



Dependence day is every day, Independence Day once a year. Isn't that about the current ratio?

July 3rd, 2012, 11:37 am · · posted by Mark Landsbaum

Last we checked, about half of Americans don't pay income tax. Is it surprising then that so many Americans want to receive benefits paid for by income taxes? When a benefit is offered at little or no cost to the one receiving it, how many people have the strength of character to turn it down on principle?

Yes, we know, some people are flummoxed by the mere raising of "principle" as a basis for turning down something of value provided at little or no cost to them. What principle might that be? Might we suggest *independence*? As opposed to *dependence*.

On that point, might we ask what to conclude from this next dreary statistic?

"A record of 8,733,461 workers took federal disability insurance payments in June 2012, according to the Social Security Administration. That was up from 8,707,185 in May," reported CNSNews.com.

Either government work is becoming more strenuous or even dangerous, or something else is going on. Perhaps more people are deciding to depend on government benefits? Could that be it?

Bail outs create dependency

Just asking, but what does it mean that the federal government in its wisdom extended unemployment benefits up to 99 weeks?

Congress allowed unemployment beneficiaries to continue collecting checks from emergency and extended programs, in short, to receive up to 99 weeks of unemployment checks. What happens – other than bruised personal self-respect – when people depend on the government for paychecks in return for not doing any work?

"...great pressure on the federal-state unemployment insurance (UI) tax and benefit system," says [the National Center for Policy Analysis](http://theNationalCenterforPolicyAnalysis.com).

State governments are borrowing from the federal government to fund these programs and to pay benefits. Let's set aside how a bankrupt federal government comes up with money to lend to others. Let's just consider this: how dependent can people become on a system that is dependent on people paying taxes?

Can no one see this house of cards ultimately collapsing?

Lest anyone suggest we are picking on the poor, defenseless, unemployed schleps, consider this variety of dependency: “*corporate welfare is rampant in the spending of the federal government*,” says a Cato Institute study.

How rampant you ask?

Subsidies amount to nearly \$100 billion a year.

Just a sampling: “Sugar subsidies offer artificially-created profits to sugar producers, protecting them from international competition, while increasing input costs for other, less influential businesses,” says Cato.

What happens when corporations depend on a flow of taxpayer money to make them profitable?

Cato says the results are economically unhealthy (and we must add, unjust): “Firms that receive subsidies become spendthrift, failing to check costs as they otherwise might. Subsidies aren’t driven by actual market demands, but instead are compelled by often arbitrary political desires. Subsidies often drive firms to make financial decisions that are uncompetitive in the long run (they may, for example, locate too many operations in the United States). Subsidies are only necessary to fund projects passed over by private investors, which were presumably passed over for a reason.”

In short, dependence on government subsidies cheats those who don’t get the subsidies, makes life more costly for those who buy what’s provided by subsidies because unfair competition keeps prices from declining and enriches people who should be allowed to fail because of their bad business models.

Of course if the subsidies were cut off, the companies probably would have to throw a lot more people out of work. And they could depend on unemployment insurance benefits.