

More people cooling to global warming fears

It's time to move beyond 'don't ask, don't tell'

Start Over Only from Time Warner Cable.







Brotherhood Bank & Trust

Home improvements on your mind? We have great HELOC rates.

Most Read

A Big 12 tournament without bubble pressure

Woman run over in Lawrence altercation

Kansas City wants to close half its public schools

How KU, K-State and MU can improve to win the

Last week, Bunning used one of the Senate's arcane rules to stop a \$10 billion spending bill and demanded that its costs be offset with spending cuts. Suddenly he became politically radioactive.

The White House, forgetting its fiscal pieties, called him "irrational."

Democrats gloated and murmured about obstructionist

Republicans. Commentators moaned about a Senate held hostage, petty tyrants in Congress, dysfunctional Washington, oh the unfairness of it all.

Instead of standing up for Bunning's simple point — if you're going to spend it, you've got to pay for it — most of Bunning's fellow Republicans cringed and ran for cover.

A few backed him up rhetorically, but you would have thought the supposed party of limited government would have made a better showing.

The impasse finally ended, but it was a most revealing week — and not only because the flap unmasked a lot of phony fiscal conservatives. There was more to this story than that.

A key part of the bill threatened by Bunning's quixotic stand was yet another extension of jobless benefits.

Democrats thoroughly enjoyed the spectacle of a Republican blocking aid to the unemployed. But actually, it's $politicians \ in \ both \ parties -- by \ continually \ extending \ jobless \ benefits -- who \ have \ unduly \ increased \ the \ number \ of$ long-term unemployed.

This is one of those cases in which economics and politics are in conflict. It's good politics to be seen offering aid to people who need it. But it's bad economics to overly subsidize joblessness.

The problem: Unemployment benefits encourage people to remain out of work longer than they would without the aid.

"Everybody in economics knows this, they're just afraid to say it," said Cato Institute economist Alan Reynolds.

Nor is this conclusion confined to those on the right. As one prominent Democratic economist wrote in a 2005 article. jobless aid contributes to "long-term unemployment by providing an incentive, and the means, not to work."

Among the points made by this economist: Federal benefits raise a worker's acceptance threshhold, encouraging a jobless person to hold out for a higher wage before accepting work. Jobless benefits lengthen the time a person

Demand for labor by companies is obviously important. But if unemployment benefits were eliminated, "the unemployment rate would drop by more than half a percentage point, which means that the number of unemployed people would fall by about 750,000."

Extension of jobless benefits feeds the...

The author of that article: Lawrence Summers, now director of the White House National Economic Council.

Other research has found that the probability of an unemployed worker going back to work triples as the duration of remaining benefits drops from six weeks to one, which is common sense. A looming deadline prompts more urgent action

No one is talking about eliminating jobless benefits, nor should they—nor should benefits be abruptly halted without warning, as they were temporarily because of Bunning's action.

The real issue is unduly extending such aid. Democrats enjoyed portraying Bunning as heartless, but now Congress is debating whether to extend unemployment benefits even further — to the end of the year.

Given that these extensions encourage long-term unemployment and profoundly damage a worker's marketability, it's worth asking whom these politicians think they're "helping" — unemployed workers, or themselves.

To reach E. Thomas McClanahan, call 816-234-4480 or send e-mail to mcclanahan@kcstar.com.

Posted on Sat, Mar. 06, 2010 10:15 PM



Join the discussion

Share your observations and experiences about news. Lively, open, civil debate is the goal. Please refrain from personal attacks or comments that are racist, vulgar or otherwise inappropriate. If you see an inappropriate comment, please click the "Report as abuse" link.

POWERED BY 🕄 Pluck

You must be logged in to leave a comment. Login | Register



Submit



Showing: Newest first

skeptic2 wrote on 3/8/2010 6:33:41 AM:

Unemployment benefits are what, one third of one's working salary? Is McCallahan suggesting that is going to encourage people to not look for employment?

Recommend (0) AReport abuse

pbrstreetgang wrote on 3/7/2010 8:17:23 PM:

I haven't been unemployed once in the last 25 years. Before that, however, I was unemployed three times, once with a baby on the way. It's not a matter to be lightly dismissed by the esoteric logic and lazy analysis of a simple-minded pundit like Tom Mclanahan. Snarky comments may be fun to read, but when they lead to superficial policy, they're dangerous. Crack open a book that' not written by Ann Coulter and you might learn something.

Recommend (0) AReport abuse

pbrstreetgang wrote on 3/7/2010 8:11:53 PM:

Hey sellersf: How hard is that to understand??? Really??? If employers had money to hire workers then we wouldn't have as many unemployed people. They don't because the financial crisis sent our economy into the outhouse. How hard is THAT to understand. I can't believe we have so many people in this country with so little compassion as to try to make unemployed people in the worst recession since the Great Depression out to be lazy. And who cares if the economist works with Republicans or Democrats? What's your answer? Let their families starve? I hope people are just as compassionate to you the next time you have a crisis.

Recommend (0) Apport abuse

sellersf wrote on 3/7/2010 1:35:53 PM:

When you subsidize something, you get more of it. Unemployment benefits subsidize unemployment. How hard is that to understand? RxBxtr missed a key point in McClanahan's commentary, namely that job-seekers hold out for higher pay when they can keep collecting unemployment benefits. And he also seems not to have noticed that the author McClanahan quoted about the dysfunctional effects of unemployment benefits is Lawrence Summers, a top economist in both the Clinton and Obama administrations.

Recommend (0) AReport abuse

RxBxtr wrote on 3/7/2010 8:11:23 AM:

"Other research has found that the probability of an unemployed worker going back to work triples as the duration of

Big 12 Tournament

The Oscars show went on and on, but the comedy sure didn't

Martin and Kansas State agree to new contract

Jason Whitlock | How the porn star got her great KU tickets

Signing now shows Martin's commitment to Kansas State

'The Hurt Locker' crushes 'Avatar' with picture, director, four more Oscars

Person in critical condition following stabbing at Midtown bar

Extension of jobless benefits feeds the...

remaining benefits drops from six weeks to one...Alooming deadline prompts more urgent action."

Seriously? And here I thought the probability of an unemployed worker going back to work increased in proportion to the number of jobs available. McClanahan obviously hasn't been in the job market for quite some time. If he were, he would know that there are hundreds of thousands of individuals collecting unemployment benefits who would give anything to have a job. And I take it that in his world, reducing the acceptance threshhold would magically allow a worker who once earned \$40,000 to make mortgage, insurance and utility payments (not to mention buying food) in a full-time job paying half that amount.

Yes, there are some who abuse the system and remain chronically unemployed. But putting the blame on the majority who want to work is obnoxious and offensive. If he wants to reduce unemployment, McClanahan would do better to focus his attention on companies that hand out pink slips like candy, double and triple work loads on remaining employees and continue to spend lavishly on executive perks and customer soirees.

Recommend (1) AReport abuse

More comments on this story: 1



Hot Penny Stock Picks - Free Alerts Find stocks that move up 700%. Make huge profits when you join today. StockPickTrading.com

Obama Urges Homeowners to Refinance Rates Hit 3.62% APR! Calculate New Mortgage Payment Now. SeeRefinanceRates Buy Stocks - \$4 Fee at ShareBuilder No Account or Investment Minimums. \$50 Account Bonus! Don't miss out. www.sharebuilder.com

Ads by Yahoo!

Terms of Service | Privacy Policy | About our ads | Copyright

HOME	NEWS	SPORTS	BUSINESS	FYI/LIVING	ENTERTAINMENT	OPINION	PROMO
Columnists	Columnists	Columnists	Columnists	Columnists	Columnists	Columnists	Place an Ad
Blogs	Breaking News	Chiefs	Announcements	Food	lnk	Editorials	Jobs
Obituaries	Nation & World	Royals	Consumer News	House & Home	Horoscopes	Letters to the Editor	Cars
Weather	Politics	Wizards	Emerging Business	Faith	Comics		Real Estate
Traffic	Lotteries	KU	Technology	Star Magazine	Games		Rentals
Community Faces	Neighborhoods	K-State	Workplace	Travel	Preview Extra		Classifieds
Forums	JoCo	MU	Star 50	Health	Movies		Shopping
About The Star	Info Central	High Schools	Stocks	Celebrations	Music		
Video	News Projects	Stats	Calendar	Dear Abby	Performing Arts		
	•	Outdoors		· ·	Calendar		
					Star TV		