAGE, May 2, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.uschamber.com/workforce/understanding-americas-labor-shortage>

We hear every day from our member companies—of every size and industry, across nearly every state—they're facing unprecedented challenges trying to find enough workers to fill open jobs. Right now, the latest data shows that we have 9.9 million job openings in the U.S., but only 5.8 million unemployed workers. We have a lot of jobs, but not enough workers to fill them. If every unemployed person in the country found a job, we would still have 4.2 million open jobs.

THE ECONOMIST, Jan. 22, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.economist.com/united-states/staffing-shortages-in-america-are-a-glimpse-into-its-future/21807256>

The economy has surged beyond its pre-covid-19 level of GDP. Companies in just about every industry, from hospitality to finance, are desperate to hire people to keep up with demand. But the numbers willing to work for them are way down: America has about 3m fewer workers now than on the eve of the pandemic, a 2% contraction in the labour force.

THE COST OF EXPANDING RETIREMENT PROGRAMS IS UNACCEPTABLY LARGE

1. SOCIAL SECURITY IS ALREADY THE MOST EXPENSIVE INCOME MAINTENANCE PROGRAM.

Charles Hurst et al., (Prof. Sociology, College of Wooster), SOCIAL INEQUALITY: FORMS, CAUSES, AND CONSEQUENCES, 2020, 54.

Social insurance programs Table 3.3 indicates the number of recipients and federal amounts for the major social insurance and public-assistance programs. Social Security is by far the most expensive of the income-maintenance programs. In 2018, annual payments exceeded \$973 billion, and the program served about 63 million beneficiaries. Social Security provides monthly benefits to eligible retired and disabled workers, as well as to their spouses, children, and survivors.

2. SOCIAL SECURITY IS ALREADY FACING A MASSIVE FUNDING SHORTFALL.

Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, ANALYSIS OF THE 2022 SOCIAL SECURITY TRUSTEES' REPORT, June 2, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.crfb.org/papers/analysis-2022-social-security-trustees-report>

According to the Trustees, Social Security will run cash deficits of nearly \$2.5 trillion over the next decade, the equivalent of 2.1 percent of taxable payroll or 0.8 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Annual deficits will grow to 3.4 percent of payroll (1.2 percent of GDP) by 2040 and total 4.3 percent of payroll (1.4 percent of GDP) by 2096. Social Security's 75-year actuarial imbalance totals 3.4 percent of payroll, which is 1.2 percent of GDP or over \$20 trillion in present value terms.

Alan Rappeport, (Economic Policy Reporter, New York Times), SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE FUNDS STILL FACE LONG-TERM SHORTFALLS, REPORT SAYS, Mar. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/31/business/social-security-trust-fund-medicare.html>

The Social Security Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, which pays retiree benefits, will be depleted in 2033, one year earlier than previously projected. At that time, the program will have funds to pay only 77 percent of total scheduled benefits.

Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, ANALYSIS OF THE 2022 SOCIAL SECURITY TRUSTEES' REPORT, June 2, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.crfb.org/papers/analysis-2022-social-security-trustees-report>

Today, the Social Security and Medicare Trustees released their annual reports on the long-term financial state of the Social Security and Medicare programs. The latest Social Security projections show the program is quickly headed toward insolvency and highlight the need for trust fund solutions sooner rather than later to prevent across-the-board benefit cuts or abrupt changes to tax or benefit levels.

Barry Huston, (Analyst in Social Policy, U.S. Congressional Research Service), SOCIAL SECURITY'S FUNDING SHORTFALL, May 10, 2023. Retrieved May 12, 2023 from <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/IF10522.pdf>

The trustees project that Social Security will continue to run cash-flow deficits throughout the 75-year projection period (2023- 2097) and that annual cash-flow deficits will grow markedly over time. For example, the program's cash-flow deficit was \$88.5 billion in 2022 and is projected to be \$440 billion in 2033 (in current dollars).

3. INCREASED LONGEVITY WILL ONLY WORSEN THE FUNDING SHORTFALL.

American Society of Actuaries, RAISING THE SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE, Feb. 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.actuary.org/sites/default/files/2022-03/SocialSecurityRetirementAge.pdf>

Although the result has been a very large buildup of the Social Security trust fund in absolute dollars (to almost \$3 trillion by 2021), the accumulated trust funds are far less than needed to fully prefund the benefits of the baby boom and future generations of retirees. Indeed, recent actuarial projections have indicated that trust funds will be exhausted by 2034. The system would then revert to pure pay-as-you-go financing. Absent further program changes, projected program income is expected to be able to support only about 75% of scheduled benefit levels.

American Society of Actuaries, RAISING THE SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE, Feb. 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.actuary.org/sites/default/files/2022-03/SocialSecurityRetirementAge.pdf>

The fact that increased longevity is among the root causes of Social Security's financial problems suggests that raising the normal retirement age is a likely—perhaps even necessary—component of any package of program changes that addresses them.

Barry Huston, (Analyst in Social Policy, U.S. Congressional Research Service), SOCIAL SECURITY'S FUNDING SHORTFALL, May 10, 2023. Retrieved May 12, 2023 from <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/IF10522.pdf>

The cost of the Social Security program is projected to increase faster than income primarily due to a decline in the number of workers paying into the system relative to the number of beneficiaries. Over the next 20 years, the worker-to-beneficiary ratio is projected to decline as the baby-boom generation moves into retirement and is replaced with workers from lower-birth-rate generations.

American Society of Actuaries, RAISING THE SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE, Feb. 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.actuary.org/sites/default/files/2022-03/SocialSecurityRetirementAge.pdf>

Financial problems stem partly from the impact of individuals living longer and receiving Social Security benefits for a longer period, and this trend is expected to continue indefinitely into the future.

THE QUALITY OF U.S. HEALTH CARE IS GOOD

1. AMERICA IS THE WORLD LEADER IN CUTTING EDGE MEDICAL TREATMENTS.

Ashish Jha, (Dean of the School of Public Health at Brown U.), WHAT DOES AN IDEAL HEALTHCARE SYSTEM LOOK LIKE?, Sept. 20, 2017. Retrieved May 5, 2023 from thehealthcareblog.com/blog/2017/09/20/what-does-an-ideal-healthcare-system-look-like/

And America is the innovation engine of the world, pumping out new drugs and treatments that benefit the whole world. All of that earns America a high rank in my book – behind Switzerland and Germany but ahead of others. You can disagree but overall, while the U.S. healthcare system has a lot of work ahead, we should not overlook its strengths – and they are sizeable.

Rich Yirkowitz, (Healthcare Actuary), MEDICARE FOR ALL, REALLY? – WHY A SINGLE PAYER HEALTHCARE PLAN WOULD BE DISASTROUS FOR AMERICA, 2022, 109.

About 5,000 heart transplants are performed every year in the world of which 2,000 occur in the US. Today, breast cancer kills 40 percent fewer women than thirty-five years ago, and prostate cancer kills 50 percent fewer men (per the American Cancer Society). Technology has been a vital part of that success.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 96.

Focus on actual health outcomes, and it's clear the United States outperforms most other countries, especially those with single-payer care. Americans are healthier because our health care system devotes more resources to the best treatments, technology, and physicians. The United States may spend more on health care than other countries, but Americans are getting the most bang for their buck.

2. U.S. HEALTH CARE SHOULD BE RATED HIGH AMONG DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.

Ashish Jha, (Dean of the School of Public Health at Brown U.), WHAT DOES AN IDEAL HEALTHCARE SYSTEM LOOK LIKE?, Sept. 20, 2017. Retrieved May 5, 2023 from thehealthcareblog.com/blog/2017/09/20/what-does-an-ideal-healthcare-system-look-like/

Ultimately, I was interested in assessing performance in areas that are clearly within the purview of the healthcare system – how many people are covered and covered for what? How quickly can you see someone when you're sick? How good is the system at taking care of you when something terrible happens, like you have a stroke or a heart attack? Does the system generate lots of innovation so that everyone's care gets better over the time? I tried not to overly weigh any one of these but tried to look at them holistically. Based on these measures, my ranking of the selected health systems is as follows: 1. Switzerland; 2. Germany; 3. U.S.A.; 4. U.K.; 5. France; 6. Australia; 7. Canada;

3. THE U.S. ATTRACTS THE BEST AND BRIGHTEST IN HEALTH CARE.

Rich Yirkowitz, (Healthcare Actuary), MEDICARE FOR ALL, REALLY? – WHY A SINGLE PAYER HEALTHCARE PLAN WOULD BE DISASTROUS FOR AMERICA, 2022, 281.

Healthcare in the US is so desired that the best and brightest want to practice medicine here, the population benefits as patients, we develop many amazing interventions and cures, and we are positioned well to tackle complex problems in the future.

4. THE U.S. IS A WORLD LEADER IN MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY.

Sally Pipes, (Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 57-58.

Take CT scanners—medical imaging devices used to detect and diagnose a number of conditions, including cancer. In 2017, Canada had less than 16 machines for every million people, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The United States had 42 per million people—2.6 times as many.

5. STATISTICS ON INFANT MORTALITY ARE MISLEADING – THE U.S. LEADS THE WORLD IN THE TREATMENT OF HIGH RISK INFANTS.

Sally Pipes, (Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 87.

America's infant mortality is so high in part because the United States has a lot of neonatal care centers dedicated to treating high-risk infants. With the exception of Sweden and Norway, the United States has the best infant mortality rate for babies born prematurely. In fact, when Canadians are faced with a difficult pregnancy, they turn to the United States for assistance.

Sally Pipes, (Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 87.

Let's turn first to infant mortality. Compared to other countries, the United States has a broader definition of what constitutes a "live birth." According to the National Institutes of Health, the United States reports "as live births more low-birth-weight babies who are at risk of dying on the first day, and then register[s] those who die as infant deaths." But in many European countries, an infant needs to meet certain height or weight requirements to be considered a "live" birth. Similarly, many countries classify infants who die within 24 hours of being born as "miscarriages," which are excluded from infant mortality calculations.

6. U.S. LIFE EXPECTANCY IS LOW BECAUSE OF GUNS, NOT BECAUSE OF POOR QUALITY HEALTH CARE.

Sally Pipes, (Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 89.

Similarly—and perhaps counterintuitively—life expectancy isn't an accurate measure of the quality of a nation's health care system. That's largely because so many of the factors that influence life expectancy have nothing to do with health care. These are just the factors that drive down U.S. life expectancy. For example, the United States has a much higher homicide rate than other developed countries. In 2016, there were 5.3 murders per 100,000 people in the United States. That same year, the United Kingdom had just 1.2 murders per 100,000 people; Canada had about 1.7.

7. THE U.S. LEADS THE WORLD IN CANCER TREATMENT.

Sally Pipes, (Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 91.

Ultimately, the best way to measure the quality of a country's health care system is to look at how patients fare when they get sick—when they actually need health care. On this score, the U.S. system performs quite well. Take cancer. Cancer mortality in the United Kingdom is higher than in two-thirds of countries worldwide. This is due in part to the poor quality of care patients receive. On average, NHS hospitals make three potentially fatal cancer diagnosis errors per week, according to the Daily Mail. Meanwhile, cancer patients in the United States are living longer than ever. Between 1991 and 2016, the cancer death rate in the United States "dropped continuously" by 27 percent, according to a study by the American Cancer Society. That's equivalent to over 2.6 million fewer cancer deaths than would have otherwise been expected over the same period.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 92.

The United States had just 181 cancer deaths per 100,000 people in 2016, compared to 216 in the United Kingdom." The five-year survival rate for breast cancer in the United States is 89 percent, outpacing most other developed countries. That includes Canada, which has a survival rate of 88 percent, and the United Kingdom, with its survival rate of 81 percent.

HEALTH CARE SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED A BASIC RIGHT

1. ESTABLISHING A RIGHT TO HEALTH CARE CREATES IMPOSSIBLE DEMANDS.

Sally Pipes, (Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 6.

Scarcity is one of the fundamental concepts of economics. Societies have limited resources. They have to be apportioned somehow. Tradeoffs are inevitable. Establishing a right to health care creates the prospect of infinite demand for care. But health care goods and services are necessarily scarce. There's no way to create an unlimited supply to meet that potential demand.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 9.

Do I waive my right to health care if I'm a smoker or if I'm obese? Would we be comfortable with the measures that officials in the United Kingdom have implemented to prohibit certain patients from having surgery unless they lose weight or quit smoking? Once the government is responsible for guaranteeing a right to health care, it has a plausible claim to micromanage what we eat, how much we exercise, and how we generally comport ourselves.

2. ESTABLISHING A RIGHT TO HEALTH CARE IGNORES THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 6.

Establishing a right to health care creates the prospect of infinite demand for care. But health care goods and services are necessarily scarce. There's no way to create an unlimited supply to meet that potential demand. Northwestern University professor Craig Garthwaite points out that health care is not a public good whose consumption the government can regulate, like parks or clean air. "If I consume health care services, someone else can't," he said in an interview with Vox.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 9.

The right to health care may also push up against the rights of others. Negative rights basically require people to "live and let live." Positive rights are more invasive. If everyone has a right to health care, the government could end up infringing on the rights of health care professionals. Can the government compel hospitals to take on more patients than they have beds to meet increased demand? Can it force doctors to log longer hours, work in subpar hospitals, or perform operations that go against their better judgment?

3. ESTABLISHING A RIGHT TO HEALTH CARE FOCUSES ON QUANTITY, RATHER THAN QUALITY OF CARE.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 8.

What does a right to health care guarantee? Is it just a right to free medical care? Perhaps it's a right to quality medical care, or efficient medical care. If so, which tradeoffs are we willing to make? The government can provide shoddy medical care to a lot of people quickly and cheaply. But that's probably not what single-payer advocates have in mind.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 8.

Does a right to health care entitle everyone to seek treatment from the best doctors or at the best hospitals? And to ensure equal protection of that right to health care, would the government have to ban people from paying extra for better treatment?.

THE U.S. DOES NOT HAVE A MAJOR PROBLEM WITH ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

1. LESS THAN 1% OF THE U.S. POPULATION LACKS ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 98.

Ultimately, Antos and Capretta found, "only 2.5 million people—or less than 1 percent of the total population—were in the U.S. legally, had low incomes, and did not have ready access to an insurance plan." It would be cheaper for the federal government to give each of these 2.5 million uninsured a million dollars than to implement Medicare for All.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 98.

We don't need a government overhaul of the health care system to provide affordable insurance to 1 percent of the population—or to ease the health cost burden the other 99 percent face. In fact, we need the opposite. Market principles have yielded better quality and lower costs in just about every sector of the economy.

2. MOST LOW-INCOME AMERICANS HAVE FREE ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE.

Chris Jacobs, (Dir., Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW "MEDICARE FOR ALL" WILL WRECK AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 92.

As it is, most lower-income Americans already qualify for "free" health care. Due to Obamacare's expansion of Medicaid to able-bodied adults, many can receive coverage with no premiums, deductibles, co-payments, or any other forms of cost-sharing. Therefore, any single-payer plan that raises their income or payroll taxes—even by as little as one dollar—will by definition make them worse off.

3. INEXPENSIVE WALK-IN HEALTH CLINICS ARE WIDELY AVAILABLE.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 103.

These small, walk-in facilities operate out of supermarkets and pharmacies and are primarily staffed by NPs and PAs." They're much more affordable than the clinical status quo. According to research published in the Journal of the American Medical Association in 2018, the average "low-severity emergency room visit" cost \$422 out of pocket; taking care of that problem at a standard retail clinic ran just \$37.

4. THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT (OBAMACARE) PROVIDES WIDESPREAD ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.

Paige Ross, (J.D. Candidate), NEBRASKA LAW REVIEW BULLETIN, December 20, 2022, 1.

The ACA works to protect people in numerous ways including: requiring insurance plans to cover people with preexisting health conditions (including pregnancy) without charging more, providing free preventive care, giving young adults more coverage options, ending lifetime and yearly dollar limits on coverage of essential health benefits, holding insurance companies accountable for rate increases, and making it illegal for health insurance companies to cancel your health insurance just because you become sick. The law also allocates additional benefits and rights to mental health and substance abuse services as well as the right to appeal a health plan decision.

MEDICARE DOES NOT PROVIDE A GOOD MODEL FOR EXPANDING HEALTH INSURANCE

1. MEDICARE SEEMS TO COST LESS ONLY BECAUSE OF COST-SHIFTING TO PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE.

Michael McDonald, (M.D., Harvard Medical School), JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND BIOMEDICINE LAW, 2018, 148.

Medicare physician fees are approximately 75% those of commercial insurance and Medicaid pays only about 70% of Medicare rates. It has been suggested that these low public insurance reimbursements have caused "cost shifting," necessitating higher private insurance premiums to pay costs not adequately covered by Medicare and Medicaid. Although this concept has been rebutted, with the argument that it is lack of competition between providers that allows higher private insurance rates, a national single-payer system using Medicare reimbursement levels would cause a massive reduction in health care funding, with unforeseeable consequences.

Scott Atlas, (Sr. Fellow, Stanford University's Hoover Institution), THE DANGERS OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, Mar. 9, 2020. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/09/opinion/medicare-for-all-cost.html>

According to a report by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, while private insurance often pays over 140 percent of the cost of care, Medicare and Medicaid pay an estimated 60 percent of what private insurance pays for inpatient services, and an estimated 60 percent to 80 percent for physician services. Most hospitals, skilled nursing facilities and in-home health care providers already lose money per Medicare patient. By 2040, under today's system, approximately half of hospitals, roughly two-thirds of skilled nursing facilities and over 80 percent of home health agencies would lose money overall.

2. MEDICARE USES CONTRACTS WITH PRIVATE HEALTH INSURERS.

Lindsay Wiley, (Prof., Law, American U. College of Law), U. CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS LAW REVIEW, Apr. 2021, "Privatized Public Health Insurance and the Goals of Progressive Health Reform," p. 2176.

In addition to maintaining the largely private health care delivery system, from its inception in 1965, Medicare has relied on private companies, known as Medicare administrative contractors ("MACs") in their current incarnation. Some benefit rules are determined at the national level by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ("CMS"), but most are handled regionally by private MACs. MACs bid on contracts to issue coverage determinations governing which goods and services are covered for which patients and to process claims for reimbursement – conducting post-utilization review – for all traditional Medicare beneficiaries within a specified geographic jurisdiction. Beneficiaries and health care providers seeking to challenge coverage denials must exhaust a series of administrative appeals before they can file a claim in court.

3. THE QUALITY OF CARE IN MEDICARE IS LOW.

Michael Cannon, (Dir., Health Policy Studies, Cato Institute), MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD DELIVER AUTHORITARIAN, UNAFFORDABLE, LOW-QUALITY CARE, Apr. 2020. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2023 from <https://www.cato-unbound.org/print-issue/2614>

Medicare has spent five decades rewarding low-quality care and punishing high-quality care. Former Medicare administrator Tom Scully complained, "Everyone with an M.D. or D.O. degree gets the same rate [from Medicare], whether they are the best or worst doc in town. Every hospital gets the same payment for a hip replacement, regardless of quality."

4. MEDICARE RECIPIENTS HAVE HIGH OUT-OF-POCKET COSTS.

Abdul El-Sayed & Micah Johnson, (MD, Former Dir., Detroit Health Department/MD, Health Policy Adviser in US House of Representatives), *MEDICARE FOR ALL: A CITIZEN'S GUIDE*, 2021, 43.

The average Medicare enrollee spends over \$3,000 a year out of their own pocket on medical bills. For one in four seniors, medical costs consume more than 20 percent of total income. Medicare beneficiaries with serious illness fare even worse: more than half have had a serious problem paying their medical bills, more than a third used up most or all of their savings on medical expenses, and one in four were unable to pay for basic necessities.

Jud Millhon, (JD Candidate), *OHIO STATE BUSINESS LAW JOURNAL*, 2020, 244-245.

On its face, Medicare is a broken system which has consistently left millions of American beneficiaries paying out-of-pocket costs in order to receive basic health care services since the program's inception in 1965.

5. MEDICARE PATIENTS TURN TO PRIVATE INSURANCE SUPPLEMENTS TO COVER WHAT MEDICARE DOES NOT.

Sharon O'Day, (Health Care Writer, MedicareGuide), *DO YOU NEED SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE WITH MEDICARE?*, Dec. 16, 2021. Retrieved Sept. 13, 2023 from <https://medicareguide.com/supplemental-insurance-with-medicare-150407>

Original Medicare does not cover all costs. Medicare Supplement insurance, or Medigap, can cover what Medicare does not. Private insurance companies – vetted by the federal government – offer it to help manage out-of-pocket expenses. These policies do not add coverage. Instead, they help pay for what Medicare Part A and B does not, including copays, coinsurance, and deductibles.

Daniell Kunkle Roberts, (Staff, Boomer Benefits), *DO I NEED A MEDICARE SUPPLEMENT*, Jan. 12, 2021. Retrieved Sept. 13, 2023 from <https://boomerbenefits.com/need-medicare-supplement/>

However, going with just Original Medicare and no supplemental coverage is not wise. The gaps in Medicare are substantial, leaving you to pay for expensive deductibles and 20% of all your outpatient coverage. If you don't have a Medicare Supplement plan, often referred to as Medigap coverage, or a Medicare Advantage Plan, you'll have to come up with the difference yourself.

6. MEDICARE IGNORES THE IMPORTANCE OF PREVENTIVE CARE.

Michael Cannon, (Dir., Health Policy Studies, Cato Institute), *MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD DELIVER AUTHORITARIAN, UNAFFORDABLE, LOW-QUALITY CARE*, Apr. 2020. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2023 from <https://www.cato-unbound.org/print-issue/2614>

Medicare has spent 55 years discouraging efforts to contain infections by shifting the financial cost of preventable infections from health care providers to taxpayers. Medicare pays ambulatory surgical centers regardless of whether they give their clinicians flu vaccines; as of next year, it won't even measure whether they do. Health systems like Kaiser Permanente internalize those costs and thus tend to do a better job of vaccinating both their enrollees and clinicians. Medicare for All would eliminate that superior model, subsidize the model that discourages efforts to fight contagion, and—at least under the Sanders bill—it would result in less health care capacity, including fewer hospital beds.

7. MEDICARE HAS LOW ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS SIMPLY BECAUSE IT “OFF-LOADS” ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS TO DOCTORS AND HOSPITALS.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 20-21.

In addition, many of Medicare for All's supposed administrative "savings" will simply be offloaded onto providers." Hospitals today spend close to \$40 billion a year complying with federal rules and regulations. In 2016 alone, the federal government produced nearly 24,000 pages of regulations governing hospitals and acute care providers. Medicare for All would require providers to regularly submit reams of additional data to the feds, including "annual financial data, the number of registered nurses per staffed bed, and spending on health IT."

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, 2020, 20.

The bill's purported administrative savings are unlikely to materialize, either. Cheerleaders for government-run care cite the current Medicare program's purportedly low administrative costs—just 1.1 percent of total spending in 2018. But that figure is misleading. For starters, other government agencies help administer Medicare. The IRS collects the taxes that fund it. The Department of Health and Human Services pitches in with office space and accounting help. The money those agencies spend helping Medicare doesn't appear on the program's balance sheet.

8. WHEN ALL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS ARE INCLUDED, MEDICARE OVERHEAD IS ACTUALLY HIGHER THAN FOR PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE.

United Health Care, MEDICARE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS MYTHS, Jan. 24, 2017. Retrieved <https://www.vcstar.com/story/opinion/readers/2017/01/24/medicare-administrative-cost-myths/97017428/>

Other government agencies help administer the Medicare program, but these agencies' costs are not reflected in the Medicare “administrative services” bucket. Rather, these overhead costs to administer the Medicare program are assigned to the specific agency that provides that service. For example, the IRS collects the taxes that fund the program. The Social Security Administration helps collect some premiums paid by beneficiaries. The Department of Health & Human Services helps manage accounting, auditing, fraud issues, marketing costs and more. Private insurers don't have this off-budget assistance, or outside sources of assistance. Medicare administration is also tax-exempt, whereas insurers must pay state excise taxes on the premiums they collect — this tax is counted as an administrative cost (as currently allowed by the Affordable Care Act). One study has demonstrated that private insurers spent \$453 per beneficiary on administrative costs, compared with \$509 for Medicare.

MEDICARE FOR ALL COSTS WOULD BE MASSIVE

1. MEDICARE FOR ALL WILL COST OVER 30 TRILLION.

Ronald Brownstein, (Sr. Editor, The Atlantic & Sr. Political Analyst, CNN), THE EYE-POPPING COST OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, Oct. 16, 2019. Retrieved Apr. 14, 2023 from <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/10/high-cost-warren-and-sanders-single-payer-plan/600166/>

The Urban Institute, a center-left think tank highly respected among Democrats, is projecting that a plan similar to what Warren and Senator Bernie Sanders are pushing would require \$34 trillion in additional federal spending over its first decade in operation. That's more than the federal government's total cost over the coming decade for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid combined, according to the most recent Congressional Budget Office projections.

Christopher Talgo, (Staff, Heartland Institute), GREEN NEW DEAL GUARANTEES MORE RED TAPE AND RED INK, Feb. 14, 2019. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from Nexis Uni.

According to a 2018 report by the Mercatus Center, Medicare for All would cost more than \$32 trillion in its first 10 years. This figure is made all the more remarkable by the fact that America's out-of-control debt currently stands at more than \$21 trillion, which has been accumulated over more than 240 years (and counting).

Chris Jacobs, (CEO, Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW "MEDICARE FOR ALL" WILL WRECK AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM – AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 45.

The number seems almost too large to comprehend. \$32 trillion—or, to be more precise, \$32,000,000,000,000. That sum exceeds the United States' entire economic output in 2018 by about 40%, or roughly \$12 trillion. That means 40% more than all the goods and services all Americans, in the world's largest economy, produce in a year. Yet that number also represents the amount by which multiple studies estimate a single-payer program would increase national taxpayer spending over the course of a decade.

2. MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD REQUIRE A DOUBLING OF FEDERAL TAXES.

Ronald Brownstein, (Sr. Editor, The Atlantic & Sr. Political Analyst, CNN), THE EYE-POPPING COST OF MEDICARE FOR ALL, Oct. 16, 2019. Retrieved Apr. 14, 2023 from <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/10/high-cost-warren-and-sanders-single-payer-plan/600166/>

How big a lift is it to raise \$32 trillion? It's almost 50 percent more than the total revenue the CBO projects Washington will collect from the personal income tax over the next decade (about \$23.3 trillion). It's more than double the amount the CBO projects Washington will collect over the next decade from the payroll tax that funds Social Security and part of Medicare (about \$15.4 trillion).

Chris Jacobs, (Dir., Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW "MEDICARE FOR ALL" WILL WRECK AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 84.

Raising the more than \$30 trillion needed to fund Sanders's health plan over a decade would require doubling all personal and corporate income taxes or tripling payroll taxes, which are split between employees and employers, said Marc Goldwein, a senior vice president at the non-partisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. "There's a lot of money out there, but there isn't \$30 trillion sitting around from high earners," he said. "It just doesn't exist."

3. FREE HEALTH CARE WILL DRAMATICALLY INCREASE USE.

Chris Jacobs, (CEO, Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW “MEDICARE FOR ALL” WILL WRECK AMERICA’S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM – AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 66.

Several years ago, the humorist P. J. O'Rourke quipped that "If you think health care is expensive now, wait until you see what it costs when it's free." Single payer epitomizes this quote, on several levels. First, providing health care to more people, and without asking them to pitch in even a token amount for it, would encourage additional demand for care. But as the Rand and Urban Institute studies concluded, the available supply of care could not meet that demand, likely leading to care rationing.

4. THE AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD WOULD PAY \$17,000 MORE PER YEAR IN TAXES.

Chris Jacobs, (CEO, Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW “MEDICARE FOR ALL” WILL WRECK AMERICA’S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM – AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 69.

The tax increases required to fund single payer would reduce the non-health share of the economy by 19%, making the average household \$17,000 per year poorer.

5. IF MEDICARE FOR ALL WERE FINANCED BY A SALES TAX, THE RATE WOULD BE 42%.

Rebecca Terrell, (Staff), THE NEW AMERICAN, January 6, 2020. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2023 from Academic Search Complete.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget (CRFB) tabulated preliminary expectations of how expensive Medicare for All would be, offering several unpalatable options to pay for the program. Using an estimate of \$30 trillion in costs over the next decade, CRFB determined that a 42-percent national sales tax could cover it, until the new tax demolishes consumer spending.

6. FUNDING MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD TIP THE ECONOMY INTO RECESSION.

Michael Cannon, (Dir., Health Policy Studies, Cato Institute), MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD DELIVER AUTHORITARIAN, UNAFFORDABLE, LOW-QUALITY CARE, Apr. 2020. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2023 from <https://www.cato-unbound.org/print-issue/2614>.

Blahous estimates that even if Congress doubled all federal individual and corporate income taxes, it would not be enough to pay for Medicare for All. The Council of Economic Advisors estimates the necessary tax increase would leave the economy 9 percent smaller than otherwise. (The Great Recession erased just 4.3 percent of GDP.) The CEA projects “free” health care would leave households with \$17,000 less to spend on non-health items.

7. THE PROPOSED INCREASES IN FEDERAL SPENDING WILL CAUSE HYPERINFLATION.

Rebecca Terrell, (Staff), THE NEW AMERICAN, January 6, 2020. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2023 from Academic Search Complete.

axing away fully half of the incomes of the top five percent of earners — those making approximately \$200,000 a year or more — would gain the federal government roughly \$950 billion in tax revenues. That number about equals the government’s yearly spending deficit, a deficit that is already propelling the country toward national insolvency and hyperinflation — in other words, toward poverty for most Americans.

ADOPTING MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD EXACERBATE THE SHORTAGE OF HEALTH CARE WORKERS

1. LOW MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT RATES WOULD FORCE ALL HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS TO PROVIDE MORE SERVICES FOR LESS MONEY.

Michael Cannon, (Dir., Health Policy Studies, Cato Institute), *MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD DELIVER AUTHORITARIAN, UNAFFORDABLE, LOW-QUALITY CARE*, Apr. 2020. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2023 from <https://www.cato-unbound.org/print-issue/2614>.

The Sanders bill proposes to pay all providers the same prices Medicare currently pays, which are more than 40 percent less than the prices they receive for privately insured patients. Warren assumes Medicare for All would increase health care consumption more than 20 percent yet leave total health care spending no higher than under current law. In other words, she assumes providers would deliver 20 percent more output—drugs, doctor’s visits, and hospitalizations—for zero additional pay.

Chris Jacobs, (CEO, Juniper Research Group), *THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW “MEDICARE FOR ALL” WILL WRECK AMERICA’S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM – AND ITS ECONOMY*, 2019, 73-74.

In addition to its direct effects on the insurance industry, single payer will attempt to save money by paying doctors and hospitals less. The legislation would base reimbursements on the current Medicare program, which pays doctors 75% of private insurance rates, and hospitals 60% of private insurance. Medicare does not just pay doctors and hospitals less than private insurance—in many cases, it pays doctors and hospitals less than the cost of care. According to the Medicare actuary, 72% of hospitals lost money on their Medicare patients in 2017.

Sally Pipes, (Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), *FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL*, 2020, 18.

Sanders and Jayapal propose to pay for their plan by ordering doctors, hospitals, and other health care providers to take massive pay cuts. Sanders would reimburse every health care provider at current Medicare rates. Medicare pays hospitals 62 percent of what private insurance pays, while doctors collect 75 percent of private insurance rates.

2. THERE IS NO REASON TO BELIEVE DOCTORS WILL SIMPLY ACCEPT THE REDUCED COMPENSATION.

Charles Silver & David Hyman, (Prof., Law, U. Texas/Prof., Law, Georgetown U.), *NO, MEDICARE FOR ALL WON’T SAVE MONEY*, Nov. 25, 2019. Retrieved Jan. 12, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/no-medicare-all-wont-save-money>

Like the advocates of Medicare for All, the public option’s proponents also hope to save billions of dollars by paying doctors and other providers at Medicare rates or something similar. (Medicare pays hospitals about half as much as commercial insurers, and it pays doctors about 20 percent less.) We’ve seen this movie before, however, and that’s not how it ends. If threatened with drastic payment cuts, doctors and hospitals will fight back in the public arena. They will generate widespread panic by threatening to close their doors.

Sally Pipes, (Pres., Pacific Research Institute), *FALSE PREMISE, FALSE PROMISE: THE DISASTROUS REALITY OF MEDICARE FOR ALL*, 2020, 20.

It’s improbable that hospitals, doctors, and other providers would agree to do more work and receive less money in return. But that’s the assumption behind Medicare for All.

3. THE DOCTOR SHORTAGE WILL BECOME MUCH MORE SERIOUS.

Chris Jacobs, (CEO, Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW "MEDICARE FOR ALL" WILL WRECK AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM – AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 129.

Single payer would exacerbate the forthcoming doctor shortage, reducing the available supply of care by driving physicians out of medicine. For doctors approaching retirement, the rapid changes envisioned by a new system, coupled with the steep pay cuts, would encourage them to hang up their proverbial spurs early. For mid-career physicians, the thought of performing more work for less pay could prompt them to leave the profession. And the prospect of permanently lower wages and high student debt could discourage some interested students from ever entering medical school.

Chris Jacobs, (Dir., Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW "MEDICARE FOR ALL" WILL WRECK AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM, AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 130.

If patients have an insurance card, but no access to medical professionals who will treat them, their "coverage" will prove meaningless. One former head of a state Medicaid program—which in many states provides notoriously stingy payment rates to doctors—called a Medicaid card a "hunting license [that gives patients] a chance to go try to find a doctor" who will see them." By encouraging doctors to leave the profession, single payer could leave most Americans with nothing more than a hunting license for medical care.

4. HOSPITALS WILL CLOSE.

Chris Jacobs, (CEO, Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW "MEDICARE FOR ALL" WILL WRECK AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM – AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 74.

Paying doctors and hospitals at much lower Medicare rates will lead to dramatic changes for the entire health-care sector. As the New York Times noted, job losses could represent the least of hospitals' concerns: "Some hospitals, especially struggling rural centers, would close virtually overnight, according to policy experts. Others, they say, would try to offset the steep [reimbursement] cuts by laying off hundreds of thousands of workers and abandoning lower-paying services like mental health."

Chris Jacobs, (CEO, Juniper Research Group), THE CASE AGAINST SINGLE PAYER: HOW "MEDICARE FOR ALL" WILL WRECK AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM – AND ITS ECONOMY, 2019, 75.

To illustrate the impact of a single-payer system, the consulting firm Navigant outlined its effects on a hypothetical small hospital system, one with five hospitals, 1,000 total beds, and annual revenues of \$1.2 billion. Navigant concluded that a single-payer system paying hospitals current Medicare rates would reduce the hospital network's revenue by \$330 million—approximately one-quarter—turning a slight annual surplus (2.3%) into a massive operating loss (22.1%). Obviously, a hospital couldn't long survive under conditions like that.

5. MEDICAL RESEARCH WILL BE GUTTED.

Rich Yirkowitz, (Healthcare Actuary), MEDICARE FOR ALL, REALLY? – WHY A SINGLE PAYER HEALTHCARE PLAN WOULD BE DISASTROUS FOR AMERICA, 2022, 118.

With no R&D, there will be little to no advancement in prescription drugs. Nearly half of all drug R&D is performed within the US market.

MEDICARE FOR ALL WOULD VIOLATE THE “TAKINGS” CLAUSE

1. AMERICANS OWN STOCK IN HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANIES TOTALLING ALMOST $\frac{3}{4}$ OF A TRILLION DOLLARS.

Chad Culpepper, (JD Candidate, Law Review Editor, Texas Tech U. School of Law), Eliminating an Industry: Why A Medicare for All Plan That Seeks to Eliminate the Private Health Insurance Industry Should Be A Compensable Regulatory Taking. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3783609

There are currently over 900 health insurance companies in the United States. The five largest companies by membership are Aetna, Anthem, Cigna, Humana, and United Healthcare Group, which insure 145.4 million members. Additionally, the entire U.S. health insurance industry in 2018 realized over \$715.6 billion in revenue.

2. THE TAKINGS CLAUSE OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT PROHIBITS THE GOVERNMENT FROM TAKING PRIVATE PROPERTY WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION.

Chad Culpepper, (JD Candidate, Law Review Editor, Texas Tech U. School of Law), Eliminating an Industry: Why A Medicare for All Plan That Seeks to Eliminate the Private Health Insurance Industry Should Be A Compensable Regulatory Taking. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3783609

The Takings Clause of the United States Constitution states that private property shall “not be taken for public use, without just compensation.” In *Omnia Commercial Co. v. United States* (Omnia), the Supreme Court deemed contracts to be property “within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment.” Since contracts are protected property, if they are taken for public purposes the government is required to provide compensation.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 9.

The Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause states: “. . . nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

3. MEDICARE FOR ALL, WITH A STROKE OF THE PEN, WIPES AWAY HUNDREDS OF BILLIONS IN ASSETS OWNED BY INDIVIDUALS AND COMPANIES.

Chad Culpepper, (JD Candidate, Law Review Editor, Texas Tech U. School of Law), Eliminating an Industry: Why A Medicare for All Plan That Seeks to Eliminate the Private Health Insurance Industry Should Be A Compensable Regulatory Taking. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3783609

Some recent Medicare for All proposals, advanced by politicians in the U.S., have called for the elimination of the private health insurance industry. Certain proposals hope to accomplish this goal by blocking health insurance companies from competing with a government run health insurance system, that proponents of Medicare for All hope to create. Such legislation would cancel virtually every current private health insurance plan in the United States and would replace them with a government run insurance plan. The question is whether such legislation constitutes a Fifth Amendment taking of private health insurance contracts, entitling the health insurance companies and their shareholders to just compensation.

Chad Culpepper, (JD Candidate, Law Review Editor, Texas Tech U. School of Law), Eliminating an Industry: Why A Medicare for All Plan That Seeks to Eliminate the Private Health Insurance Industry Should Be A Compensable Regulatory Taking. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3783609

The Medicare for All Act does not merely frustrate contracts between insurance companies and consumers, it prohibits insurance companies from contracting with consumers ever again.

4. FINANCIAL ASSETS ARE PROTECTED BY THE TAKINGS CLAUSE.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 10.

Importantly, the Takings Clause is not limited to real property. "Nothing in the text or history of the Takings Clause, or our precedents, suggests that the rule is any different when it comes to appropriation of personal property. The Government has a categorical duty to pay just compensation when it takes your car, just as when it takes your home." Thus, over the years the Takings Clause has applied to tangible property such as fixtures and equipment located on real property, presidential papers made while in office, and the feathers and body parts of eagles. Intangible property also counts: the interest on lawyers' trust accounts, contract rights such as a materialman's lien or war risk insurance, tenure in the academic setting, lease and rental rights, and intellectual property such as trade secrets have all been deemed compensable property under the Takings Clause. Thus, it is clear that financial assets such as stocks and bonds – here, as connected with a healthcare insurer – are property capable of Takings Clause protection, just as any other kind of intangible property.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 11.

Complete or near-complete destruction of financial value can also present a categorical Taking. In *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, a developer had purchased oceanfront land in hopes of building residential properties. Subsequent environmental restrictions prohibited such construction, effectively depriving the owner of "all economically beneficial use" of his land. This, said the Court, was a per se Taking.

5. THE SUPREME COURT WOULD RULE THAT JUST COMPENSATION MUST BE PROVIDED.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 15.

However, a complete government takeover of an entire, enormous sector of the private economy is not such a normal, predictable exigency. Someone who 10 years earlier bought stocks or bonds in a publicly traded healthcare company would have had no reason to expect such an investment to be decimated in one fell swoop by an act of Congress. Hence, the Supreme Court would very likely regard PTHI's stock- and bondholders as holding reasonable investment-backed expectations.

6. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO COMPENSATE PRIVATE INSURERS AND INVESTORS FOR THE VALUE OF THEIR PROPERTY – AN AMOUNT THAT IS OVER 5% OF TOTAL U.S. GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 7.

According to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), national health expenditures (NHE) in 2020 accounted for nearly 20 percent of the U.S. GDP. During that year, private health insurance spending constituted 28 percent of NHE. Thus, private health insurance accounted for around 5.6 percent of the GDP. Equally important, a large portion of these private health insurers are publicly traded, for-profit entities. They are owned by shareholders and owe debts to bondholders.

7. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO PAY THE FULL AMOUNT OF THE ASSETS TAKEN.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 12.

Once a Taking is found, the question turns to compensation. As the overriding concept, "[t]he Fifth Amendment does not allow simply an approximate compensation but rather requires 'a full and perfect equivalent for the property taken,'" which is "the full monetary equivalent of the property taken." "In determining the amount of just compensation for a taking, a court seeks to place a claimant "in as good a position pecuniarily as if his property had not been taken."

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 13.

As discussed above, the Takings Clause encompasses personal property – both tangible and intangible – just as it does real property. This includes such property as interest on attorneys' trust accounts, contract rights such as a materialman's lien, lease and rental rights, and intellectual property such as trade secrets. Hence, financial property such as stocks or bonds is assuredly encompassed.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 14.

We already noted that [single power's] extinguishing of [Publicly-Traded Health Insurance's] at-risk insurance products will destroy most of the company's value. If under SPH the government additionally brings TPA, information technology (IT), wellness, telehealth, and all other ancillary healthcare-related services in-house rather than buying them in the private marketplace, or if government buys these services from other providers in the market, then the value of [Publicly-Traded Health Insurance's] stocks and bonds will be entirely or almost-entirely nullified. By implication, this would be a per se Taking compensable without further discussion.

8. THE VIOLATION OF THE TAKINGS CLAUSE WOULD UNDERMINE INVESTOR CONFIDENCE IN ALL OTHER SECTORS OF THE ECONOMY.

Haavi Morreim & Alan Jacobs, (Prof., U. of Tennessee Health Science Center/Former Prof., Medicine, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), HEALTH LAWYER, Aug. 2022, 17.

Aside from the question of whether the country could afford to pay the owners of private health insurers anywhere near such amounts [to compensate for their losses], we must additionally consider the likely-seismic ramifications throughout the rest of the markets, following government takeover of this large sector of the economy. And to these, finally, add the costs of litigation – not just to establish the existence and fair compensation for Takings of stock- and bondholders' property, but potentially to meet challenges from others whose economic interests are damaged in the process. These include over a million employees of health insurers – both for-profit and not-for-profit. In addition, add the large number of individuals who work for healthcare providers in coding, billing, precertification, and appeals of denials. Abrupt termination of their employment due to SPH likely would have its own significant effect on the economy, regardless of whether loss of these jobs constitutes a Taking, beyond the scope of this article.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME (SSI) IS NOT SOCIAL SECURITY

1. THE IRS SAYS THAT SSI IS NOT SOCIAL SECURITY.

Internal Revenue Service, DO I HAVE TO PAY TAXES ON MY SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS?, Apr. 11, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.irs.gov/faqs/social-security-income/regular-disability-benefits/regular-disability-benefits>

Social security benefits include monthly retirement, survivor and disability benefits. They don't include supplemental security income (SSI) payments, which aren't taxable.

2. SSI DIFFERS FROM SOCIAL SECURITY IN MANY WAYS.

National Council on Aging, CAN YOU GET BOTH SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME (SSI) AND SOCIAL SECURITY?, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://ncoa.org/article/can-you-get-both-supplemental-security-income-ssi-and-social-security>

What is the difference between Social Security and SSI? The two programs are independent of one another, and distinct. Here are some of the ways they differ: You may receive Social Security benefits if you've worked long enough and paid Social Security taxes. SSI benefits are based on need and not your work history. SSI is for people with limited income and resources. There are no income and resource limits for people receiving Social Security. SSI is financed by general funds from the U.S. Treasury—from sources like corporate and income taxes. Social Security's funding comes from a dedicated payroll tax paid by employers and workers.

3. SSI IS IMPROPERLY CONFUSED WITH SOCIAL SECURITY.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), THE EPOCH TIMES, Feb. 15, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from https://www.theepochtimes.com/repeat-after-me-ssi-is-not-social-security_4245576.html

If I had a million dollars, I'd buy commercial time at the upcoming Super Bowl and run an ad that would say, in big bold letters, "SSI is not Social Security." I have written dozens of past columns about this topic. But I've just got to do so again. It seems to me that just about everyone in this country confuses the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program with the Social Security program.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), REPEAT AFTER ME: 'SSI IS NOT SOCIAL SECURITY', Feb. 15, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from www.theepochtimes.com/repeat-after-me-ssi-is-not-social-security_4245576.html

I'm sure everybody knows what Social Security is. You get a Social Security number, you work, you pay Social Security taxes, and one day you and possibly some of your dependents collect Social Security retirement benefits. Or you become disabled before reaching retirement age and you and possibly some of your dependents get Social Security disability benefits. Or you die and your widow or widower and/or minor children collect Social Security survivor benefits. But only a small percentage of Americans really know what Supplemental Security Income is.

4. SSI HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH SOCIAL SECURITY.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), REPEAT AFTER ME: 'SSI IS NOT SOCIAL SECURITY', Feb. 15, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from www.theepochtimes.com/repeat-after-me-ssi-is-not-social-security_4245576.html

SSI is a federal welfare program that has absolutely nothing to do with Social Security other than the fact that it happens to be managed by the Social Security Administration. SSI payments are funded out of general tax revenues—not Social Security taxes.

5. UNLIKE SOCIAL SECURITY, SSI IS A WELFARE PROGRAM.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), REPEAT AFTER ME: 'SSI IS NOT SOCIAL SECURITY', Feb. 15, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from www.theepochtimes.com/repeat-after-me-ssi-is-not-social-security_4245576.html

SSI is a federal welfare program that is managed by the Social Security Administration. And in that column, I said that many people confuse SSI with Social Security. And I specifically wrote that lots of folks (obviously including you) mistakenly think that SSI stands for Social Security Income. It does not. To repeat, SSI stands for Supplemental Security Income, which is a welfare program.

Kathleen Romig & Sam Washington, (Analysts, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), POLICYMAKERS SHOULD EXPAND AND SIMPLIFY SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME, May 4, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/social-security/policymakers-should-expand-and-simplify-supplemental-security-income>

SSI provides monthly cash assistance to older or disabled people with little income and few assets. It supplements the incomes of those who aren't eligible for Social Security or whose benefits are very low. SSI is administered by SSA, but it's distinct from the Social Security retirement program because it is means-tested and funded by general revenue, not payroll tax contributions. In March 2022, about one-third of SSI recipients also received Social Security retirement, survivors, or disability benefits. SSI uses the same medical criteria as SSDI to determine eligibility for disability benefits but different financial criteria.

6. SOCIAL SECURITY IS FINANCED BY ITS TRUST FUND; SSI COMES OUT OF GENERAL FEDERAL REVENUES.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), SOCIAL SECURITY: 100 MYTHS AND 100 FACTS, 2022, 25-26.

SSI is a federal welfare program the Social Security Administration manages for the government. It pays a very small monthly stipend to poor elderly and disabled people. SSI benefits, which may indeed go to people who have never worked and paid taxes, are NOT funded out of Social Security taxes. They are financed, like all other welfare programs, out of general tax revenues.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), SOCIAL SECURITY: 100 MYTHS AND 100 FACTS, 2022, 98.

Although the program is managed by the Social Security Administration, SSI payments are funded out of general tax revenues—NOT Social Security taxes.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), SOCIAL SECURITY: 100 MYTHS AND 100 FACTS, 2022, 98.

Both the Social Security program and the Supplemental Security Income program pay disability benefits. But they are two separate programs that really have nothing to do with each other.

THE ASSET LIMIT IN SSI IS NOT A SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM

1. THE SSI ASSET LIMIT EXCLUDES MANY ITEMS, INCLUDING A HOUSE AND A CAR.

Jessica Breslin, (Sr. Attorney, ChangeLab Solutions; JD Georgetown U. Law Center), HOW TO SUPPORT SSI APPLICANTS AND EXPAND ACCESS, 2021. Retrieved Mar. 30, 2023 from https://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/Asset_Requirements_for_SSI_Factsheet_FINAL-20210113_ACCESS.pdf

The good news for both families and individual SSI applicants is that the following items are not considered when evaluating resource limits: A home, if it is the SSI recipient's principal place of residence, and all contiguous land, regardless of the value; Household goods and personal effects, such as a refrigerator or family jewelry; One car, if it is used to transport the applicant or someone in their household; Various types of financial assistance (e.g., disaster relief assistance, housing assistance, child tax credits.

2. SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INCOME (SSDI) – WHICH IS ANOTHER PROGRAM FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES – HAS NO ASSET LIMIT.

Disability Benefits Help, YOU COULD BE ENTITLED TO \$3,627 PER MONTH!, Feb. 8, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.disability-benefits-help.org/faq/ssi-ssdi-same-time>

If your income and assets are too high to qualify for SSI benefits, you may still meet the criteria for SSDI. Likewise, even if you don't have the work history/credits to receive SSDI benefits, you may still qualify for SSI. However, if you meet the financial and medical requirements, there are instances in which you can qualify to receive both SSI and SSDI at the same time.

AARP, CAN I GET BOTH SSDI AND SSI AT THE SAME TIME?, DEC. 20, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.aarp.org/retirement/social-security/questions-answers/can-you-get-both-ssdi-and-ssi.html>

Both SSDI and SSI provide benefits to people who meet Social Security's definition of a disability: a physical or mental health condition severe enough to prevent you from doing most work for at least a year. But SSDI provides payments to disabled people regardless of their financial situation.

3. MANY PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE BOTH SSI AND SSDI.

Disability Benefits Help, YOU COULD BE ENTITLED TO \$3,627 PER MONTH!, Feb. 8, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.disability-benefits-help.org/faq/ssi-ssdi-same-time>

Fortunately, you are able to receive SSI and Social Security retirement at the same time. Your overall monthly value will not change.

National Council on Aging, CAN YOU GET BOTH SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME (SSI) AND SOCIAL SECURITY?, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://ncoa.org/article/can-you-get-both-supplemental-security-income-ssi-and-social-security>

Older adults with limited income that includes a Social Security benefit may be eligible for monthly cash payments from the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program. In fact, more than half of the people 65 and older who get SSI benefits also receive Social Security.

AARP, CAN I GET BOTH SSDI AND SSI AT THE SAME TIME?, DEC. 20, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.aarp.org/retirement/social-security/questions-answers/can-you-get-both-ssdi-and-ssi.html>

Yes, you can receive Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) at the same time. Social Security uses the term "concurrent" when you qualify for both disability benefits it administers.

MEDICAID EXPANSION IS NOT NECESSARY FOR PEOPLE TO RECEIVE CARE

1. EMERGENCY ROOMS ARE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE CARE REGARDLESS OF ABILITY TO PAY.

Mark Hooper, (Staff, FrontLine ER), HOW TO VISIT AN EMERGENCY ROOM WITHOUT INSURANCE CARD, Mar 23, 2018. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from <https://frontlineer.com/visit-emergency-room-without-insurance-card/>

If you are being rushed to the emergency room, you are probably too injured or even unconscious to hassle with emergency room administrators on how you are planning to pay for your care; even if you don't have a medical insurance cover. Luckily, the Congress passed a bill in 1986 that gives patients the right to emergency care regardless of their ability to pay.

2. NON-EXPANSION STATES HAVE THEIR OWN SYSTEMS OF FREE CARE FOR LOW-INCOME PEOPLE.

FreeClinics.com, FREE CLINICS IN TENNESSEE, Mar. 5, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from web.archive.org/web/202300000000000*/https://www.freeclinics.com/sta/tennessee

We are the largest online directory of free and affordable health clinics. Most clinics listed in our database receive federal grants, state subsidies, or are owned and operated by non-profit organizations and provide services that are either free or at a reduced rate. There are a total of 220 clinics in the state of Tennessee. Memphis has a total of 29 clinics and the city with most clinics in Tennessee. The next city with most clinics is Chattanooga with a total of 14 clinics. FreeClinics.com is updated and maintained by users like you so if you know of any new clinics in Tennessee or any updates that need to be made to our database please contribute.

Jon McNamara, (Staff, NeedHelpPayingBills.com), TEXAS FREE CLINICS, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from www.needhelpayingbills.com/html/texas_free_community_clinics.html

Get free or low cost healthcare from community clinics that are located throughout Texas. There may be free prescription medications, general check ups, referrals to specialty care, eye exams, diabetes management, mental health counseling, care for women and other forms of medical assistance. Hundreds of thousands of low income and/or uninsured patients, seniors, women, immigrants and disabled receive help from these health care centers every year. The free medical clinics help people with no health insurance too as well as walk-in patients. Many are Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC) or part of the nation's Rural Health Clinics program.

3. FREE COMMUNITY CLINICS PROVIDE CARE.

Bradley Corallo, (Analyst, Kaiser Family Foundation), CHANGES IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER PATIENTS AND SERVICES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC, Dec. 21, 2022. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/changes-in-community-health-center-patients-and-services-during-the-covid-19-pandemic/>

Health centers served more than 30 million patients in 2021, which was the largest number of patients ever recorded in a calendar year and represented a 1.2% increase from 2019 (before the pandemic). Similarly, the number of health center visits reached a record 124 million in 2021. Even as patients returned to in-person care, reliance on telehealth visits continued in 2021. Telehealth visits represented 21% of visits (26 million) in 2021 compared to less than 1% of total visits in 2019. While in-person visits increased relative to 2020, they remained below their pre-pandemic levels.

MEDICAID EXPANSION DOES NOT IMPROVE PUBLIC HEALTH

1. STUDIES HAVE FOUND NO MEASURABLE IMPROVEMENT IN HEALTH.

Sally Pipes, (Smith Fellow, Health Care Policy, Pacific Research Institute), MEDICAID EXPANSION WOULD ONLY EXPAND WASTE AND POOR CARE, Apr. 25, 2022. Retrieved Apr. 3, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/sallypipes/2022/04/25/medicaid-expansion-would-only-expand-waste-and-poor-care/?sh=2942b7e153ea>

Other researchers have come to similar conclusions. A landmark study in Oregon, for example, found that "Medicaid coverage generated no significant improvements in measured physical health outcomes" when compared with being uninsured. Americans living in non-expansion states should consider themselves lucky. Expanding Medicaid would only expand the entitlement's inefficiencies and poor health outcomes.

2. MEDICAID EXPANSION LEADS TO INCREASED OPIOID ABUSE.

Sam Adolphsen, (Sr. Fellow, Foundation for Government Accountability), TESTIMONY ON UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES: MEDICAID AND THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC, Jan. 17, 2018. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Testimony-Adolphsen-2018-01-17.pdf>

These numbers show there is clearly a challenge with Medicaid and Medicaid expansion funding legal prescriptions for opioids that results in abuse, overdoses, and addiction. The flood of opioids into the market in the form of painkillers and other opioids like suboxone have made the drugs more available than ever. The massive supply of opioids that Medicaid has made readily available has helped to create an underground market that is helping to fuel the epidemic. Again, during my time in Maine as COO of Maine DHHS, we regularly saw the intersection between the criminal drug world and welfare benefits, including Medicaid.

Sam Adolphsen, (Sr. Fellow, Foundation for Government Accountability), TESTIMONY ON UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES: MEDICAID AND THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC, Jan. 17, 2018. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Testimony-Adolphsen-2018-01-17.pdf>

Medicaid also provides access to prescription drugs that is unparalleled and too easy. The day you become eligible for Medicaid, you get a plastic card that turns on immediately, and at little or zero cost you get access to health care, including prescription painkillers. This dynamic manifest itself in many ways, including people going to multiple doctors and pharmacies to get prescriptions for painkillers. We saw this often at Maine DHHS. With very limited co-pays, no premiums, and few restrictions on providers, prescription painkillers flowed unfettered to Medicaid recipients. I saw personally that every month opioids were found at or near the top of the list of most utilized prescriptions. Federal policy limits how many guardrails state can use to prevent such practices.

Sam Adolphsen, (Sr. Fellow, Foundation for Government Accountability), TESTIMONY ON UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES: MEDICAID AND THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC, Jan. 17, 2018. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Testimony-Adolphsen-2018-01-17.pdf>

In the current Medicaid expansion environment, 20 percent of the population is on Medicaid. While Medicaid covers one out of five people, it is the payer for 36.5 percent of all Emergency Department visits for Opioid poisonings. Forty percent of all heroin poisonings that present at the ED are Medicaid recipients and just under half (or 47 percent) of all methadone poisonings in the ED are experienced by individuals on Medicaid. These opioid related ED visits have spiked since 2014, when Medicaid expansion began. In Rhode Island for example, ED visits paid for by Medicaid for opioid-related reasons more than tripled, from 500 in 2011 to 1,850 in 2015. Nationally, Medicaid funded about 120,000 opioid related ED trips in 2011 and funded about 280,000 in 2015.

3. INCREASED OPIOID ABUSE LEADS TO HIGHER OPIOID DEATHS.

Staff Report, Senate Committee on Homeland Security, (Majority Report), DRUGS FOR DOLLARS: HOW MEDICAID HELPS FUEL THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC, Jan. 17, 2018. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from [https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Statement for Record-HSGAC Majority Staff Report-2018-01-17.pdf](https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Statement%20for%20Record-HSGAC%20Majority%20Staff%20Report-2018-01-17.pdf)

In 2010, the Affordable Care Act expanded Medicaid eligibility to include adults under 65 with incomes up to 133 percent of the federal poverty level. The expansion took effect on January 1, 2014, in most states adopting it. Overall drug overdose deaths, largely from opioids, rose seven percent in 2014, compared to six percent the year before, according to CDC data. In 2015, the CDC reported, overdose deaths spiked 11.4 percent. Last year, in 2016, CDC data show a staggering rise of 21 percent—the largest one-year increase in U.S. history. The surge in deaths even fueled a two-year decline in U.S. life expectancy, a first since the early 1960s.⁵⁰ Of the 63,632 total drug overdose deaths in 2016, more than 42,000 were from opioids, a 28 percent increase in opioid-related deaths in a single year.

Staff Report, Senate Committee on Homeland Security, (Majority Report), DRUGS FOR DOLLARS: HOW MEDICAID HELPS FUEL THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC, Jan. 17, 2018. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from [https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Statement for Record-HSGAC Majority Staff Report-2018-01-17.pdf](https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Statement%20for%20Record-HSGAC%20Majority%20Staff%20Report-2018-01-17.pdf)

Hardest hit have been Medicaid expansion states. Internal data from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) comparing expansion and non-expansion states show drug overdose deaths rose nearly twice as fast per one million people in expansion states between 2013 and 2015. In 2015, according to CDC figures, the five states with the highest rate of overdose deaths were all expansion states: West Virginia; New Hampshire; Kentucky; Ohio and Rhode Island. As the CDC points out: “Opioids—prescription and illicit—are the main driver of drug overdose deaths.”

Staff Report, Senate Committee on Homeland Security, (Majority Report), DRUGS FOR DOLLARS: HOW MEDICAID HELPS FUEL THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC, Jan. 17, 2018. Retrieved Apr. 4, 2023 from [https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Statement for Record-HSGAC Majority Staff Report-2018-01-17.pdf](https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Statement%20for%20Record-HSGAC%20Majority%20Staff%20Report-2018-01-17.pdf)

Medicaid has contributed to the nation’s opioid epidemic by establishing a series of incentives that make it enormously profitable to abuse and sell dangerous drugs. Growing evidence indicates that the Medicaid expansion, by providing prescription opioids to a wider pool of people, may be worsening the epidemic.

Jeremy Deutchman, (Media Relations, Keck School of Medicine at the U. of Southern California), MEDICAID EXPANSION LINKED TO REDUCTIONS IN MORTALITY, ACCORDING TO USC RESEARCH, DEC. 2, 2021. Retrieved Apr. 3, 2023 from <https://keck.usc.edu/medicaid-expansion-linked-to-reductions-in-mortality-according-to-usc-research/>

“Certain states – like Delaware, New Hampshire and New Jersey – have actually seen an increase in opioid-related mortality associated with Medicaid expansion. Some people have hypothesized that gaining access to prescription pain medication may result in more opioid-related deaths. Our study shows that hypothesis is something that needs to be explored more definitively,” [Brian Lee, professor of medicine at the University of Southern California] said.

IMMIGRANT CHILDREN HAVE ADEQUATE ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE

1. THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL TREATMENT ACT (EMTALA) REQUIRES EMERGENCY ROOMS TO PROVIDE TREATMENT TO ALL, INCLUDING IMMIGRANTS.

National Immigration Law Forum, FACT SHEET: UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS AND FEDERAL HEALTH CARE BENEFITS, Sept. 21, 2022. Retrieved Sept. 14, 2023 from <https://immigrationforum.org/article/fact-sheet-undocumented-immigrants-and-federal-health-care-benefits/>

The Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA) ensures that all patients regardless of citizenship or immigration status have access to emergency medical treatment. The purpose of EMTALA is to ensure all Medicare-participating hospitals do not to turn away individuals who need lifesaving care.

Medha Makhoulf, (Prof., Law, Penn State U.), U. OF PENNSYLVANIA JOURNAL OF LAW & PUBLIC AFFAIRS, January 2019, 255.

Together, EMTALA and emergency Medicaid provide universal access to care for the stabilization of emergency medical conditions, and near-universal access to publicly funded coverage of such treatment for low-income uninsured people.

2. EMERGENCY MEDICAID PROVIDES COVERAGE FOR IMMIGRANTS.

Office of Health Policy, U.S. Health & Human Services, HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE AND ACCESS TO CARE FOR IMMIGRANTS, Dec. 17, 2021. Retrieved Apr. 7, 2023 from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/96cf770b168dfd45784cdcefd533d53e/immigrant-health-equity-brief.pdf>

However, undocumented persons may qualify for emergency Medicaid benefits. States must provide limited coverage of emergency medical services to non-citizens who would qualify for full Medicaid benefits except for their immigration status, including undocumented immigrants. Emergency Medicaid provides payment for treatment of an emergency medical condition for non-citizens who meet all the eligibility requirements for Medicaid in the state but are not in an immigration status that qualifies them for full benefits.

3. STATES HAVE THE OPTION TO EXTEND CHIP TO IMMIGRANT CHILDREN.

Patrick Glen, (Prof., Law, Georgetown Law Center), ST. LOUIS U. JOURNAL OF HEALTH LAW & POLICY, 2022, 304.

In 2009, Congress gave states options to expand Medicaid and *CHIP* access to lawfully residing *children* and lawfully residing pregnant women, but this legislative intervention benefits only a small proportion of the noncitizens who are subject to the five-year waiting period. Only about half of the states have elected the option to expand Medicaid or *CHIP* to lawfully residing *children*, and a smaller number have elected the option to expand eligibility for these programs to lawfully residing pregnant women, contributing to the arbitrary national patchwork of *immigrant* access to health care. Moreover, the statute did not expand Medicaid or *CHIP* access to other qualified *immigrants* who may have greater needs for health coverage, including elderly, disabled, or injured people.

4. THE IMMIGRANT CHILDREN'S HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT PROVIDES CARE.

Susan Sumrell, (Staff, National Association of Community Health Centers), ICHIA: THE LEGAL IMMIGRANT CHILDREN'S HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT, Apr. 25, 2016. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://blog.nachc.org/ichia-the-legal-immigrant-childrens-health-improvement-act/>

At this time, 31 states have adopted the ICHIA expansion, the most recent being Florida and Utah in March 2016. Insurance rates for immigrant children in those states was 62%, compared with just 21% in states that did not adopt the expansion.

MEDICARE PROVIDES APPROPRIATE CARE FOR MENTAL ILLNESS

1. MEDICARE COVERS MENTAL HEALTH THERAPY.

Jeanna Smiley, (Staff, VeryWell Health), DOES MEDICARE COVER COUNSELING?, Mar. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.verywellhealth.com/does-medicare-cover-counseling-explained-5219737>

Medicare enrollees face an increased risk of having mental health concerns. Fortunately, Medicare covers counseling, which can help make support more accessible for you. Mental health programs and services are designed to help diagnose and treat mental health needs. As a beneficiary, you can take advantage of depression screenings, counseling sessions, medications, and partial hospitalization through your Medicare plan.

Kelly Blackwell, (Nurse & Certified Senior Adviser, Medicare), DOES MEDICARE COVER MENTAL HEALTH THERAPY?, Apr. 16, 2022. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.medicareplans.com/outpatient-mental-health-coverage/>

As part of Medicare's mental health care benefits, therapy, or counseling is typically covered under Part B as an outpatient service with Original Medicare. MA plans provide the same benefits as Part B does. Therapy generally can be for an individual or a group. Family therapy is covered if it is to support the Medicare beneficiary's mental health treatment goals.

2. MEDICARE COVERS SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.

Marcelo H. Fernández-Viña, (Staff, Pew Charitable Trusts), NEW MEDICARE POLICIES EXPAND ACCESS TO TREATMENT FOR OPIOID USE DISORDER, Jan. 26, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2023/01/26/new-medicare-policies-expand-access-to-treatment-for-opioid-use-disorder>

Through 2024, Medicare will continue to allow opioid treatment programs (OTPs) to use telehealth to start people on buprenorphine, a highly effective OUD medication. The agency will cover this and related services (such as required physical exams) permanently if the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration finalizes recently proposed rules to permanently allow OTPs to initiate buprenorphine via telehealth, including through audio-only means.

3. MEDICARE COVERS ALCOHOL ABUSE TREATMENT.

Jeanna Smiley, (Staff, VeryWell Health), DOES MEDICARE COVER COUNSELING?, Mar. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.verywellhealth.com/does-medicare-cover-counseling-explained-5219737>

Medicare provides alcohol use disorder screening and therapy for people who use alcohol but aren't dependent. If alcohol misuse is detected, Medicare may cover up to four counseling sessions per year. Medicare also covers: Detoxification; Rehabilitation; Advance care planning; Behavioral health integration into primary care to better plan and monitor care. You pay nothing for alcohol misuse screening and counseling if your healthcare provider accepts assignment.

4. MEDICARE COVERS TELEHEALTH MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

Jeanna Smiley, (Staff, VeryWell Health), DOES MEDICARE COVER COUNSELING?, Mar. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.verywellhealth.com/does-medicare-cover-counseling-explained-5219737>

Medicare Part B helps cover telehealth office visits, consultations, and psychotherapy. You'll pay the Part B deductible and 20% of the amount Medicare approves for your healthcare provider's services.

5. MEDICARE COVERS DRUG PRESCRIPTIONS FOR MENTAL HEALTH CARE.

Jeanna Smiley, (Staff, VeryWell Health), DOES MEDICARE COVER COUNSELING?, Mar. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.verywellhealth.com/does-medicare-cover-counseling-explained-5219737>

Medicare Part D covers prescription drug benefits. Part D plans help pay for antidepressants, mood stabilizers, and most other protected mental health treatment medications.

Jeanna Smiley, (Staff, VeryWell Health), DOES MEDICARE COVER COUNSELING?, Mar. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.verywellhealth.com/does-medicare-cover-counseling-explained-5219737>

Medicare may cover some medications to treat mental illness in inpatient or outpatient care. You must enroll in a Medicare-approved Part D drug plan to get drug coverage. Most Part D plans list the drugs they pay for. They must cover most antidepressants, antipsychotics, anticonvulsants, and opioid use disorder treatment drugs.

6. LICENSED PROFESSIONAL COUNSELORS ARE NOW COVERED IN MEDICARE.

American Counseling Association, MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT NOW LAW, Dec. 23, 2022. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.counseling.org/news/news-detail/2022/12/23/we-did-it!-medicare-reimbursement-now-law>

For over a decade, the American Counseling Association and its partner organizations have advocated for the successful passage of the Mental Health Access Improvement Act (S. 828/H.R. 432). Although this bill has previously passed the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, it has never passed both at the same time. Today we can say that this monumental legislation has passed in both chambers and is on its way to President Biden to be signed into law. The Mental Health Access Improvement Act will close the gap in federal law that prevents licensed professional counselors from being recognized as Medicare providers. The legislation is expected to give Medicare beneficiaries immediate access to more than 225,000 additional licensed mental health professionals and to help close the widening treatment gap.

Vasilios Kalogredis, (Staff, The Legal Intelligencer), PASSAGE OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT, Mar. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.law.com/thelegalintelligencer/2023/03/30/passage-of-the-mental-health-access-improvement-act/?sreturn=20230409225242>

The passage of MHAIA is critically important to both counselors and clients for several reasons. First and foremost, it seeks to address the significant barriers that individuals face when trying to access mental health care and will improve access to mental health services for millions of Americans, particularly those in rural and underserved areas.

Vasilios Kalogredis, (Staff, The Legal Intelligencer), PASSAGE OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT, Mar. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.law.com/thelegalintelligencer/2023/03/30/passage-of-the-mental-health-access-improvement-act/?sreturn=20230409225242>

Secondly, the passage of MHAIA [Mental Health Access Improvement Act] is important for LPCs [licensed professional counselors] and MFTs, [marriage and family therapists] who are currently not allowed to bill Medicare for their services. The new legislation will provide coverage under Medicare for such services as psychotherapy, pharmacologic management and other treatments deemed medically necessary. These services will be provided by licensed mental health professionals, including LPCs, MFTs and clinical social workers. This is a crucial step in ensuring that mental health care is accessible to all, regardless of their financial situation. LPCs are trained professionals who provide counseling services to those struggling with mental health issues.

7. THE COST SHARING ARRANGEMENTS FOR MENTAL HEALTH CARE ARE NOW THE SAME AS FOR ANY OTHER HEALTH SERVICES.

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Texas, MENTAL HEALTH PARITY, Mar. 26, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from www.bcbstx.com/insurance-basics/coverage-information/mental-health-parity

In 2008, Congress passed the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 (MHPAEA). MHPAEA created standards for most large groups that required those covering mental health services to not apply stronger coverage limitations or require higher cost sharing than what the group uses for the physical health services it covers. Starting with plan/policy years after July 1, 2014, the Affordable Care Act (ACA) expanded these requirements to apply to small groups and individual health plans too.

8. THE DECEMBER 2022 PASSAGE OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT (MHAIA) CORRECTS THE PREVIOUS COVERAGE SHORTCOMINGS.

Vasilios Kalogredis, (Staff, The Legal Intelligencer), PASSAGE OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT, Mar. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.law.com/thelegalintelligencer/2023/03/30/passage-of-the-mental-health-access-improvement-act/?slreturn=20230409225242>

In conclusion, the passage of MHAIA is critically important for both counselors and clients. It expands access to mental health services, particularly for those in underserved and rural areas. It also allows LPCs to bill Medicare for their services, which can expand the pool of mental health professionals available to treat patients. Additionally, the passage of MHAIA should improve the overall quality of mental health care and have important economic benefits. While there may be some challenges in the implementation process, the MHAIA has the potential to improve mental health outcomes and reduce stigma surrounding mental health.

Vasilios Kalogredis, (Staff, The Legal Intelligencer), PASSAGE OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT, Mar. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.law.com/thelegalintelligencer/2023/03/30/passage-of-the-mental-health-access-improvement-act/?slreturn=20230409225242>

Thirdly, the passage of MHAIA will improve the overall quality of mental health care in the United States. By expanding access to mental health services, the act will allow mental health professionals to diagnose and treat mental health disorders earlier, which can lead to better outcomes for patients. Mental health issues can have a significant impact on a person's quality of life, and untreated mental health conditions can lead to a host of negative outcomes, including substance abuse, unemployment, and even suicide. By increasing access to mental health care, the MHAIA can help ensure that individuals receive the care they need to manage their mental health conditions. This can lead to better mental health outcomes, including increased productivity, and better overall health.

Vasilios Kalogredis, (Staff, The Legal Intelligencer), PASSAGE OF THE MENTAL HEALTH ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT, Mar. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 9, 2023 from <https://www.law.com/thelegalintelligencer/2023/03/30/passage-of-the-mental-health-access-improvement-act/?slreturn=20230409225242>

Another important benefit of the MHAIA [Mental Health Access Improvement Act] is that it can help reduce the stigma around mental health. Stigma is a significant barrier to accessing mental health care, as many individuals may be reluctant to seek help due to the negative stereotypes surrounding mental illness. By expanding access to mental health care and providing reimbursement for LPCs [licensed professional counselors], the MHAIA can help to reduce stigma and promote a more positive view of mental health.

SSI SHOULD NOT APPLY IN THE U.S. TERRITORIES

1. SSI IS FUNDED OUT OF GENERAL FEDERAL REVENUES – NOT THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND.

Tom Margenau, (Former Dir., Public Information Office, Social Security Administration), REPEAT AFTER ME: 'SSI IS NOT SOCIAL SECURITY', Feb. 15, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from www.theepochtimes.com/repeat-after-me-ssi-is-not-social-security_4245576.html

SSI is a federal welfare program that has absolutely nothing to do with Social Security other than the fact that it happens to be managed by the Social Security Administration. SSI payments are funded out of general tax revenues—not Social Security taxes.

2. RESIDENTS OF U.S. TERRITORIES DO NOT PAY FEDERAL INCOME TAXES.

Elizabeth Prelogar, (Acting Solicitor General of the United States), BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN UNITED STATES V. JOSE LUIS VAELLO-MADERO, June 2021. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-303/181129/20210607194124315_20-303tsUnitedStates.pdf

Residents of Puerto Rico generally owe no federal income tax on income from sources in Puerto Rico. That exemption saves residents of the island an estimated \$2 billion a year.

Elizabeth Prelogar, (Acting Solicitor General of the United States), BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN UNITED STATES V. JOSE LUIS VAELLO-MADERO, June 2021. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-303/181129/20210607194124315_20-303tsUnitedStates.pdf

Residents of Puerto Rico are generally exempt from most federal taxes, including the income tax, excise taxes, and estate and gift taxes. Congress could rationally conclude that a jurisdiction that makes a reduced contribution to the general federal treasury should receive a reduced share of the benefits funded by the general treasury. And that consideration carries additional force since including Puerto Rico in the program would cost the federal government around two billion dollars each year.

3. THE EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX ALLOWS THE TERRITORIES TO MAKE PROVISION FOR THEIR OWN WELFARE PROGRAMS.

Brian Fletcher, (Acting Solicitor General of the United States), REPLY BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN UNITED STATES v. JOSE LUIS VAELLO-MADERO, Sept. 2021. Retrieved May 24, 2023 from https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-303/194142/20210929171646729_20-303%20Vaello-Madero%20Reply%20Final.pdf

Even as to income taxes, moreover, the fact that residents of Puerto Rico in general pay no federal income tax means that the revenue that would otherwise be captured by federal taxes and paid into the federal Treasury is instead available to Puerto Rico through the levying of its own taxes. The availability of that source of revenue benefits all residents of the Commonwealth, including respondent, by providing the means for furnishing governmental services and benefits at the territorial level. Given that source of revenue, Congress could rationally conclude that Puerto Rico should administer and primarily fund aid for aged, blind, and disabled residents in the Territory.

Elizabeth Prelogar, (Acting Solicitor General of the United States), BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN UNITED STATES V. JOSE LUIS VAELLO-MADERO, June 2021. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20-303/181129/20210607194124315_20-303tsUnitedStates.pdf

The exemptions from federal taxes also enable Puerto Rico to levy higher territorial taxes and use the revenues from those taxes to support its own expenditures to promote the general welfare of its residents. For example, Puerto Rico could decide whether to spend its tax revenues to furnish additional aid to needy aged, blind, or disabled residents.

MEDICAID IN THE U.S. TERRITORIES IS NOW FUNDED AT THE SAME LEVEL AS THE STATES

1. THE DECEMBER 2022 OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL PROVIDES AN 83% FEDERAL MEDICAID MATCH – THE SAME AS FOR U.S. STATES.

Anita Hofschneider, (Staff, Civil Beat), FEDERAL BUDGET BILL PERMANENTLY INCREASES MEDICAID FUNDING FOR U.S. PACIFIC TERRITORIES, Dec. 30, 2022. Retrieved Mar. 31, 2023 from <https://www.civilbeat.org/2022/12/federal-budget-bill-permanently-increases-medicaid-funding-for-us-pacific-territories/>

The Covid-19 pandemic in U.S. Pacific territories drove up unemployment, halted tourism economies and prevented families from going home. But it also brought a much-needed influx of federal funding that local officials say helped island governments provide more health care services. Now, some of that funding will be permanent. On Thursday, President Joe Biden signed the \$1.7 trillion budget bill. The bill preserves a federal Medicaid funding match of 83% for all three U.S. Pacific island territories — Guam, American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands — as well as the U.S. Virgin Islands, and extends Puerto Rico's 76% rate for another five years.

2. THE FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGE FOR THE TERRITORIES HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY EXTENDED.

Edwin Park, (Prof., Georgetown University Health Policy Institute), END OF THE YEAR APPROPRIATIONS BILL WILL AVERT MEDICAID FISCAL CLIFF FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE TERRITORIES, Dec. 20, 2022. Retrieved Mar. 30, 2023 from <https://ccf.georgetown.edu/2022/12/20/end-of-the-year-appropriations-bill-would-avert-medicaid-fiscal-cliff-for-puerto-rico-and-the-territories/>

The omnibus bill would extend the 76% FMAP for Puerto Rico for another five years (through the end of federal fiscal year 2027) and extend the 83% FMAPs for the other territories on a permanent basis. It would also likely provide sufficient federal block grant funding for each of the next five years to not only sustain Puerto Rico's Medicaid program at that higher level but also allow for further programmatic improvements. This would ensure greatly needed fiscal stability for Puerto Rico for the medium term and for the other territories over the long term and thereby increase access to needed care for low-income individuals and families in Puerto Rico and the other territories.

Georgetown University Health Policy Institute, CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2023: MEDICAID AND CHIP PROVISIONS EXPLAINED, Jan. 5, 2023. Retrieved Mar. 30, 2023 from <https://ccf.georgetown.edu/2023/01/05/consolidated-appropriations-act-2023-medicaid-and-chip-provisions-explained/>

Section 5101 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act extends the 76 percent FMAP for Puerto Rico for another five years (through the end of federal fiscal year 2027) and extends the 83 percent FMAPs for the other territories on a permanent basis. It also provides sufficient federal block grant funding for each of the next five years to not only sustain Puerto Rico's Medicaid program at that higher level but also allow for some further programmatic improvements. This would ensure greatly needed fiscal stability for Puerto Rico for the medium term and for the other territories over the long term and thereby increase access to needed care for low-income individuals and families in Puerto Rico and the other territories.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IS PRIMARILY A STATE-RUN ENTERPRISE

1. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IS A COLLECTION OF 50 STATE-RUN PROGRAMS.

Jeremy Pilaar, (Prof., Law, Yale Law School), HARVARD LAW & POLICY REVIEW, Summer 2018, 331.

The unemployment insurance program is a state-federal partnership. It is funded by both federal taxes under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and state payroll taxes under state unemployment tax acts. It is therefore best described as a collection of fifty state-administered programs subject to federal oversight. States determine the key features of their systems, including eligibility conditions, benefit levels and duration, and employer tax rates and exemptions.

2. THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT DID NOT CREATE A FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM – IT SIMPLY ENABLES THE STATES TO DO SO.

Edwin Witte, (Prof., Economics, U. of Wisconsin), LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS, 1936, Vol. 3(1), p. 168.

In its final form, the Social Security Act neither sets up a federal system nor provides for federal regulation of unemployment insurance. This act merely seeks to make it possible for the states to pass unemployment compensation laws and to induce them to do so.

3. EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE DOES NOT EXPAND SOCIAL SECURITY.

Mark Henricks, (Financial Adviser, SmartAsset), CAN YOU COLLECT UNEMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY?, Feb. 28, 2023. Retrieved Mar. 28, 2023 from <https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/can-you-collect-unemployment-and-social-security>

The national unemployment insurance program was established in 1932 under the same legislation that created Social Security. Though both programs sprang from the same initiative, unemployment insurance and Social Security are different in purpose and practice. Those differences include their funding, eligibility and how each affects the other. Social Security is funded by payroll taxes on both employers and employees. The system is run by the federal government through the Social Security Administration. Unemployment insurance is funded by unemployment taxes paid by employers and collected by the states.

4. THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM IS BOTH FUNDED AND ADMINISTERED BY THE STATES.

Jeremy Pilaar, (Prof., Law, Yale Law School), HARVARD LAW & POLICY REVIEW, Summer 2018, 331.

UI remains one of the pillars of the American welfare system. In 2015, state governments collected more than forty-two billion dollars in unemployment taxes and disbursed close to thirty-two billion dollars in regular benefits. The excess revenue went toward rebuilding states' UI trust funds, which were badly depleted during the Great Recession.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS NOT A MAJOR PROBLEM AT PRESENT

1. UNEMPLOYMENT IS AT AN ALL-TIME LOW.

David Harrison, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), UNEMPLOYMENT FALLS TO 3.4%, LOWEST IN 53 YEARS, JOBS REPORT SHOWS, Feb. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/january-jobs-report-unemployment-rate-economy-growth-2023-11675374490>

U.S. job growth accelerated at the start of the year as employers added a robust 517,000 jobs and pushed the unemployment rate to a 53-year low.

Lydia DePillis, (Staff, New York Times), IF THE JOB MARKET IS SO GOOD, WHY IS GIG WORK THRIVING?, Aug. 15, 2022. Retrieved Mar. 29, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/08/15/business/economy/gig-work.html>

American workers are experiencing, by many measures, one of the best job markets ever. The unemployment rate has matched a 53-year low. Job listings per available worker are at historic highs.

2. THERE ARE TWICE AS MANY JOB OPENINGS AS PEOPLE LOOKING FOR WORK.

David Harrison, (Staff, Wall Street Journal), UNEMPLOYMENT FALLS TO 3.4%, LOWEST IN 53 YEARS, JOBS REPORT SHOWS, Feb. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/january-jobs-report-unemployment-rate-economy-growth-2023-11675374490>

“This is just incredibly, surprisingly strong,” said Kathy Bostjancic, chief economist at Nationwide. “Not only are you hiring more workers but the workers you have overall are working more hours. It doesn’t really get stronger than that.” Other recent figures point to a tight labor market. Employers had 11 million job openings at the end of December, or nearly double the number of unemployed people looking for work that month, the Labor Department said earlier this week.

3. THE ECONOMY CONTINUES TO ADD JOBS AT A RECORD PACE.

Gili Malinsky, (Staff, CNBC), U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT JUST HIT ITS LOWEST RATE SINCE 1969—ECONOMISTS AREN’T OPTIMISTIC IT’LL LAST, Feb. 3, 2023. Retrieved Mar. 29, 2023 from <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/02/03/us-unemployment-hit-a-historic-low-economists-arent-sure-itll-stick.html>

The U.S. labor market started 2023 on a high note. The economy added 517,000 jobs, according to the Labor Department, far exceeding the 187,000 jobs the Dow Jones had anticipated. Among the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ findings for the month was also the market’s historically low unemployment rate of 3.4% or 5.7 million people. That’s the lowest it’s been since 1969. The rate “continues to show the we have an especially tight labor market,” says Ben Zipperer, economist at the Economic Policy Institute, meaning one in which workers have a lot of opportunities.

4. THE U.S. ECONOMY IS NOW AT A GOLDBLOCKS MOMENT – PROPERLY BALANCING UNEMPLOYMENT AND INFLATION.

Scott Horsley, (Staff, NPR), UNEMPLOYMENT HAS FALLEN TO 3.5%, MATCHING THE LOWEST LEVEL IN HALF A CENTURY, Jan. 6, 2023. Retrieved Mar. 29, 2023 from <https://www.npr.org/2023/01/06/1147547807/unemployment-has-fallen-to-3-5-matching-the-lowest-level-in-half-a-century>

U.S. employers added 223,000 jobs last month and the unemployment rate fell to just 3.5%, matching the lowest level in half a century. The overall job market remains tight. We are in a Goldilocks moment for the U.S. job market - not too hot and not too cold.

MINORITY UNEMPLOYMENT IS NOT A SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM

1. MINORITY UNEMPLOYMENT IS AT RECORD LOW LEVELS.

Emma Ockerman, (Analyst, MarketWatch), BIDEN'S STATE OF THE UNION HIGHLIGHTED NEAR RECORD-LOW BLACK UNEMPLOYMENT, Feb. 11, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/bidens-state-of-the-union-highlighted-near-record-low-black-unemployment-heres-the-full-story-f2b80134>

President Joe Biden highlighted a "near record-low" unemployment rate for Black workers in the U.S. during his State of the Union address Tuesday while laying out a more positive story about the state of the economy. It's true that the overall unemployment rate of 3.4% in January was the country's lowest level since 1969, and the unemployment rate for Black workers was 5.4%, according to Labor Department data. The latter was down from 6.9% in January 2022, the even higher level of 9.2% in January 2021, and the pandemic high of 16.8% in May 2020. The unemployment rate for Hispanic workers, which Biden also highlighted, was 4.5% in January, compared to 4.9% during the same time last year. "In many ways, he was actually being too modest," William Spriggs, an economics professor at Howard University and the chief economist for the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), said of Biden's comments.

2. AFRICAN-AMERICAN UNEMPLOYMENT IS AT HISTORIC LOW LEVEL.

Lauren Gurley, (Staff, Washington Post), BLACK UNEMPLOYMENT RATE HITS RECORD LOW 5 PERCENT, Apr. 7, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/04/07/black-unemployment-rate-record-low/>

"The unemployment rate is close to the lowest it has been in more than 50 years and a record low for African Americans," President Biden said in a statement, trumpeting the administration's pandemic stimulus packages. "Thanks to the policies we have put in place, the recovery is creating good jobs that you can raise a family on."

Stephanie Whiteside, (Staff, NewsNation), BLACK UNEMPLOYMENT HITS HISTORIC LOW, May 5, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.newsnationnow.com/business/black-unemployment-hits-historic-low/>

The latest unemployment numbers show a surprisingly strong labor market, with unemployment for Black Americans hitting a record low. The latest round of unemployment numbers defied predictions, with the rate continuing to drop even as inflation continues to soar. Overall unemployment hit 3.4%, a number that is as low or lower than anything seen since 1969. For Black Americans, unemployment rates hit historic lows. Black men ages 20 and older had an unemployment rate of 4.5%, which is the lowest on record and the first time the unemployment rate for that group has been under 5% since the government began using the current unemployment tracking system in 1972.

3. HISPANIC UNEMPLOYMENT IS AT A VERY LOW LEVEL.

Lauren Gurley, (Staff, Washington Post), BLACK UNEMPLOYMENT RATE HITS RECORD LOW 5 PERCENT, Apr. 7, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/04/07/black-unemployment-rate-record-low/>

Several economists credited the White House stimulus package of 2021 for kick-starting the labor market into overdrive, in a way that benefited many groups of workers. The unemployment rate for Latinos for March had dropped to 4.6 percent, which is low, although not a record.

INCOME INEQUALITY IS INEVITABLE AND BENEFICIAL.

1. INEQUALITY IS THE NATURAL RESULT OF ALLOWING INDIVIDUALS TO MAKE CHOICES.

John Tamny, (Editor of Real Clear Markets, for Prager University), INCOME INEQUALITY IS GOOD, Mar. 26, 2022. Retrieved Aug. 18, 2023 from https://assets.ctfassets.net/qnesrjodfi80/yH7we4V3nEq6UcKOWcmku/f657cc2e889beb0ec8ffc845cb7d6659/tamny-income_inequality_is_good-transcript.pdf

In a country like the United States, you are free to pursue a path in life that you believe best suits your talents. That talent might be teaching, or making music, or banking, or starting a small business, or raising a family. Whatever it is, this freedom helps to make life enjoyable, exciting and meaningful. But it's also an expression of inequality. This is simply because we're all different. We have different talents, different temperaments, different ambitions. That's okay because – again in a free society – we can seek out opportunities that play to our personal strengths; that distinguish us from others. If you find what you're really good at and work hard, you might have great success and make a lot of money. If you're an outstanding athlete, I'll buy a ticket to see you play. If you're a savvy investor, I'll give you some of my money to invest. As long as you have the freedom to guide your own destiny, you have a chance to reach your full potential – achieving success, however you define it. But if someone, say, a government bureaucrat, told you that your ambition had limits, that there was a ceiling above which you could not rise, I doubt you'd be happy about it. You'd feel like you were in a straightjacket. Forced equality means less opportunity to pursue what makes you individually great.

2. THE ECONOMY WORKS BEST WHEN COMPENSATION IS DETERMINED BY THE MARKETPLACE.

Kenneth Hersh, (President, George W. Bush Presidential Center), TRUST OUR MARKET INSTITUTIONS BECAUSE THE ROAD FROM BUDAPEST TO CARACAS IS A SHORT ONE, Winter 2022. Retrieved Aug. 20, 2023 from www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/restoring-trust-in-institutions/hersh-trust-our-market-institutions

One of our governing philosophies has been that human beings realize their fullest potential by maximizing political and economic freedom. Market economies innovate and allocate resources better than any other system. When people are free to work and innovate, dignity rises along with productivity and income. Democratic capitalism has led to world-changing advances and has lifted billions out of poverty. Of course, no system is perfect, but empirical evidence supporting freedom, democracy, and capitalism is just too hard to ignore.

Michael Barone, (Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), ITS ABOUT MORE THAN MONEY, Jan. 3, 2011. Retrieved Aug. 20, 2023 from <https://www.npr.org/2011/01/03/132615955/national-review-its-about-more-than-money>

There's little evidence that most Americans begrudge the exceedingly high earnings of the likes of Steve Jobs, Steven Spielberg or J.K. Rowling. We believe they have earned their success and don't see how taking money away from them will make the rest of us better off.

3. MUCH OF THE WEALTH ACCUMULATED BY THE TOP 1% IS A MARKETPLACE REWARD FOR INNOVATIVE IDEAS.

Chris Edwards, (Chair in Fiscal Studies, Cato Institute & former Chief Economist, U.S. Joint Economic Committee), HOW WEALTH FUELS GROWTH, Sept. 29, 2021. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/how-wealth-fuels-growth>

Where does top wealth come from? In the U.S. economy, the wealthiest 1 percent of households mainly earn their wealth from work and entrepreneurship. About 70 percent of these wealthiest Americans are self-made, rather than inheriting fortunes. Also, 74 percent of them own a business, compared to 13 percent of all households.

Deirdre McCloskey, (Prof., Economics, Emeritus, U. of Illinois at Chicago), GROWTH, NOT FORCED EQUALITY, SAVES THE POOR, Dec. 23, 2016. Retrieved Aug. 18, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/23/business/growth-not-forced-equality-saves-the-poor.html>

Another eminent philosopher, John Rawls of Harvard, articulated what he called the Difference Principle: If the entrepreneurship of a rich person made the poorest better off, then the higher income of the entrepreneur was justified. It works for me.

Edwards, Chris & Ryan Bourne, (Analysts, Cato Institute), EXPLORING WEALTH INEQUALITY, Nov. 5, 2019. Retrieved Aug. 18, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/exploring-wealth-inequality>

Far from being idle, many of the wealthiest people in our society create new products, generate competition in markets, and drive down consumer prices. Their innovations have been diffused across the economy and benefited many millions of people. Most Americans understand this. A 2019 poll found that 69 percent of the public agrees that billionaires “earned their wealth by creating value for others like inventing new technologies or starting businesses that improve lives.”

David Henderson, (Prof., Economics, Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California), INCOME INEQUALITY ISN'T THE PROBLEM, Feb. 20, 2018. Retrieved Aug. 15, 2023 from <https://www.hoover.org/research/income-inequality-isnt-problem>

Consider another example—two of the richest people in the world are Bill Gates and Carlos Slim. Gates got rich by starting and building Microsoft, whose main product, an operating system for personal computers, made life better for the rest of us. Would you have a well-functioning personal computer if Bill Gates hadn't existed? Yes. But his existence and his clear thinking early on hastened the PC revolution by at least a year. That might not sound like a lot, but each gain we consumers got from each step of the PC revolution occurred a year earlier because of Bill Gates. Over 40 years, that amounts to trillions of dollars in value to consumers. The market value of Microsoft is currently just shy of \$700 billion. Assume that Microsoft was much better than other innovators at capturing consumer value and captured fully 10 percent of the value it created, rather than the usual 2.2 percent. That means it has created almost \$7 trillion of value for consumers over those forty years.

Stan Veuger, (Economist, American Enterprise Institute), LEARN TO STOP WORRYING AND LOVE INCOME INEQUALITY, June 4, 2015. Retrieved Aug. 20, 2023 from <https://www.aei.org/economics/study-how-creative-destruction-and-innovation-drives-income-inequality-but-also-upward-social-mobility/>

All in all this research suggests that some 20 percent of the increase in the share of income going to the top 1 percent since the mid-70s was caused by innovation alone. That may not sound like that much – but of course, we can't just eliminate only the inequality we don't like and keep the inequality that incentivized people to innovate. Bad news, perhaps, for those who would like to spread the wealth around.

4. SOCIETY BENEFITS FROM THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE WEALTHY.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST, 2019, 119.

When you redistribute money nothing new is created in the process that will actually increase productivity or living standards. However — when the "greedy rich" invest their money in businesses those businesses buy factories and machines which increase productivity and increases supply of goods, making them more affordable to everyone. This benefits the poor the most, which is why so many items that were once considered a luxury (such as a personal computer or smart phone) are the norm — even in poor households in the west.

Chris Edwards, (Chair in Fiscal Studies, Cato Institute & former Chief Economist, U.S. Joint Economic Committee), HOW WEALTH FUELS GROWTH, Sept. 29, 2021. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/how-wealth-fuels-growth>

Today, there are 335,000 wealthy angels across the nation who take large risks to fund a diversity of startup businesses. Angel-backed startups often pioneer breakthrough products and technologies that create broad-based benefits to society, a role that goes back to the Industrial Revolution. Young companies funded by angels are making advances today in biotechnology, energy, transportation, financial services, space travel, and many other industries. Some policymakers complain that wealthy people and big corporations rig the economy and deny opportunities to others. But wealthy angels do the opposite: they fund startups that pry open rigged industries and generate competition.

Chris Edwards, (Chair in Fiscal Studies, Cato Institute & former Chief Economist, U.S. Joint Economic Committee), HOW WEALTH FUELS GROWTH, Sept. 29, 2021. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/how-wealth-fuels-growth>

America needs diverse sources of funding for innovative businesses, and wealthy individuals are a crucial source. Wealth is central to the nation's entrepreneurial ecosystem, which has spawned so many great companies and advances over the decades.

5. FORCED INCOME EQUALITY CAN LEAVE EVERYONE WORSE OFF.

Edward Stringham, (Prof., Economic Organizations and Innovation, Trinity College), DECRYING INCOME INEQUALITY IS A HARMFUL TACTIC THAT WILL MAKE US ALL WORSE OFF, Nov. 20, 2019. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.independent.org/news/article.asp?id=12989>

Consider choosing between the following two actual countries. Country A has much more inequality than Country B. On the Gini measure of inequality where 0 indicates perfect equality and 100 perfect inequality, Country A has a Gini index of 45 (the 103rd least-equal country) and Country B has a Gini index of 26 (among the top-ten most equal countries). In Country A, the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita is \$62,000, while in Country B, the GDP per capita is \$5,700. In Country A, income in the highest quintile averages \$143,000 and in the lowest quintile \$15,500. In Country B, income in the highest quintile averages \$10,300 and in the lowest quintile \$2,900. Country A describes the United States, and Country B describes the far more equal former Soviet state of Belarus. While everyone in Belarus is relatively much more equal, they are certainly not better off. In fact, relative to the rest of the world, the citizens of Belarus are for the most part, much poorer."

INCOME INEQUALITY DOES NOT COME AT THE EXPENSE OF THE POOR.

1. THE MARXIST NOTION THAT FREE ENTERPRISE BENEFITS ONLY THE RICH HAS BEEN DISPROVEN.

Thomas Mayor, (Prof., Economics, U. Houston), CATO JOURNAL, Winter 2015, 96.

The Marxist view that increases in wealth accumulation, productivity, and economic growth benefit only the owners of capital has been and should be resoundingly rejected given the enormous increase in the incomes of workers in advanced countries over the past two centuries. Such facts cannot be ignored.

2. ZERO-SUM ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS SHOULD BE REJECTED.

Edwards, Chris & Ryan Bourne, (Analysts, Cato Institute), EXPLORING WEALTH INEQUALITY, Nov. 5, 2019. Retrieved Aug. 18, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/exploring-wealth-inequality>

Measures of wealth inequality do not tell us anything about the well-being of the poor, which is a more important focus for public policy than inequality. Poverty may fall as wealth inequality rises, such as when entrepreneurs build fortunes by generating economic growth.

Edwards, Chris & Ryan Bourne, (Analysts, Cato Institute), EXPLORING WEALTH INEQUALITY, Nov. 5, 2019. Retrieved Aug. 18, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/exploring-wealth-inequality>

Martin Feldstein was right that “inequality is not a problem in need of remedy.” Instead, he noted that economists start with the “Pareto principle that a change is good if it makes someone better off without making anyone else worse off.” An example is an entrepreneur who builds her wealth by making product innovations that reduce prices for consumers.

Arthur Brooks, (Pres., American Enterprise Institute), OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL: HOW TO THINK ABOUT INCOME INEQUALITY, Mar. 17, 2014, 1.

A free enterprise society is not a zero-sum game in which citizens fight over resources. It should be a shared journey that empowers everyone to improve their station and earn their own success. Income differences are inevitable, and they are not inherently problematic as long as the opportunity to rise is available to everyone. Survey data show that the American people agree.

3. THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM HAS INCREASED THE WELL-BEING OF PERSONS AT THE BOTTOM END OF THE INCOME SPECTRUM.

Gerald Auten & David Splinter, (Sr. Economist, U.S. Treasury Dept./Economist, Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation), UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY, 2021, 128.

Our estimates indicate that average per capita incomes of the bottom 50 percent increased by nearly one-third. Accounting for transfers, real incomes of this group increased by nearly two-thirds. Similarly, Congressional Budget Office estimates suggest that per capita after-tax/transfer real incomes of the bottom two quintiles increased by 62 percent from 1979 to 2014.

Michael Barone, (Staff, Washington Examiner), LET’S BASE POLICY ON REAL FACTS, NOT MISLEADING STATISTICS, Jan. 5, 2023. Retrieved Jan. 21, 2023 from <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/lets-base-policy-on-real-facts-not-misleading-statistics/>

And the poverty rate, which government statistics peg at 12 percent, is only 2 percent when you cover government transfers. Many of these are people who “lack the basic mental and physical capabilities to care for themselves and their children” and need not income but “specifically tailored programs to address their specific needs.”

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 4.

The official measure of the poverty rate, which uses the Census Bureau definition of income, does not count two-thirds of all transfer payments as income to the recipients. As a result, for more than fifty years, the measured income of low-income Americans has been substantially understated. As we will show, when you count all transfer payments as income to the households that receive the payments, the number of Americans living in poverty in 2017 plummets from 12.3 percent, the official Census number, to only 2.5 percent.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 13-14.

In 2017, the average household with earned income in the bottom 20 percent of all households received more than \$45,000 in government transfer payments; yet, remarkably, Census failed to count nearly \$32,000 of those transfers as income to the recipients. This substantial omission has caused the Census calculations of income inequality and the poverty rate to be seriously overstated. In addition, the expanding number and size of these transfer payments has caused the overstatement of inequality and poverty to grow over time.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 142.

When all the transfer payments to households are counted as income and household income is reduced by the taxes paid, not only do both the top and the fourth quintiles in 2017 have income that would have placed them in the top quintile in 1967, but all the households in the middle quintile and almost a third of those in the second quintile also had incomes equivalent to top-quintile incomes in 1967. An extraordinary 66.3 percent of households in 2017 had incomes after transfers and taxes that would have been enjoyed only by those in the top quintile in 1967.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 42.

Except for a very few individual outliers who have special needs that income redistribution cannot meet, America's poverty program has virtually eliminated most poverty and raised most households to middle-income levels.

4. PEOPLE AT ALL INCOME LEVELS ARE BETTER OFF THAN THEY HAVE BEEN BEFORE.

James Elwell, (Economist, Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation), UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY, 2021, 91-92.

When we adjust for government taxes, include cash and in-kind transfers, but exclude the value of Medicare, Medicaid, and ESI benefits—thus creating a lower bound measure of disposable income—we find that all five quintiles have experienced gains of more than 100 percent since 1959, with the highest gains among the top and bottom quintiles. When we include the market values of Medicare, Medicaid, and ESI (the former two of which are programs that only began in 1966) in our upper bound measures of disposable income, the bottom quintile of the income distribution registers the greatest gains since 1959 and there are much smaller differences in gains across the other quintiles.

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

When properly constructed, all measures of economic well-being have shown rapid improvement over the past 50 years, including the following, in inflation adjusted dollars: Median household income; Average hourly earnings; Gross domestic product.

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

Today, most people are economically as prosperous as many people in the top 20 percent were 50 years ago.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 146.

Even the fact that the lower income households today are economically as well off as some households in the top 20 percent of income in 1967 is easily understood. Health insurance for the top quintile would usually have covered only hospitalization in 1967, but most of the poorest households in the land now get full, first-dollar coverage without any cost sharing. Even with full coverage, the poorest today are still about 20 percent less likely to need hospitalization than their rich predecessors in 1967 because of improved treatments. When people at any income level go to the hospital, they will stay only a fraction of the time spent in 1967, are more likely to emerge fully restored, and are far less likely to be readmitted with the same complaint. An average lower-income person in 2017 will live eight years longer than a top-quintile person did in 1967.

OFFICIAL POVERTY STATISTICS ARE MISLEADING.**1. FEDERAL TRANSFER PAYMENTS ARE NOT COUNTED IN OFFICIAL POVERTY STATISTICS.**

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

The Census Bureau excludes more than 100 transfer programs, such as the Treasury Department checks that pay low-income households refundable tax credits in excess of their tax liabilities, food-stamp debit cards, and doctor bills paid by Medicaid. Adding those missing transfer payments increases earned income in the bottom quintile by almost 700 percent and in the second quintile by more than 70 percent.

Michael Barone, (Staff, Washington Examiner), LET'S BASE POLICY ON REAL FACTS, NOT MISLEADING STATISTICS, Jan. 5, 2023. Retrieved Jan. 21, 2023 from <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/lets-base-policy-on-real-facts-not-misleading-statistics/>

The first reason is that Census Bureau statistics on income, on which just about everyone relies, do not include two-thirds of government transfer payments. That made sense in 1947, when Census started reporting the number, and most transfer programs—food stamps, Medicare, Medicaid, the Earned Income Tax Credit, the child tax credit—didn't exist. But today they do, and the bottom two quintiles on the income scale (each quintile is one-fifth of households) get 59 percent and 24 percent of their incomes from government transfers.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 3.

In measuring income, the Census Bureau chooses not to count over two-thirds of all transfer payments made by federal, state, and local governments as income to the recipients of those transfer payments. In 2017, federal, state, and local governments redistributed \$2.8 trillion, 22 percent of the nation's earned household income, with 68 percent of those transfer payments going to households earning in the bottom 40 percent. Remarkably, the Census Bureau chooses to count only \$0.9 trillion of that \$2.8 trillion in government transfer payments as income for the recipients of those transfers, counting only eight of the more than one hundred federal transfer payment programs and only a select number of state and local transfer payment programs. Excluded from the measurement of household income are some \$1.9 trillion of government transfers—programs like refundable tax credits, where beneficiaries get checks from the Treasury; food stamps, where beneficiaries buy food with government-issued debit cards; and numerous other programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, where government directly pays the bills of the beneficiaries.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 13.

Almost three-quarters of a century ago, the Census established a procedure for measuring income by counting only "cash" payments—currency, check, or direct deposit to a recipient's bank account—as income. Because in 1947 over 90 percent of all employment compensation and government assistance was received in cash payments and it was difficult to measure the value of noncash payments, the decision was made to define income simply as the total of all cash payments received. At the time, cash payments received were reasonable approximations of total income. Since then, however, the value of employer-paid benefits has expanded, and the War on Poverty has created an explosion of new programs, such as Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, housing subsidies, and numerous others that have not been classified as cash payments. None of these new sources of income have been counted as income by the Census.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 14.

There are now at least one hundred federal programs that each spend more than \$100 million annually providing transfer payments to households, as well as an uncounted number of smaller programs. Of that total number, Census counts only eight in its measure of income and chooses not to count the others as income to the recipients. The majority of state and local transfer payments are similarly not counted by the Census. The result is that today two-thirds of all government transfer payments to individuals and households are not counted by Census in its income estimates.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 24.

The implications of omitting these transfer payments when calculating measures of income inequality are huge. In 2017, Census omitted counting transfers that constituted 59 percent of total pretax income for households in the bottom quintile. Far more than half their pretax income was simply ignored.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 37.

Because most of the spending on massive transfer payments undertaken by the federal government to alleviate poverty was never counted in the official poverty measure, the poverty rate did not improve. Government transfer payments specifically targeted to alleviate poverty rose by 269 percent in real dollars per household in the bottom quintile. By 2017, transfer payments constituted 91 percent of before-tax income for the average household in the bottom quintile.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 52.

The US data submissions deviate significantly from the norm by excluding large portions of government transfers to low-income households. The Census Bureau excludes two of the three largest transfer programs—Medicare and Medicaid (including the Children's Health Insurance Program [CHIP])—which transfer more than \$1.1 trillion annually, most of it to the bottom two quintiles of American households. The US data also exclude eighty-four other federal transfer programs such as Supplemental Security Income, Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 15.

The problem is that Census uses "money income" to measure income inequality and poverty as if it were an accurate measure of the totality of income. The result of these and other, lesser shortcomings is a gross overstatement of both income inequality and poverty.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 34.

The incomplete numbers being used by the Census to measure income distribution distort the debate. As a country we need to get our facts straight. Debate on income distribution in America should center on facts that include not only the value of what is produced but also the total resources that are available to households after all transfer payments are made and all taxes are paid.

2. WHEN ALL TRANSFERS ARE COUNTED, POVERTY LEVELS HAVE PLUMMETED.

Hannah Frankman & Dan Sanchez, (Analysts, Foundation for Economic Education), EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY, NOT OUTCOME, IS WHAT MADE AMERICA AWESOME, Apr. 3, 2022. Retrieved Aug. 20, 2023 from <https://fee.org/articles/equality-of-opportunity-not-outcome-is-what-made-america-awesome/>

When we look at poverty rates – a much more important measure of the progress of society than the wealthy outliers – we see that they've plummeted. Extreme poverty (less than \$1.25/day, adjusted for purchasing power) fell by 80 percent globally and is so low in the US that it isn't even measurable. The modern "poor" enjoy indoor plumbing, clean water, an abundance of foods, clothes, luxuries, and devices that the richest dandies of Jefferson's day couldn't have imagined owning.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 38.

When two unmarried, unrelated adults live together in a single household, each one of them (along with any of his or her children) is treated as a separate family. If one of the adults has income below the relevant poverty threshold, that person and any of his or her children will be counted as poor, even when the household income that supports them is far above the poverty level. As unbelievable as it may be, about 1 percent of the people counted as poor in the official poverty measure live in households in the top income quintile, which means a household with before-tax income greater than \$157,328 can include people who are classified as poor.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 42.

Our success in virtually banishing poverty is an important victory and a tribute both to the power of our economic system to generate the world's largest national income and to the trillions of dollars in taxpayer support for low-income households. Yet the official statistics obscure these triumphs because federal statistical agencies continue to undercount transfer payments to low-income Americans and, in the process, overstate the poverty rate.

IN THE U.S., INCOME DISPARITIES ARE NOT A SOURCE OF MAJOR CONCERN

1. CONSUMPTION MEASURES ARE MORE MEANINGFUL THAN INCOME MEASURES.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 39.

Consumption is a more direct measure of well-being, and it usually varies less than income over time. Because the majority of people who fall below the poverty thresholds do so for relatively short periods, their consumption does not show the same drop as their income because they draw on savings, borrow, or consume the stored value of assets like owned homes and automobiles until their economic situation improves. Consumption also captures a more complete view of available resources because it is not distorted by arbitrary definitions of what is counted as income.

Stephen Rose, (Prof., Economics, George Washington U.), *UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY*, 2021, 22.

Many economists and sociologists believe that multiyear incomes (sometimes referred to as permanent income) are a much more accurate indicator of people's standard of living. Changes in consumption are less volatile than changes in income because people can go into debt when they have a temporary decline in income or they can save more when their incomes are above their permanent level. If continued lower or higher incomes tend to persist, then the sense of permanent income will change. Using the Survey of Consumer Expenditures, Meyer and Sullivan claim that poverty rates are much lower than official rates based on levels of consumption for low-income individuals. They argue that consumption is a better indicator of permanent income than reported monetary income in a specific year.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 19.

The resources available to American households are not determined only by the \$13.0 trillion of income they earn producing value with their labor and with the investment of the fruits of their thrift. The total resources available for consumption are also determined by the \$2.8 trillion of government transfer payments received, \$0.2 trillion of private transfer payments, and the \$4.4 trillion of taxes paid. After receiving transfer payments and paying taxes, American households in 2017 had \$11.7 trillion of available income, one-fourth of which had been redistributed through taxes and transfer payments.

2. CONSUMPTION MEASURES SHOW THAT INEQUALITY HAS NOT INCREASED IN AMERICA.

Diana Furchtgott-Roth, Diana, (Prof., Economics, George Washington U.), *UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY*, 2021, 3.

The prevalent use of wages and capital gains as a standard compound measure has tended to overlook their flaws as a proxy for well-being. Individuals and households can call on government transfers, savings, and physical assets to smooth out consumption through spells of unemployment, as many did during the global pandemic, making comparisons across income groups complicated.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 2.

The final clue that the official numbers do not reflect reality is that while highly publicized numbers from the Bureau of the Census on household income inequality show that in 2017 the bottom 20 percent of households had an average income of \$13,258, other, less publicized data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that these same households spent \$26,091 on consumption—two times more than their income. Households in the second 20 percent income group spent 11.0 percent more than their Census income.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 2.

The bottom quintile can consume more than twice its Census income only because the Census does not count two-thirds of transfer payments as income for those who receive them. The Census report that the top 20 percent of households averaged 16.7 times as much income as the bottom 20 percent can be reconciled with the BLS report that they only consumed 4.5 times as much only by adding the value of transfer payments received to the income of the bottom 20 percent and subtracting the taxes paid by the top 20 percent.

Stephen Rose, (Prof., Economics, George Washington U.), UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY, 2021, 30.

Because consumption is so high among low-income households, Meyer has reported that consumption poverty is very low: his last press release said that it was just 3 percent. In terms of inequality, Meyer and Sullivan report a 7 percent rise in the 90/10 ratio of consumer expenditures from 1961 to 2014 and a 29 percent rise in the 90/10 ratio of post-tax and post-transfer incomes over these years.

3. INCOME HAS INCREASED FOR ALL GROUPS, INCLUDING THE POOREST AMERICANS.

James Elwell, (Economist, Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation), UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY, 2021, 107.

When taxes and in-kind transfers (but not Medicare, Medicaid, or ESI) are included, income growth in the bottom quintile increases to 188.1 percent—an increase greater than that found in all other quintiles and the top 5 percent. The growth rate rises to 246.8 percent when we add the market values of Medicare, Medicaid, and ESI, far greater than the increases found in all the other quintiles as well as in the top 5 percent.

4. WHEN ALL FEDERAL POVERTY PROGRAMS ARE CONSIDERED, INEQUALITY HAS DECREASED.

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

Income inequality is lower today than it was three-quarters of a century ago. The facts reveal a very different and better America than the one currently described in debates across much of the political spectrum.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 4.

When you include all transfer payments and taxes and look at changes in income inequality over time, you find that income inequality is not rising. It has in fact fallen by 3.0 percent since 1947 as compared to the 22.9 percent increase shown in the Census measure.

Abigail Romero, (Staff, Harvard Crimson), FORMER SENATOR PHIL GRAMM, LAWRENCE SUMMERS DISCUSS AMERICAN INEQUALITY IN HKS TALK, Apr. 6, 2023. Retrieved Apr. 7, 2023 from <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2023/4/6/gramm-summers-hks/>

[Former Senator Phil] Gramm's recent research found that "if you count all transfer payments and taxes," the poverty rate is 2.5 percent. "Actually, income inequality is lower today, very slightly lower than what it was in 1947," he said.

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

The Census Bureau does not count two-thirds of government subsidies to households (called transfer payments) as income or any taxes taken as reductions to income, so it overstates both income inequality and poverty. Counting all subsidies and taxes shows that income inequality is far less than claimed and continuing to fall.

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

By not counting two-thirds of all transfer payments as income to the recipients of the transfers and not counting taxes paid as income lost to taxpayers, government statistics dramatically overstate income inequality.

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

Official statistics on economic well-being distort the dialogue on public policy because they do not count more than two-thirds of the transfer payments that the government gives to low-income households; do not reduce the income that the government takes as taxes, which average 35 percent of income for the top quintile; and adjust for inflation using price indexes that are not the most accurate. As a result, official statistics overstate income inequality by a factor of four and claim that inequality has been rising when it has actually been falling for the past 70 years. Similarly, official poverty counts are 10 times larger than the actual number.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 3-4.

In this book we will show that when all transfer payments, not counting government's administrative costs in making the transfers, are counted as income of the recipients of those payments and when all taxes paid are counted as income lost to the taxpayers, the measurement of income inequality in America is profoundly altered. Accounting for all transfer payments and taxes yields a measure of income inequality that is only one-fourth as large as the official Census measure. Whatever your value judgments are about the desirable amount of income redistribution in a free society, it is much harder to argue that the distribution of income is unfair when the ratio of the income for the top 20 percent of households to the bottom 20 percent is 4.0 to 1 rather than the 16.7 to 1 ratio found in the official Census numbers.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 30.

The Census publications for 2017 show a ratio of the average income for the top quintile to the average for the bottom quintile as 16.7 to 1. That is more than four times larger than the 4.0 ratio that exists when all earnings, transfers, and taxes are counted.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 34.

It is perfectly legitimate to debate how much income redistribution is appropriate in a free society. Those debates have a long and rich history, but it is much harder to argue that the top quintile of households gets too much and the bottom quintile gets too little when the top gets 4.0 times as much rather than the official Census measure of 16.7 times as much. When household income is adjusted for household size, it becomes even more difficult to claim that Americans suffer from "obscene" income inequality. In fact, a real question can be raised as to the fairness of current income redistribution policies that, after adjusting for household size, provide the average bottom-quintile household with about as many resources as the second and middle quintiles, even though prime work-age persons in the bottom quintile are less than half as likely to work and work only about half as many hours when they do work.

5. THE AMERICAN MIDDLE CLASS IS DOING WELL.

James Elwell, (Economist, Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation), *UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY*, 2021, 91.

As we broaden our income definition to the disposable size-adjusted household income (including both cash and some in-kind transfers) of persons—the measure of income most commonly used in the survey data-based literature—middle class Americans have made peak-to-peak gains over all completed business cycles since 1959, including the 2000-2007 business cycle. In 2016, this disposable income measure finally returned to its peak year 2007, pre-Great Recession high at the start of the current, ongoing business cycle.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), *THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY*, 2022, 31.

The bottom quintile's average net income after transfers and taxes is \$49,613, clearly within the range of what is generally considered the earned income of middle-income America, \$46,656 to \$87,171. Government takes and redistributes enough resources to elevate the average bottom-quintile household into the American middle class.

Stephen Rose, (Prof., Economics, George Washington U.), UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY, 2021, 32-33.

Measuring inequality is difficult, but the findings of four studies show that real median incomes have grown from 30 percent to 51 percent since 1979. Many people think that middle-class incomes have stagnated even though their evaluation of their own condition is positive. Instead the press is biased against good news (it is not interesting), and both the left and the right have reasons to proclaim that people are doing badly. This study shows that the best estimates of changes between 1979 and 2014 are that real median income grew by 42 percent, that the share of growth going to the top 10 percent over these years was 45 percent, and that the share of the top 1 percent grew by 3.5 percentage points.

6. INCOME DISPARITIES ARE NOT A CONCERN FOR MOST AMERICANS.

Eamonn Butler, (Dir., Adam Smith Institute), ECONOMIC INEQUALITY, 2022, p. 94.

There is little indication that the public share the academics' ideal of an equal, uniform, uncompetitive society. Rather, they seem to prefer a diverse society in which they can aspire to rise up.

Edwards, Chris & Ryan Bourne, (Analysts, Cato Institute), EXPLORING WEALTH INEQUALITY, Nov. 5, 2019. Retrieved Aug. 18, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/exploring-wealth-inequality>

Two percent or less of the public say "the gap between rich and poor" is the "most important issue" facing the country. Even those who express concern disagree about what to do about it.

Karlyn Bowman & Eleanor O'Neil, (Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute/Former Dir., Congressional Budget Office), UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY, 2021, 250.

While polling evidence clearly indicates that Americans believe inequality is a big or moderately big problem and that it is growing, the issue is rarely mentioned spontaneously as a top or even middling level problem facing the country. In Gallup's 2019 monthly surveys between January and August, when people were asked to name the most important problem facing the country, dissatisfaction with the government and immigration were generally the top problems. No more than 2 percent mentioned the gap between rich and poor.

7. THE CLAIM THAT WEALTHY AMERICANS ESCAPE TAXATION IS FALSE.

Michael Barone, (Staff, Washington Examiner), LET'S BASE POLICY ON REAL FACTS, NOT MISLEADING STATISTICS, Jan. 5, 2023. Retrieved Jan. 21, 2023 from <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/lets-base-policy-on-real-facts-not-misleading-statistics/>

Second, Census income statistics don't account for taxes people pay. Since the United States has the most progressive national tax system of any advanced economy — because other advanced countries rely heavily on flat rate value-added taxes — the bottom two quintiles of Americans essentially pay no income tax, while the top quintile provides 83 percent of federal income tax revenue.

Gerald Auten & David Splinter, (Sr. Economist, U.S. Treasury Dept./Economist, Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation), UNITED STATES INCOME, WEALTH, CONSUMPTION, AND INEQUALITY, 2021, 130.

Individual income taxes paid by the top 1 percent have increased despite top federal individual tax rates falling from 91 percent to 39.6 percent. In 1962, only about 1 in 1,000 of the top 1 percent paid the top tax rate, as it only applied to extremely high incomes. But, in 2014, the majority paid the top rate.

John Early, (Former Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics & Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INCOME INEQUALITY, Sept. 20, 2022. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/study/myth-american-income-inequality>

Finally, the official income numbers make no adjustment for the loss of income to taxes. In the bottom quintile, only 7 percent of household income is lost to taxes, but in the top quintile, 35 percent, or five times as much, is lost. After transfers and taxes, the top quintile receives only 4 times as much income as the bottom, only one-quarter as much inequality as the 16.7 ratio for the incomplete official Census measure.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 3.

Americans pay \$4.4 trillion a year in federal, state, and local taxes, 82 percent of which are paid by the top 40 percent of household earners. Even though most households never see this money, because it is withheld from their paychecks, the Census Bureau does not reduce household income by the amount of taxes paid when it measures income inequality. The net result is that in total the Census Bureau chooses not to count the impact of more than 40 percent of all income, which is gained in transfer payments or lost in taxes.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 15.

Households in the top fifth of income earners lose 35.2 percent of their pretax income to taxes of all kinds; those in the bottom fifth of earners lose only 7.5 percent. Therefore, any claim about income inequality that does not adjust for these vast differences in taxes paid is extremely misleading,

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 25-26.

The top quintile on average paid \$80,828 of federal taxes, more than eighty-three times as much as the bottom quintile. The federal personal income tax was the largest tax payment, with top-quintile households paying an average of \$54,006, while the bottom two quintiles paid no federal income tax at all, in part because the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Child Tax Credit offset any income taxes that they would have otherwise owed.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 28.

State and local personal income taxes were very progressive, with the average household in the top income quintile paying 1,345 times as much as the average household in the bottom quintile, but they were still less progressive than the federal personal income tax, which, on average, collected no taxes from households in the two lowest quintiles. The top quintile paid a smaller share of state and local income taxes than its share of the federal tax, but it still paid 72 percent of the total.

Phil Gramm, et al. (Former Prof., Economics, Texas A&M U.; Former U.S. Senator, Current Sr. Fellow, American Enterprise Institute), THE MYTH OF AMERICAN INEQUALITY, 2022, 28.

In total, the top quintile paid some 61 percent of all federal, state, and local taxes as compared to 20 percent paid by the fourth quintile, 11 percent paid by the middle quintile, 5 percent paid by the second quintile, and 2 percent paid by the bottom quintile.

THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT (EITC) OFFERS THE SUPERIOR MEANS FOR ADDRESSING INCOME INEQUALITY

1. THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT IS NOW THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS LARGEST ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAM – BY FAR.

Christopher Ellis, (Prof., Political Science, Bucknell U.), OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN: PUBLIC OPINION TOWARD SOCIAL TAX EXPENDITURES, 2021, 1. 86.

Owing to these differential changes, the EITC overtook TANF/AFDC as the federal government's primary way of providing cash assistance to low-income families in 1993. The federal government now spends three times as much money on the EITC as it does on "conventional" welfare programs.

2. THE EITC ENJOYS BIPARTISAN SUPPORT IN CONGRESS.

Hillary Escajeda, (JD, U. of Denver College of Law), WAKE FOREST JOURNAL OF LAW & POLICY, 2020, 180.

Since 1975, the EITC "has become one of the pillars of American transfer policy." In 2017, twenty-seven million workers and families claimed the EITC. Reflecting bipartisan support, former Speaker of the House Paul Ryan, "called the EITC 'one of the federal government's most effective anti-poverty programs'" and advocated for EITC expansion. Similarly, a U.S. Census report found that the EITC lifted nine point two million workers out of poverty in 2015.

3. THE EITC OFFERS THE SUPERIOR WAY TO FIGHT POVERTY.

Leah Hamilton, (Prof., Social Work, Appalachian State U.), WELFARE DOESN'T WORK: THE PROMISES OF BASIC INCOME FOR A FAILED AMERICAN SAFETY NET, 2020, 127-128.

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a refundable credit for low- and moderate-income households and has now eclipsed TANF as the primary anti-poverty program in the United States, comprising \$77 billion of the annual federal budget and lifting 8.9 million Americans out of poverty in 2016. Similar to basic income, the EITC is associated with improved health and educational outcomes and does not carry the same employment disincentives as income-restricted programs like TANF, SNAP, and SSI.

William Franko & Christopher Witko, (Prof., Political Science, West Virginia U./Prof., Political Science, Penn State U.), THE NEW ECONOMIC POPULISM: HOW STATES RESPOND TO ECONOMIC INEQUALITY, 2018, 160.

The earned income tax credit is an effective policy that has been implemented by both the federal and state governments. It has been shown to reduce poverty, curtail income inequality, and boost overall levels of employment.

4. EITC ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS ARE VERY LOW.

Robert Greenstein et. al. (Analysts, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), REDUCING OVERPAYMENTS IN THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT, Jan. 31, 2019. Retrieved Sept. 15, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-tax/reducing-overpayments-in-the-earned-income-tax-credit>

As the IRS has noted to the Treasury Department's Inspector General for Tax Administration, EITC administrative costs are very low, at less than 1 percent of the benefits provided.

THE CLAIM THAT AI WORSENS UNEMPLOYMENT IS FALSE

1. AI CREATES MORE JOBS THAN IT DESTROYS.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 109-110.

Machines have created altogether new jobs, and even entire industries, by allowing people to create things that were completely impossible to produce prior to automation. For example, CT Scan Operators and Microchip Assemblers have positions that simply would not have existed without technology. New jobs are being created that couldn't have even been imagined some years ago, and technology will continue to create new fields that we still can't imagine.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 109.

Jobs are meanwhile being created in the manufacturing, servicing and maintenance of machines. As economist Johan Norberg, author of *Progress: Ten Reasons to Look Forward to the Future*, put it, "the more machines we have the more people we need to develop them, to manage, and monitor them. It sounds like an unmanned drone is really unmanned, but not really. The US Airforce has concluded that a small MQ1 drone requires a ground crew of 168 personnel. A big surveillance drone relies on 300 people to operate it.

Annette Bernhardt, (Dir., Project on Low-Wage Work, U. California at Berkeley), *WORK, INEQUALITY & BASIC INCOME*, 2017, 37.

Technological change within one industry can also open up opportunities in another. For example, meal delivery apps are disrupting the food supply chain by delivering prepared meals and meal kits directly to consumers. But beneath the high-tech gloss lies surprisingly traditional work structures: scores of workers in large food processing facilities, many of them direct employees.

2. AI FREES PEOPLE TO MOVE TO BETTER JOBS.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 111.

Technology is a win-win. When workers are displaced by it, it makes them available to find more productive or specialised work that machines can't do yet. The public is better served because people are now doing things that only people can do, whereas machines are taking up the work that people are no longer necessary to do. Our time is being freed up. In fact, the only reason why most people even have the time and money to enjoy art, culture, science, even a book like this, is because mechanisation has freed up our time.

Cynthia Estlund, (Prof., Law, NYU School of Law), *AUTOMATION ANXIETY: WHY AND HOW TO SAVE WORK*, 2021. 12.

Futurists of the past have predicted that mass automation will usher in an era of human liberation from toil, or that it will immiserate all but the fortunate few who own or create the machines. Time and again, however, the economy has defied such predictions. For centuries, automation has been destroying some jobs while creating other jobs—usually better paid and less grueling—and driving economic growth and prosperity.

Cynthia Estlund, (Prof., Law, NYU School of Law), *AUTOMATION ANXIETY: WHY AND HOW TO SAVE WORK*, 2021. 23.

How is it that, after the introduction of ATMs in the 1970s, bank teller employment held steady in the next few decades? "[W]hat are all of these tellers doing?" It seems that, as tellers were liberated from counting and accounting for deposits and withdrawals, many were redeployed "as salespersons, forging relationships with customers and introducing them to additional bank services like credit cards, loans, and investment products."

3. PAST PREDICTIONS OF AUTOMATION DESTROYING JOBS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN SHOWN TO BE FALSE.

Cynthia Estlund, (Prof., Law, NYU School of Law), *AUTOMATION ANXIETY: WHY AND HOW TO SAVE WORK*, 2021. 31.

Predictions of technological unemployment have recurred since the onset of the Industrial Revolution. But the recurring reality was one of economic growth through creative destruction. Yes, machines destroyed lots of jobs, often with devastating effects on displaced workers for whom new jobs were often too late or out of reach. Over time, however, job destruction freed up labor and capital that went into new and usually better jobs and higher incomes. That is because technology both substitutes for labor—in particular, less-skilled labor—and complements labor, or makes it more productive, thus generating new demand for labor.

Dian Coyle, (Prof., U. of Manchester), *WORK, INEQUALITY & BASIC INCOME*, 2017, 61.

Rogers is correct to emphasize that fears about the end of work have proven to be overstated. In both of those recent episodes, machines did kill some jobs, but created more as the economy grew and new occupations emerged. The arrival of automatic teller machines, James Bessen points out in his book *Learning by Doing*, led to an increase, rather than a decrease, in the number of jobs for humans. Demand for banking services increased, and people carried out tasks other than mechanically handing cash to customers.

Robert Wright & Aleksandra Przegalinska, (American Institute for Economic Research), *DEBATING UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: PROS, CONS, AND ALTERNATIVES*, 2022, 48.

If AI-based systems ever do manage to take many jobs, they will probably create just as many jobs suitable for bipedal carbon-based entities. Like machines and overseas workers in the past, they will simply free people to do other, more productive work. Technological improvements always have, and always will, enable people to do other, better work.

4. THE U.S. ECONOMY IS PERFECTLY CAPABLE OF ADAPTING TO AI.

Dian Coyle, (Prof., U. of Manchester), *WORK, INEQUALITY & BASIC INCOME*, 2017, 64-65.

A basic income is an answer to the wrong question. It addresses a hypothetical future problem of no jobs in place of jobs of the kind many people still do—such as driving trucks, or nursing patients. Market economies can always adjust to create new kinds of work. We have very few horse-and-carriage drivers or dock hands these days, and many social media consultants and special effects designers for video games. If the robots take over those jobs in turn, humans will define other activities as work, impossible to foresee now. This is the kind of transition that has been occurring for a quarter of a millennium now, and it will occur again.

5. AI IS BRINGING JOBS BACK TO THE U.S.

Mark McCarthy, (Prof., Communication & Technology, Georgetown U.), *THE HILL*, Feb. 9, 2017. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/economy-budget/318775-yes-theres-a-job-creation-argument-for-automation-and>.

The opportunity of automation is enormous. Consider that, as autonomous vehicles become the primary means of transportation, accidents will decline by 90 percent, saving lives and billions of dollars. Furthermore, automation will actually return jobs to the United States. One-quarter of the decline in U.S. manufacturing jobs is due to competition from China, driven largely by lower labor costs. But this offshoring is a station on the way to the new globally-competitive automated U.S. factories that are creating good paying jobs for skilled workers.

6. AI IS CREATING NEW JOBS IN THE SERVICE SECTOR.

Rick Watzman, (Staff), FORTUNE, Jan. 15, 2016. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <http://fortune.com/2016/01/15/new-jobs-technology/>.

[Senior Fellow at the Economic Strategy Institute, Robert] Cohen not only sees the glass as half full; he sees it brimming over, thanks to three major trends: First, more and more companies, including many old-line manufacturers, are moving to offer services — sometimes pushed there by upstart rivals. Second, there is a need for new networks to handle sensor data from driverless cars and wearable devices. Third, the increasingly rapid development and deployment of software and applications is feeding a surge of data analytics. With this in mind, Cohen says, “cloud computing, Big Data, and the Internet of Things will employ millions of people in new types of jobs.” More precisely, Cohen figures that as a new “virtualized infrastructure” gets built out over the next 15 years, as many as 25 million jobs will be created. He acknowledges that automation is certain to wipe out a bunch of positions, but he estimates that the net gain will still be around 15 million.

7. AI JOBS PAY WELL.

Nik Popli, (Staff, Time Magazine), THE AI JOB THAT PAYS UP TO \$335K – AND YOU DON’T NEED A COMPUTER ENGINEERING BACKGROUND, Apr. 14, 2023. Retrieved May 28, 2023 from <https://time.com/6272103/ai-prompt-engineer-job/>

A new kind of AI job is emerging—and it pays six-figure salaries and doesn’t require a degree in computer engineering, or even advanced coding skills. With the rise in generative artificial intelligence, a host of companies are now looking to hire “prompt engineers” who are tasked with training the emerging crop of AI tools to deliver more accurate and relevant responses to the questions real people are likely to pose.

8. IF AI IS DESTROYING JOBS, WHY IS UNEMPLOYMENT AT RECORD LOWS?

Casey Quinlan, (Staff, (Tennessee Lookout), STATES SEE RECORD LW UNEMPLOYMENT ACROSS THE U.S., May 30, 2023. Retrieved Sept. 15, 2023 from <https://tennesseelookout.com/2023/05/30/states-see-record-low-unemployment-across-the-us/>

Across much of the country, the jobs market is as strong as it’s ever been, and Black women, young people and people with disabilities are among the workers benefiting, recent U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data show. Twenty states reported an unemployment rate under 3% in April, while 15 states saw record lows, led by South Dakota at 1.9%, followed by Nebraska at 2%, and New Hampshire and North Dakota at 2.1%. The national rate was 3.4%. Other states that saw their unemployment rates reach levels not seen since the BLS began recording them in 1976, include Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Maine, Montana, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, according to BLS data released on Friday.

Brishen Rogers, (Prof., Law, Temple U. Beasley School of Law), COMPARATIVE LABOR LAW AND POLICY JOURNAL, Winter 2019, 208.

As Carl Sagan once put it, "Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence." If we're going to reorient social policy because robots or artificial intelligence are about to take millions of jobs, we ought to be very sure that the threat is real and severe. There is no evidence that it is.

9. EVEN IF UBI ADVOCATES ARE RIGHT, AND UNEMPLOYMENT WILL SPIKE IN THE FUTURE, WE SHOULD AT LEAST WAIT TO SEE IF THAT ACTUALLY HAPPENS.

Megan McArdle, (Staff, Bloomberg News), BLOOMBERG VIEW, June 6, 2016. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2016-06-06/universal-basic-income-is-ahead-of-its-time-to-say-the-least>.

The idea is that automation will make human labor so worthless, and make humanity so fantastically wealthy, that we practically won't notice if we siphon a considerable amount of that money into a benefit that will, effectively, allow people to be permanently unemployed without starving to death. I'm skeptical of this story for a number of reasons – starting with the fact that “the machines are about to put us all out of work” has been a staple of science fiction for a century without coming noticeably closer to science reality. This time may be different, of course; even the boy who cried wolf eventually did come across a predator. But even if this story eventually comes true, it isn't true now – and until it is true, there's no real reason for voters to want to shuck their current welfare state for one that is either much more expensive or cuts benefits for current beneficiaries, while throwing in some possibly strong disincentives for lower-skilled people to hold jobs. After all, the government is pretty good at mailing checks. In the event that a majority of the population is thrown out of work by robots, a UBI can be set up in a trice. The UBI advocates, in other words, have provided neither a realistic fiscal plan for their policy, nor any urgently compelling reason for us to pursue it. It's possible that the UBI is the policy of the future. But if so, that future is probably still quite a ways off.

Robert Wright & Aleksandra Przegalinska, (American Institute for Econ. Res.), DEBATING UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: PROS, CONS, AND ALTERNATIVES, 2022, 48.

Maybe someday an AI-enabled robot will stroll or roll into your workplace and take your job. But it won't be today. Or tomorrow. Or any time soon. According to an editorial in Skynet Today, AI remains very narrow in scope. While half of all jobs may entail tasks that can be automated at some point, fewer than 5% of jobs will be fully automated by 2030.

Brishen Rogers, (Prof., Law, Temple U. Beasley School of Law), COMPARATIVE LABOR LAW AND POLICY JOURNAL, Winter 2019, 217.

To summarize, a UBI is neither necessary nor sufficient to empower workers. Not necessary because widespread technological unemployment is not on the horizon, and not sufficient because it would do relatively little for them in any event. U.S. workers are under threat, not from technology, nor from the obsolescence of worker protections, but rather from a long-running effort to end those protections.

Andrew Thompson, (CEO, *Proteus Digital Health*), WHY DIGITAL TECH WILL CREATE MORE JOBS THAN IT DESTROYS, Apr. 28, 2017. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from <http://techonomy.com/2017/04/why-digital-tech-will-create-more-jobs-than-it-destroys/>.

Many worry that new digital tools, robots and artificial intelligence are going to replace entry-level and middle class jobs. A common view is that we are going to become a society of a few rich programmers and a vast number of incapable meth heads who have no chance of getting meaningful employment (unless you include burger flipping). I appreciate the concern these people have for the fate of their fellow human beings. But I think they are just about 100% wrong. These new technologies do represent a step change in the capabilities of machines. But just as the new utility of the 20th century – electricity – created vastly more jobs than it destroyed, the new utility of the 21st century – the mobile internet – will also create more jobs than it replaces.

A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WILL NOT SOLVE INCOME INEQUALITY PROBLEMS

1. CONSERVATIVES IN CONGRESS WOULD USE THE UBI AS JUSTIFICATION FOR CUTTING WELFARE PROGRAMS.

Algernon Austin, (Sr. Researcher, Thurgood Marshall Institute), *LAW & INEQUALITY*, Summer 2021, 289.

Conservatives support a UBI precisely because they see it as a means to eliminate safety net programs. For example, in 2006 the conservative Charles Murray argued for eliminating all welfare transfer programs – including Social Security and Medicare – for an annual grant of \$ 10,000. Adjusting that amount for inflation would make it about \$ 12,700 in 2020. The average Social Security benefit in 2020 was worth \$ 18,000-\$ 5,300 more. For some people, before retiring, Murray's UBI would add to their income, but once they retire it would significantly reduce their income. The medical bills covered by Medicare can easily be worth much more than \$ 12,700. In retirement, Murray's UBI would dramatically increase poverty and extreme economic hardship among the elderly.

Jacob Nava, (J.D. Candidate), *GEORGETOWN IMMIGRATION LAW JOURNAL*, Fall 2022, 146.

While UBI could either replace or complement social programs, funding restraints would likely lead to UBI program like Yang's \$1,000 a month proposal replacing many current social programs. This leads to the question of whether the economic benefits of UBI are greater than the economic benefits of the social welfare programs it is replacing.

2. A UBI WOULD TRANSFER MONEY TO THE RICH.

Matthew Bruckner, (Prof., Law, Howard U. School of Law), *AMERICAN BANKER INSTITUTE LAW REVIEW*, Summer 2021, 188.

Even if a BIG [basic income grant] were financially feasible, some contend a BIG would effectively redistribute income upwards, at least from the status quo. In other words, if we dismantled the current social safety net and gave everyone an equal payment, we would move from a somewhat progressive tax and transfer system to an egalitarian one – but that means moving money from those at the bottom to those at the top.

3. A UBI WOULD NOT BENEFIT WOMEN.

Patrick Diamond, (Visiting Fellow, Kellogg College), *WORK, INEQUALITY & BASIC INCOME*, 2017, 32.

A basic income could increase unemployment among vulnerable constituencies, exposing them to even greater precariousness. Research by Evelyn Forget in Canada and the United States in the 1970s showed that guaranteed income schemes reduced the working hours of "secondary earners," usually women, who were then more dependent on the principle breadwinner in the household. Feminist critics fear that basic income would lead to greater numbers of women dropping out of the labor market, or significantly reducing their working hours. Women would end up doing more unpaid domestic labor relative to men, making the household division of labor even more unequal.

4. EMPLOYERS WOULD USE THE UBI AS A JUSTIFICATION FOR CUTTING WAGES.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 30.

Another might be that employers will see that people do not need the wage they are getting to live on any more, thanks to their basic income, and slash wages. This is tantamount to the government subsidizing private companies, shoveling money from the public purse into corporate profits.

5. THE UBI CREATES FUNDING TRADEOFFS THAT WOULD HURT THE POOR.

Patrick Diamond, (Visiting Fellow, Kellogg College), *WORK, INEQUALITY & BASIC INCOME*, 2017, 33.

A basic income could have a detrimental impact on existing social policy. The cost of basic income would mean that credible and evidence-based reforms of the welfare state and the labor market might become unaffordable. Most benefits and subsidies already in place would have to be renegotiated. Neoliberal advocates of basic income celebrate the idea because, in the words of Charles Murray, it would be a "replacement for the welfare state." Market liberals argue individuals could use their basic income to purchase services currently provided through the state: education, pensions, healthcare, unemployment insurance, childcare, and so on. Thus perversely (and contrary to the intentions of many of its advocates on the left), basic income might end up encouraging the marketization of the public sector, while limiting the funding available for social investment.

Cynthia Estlund, (Prof., Law, NYU School of Law), *AUTOMATION ANXIETY: WHY AND HOW TO SAVE WORK*, 2021. 89.

The cost of a full UBI would also foreclose other policy options. In particular, UBI is a rival, not a complement, to the federal job guarantee, and perhaps to any large-scale jobs program. The incompatibility of UBI and a JG goes beyond cost. On the political plane, it is hard to imagine selling the public on the idea of granting and funding unconditional basic income for individuals who could, but chose not to, secure a guaranteed job at a living wage. Indeed, why should the public subsidize individuals' choice to opt out of paid work if that clearly is a choice—if a job is guaranteed at public expense?

Patrick Diamond, (Visiting Fellow, Kellogg College), *WORK, INEQUALITY & BASIC INCOME*, 2017, 31.

In a climate of austerity marked by declining real wages, a basic income could well entail higher taxes on average incomes. Raising taxes is never politically popular, but to add insult to injury, these taxes would be used to fund a proposal that contradicted many citizens' notion of what is fair, flipping the concepts of contribution and reciprocity on their head. This is even more likely in countries such as the United States and the UK where there is a higher level of diversity and less sympathy for a universal social safety net.

Robert Greenstein, (President, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME MAY SOUND ATTRACTIVE BUT, IF IT OCCURRED, WOULD LIKELIER INCREASE POVERTY THAN REDUCE IT*, June 13, 2019. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it>

Where would the money to finance such a large expenditure come from? That it would come mainly or entirely from new taxes isn't plausible. We'll already need substantial new revenues in the coming decades to help keep Social Security and Medicare solvent and avoid large benefit cuts in them. We'll need further tax increases to help repair a crumbling infrastructure that will otherwise impede economic growth. And if we want to create more opportunity and reduce racial and other barriers and inequities, we'll also need to raise new revenues to invest more in areas like pre-school education, child care, college affordability, and revitalizing segregated inner-city communities.

THE UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WOULD BE RUINOUSLY EXPENSIVE

1. A UBI WOULD COST 3 TRILLION ANNUALLY.

Peter Goodman, (Staff), NEW YORK TIMES, Dec. 17, 2016. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis.

If every American were to receive just \$10,000 a year, the tab would be roughly \$3 trillion a year, roughly eight times what the United States now spends on social service programs. The government might just as well commit to handing out unicorns.

Judith Shulevitz, (Staff), NEW YORK TIMES, Jan. 10, 2016, SR-1.

A truly universal guaranteed minimum income would be expensive. Say the U.B.I. was \$12,000 a year per citizen over 18, and \$4,000 per child. At that rate, we'd need about \$3 trillion, roughly 80 percent of the total federal budget.

Peter Goodman, (Staff), NEW YORK TIMES, Nov. 15, 2017. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2022 from Nexis.

In the American context, any talk of a truly universal form of basic income also collides with arithmetic. Give every American \$10,000 a year – a sum still below the poverty line for an individual – and the tab runs to \$3 trillion a year. That is about eight times what the United States now spends on social service programs. Conversation over.

2. A UBI WOULD REQUIRE A DOUBLING OF U.S. TAX REVENUES.

Algernon Austin, (Sr. Researcher, Thurgood Marshall Institute), LAW & INEQUALITY, Summer 2021, 290.

The public policy professors Hilary W. Hoynes and Jesse Rothstein calculate that Yang's \$1,000-per-month UBI proposal would require doubling federal tax revenue to pay for it. Of course, if we wished the UBI to meet the higher family-budget standard, it would be much, much more costly. Since a UBI is universal, most of this increased federal expenditure would go to non-poor, non-jobless households while possibly putting at risk safety net programs for the needy.

Annie Lowery, (Contributing Editor, The Atlantic), GIVE PEOPLE MONEY: HOW A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WOULD END POVERTY, REVOLUTIONIZE WORK, AND REMAKE THE WORLD, 2018, 185.

The expense is one obvious downside, so let's start there. Providing a \$1,000-a-month UBI to every American citizen would mean spending something like an additional \$3.9 trillion a year. That is equivalent to a fifth of the American economy—and equal to every penny the federal government currently spends, on everything from building bridges to fighting wars to caring for the elderly to prosecuting crimes to protecting wetlands. If politicians were to fully finance that expansion of benefits through the tax code as it is structured now, it would mean steep income-tax increases not just on the wealthiest Americans but on middle-income Americans too. The top 1 percent of earners pay about 40 percent of all income taxes, which comes out to about \$540 billion a year. You could tax away every penny they earned, and it would still not come close to paying for a full-fat UBI, in other words. "Nothing in the history of this country suggests Americans are ready to add that kind of burden to their current taxes," the columnist Eduardo Porter has argued in the New York Times, in one of many such pieces questioning the policy on the grounds of its cost.

3. FUNDING EVEN A PARTIAL UBI IS PROBLEMATIC.

Eduardo Porter, (Staff), THE NEW YORK TIMES, June 1, 2016, B1.

Its first hurdle is arithmetic. As Robert Greenstein of the left-leaning Center on Budget and Policy Priorities put it, a check of \$10,000 to each of 300 million Americans would cost more than \$3 trillion a year. Where would that money come from? It amounts to nearly all the tax revenue collected by the federal government. Nothing in the history of this country suggests Americans are ready to add that kind of burden to their current taxes. Cut it by half to \$5,000? That wouldn't even clear the poverty line. And it would still cost as much as the entire federal budget except for Social Security, Medicare, defense and interest payments.

Cynthia Estlund, (Prof., Law, NYU School of Law), AUTOMATION ANXIETY: WHY AND HOW TO SAVE WORK, 2021. 88-89.

Leading proponents Van Parijs and Vanderborght concede that a full-scale UBI is too costly to be politically feasible in the United States or other rich countries in the near or medium term; they propose instead a partial UBI—below the individual poverty level—that they hope will pave the way eventually for a full UBI. That creates a dilemma. As one UBI critic argues, "to deliver the benefits its supporters hold out for it, the income must be substantial," and probably "too great for a society like ours to afford"; yet a more feasible partial UBI "would deliver few of the promised benefits yet still cost enough to present a serious hurdle."

4. THE UBI PREMISE THAT AI WILL MAKE JOBS DISAPPEAR CREATES A FURTHER FUNDING PROBLEM – FEWER PEOPLE ARE EMPLOYED, SO THE TAX BURDEN WILL FALL ON THE REMAINING WORKERS.

Peter Nelson, (Australian Economist & Accountant), UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AND THE THREAT TO DEMOCRACY AS WE KNOW IT?, 2018, 53.

The future UBI funding problem, as easily recognized, is that these figures are based on a current unemployment rate of about 10 percent; so, as jobs disappear and can no longer be taxed, the revenues decrease, while at the same time, UBI (as with any social welfare system), if it exists, becomes another expense item.

Robert Greenstein, (President, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME MAY SOUND ATTRACTIVE BUT, IF IT OCCURRED, WOULD LIKELIER INCREASE POVERTY THAN REDUCE IT, June 13, 2019. Retrieved Jan. 27, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it>

A UBI that's financed primarily by tax increases would require the American people to accept a level of taxation that vastly exceeds anything in U.S. history. It's hard to imagine that such a UBI would advance very far, especially given the tax increases we'll already need for Social Security, Medicare, infrastructure, and other needs.

SUGGESTED FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR THE UBI ARE PROBLEMATIC

1. THE VALUE ADDED TAX IS REGRESSIVE.

Oshan Jarow, (Economic Analyst, Medium.com), A NEGATIVE INCOME TAX FOR THE 21ST CENTURY, Oct. 18, 2020. Retrieved May 14, 2023 from <https://oshanjarow.medium.com/a-negative-income-tax-for-the-21st-century-99f6d4e3393b>

Empirical studies are increasingly finding that a VAT is regressive (hits those with lower incomes harder than those with higher incomes), though debate remains as to precisely how regressive.

2. A ROBOT TAX WOULD BE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE.

Roberta Mann, (Prof., Business Law, U. of Oregon School of Law), MCGILL LAW JOURNAL, June 2019, 803.

Lawrence Summers, former Treasury Secretary, former International Monetary Fund Chairman, and former president of Harvard University, wrote that taxing robots is illogical because they are wealth creators. Summers views robots and automation as technological progress, and suggests that "staving off progress is a poor strategy for helping less-fortunate workers." Economist Thomas Straubhaar bluntly assessed the idea of taxing robots, writing that "taxing robots would be shooting oneself in the foot." He argued that taxing robots would slow technological progress and impair the competitiveness of workers, as jobs might not be lost to robots but to foreign competitors making use of robots, thereby harming "the very people [the policy] claims to protect."

3. THE "MODERN MONETARY THEORY" (MMT) OPTION OF JUST PRINTING MONEY CREATES INFLATION.

Cynthia Estlund, (Prof., Law, NYU School of Law), AUTOMATION ANXIETY: WHY AND HOW TO SAVE WORK, 2021. 153.

The point is not that the government can simply print money to pay for programs. Spending is still constrained, but it is constrained by the risk of inflation, not by the availability of revenue. That puts a premium on spending money in ways that support economic growth. In particular, job-creating investments in physical and social infrastructure are seen as effectively self-financing. That is how some proponents of a federal job guarantee respond to the cost question.

4. MODERN MONETARY THEORY RISKS THE U.S. LOSING CONTROL OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL MARKETS TO CHINA.

Peter Nelson, (Australian Economist & Accountant), UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AND THE THREAT TO DEMOCRACY AS WE KNOW IT?, 2018, 56.

Down the road, however, the Treasury must pay back the money it has borrowed with interest. Ultimately, it is difficult to see how such a system can work in perpetuity unless the overall rules are eventually changed. This can always be done if you are the dominant financial country with your currency used as reserve as was achieved when moving from the gold standard, America decided and the rest had to follow. This may not be easy in future, with both China and Russia flexing their international financial muscles. Where the United States runs continuing and mounting deficits, in China, the balance of payment in 2014 recorded a surplus of 257.9 billion U.S. dollars.

THE U.S. BUDGET DEFICIT IS TOO LARGE TO SIMPLY CONTINUE MORE DEFICIT SPENDING

1. FURTHER GROWTH IN THE DEFICIT RISKS FINANCIAL CRISIS.

David Barnhizer & Daniel Barnhizer, (Prof., Law, Emeritus, Cleveland State/Prof. Law, Michigan State U. College of Law), *THE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE CONTAGION: CAN DEMOCRACY WITHSTAND THE IMMINENT TRANSFORMATION OF WORK, WEALTH, AND THE SOCIAL ORDER?*, 2019, 192.

The 2016 CBO Report on budgetary concerns concluded that: "A large and continuously growing federal debt would make a fiscal crisis in the United States more likely. It added, "The potential losses for mutual funds, pension funds, insurance companies, banks, and other holders of government debt might be large enough to cause some financial institutions to fail, creating a fiscal crisis."

David Barnhizer & Daniel Barnhizer, (Prof., Law, Emeritus, Cleveland State/Prof. Law, Michigan State U. College of Law), *THE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE CONTAGION: CAN DEMOCRACY WITHSTAND THE IMMINENT TRANSFORMATION OF WORK, WEALTH, AND THE SOCIAL ORDER?*, 2019, 187.

A 2018 report by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) indicates that the US faces ten straight years of plus-trillion dollar budget deficits between 2018 and 2028. While the current official figure states the National Debt is rapidly edging toward \$22 trillion, the budget situation is much worse than is generally admitted. Former US Comptroller-General David Walker warned in 2015 that an honest level for the national debt was \$65 trillion once you include not only the external indebtedness represented by the Treasury's sales of financial instruments on the public market and to foreign governments but plug in all the deferred and off-the-books "borrowing" from itself the US government has done.

2. THE U.S. ALREADY FACES INTEREST PAYMENTS ON THE NATIONAL DEBT OF ONE TRILLION ANNUALLY.

David Barnhizer & Daniel Barnhizer, (Prof., Law, Emeritus, Cleveland State/Prof. Law, Michigan State U. College of Law), *THE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE CONTAGION: CAN DEMOCRACY WITHSTAND THE IMMINENT TRANSFORMATION OF WORK, WEALTH, AND THE SOCIAL ORDER?*, 2019, 197-198.

The interest payments will increase dramatically as the national debt balance grows by at least 50 percent over the next ten years given the projected annual additions of more than \$1 trillion. The combination of higher interest rates and the rapidly escalating national debt balance means that over the next decade the federal budget will require interest-related annual payouts between \$750 billion and even close to \$1 trillion in yearly interest payments alone toward the end of FY 2028.

Emily Moss, et al., (Research Assistant, The Hamilton Project of the Brookings Institution), *TACKLING THE TAX CODE: EFFICIENT AND EQUITABLE WAYS TO RAISE REVENUE*, Jan. 2020. Retrieved Jan. 21, 2023 from https://www.hamiltonproject.org/assets/files/TaxBookforWeb_12320.pdf

In June, the Congressional Budget Office reported that "large budget deficits over the next 30 years are projected to drive federal debt held by the public to unprecedented levels—from 78 percent of gross domestic product in 2019 to 144 percent by 2049."

THE UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME CREATES AN OPENING FOR AUTHORITARIANISM

1. THE UBI WILL BECOME A TOOL OF POLITICAL MANIPULATION.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 37.

I fear that with the institution of a Universal Basic Income, at election time each party will seek to get elected by increasing the basic income by more than the next. It must be obvious that there is some point at which this just gets ridiculous and the basic income itself becomes untenable, otherwise we would all be millionaires already from government handouts. Unfortunately, the public will not easily be able to judge ahead of time what that breaking point is — especially with perceptions clouded by the promise of more booty!

Peter Nelson, (Australian Economist & Accountant), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AND THE THREAT TO DEMOCRACY AS WE KNOW IT?*, 2018, 2.

As human nature will have it, under a democratic system, supposedly based on one person one vote, people will vote for whoever gives them more, and more, until the economic system would break down unable to afford the UBI payments.

2. THE UBI WILL BE USED AS A WEAPON AGAINST POLITICALLY WEAK GROUPS.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 148.

Now a Basic Income Guarantee may begin universal, but as the years wear on and it proves expensive to grant, corners may be cut to ensure its continuance. Hardly anyone will object to the UBI being withdrawn from criminals, for example. And then perhaps for anti-social behaviour. Petty crimes, like littering the street, might lead people to receive a penalty against their UBI. A few might moan that this is the beginning of a government social-engineering program, but to most people it will seem like a quite a sensible and reasonable measure.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 151.

The Universal Basic Income could easily become the new weapon to wield against those who hold unpopular opinions or those that are simply no longer politically correct. It will be first used to strike against unpopular groups such as racists, misogynists, homophobes and bigots. Not many people will come to their defence when they lose their Basic Income for spreading hate. But one day you yourself may hold an unpopular opinion that is relatively benign.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 152.

Certainly, the poor, who depend solely on their handouts to survive, will quickly become very cautious of what they say and do. But even reasonably affluent people will think twice before risking the money. The UBI institutionalises the state as patron, and citizen as ward. Before long we may arrive in a frightening era where payments and penalties are used to mould us into compliant little drones. The utopian dream will have descended into a tyrannical nightmare.

3. THE UBI CREATES AN OPENING FOR TOTALITARIAN CONTROL.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 152.

Far from creating a futuristic utopia where — once our security needs are met — we are all liberated to pursue our dreams, become great scientists, scholars, artists and entrepreneurs, the universal basic income threatens a totalitarian horror the likes of which we are used to seeing imagined only on *The Twilight Zone* and *The Outer Limits*.

4. THE UBI WOULD INCREASE DEPENDENCE ON GOVERNMENT.

Robert Wright & Aleksandra Przegalinska, (American Institute for Economic Research), *DEBATING UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: PROS, CONS, AND ALTERNATIVES*, 2022, 86.

UBI will not reduce power disparities and may, in fact, increase them by making individuals dependent on governments. "A power over a man's subsistence," Alexander Hamilton understood, "amounts to a power over his will". Imagine, for example, a policymaker revoking the UBI payments of anyone who refuses to take a vaccine, or to vote, or to protest, or to stop protesting.

5. CHINA PROVIDES A CAUTIONARY TALE.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 147-148.

Am I the only one who thinks the power to give (and withhold) a UBI may one day also be used for evil rather than good? If we take a look across to China, where they are instituting a "Social Credit System", we might glean some insight into what may be in store for us around the corner with the application of the UBI.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 148.

Under the Chinese Social Credit System the government judges their citizens behaviour and trustworthiness in order to give them a rating out of 1000 which officials can then improve or dock. If people play their music too loud, don't pay a court bill, owe the government money, or are caught jaywalking, for example, they can lose certain rights such as booking flights or train tickets. The government can have their Internet speed throttled, or exclude them from getting the best jobs. They can be banned from the best hotels. Their children may be refused the best schools. They may be publicly named and shamed as "bad citizens" — or even have their dog taken away. This is literal tyranny. Rule by fear.

Robert Wright & Aleksandra Przegalinska, (American Institute for Economic Research), *DEBATING UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: PROS, CONS, AND ALTERNATIVES*, 2022, 87.

If holding UBI payments hostage sounds unlikely, consider an article published by the pro-UBI Basic Income Today website chiding Republican state governors in the United States for "coddl[ing] vaccine refusers" by extending unemployment insurance to them after being forced out of work by vaccine mandates. Consider, too, China's social credit system, which rewards obedience, and punishes disobedience, to the Chinese Communist Party. What happened in Ottawa in February 2022 suggests a similar system could be introduced anywhere. Obviously, governments may employ oppressive tactics without UBI, but UBI would give them an additional lever by which to cajole people.

Antony Sammeroff, (Journalist), *UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME: FOR AND AGAINST*, 2019, 151-152.

Conservative, Charles Murray, states in *Losing Ground*, his book advocating the UBI, that it would require people to have a "universal passport" and "known bank account." I don't think it's unrealistic to imagine that people may soon be forced to accept a mandatory Government ID Card in order to claim their Basic Income. Before long they will be asked to show it in order to get into government buildings. Then at the airport to get on a plane. Then simply to board a train or a bus. Then to post a package. Then to get into a bar. Then a restaurant. Before long every public place will ask you to show your ID Card. If a policeman asks you to identify yourself you will be expected to produce it, and failure to comply might result in a penalty to your UBI.

CURRENT WELFARE PROGRAMS BEST MEET THE NEEDS OF PERSONS IN POVERTY

1. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS IN CURRENT PROGRAMS ARE ACTUALLY VERY LOW.

Robert Greenstein, (Analyst, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), REDUCING OVERPAYMENTS IN THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT, Jan. 31, 2019. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-tax/reducing-overpayments-in-the-earned-income-tax-credit>

As the IRS has noted to the Treasury Department's Inspector General for Tax Administration, EITC administrative costs are very low, at less than 1 percent of the benefits provided.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Policy Basics: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), June 9, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/the-supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-snap>

About 5 percent of SNAP spending in 2021 went to state administrative costs, including eligibility determinations, employment and training and nutrition education for SNAP households, and anti-fraud activities.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, POLICY BASICS: SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN, Oct. 5, 2022. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/special-supplemental-nutrition-program-for-women-infants-and-children>

The remainder of WIC funds are devoted to the staff and overhead needed to provide nutrition education, breastfeeding support, and other services — a key part of the program's success. WIC's administrative costs have remained at about 6 to 11 percent of total program costs for two decades.

2. CURRENT WELFARE PROGRAMS ARE LIFTING PEOPLE OUT OF POVERTY.

Matt Saenz, (Analyst, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), ECONOMIC SECURITY PROGRAMS REDUCED POVERTY, RACIAL AND ETHNIC INEQUITY, July 1, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/economic-security-programs-reduce-overall-poverty-racial-and-ethnic>

Economic security programs lifted 39 million people above the poverty line in 2017, including nearly 9 million children. Some 83 million people are below the poverty line when government assistance income and taxes are not considered, 44 million when they are. Government benefits and tax policies cut the poverty rate from 25.6 percent to 13.5 percent in 2017, and from 25.5 percent to 13.6 percent among children.

3. POVERTY REDUCTION IS HAPPENING FOR MINORITY GROUPS.

Matt Saenz, (Analyst, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), ECONOMIC SECURITY PROGRAMS REDUCED POVERTY, RACIAL AND ETHNIC INEQUITY, July 1, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/economic-security-programs-reduce-overall-poverty-racial-and-ethnic>

Economic security programs have become increasingly effective at reducing poverty for all major racial and ethnic groups.

Matt Saenz, (Analyst, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities), ECONOMIC SECURITY PROGRAMS REDUCED POVERTY, RACIAL AND ETHNIC INEQUITY, July 1, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/economic-security-programs-reduce-overall-poverty-racial-and-ethnic>

Between 1970 and 2017 the poverty rate fell for all groups, but it fell even more for Black and Latino people: by 27 and 24 percentage points, respectively, compared to 8 percentage points for white non-Latino people, we calculate.

REPARATIONS CREATES MORE PROBLEMS THAN IT SOLVES

1. NO REPARATIONS AMOUNT WOULD SEEM FAIR TO THOSE WRONGED.

Billy Lurken, (News Director for the Mitchell Radio Group), REPARATIONS, May 10, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://mitchellnow.com/news/236632-mels-musings-reparations/>

Reparations aren't practical. They aren't fair to the current generation of Americans. They would never be enough to satisfy those who still feel wronged and cannot possibly go to those who actually suffered from slavery since they are long dead. Reparations are another one of those legislative ideas that look good on paper but are a bad reality. The whole concept should be dropped as too expensive, unworkable and unnecessarily divisive.

2. REPARATIONS WOULD INFLAME RACIAL TENSIONS.

Steven Hayward, (Resident Scholar, Institute of Governmental Studies at UC Berkeley), REPARATION ABOMINATION WOULD PROVE TO BE UNAFFORDABLE AND UNFAIR, Jan. 17, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://nypost.com/2023/01/17/reparation-abomination-would-prove-to-be-unaffordable-and-unfair/>

The reparations program would be unaffordable, unfair and inflame rather than calm race relations. Would second-generation immigrants from Africa qualify? Would second-generation immigrants from anywhere else have to pay? If Stephen Curry, the basketball star with the Golden State Warriors who makes \$48 million, has property within San Francisco, does he qualify?

Peter Schuck, (Prof., Emeritus, Yale Law School), BLACK REPARATIONS: A MISGUIDED MISSILE AIMED AT THE WRONG TARGET, Apr. 28, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://heterodoxacademy.org/blog/black-reparations-a-misguided-missile-aimed-at-the-wrong-target/>

At a time when Americans are more sharply divided and mutually suspicious than any time in recent memory, reparations just for Blacks would surely exacerbate our sociopolitical divisions by stoking intergroup competition over comparative victimhood. Is slavery the greatest injustice in American history? I think so, but I would not expect Native Americans whose ancestors were systematically exterminated by the U.S. Army to readily concede the point.

Peter Schuck, (Prof., Emeritus, Yale Law School), BLACK REPARATIONS: A MISGUIDED MISSILE AIMED AT THE WRONG TARGET, Apr. 28, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://heterodoxacademy.org/blog/black-reparations-a-misguided-missile-aimed-at-the-wrong-target/> To be meaningful, the reparations amount must be substantial — or risk adding insult to injury. Indeed, many Blacks will argue that any amount is inadequate to expiate the crime of slavery, which is true.

Peter Schuck, (Prof., Emeritus, Yale Law School), BLACK REPARATIONS: A MISGUIDED MISSILE AIMED AT THE WRONG TARGET, Apr. 28, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://heterodoxacademy.org/blog/black-reparations-a-misguided-missile-aimed-at-the-wrong-target/>

Reparations are more likely to aggravate Black resentment than to assuage it, making reconciliation even harder. The path to greater equality and the American Dream runs through stronger families, safer communities, better education, and decent jobs for all Americans — not through a government reparations check mailed to an amorphous group.

3. REPARATIONS PROPOSALS RAISE TOO MANY QUESTIONS ABOUT WHO SHOULD PAY AND WHO SHOULD RECEIVE.

Robert McGee, (Prof., Economics, Fayetteville State U.), TWENTY-NINE REASONS WHY PAYING REPARATIONS FOR SLAVERY IS A BAD IDEA, June 23, 2019. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3408860

The vast majority of blacks currently living in the United States are less than 100 percent black. They are mixed. Would someone who is only 60 percent black be entitled to only 60 percent of the reparation amount? Measurement of “blackness” would be a problem, but could be solved by forcing all blacks to take a DNA test, but that would create other problems. Forcing someone to take a DNA test is an invasion of privacy, and a violation of rights. It could also lead to other problems.

Peter Schuck, (Prof., Emeritus, Yale Law School), BLACK REPARATIONS: A MISGUIDED MISSILE AIMED AT THE WRONG TARGET, Apr. 28, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://heterodoxacademy.org/blog/black-reparations-a-misguided-missile-aimed-at-the-wrong-target/>

And who should pay for reparations — descendants of slave owners or all taxpayers? If the latter (most likely as a practical matter), most of the cost would be borne by non-Blacks who had nothing to do with the crime, including descendants of immigrants who weren't even in the U.S. then and many of whom have suffered their own severe mistreatment here. But also perversely, taxpayers would necessarily include Black descendants of slaves unless they can somehow be identified and exempted — yet efforts to do so would raise many of the same definitional problems plus some others.

Doug Bandow, (Sr. Fellow, Cato Institute), SAN FRANCISCO'S REPARATIONS PLAN IS TRUE LUNACY, Jan. 19, 2023. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://www.cato.org/commentary/san-franciscos-reparations-plan-true-lunacy>

What about people descended from the Union soldiers who ended the Confederacy and slavery? Or descendants of immigrants or other oppressed peoples — California's early Chinese population, for instance? This latter category also should include disadvantaged whites, such as the poor from Appalachia or those who grew up in Unionist sections of Southern states and suffered after the withdrawal of northern troops after the Civil War. This is just a start. After all, injustice is ubiquitous, which means there are too many victims to keep track of.

Armstrong Williams, (Contributor, The Hill), SLAVERY REPARATIONS ARE A DIVISIVE WASTE OF TIME, Mar. 1, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/civil-rights/540812-slavery-reparations-are-a-divisive-waste-of-time/>

We must leave this horrendous chapter in the past, where it belongs. What's more, no white person living today ever owned slaves, and not all the Blacks living in the U.S. today are descendants of slaves. The Civil War was fought over the practice of slavery. Thousands died to end this barbaric practice. I think that price tag was high enough.

Billy Lurken, (News Director for the Mitchell Radio Group), REPARATIONS, May 10, 2021. Retrieved May 11, 2023 from <https://mitchellnow.com/news/236632-mels-musings-reparations/>

Slavery certainly was wrong but what can be done about it now? Are you responsible for slavery, a practice that ended more than 150 years ago? We're a nation of immigrants, were your ancestors even here 150 years ago.? If they were did your ancestors own slaves?

SPENDING TRADE-OFF DISADVANTAGE

The thesis of this disadvantage is that increased spending on the affirmative plan will be offset by a decrease in spending elsewhere. Current PAYGO rules in Congress require that an increase in spending in one area will require cuts in another area. Republicans have grown increasingly frustrated with the Iraqi government's closeness to the government in Iran and will target the aid the United States gives to Iraq. Unfortunately, U.S. aid to Iraq is necessary to stabilize the Iraqi economy and prevent a conflict in the Middle East, risking nuclear escalation from Israel.

I. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WILL RESULT IN A SPENDING TRADE-OFF WITH AID TO IRAQ.

A. PAYGO RULES REQUIRE THAT INCREASES IN SPENDING BE OFFSET BY CUTS IN SPENDING ELSEWHERE.

Peter G. Peterson Foundation, WHAT IS PAYGO? Mar. 9, 2020. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.pgpf.org/budget-basics/understanding-complex-budget-terms-and-processes-and-why-they-matter/what-is-paygo>

PAYGO, or Pay-As-You-Go, is a budget enforcement mechanism aimed at encouraging fiscally responsible policymaking. In the simplest terms, PAYGO forces lawmakers to pay for their priorities. It requires that any new legislation that adds to the deficit, whether through an increase in mandatory spending or a decrease in revenues, must be fully offset by other spending or revenue changes so that the net effect of legislative changes is deficit neutral.

B. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN IS EXTREMELY EXPENSIVE (NOTE: ONLY READ LINKS TO THE SPECIFIC AFFIRMATIVE PLAN YOU ARE DEBATING)

1. A federal jobs guarantee would be extremely expensive.

Peter C. Earle, (Research Fellow at the American Institute for Economic Research), 'FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE' IDEA IS COSTLY, MISGUIDED, AND INCREASINGLY POPULAR WITH DEMOCRATS. Nov. 19, 2018. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.investors.com/politics/commentary/federal-jobs-guarantee-democrats/>.

Simply finding work for tens of millions of job guarantee enrollees would be a formidable task; finding productive, impactful work catering to an individual's skills, in a given locality and in a timely manner, would be staggeringly difficult — if possible at all. The costs, too, are daunting. Both the CBPP and LEI reports project costs ranging from \$450 billion to more than \$600 billion, which put the proposed programs in the same league with the Pentagon in terms of discretionary spending.

2. Expanding Social Security will compete with other uses for federal money.

Andrew G. Biggs, (senior fellow, American Enterprise Institute), WE DO NOT NEED TO EXPAND SOCIAL SECURITY. Dec. 5, 2019. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.aei.org/articles/we-do-not-need-to-expand-social-security/>

Almost no one is asking whether these fears of a retirement crisis are justified and whether expanding Social Security benefits outweighs all the other competing uses for federal dollars. But new data from three trusted government agencies say that the answer to both questions is almost certainly no. While Social Security requires changes to ensure solvency and to better protect against poverty in old age, Americans' retirement incomes and retirement savings have never been stronger.

3. *Universal basic income costs 2.8 trillion dollars a year.*

Catherine Clifford, (staff writer), THIS FREE CASH PLAN WOULD PAY YOU \$1,320 PER MONTH AND WOULDN'T COST THE GOVERNMENT A CENT. Jan. 14, 2020. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.cnn.com/2020/01/14/budget-neutral-universal-basic-income-plan-would-pay-1320-per-month.html>.

According to one estimate, Yang's universal basic income would cost \$2.8 trillion a year — an estimated 236 million adult citizens in the United States multiplied by a \$12,000 yearly payment. (With Yang's plan welfare and social program beneficiaries could choose to keep their benefits in lieu of receiving the cash payment, so number of adults receiving it could vary.)

C. CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS WILL PUT AID FOR IRAQ ON THE CHOPPING BLOCK.

Adam Kredo, (staff writer), WASHINGTON FREE BEACON. Feb. 9, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://freebeacon.com/national-security/republicans-put-iraq-aid-on-chopping-block-over-countrys-support-for-iranian-terrorism/>

Rep. Joe Wilson (R., S.C.), a House Foreign Affairs Committee member who chairs the Middle East subcommittee, said the Trump arrest warrant was a tipping point to some members who are concerned that U.S. aid to Iraq is benefiting Iranian terrorists operating in the country. "This renewed call for former president Trump's arrest necessitates that Congress take a hard look at aid to Iraq," Wilson told the Free Beacon. Republican leaders "are more ready than ever before to finally cut aid to Iraq for good," one senior congressional aide familiar with the discussions told the Free Beacon. The Republican Study Committee, the largest Republican caucus in Congress, has repeatedly called in its annual budget proposal for cuts in American aid to Iraq. With Republicans now in control of the House and its appropriations committees, Iraq's aid could end up on the chopping block.

D. US AID TO IRAQ IS KEY TO IRAQ'S ECONOMY.

Adam Kredo, (staff writer), WASHINGTON FREE BEACON. Feb. 9, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://freebeacon.com/national-security/republicans-put-iraq-aid-on-chopping-block-over-countrys-support-for-iranian-terrorism/>

These plans could spell diplomatic trouble for the Biden administration, which is scheduled to meet at the State Department on Thursday with an Iraqi government delegation. Any congressional effort to cut off the Iraqi government's aid pipeline is certain to be raised with the Biden administration in these meetings. U.S. aid has become increasingly important to the Iraqi government as it faces a massive cash crunch and deteriorating economy.

E. THE FAILURE OF IRAQ'S GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE WILL LEAD TO IRAQI INSTABILITY.

INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP, IRAQ: STAVING OFF INSTABILITY IN THE NEAR AND DISTANT FUTURES. Jan. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/gulf-and-arabian-peninsula/iraq/iraq-staving-instability-near-and-distant-futures>

A year of tumult in Iraq appeared to quiet when the Council of Representatives, on 27 October 2022, approved the cabinet of a new prime minister, Mohammed Shia al-Sudani. It was a breakthrough in what had seemed an interminable stalemate since parliamentary elections twelve months earlier. The deadlock ended when loyalists of Muqtada al-Sadr, the Shiite cleric and firebrand populist politician, who had been thwarting their adversaries' government formation plans, withdrew their representatives from parliament. But the country is hardly stable. Tensions between Sadr and his Shiite counterparts could easily flare again. Challenges to the ethno-sectarian system – which allocates power and resources among Iraq's Shiites, Sunnis and Kurds – also persist. It was that system's inability to provide effective governance that sparked the 2019 Tishreen protests, which in turn precipitated the early elections of 2021. The return of politics as usual with the advent of Sudani's government represents the system's triumph over the protests. Yet the gap between citizens and elites has only widened since 2019, as rampant corruption continues to prevent the state from providing adequate public services. In the short term, the Sudani government may try to keep grievances in check through higher spending for services and public-sector expansion, but it can do so only as long as oil prices remain high – which will be difficult, as falling demand is pushing prices down amid fears of a global recession. Meanwhile, Iraq's population is growing and its water supply dwindling. In the long run, if governance and public services do not improve, the combination of demographic pressure and climate stresses will undermine any attempt at buying stability with oil revenue.

F. IRAQ IS ONE CRISIS AWAY FROM AN ALL-OUT CONFLICT.

Ahmed Twajj, (an independent Middle East analyst and an advisor to the Iraqi nongovernmental organization Sanad for Peacebuilding), FOREIGN POLICY. Sept. 15, 2022. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/09/15/iraq-sadr-iran-shiite-civil-war/>

Although Tehran may not have asked directly for violence on the streets of Baghdad, its continued attempts to influence the country are yielding rewards neither for Iran nor for Iraq but contributing to rising tensions in the country. The example of Haeri's shock resignation shows the country is one event away from all-out conflict.

G. A CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE EAST RISKS NUCLEAR ESCALATION.

Ramzy Baroud, (Non-resident Senior Research Fellow at the Center for Islam and Global Affairs), MIDDLE EAST MONITOR. Nov. 28, 2022. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20221128-deliberate-ambiguity-israels-nuclear-weapons-are-greatest-threat-to-middle-east/>

The debate regarding nuclear weapons in the Middle East could not possibly be any more pertinent or urgent. International observers rightly note that the period following the Russia-Ukraine war is likely to accelerate the quest for nuclear weapons throughout the world. Considering the seemingly perpetual state of conflict in the Middle East, the region is likely to witness nuclear rivalry as well. For years, Arab and other countries attempted to raise the issue that accountability regarding the development and acquisition of nuclear weapons cannot be confined to states that are perceived to be enemies of Israel and the West. The latest of these efforts was a United Nations resolution that called on Israel to dispose of its nuclear weapons, and to place its nuclear facilities under the monitoring of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Resolution number A/C.1/77/L.2, which was drafted by Egypt with the support of other Arab countries, passed with an initial vote of 152-5. Unsurprisingly, among the five countries that voted against the draft were the United States, Canada and, of course, Israel itself. U.S. and Canadian blind support of Tel Aviv notwithstanding, what compels Washington and Ottawa to vote against a draft entitled: "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East"? Keeping in mind the successive right-wing extremist governments that have ruled over Israel for many years, Washington must understand that the risk of using nuclear weapons under the guise of fending off an 'existential threat' is a real possibility.

BUSINESS CONFIDENCE DISADVANTAGE

The thesis of this disadvantage is that the plan will cause an economic crisis by discouraging business investments and spending. Right now, the economy is able to remain strong enough to hold off a recession due to added jobs and continued investment. However, the plan will cause significant uncertainty among top investors in the economy, causing them to sell off large portions of stocks and stop them from continuing and increasing their levels of investment. This causes a crisis by causing an immediate and significant drop in economic strength, leading to a recession.

I. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WOULD UNDERMINE BUSINESS CONFIDENCE AND RESULT IN A RECESSION.

A. THE ECONOMY IS NARROWLY AVOIDING A RECESSION NOW.

Rob Wile and Brian Cheung, (business news reporter for NBC News Digital; business and data reporter for NBC News), April 7, 2023. THE ECONOMY IS HOLDING UP DESPITE SIGNS OF SLOWDOWN AS SOME WAIT FOR THE OTHER SHOE TO DROP, Retrieved Apr. 30, 2023 from <https://www.nbcnews.com/business/economy/how-is-the-economy-doing-right-now-jobs-inflation-housing-prices-rcna78674>

Talk of the U.S. entering a recession has been swirling for at least a year now, as the Federal Reserve's campaign to raise interest rates to combat persisting inflation bites into overall demand and investment. To date, a full-fledged economic downturn has not yet materialized. And on Friday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released jobs data confirming that, at least as of last month, the recession had still not arrived: The U.S. economy added 236,000 jobs in March and the unemployment rate dipped from 3.6% to 3.5%.

B. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WOULD UNDERMINE BUSINESS CONFIDENCE (NOTE: ONLY READ THE SPECIFIC LINKS TO THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN YOU ARE DEBATING).

1. A federal job guarantee would crush small businesses.

Dwyer Gunn, (Pacific Standard contributing writer), HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD BE HELPED BY A FEDERAL JOBS GUARANTEE? Dec. 6, 2018. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://psmag.com/economics/how-many-people-would-be-helped-by-a-federal-jobs-guarantee>

Opponents of federal job guarantees point to the high price tags associated with such programs, and the potentially damaging effects they could have on small businesses that can't afford to compete with the wages offered by the federal government.

2. *Social Security expansion would destroy small businesses and devastate the economy.*

Rachel Greszler, (Senior Research Fellow for Budget and Entitlements in the Grover M. Hermann Center for the Federal Budget at The Heritage Foundation), SOCIAL SECURITY EXPANSION ACT: \$33.8 TRILLION TAX WOULD DESTROY JOBS, SLASH INCOMES, AND INCREASE WORKERS' DEPENDENCE ON THE STATE. Mar. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.heritage.org/social-security/report/social-security-expansion-act-338-trillion-tax-would-destroy-jobs-slash>

A New 16.2 Percent Tax on Small Business Owners. Currently, S-corporations, limited partnerships, and other businesses that file taxes as “pass-through entities” (which pay taxes at the individual level and not at the corporate level) are subject to these Social Security, Medicare, and Obamacare taxes only on the salaries and certain compensation paid to employees or owners (and only up to the current taxable max for Social Security), but not on owners' share of the active business income, which carries more inherent risk. The Social Security Expansion Act would impose a new, 16.2 percent “net investment income” surtax on all such entrepreneurial profits of these business owners above \$200,000 for individuals and \$250,000 for married couples. Of the new 16.2 percent tax, 12.4 percent would go to Social Security and the other 3.8 percent would go to general tax revenues. This would mark an unprecedented tax increase on small businesses, stifling their growth prospects, handicapping their ability to stay afloat in downturns (such as the COVID-19 pandemic), and impeding innovation. Small businesses are the engine of America's growth and multi-trillion-dollar tax hikes on them would surely suppress innovation, entrepreneurship, jobs, incomes, and economic growth.

3. *A universal basic income would hurt businesses.*

Todd Steen, (Granger Professor of Economics at Hope College), UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AND BUSINESS: A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE. Mar. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://hc.edu/center-for-christianity-in-business/2023/03/30/universal-basic-income-and-business-a-christian-perspective/>

Some of the most important questions about UBI programs focus on the uncertain but likely negative impact of UBI programs on work behavior. Work is a central feature of our existence as human beings and of our calling in God's Kingdom (while of course not being everything—rest and non-market activities are important too). Does a UBI remove the curse on our work? Or does it reduce our inclination and ability to serve others, and instead promote a greater interest in serving ourselves? It seems likely that for many people, work would become less important in the presence of a universal basic income. This alone could have a substantial negative impact on the ability of businesses to hire capable workers. For those who did work and for those who owned and managed businesses, the rewards of such work might diminish. There are very interesting tradeoffs inherent in UBI programs, and the real opportunity costs are uncertain.

4. *A wealth tax would undermine business assets, hurting the economy.*

Jamie Moraga, (Senior Advisor at IntelliSolutions), October 25, 2019, IS A WEALTH TAX A GOOD IDEA? Retrieved Apr. 30, 2023 from <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/business/economy/story/2019-10-25/is-a-wealth-tax-a-good-idea>

Some European nations have tried to implement a wealth tax, and most have repealed it because it brought in limited revenue compared to the cost. It was also difficult for these countries to value assets. According to the Cato Institute, the lion's share of the wealth of the wealthiest is in business assets that produce economic growth and forcing their owners to sell them to pay taxes could hurt future growth. A wealth tax could harm our economy overall if people decide to invest or innovate less. If a wealth tax is implemented, the middle class will likely be the ones feeling the squeeze thus widening the income gap even further.

C. A LOSS OF BUSINESS CONFIDENCE UNDERMINES THE ECONOMY.

BANCO SANTANDER. August 8, 2022. WHAT IS AN ECONOMIC RECESSION? Retrieved Apr. 30, 2023 from <https://www.santander.com/en/stories/economic-recession>

Uncertainty. Not knowing how the economy will change makes business decision-making riskier. Wars and pandemics are two situations that can make consumer trends unpredictable in the short, medium and long term, thus generating economic uncertainty. Because businesses and people hold off on spending and investment decisions, economic activity declines.

D. ECONOMIC CRISIS RISKS MILITARY CONFLICT AND WORLD WAR.

Jomo Kwame Sundaram and Vladimir Popov, (Former economics professor, was United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development; Former senior economics researcher in the Soviet Union, Russia and the United Nations Secretariat, is now Research Director at the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute in Berlin), February 12, 2019. ECONOMIC CRISIS CAN TRIGGER WORLD WAR. Retrieved Apr. 30, 2023 from <http://www.ipsnews.net/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war/>

Economic recovery efforts since the 2008-2009 global financial crisis have mainly depended on unconventional monetary policies. As fears rise of yet another international financial crisis, there are growing concerns about the increased possibility of large-scale military conflict. More worryingly, in the current political landscape, prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising economic inequality, chauvinistic ethno-populism as well as aggressive jingoist rhetoric, including threats, could easily spin out of control and 'morph' into military conflict, and worse, world war.

INFLATION DISADVANTAGE

The thesis of this disadvantage is that measures to create economic equality will lead to widespread inflation, causing a surge in dangerous populism in the United States. Currently, inflation is declining in the United States. However, the plan will increase inflation, triggering a surge in right-wing populism that blames the government for its problems. This will cause a weak and ineffective American government incapable of solving problems on a global stage.

I. THE PLAN CAUSES AN INFLATIONARY SPIRAL, DEVASTATING US LEADERSHIP

A. INFLATION IS DECREASING NOW.

Wayne Duggan, (contributor, Forbes Magazine), & Benjamin Curry, (editor Forbes magazine), INFLATION FELL SHARPLY IN MARCH. Apr. 12, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/advisor/investing/current-inflation-rate/>

A key measure of consumer prices dropped sharply in March, suggesting that high U.S. inflation is beginning to wane. The Labor Department reported the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose at an annual rate of 5% in March, its lowest level since 2021. This was down from a 6% year-over-year gain in February and below the 5.3% gain economists were expecting. On a monthly basis, the CPI was up 0.1% compared to February, below economist estimates of a 0.3% gain. The CPI reading is the latest indicator that inflation is trending steadily downward after hitting 40-year highs in 2022. Investors are growing increasingly optimistic the Federal Reserve will soon pause its aggressive interest rate hiking cycle.

B. THE PLAN CAUSES MASSIVE INFLATION (NOTE: ONLY READ THE LINK SPECIFIC TO THE AFFIRMATIVE YOU ARE DEBATING).

1. *A job guarantee causes higher inflation.*

Cullen Roche, (Founder and Chief Investment Officer of Discipline Funds), CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISMS OF A JOB GUARANTEE PROGRAM. Feb. 8, 2022. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.pragcap.com/mmt-job-guarantee/>

So the upside benefits will be relatively muted regarding price stability during an economic boom (when we're nearing traditional "full employment"). Additionally, the job guarantee pool at 3-5% of all unemployed will be so small and non-convertible into widespread private sector jobs that it won't come close to impacting prices and wages to the extent that private sector jobs will (which will see substantial wage pressure during a boom period as skilled laborers compete for the other 95-97% of jobs. As Mitchell and Wray say, this would most certainly add to aggregate demand during the boom times which would lead to higher inflation. Ultimately, we will still rely on counter cyclical policy to be implemented at levels of full capacity regardless of whether we have a buffer stock of unemployed or employed so the fact that the employed buffer stock acts as a price buoy and not a price anchor is quite substantial. Given the fact that modern governments have become particularly adept at fighting deflation, I think the inflation fighting case for the JG is vastly overstated.

2. *A Universal Basic Income will cause inflation to roar*

Ryan A. Hughes, (Founder of Bull Oak Capital, an investment advisory firm in San Diego), UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME IS A BAD IDEA. Jan. 27, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://bulloakcapital.com/blog/universal-basic-income-is-a-bad-idea/>

If UBI were to be financed by increasing the federal deficit, it would most undoubtedly fuel inflation. As a reminder, inflation is caused by a more rapid increase in the quantity of money than the quantity of goods or services produced during the same time period. In other words, if the nation's printing press produces money at a greater rate than its economy can produce, the result will be higher inflation levels. Printing an extra \$3.8T yearly will surely cause inflation to roar. If our irresponsible fiscal spending habits during 2020 and 2021 taught us anything, it is that handing out money to anybody and everybody does not contribute to low inflation levels.

C. INFLATION TRIGGERS POPULISM.

Mike O'Sullivan, (Senior Contributor @ Forbes), IS INFLATION A BOON FOR POPULISTS? July 17, 2021. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mike-osullivan/2021/07/17/is-inflation-a-boon-for-populists/?sh=633b4d603de7>

My hunch is that inflation is about to become the latest populist focus. Recent data show that in the U.S. and increasingly in Europe, inflation is awakening after a long slumber. Indeed, many professional economists and investors have never experienced high inflation. In the USA, some inflation measures and price components are the highest that they have been since the 1980's. The consensus and official view on rising inflation is that it is 'transitory' – driven by a burst of coronavirus recovery spending. The risk, across many fronts is that it proves more enduring and thus can cause financial, economic and political pain. Inflation is transitory? This is where inflation becomes interesting to populists – anything that causes economic pain and social discomfort is populist ammunition. Indeed, there is plenty of evidence to show that inflation is often the offshoot of populist economic policies as the economic history of Latin America shows.

D. POPULISM CREATES ERRATIC AND POOR DECISION MAKING.

Brett Meyer, (Senior Policy Advisor of Global Progressive Politics at the Tony Blair Institute for Global Change), REPEL AND REBUILD: EXPANDING THE PLAYBOOK AGAINST POPULISM. Jan. 5, 2023. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.institute.global/insights/geopolitics-and-security/repel-and-rebuild-expanding-playbook-against-populism>

Finally, one of the main concerns about populism is that populist leaders erode checks and balances. While we're primarily concerned about how this affects democratic competition, it can also enable erratic and poor policymaking. We witnessed this during the Covid-19 pandemic and have seen it the past year with fiscal and macroeconomic policy in Turkey and Sri Lanka, which had some of the highest inflation rates in the world in 2022. It also caused a food shortage in Sri Lanka, which in turn caused a mob to storm the presidential palace and topple President Gotabaya Rajapaksa's government. And despite high inflation, the Turkish central bank continues to cut interest rates, ensuring that inflation will remain high and be a central battleground in the country's upcoming presidential election.

E. ERRATIC POLICYMAKING UNDERMINES U.S. LEADERSHIP.

Matthew Kroenig, (professor of history and government @ Georgetown University), THE RETURN OF GREAT POWER RIVALRY: DEMOCRACY VERSUS AUTOCRACY FROM THE ANCIENT WORLD TO THE U.S. AND CHINA, 2020, p. 5

It is true that autocracies are better at taking swift and bold action, but impulsive decisions uninformed by vigorous public debate often result in spectacular failure. Hitler, for example, was able to harness new technology to create blitzkrieg warfare and conquer much of Western Europe in the early stages of World War II, but he also foolishly invaded Russia and declared war on the United States. Unfortunately for autocracies, this story is all too common. As Machiavelli wrote in his Discourses on Livy in the 16th century: "Fewer errors will be seen in the people than in the prince—and those lesser and having greater remedies." "Hence it arises that a republic has greater life and has good fortune longer than a principality." There is good reason to hope that this argument is true, because continued American leadership would be beneficial to the United States and the rest of the free world. The decline of American power would certainly be unwelcome for the United States. Americans have grown accustomed to the benefits that accrue to the world's leading power. But billions of others also have a stake in America's success. For all of its faults, the United States has been a fairly benevolent hegemon. While far from perfect, it has gone to extraordinary lengths to provide security, promote economic development, and nurture democracy and human rights.

Matthew Kroenig, (Prof., Government, Georgetown University), THE RETURN OF GREAT POWER RIVALRY: DEMOCRACY VERSUS AUTOCRACY FROM THE ANCIENT WORLD TO THE U.S. AND CHINA, 2020, p. 5

The world is certainly safer, richer, and freer today than it was before the dawn of the American era. Indeed, China itself has been among the greatest beneficiaries of a U.S.-led international order. American military and economic power have provided the peace and macroeconomic stability that allowed China to grow into the major power that it is today. There is little reason to believe that Russia and China will be as kind. These autocratic powers long to establish spheres of influence in their near abroad, and they have shown little concern for the sovereignty or personal freedoms of their own citizens or subjected populations. To get a vision of a world led by Russia or China, just look at how they treat the people that fall under their influence today. Russian dictator Vladimir Putin invades neighboring countries and murders critical journalists. And China takes contested territory from its neighbors through brute force and locks up one million Muslim minorities in "re-education" camps. And this is but a small taste of the brutality of these governments. If readers doubt these claims, they can simply ask citizens of American allies in Eastern Europe or East Asia whether they desire continued American leadership, or whether they would prefer to live under the thumb of Moscow or Beijing, respectively.

F. A DECLINE IN U.S. LEADERSHIP LEADS TO GREAT POWER WAR.

Matthew Kroenig, (Prof., Government, Georgetown University), THE RETURN OF GREAT POWER RIVALRY: DEMOCRACY VERSUS AUTOCRACY FROM THE ANCIENT WORLD TO THE U.S. AND CHINA. 2020, p. 6.

Moreover, just as consequentially for the globe, the decline of the United States could very well result in war. As noted earlier, international relations theory maintains that the decline of one dominant power and the rise of another often results in great power conflict." According to this telling, World War I and World War II were primarily the result of the decline of the British Empire and the rise of Imperial and then Nazi Germany. Falling powers fight preventive wars in a bid to remain on top, and rising powers launch conflicts to dislodge the reigning power and claim their "place in the sun:" Many fear that a power transition between Beijing and Washington would produce a similar catastrophic result." Continued American leadership, therefore, could forestall this transition and may be necessary for continued peace and stability among the major powers.

INNOVATION DISADVANTAGE

Thesis: The thesis of this disadvantage is that measures to solve economic inequality will require huge tax increases, which will stifle innovation in the United States, the key to US global leadership. While the affirmative plan may sound good at first, the question will quickly be raised as to how we should pay for it. The proposals for advancing economic equality often call for raising taxes to pay for the costs of the program. However, high taxation discourages innovation into new ideas, undermining the US advantage in innovation we retain over other countries. This decline in US leadership will result in several scenarios for global conflict and prevent the US from solving the world's many problems.

I. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WILL RESULT IN HUGE TAX HIKES THAT WILL STIFLE US INNOVATION.

A. AMERICA IS THE MOST PRODUCTIVE AND INNOVATIVE ECONOMY IN THE WORLD—IT IS LEAVING ITS PEERS IN THE DUST.

THE ECONOMIST. Apr. 13, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2023/04/13/the-lessons-from-americas-astonishing-economic-record>

Yet the anxiety obscures a stunning success story—one of enduring but underappreciated outperformance. America remains the world's richest, most productive and most innovative big economy. By an impressive number of measures, it is leaving its peers ever further in the dust.

B. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WILL RESULT IN HUGE TAX INCREASES (NOTE: ONLY READ THE LINK SPECIFIC TO THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN YOU ARE DEBATING)

1. A job guarantee would lead to middle-class tax increases.

Don Arthur, (Parliament of Australia), RADICAL IDEAS—THE JOBS GUARANTEE. Apr. 30, 2018. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/FlagPost/2018/April/Jobs_Guarantee

Arguments against a jobs guarantee The idea has attracted criticism from all sides. In New York magazine Jonathan Chait acknowledges that the jobs guarantee co-opts 'the conservative themes of self-sufficiency and hard work' and neutralises the objection that Democratic policies subsidise sloth. However, he argues that the proposal suffers from two serious problems—its cost and the practical difficulty of creating such a large number of jobs. According to Chait, a program that provided good pay and benefits could quickly expand beyond the target group of unemployed and underemployed workers. The cost of running such a large program would probably mean increased taxes on the middle class and this would put an end to its popularity.

2. *Tax hikes caused by expanding Social Security would ripple destructively throughout the economy.*

Rachel Greszler, (Senior Research Fellow for Budget and Entitlements in the Grover M. Hermann Center for the Federal Budget at The Heritage Foundation), SOCIAL SECURITY EXPANSION ACT: \$33.8 TRILLION TAX WOULD DESTROY JOBS, SLASH INCOMES, AND INCREASE WORKERS' DEPENDENCE ON THE STATE. Mar. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.heritage.org/social-security/report/social-security-expansion-act-338-trillion-tax-would-destroy-jobs-slash>

Regardless of who pays higher taxes, the Social Security Expansion Act's massive tax hikes would ripple destructively across the entire economy, including all other government revenues. Taking into account how people would respond to these new tax increases, it is almost certain that the Social Security Expansion Act would fail to make the program solvent and would cause large declines in other government tax revenues.

3. *A \$1000 a month Universal Basic Income would require historically unprecedented tax increases.*

Dylan Matthews, (senior correspondent and head writer for Future Perfect), STUDY: A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WOULD GROW THE ECONOMY. Aug. 30, 2017. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/8/30/16220134/universal-basic-income-roosevelt-institute-economic-growth>

But a \$12,000 a year per adult basic income is another matter. The Roosevelt paper finds that paying for it would require increasing household tax revenue by 120 percent — a more than doubling. To do that, it assumes that all but the poorest 40 percent pay more in taxes. The middle quintile (households with an income between \$48,300 and \$85,600, per the Tax Policy Center) would see their average tax rate go from 14 percent to 25 percent; the top one percent would see its average tax rate go from 32.9 percent to 67.9 percent. This would be historically unprecedented. Note that even in 1979, when the top marginal tax rate was 70 percent, the top one percent only paid 35.2 percent of their income in federal taxes on average. To nearly double that number, we'd need much, much higher income tax rates, and likely a few other new measures to tax the rich.

C. TAXES ON CORPORATE AND PERSONAL INCOME UNDERMINE INNOVATION.

Ufuk Akcigit, (associate professor of economics at the University of Chicago), & Stefanie Stantcheva, (professor of economics at Harvard University), TAXATION AND INNOVATION. Sept. 2018. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.nber.org/reporter/2018number3/taxation-and-innovation>

We find that taxation of both corporate and personal income negatively affects the quantity, quality, and location of innovation at the state level and the individual inventor and firm levels.⁸ The elasticities of all these innovation outcomes with respect to taxes are relatively large, especially at the macro level, where cross-state spillovers and extensive margin responses add to the micro elasticities. Figure 1 illustrates the negative correlation between the personal income tax at the 90th income percentile and the log of patents in a state.

D. AMERICAN INNOVATION IS KEY TO AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE WORLD.

Jordan Crenshaw, (Senior Vice President, C_TEC), AMERICA'S INNOVATIVE EDGE. Apr. 18, 2022. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.uschamber.com/technology/three-priorities-to-keep-americas-innovative-edge>

The U.S. has long led the world in technological advancement. A close partnership between government, academia, and industry is the vibrant engine that has powered an innovation ecosystem that has secured America's leadership role in setting rules and standards around the globe. The Internet, for example, was developed from the technical foundation laid by the Advanced Research Projects Agency Network (ARPANET), which was established by the United States Department of Defense's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA). The Pfizer and Moderna vaccines are based on a new technology called mRNA that allows a person's RNA to produce a vaccine, with key early contributions from researchers at the University of Pennsylvania. Despite accomplishments like these, countries like China, Japan, the European Union, South Korea, and others are quickly closing in on the U.S.'s lead, spending record amounts on research and development (R&D) to bolster their innovative economies. America's global competitors understand that winning the future means investing in science and technology.

3. US LEADERSHIP STOPS A NUCLEAR WAR:

Michael Beckley, (professor of political science at Tufts), UNRIVALED: WHY AMERICA WILL REMAIN THE WORLD'S SOLE SUPERPOWER. 2018. Pg. 135-136.

The story of world politics is often told as a game of thrones in which a rotating cast of great powers battles for top-dog status. According to researchers led by Graham Allison at Harvard, there have been sixteen cases in the past five hundred years when a rising power challenged a ruling power. 3 Twelve of these cases ended in carnage. One can quibble with Allison's case selection, but the basic pattern is clear: hegemonic rivalry has sparked a catastrophic war every forty years on average for the past half millennium. The emergence of unipolarity in 1991 has put this cycle of hegemonic competition on hold. Obviously wars and security competition still occur in today's unipolar world—in fact, as I explain later, unipolarity has made certain types of asymmetric conflict more likely—but none of these conflicts have the global scope or generational length of a hegemonic rivalry. To appreciate this point, just consider the Cold War—one of the four “peaceful” cases of hegemonic rivalry identified by Allison's study. Although the two superpowers never went to war, they divided the world into rival camps, waged proxy wars that killed millions of people, and pushed each other to the brink of nuclear Armageddon. For forty-five years, World War III and human extinction were nontrivial possibilities. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, by contrast, the United States has not faced a hegemonic rival, and the world, though far from perfect, has been more peaceful and prosperous than ever before.

II. THE AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS TO THE DISADVANTAGE ARE INADEQUATE.

A. THE UNITED STATES LEADS THE WORLD IN INNOVATION.

1. *The US is a global leader in innovation.*

Shawn Johnson, (staff writer, Business News), WHY AMERICA LEADS THE WORLD IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION – RESEARCHFDI. May 17, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://biz.crast.net/why-america-leads-the-world-in-entrepreneurship-and-innovation-researchfdi/>

The United States has long been recognized as a global leader in entrepreneurship, innovation, and business creation. With its diverse population, strong economy, and culture that encourages risk-taking and innovation, America has fostered a thriving entrepreneurial ecosystem that continues to attract entrepreneurs from around the world. From the tech giants of Silicon Valley to the financial powerhouses of Wall Street, the USA provides a fertile ground for entrepreneurs and startups to flourish. In this installment of our “Investing in the USA” series, we’ll explore the key factors that make the USA an unrivaled hotbed of entrepreneurial activity, discuss its strengths, and explore the reasons behind its continued success.

2. *The US ranks number one in the world in a number of indicators of innovation.*

Dorothy Neufeld, (financial writer), MAPPED: THE MOST INNOVATIVE COUNTRIES IN THE WORLD IN 2022. Dec. 15, 2022. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.visualcapitalist.com/most-innovative-countries-2022/>

In North America, the U.S. ranks highest. The country has long been known as a global leader in innovation, with a strong track record of introducing new ideas and technologies that have transformed the way we live and work. The U.S. ranks #1 in a number of indicators, including university-industry R&D collaboration and intangible asset intensity.

3. *America’s diversity fosters creativity and innovation.*

Shawn Johnson, (staff writer, Business News), WHY AMERICA LEADS THE WORLD IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION – RESEARCHFDI. May 17, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://biz.crast.net/why-america-leads-the-world-in-entrepreneurship-and-innovation-researchfdi/>

Diverse and Skilled Workforce America is a melting pot of cultures and ideas, which contribute to its entrepreneurial success. This diversity fosters creativity and innovation, as entrepreneurs from different backgrounds bring unique perspectives and experiences to the table. Furthermore, the US has a highly skilled workforce, with 36.6% of the population holding a bachelor’s degree or higher in 2020. This educated workforce provides a strong talent pool for startups to attract, allowing them to grow and compete globally.

4. *US culture fosters innovation.*

Shawn Johnson, (staff writer, Business News), WHY AMERICA LEADS THE WORLD IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION – RESEARCHFDI. May 17, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://biz.crastr.net/why-america-leads-the-world-in-entrepreneurship-and-innovation-researchfdi/>

The entrepreneurial spirit runs deep in the United States, fostering a culture that celebrates innovation and risk-taking. From legendary entrepreneurs like Steve Jobs and Elon Musk to countless success stories emerging from every corner of the country, American culture encourages people to pursue their dreams and disrupt traditional industries. This cultural aspect is an important factor in the success of the American entrepreneurial ecosystem, as it enables entrepreneurs to learn from their failures and iterate on their ideas. Society celebrates success stories and embraces failure as an opportunity to learn. This culture fosters an environment where individuals are inspired to pursue their entrepreneurial aspirations, contributing to the overall vibrancy of the ecosystem.

5. *The US is at the forefront of technological advancement because of its culture of innovation.*

Shawn Johnson, (staff writer, Business News), WHY AMERICA LEADS THE WORLD IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION – RESEARCHFDI. May 17, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://biz.crastr.net/why-america-leads-the-world-in-entrepreneurship-and-innovation-researchfdi/>

The United States has been at the forefront of technological advancement in various fields. This culture of innovation has created a fertile ground for entrepreneurs to develop new products and services that meet market needs and address global challenges. Additionally, the US has a strong intellectual property (IP) protection system that encourages innovation by protecting the rights of inventors and entrepreneurs.

6. *The United States has low taxes now.*

Bobby Kogan, (Senior Director, Federal Budget Policy, Center for American Progress), TAX CUTS ARE PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INCREASING DEBT RATIO. Mar. 27, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/tax-cuts-are-primarily-responsible-for-the-increasing-debt-ratio/>

The United States is a low-tax country. Compared with other nations in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United States ranks 32nd out of 38 in revenue as a percentage of GDP.²⁰ But it's not just that the United States is near the bottom end of revenue; it is nowhere close even to the average. Over the CBO's 10-year budget window, the United States will collect \$26 trillion less in revenues than it would if its revenue as a percentage of GDP were as high as the average OECD nation. When compared to EU nations, that number rises to \$36 trillion. (see Figure 2) In contrast, the \$289 billion projected revenue increase in the Inflation Reduction Act²¹ still leaves the United States ranking 32nd out of 38 OECD countries.

B. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WILL REQUIRE MASSIVE TAX INCREASES.

1. A job guarantee would lead to middle class tax increases.

Jonathan Chait, (political columnist), THE NATIONAL INTEREST. Apr. 25, 2018.

Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2018/04/democrats-are-rushing-a-jobs-guarantee-its-a-huge-mistake.html>

Unfortunately, Democrats do not yet have a proposal that can bring these aspirations to life. One problem to work through is the traditional Democratic question of how to finance their new program. (Republican policy ideas never have this issue — they just put everything on the credit card and stick the next president with the bill.) It's quite a large expenditure, perhaps half a trillion dollars a year, depending on the exact contours. Progressives have circulated polling showing support for a job guarantee financed by a 5 percent income tax hike on earnings over \$200,000 a year, but Josh Bivens at the liberal Economic Policy Institute notes that that would cover less than a fifth of the cost. And even that figure optimistically assumes the federal job guarantee would attract only people who are currently unemployed or underemployed. Since the most popular job guarantee plans would offer relatively solid wages and benefits (\$15 an hour plus benefits), they would probably draw applicants who currently have jobs with stingier compensation. If that happened, as you'd expect, the cost of the program might balloon up to several times over. Once you start financing the program with taxes on the middle class — which would probably be necessary given the scale of its cost — then the popularity would drop off precipitously.

2. Expanding Social Security will cause skyrocketing taxes.

Christine Williams, (Personal Finance Expert), YOUR TAXES COULD SKYROCKET UNDER THIS NEW SOCIAL SECURITY BILL. May 17, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://smartasset.com/taxes/your-taxes-could-skyrocket-under-this-new-social-security-bill>

Your Taxes Could Skyrocket Under This New Social Security Bill One of the most popular and enduring government programs in U.S. history, Social Security has funded the lives of senior citizens for more than 80 years. As a result, today the senior poverty rate clocks in at a mere 9%. Yet research indicates that the trust funds providing Social Security benefits will deplete their reserves by 2034. In an effort to extend the program's solvency, Democrats have recently introduced a new bill aiming to expand Social Security — at a cost.

3. The tax hikes of the Social Security Expansion Act would cause significant economic damage.

Rachel Greszler, (Senior Research Fellow for Budget and Entitlements in the Grover M. Hermann Center for the Federal Budget at The Heritage Foundation), SOCIAL SECURITY EXPANSION ACT: \$33.8 TRILLION TAX WOULD DESTROY JOBS, SLASH INCOMES, AND INCREASE WORKERS' DEPENDENCE ON THE STATE. Mar. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.heritage.org/social-security/report/social-security-expansion-act-338-trillion-tax-would-destroy-jobs-slash>

The Social Security Expansion Act's expanded benefits and enormous tax increases would exacerbate Social Security's strain on workers and families, making all but the oldest generations worse off. The \$33.8 trillion in tax hikes on workers, savers, investors, and small business owners would distort positive activities and cause significant economic damage. And by taking more income away from people and promising them higher government benefits, the Social Security Expansion Act would make Americans more dependent on the government, less free to pursue their own goals, and more vulnerable to an increasingly likely fiscal crisis.

4. *Increasing Social Security benefits will require tax increases.*

Andrew Biggs, (Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute), FORBES. Jun 11, 2019. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewbiggs/2019/06/11/social-security-expansion-could-shrink-economy-by-1-6-trillion/?sh=39be55cd15b0>

Congressional Democrats are poised to pass the first Social Security reform bill in 35 years, with House passage predicted by Congress's summer recess. But unlike the 1983 reforms, which were evenly split between tax increases and benefit cuts, the Social Security 2100 Act consists of more than 100% tax increases – because it not only raises payroll taxes to fund currently promised benefits, but increases benefits for all current and future retirees. But when we're talking about the biggest federal program, the biggest tax most workers pay, and the biggest source of income for most retirees, Social Security reform doesn't take place in a vacuum. An Ivy League economic model projects that the Social Security 2100 Act's tax and benefit increases could dramatically shrink the economy over the next two decades.

5. *Social Security expansion leads to tax increases on a large percentage of society.*

Christine Williams, (Personal Finance Expert), YOUR TAXES COULD SKYROCKET UNDER THIS NEW SOCIAL SECURITY BILL. May 17, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://smartasset.com/taxes/your-taxes-could-skyrocket-under-this-new-social-security-bill>

Senator Bernie Sanders (I-VT), along with more than 15 Democratic co-sponsors, recently introduced the Social Security Expansion Act to the Senate floor. Aiming to enhance benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program, the bill proposes an increase in taxes to further support the aging U.S. population. Under this new bill, sponsors would like to see Social Security benefits rise by \$200 across the board for both new and current beneficiaries. The bill would also change the existing Social Security Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) formula to more heavily weight the costs of healthcare and prescription drugs, given the disproportionate and rising share of this category's expenses for the elderly. Additionally, the bill would update the Special Minimum Benefit to help low-income workers, such that the benefit level would equal 125% of the poverty level or roughly \$17,000 a year for a single worker who worked a full career, and it would restore student benefits up to age 22 for the children of disabled recipients. Important to note, however, is how the legislation would fund this expansion: increasing taxes. The Social Security program limits the amount of earnings subject to taxation in a given year, currently set at a taxable maximum of \$147,000 in 2022. The tax rate for wages is set at 6.2%, or 12.4% split evenly between employers and employees. The Social Security Expansion Act would amend this payroll tax and subject all income over \$250,000 to the tax. The bill sponsors estimate that 93% of American households would see no increase, but high-earners could see a substantial impact in their net pay. Furthermore the new bill would target the self-employed, business owners and investors. The self-employed would see the same tax increase as the salaried, with a new payroll tax on those earning more than \$250,000. Net investment income taxes would jump from 3.8% to 16.4% in order to include additional taxes in lieu of Social Security and Medicare payroll taxes. Business owners, too, would be hit with a new 12.4% Social Security tax on business income not already covered by payroll taxes. A new bill aiming to expand the quickly-depleting Social Security fund could potentially increase taxes for high-earners. Taxable Social Security earnings are currently capped at \$147,000 for the year, but this new legislation could tap individuals earning more than \$250,000 and subject them to a further 6.2% in payroll taxes. The bill additionally proposes increased taxes on investors and businesses. While these changes could support millions more elderly Americans in their retirement, the impact on high-earners is significant.

6. *Social Security expansion would lead to massive new tax increases.*

Rachel Greszler, (Senior Research Fellow for Budget and Entitlements in the Grover M. Hermann Center for the Federal Budget at The Heritage Foundation), SOCIAL SECURITY EXPANSION ACT: \$33.8 TRILLION TAX WOULD DESTROY JOBS, SLASH INCOMES, AND INCREASE WORKERS' DEPENDENCE ON THE STATE. Mar. 31, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.heritage.org/social-security/report/social-security-expansion-act-338-trillion-tax-would-destroy-jobs-slash>

To pay for all those benefit increases and cover the program's existing \$20.4 trillion shortfall, the Social Security Expansion Act would impose three massive new taxes on workers, savers, and small business owners. Those three tax increases are: 1. Raising and Then Eliminating Social Security's Payroll Tax Cap. Currently, Social Security's 12.4 percent tax rate applies to the first \$160,200 of workers earnings. The Social Security Expansion Act would add Social Security's 12.4 percent tax to all earnings above \$250,000 without any increase in benefits for the newly taxed earnings. Initially, there would be a "donut hole" of earnings between the \$160,200 cap and \$250,000 threshold that would not be subject to the 12.4 percent tax, but because the cap will continue to rise with inflation and the \$250,000 threshold remains constant, all earnings would be subject to the Social Security tax after about 15 years. Eliminating the payroll tax cap is counter to Social Security's original intent, which was to prevent poverty in old age, and not to serve as Americans' primary source of retirement income. When President Franklin Roosevelt's Committee on Economic Security designed the Social Security program, it proposed exempting people making over \$3,000 annually—the equivalent of about \$66,000 in 2023—from the Social Security system altogether because those workers were expected to be saving on their own. The House Ways and Means Committee decided to instead include most workers in the program, and to cap contributions at the first \$3,000 of income. That \$3,000 cap did not increase until 1950. In inflation-adjusted dollars, the current maximum of \$166,200 is nearly 2.5 times Social Security's original taxable maximum and four times the program's 1950 maximum. Raising and eliminating the payroll tax cap would also make the U.S. an anomaly among other industrialized countries that apply Social Security taxes to a significantly lower level of earnings.

7. *Expanding Social Security would massively increase taxes.*

Mark J. Warshawsky, (Searle Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute), SANDERS'S LATEST SHOT IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY WARS COULD WOUND US ALL. Mar. 8, 2023. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/3889950-sanderss-latest-shot-in-the-social-security-wars-could-wound-us-all/>

This piece is best described as everything you need to know about Sen. Bernie Sanders's (I-Vt.) new flawed Social Security proposal, and why no sensible American should love it. His proposed legislation, the Social Security Expansion Act, according to the calculations of Stephen Goss, Social Security's chief actuary, would make Social Security solvent for the next 75 years by massively increasing taxes by about \$4.8 trillion over the next 10 years, while modestly increasing benefits.

8. *A Universal Basic Income would lead to increased taxes.*

Robert Doar, (Morgridge Fellow in Poverty Studies at the American Enterprise Institute), UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WOULD UNDERMINE THE SUCCESS OF OUR SAFETY NET. Spring 2018. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/are-we-ready/doar-universal-basic-income>

Some of the money needed to pay for UBI would have to come from the middle- and lower-middle classes, either in reduced benefits or increased taxes, and they would then see some of their money transferred up to wealthier recipients of UBI.

9. *A UBI would be funded through a Value Added Tax*

James Jarvis, (staff writer), THE HILL, October 15, 2019. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/policy/finance/465906-universal-basic-income-advocates-warn-yangs-freedom-dividend-would-harm-low-income-americans/>

Yang has also proposed a 10 percent value added tax (VAT) to help pay for his Freedom Dividend. A VAT, which is the value added to a product in the supply chain, is added to the sales price when it reaches the retailer. Pugh and Reich argued that a VAT would hurt consumers, especially low-income Americans. “Because the Freedom Dividend is funded through a regressive Value Added Tax, costs will rise for low-income Americans, leaving some of the most vulnerable Americans worse off than before,” Pugh said. Reich added that the poor would pay a higher percentage of their income under a VAT. Instead, Reich argued, UBI should be “financed through a wealth tax.” Yang’s campaign argued that a VAT at 10 percent forces massive tech companies like Amazon and Google to pay more in taxes, and consumers will not see a dramatic increase in prices for basic necessities like food. Luxury goods, however, will be subject to “higher rates” Lee said. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget published an article in June that challenged Yang’s claim that a VAT would cover a sizable portion of the bill for his guaranteed income proposal. In its analysis, the group determined that a 10 percent VAT would generate an estimated \$600 billion in annual revenue, which would cover about one-fifth of the total cost of the Freedom Dividend. The Brookings Institution in August published a paper co-authored by Melissa Kearney, an economics professor at the University of Maryland who argued that proposals like Yang’s would do very little to “reduce inequality of advance opportunity and social mobility.”

C. INCREASING TAXES DECREASES INNOVATION.

1. *Taxes on personal and corporate income undermine innovation.*

Ufuk Akcigit, (associate professor of economics at the University of Chicago), & Stefanie Stantcheva, (professor of economics at Harvard University), TAXATION AND INNOVATION. Sept. 2018. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.nber.org/reporter/2018number3/taxation-and-innovation>

There are two complementary dimensions along which to think about the interplay between taxation and innovation. First, taxation on personal or corporate income or wealth may affect innovation. This may be an unwelcome byproduct of taxes that are set for completely unrelated goals, such as to raise revenues. Thus, reduced innovation could be one of the efficiency costs of taxation; this could affect the assessment of optimal taxes, since the elasticity of innovation with respect to taxes would influence the elasticities that enter into the optimal tax formulas.^{4,5} This underscores the importance of quantifying the elasticity of innovation to taxation along all the relevant margins. Second, tax policy could be designed intentionally so as not to hurt, or even to stimulate, innovation.

2. *High personal taxes will cause superstar inventors to leave the country.*

Jack M. Mintz, (staff writer, Financial Post), FINANCIAL POST. July 15, 2021. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://financialpost.com/opinion/jack-m-mintz-to-kill-innovation-raise-personal-taxes>

Personal taxes aren't included at all, though if there's one tax variable innovators will say is important to competitiveness, it is the personal income tax. In a 2016 American Economic Review study of eight OECD countries, three economists looked at the effects of personal tax rates on "superstar inventors" — those with the most and best patents. They estimated that a 10 per cent increase in personal income tax rates — the top marginal rate rising from 50 to 55 per cent, say — causes inventor in-migration to fall by 10 per cent. In a 2018 study, the authors estimate an even stronger superstar response to personal tax differentials across U.S. states: a 16 per cent decline in in-migration for a 10 per cent hike in personal taxes. Fear of brain drain has pushed some high-tax jurisdictions, including Quebec, to lower their personal taxes to attract inventors, sports stars or researchers. Denmark started the trend in 1992 by introducing a concessionary personal income tax rate for expatriates and scientists with earnings above a threshold monthly salary. The rate is currently 32.84 per cent on a monthly salary of roughly C\$13,900, compared to a top rate for all other Danes of 55.3 per cent.

3. *Taxes impede innovation.*

Adam A. Millsap, (Senior Fellow for economic opportunity issues at Stand Together and Stand Together Trust), FORBES. Aug. 10, 2020. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adammillsap/2020/08/10/tax-hikes-reduce-innovation-and-could-delay-recovery/?sh=6dcf9e15289c>

Even though some taxes are necessary, we must be mindful of the effects taxes have on the economy. A new paper from economists Ufuk Akcigit and Stefanie Stantcheva discusses how taxes impede innovation. Both the quantity and quality of innovation—measured by patents and citations, respectively—decrease as personal income taxes rise. A 10% increase in personal income taxes reduces the quantity and quality of patents by about 6% and 8%, respectively.

4. *Taxes significantly affect innovation and have far-reaching consequences on technological progress.*

Ufuk Akcigit, (associate professor of economics at the University of Chicago), & Stefanie Stantcheva, (professor of economics at Harvard University), TAXATION AND INNOVATION. Sept. 2018. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.nber.org/reporter/2018number3/taxation-and-innovation>

The policies that efficiently trade off these considerations are different from current policies as well as simpler policies, such as linear R&D subsidies and taxes. Nonlinear policies, such as an R&D subsidy that depends on the amount of R&D investment and a profit tax that depends on the level of profits, can come closer to the constrained-efficient outcome. Our findings suggest that taxes significantly affect innovation and that they can thus have far-reaching consequences on technological progress and growth. If designed properly, the tax system could help foster innovation by better aligning the incentives of private agents with the social value of innovation.

5. *Corporate and business taxes undermine the ability to attract innovative companies.*

Jack M. Mintz, (staff writer, Financial Post), FINANCIAL POST. July 15, 2021. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://financialpost.com/opinion/jack-m-mintz-to-kill-innovation-raise-personal-taxes>

Being a tax guy, I was surprised to see that the people compiling the index included only the corporate income tax rate and sales tax rate in their 162 indicators. Corporate tax incentives and other business taxes certainly should be important in attracting innovative companies, but sales taxes not so much. They probably do reduce company revenues but their true economic cost is very likely to be borne by consumers.

6. *Taxes have a tremendous impact on business decisions and hurt the economy.*

Dylan Matthews, (senior correspondent and head writer for Future Perfect), STUDY: A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WOULD GROW THE ECONOMY. Aug. 30, 2017. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/8/30/16220134/universal-basic-income-roosevelt-institute-economic-growth>

The assumption of no household response to changes in taxes is also sure to be contentious. It cuts two ways. On the one hand, most conservative/libertarian leaning economists would argue that taxes, especially corporate and investment taxes and high individual income tax rates, have a tremendous impact on business decisions and individual decisions about work. This is the whole idea behind supply-side economics as practiced by the Reagan, Bush, and most recently Brownback administration in Kansas: that lowering taxes on economic activity will lead to more of it, which grows the economy. Correspondingly, enacting big tax increases to pay for a basic income would be predicted to hurt the economy. The right-leaning Tax Foundation, for instance, has an economic model that predicts huge positive impacts from cutting taxes on corporations and high-income individuals, and significant negative impacts from raising them. For instance, the Tax Foundation found that the House Republican plan to cut individual and business taxes would lead to a 9.1 percent boost in GDP and a 7.7 percent boost in wages, and that Bernie Sanders's tax plan would cut GDP by 9.5 percent and would lower the average American's income by nearly 13 percent.

D. INNOVATION IS KEY TO US LEADERSHIP

1. *Innovation is key to America's economic recovery and global leadership.*

Jordan Crenshaw, (Senior Vice President, C_TEC), AMERICA'S INNOVATIVE EDGE. Apr. 18, 2022. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.uschamber.com/technology/three-priorities-to-keep-americas-innovative-edge>

America's innovation ecosystem – a virtuous cycle of development resulting from a partnership between government, universities, and industry – enabled us to put a man on the moon, connect to the Internet, and tackle COVID-19 in record time. Innovation is the key to enabling the United States to emerge from the pandemic, spurring economic recovery, creating jobs, and continuing America's global leadership. But if we don't invest in developing and nurturing this ecosystem, we are at risk of allowing other countries to write the rules of the road and losing our grasp on the future.

2. *Innovation is key to American leadership.*

Mir Sadat, (former policy director at the National Security Council), THE HILL. Nov. 22, 2020. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/526535-why-innovation-is-so-important-to-americas-global-leadership/>

Fourth, if rules-based, free-market innovation is to compete economically and demonstrate American leadership, then the government must create and enhance opportunities for innovators to compete in international markets and garner global funding. Innovation is the global competition that transcends borders. We must be the first to disrupt our markets, rather than others who could render particular industries potentially obsolete.

3. *American innovations are critical to prevent ceding leadership to China.*

Mir Sadat, (former policy director at the National Security Council), THE HILL. Nov. 22, 2020. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/526535-why-innovation-is-so-important-to-americas-global-leadership/>

The technological innovations of the past 10 years have been exponentially greater than those that have been achieved over the previous 2,000 years combined. While even more innovation is expected over the next 10 to 15 years, America is projected to lose its innovation ecosystem and political leadership to China. In such a scenario, our national policies no longer would set agendas for democratic norms and values, ethical business practices, human rights, environmental and social impacts, or financial transparency.

4. *Innovation is key to US leadership:*

Gina Raimondo, (U.S. Secretary of Commerce), U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE STRATEGIC PLAN 2022 – 2026, 2022. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.commerce.gov/sites/default/files/2022-03/DOC-Strategic-Plan-2022%E2%80%932026.pdf>

To maintain its global leadership, the Nation must innovate more and innovate faster than the rest of the world. Entrepreneurship depends on innovation and market opportunities, which drive economic growth, create jobs, raise wages, and help Americans lead better lives. Department bureaus NIST, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) will conduct foundational and applied research in critical and emerging technologies, including quantum computing, AI, bioscience, advanced manufacturing, advanced communications, semiconductors, next-generation space and satellite technologies, and more. The Department will also work closely with industry to create the necessary conditions for innovation in the public and private sectors. This includes ensuring strong U.S. engagement and representation in the development of international standards and supporting the development of frameworks and best practices. MBDA and EDA will help drive domestic competitiveness by expanding the number of businesses and regions that contribute to the innovation economy and benefit from technological diffusion.

E. INNOVATION IS KEY TO ECONOMIC GROWTH

1. Higher taxes reduce the incentive to innovate—hurting GDP.

Adam A. Millsap, (Senior Fellow for economic opportunity issues at Stand Together and Stand Together Trust), FORBES. Aug. 10, 2020. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adammillsap/2020/08/10/tax-hikes-reduce-innovation-and-could-delay-recovery/?sh=6dcf9e15289c>

Worse, as just mentioned, higher taxes reduce the incentive to innovate and invest which decreases GDP and employment over time. According to a recent report from CRFB, estimates show Biden's tax plan would reduce long-run GDP between 0.2% and 1.5% and likely shrink the labor force. These negative long-term effects are bad enough, but since higher taxes reduce innovation any near-term increases are likely to stifle new business formations just when we need them most. Government shutdowns and consumer fears caused by Covid-19 have forced thousands of businesses to close, many of them permanently. A strong recovery hinges on new entrepreneurs and innovators replacing the businesses that are no longer viable in a post-pandemic world, while in the process creating jobs for the millions of people who are currently unemployed.

2. Less innovation hurts the economy.

Adam A. Millsap, (Senior Fellow for economic opportunity issues at Stand Together and Stand Together Trust), FORBES. Aug. 10, 2020. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adammillsap/2020/08/10/tax-hikes-reduce-innovation-and-could-delay-recovery/?sh=6dcf9e15289c>

Less innovation hurts the broader economy. Business dynamism has declined since the early 2000s, and even the long recovery after the Great Recession wasn't enough to fully restore it. One measure of the economy's overall dynamism is "churn", measured as the sum of the rates of establishment births and deaths. The figure below shows the churn of U.S. businesses over time. It was highest in the early 2000s and then trended downward. Churn increased more recently but was still below the peak.

3. Innovation is key to economic growth.

Ufuk Akcigit, (associate professor of economics at the University of Chicago), & Stefanie Stantcheva, (professor of economics at Harvard University), TAXATION AND INNOVATION. Sept. 2018. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.nber.org/reporter/2018number3/taxation-and-innovation>

Innovation is the source of technological progress and, ultimately, the main driver of long-run economic growth. In recent work with several co-authors, we have shown that the U.S. states that produced the most innovations also grew fastest over the 100-year period from 1900 to 2000.¹ We also have documented that innovation is strongly associated with social mobility. U.S. regions that experienced more innovation also witnessed much stronger intergenerational and social mobility, especially when innovations were attributable to new entrant firms. Innovation also correlates strongly with top income inequality, but not so much with measures of inequality such as the Gini or the 90/10 ratio, and is associated with greater well-being across the United States.^{2,3}

4. *Commercial sector innovation spills over to military technological innovations.*

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. MAINTAINING U.S. GLOBAL LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY REQUIRES GREATER FOCUS ON STRENGTHENING INNOVATION, NOT SOLELY ON RESTRICTING ACCESS TO SPECIFIC TECHNOLOGIES. Sept. 29, 2022. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2022/09/maintaining-u-s-global-leadership-in-science-and-technology-requires-greater-focus-on-strengthening-innovation-not-solely-on-restricting-access-to-specific-technologies>

For example, military technologies have become increasingly dependent on technology development in the commercial sector. Also, science, technology, and innovation are much more multidisciplinary and multinational today than in the past, which complicates efforts to protect individual technologies from military or commercial competitors. Moreover, many new technologies are developed and produced using systems of enabling technologies — platforms such as 5G and the internet — that have many potential applications, often at a global scale. Such platforms cannot be protected with restrictions on use or knowledge without causing widespread problems with other technologies that share those platforms.

F. US INNOVATION SOLVES NUCLEAR WAR.

1. *American innovation empirically prevents nuclear war.*

Mir Sadat, (former policy director at the National Security Council), THE HILL. Nov. 22, 2020. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/526535-why-innovation-is-so-important-to-americas-global-leadership/>

From health care to finance, education to navigating space, agriculture to climate research, and from Hollywood to the Pentagon, innovation has been America's lifeblood. Innovation is new or improved art, products, processes, services, business models, or technologies. In the 1950s, the United States invested heavily in revolutionary technology in order to block Soviet aggression. The internet, GPS, weather forecasting and space utilities all spread information globally and averted nuclear warfare, exposed the lies of authoritarian regimes, possibly ended the Cold War, and ushered in the digital age.

2. *American innovation is key to peace and economic prosperity.*

ASPEN CYBERSECURITY GROUP. AN INNOVATION CHALLENGE FOR THE UNITED STATES. Oct. 1, 2019. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/an-innovation-challenge-for-the-united-states/>

To maintain our global position, the United States—government, private sector, and academia— must chart a purposeful course to maintain our leadership while embracing the values that have long propelled American innovation. If not, we run the risk of squandering the many national advantages we still possess. We cannot wait for the next Sputnik moment—whether in quantum computing, artificial intelligence (AI), or some yet-to-be-discovered technology—to focus our national attention and efforts. Much is at stake. Continued innovation leadership is essential to peace and economic prosperity for the United States and the global community. If the United States cedes leadership in innovation, there is a risk that new technologies will be developed and implemented by nations that do not share values of liberty and freedom.

3. *Innovation is necessary to solve a range of existential threats.*

Joe McCarthy, (Staff Writer at Global Citizen), 8 CLEVER INNOVATIONS THAT COULD HELP FIGHT CLIMATE CHANGE. Apr. 20, 2018. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/8-crazy-inventions-that-can-save-the-planet/>

Cars and coal factories have partly driven climate change. Early air conditioners tore a massive hole in the ozone layer. Pesticides have destroyed ecosystems and harmed wildlife. And now plastic is choking the oceans. But some inventions rehabilitate, protect, and rejuvenate the Earth. These inventions have become all the more necessary as the planet faces a range of existential threats from climate change to deforestation to ocean acidification, and more.

4. *Continued US leadership allows solutions to multiple existential threats to the world.*

Alex Bierman, (Former Contributor, Security Policy Studies M.A. candidate at the George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs), THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS REVIEW. June 15, 2021. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.iar-gwu.org/print-archive/c5ee5i5hmu2a01p91e0jbr24e03t3n>

A grand strategy of engagement allows the United States to sustain its position at the top of an open economic system. Wanting to maintain their political and security ties with the U.S. has partially been a driving force behind the economic concessions made by more than 60 U.S. allies. For example, the United States has the largest percentage of voting power in the International Monetary Fund because of its outsized monetary contribution. With more than ten percent more voting power than the next country, the United States ensures the advancement of its interests in the global economy. Furthermore, the U.S. government has historically been able to use its security guarantees to persuade cooperation from European and Asian allies. The 1985 Plaza Accord, which resulted in the depreciation of the US dollar and the appreciation of Western European currencies and the Japanese Yen, helped ameliorate the effects of America's trade deficit by making U.S. exports more competitive. Indeed, the fact that Japan was willing to accept this deal, which resulted in a serious recession that it has yet to recover from, demonstrates how U.S. engagement in international security and economic affairs grants it leverage that it may not have otherwise. Global economic and trade freedom is also inextricably linked to the expansive presence of U.S. naval forces. Securing critical sea lanes, such as the Taiwan Strait, allows for the free flow of goods, which is a key feature of the modern globalized economy. Engagement grants the U.S. government the opportunity to foster international cooperation on issues like combating transnational organized crime, climate change, terrorism, and public health more easily as well. Exemplary of the spillover effects of security agreements is the robust information sharing agreement between the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Known as the Five Eyes, this multilateral intelligence sharing agreement is one of the world's most ironclad.

G. US LEADERSHIP STOPS DEADLY CONFLICTS:

Alex Bierman, (Former Contributor, Security Policy Studies M.A. candidate at the George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs), THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS REVIEW. June 15, 2021. Retrieved May 22, 2023 from <https://www.iar-gwu.org/print-archive/c5ee5i5hmu2a01p91e0jbr24e03t3n>

The global benefits of an engaged United States are most evident in terms of security and relative inter-state peace. During the Cold War, the preponderance of U.S. military strength and the utilization of both multilateral security partnerships, such as NATO, and bilateral agreements with South Korea and Japan deterred many instances of inter-state war. Placing allied countries under the United States' nuclear umbrella guaranteed retaliation in the case of an attack. Continuing U.S. military and economic support for these alliances after the end of the Cold War assured allies that the security guarantees were not just relationships of convenience and increased trust in the United States as a negotiating partner as a result. Invoking NATO's Article Five – which explains the principle of collective defense – for the first time in the 2001 Afghanistan War showed the international community that the post-Cold War order would still feature U.S. global engagement.¹⁴ Furthermore, NATO's expansion in 1999, 2004, 2009, and 2017 did more to bolster Pax Americana, which has been the most successful of any world order in preventing deadly conflicts.¹⁵ Not only does U.S. involvement diminish regional competition between possible adversaries, the disproportionality of U.S. military strength better hedges against the emerging hegemons.¹⁶ For example, had (West) Germany not joined NATO in 1955, it could have potentially sought to acquire nuclear weapons and destabilize the region as a consequence.¹⁷ The same destabilizing result could have occurred in East Asia had the U.S. policy of non-proliferation not placed Japan and South Korea under its nuclear umbrella.¹⁸ The recent military buildup by China's People's Liberation Army could be viewed as evidence against U.S. capability to limit competition. The presence of the U.S. in the region, however, impedes Chinese regional hegemony,¹⁹ through support of other regional powers and coalitions like Japan and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

INTEREST RATES DISADVANTAGE

Thesis: The thesis of this disadvantage is that the affirmative plan will cause a burst of inflation, leading the Federal Reserve Board to hike interest rates, threatening a collapse of the United States economy. In the present system, the Federal Reserve will pause its efforts to increase interest rates, in the belief that inflation has cooled off. However, the affirmative plan, by pouring substantial sums of money into the US economy, risks a renewed inflation spiral, causing the Fed to put the brakes on the economy by hiking interest rates. Further interest rate hikes this year risk a full-blown recession, which would manifest into a global conflict.

I. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN CAUSES THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD TO HIKE INTEREST RATES, COLLAPSING THE US ECONOMY.

A. THE FEDERAL RESERVE WILL PAUSE RAISING INTEREST RATES IN THE STATUS QUO.

Christopher Rugaber, (staff writer), FED RAISES KEY RATE BUT HINTS IT MAY PAUSE AMID BANK TURMOIL. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://apnews.com/article/federal-reserve-inflation-interest-rate-hikes-recession-aba096229d327d8abeb4bc13d85d1b2b>

The Federal Reserve reinforced its fight against high inflation Wednesday by raising its key interest rate by a quarter-point to the highest level in 16 years. But the Fed also signaled that it may now pause its streak of 10 rate hikes, which have made borrowing for consumers and businesses steadily more expensive.

B. THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN WILL INCREASE INFLATION (NOTE: ONLY READ EVIDENCE SPECIFIC TO THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN YOU ARE DEBATING).

1. A job guarantee causes inflation.

Professor William Mitchell, (professor of economics at the University of Newcastle), FULL EMPLOYMENT VIA A JOB GUARANTEE. 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from https://www.billmitchell.org/Job_Guarantee.php

The Job Guarantee wage provides a floor that prevents serious deflation from occurring and defines the private sector wage structure. However, if the private labor market is tight, the non-Job Guarantee wage will rise relative to the Job Guarantee wage, and the Job Guarantee pool drains. The smaller this pool, the less influence the Job Guarantee wage has on wage patterning. Unless the government stifles demand, the economy will then enter an inflationary episode, depending on the behaviour of labor and capital in the bargaining environment.

2. A Universal Basic Income will cause an inflation spiral.

Daniel Tsai, (Lecturer in Business and Law, Toronto Metropolitan University), WHY A UNIVERSAL JOB GUARANTEE BEATS THE BASIC INCOME PIPE DREAM. July 27, 2022. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://ca.news.yahoo.com/why-universal-job-guarantee-beats-155407371.html>

There are a few unique barriers that undermine universal basic income and its ability to be implemented. As we have seen with government support programs related to COVID-19, government stimulus in the form of direct cash can cause inflation. These programs reduce the supply of lower skilled employees in the job market, as some people invariably decide to stay at home, rather than work. Like the Canada Emergency Response Benefit, universal basic income might take away the incentive to work for some, resulting in a labour market bereft of workers. This would result in a vicious cycle: employers would raise wages to attract those willing to work, which would increase inflation and cost of living, causing businesses, in turn, to raise costs to be able to afford higher salaries for their workers.

3. *Accelerating inflation will cause the Fed to raise interest rates even further.*

Christopher Rugaber, (staff writer), FED RAISES KEY RATE BUT HINTS IT MAY PAUSE AMID BANK TURMOIL. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://apnews.com/article/federal-reserve-inflation-interest-rate-hikes-recession-aba096229d327d8abeb4bc13d85d1b2b>

When asked whether the Fed's key rate was now high enough to restrain the economy and curb inflation, Powell said, "We may not be far off — or possibly even at that level." James Knightley, chief international economist at ING, suggested that "with lending conditions rapidly tightening in the wake of recent bank stresses, we think this will mark the peak for interest rates." Still, if inflation were to accelerate, the Fed "won't hesitate to resume hiking interest rates because they're determined to break inflation's back," said Ryan Sweet, chief economist at Oxford Economics. "As such, there is a risk that the pause is temporary."

4. *Another interest rate hike could cause a recession.*

Li Zhouli, (politics reporter at Vox), WHY THE FED'S LATEST INTEREST RATE HIKE IS CONTROVERSIAL. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.vox.com/2023/5/3/23709902/federal-reserve-interest-rate-hike-recession>

Economists and experts who oppose raising rates, however, say inflation is already showing signs of slowing, and that additional rate increases could add even more challenges for small businesses and lead to a harmful uptick in unemployment. Ultimately, the concern is that another quarter-point rate hike could contribute to a recession that many have been dreading for months. On Monday, a group of Democrats including Sen. Elizabeth Warren and Rep. Pramila Jayapal were among those who urged a pause on the Fed's hikes, in order to "avoid engineering a recession that destroys jobs and crushes small businesses." "The arguments in favor of another rate hike ... rest on the concern that inflation will remain persistently too high," Moody's chief economist Mark Zandi told Vox. "My view is that ... any further rate hikes increases the odds that the Fed will unnecessarily push the economy into recession." [ellipses in original].

5. *Higher interest rates lead to a market meltdown and war.*

Cornelius Christian, (staff writer, Kitco News), THE BOTTOM IS IN FOR GOLD - WORLD WAR 3 IS ALREADY HERE & A GLOBAL ECONOMIC COLLAPSE WILL PAVE WAY FOR CBDCS. Jan. 18, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.kitco.com/news/2023-01-18/The-bottom-is-in-for-gold-World-War-3-is-already-here-a-global-economic-collapse-will-pave-way-for-CBDCs-Gerald-Celente.html>

Celente's optimistic prognosis for gold is due to his grim macroeconomic outlook, as well as gold's role as a hedge against financial instability. He claimed that 2023 would witness a "market meltdown," and suggested that the U.S. government would use war to distract its citizens from the harsh economic reality. "This is very important... we're talking about a market meltdown [in 2023]," said Celente. "The only thing that's keeping the markets up are interest rates. They go high, and the market goes down. When all else fails, they take you to war."

II. THE AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS TO THE DISADVANTAGE ARE INADEQUATE.

A. THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD WILL NOT RAISE INTEREST RATES NOW.

1. *The Federal Reserve will stop raising interest rates in the status quo.*

Brian Cheung, (staff writer), FEDERAL RESERVE SAYS IT MAY STOP INTEREST RATE HIKES AS BANKING CONCERNS LINGER. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.nbcnews.com/business/economy/when-will-interest-rate-hikes-stop-federal-reserve-banking-sector-rcna82763>

The Federal Reserve raised interest rates for the 10th consecutive meeting Wednesday but signaled those hikes might be done — thanks in part to jitters in the banking system. Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell said a pullback in bank lending would slow an economy that the central bank was already trying to cool as part of a broader effort to slow high inflation. The central bank expects banks to be more conservative in lending to households and businesses after the failures of three of the nation's 30 largest banks (Silicon Valley Bank, Signature Bank and First Republic Bank) in just the last two months. "In principle, we won't have to raise rates quite as high as we would have had this not happened," Powell told reporters Wednesday after the board raised interest rates by 0.25%, to a target range of 5.00% to 5.25%. Powell added that the Fed "may not be far off, or possibility even at," the level where it may not have to raise rates further.

2. *The Federal Reserve will pause its interest rate hikes in the status quo.*

Dani Romero, (staff writer, Yahoo Finance), STOCKS MIXED AS INFLATION DROPS BELOW 5% LEVEL: STOCK MARKET NEWS TODAY. May 10, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/stock-market-news-today-live-updates-may-10-113628919.html>

According to the latest data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics released Wednesday, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 0.4% in April over last month and 4.9% annually. Prices in March rose 0.1% on a monthly basis and 5% from the prior year. Economists had expected a monthly increase of 0.4% and an annual increase of 5%, according to data from Bloomberg. The report could add to expectations that the Fed will pause its rate-hiking campaign at its next meeting in June. April's 4.9% annual increase is still significantly above the Federal Reserve's 2% target, though.

3. *The Fed will stop raising interest rates now.*

Scott Horsley, (staff, National Public Radio), THE FED RAISES INTEREST RATES AGAIN IN WHAT COULD BE ITS FINAL ATTACK ON INFLATION. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.npr.org/2023/05/03/1173371788/the-fed-raises-interest-rates-again-in-what-could-be-its-final-attack-on-inflati>

Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell speaks during a news conference at the Federal Reserve in Washington, D.C, on March 22, 2023. The Fed raised interest rates again Wednesday but signalled it may be the last hike for a while. The Federal Reserve raised interest rates by another quarter percentage point Wednesday, extending its 14-month crackdown on stubborn inflation. With signs of a softening job market and slower economic growth, this could be the central bank's last rate hike for a while, especially as turmoil in the banking sector raises new uncertainties. The Fed hinted as much in a statement, dropping a line it used previously about the likely need for additional rate increases.

4. *The Fed won't increase interest rates anymore.*

Sarah Foster, (economics reporter), HOW MUCH MORE WILL THE FED RAISE RATES IN 2023? OFFICIALS 'MIGHT NOT BE FAR OFF,' FED CHIEF SAYS. May 16, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.bankrate.com/banking/federal-reserve/how-much-will-fed-raise-rates-in-2023/>

Investors, however, don't see the Fed lifting rates anymore from here. Officials are seen standing pat on rates at the June and July meetings, according to CME Group's FedWatch tool. An even bigger curveball from what Fed officials are expecting, traders also see 75 basis points worth of cuts by the end of the year, the tool also shows.

5. *The Federal Reserve will cut interest rates this year.*

Michael S. Derby, (staff writer), PREMATURE FOR FED TO CALL END TO RATE HIKES WITH INFLATION STILL HIGH, WILLIAMS SAYS. May 9, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.reuters.com/markets/us/feds-williams-says-inflation-still-too-high-eyeing-financial-conditions-2023-05-09/>

Williams' remarks on the outlook for interest rates marked his first public comments since the Fed last week raised its benchmark overnight interest rate by a quarter of a percentage point to the 5.00%-5.25% range. The central bank also signaled that after just over a year of aggressive rate hikes, it may be done, or close to it, with the rate rises. Many participants in financial markets reckon the Fed will refrain from raising rates at its June 13-14 policy meeting, and traders are pricing in the strong possibility the U.S. central bank will cut rates this year.

6. *There will be no further interest rate hikes in the present system.*

Li Zhouli, (politics reporter at Vox), WHY THE FED'S LATEST INTEREST RATE HIKE IS CONTROVERSIAL. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.vox.com/2023/5/3/23709902/federal-reserve-interest-rate-hike-recession>

In the last year, the Fed has been laser-focused on a central goal: bringing inflation down. As Vox's Emily Stewart explained, its main tool for doing that has been raising interest rates, which makes borrowing money more expensive for consumers and businesses. The thinking behind this approach is that as borrowing goes down, consumer spending and demand also decline, leading to reductions in price. The Fed's decision to hike interest rates again is simply a continuation of this approach, and many economists and market watchers theorize that this could be the last hike for the next few months. "We are taking the only measures we have to bring inflation down," Powell testified in Congress earlier this year. Comments he made Wednesday also signaled that the Fed would likely be more conservative about additional rate increases, though he didn't take them off the table completely.

C. INFLATION WILL DECREASE IN THE STATUS QUO

1. *Inflation will decrease in the present system.*

Michael S. Derby, (staff writer), PREMATURE FOR FED TO CALL END TO RATE HIKES WITH INFLATION STILL HIGH, WILLIAMS SAYS. May 9, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.reuters.com/markets/us/feds-williams-says-inflation-still-too-high-eyeing-financial-conditions-2023-05-09/>

In his speech, Williams said he expects inflation, which was running at an annual rate of 4.2% in March as measured by the personal consumption expenditures price index, to fall to 3.25% this year and back to the 2% target by 2025. He noted there have been signs of slowing price pressures but core services inflation stripped of housing factors remains persistent.

2. *Inflation is slowing now.*

Christopher Rugaber, (staff writer), FED RAISES KEY RATE BUT HINTS IT MAY PAUSE AMID BANK TURMOIL. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://apnews.com/article/federal-reserve-inflation-interest-rate-hikes-recession-aba096229d327d8abeb4bc13d85d1b2b>

In the U.S., several factors are slowing inflation. The rise in rental costs has eased as more newly built apartments have come online. Gas and energy prices have fallen. Food costs are moderating. Supply chain snarls are no longer blocking trade, thereby lowering the cost for new and used cars, furniture and appliances.

3. *Inflation is slowing now.*

Jeff Cox, (staff writer), INFLATION RATE EASES TO 4.9% IN APRIL, LESS THAN EXPECTATIONS. May 10, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/05/10/cpi-inflation-april-2023.html>

A widely followed measure of inflation rose in April, though the pace of the annual increase provided some hope that the cost of living will head lower later this year. The consumer price index, which measures the cost of a broad swath of goods and services, increased 0.4% for the month, in line with the Dow Jones estimate, according to a Labor Department report Wednesday. However, that equated to an annual increase of 4.9%, slightly less than the 5% estimate and the lowest annual pace since April 2021. The annual rate was 5% in March.

Lauren Aratani, (reporter for Guardian US), THE GUARDIAN. Apr. 12, 2023. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2023/apr/12/cpi-inflation-rate-march-prices-fed>

US annual inflation reduced to 5% last month, official figures reveal, the slowest pace for price increases since 2021 they first began to climb. March's monthly consumer price index (CPI), which measures the price of a basket of goods and services, showed the rate easing off over the last year. In February, the annual inflation figure stood at 6%, already a steep decline from its peak of 9.1% in June.

4. *The United States Will Avoid A Recession In the Status Quo*

Brian Cheung, (staff writer), FEDERAL RESERVE SAYS IT MAY STOP INTEREST RATE HIKES AS BANKING CONCERNS LINGER. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.nbcnews.com/business/economy/when-will-interest-rate-hikes-stop-federal-reserve-banking-sector-rcna82763>

Powell said the U.S. banking sector looks "sound and resilient." Asked about the odds of a recession, he said he was optimistic. "The case of avoiding a recession is in my view more likely than that of having a recession," Powell told reporters Wednesday.

D. THE FEDERAL RESERVE IS WILLING TO RAISE INTEREST RATES TO FIGHT RENEWED INFLATION

1. *The Fed is willing to raise interest rates to fight inflation.*

Michael S. Derby, (staff writer), PREMATURE FOR FED TO CALL END TO RATE HIKES WITH INFLATION STILL HIGH, WILLIAMS SAYS. May 9, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.reuters.com/markets/us/feds-williams-says-inflation-still-too-high-eyeing-financial-conditions-2023-05-09/>

New York Federal Reserve President John Williams said on Tuesday it is too soon to say whether the U.S. central bank is done raising interest rates, arguing that if more action is needed policymakers won't hold back. "We haven't said we are done raising rates" and Fed officials have not yet decided what lies ahead with possible increases in short-term borrowing costs, Williams said at an Economic Club of New York gathering. "We've made incredible progress" in taking action to lower overly high levels of inflation, but "if additional policy firming is appropriate, we'll do that," he said.

2. *The Fed is willing to raise interest rates this year.*

Michael S. Derby, (staff writer), PREMATURE FOR FED TO CALL END TO RATE HIKES WITH INFLATION STILL HIGH, WILLIAMS SAYS. May 9, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.reuters.com/markets/us/feds-williams-says-inflation-still-too-high-eyeing-financial-conditions-2023-05-09/>

The Fed is eyeing an end to the rate-hike cycle as inflation pressures have eased a bit and banking sector stress has increased uncertainty about the outlook. Tighter financial conditions tied to banking sector troubles are expected to help further cool the economy, although it's unclear by how much. But the prospect of further rate rises remains alive, and last week's robust employment report for April showed that the job market remains very strong even in the face of Fed action, which could in turn compel the central bank to press forward with rate hikes at some point this year.

3. *The Fed has left the window open for future rate hikes.*

Irina Ivanova, (staff writer), FED RAISES INTEREST RATE 0.25 PERCENTAGE POINT, BUT COULD BE READY TO PAUSE. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/federal-reserve-interest-rate-hike-0-25-percentage-point/>

"The Fed is no longer flagging that further hikes should clearly be expected, but this falls short of a strong commitment to 'pause' on rate hikes," Brian Coulton, chief economist at Fitch, said in a note. "They are still talking about how they will determine the 'extent' of additional policy firming — not whether additional tightening is needed or not. The ongoing tightening of credit conditions is recognized, but they have still raised rates today and have left the window open for future hikes."

4. *Future events will be key to determining whether the Fed raises interest rates.*

Irina Ivanova, (staff writer), FED RAISES INTEREST RATE 0.25 PERCENTAGE POINT, BUT COULD BE READY TO PAUSE. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/federal-reserve-interest-rate-hike-0-25-percentage-point/>

Still, banks will likely be more hesitant to lend in wake of the turmoil, further slowing the economy and muting inflation pressures, he said. "The strains that emerged in the banking sector in March result in tighter conditions. These tighter credit conditions are likely to weigh on economic activity, hiring and inflation," Powell said. "In light of these uncertain headwinds, along with monetary policy restraint we put in place, our future policy actions will depend on how events unfold."

E. A JOBS GUARANTEE WILL TRIGGER THE DISADVANTAGE.

1. *A job guarantee will cause an inflation spiral.*

Thomas Palley, (independent economist living in Washington DC), JOB GUARANTEE PROGRAMS: CAREFUL WHAT YOU WISH FOR. Sept. 14, 2018. Retrieved May 23, 2023 from <https://www.socialeurope.eu/job-guarantee-programs-careful-what-you-wish-for>

A third macroeconomic concern is inflation. The JGP wage is a real wage, which means the JGP nominal wage must be tied to inflation. Private sector nominal wages may then likely be tied to the JGP nominal wage to maintain an appropriate wage differential. Consequently, the JGP nominal wage could start to act as a form of economy-wide nominal wage indexation. Such indexation could potentially generate an unstable wage – price spiral, particularly if the existence of a JGP aggravates distributional conflict by increasing private sector wage demands. Raising the private sector wage share may be a desirable feature, but it points to the need for additional macroeconomic stabilisation policy tools. That requirement is either ignored or denied by JGP proponents.

2. *A job guarantee causes wage inflation.*

Eduardo Porter, (economics reporter for the business section of The New York Times), SHOULD THE FEDS GUARANTEE YOU A JOB? Feb. 18, 2021. Retrieved May 6, 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/18/business/economy/job-guarantee.html>

On paper, at least, a job guarantee would drastically moderate recessions, as the government mopped up workers displaced by an economic downturn. But unlike President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s programs to provide jobs to millions displaced by the Great Depression, the idea now is not just to address joblessness, but to improve jobs even in good times. If the federal government offered jobs at \$15 an hour plus health insurance, it would force private employers who wanted to hang on to their work force to pay at least as much. A federal job guarantee “sets minimum standards for work,” Dr. Hamilton said.

3. *Lobbyists will demand high wages and benefits for a job guarantee—causing inflation.*

Cullen Roche, (Founder and Chief Investment Officer of Discipline Funds), CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISMS OF A JOB GUARANTEE PROGRAM. Feb. 8, 2022. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.pragcap.com/mmt-job-guarantee/>

Are there enough productive jobs to justify the potential rise in prices that could occur from demand pull inflation (oil, gas, food, etc)? Bill Mitchell says there will be a “one off” rise in prices, but this assumes a perfect elasticity of supply. Anyone watching the oil markets in recent years know this is not a hard and fast rule. More demand is not always met by more supply. Since the program is permanent it’s likely that the effect on prices will become permanent (again, just wait til the army of lobbyists get involved fixing prices, benefits, etc etc) to some degree. This will be a largely permanent allocation of Federal spending going towards the JG. If the transition isn’t as smooth as theorists expect or any other of numbers eat into its counter-cyclical effects then the program because ripe to becoming a massive case of malinvestment.

F. A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME WILL CAUSE AN INFLATION SPIRAL

1. *A Universal Basic Income causes inflation.*

CORPORATE FINANCE INSTITUTE, UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME (UBI). Jan. 7, 2023. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/career/universal-basic-income-ubi/>

Drawbacks of a Universal Basic Income A UBI system is still a theoretical approach, one that comes with good intentions and noble goals. Still, widespread financial equality and independence offer the potential to cause some serious economic issues. One major issue with a universal basic income, raised by those who oppose such a practice, is inflation. It's easy to see how the institution of a UBI may fuel inflation. If every individual is granted an unconditional income from the government, then there is money to be spent. Providing massive amounts of money to virtually every individual in the country translates to a massively expanded money supply. It means that there is a higher demand for goods and services that manufacturers and retailers produce and sell. The law of supply and demand dictates that, as demand pressure increases on producers and retailers, they must increase prices on the available supply of goods and services to avoid being overwhelmed by the increased demand. That is inflation.

2. *A Universal Basic Income causes an inflation spiral.*

CORPORATE FINANCE INSTITUTE, UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME (UBI). Jan. 7, 2023. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/career/universal-basic-income-ubi/>

If the end result of a UBI turns out to be uncontrolled inflation, then the cost of living continues to increase. It would necessitate an increase in the level of universal basic income provided to all citizens or allowing the standard of living for UBI recipients to decline, as they are able to purchase fewer goods and services with the amount of UBI they receive. Unless something can be done to manage the situation, there would just be a vicious circle created of higher UBI leading to increased prices, leading to a necessary increase in the UBI amount, leading to still higher prices... you get the idea.

3. *Despite some pilot projects saying a UBI would not increase inflation, a more generous program could fuel inflation.*

Amy Livingston, (freelance writer), Pros and Cons of Universal Basic Income (UBI). Jan. 26, 2023. Retrieved May 26, 2023 from <https://www.moneycrashers.com/pros-and-cons-universal-basic-income/>

Some economists argue that higher wages could be a bad thing because they might drive up inflation. But that hasn't happened in Alaska, the one state with a UBI program. On average, inflation in Alaska is rising about as fast as in the U.S. as a whole. However, the yearly payouts from the Alaska Permanent Fund are fairly small. It's still possible a more generous UBI program, such as former presidential candidate Andrew Yang's proposed Freedom Dividend of \$1,000 per month, would be enough to drive both wages and prices higher.

G. RENEWED INFLATION CAUSES THE FED TO HIKE INTEREST RATES

1. *A surprise increase in inflation will lead the Fed to raise interest rates.*

Alexandra Canal, (Senior Reporter Yahoo Finance), INFLATION: CONSUMER PRICES IN APRIL RISE AT SLOWEST ANNUAL RATE IN 2 YEARS. May 10, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/april-cpi-inflation-data-may-10-2023-123320030.html>

"We expect to receive more encouraging news on the inflation front as the economy cools though we won't reach the Fed's 2% inflation target for quite some time," Oren Klachkin, lead US economist at Oxford Economics, wrote in reaction to Wednesday's report. "Investors have been betting on Fed rate cuts later this year but we think that view is misguided. We think the Fed will maintain a hawkish bias through year-end and won't hesitate to raise rates again if inflation and the labor market data surprise strongly to the upside," Klachkin warned.

2. *Raising interest rates too fast could send the economy into recession.*

Alexandra Canal, (Senior Reporter Yahoo Finance), INFLATION: CONSUMER PRICES IN APRIL RISE AT SLOWEST ANNUAL RATE IN 2 YEARS. May 10, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/april-cpi-inflation-data-may-10-2023-123320030.html>

The Fed has been raising interest rates in an effort to bring down inflation, but the central bank risks sending the economy into recession by raising rates too high too fast. Last week, the Fed signaled it could pause its hikes, saying it would assess incoming data ahead of its June meeting.

3. *Higher inflation rates will lead to interest rate hikes.*

Sarah Foster, (economics reporter), HOW MUCH MORE WILL THE FED RAISE RATES IN 2023? OFFICIALS 'MIGHT NOT BE FAR OFF,' FED CHIEF SAYS. May 16, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.bankrate.com/banking/federal-reserve/how-much-will-fed-raise-rates-in-2023/>

The largest majority of Fed officials also showed they see the risks to core and headline inflation as weighted to the upside, even if a growing share of officials are starting to see those risks as balanced. "They may or may not be right with that risk assessment, but it tells you a lot about where they're willing to air," says Kathy Bostjancic, chief economist at Nationwide. "They're willing to air on the side of higher interest rates because of the risk of inflation being higher."

4. *Inflation would be a primary factor in decisions to raise interest rates further.*

Jeff Cox, (staff writer), FED INCREASES RATES A QUARTER POINT AND SIGNALS A POTENTIAL END TO HIKES. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/05/03/fed-rate-decision-may-2023-.html>

The statement also tweaked language to outline the conditions under which "additional policy firming may be appropriate." Previously, the FOMC had framed the forward guidance around how it would determine "the extent of future increases in the target range." The statement reiterated that the Fed "will take into account the cumulative tightening of monetary policy, the lags with which monetary policy affects economic activity and inflation, and economic and financial developments." Taken together, the moves are at least a tenuous nod that while tight policy could remain in effect, the path ahead is less clear for actual interest rate hikes as policymakers assess incoming data and financial conditions.

5. *A rise in inflation expectations risks a market over-reaction that is worse than the inflation itself.*

George Calhoun, (Founder & Director of the Quantitative Finance Program and Hanlon Financial Systems Center at the Stevens Institute of Technology), THE INFLATION SCARE DOESN'T MATCH REALITY. May 1, 2021. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/georgecalhoun/2021/05/01/the-inflation-scare-doesnt-match-reality/?sh=a07a6f610495>

The important question is whether this climate of pessimism will influence policy-makers in a way that leads to further trouble. Inflation is said to be driven partly (or principally) by the public's expectations of inflation. The surfeit of false alarms may end up creating the very danger that it is designed to forestall. "If inflation expectations lurch upward, that could embolden more hawkish officials to press for faster rate increases. Overreacting to such an inflation scare may be a bigger risk than inflation itself."

H. A US RECESSION CAUSES A GLOBAL RECESSION

1. *The Great Recession proves: US economic decline will quickly spread to other nations around the globe.*

Muhammad Shahzad Akram, (Research Officer at the Center for International Strategic Studies), Jan. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2023/01/30/are-we-going-into-another-economic-recession-what-history-tells-us/>

The Great Recession was a period of economic decline that lasted from December 2007 to June 2009. It was considered the most severe recession since the Great Depression of the 1930s. The Great Recession began in the United States and quickly spread to other countries around the world. The primary cause of the Great Recession was the collapse of the housing market in the United States, triggered by the widespread use of risky subprime mortgages and lax lending standards. The housing market crash led to a decline in housing prices and a wave of foreclosures, which in turn led to a decline in consumer spending and a decrease in economic activity.

2. *A decline in the US economy threatens the world economy.*

THE ECONOMIST. Oct. 11, 2018. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2018/10/11/the-world-economy-looks-dependent-on-booming-america>

The danger is that America's outperformance pushes the dollar even higher, leading to more volatility in global finance and crimping growth in emerging markets. Yet America's boom will not last for ever. Tax cuts will no longer provide incremental stimulus after 2019. Some forecasters fret that an end to the largesse, together with higher interest rates, may be sufficient to tip the country into recession by 2020. Analysts expect America's economy, with its ageing population, to expand by less than 2% a year in the long run. That suggests that, unless productivity surges, a slowdown must eventually come. The question then is whether the rest of the world can withstand, let alone make up for, an eventual slowdown in America. Not long ago, the consensus may have been that it could cope. Now there is more to worry about.

3. *The global economy is interconnected.*

Muhammad Shahzad Akram, (Research Officer at the Center for International Strategic Studies), Jan. 30, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2023/01/30/are-we-going-into-another-economic-recession-what-history-tells-us/>

Governments around the world are taking measures to mitigate the economic impact of the crisis, including fiscal policies such as stimulus spending and monetary policies such as interest rate cuts. Central banks are also taking action to provide liquidity to the financial system and to support the economy. The current economic crisis is a reminder of the interconnectedness of the global economy and the importance of swift and coordinated action to mitigate the economic impact of such crises. The crisis has also highlighted the importance of economic diversification, and the need for countries to build resilient economies that can withstand future shocks.

I. INTEREST RATE HIKES RISK RECESSION

1. *Further rate hikes could fuel another recession.*

Li Zhouli, (politics reporter at Vox), WHY THE FED'S LATEST INTEREST RATE HIKE IS CONTROVERSIAL. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.vox.com/2023/5/3/23709902/federal-reserve-interest-rate-hike-recession>

As the Fed's hikes have continued, there's also been growing opposition to them due to fears that they could fuel another recession and have other negative side effects. As the failure of multiple banks — including Silicon Valley Bank, Signature Bank, and First Republic Bank — have shown, higher interest rates have meant that the Fed's rate hikes can have unexpected ripple effects. "The Fed has already broken something. It is going to break more things if it keeps hiking," says Stony Brook economist Stephanie Kelton. Given the recent bank failures, other financial institutions are poised to limit the lending they do, a move that could impact small businesses and their ability to get loans.

2. *A pause in increasing interest rates is necessary to avoid pushing the US economy into a recession.*

Irina Ivanova, (staff writer), FED RAISES INTEREST RATE 0.25 PERCENTAGE POINT, BUT COULD BE READY TO PAUSE. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/federal-reserve-interest-rate-hike-0-25-percentage-point/>

Higher interest rates act on inflation by making it more expensive for businesses and consumers to borrow money, slowing economic activity. Many economists have been calling on the Fed to pause its current rate-hiking regime to avoid pushing the economy into a recession and, more recently, raising pressure on the banking sector.

3. *Tightening interest rates causes economic growth to decline.*

US WEALTH MANAGEMENT, May 5, 2023. HOW DO RISING INTEREST RATES AFFECT THE STOCK MARKET? Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.usbank.com/investing/financial-perspectives/market-news/how-do-rising-interest-rates-affect-the-stock-market.html>

There are various reasons why increasing interest rates can have an impact on equity markets. For example, it could affect future earnings growth for U.S. companies. “As the Fed tightens interest rates, we can expect a decline in economic growth,” says Freedman. In fact, GDP growth slowed considerably in 2022, growing at 2.1% (compared to 5.9% in 2021). In the first quarter of 2023, the economy grew at an annualized rate of just 1.1%. Economic weakness can slow down business activity, which potentially detracts from corporate earnings, and ultimately pressuring stock prices.

4. *Each new rate hike will have a greater effect on the US economy.*

Sarah Foster, (economics reporter), HOW MUCH MORE WILL THE FED RAISE RATES IN 2023? OFFICIALS ‘MIGHT NOT BE FAR OFF,’ FED CHIEF SAYS. May 16, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.bankrate.com/banking/federal-reserve/how-much-will-fed-raise-rates-in-2023/>

With rates no longer stimulating economic growth, each rate hike from here could have an even greater effect on the U.S. economy. “If you’re balancing risks and you get less worried about the economy slowing and more worried about inflation just staying high and getting built in to the price and wage-setting process, then you might conclude you need to move faster,” says Bill English, a finance professor at the Yale School of Management, who spent 20 years at the Fed. “Lags just make the problem harder because you have to be forward-looking and judge where the economy is going to be.”

J. INTEREST RATE HIKES CAUSE A BANKING COLLAPSE

1. *Heightened inflation and interest rate hikes risk a full-fledged banking crisis.*

Sarah Foster, (economics reporter), HOW MUCH MORE WILL THE FED RAISE RATES IN 2023? OFFICIALS ‘MIGHT NOT BE FAR OFF,’ FED CHIEF SAYS. May 16, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.bankrate.com/banking/federal-reserve/how-much-will-fed-raise-rates-in-2023/>

But those smaller moves haven’t been without bumps in the road — and staying focused on fighting inflation hasn’t been easy. Three major bank failures rocked financial markets throughout the first half of the year, creating stability concerns and amplifying fears of a full-fledged banking crisis. Experts say those bank failures are unlike what happened during the 2008 financial crisis but highlight just how many cracks in an otherwise-sound system can form when inflation — and interest rates — soar much higher and faster than anyone could’ve predicted.

2. *A pullback in bank lending could cause a recession.*

Christopher Rugaber, (staff writer), FED RAISES KEY RATE BUT HINTS IT MAY PAUSE AMID BANK TURMOIL. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://apnews.com/article/federal-reserve-inflation-interest-rate-hikes-recession-aba096229d327d8abeb4bc13d85d1b2b>

Goldman Sachs estimates that a widespread pullback in bank lending could cut U.S. growth by 0.4 percentage point this year. That could be enough to cause a recession. In December, the Fed projected growth of just 0.5% in 2023.

3. *Interest rate hikes threaten a bank collapse.*

Elisabeth Buchwald, (staff writer), WHY THE FED WILL LIKELY RAISE RATES TWO DAYS AFTER FIRST REPUBLIC FAILED. May 2, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.cnn.com/2023/05/02/business/fed-rate-hike-banking-crisis/index.html>

When the Fed raises interest rates, banks need to raise the rates on their savings accounts in order to lure in depositors from their competitors. That can put a disproportionate amount of pressure on mid-sized and regional banks — like the ones who saw depositors pull their money when the banking crisis began in March.

4. *Tremors in the banking system add to the risk of a recession.*

Brian Cheung, (staff writer), FEDERAL RESERVE SAYS IT MAY STOP INTEREST RATE HIKES AS BANKING CONCERNS LINGER. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.nbcnews.com/business/economy/when-will-interest-rate-hikes-stop-federal-reserve-banking-sector-rcna82763>

Although they are helpful to the Fed's mission to lower inflation, the tremors in the banking system add the risk of financial instability to an already uncertain economic outlook. "Credit conditions risks will naturally raise questions about recession," Deutsche Bank wrote April 28.

5. *Bank failures hurt the economy.*

Sarah Foster, (economics reporter), HOW MUCH MORE WILL THE FED RAISE RATES IN 2023? OFFICIALS 'MIGHT NOT BE FAR OFF,' FED CHIEF SAYS. May 16, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.bankrate.com/banking/federal-reserve/how-much-will-fed-raise-rates-in-2023/>

Powell repeated in May that those hot prices are underscoring the need for monetary policy to remain tight. But those bank failures could also weigh on the economy, especially if banks tighten lending even more than they already have been in response to higher rates from the Fed. Less credit in the financial system could weigh on spending and cool inflation, meaning the Fed might not have to raise interest rates as high.

K. INTEREST RATE HIKES UNDERMINE CHINA'S ECONOMY.

1. *Interest Rate Hikes in America undermine China's economy.*

Trevir Nath, (financial writer), HOW US INTEREST RATES MOVE THE WORLD ECONOMY. Nov. 30, 2022. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/092415/how-us-interest-rates-move-world-economy.asp>

The most profound consequences of interest rate hikes in America are likely to come at the expense of Asian economies, accelerating capital outflows from China and creating more instability in that nation, which is already experiencing financial turbulence. Historically, China has borrowed from foreign banks to stimulate growth. This borrowing was fueled by lower interest rates. But with tighter credit conditions looming, foreign lending to heavily indebted countries will drop off significantly.

2. *A collapse in the Chinese economy leads to a Chinese invasion of Taiwan.*

Andrew Zeng, (Stanford University), STANFORD ECONOMIC REVIEW. Mar. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://stanfordeconreview.com/2023/03/02/long-form-commentary-chinas-economic-decline-is-imminent-which-spells-trouble-for-taiwan/>

But what Heath and others like him fail to take into account is the mercuriality of authoritarian leadership and the fact that, as Hicham Alaoui puts it, “political regimes are not static.” Indeed, within the next half-decade, China will experience a series of changes that could wreak havoc on its economy and lead it to lose pace with the United States. These changes include the demographic legacy of the one-child policy, the collapse of a housing bubble, and fallout from its draconian zero-COVID policy. These three factors could, in conjunction, cause China to realize that if it does not invade Taiwan immediately, it may never get the chance; as a result, there could emerge a strict time window under which China would have to act. The economic decline of America’s fiercest peer-competitor, then, might prove even deadlier than its continued growth. Given the timescales on which many scholars believe China’s economic decline could occur, an invasion of Taiwan within the next half-decade is a very real possibility, and adequate research should be taken to guard against it.

3. *A collapse in China’s economy leads to an invasion of Taiwan.*

Andrew Zeng, (Stanford University), STANFORD ECONOMIC REVIEW. Mar. 2, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://stanfordeconreview.com/2023/03/02/long-form-commentary-chinas-economic-decline-is-imminent-which-spells-trouble-for-taiwan/>

China will face extreme economic and societal pressures within the next few years. These pressures will lead to a hampering of economic growth that could in turn feasibly result in a decline in power relative to the US. At this point, it is important to consider that the Chinese government is, at least to some degree, aware of the issues which might plague it in the next few years, and that the Xi administration has taken some concrete steps towards addressing many of them. Still, it may be a case of too little, too late. And if the administration believes that China’s relative decline is inevitable, it could decide that the best time to take back Taiwan is now. This is what Heath fails to consider when he states that an invasion of Taiwan appears, despite all evidence to the contrary, not to be imminent. China is making any preparations it can for war without seeming outright hostile to the US, as an immediate escalation of warlike language on state TV networks would undoubtedly do. And while the Chinese economy continues to grow (albeit at a slower pace than before and at a miniscule rate higher than the US), it could come toppling down in an instant. Given this, it is fair to wonder whether at its peak, China would really accept falling so far behind the US that any ambitions it has of retaking Taiwan become little more than a pipe dream. In such a circumstance, there is a real and significant chance that China could attempt to retake Taiwan. Such a scenario could come dangerously soon, and policymakers and decision-makers at the upper echelons of the US government should have their eyes transfixed on China’s circumstances and actions, so that adequate planning will be in place in the event of a Taiwanese invasion in the near future. A Repugnant Conclusion To his credit, Mr. Heath does advise to “closely monitor Chinese military deployments and ensure appropriate deterrence.” It’s certainly a positive step, but much more would be necessary to ensure that American interests are protected. The US would need to monitor China’s economic situation closely and take note of any changes in rhetoric at the highest levels of the CCP that could be indicative of a wider policy shift towards preparing for an invasion of Taiwan. Importantly, US policymakers should not make the mistake of viewing any Chinese economic decline with euphoria, but rather with a cautious eye. A weaker China, after all, is also a more desperate China.

4. *A Chinese invasion of Taiwan goes nuclear and risks extinction.*

Ryan Bohl, (Middle East and North Africa analyst for Stratfor), ATLANTIC SENTINEL. Dec. 8, 2016. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://atlanticsentinel.com/2016/12/why-taiwan-could-still-start-world-war-iii/>

Surely you know already the tripwire: Taiwan is a de facto country but a de jure province of mainland China. The people's republic wants to bring it back under mainland China's rule while the people of Taiwan want exactly the opposite. Moreover, Taiwan's military security is guaranteed by the United States via the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, which stipulates the United States must respond militarily to a communist invasion. So if the PRC tries to bring Taiwan back into the fold by military force, the United States must retaliate. Conventional battles turn to nuclear battles and then we all die in the irradiated glow of our own monstrous weapons.

L. ADDITIONAL RATE HIKES HURT THE LABOR MARKET.

1. *Additional rate hikes risk collapsing the labor market.*

Scott Horsley, (staff, National Public Radio), THE FED RAISES INTEREST RATES AGAIN IN WHAT COULD BE ITS FINAL ATTACK ON INFLATION. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.npr.org/2023/05/03/1173371788/the-fed-raises-interest-rates-again-in-what-could-be-its-final-attack-on-inflati>

Some observers warn that any additional rate hikes by the Fed would put more jobs at risk, without necessarily doing much to control prices. "It becomes less and less warranted to continue pursuing policies that theoretically bring down inflation but at expense of the labor market," said Lindsay Owens, executive director of the Groundwork Collaborative, a progressive think tank in Washington, D.C. "It's not the case that we have to keep hammering away."

2. *Strong labor market key to the US avoiding a recession.*

Lauren Kaori Gurley, (labor reporter for the Washington Post), WASHINGTON POST. May 5, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/05/05/april-jobs-report-unemployment/>

Federal Reserve Chair Jerome H. Powell said on Wednesday that he remains optimistic that the United States can narrowly avoid a recession thanks to the ongoing resilience of the labor market, which has persevered in the face of more than a year of aggressive interest rate increases.

3. *The strong US labor market is buoying the US economy.*

Lauren Kaori Gurley, (labor reporter for the Washington Post), WASHINGTON POST. May 5, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/05/05/april-jobs-report-unemployment/>

Employers created 253,000 jobs in April, keeping the U.S. economy afloat amid a banking crisis, rising interest rates, the prospect of devastating U.S. government default and a spike in layoffs. The unemployment rate dropped to 3.4 percent last month, according to a Bureau of Labor Statistics report released Friday, matching a low from May 1969. "This jobs report does not look recessionary at all," said Bill Adams, chief economist for Comerica Bank. "Other economic indicators give more reasons for concern, but the jobs report says the labor market is still extremely tight." The remarkable strength of the pandemic recovery labor market, despite some softening, is buoying the U.S. economy through enormous uncertainty. The April jobs report, which beat economists' forecasts, showed the 28th straight month of solid job growth. Adults in their prime working age of between 25 and 54 are back in the workforce at rates not seen since before the labor market wreckage of the Great Recession. Jobless benefit claims have been slowly inching up but still show no signs of an economic downturn.

4. *Markets would be concerned about future rate increases.*

Jeff Cox, (staff writer), FED INCREASES RATES A QUARTER POINT AND SIGNALS A POTENTIAL END TO HIKES. May 3, 2023. Retrieved May 21, 2023 from <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/05/03/fed-rate-decision-may-2023-.html>

The Federal Reserve on Wednesday approved its 10th interest rate increase in just a little over a year and dropped a tentative hint that the current tightening cycle is at an end. In a unanimous decision widely expected by markets, the central bank's Federal Open Market Committee raised its benchmark borrowing rate by 0.25 percentage point. The rate sets what banks charge each other for overnight lending but feeds through to many consumer debt products such as mortgages, auto loans and credit cards. The increase takes the fed funds rate to a target range of 5%-5.25%, the highest since August 2007. Markets, though, are more focused on whether the Fed will pause here, particularly with lingering concerns over economic growth and a banking crisis that has rattled nerves on Wall Street. Stocks rose slightly and Treasury yields were mostly lower immediately following the Fed news, but stocks struggled to hold on to the gains.

5. *Continued US economic strength is necessary to deter a great power nuclear war.*

Thomas H. Henriksen, (Hoover Institution), POST-AMERICAN WORLD ORDER, Mar. 23, 2017. Retrieved May 11, 2021 from <https://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>

The tensions stoked by the assertive regimes in the Kremlin or Tiananmen Square could spark a political or military incident that might set off a chain reaction leading to a large-scale war. Historically, powerful rivalries nearly always lead to at least skirmishes, if not a full-blown war. The anomalous Cold War era spared the United States and Soviet Russia a direct conflict, largely from concerns that one would trigger a nuclear exchange destroying both states and much of the world. Such a repetition might reoccur in the unfolding three-cornered geopolitical world. It seems safe to acknowledge that an ascendant China and a resurgent Russia will persist in their geo-strategic ambitions. What Is To Be Done? The first marching order is to dodge any kind of perpetual war of the sort that George Orwell outlined in “1984,” which engulfed the three super states of Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania, and made possible the totalitarian Big Brother regime. A long-running Cold War-type confrontation would almost certainly take another form than the one that ran from 1945 until the downfall of the Soviet Union. What prescriptions can be offered in the face of the escalating competition among the three global powers? First, by staying militarily and economically strong, the United States will have the resources to deter its peers’ hawkish behavior that might otherwise trigger a major conflict. Judging by the history of the Cold War, the coming strategic chess match with Russia and China will prove tense and demanding—since all the countries boast nuclear arms and long-range ballistic missiles. Next, the United States should widen and sustain willing coalitions of partners, something at which America excels, and at which China and Russia fail conspicuously. There can be little room for error in fraught crises among nuclear-weaponized and hostile powers. Short- and long-term standoffs are likely, as they were during the Cold War. Thus, the playbook, in part, involves a waiting game in which each power looks to its rivals to suffer grievous internal problems which could entail a collapse, as happened to the Soviet Union.

6. *Economic growth is critical to avert great power war.*

Thomas H. Henriksen, (Hoover Institution), POST-AMERICAN WORLD ORDER, Mar. 23, 2017. Retrieved May 11, 2021 from <https://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>

Some Chinese and Russian experts predict grave domestic problems for each other. They also entertain similar thoughts about the United States, which they view as terminally decadent and catastrophically polarized over politics, ethnicity, and the future direction of the country. So, the brewing three-way struggle also involves a systemic contest, which will test the competitors’ economic and political institutions. At this juncture, the world is entering a standoff among the three great and several not-so-great powers. Averting war, while defending our interests, will prove a challenge, calling for deft policy, political endurance, and economic growth, as well as sufficient military force to keep at bay aggressive states or prevail over them if ever a war breaks out.

7. *Inflation harms the most economically vulnerable of society.*

Desmond Lachman, (fellow @ the American Enterprise Institute), THE HILL. INFLATION STALKS THE US ECONOMY. May 4, 2021. Retrieved from <https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/551727-inflation-stalks-the-us-economy>

The Fed's tardiness in responding to mounting inflationary evidence is to be regretted since we know that the main victims of higher inflation are the economically most vulnerable members of society. It is also to be regretted since it heightens the chances that we will have a hard economic landing when the Fed eventually has to slam on the monetary policy brakes.