

Written by <u>William P. Hoar</u> on October 7, 2020 Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of <u>the New American</u> magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

Correction, Please!

Biden's New Plan Is an Old Ploy: More Taxing, Spending, and Regulating



Math challenged or untruthful? America's "rich" — those making over \$200,000 per year — earn about \$3.5 trillion per year, and taking half of that would barely pay off America's yearly deficit, yet Biden promises only the rich will pay for his multiple multi-trillion-dollar plans for our country. (*Photo: AP Images*)

Item: Bloomberg Businessweek, in a double issue on voting dated September 7, included a section on "What Will Change" in various U.S. post-election policy scenarios. In the "Regulation" section, for example, the scenario shown is President Trump's reelection. The outcome (clearly opposed by the leftwing magazine) is: "A 'bonfire' for rulebooks as Trump continues deregulation."

The potential results with a Democratic Senate (and a White House win by Joe Biden) are summarized under "Taxes." The publication happily projects: "The top individual rate, now 37%, returns to 39.6%. Payroll tax is levied on incomes over \$400,000. Capital gains are taxed as ordinary income for high earners. Step-up in cost basis for estate tax is eliminated. Corporate income tax rate rises to 28%, from 21%."

Item: A CNN account that appeared in the (New York) Daily News for September 14 states: "The nation's deficits and outlays have hit post-World War II highs thanks to tax cuts under President Donald Trump, but Democratic presidential nominee Joe Biden is proposing adding to that, at least in the near term, with a \$5.4 trillion spending plan." These figures came from a recent analysis by the Penn Wharton Budget Model, an organization within the University of Pennsylvania's business school.

Quoted is Michael Gwin, the Biden campaign's deputy rapid-response director, saying: "Biden is committed to paying for the ongoing cost of his bold agenda in the long run by making sure big corporations and the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share — with no one making under \$400,000 seeing an increase in their taxes."

Item: <u>Bloomberg.com</u> for September 14 carried a bullet-point summary of policy differences between Biden and Trump, noting, under "Energy Jobs," that Trump "has said he will 'continue to unleash American energy' by cutting more regulations."





Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

Meanwhile, Joe Biden "says his plan for \$2 trillion in clean-energy projects would create at least 10 million jobs — including some in the auto industry, driven by a shift to electric cars. He'd also set up a 'civilian climate corps' modeled on work-relief programs during the Great Depression. The Democratic contender acknowledges that some existing energy jobs, such as those at coal mines and power plants that rely on the fossil fuel, would disappear — and he's pledged training and other support for the displaced workers."

Correction: Alternatively, you could consider the situation from a constitutional vantage point: As bad as Joe Biden's policies are, those of other Democratic candidates were worse. (Biden has on occasion called himself a "transition" candidate. This naturally raises the obvious question: A transition to what?)

Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.), widely known as AOC and an influential Sanders acolyte (who subsequently co-chaired a task force for Biden's campaign on climate change), has publicly asserted that she and her radical allies "can likely push Vice President Biden in a more progressive direction across policy issues" should he be elected president. Be assured: The Left never stops pushing further.

That said, even Biden's current public positions are injurious enough to shun, if they're not yet full-bore Bolshevik. The nation cannot afford such levels of spending, taxing, and regulating.

Be prepared. The following are notices from Biden promoters, not opponents. Nonetheless, they should be read as words of warning.

For example, New York Times columnist Jamelle Bouie cheers:

If the goal is to move America to the left ... then a Biden candidacy ... represents an opportunity.... If Biden goes on to win the White House, there's real space for the pro-Sanders left to work its will on policy.... It can fulfill some of its goals under the cover of Biden's moderation, from raising the minimum wage nationally to pushing the American health care system closer to single-payer.... Biden ... is a creature of the party. [March 11, 2020]

Here's a boost from the influential website FiveThirtyEight (May 21, 2020), which quotes Waleed Shahid, the communications director for Justice Democrats, a left-wing group aligned with AOC:

Joe Biden is running on the most progressive platform of any Democratic nominee in recent history. But given the pandemic, he has to look at the New Deal and Great Society traditions in the Democratic Party and go bigger.

Steve Friess puts it this way for *Newsweek* (June 1, 2020):

Go forth, he [Biden] urged his financial brain trust, and bring back the boldest, most ambitious proposals they'd ever dreamed of to reshape the U.S. economy.... Biden began issuing a raft of new proposals that move his positions closer to the progressive wing of the Democratic Party, with a promise to unveil an even more transformative economic plan this summer.... It's a yes to adding \$200 a month to Social Security benefits and lowering the qualifying age for Medicare from 65 to 60. Yes to trillions in new spending, yes to new





Written by <u>William P. Hoar</u> on October 7, 2020 Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

regulations on banks and industry, yes to devil-may-care deficits.

Finally, here's another *New York Times* opinion columnist, Michelle Goldberg, who gushes (April 20, 2020):

To try to unite the party around him, he's making serious progressive commitments.... he's moving leftward. Biden recently came out for tuition-free college for students whose families earn less than \$125,000. He endorsed Elizabeth Warren's bankruptcy plan.... His climate plan already went beyond any of Barack Obama's initiatives, and he's pledged to make it even more robust.

Robust is one word for it. More accurate terms would be irrational, bizarre, or outright daft. Here are some of the promises in Joe's plan (though clearly put together by others). He will "establish an Environmental and Climate Justice Division within the U.S. Department of Justice"; the Biden Department of Health and Human Services "will lead a Task Force to Decrease Risk of Climate Change to Children, the Elderly, People with Disabilities, and the Vulnerable"; and the presumed president will "establish an Office of Climate Change and Health Equity at HHS."

Imagine the thunderstruck reaction of a returning Patrick Henry if he saw what it is like to have taxation *with* representation!

There are heaps of taxing and spending boosts in the various Biden proposals — as well as a growing pile of regulations that would reverse the progress of the Trump years. Many of these "climate change" edicts are meant to appease the wildest of progressives en route to completely reorganizing the nation's economy. Biden's goals, points out the *Wall Street Journal*,

include carbon-free electricity by 2035 and "a 100% clean energy economy and net-zero emissions no later than 2050." He'd ask Congress to pass "an enforcement mechanism" with "clear, legally-binding emissions reductions." This means either a carbon tax or tight mandated limits on fossil-fuel energy, or both.

He'd start by spending \$2 trillion in four years — building 500,000 electric-vehicle charging stations, hiring 250,000 workers to plug abandoned oil-and-gas wells, and even building "an end-to-end high speed rail system that will connect the coasts." California can't even build this train from Bakersfield to the Bay Area.

A massive figure such as \$2 trillion can be hard to comprehend. For perspective, consider that it represents around \$6,000 for each adult and child in the country.

Meanwhile, Joe boasts himself to be a proud enemy the world's primary energy source — fossil fuels. And, depending on the day and location, the candidate either wants to ban or phase out "fracking," a game-changing process to extract such fuel — all of which should make millions of people worry about their jobs. It also should be a concern for those of us fond of the ample use of electricity, transportation, and heating.

In fact, in the real United States (not the pipedreams of those afflicted with the Green New Delusion),



Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

Americans obtain about 80 percent of their energy from oil, gas, and coal. By some counts, around 1.2 million people work in coal, oil, and natural gas fields, while about 800,000 work in the petroleum industry.

Other accounts place the number with such related jobs much higher than that, including many found in "battlefield" states of this year's elections. The oil, gas, and coal industries account for an estimated five million to 10 million jobs, as pointed out by economic commentator Stephen Moore. A study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (cited by the *Washington Times*) revealed that a ban on hydraulic fracturing would have a wide effect on the U.S. economy, potentially eliminating 14.8 million jobs and doubling the cost of gasoline by 2022.



Against gas and oil: Though Joe Biden vacillates on the topic of fracking, depending on his audience, he routinely says that he will eliminate fracking — and the jobs that go with it. (*Photo: AP Images*)

If pressed, lifelong politician Joe blithely says he would simply retrain (or put on the dole) the folks he throws out of their current good-paying jobs. How generous and considerate. Oil roustabouts will magically become solar installers and roughnecks will quickly transit into wind techs in the new Biden world order. Of course, those pushed into "renewable" jobs would probably take a "50% to 75% pay cut," according to the president of North America's Building Trades Union (NABTU).

Repeatedly, as if saying it over and over again makes it so, Biden and his socialistic buddies claim that absolutely none of those making less than \$400,000 will have their taxes increased with the coming money grab. Don't believe it. Many Americans with smaller incomes than that will pay the bill in lower wages, poorer returns on their retirement investments, and other ways. A study by the American Enterprise Institute finds: "Overall, 24.7 percent of the new tax revenue in 2021 would come from the bottom 99 percent of taxpayers."

Biden's proposed increased corporate taxation would further tighten the handcuffs on businesses and hurt investment — driving down wages, sending operations out of the county, and reducing the GDP, among other negative effects. Indeed, if Joe were to get his way, and push the U.S. corporate tax rate from 21 percent to 28 percent, this would become one of the highest such rates in the developed world (a point that has been made by Americans for Tax Reform).

Casey Mulligan, a professor of economics at the University of Chicago who also served as chief economist of the White House Council of Economic Advisers from 2018 to 2019, has determined the





Published in the October 19, 2020 issue of the New American magazine. Vol. 36, No. 20

actual cost of the regulatory state that Biden would create. He includes a fracking ban, other consumer regulations, and regulations on labor (as reflected in wages). Progressives say they want to soak the wicked rich. Yet, as Mulligan shows, it is the poor who would be paying:

The costs to the bottom group amount to 15.3% of its total income — representing a burden equal to all the taxes they currently pay. This group would experience part of the cost as lower wages, but the biggest bite would come in diminished purchasing power due to higher prices for energy, cars and other consumer goods.

Biden's would-be spending totals are staggering. A recent study by the Penn Wharton Budget Model, a group at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, points to \$5.4 trillion in new spending over the next decade. Large as that is, the total is likely low-balling, say other analysts.

The calculations of Brian Riedl, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, show a considerably larger aggregate. Joe Biden, according to this reckoning, backs an astounding \$11 trillion in new spending over the next 10 years:

His \$1.4 trillion health care plan would expand the Affordable Care Act, bring a "public option" to the health exchanges, and expand long-term care assistance. More recently, Biden proposed reducing the Medicare eligibility age to 60, at an estimated cost of \$300 billion. He also has proposed new spending on climate and infrastructure (\$2 trillion), Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (\$1 trillion according to the Progressive Policy Institute), college, K-12 education, and preschool aid (\$1.5 trillion), family leave assistance (\$550 billion), "Buy America" investments (\$700 billion), housing aid (\$640 billion), and combatting opioid addiction (\$125 billion). Finally, Biden has endorsed the \$3 trillion in stimulus spending passed by the Democratic House.

Biden doesn't ever pretend to cover all these expenses with his massive taxation.

On the other hand, here's a real radical suggestion: Why not allow Americans keep more of our own assets and use them as we deem proper? Sadly, as history has shown time after time, a government that gives too much also costs too much.







Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.