Two notions have achieved conventional wisdom status in many quarters. First, that the United States is a safety net laggard when compared with other highly developed nations; and second, that the obvious thing to do to improve our safety net is to become more like those other nations. In my judgment, both claims are wrong. Far from being a “welfare state laggard,” the United States has a rich tradition of a strong, unique safety net, one that has over the course of the nation’s history reflected a distinct American identity. At its best, America’s safety net is bouncy and a key component of
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what, at least until fairly recently, has been an extraordinarily entrepreneurial and dynamic society.\(^6\)

That said, right now our safety net is not as bouncy as it once was, and not as bouncy as it has the potential to be.\(^7\) In what follows, I detail some of the reasons why what should be a springy safety net—catching those in distress and then propelling them back up—is looking downright frayed these days. After describing the challenges we face, I offer some “outside the box” suggestions\(^8\) that aim to draw on the United States’ exceptional institutions to help reweave our social fabric.

So, first, why do I not see America as a safety net laggard? The answer is that unlike many policy experts and academics have had a way-too-cramped definition, in defining “safety net” I take into account the full panoply of United States institutions. When we carefully consider programs such as government-provided or government-subsidized health care and health insurance; Social Security, private pensions, tax-advantaged retirement accounts, and public expenditures on education,\(^9\) the United States does not trail peer nations.\(^10\)
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It is true that many of these institutions differ from the means-tested government programs for the poor and near-poor like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)\textsuperscript{11} that are often the first thing to leap to mind at the phrase “safety net.”\textsuperscript{12} But when we ponder what prevents and ameliorates poverty, we have to view matters with a far wider lens. The fact is that as U.S. society has evolved, programs with benefits that flow substantially—even primarily—to those other than the poor and near-poor are essential for preventing or allaying poverty.\textsuperscript{13}

Perhaps most striking, when comparing the United States with other rich nations many neglect to account for the so-called “third sector” of nonprofit firms that undergirds civil society. One of the courses I teach at the University of Virginia School of Law is Nonprofit Organizations, and each time I teach it I am struck anew by the beneficence of individual and institutional donors in the United States. This tradition of benevolence, which predates U.S. independence,\textsuperscript{14} remains strong today, as Americans of all political stripes give time, money, and expertise to a wide range of worthy causes in a way and to a degree that citizens of other highly prosperous nations simply do not.\textsuperscript{15} These institutions of civil society often substitute for government, providing services similar to those provided by


They provide important goods and services, including religious instruction and support, that the government cannot. Even in areas where the United States provides safety net services that have direct analogues in other developed nations, we are exceptional. Examining Medicare and Medicaid, we see that there is far more respect for individual needs and preferences than is the case in most other societies. It is interesting to me that the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) contained in the Affordable Care Act has incited so much opposition, because it was modeled on institutions in other nations that command acceptance. But the sort of rationing the IPAB was charged with, where a panel of experts deliberately insulated from the political process makes life-and-death decisions, does not map well on to American institutions and political commitments.

So what has gone wrong? Why do I and many others fear that America’s safety net is less effective than it once was at providing a “hand up”? There are several reasons. The first is the omnipresence of “cliffs,” whereby benefits plunge or even disappear altogether if beneficiaries earn more money. These “cliffs” include subsidies for health insurance premiums under the Affordable Care Act, rights to live in public housing...
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projects, and student loan forgiveness programs. It is a long, long list, and, disturbingly, it is growing. Second is the rise of occupational licensing requirements. In the last generation or two, the percentage of jobs that require some form of occupational license has soared. That makes it tougher for those in financial difficulty to redepoly their human capital to new jobs. Third is tightened credit as the result of the Dodd-Frank Act and various other regulatory “reform” measures. Frequently justified as necessary to protect people from making bad choices, these measures discourage the formation of new businesses and thus reduce the ability of those living on the edge to prosper.

And that is not all. We have also made mistakes extremely costly for many citizens. Civil forfeiture is rampant. If you
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have saved any money, it is possible to lose it if you get mixed up with the wrong people, even tangentially.31 Excessive fines are imposed by many jurisdictions.32 Over-criminalization saddles many with criminal records that make it hard to get hired.33 Finally, perhaps the greatest strain on America’s safety net is the precarious financial condition of the United States government. With total U.S. government debt projected to exceed $20 trillion in 2017,34 America’s capacity to fulfill all its obligations looks increasingly in doubt.35

So what should we do? In thinking about where to go next, we should start with what we have. That is, we should not aim to copy a fantasy paradise across the Atlantic, for those nations are for the most part under even greater financial pressure than we are.36 The better course is to focus on what the United States does well and build on it. In the spirit of extending our panel discussion beyond the usual anti-poverty prescriptions,37 I offer two suggestions. The first is think seriously about how better to
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harness the capabilities of our civil societal institutions, particularly in the area of healthcare. The Affordable Care Act focused on insuring people or enrolling them in Medicaid—in short, on “covering” them—but “coverage” is not access.\textsuperscript{38} We blundered into a system whereby “nonprofit” hospitals only have to offer nebulous “community benefit,” not demonstrable charitable payoffs, in order to enjoy valuable tax benefits.\textsuperscript{39} We should reconsider that approach in order to boost access to needed health care. In addition, we should encourage the many “grass roots” health care innovations we are seeing, especially free clinics and low-cost clinics. My second suggestion is that we think very seriously about a major restructuring of the finances of the United States government. Such a restructuring could include selling off some of the nation’s plentiful assets, including its carbon energy assets.
