There are two views of markets. In one view of markets, held perhaps most famously by my former colleague Senator Warren, markets are a place where people are trapped, manipulated, and made worse off.1 If they borrow money, they’ll probably borrow too much that they won’t be able to repay, and then they’ll be out on the street. If they were allowed to choose their own school in a market system, they’d make the wrong choice, and so we have to make that choice for them. The other view of markets is that markets offer a chance. All real market choices involve risks. Sometimes people will fail, but sometimes they will win. They build businesses, their kids get better educations, and they escape poverty and move up the ladder economically.

I am an economist, a lawyer, and a law professor, so I’ll address both law and economics. Economics has taught us that the ability to access credit markets is an absolute prerequisite to the formation of new businesses.2 Most new jobs come from new small businesses.3 For example, from 1980 to 2012—over a
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30-year period—average net employment growth in big businesses hovered around zero. Net employment growth was entirely in smaller and newer businesses.

The bad news is that employment in firms that are newer (less than five years old) fell from 18 percent of private-sector employment in 1981, and even 16 percent in 1988, down to twelve percent in 2012. Why was that? There are a lot of factors, but certainly one factor has to be that we have not created conditions in credit markets, especially since the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act in 2010, that are favorable to creation of new businesses. Credit markets have tightened up and it has become much more difficult for new businesses to get outside capital.

Most new businesses are not created by raising equity from friends and family. Outside capital is absolutely crucial to the creation of new businesses. New businesses mean more jobs, and new businesses also mean new


entrepreneurs. And entrepreneurship is a major way that people move up the economic ladder.9

So where do people get the capital? How do you get outside capital to start a new business? You need collateral and you have to be able to borrow.10 What are two ways that economists know small businesses get going? The first important way businesses are started is by using collateral in homes: people take out home equity lines of credit.11

The second way is credit card debt.12 A huge fraction—54 percent—of new businesses are using personal credit cards to finance the business.13 Not business credit cards, but personal credit cards. Senator Warren looks at credit cards, and she sees people in bankruptcy who have made a lot of bad financial decisions including in how they use their credit cards. In response, the CARD Act14 was passed. The CARD Act mandates certain terms in credit card contracts and forbids others. The net effect of these restrictions on contractual choice has been that it is more difficult for people to get credit cards. As a result, it is surely true that some consumers are paternalistically prevented from running up credit card debts that they can’t pay. But another consequence, forgotten by
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parternalists, is that it is more difficult for people to get credit cards that can be used for starting new businesses.\textsuperscript{15}

What about home equity? How do you get home equity? Well, you get a loan, a mortgage. What have we done with the Dodd-Frank Act?\textsuperscript{16} As interpreted by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), that law’s requirement that lenders make loans only to people with a reasonable ability to repay has wiped out the market for mortgages for young people, for minorities, and for anybody who doesn’t have an established credit history. We have eliminated the subprime mortgage market. Is that a bad thing for income and wealth mobility and for the creation of new businesses? Yes, it is.\textsuperscript{17}

A couple of very recent studies have reinforced this conclusion. During the 2000s, the rate of new business formation was the greatest in places where home prices were increasing.\textsuperscript{18} Another study found that every ten percent increase in home equity increased the probability that a household would become entrepreneurial by fourteen
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When you restrict mortgages, you restrict the ability of people to acquire capital in their homes. If people cannot acquire capital, a very important source of collateral for getting a loan to start a new business has disappeared.

Why did Congress enact the Dodd-Frank Act? Because people looked around after the fact and saw that a large number of people defaulted on their mortgages at the end of the early twenty-first century housing boom. But the major increase in mortgage delinquencies was not among lower income borrowers, but among higher income borrowers who were speculating on rising housing prices. Was there fraud in the subprime mortgage market? Yes, there was fraud in the
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subprime mortgage market. But, under the common law, fraud is a defense to contract enforcement, and fraud is a tort. We didn’t need the Dodd-Frank Act to deal with fraud; we’ve always known that active fraud is going to hurt people. Dodd-Frank was premised on a much different model of human behavior: a view that people are not smart enough to make the right choices; therefore, they should not be allowed to choose at all. Just like with credit cards, Dodd Frank is based
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on the view that consumers should not be allowed to take certain types of market risks.28

So, in these two areas, we have done exactly the wrong thing. Instead of harnessing market forces and making credit more available to people who are going use it to start new businesses and create jobs that benefit not just themselves but all the people they employ, we have done the opposite. We have been moving in the wrong direction at a rapid pace, though it has slowed in recent years as the political constellations have changed.29 These laws prevent people from accessing the market in a way that can help overcome both poverty and inequality.30

In addition to accumulating financial wealth through the creation of new businesses, another way that people overcome poverty is through the accumulation of human capital: education. Here too we have restricted choice in a way that perpetuates poverty. Centralized policies have denied to poor parents a market choice of which schools their children may attend. We know such a choice has not been made widely available; we also know that it is what parents want and that it should happen.31 Eighty percent of the African-American families in Philadelphia want their kids to have to have a
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choice in what school to attend. But they are not given that opportunity because the teacher’s unions have invested enormous amounts to erect legal obstacles to such parental choice. Those obstacles have to be removed. Now more than ever, investing in human capital is the surest path to intergenerational movement up the income and wealth ladder. Obstacles to market choice in education have to be removed.

Instead of opening up markets and making them accessible to people so that they can be an engine for overcoming poverty and inequality, we have done exactly the opposite. And why? There is a tendency of both lawyers and politicians to consider selected stories—sad stories sometimes—of people who’ve failed. They look at stories of failed choices and jump to the conclusion that the solution is to prevent people from making choices in the first place.
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You have to look at the situation in a different way and take a different perspective. You have to look at the people who took chances and succeeded. How often do you hear those stories? Taking chances and succeeding is the engine of growth. It is the engine for overcoming inequality and poverty.\textsuperscript{37} And it is where we have to focus.