We are 2 years into Biden's presidency. Many are saying that Biden has had the most successful legislative agenda for a democrat since LBJ. He just had the best midterm performance in modern history not counting post 9/11 2002. While I agree that Biden has been better at getting legislation passed than recent presidents and thus more effective or legislatively successful in a technical sense, I strongly disagree with any assertion the bills he has passed have been positive or transformative ones. Let me first acknowledge my bias, I believe in progressive economic policy. When I say that I mean that I support Medicare for all and labor politics such as a $15 minimum wage and unions. I want a higher percentage of the fruits of labor to go to labor. I want less income inequality. To me, this is the essence of being "progressive." Other than that, I tend to find government spending detrimental. I am a big fan of certain government programs like social security and Medicare, but where I find a problem is spending for the sake of spending. Spending that doesn't take over an industry and put it in the hands of the government, but rather subsidizes private industry with no real arguments as to why it is necessary to do so. The market, in absence of a market failure or perverse incentive structure which happens from time to time in industries like healthcare and prisons, is capable of managing itself well. The free market is generally better at managing itself than the government ever could be. If the producer and the consumer agree via the market that a good should be sold at $5, but the government comes in and gives the consumer $1 to buy this good, the government has not simply reduced the price to $4, for half of the market equation is how much that the consumer is willing to pay. It follows that the price as a result of this subsidy would increase to somewhere between $5 and $6. I won't say that the price simply goes up $1, though it could be much closer to that than we would all like. Let's split the difference and say the price is hypothetically now $5.50. That means that $0.50 have gone to increasing the profit of the business, and $0.50 have gone to the consumer. Naturally, I don't care much for the profits of businesses, so we are essentially paying $1 for $0.50 in return. How is that an effective government program? The government has taken $1 out of the economy through taxes of one form or another on one person or another and has given $0.50 to a corporation and $0.50 to a person. So if 50% of the tax was paid by corporations and 50% by people, this has been a net nothing. No one has benefited. But, it's real easy to brag about how this subsidy helped the person buying the good, from their perspective you did give them money. Who would be against giving people money? Now the actual numbers of all of these figures here could vary massively. One of the fundamental problems here is that many left wing people and even most people in general really have started to take the taxation out of the equation and just factor in the positives of the spending. If you do that then even if the subsidy saves the consumer $0.01 and the other $0.99 goes to the corporation, people as a whole have benefitted and this is a net good, even if a small one. But the idea that taxation can be of no negative impact and just be all paid for by some corporations or rich people is economically illiterate, and yet is mainstream amongst the left. These people have never found a spending program they don't support because spending is inherently good and taxes are either also good or have no impact somehow. If you let them control the government, every single time a new government spending program idea pops into their head, they'd spend it. They would spend an infinite amount of money if possible. There is no limit to spending if spending money is inherently good. Let's ignore the deficit argument for I think that's a much harder issue that's not really my expertise. People who believe you can just deficit spend infinitely will never be convinced otherwise. For those people it's practically a

religious belief. The burden of evidence is on them to prove that printing money doesn't cause inflation. The safest assumption is that it does so let's assume that spending has to be paid for through taxes.

Corporate Taxes

The idea of the corporate tax as a perfect progressive tax is a myth. I was a big fan of corporate taxes before I looked into them. In theory, it seems like the perfect tax. Corporations are generally profiting far too much off of their workers so go ahead and take some of that from them to fund social programs. But, unfortunately all reputable studies that I have found come to the same conclusion(though some less reputable studies make absurd claims like for every $1 in taxes workers make $22 less in wages.) Roughly ⅓ of the corporate tax is paid by the workers in the form of lower wages. Roughly ⅓ of the corporate tax is paid by the consumer in the form of higher prices. And roughly ⅓ of the corporate tax is paid by the corporation, the executives and the shareholders and the like. If that last third paid all of the tax I would be the corporate tax's biggest fan. The disagreement here is not an ideological one. It's an issue about the actual impact of the tax. Also, if a business is unionized then the workers share an even larger burden of the corporate tax. In my ideal world nearly every business would be unionized and thus the tax would even more so tax workers as they've already negotiated a fair wage as a percentage of the profits, but now profits are down because of the corporate tax so of course their wages have to come down. Now, with that said, I am still not necessarily an opponent of the corporate tax because as I said ⅓ of it is paid for by people who I would like to see pay taxes which makes it a decently progressive tax. It is just important that we recognize that ⅔ of the tax functions much the same as an income tax on the working class. At the very least just acknowledge that there is some impact on the working class and it isn't all paid for by the corporation itself. The exact percentages could be different. The negatives of the tax have to be factored in.

Subsidies

So back to my subsidy example. If you pay for the subsidy with a corporate tax, the corporation is paying $0.33 and getting $0.50 and the worker/consumer is paying $0.66 and getting $0.50. Effectively stealing $0.16 from the worker/consumer and giving it to the corporation. So a subsidy with the goal of transferring money from the wealthy to the poor is a misguided one. Furthermore, even if the corporate tax and subsidy worked in the way you people think and 100% of the corporate tax was paid for by executives and shareholders and 100% of the subsidy decreased the price the consumer paid. It would still be equally as effective at helping the working class as just making companies pay their workers more. Why should we engage in taxation and redistribution of works when direct redistribution is an option. The wealthy pay the poor. If you make them pay them a little less, income for the working class goes up, corporate profits go down. Same impact as the subsidy. So, why do you think corporations are so much more opposed to the second option than the first option? Why do corporations love subsidies so much if it doesn't increase their profits and just lowers prices? But, there are subsidies with a different goal. Subsidies that intend to shift the market towards something that the government believes people need to be buying/producing more of to serve some societal purpose. A big example is green energy. Biden's Inflation Reduction Act included many subsidies for everything

you can think of that's related to green energy. Buy an EV, get a subsidy. Put solar panels on your house, get a subsidy. Build a windmill, get a subsidy. The purpose of this of course is to fight climate change. I'm not here to discuss climate change. I'm here to discuss economics, but I will acknowledge that if you assume the worst possible assumptions of climate change, then it would make perfect sense to support desperate measures like this. When you're discussing subsidizing in relation to an emergency like that where you really need new investment in a particular industry the argument is no longer about the economics of subsidies, it's about if the emergency justifies the money spent. I do not take issue with subsidies as a way of increasing investment in an area of particular importance, though I do have qualms about the government's competence in choosing which areas are of particular importance especially when the corporations have bought the government twenty times over. I take issue with subsidies as a way of lowering prices. Joe Biden seems to have a love for this type of subsidy unmatched by any modern president.

The key legislation of the Biden Administration is as follows: The American Rescue Plan, the Infrastructure Bill, the CHIPS act, the Inflation Reduction Act, The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and Student loan debt forgiveness(though that technically wasn't legislation as he did it via executive order).

The American Rescue Plan

The American Rescue Plan was the first spending package of the Biden administration with the intention of recovering or rescuing the economy from the recession that the pandemic caused. It included $1.9 trillion in total spending.
It extended expanded unemployment benefits of $300 weekly from March 31 to September 6. I don't have anything to say on that. That's fine.
$1400 stimulus checks, also fine. Economy needed some stimulus. These both seem like reasonable ways to do that.
The act provided a tax credit to employers who chose to offer paid sick leave and paid family leave benefits. However, the act did not require employers to provide the benefit, as Biden initially proposed. I prefer requiring it to the tax credit. I support this tax credit. People need to have some time off of work to enjoy the wonders of life and their family.
The bill extended a 15% increase in food stamps by a few months. I'm not a fan of food stamps generally, but with how bad the economy was this is okay as a temporary thing.
The expanded child tax credit from $2,000 to $3,000 and made it available via monthly payments instead of a tax season credit. I strongly support the child tax credit. The results from this are in, it was successful in its desired effect. It isn't really arguable anymore. Also people are not popping out babies like they used to and that is somewhat an issue and making it more affordable helps.
Limited publicly traded companies' ability to deduct executive compensation from their corporate taxes, generating $6 billion in revenue. I fully support that, though I wonder what they mean by "limited" instead of just eliminating it.
Repeals an obscure provision in the tax code that gave multinational corporations additional discretion in accounting for interest expenses (will generate $22 billion in tax revenue). Also

great. Extends "loss limitation" restrictions on unincorporated businesses (will generate $31 billion in tax revenue). This means people who write off losses from their business on their taxes. Again they use the word “restrictions” which is quite vague, but alright.
The PPP loans, around $54 billion total. Awful idea, major corruption was involved. Sorry, your business is going bankrupt. Tough luck. Free market baby. If you can’t get a new loan from the private market, don’t expect the government to bail you out. If I could trust the government to not mostly give this money to businesses that don’t need it I would support it, but at least 20% of a program like this will always be fraud.
$350 billion to state, local, and tribal governments. I really can not wrap my head around this one with any explanation other than they were just looking for ways to spend money. Why would you ever do this? The states can fund their own spending. This has lead to every governor bragging about their budget surplus and either increasing spending or cutting taxes in a way that’ll be unsustainable once the money dries up. It’s just an electoral boost to every incumbent governor, and will eventually have the opposite effect and states will have big deficits until they reduce the spending back to normal.
$122 billion for K-12 schools. Again, why would the federal government be spending money on this? Schools are meant to be paid for with local taxes of the people going there. Bad
$40 billion for colleges and universities. These are private institutions that take large amounts of money from students why do they need money from the feds? Bad
$21.6 billion for rental assistance programs. This fund will provide money to states and local governments, which will then provide grants to eligible households.
$10 billion for the Homeowner Assistance Fund. This fund will allocate money to states and local governments, which will then give grants to homeowners to prevent them from defaulting on their mortgage or foreclosing on their home. $4.5 billion for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which will assist homeowners with the costs of heating and cooling. Anyone unemployed as a result of covid is already getting enhanced benefits that are sufficient for them to pay for rent and heating, or if they aren’t, increase those payments. This is all double spending intended to make things as complicated as possible to avoid accountability.
$50 billion to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for vaccine distribution and assistance. Additionally, FEMA will reimburse up to $9,000 for a funeral held for a COVID-19 victim. The vaccine distribution is good. Why should the government pay for your funeral? That’s ridiculous.
$47.8 billion on COVID-19 testing, mitigation, and transmission prevention, including diagnosis, tracing, and monitoring. Cool.
$7.66 billion for workforce programs for state, local, and territorial public health departments and certain nonprofits, including funds to hire and train "case investigators, contact tracers, social support specialists, community health workers, public health nurses, disease intervention specialists, epidemiologists, program managers, laboratory personnel, informaticians, communication and policy experts, and any other positions as may be required to prevent, prepare for, and respond to COVID-19." These departments can hire their own people with their own money. Why must the federal government 1. Distribute the vaccine themselves 2. Pay other governments and private organizations to distribute the vaccine and 3. Pay those organizations to hire workers to distribute the vaccine. It seems overboard, but not a major issue cause it’s not a lot of money and handling covid vaccine rollout was very important. I somewhat support this.

$86 billion for a rescue package/bailout for approximately 185 multiemployer pension funds (usually pension plans set up by a union and industry) that are close to insolvency. The pension funds collectively cover 10.7 million workers. Awful provision. Why should pension funds get money from the government? Because they made bad investments? That's a you problem. The government has social security to pay for peoples retirements. Anything more than that is gravy. Don't pay for their gravy.
$30.5 billion in grants to public transit and commuter rail agencies across the country to mitigate major decreases in ridership and fare revenue due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This includes $6 billion to the MTA in the New York area (the U.S.'s largest public transit agency) and $1.4 billion to WMATA, VRE and MARC in the D.C. area. You already sent the governments hundreds of billions of dollars for general purposes that could sufficiently cover this. $8 billion to airports. We did fully shut down airports and airport companies aren't exactly very profitable so this is fine.
$10 billion to farmers. Did people stop buying food because of covid? What's up with this? The regular subsidies we give to them weren't enough? Subsidizes 100% of premiums for COBRA recipients from April 1 to September 30, 2021. Due to these subsidies, at least 2.2 million additional people will enroll in COBRA in 2021. Really brilliant example of liberal policy. The left wants the government to pay for health insurance. The right wants people to pay for their own health insurance and for the government to get out of the way. The liberal wants both. The liberal has the least reasonable position. The most incoherent unexplainable reason. This just lines the pockets of health insurance companies. But, since it's in between the other two positions it's touted as a reasonable moderate compromise. It makes no sense. If private corporations run health insurance, let private corporations run health insurance. The subsidy just distorts the market and increases the price. While the price might seem less at the point of sale, the true price(that is the combined price that both the consumer and the government pay) is higher. I support Medicare for all. I do not support this insane garbage.
This legislation provides a COBRA subsidy tax credit to employers to offset the costs of this coverage. The COBRA Premium Assistance Credit essentially reimburses the cost of providing "free" COBRA coverage to eligible individuals. So how is the market to work? What is the price of health insurance? How is there to be any price discovery when the government engages in shenanigans like this. Oh we'll pay for this kind of health insurance, but not the other. Oh you raised the price? No worries, we're the government we have all kinds of money. And just like that other people buying health insurance are paying higher prices. It's a complete rejection of economics, of markets. If the market controls the industry the government can not spend any amount of money that will stop the market from having the power. It can only distort the market and increase prices.

So in conclusion, this bill 1. Gave money directly to people through stimulus checks($390 billion) and enhanced unemployment benefits(around $150 billion). 2. Gave $350 billion to state and local governments for general purposes. 3. Gave even more money to state and local governments to give money to people struggling to pay rent and pay for transportation services.($62 billion) 4. Gave money to K-12 schools and colleges($160 billion) 5 Bought and distributed the vaccine and paid other organizations and local governments to distribute the vaccine and to hire people to distribute the vaccine, also $9000 in reimbursement payments for funerals ($100 billion) 6. $8 billion to airports 7. $10 billion to farmers. 8. Money to employers to

pay for the health insurance of employees they just fired(can't find a number on this) 9. $85 billion to bail out pension funds that made poor investments when the workers who rely on these funds already get retirement money from the government called SOCIAL SECURITY. Now, can anyone explain to me how this is a good bill? Almost every provision is something there is no argument for the federal government to be paying for. The regular stimulus: the checks and unemployment benefits are good. Everything else could've been accomplished by increasing those. It seems like it was written with the intention of being complicated. The intention of people having no idea where the money is going or coming from, so they can't evaluate if it was a good bill other than simple "well we needed to stimulate the economy and help people get through the pandemic" analysis. The less people understand these gargantuan disaster bills the better for the government. The average American only knowing a few top line provisions isn't an accident. It's intentional. People can't get mad at how their representative voted and vote them out if they don't even know what the bill does. But, some of the provisions in this bill were helpful in stimulating the economy, and the general idea of the bill was good so this might be one of the more reasonable bills.

Infrastructure bill

I believe that infrastructure is a states issue. Especially if you just gave states all that money, why can't they handle this infrastructure spending? But nonetheless, infrastructure spending was necessary. Our infrastructure is pretty awful compared to other wealthy countries. My main issue with this one is the public transit money. That's really the type of infrastructure that should be a local issue, not a federal one. But overall I don't have any major complaints on this one. I don't think about it much. It's fine. No, it is not a large "accomplishment" of the Biden administration.

CHIPS Act

The CHIPS act gives $280 billion to semiconductor companies to build factories in the U.S instead of in other countries. The main arguments in favor of this are 1. To create jobs in the US instead of in other countries and 2. National security. It's simple. We can not let China dominate the semiconductor industry because they're subsidizing it, so we have to counter with our own subsidies. If there were no countries currently subsidizing the industry I would not support the bill. China, Taiwan, all major players in this industry subsidize it so we have to as well. It's like with tariffs. The goal of a tariff is to make it equally profitable for a business to manufacture a product in the US vs in whatever country the tariff applies to. When a country subsidizes one of their industries it's like a reverse tariff. They have now artificially made it more profitable for businesses to manufacture a product in their country so to get back to a fair market other countries must do the same. This of course only benefits the corporations as they get all the subsidy money, but the blame is on the first country to impose the subsidy, which I assume was Taiwan. In this case, we're the last. Frankly, before looking into this further I was opposed to this bill because I did not realize that other countries were already subsidizing this industry, though I wasn't that strongly opposed to it. Though the reason I support it is still differently than many I've heard. I've heard many people put it in as simple terms as "all our chips are made in Taiwan, if

China invades taiwan we can't get those chips anymore, therefore we must make chips here instead by any means" while ignoring that the factors that lead us as a country to feel that way also lead businessmen to feel that way. No amount of subsidies will move the present taiwan semiconductor factories to the U.S, only the new ones. And new factories are already not going to be built in taiwan for the same reasons as we're worried about taiwan. The main concern is China competition, not taiwan. I love tariffs. China subsidizing their semiconductor industry is an anti-tariff. Thus, we must respond with a tariff. However, in this particular industry, we have a major shortage. We need to be buying every microchip we can find. So a tariff doesn't make sense. So the only rational response is our own equivalent subsidy.

Gas prices

The Biden administration and the left's general attitude towards the fossil fuel industry is psychotic. For starters, I'm not gonna talk about the Keystone XL pipeline. Anyone claiming that would've had a significant impact on gas prices is a liar or has listened to several liars that convinced them of it and hasn't thought about it for themselves too much. I don't believe there are people that stupid. 1. The keystone pipeline was for transporting tar sands oil. The oil most likely to spill and that causes the worst spills when it does. So, we must be extra cautious about ensuring that where they're gonna send this oil is appropriate and won't cause massive environmental harm and really we shouldn't incentivize the production of such oil if we care even a moderate amount about the environment.
2. The pipeline would not have brought new oil, it simply would've reduced the cost of transporting that oil, which has some impact on the cost of the oil at the pump, but much less than if it was a matter of getting the oil vs not getting it.
3. Even if it had been completed, it would still not be operational today and would become operational in 2023, so it would not have had any impact on the prices we've been paying in 2021 and 2022.
4. It appears to me like the obsession with the keystone XL pipeline is not about the actual impact it would have on gas prices, as no matter how you crunch the numbers it would've had less than a 5% impact on gas prices, making its cancellation responsible for at worst a non consequential amount of the total increase in prices we've seen while Biden's been in office. It's a symbolic thing. People view the pipeline as being a symbol for the president's anti-fossil fuels positioning and policy. We should focus more on policies that have actually impacted people's wallets than symbols.

Joe Biden and the left's ideas around Energy are entirely emotional. I get it. People are worried about the environment and climate change. Right now as we speak the only energy source capable of powering the world economy is fossil fuels. That is a fact. There exists no policy Biden can pass that will change this in the near term. Right now and for the foreseeable future, at LEAST the next decade, the US will have to rely on fossil fuels. It's non-negotiable. Claiming otherwise is to deny reality. No matter how much you think climate change is going to destroy the planet, we still need to use fossil fuels in the near to medium term unless you propose going back to pre-industrial society. Since we're going to have to use fossil fuels until renewable energy technological development makes it an actual viable full replacement, we should drill for

oil. We should drill a lot in a lot of places. We should drill as much as needed to keep prices stable and cheap. When deciding what drilling we do and do not allow we can take into account the environmental impact of different types of fossil fuels, but only so much as it doesn't spike the price significantly higher. If the US drills less oil, we will not buy less oil. We will not protect the environment. We will just buy the oil from other countries who likely have zero environmental protections. It's even possible in some situations the US drilling less oil could hurt the environment. The idea that you can stop consumption of such a necessary component of everyone's lives as energy is just wrong. Produce less oil, people still buy oil, just at a higher price, and more if it coming from our enemies who now gain power over us. If I go to the gas station and gas is $1.50 I'll fill up my tank with a big smile on my face. If I go to that same gas station and gas is $6 I'll fill up my tank with a big frown on my face. I'm still filling up my tank. I'm still purchasing the oil because I still need to get where I'm driving. For prices to get to such a level for energy consumption to really go down, the ramifications for the economy would be catastrophic. Nothing could damage the environmentalist movement more than that. If you're an environmentalist you do not want to see how little people care for your cause as soon as it's destroying the global economy and it's the reason they're poorer than they were just a few years ago. Biden should be able to allow new drilling leases without people complaining about how it's gonna destroy the world. It's not. Fossil fuel production should be universally supported regardless of your thoughts on fossil fuels impact on the environment or how long you think we have to switch to renewables before everyone will die.

Why are gas prices higher?

1. offering less gas leases and at times suspending them entirely for months 2. General attacks of the fossil fuel industry, saying you'll ban fracking, saying you'll get rid of fossil fuels entirely makes it impossible for fossil fuel companies to feel confident in investing in new drilling. Proposing a "windfall profits tax"
The risk is just too high if the government and a large portion of the population is fundamentally opposed to your business' existence. Then, they only want to invest if the prices are so high they will get their money back very quickly so there's less risk of not getting a return on their capital. That brings about the high prices.

Getting mad at fossil fuel companies or claiming they are in any way immoral for conducting their business is ridiculous. They are simply meeting a demand of the market. If the market demands a good they will get it. No business or individual can stop that. The best way to combat climate change through policy is not to reduce drilling, but to increase investment in renewable energy. You reduce the demand, not the supply. The inflation reduction act does that. That's all that's needed and that's all that helps. If you want to keep doing the renewable energy spending, you need to win elections. High energy costs make that harder. Speaking of high energy costs, let's talk about the "Inflation Reduction Act."

Inflation Reduction Act

$738 billion total(all figures are over a 10 year period unless I say otherwise)

$391 billion for renewable energy subsidies, $238 billion in deficit reduction.
3 years of ACA subsidies costing $64 billion. We'll elaborate on the specifics of the renewable energy subsidies later, but the general idea of subsidizing investment in renewable energy is a good one. Reducing the deficit is good. ACA subsidies are insane policy. You heard that subsidy word and instantly assumed the worst I hope. There are two healthcare options. Universal healthcare covered by the government(my preferred option) or if you're not gonna do that, keep the government out as much as possible and ensure there's enough competition to reduce prices. The third way option of letting it be run by private companies, but somehow the government is also paying for it? They're paying the private companies. Most of these subsidies will simply go to the private health insurance companies profits. There is no defending this policy. Please take it out. I could not vote for it if this is in it.

How did we pay for this? Letting Medicare negotiate (some) drug prices, half starting in 2026, other half starting in 2029. Obviously, Medicare always should've been able to negotiate drug prices and it should be able to do that with every drug as soon as the law went into effect, but big pharma still has a lot of power over the Democratic Party. Likely, big pharma will do everything they can to make sure this negotiation only applies to some niche drugs and starts as late as possible. But nonetheless, some credit is due for this provision and it is a great thing that it made its way into law. 15% corporate minimum tax for companies with higher than $1 billion net income raising $222 billion. A lot of people don't understand what this corporate minimum tax is. Seems like most people think it's just making sure that corporations pay at least 15%, because some are "cheating" on their taxes. The reason some companies pay less than 15% isn't because of cheating. It's because of tax incentives. Certain spending is allowed to be deducted from taxable income to reduce your tax burden. This is set up to incentivize companies to spend money on things that benefit the economy. There are so many different tax incentives different companies could benefit from that it'd be very difficult to list out all of them and explain why some are good and some are bad. The policy solution however is to get rid of the bad ones, not to basically get rid of the idea of tax deductions entirely. There are many tax deductions progressives want like ones that incentive companies to limit their carbon footprint. Let's use an example. In 2021, Amazon made $35 billion before taxes. They paid $2.1 billion in taxes, a 6% effective tax rate, way below the 21% corporate tax rate. The 15% corporate minimum tax basically abolished that. Now, no matter what you spend money on, you have to pay a 15% minimum on your "book income." So this tax is a very lazy way of getting rid of corporate tax deductions, getting rid of some specific bad corporate tax deductions would've been better, but based on how they advertise this provision it's clear it's a solution searching for a problem. Corporations do not "cheat" on their taxes. If their effective tax rate is lower then the corporate tax rate it's because of tax deductions, usually losses from previous years. Other tax deductions are because of actions the company took that helped workers, the economy as a whole, or the environment. "Oh no this company lost billions for several years and now they saved a little on their taxes." I already explained my issue with corporate taxes above, but I'll reiterate it quickly here. The idea that this is essentially a tax without a tax, that it's only taking money from some rich people that don't deserve it anyway, is false. Such a tax only exists in your imagination. There isn't even a hypothetical tax that doesn't have a negative impact on the economy. That's what a tax is. It takes money out of the economy. When you neglect that, that's

when you start passing a trillion dollar spending plan 3 times a year. You're looking at one side of a two sided equation. There are many cases of a spending plan where the benefits of the spending outweigh the negatives of the taxes, but when you don't even weigh the negatives of the taxes you have a broken weighing machine.

The next provision of the Inflation Reduction Act is a controversial one. It's the one Republicans have spent the most time complaining about. Expansion of the IRS, hiring 87,000 new IRS agents. This is expected to cost $80 billion and raise $180 billion. The criticism of this that's ridiculous is the idea that it's a "tax hike." It is not a tax hike to make sure that people pay the actual tax rate. They do this all the time. The IRS was gonna start making sure people are paying their taxes for income they make from PayPal. Republicans went "they wanna tax your side gig, your ebay!" Well, if you want to propose a tax exemption for eBay and PayPal, go right ahead. Oh wait, that's not popular. But, for some reason tax exemption isn't popular and making sure people pay their taxes isn't popular. So people want the tax on the books but they don't really want it enforced. That's rather inconsistent if you ask me. Spending $80 bill to raise $180 bill is a pretty bad return in my opinion. That already means 44% of the money raised has been spent/wasted. At that point keeping that money in private hands would be better. Though the problem there is most likely an underestimation of how much this would raise. Only time will tell but most people and organizations I've seen say that that $180 billion figure could be $1 trillion or at least closer to $1 trillion than $180 billion. Now, I've already said the most ridiculous argument against this provision. The most ridiculous argument in favor of this is "The IRS already audits working class people. They just need more resources to audit the rich. All of this funding is for taxing the rich." There was an amendment to this bill, the Crapo amendment, that asked to do just that. The Crapo amendment simply said "this funding can only be used to audit people who make $400k or more." The exact amount that Biden keeps using so it's not like this amendment was written intentionally to not pass nor is it an unreasonable amendment. Did the amendment pass? Not only did it not pass, it didn't get a single democrats vote. So, we have to conclude that at least some of the audits will be on working class people and knowing how the IRS functions, most of the audits will be on working class people. Now, I'm not opposed to auditing working class people. I believe people should pay the taxes that they're legally required to pay. If I wanted people to pay less taxes, I'd want to reduce the taxes, not stop enforcing the taxes. I'm fine with this provision assuming that it returns at least $500billion in revenue, not the $180 billion estimate. I also would have supported the Crapo amendment not because I believe people who make less than $400k should be able to cheat on their taxes, but because I believe that as long as rich people are getting away with tax fraud that's a WAY bigger concern. So, my proposal is first we should audit the wealthy. Then, after the IRS sufficiently enforces taxes on the wealthy, we can circle back to increasing funding for working class audits. It's also worth mentioning when it comes to tax enforcement, that much like traffic enforcement, the goal isn't to catch everyone that breaks the law. It isn't even to catch most people who break the law. The goal is to increase the risk of breaking the law to the point where people choose not to break the law.

The next provision is one that's unequivocally good, with one caveat. It doesn't go far enough. A 1% tax on stock buybacks. Stock buybacks are the most direct way to prevent capitalism from benefiting everyone. So many theories on economics rely on the idea that businesses will reinvest profits if they feel that the return is high enough. With stock buybacks, businesses have

to compare that return to the return they expect from their own stock. The only beneficiaries of stock buybacks are shareholders. Frankly, in many cases the business is wrong and reinvesting the money would have yielded a greater return, but the shareholders don't see that. They want that money now. A shareholder should get a return by buying into a company that runs a good business and reinvests its profits to yield even greater profits in the future. A shareholder should not make money by the company just giving them money. If stock buybacks didn't exist, businesses would reinvest their earnings like they're supposed to. That would grow the economy, increase the supply of goods, lower prices, empower the business to hire more people in the future at higher wages. Everyone benefits. That's why people believe in the system. It's no coincidence that since stock buybacks have been legal, belief in the economic system has gone down dramatically. Stock buybacks were legalized in 1982, during Ronald Reagan's disastrous presidency. You can look at just about any economic statistic to see who's been the main beneficiaries of economic growth since then. More money has gone into the hands of the wealthy than the workers. The markets had kept this in balance for decades. We must ban stock buybacks once again. This provision also begs the question that if a 1% tax is good, why not a 2% tax or a 5% tax? With all those caveats, this is a good provision and it can be expanded upon in the future. I'm glad this is in the bill.

Next is a two year extension of the limitation on excess business losses. This is another one where the main question is why is it temporary? Why is this a 2 year extension in a 10 year bill? It's almost like they're not confident in the legislation. You're telling me the limitations on excess business losses is a good idea, but only for 2 years? Now, the limitation on excess business losses simply means that there's a limit to how much a person can write off on their personal income taxes from their losses from a business that they own. I don't know exactly what the limit is, but this isn't a large provision or a controversial one. It's not that important or interesting so we won't waste too much time dwelling on it.

Now, for the specific climate provisions. Remember, any subsidy sold as a price reduction plan is a lie. The purpose of subsidizing renewable energy is to make it more profitable so more companies invest in it so that renewable energy innovates faster and becomes capable of replacing fossil fuels. It increases profits for the clean energy companies, it does not reduce the prices of current clean energy, so some of these provisions will be poorly designed and won't actually fulfill the purpose of a good subsidy.

$391 billion for energy security and climate change. Extended the 30% tax credit/subsidy for individuals installing solar systems on residential property. Solid provision, exactly what I want here. Directly serves the purpose.

$7,500 electric vehicle tax credits. Absolutely not, we need the green energy before we worry about electric vehicles. Most electric vehicles are not charged with renewable energy. This is not a climate provision. This is just free money to the car companies that donate to democrats.

$14,000 for "home energy efficiency upgrades" including up to $8,000 to install a heat pump. People pay for their energy, so if they could get upgrades to their home that would make them more energy efficient and it made economic sense they would already do that. This doesn't really accomplish anything. I do not approve. It's essentially saying "it doesn't make sense for an individual to do this energy efficiency upgrade to their home so we'll cover some of the cost for them so from their perspective it now make sense" but if you include the cost the government is

paying it still doesn't make sense for them to do this upgrade, and now with the new demand because of the tax credit, the price is higher and it makes even less since. Thanks Biden.
Tax credits for carbon capture. This is a good one. Carbon capture is a great example of something that is good but can not possibly be paid by the private economy and markets. It requires government subsidies. Though I am concerned about the actual viability of carbon capture. For now I'll assume it does work but I could use more evidence to sway me either way.
The inflation reduction act mandates the federal government to offer up parts of the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska for oil and gas development. Many supporters of this bill call this part a compromise that they don't support but understand was necessary for Manchin's vote. I fully support this provision. We need an all of the above energy solution. It's the best policy and the best politics. Permitting reform to make it easier to start both fossil fuel and green energy projects. A lot of projects can be delayed for so long because of lawsuits and people complaining about seeing some wind turbines. This is a complicated issue and there has to be some level of people being able to have input in their communities with these projects, but it's a difficult balance and we are clearly currently too far to that side. With all that, I do not support this bill. I support some provisions, and oppose some provisions. If I was a part of the negotiation in congress I probably could have improved the bill to the point where it would get my vote, but as an outsider I obviously can't do that so I can only really have an opinion on the final product. I wouldn't say I'm strongly opposed to this bill. It has a small negative impact on the country. It is not this transformational bill that some people claim it to be. It has a pretty small impact. Either a small positive or small negative impact can be debated, but it's certainly not transformational. Remember that $238 billion deficit reduction in this bill? This next piece of "legislation" already undid all of that and then some and this is a one time expense while that deficit reduction is over 10 years.

Student Debt Cancellation

Biden via executive order paid for $10k of student debt for every borrower with an income below $75k and $20k for pell grant recipients(because people who have already gotten money from the government to go to college are more in need of this new money, somehow.) This is the worst thing Biden has done so far in his presidency. I have one question I'd like for Biden to answer. Should people pay for college or not? This is the core problem Biden and liberalism as an ideology has. There are two sides to this debate, both I'm perfectly fine with. Personally, I believe that people should have to pay for college. You pay money, and you make way more money over your lifetime. Making it free would only increase inequality between college-goers and non-college-goers. I also do not believe that we need more people to go to college which would be another reason to make it free. If anything we have too many people going to college and not enough going into trades in America. College costing money is a regulating force to ensure that we don't have a bunch of people going to college who the economy doesn't need to go to college. However, I acknowledge that a lot of countries that are doing better than the US have free college and I see some benefits to such a policy. It's not a hill I'd die on. I'm fine with free college as a policy. My support for a candidate has never depended on their position on this policy. But, this third way choice simply makes no sense. Student debt cancellation incentivizes colleges to raise tuition prices, students to take out debt and not pay it back. It creates a lot of

perverse incentives. Government spending is supposed to end perverse incentives, not create them. Student debt cancellation doesn't fix the problem of high tuition costs. The moral argument for student debt doesn't work as it's not saying that it's immoral for people to have to pay for college as they're still paying, just a little bit less in the short term. In the long term this policy will increase the cost of college. For the government to PAY MONEY to INCREASE the cost of college is such an awful policy it angers me that it's the only progressive demand that has been successful. Progressives never should have latched onto this. Giving a college student $10k accomplishes just as much as giving a non college student $10k. I don't see how college students are especially in need of money. I wouldn't support an across the board $10k stimulus check and very few people would right now. Also, a less often mentioned part of this student debt cancellation is a more long term program. Obama started a program where if a student pays 10% of their income for 20 years, the government will cancel their remaining debt. Biden has cut both of those in half so it's now 5% of your income for 10 years, or 50% of one year of income. This provision will actually cost a lot more than the up front $10k/$20k cancellation over time. This program is a no brainer decision for the vast majority of people who go to college. That's a lot cheaper than just paying the tuition. The average income for someone with a bachelors degree is $60k so they would pay $30k under this program over 10 years with no interest. Anything past that, the taxpayer foots the bill. You see any problem with that? The government is saying anything past that amount they will pay for it. Why wouldn't the colleges raise tuition? The governments functionally paying the tuition, not the student. The student just pays a percent of their income. They don't have to worry about the cost of tuition. If you're gonna go this far, I'm begging you to just do free college. What angers me so much about this part of the cancellation program is that it's somewhat similar to a solution I came up with. The incentives of colleges are currently somewhat imperfect and the incentives of student lenders(the government) are more imperfect, so my proposal was that instead of students paying a set tuition price and taking out a loan to cover it because it's too large to pay all at once and many of them won't have any income until after college, what if tuition was restructured as a percentage of a students income for 5/10/20 years after they graduate. The exact percentage that would work best I don't really know, but this fixes any problems of colleges not properly preparing students for a job. It further incentivizes the college to make sure the student gets a job at all and the more money the student makes the more money the college makes. The incentives are now more directly aligned and now the government doesn't have to come in with a loan program and there's no problem of interest payments. But Biden took this idea and completely butchered it by adding "we'll pay whatever you charge above that." The beauty of student debt cancellation from a political perspective is how indirect it is. It has so much plausible deniability. "Oh it doesn't cost money blah blah blah something money just appears out of mid air". Student debt cancellation does cost money. Some say it doesn't cost money because "you're just canceling the debt" or it doesn't add to the national debt because "its already factored in to the national debt." I've also heard that "it doesn't increase the money supply." From a purely technical standpoint you can argue that the mere act of student debt cancellation does not directly cost money, does not DIRECTLY increase the national debt. But, you can only argue that if you ignore the full picture. The debt first had to be taken on by the federal government. When the government gives a student a loan, the student now has money which they give to the college, and the government now has spent money by giving this money

out. This isn't an expenditure if the debtor gives the money back to the government. Actually, it's a profitable program for the government because of the interest. If you "cancel" $10k of the debt, you are not in that act printing 10,000 new dollar bills and giving them to the student, you already did that part. You're taking out the part where they give it back. If they don't give it back, then functionally you are just giving $10,000 to the student. If I loan you $10,000 and then 2 years later say you don't have to pay me back, I have given you $10,000. I have lost $10,000. Thus, student debt cancellation costs money. One could also plausibly claim that it isn't a subsidy of college. It's just a one time elimination of debt. Young people being shackled by the weight of debt is bad, how could you possibly oppose a program to reduce that? Especially because the program doesn't cost money, somehow. The fundamental purpose of student debt cancellation is to make it cheaper to go to college and anyone going to college would reasonably expect more student debt cancellation in the future. College costing money isn't just a socially fabricated idea to hurt students. College takes resources. You have to build the college, hire the teachers, and provide various services to help students figure things out. You can not through any policy prevent the fact that college costs money. You can make it not cost money at the point of service. The arguments for making something a government program instead of a private industry are either 1. The private industry is monopolized and charging such high prices that the government program could greatly reduce the price, 2. The private industry fundamentally has immoral incentives like prisons profiting off of more prisoners and their labor or health insurance companies profiting more the less people get healthcare, or 3. There is some large benefit to it being a universal program instead of something only certain people have access to. To answer the first argument, private colleges do not have any monopoly power that lets them charge absurdly high prices. There are so many colleges competing for students. In regard to the second argument, there is no immoral incentive for colleges. They make money by providing students with quality education and making sure that they get good jobs afterwards. Every incentive works perfectly here. To address the third argument, it is currently impossible for college to be a universal program. At a BARE minimum, for ⅓ of the jobs in the United States there does not exist a degree that would be beneficial. If you walk into McDonald's and tell them you have a degree in sociology, economics, business, no one cares. You are no better at flipping burgers or asking people if they want fries with that. Same thing for all jobs that are manual labor. For example, of a government program that passes these three tests, Medicare for all. First, the economics of health insurance require monopolistic companies with little competition. The whole price system of medical care is inefficient from a consumer standpoint. If health insurance didn't exist, and hospitals expected you to pay for the service out of pocket, and you had a medical emergency, are you expected to shop around for the different prices at the different hospitals within a 30 mile distance? You don't have time for the shopping or the driving to a further hospital than the closest one. With health insurance you simply have whatever health insurance your boss decided to get. The actual consumer and the purchaser are different and that creates a lot of inefficiencies. The amount of administrative costs with health insurance companies negotiating prices with hospitals and billing doctors is astronomically high. It's just clearly not a normal market system that follows normal rules of capitalist markets. Every country with government healthcare pays less for healthcare than the US with our private healthcare. There's overwhelming evidence that a Medicare for all system would cost less money. 2. I already said this when I described this argument, but I'll repeat: the

way that health insurance companies make money is by providing as little of the service they exist to provide as possible. 3. Homeless people, unemployed people, poor people with jobs that don't offer health insurance and can't afford it on their own would greatly benefit from healthcare being universal instead of gatekept. Also, healthcare costing nothing at the point of service makes people more likely to seek medical care because they're not worried about the cost and going "oh it's probably nothing." Medicare for all passes all three tests. Free college is 0/3. That's why I support one and not the other. In absence of these three arguments, there's no reason private industry isn't the better option. Free markets are great most of the time. I've also heard the argument that people going to college benefits society as a whole, therefore it should be subsidized or turned into a government program and any other people being forced to pay for that benefits from the program as well. There are two different kinds of benefits. Direct and indirect. College students directly benefit from going to college in the form of higher wages throughout their lifetime, on average $1 million. It reasonably follows that the people directly benefiting from that $1 million could pay some amount in order for the service they were provided to fund it. The indirect benefit of other people going to college is however much less quantifiable and frankly pretty small. A person who doesn't go to college and instead becomes a coal miner benefits from someone who goes to college and becomes a lawyer just as much as the lawyer benefits from the coal miner. They're both essential for society to function. The lawyer needs the coal miner to keep his lights on in his office and the coal miner needs the lawyer if he's ever in a legal dispute. Of course, we all indirectly help others with our jobs. Frankly, a lot of student debt cancellation arguments rely on some elitist assumptions that people who go to college and have jobs that require a degree are better and contribute more to society. A business owner benefits society by providing goods and jobs. We tax business owners, we do not subsidize them because of their positive impact on society. The argument that someone going to college benefits society is a rather weak one and frankly people who use it do not apply that principle elsewhere. I like people going to college. It benefits society. I like people starting businesses. It benefits society. Both of these things cost money. The most logical person to bear that cost is the person doing it themselves. They benefit the most. They are most capable of determining if that cost is worth it for the benefit. Yes, the government giving either businesses or college students cheap loans that they then cancel later would make more people start businesses or go to college. But that would cost money. If you give businesses cheap loans and pay for that program with a corporate tax, the benefit of the cheap loans is real. It's noticeable. Wow, those cheap loans are great. The negative of the corporate tax is also real. It's noticeable. Wow those taxes are damaging. If you can't justify a spending program if the person benefiting from it is also paying it; it isn't a good spending program. It relies on the assumption that someone else somewhere will pay for it which you won't personally notice the impact of. There are plenty of better ways that money could be spent.

The last policy is one that actually didn't get passed. It passed the house but failed in the senate. The opposition was from Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema.

Build Back Better

The build back better act, or BBB for short as it's often called(Not to be confused with the Better Business Bureau.) This was the biggest of them all and the inflation reduction act is eventually what BBB became, a much smaller version, so I'll ignore any overlapping provisions as we already discussed those.
$400 billion for childcare and universal pre-k(pre-k is for 3 and 4 year olds, Child-care cost cap of 7% of income for parents earning up to 250% of a state's median income including faith-based child-care that complies with ideological requirements). This is once again, subsidizing a private business, essentially saying whatever you raise the price to we will pay it. I really shouldn't have to say how insane that is. Might as well officially name it "raise the price of this service" act.I don't believe that pre-k needs to be universal. It's not exactly that important. It's clear these two policies are intended to push parents into the workplace. I see no reason to incentivize that. Makes more sense for some people to stay at home and raise their kids. It makes more sense for some people to leave their kids at pre-k/childcare. There's no strong argument for this to be a universal program or a government program, especially a federal one. I wouldn't say I'm strongly opposed to this. On a scale of 1 = I really support this this will fix so many problems and 10 = I will not allow this to happen this is evil, I'd give this a 5. $200 billion for another one year child tax credit extension(the policy that cut child poverty in half but only lasted a year.) This is a better policy to help parents. They can pay for childcare, pre-k, or use that money to help them stay at home and rely on a single income for a while. This policy has already been enacted, the results are in, and the results are good. This should become a permanent program.
$150 billion for expanded home care through Medicaid(professionals who take care of old people at their house.) I'm not exactly an expert on this and how important it is but that seems good. Seniors do need help getting around and doing basic things in their house. I support this provision. $150 billion for affordable housing(one million homes, $150k cost per home.) I believe private businesses handle building houses just fine. The main inhibitor of homebuilding is not that private businesses won't do it, but that local governments wont let them. Housing is inherently a local issue. I don't see how the federal government could reasonably decide where to build this affordable housing. I don't support affordable housing generally, the better solution is zoning reform. IF affordable housing is a good government policy, it should be on a local level where there is local support and local need for such a policy.
$90 billion for "equity and other investments"(that's so vague I'll just ignore it.)
$40 billion for higher education(financial aid, more subsidies for students going to college.) Just like student loan debt, I do not support this.
$35 billion to expand Medicare for hearing services. Bernie pushed for this one heavy. This always should have been the case. Why would hearing not be covered under Medicare? Is being able to hear not a medical issue, is it elective? No
Raising the salt tax deduction cap from $10k to $80k(should be $0. This is a tax cut to the rich that even moderate Jared golden was the provision he was most opposed to). The SALT tax deduction stands for State and Local Taxes. It lets you write your state and local taxes off of your federal taxes. Can you think of a single reason why your local taxes and federal taxes should have anything to do with each other? You pay your state taxes and you get the benefits of the spending that pays for. You're not being oppressed because you pay so much in property taxes. 1. You voted for it. 2. You get the spending that comes from those property taxes. If

you're getting a bad deal from your state government, vote for people that will reduce taxes, don't expect to pay less in federal taxes at the expense of other states with lower taxes. This tax should be abolished 100%. That shouldn't be controversial. But, if it's gonna be there it should absolutely have a limit, and $10k is already sort of high. Someone paying $80,000 in state taxes is both very rich and in a very high tax area. This is a tax cut for the rich. For this bill to have so many tax increases and then randomly add in a tax cut for them, but only if they live in a high tax state is incoherent.

4 weeks of paid family and medical leave(I don't like that they pay the companies to do this instead of making the companies do this, but people having actual free time to enjoy our limited time on this earth instead of being wage slaves their whole lives is such an important virtuous thing that I'll take that compromise for now.)

This bill had an additional EV tax credit of $4,500 for American unionized car companies. I have some problems with this. A lot of these car company unions are really corrupt and have given so much money to democrats that clearly this is a payoff to them in return. I don't really see why unionized businesses should get money for letting their workers unionize. Is it to make up for the increase in labor costs? Why would you make up for that? That defeats the purpose. I don't care if a business makes less money because their workers are unionized. In fact, I support them making less money. Businesses don't need to be incentivized to let their workers unionize. They need to be FORCED to let their workers unionize and for the most part they already are so I don't see any benefit to this other than to help the bottom lines of these businesses and also a lot of that money gets to the workers because they're unionized, but I don't see how that is a useful spending of money. I don't want people to join unions because they might get money from the fed government for that. They should join unions to increase the percent of the businesses profits that go to workers.

$350 billion by imposing a 15% minimum tax on foreign corporate profits.So, the 2017 tax cut act changed US corporate taxes from a global system to a territorial system. In a global tax system, the company incorporated in the US pays US tax rates on profits they make in other countries. In a territorial system, they pay the taxes to the government they are making the profits in.The global system greatly disincentivizes companies from being incorporated in the US. Most other countries use a territorial system so they can just incorporate there and then they can still operate in the US all the same, but now their operations in other countries they can pay less taxes. So this provision is bad and frankly it will probably be a net revenue decreaser not a net revenue increaser. It will certainly not hit that estimate of how much revenue it will bring in. It's also just fundamentally an idea I disagree with. I don't see why a company incorporated in the US should be paying US corporate taxes for profits made by subsidiaries in Mexico or Europe. You want as many businesses that do most of their business in the US to incorporate their business in the US as possible. $250 billion by eliminating Medicare tax cap so that rich people continue paying into Medicare at the 3%, functionally raising taxes on the wealthy because they aren't getting benefits from this Medicare that they're paying into. I think acting like this is a Medicare thing is a little disingenuous, but I support this.

$230 billion from an adjusted gross income surcharge on the 0.02% most wealthy, applying a 5% rate for those who make $10 million, and an additional 3% surtax above $25 million. If you combine the 5% there, the 3% there, and the 3% from Medicare tax, that's a tax increase of 11% on the wealthy. That essentially increases the top marginal tax rate from 37% to 48%,

which is a welcome change. The idea that someone making $600k a year and someone making $10billion a year would pay the same tax rate just makes no sense. 37% is too low. Should be at least 45%, but not above 55%. Between that is the right spot to raise as much revenue as possible without increasing it so much to make rich people leave to other countries.
$145 billion by repealing the 2017 tax act's rebate rule regarding prescription drugs. This makes prescription drug manufacturers give the government the profits of an increase in the price of a drug if it increases by more than inflation. Might as well just force them to not raise by more than inflation then because why would they ever if all of the profit goes to the government, but I guess you gotta try to get revenue anyway you can, ya greedy government. Also this is listed as a repeal of something in the 2017 tax cut and I don't know what the 2017 tax cut did. I can't find anything in it related to prescription drugs. Was this already a thing before 2017 and they got rid of it? If so that's pretty bad. Big pharma might have greater control of the Republican Party then the democrats. Also, the climate provisions were larger and there were some new ones.

Conclusions

The fundamental problem of the Biden Administration is 1. The idea that the government should tax the rich and then give that money to the working class. I much prefer just making the rich pay workers more directly to avoid government waste. No, you can't do both. If you only do each half heartedly then both maybe makes sense, but if you really make businesses pay as much as is possible with collective bargaining and all the power of the government, there's no more money to tax and the workers no longer need whatever spending programs you had in mind. If you make it impossible for rich people to make any money they'll move to other countries. We must choose one of 2 fundamental progressive redistribution policies. Either take money from the rich and spend that on government programs that help the working class OR through unions and higher minimum wages make businesses pay workers more directly. "Why can't we do both?" Do you not understand the business owner has limits? If first you reduce his profit margin from 20% to 10% by making him pay his workers more, he'll accept that. If then, you take that 10% to 5% with higher taxes, he moves to another country where he can make 10% or higher. New entrepreneurs who are deciding what country to move to to start a business will never choose to move to the US if they will both have to pay way higher wages and way higher taxes than other countries to the point where there's almost no money left to reward them. I prefer the direct route.

2. Subsidies. 90% of spending Biden has proposed is a subsidy that is somehow supposed to reduce the price of a good. The market finds the best price for a good(assuming government doesn't prevent the market from doing this and it isn't a specific industry in which the market doesn't work efficiently to get fair market prices.) The majority of subsidies goes to corporations, not consumers. You can not reduce the price to a good by taking $1 from the economy and then giving that $1 back to a consumer. That increases the price, it does not reduce the price.

3. The liberal governing ideology is to listen to reasonable ideas from the left(like free college) and reasonable ideas from the right(like letting college be a private industry that students have to pay for) and instead of listening to both sides and concluding who is right, take the path of

least resistance where both sides are the least mad, regardless of how incoherent the actual policy is, like giving students $10k one time to help them pay for college, while doing nothing about the actual tuition rates.

4. Simply taking money from taxpayers and then giving it back to someone like a student or a parent paying for child care is not a “good” you have accomplished nothing. You’ve simply moved money around. You haven’t created anything new and good. It is not inherently good for the government to give people money. You can only believe that if you ignore the inherent bad of taking money out of the economy through taxes.

5. The main reason Biden likes doing things with this third way method is because it doesn’t actually threaten the profits of the corporations because the corporations fund the democrats campaigns.

6. I don’t want the government to spend money on a bunch of random private industries. I don’t want the government to give money to private companies. I don’t want the government to somehow “reduce” the price of a good or service handled by private industry. I want the government to provide the services instead of private industries OR stay out of it and let the market do its thing. Pick one.

7. Legislation being passed in massive packages that take several pages to even get a basic understanding of what it does makes it harder to hold your representative accountable for their vote. People barely even know what’s in the legislation. Accountability is a fundamental aspect of a government that is of the people, by the people, for the people. An unaccountable government is an un-American government. Most things should be voted on on a single issue basis. This would also make things less partisan as you’re more likely to find a few republicans who support paid family leave or a child tax credit than republicans who support the entire 20 provision bill that’s basically a Democratic Party manifesto. They’d switch parties at that point.