

Rand Paul Office Visit December 27, 2017

Synopsis for talking points

Rand Paul promoted his vote in support of the recent tax bill on Fox News and elsewhere. He based his justification for supporting the tax cuts based on the belief that tax money belongs to people and not the government. He would even support larger tax cuts than \$1.5 trillion. Senator Paul also supported the elimination of the health insurance mandate claiming it would save the government \$350 billion and further reduce taxes. The fact those Federal savings are achieved because an estimated 13 million Americans will lose health coverage, or a Federal savings of about \$26.92/person who loses health coverage is apparently irrelevant.

The fact the tax bill increases the deficit has not seemed to bother Rand Paul, even though he often complains about the need to reduce the deficit. Paul is apparently unable to grasp the connection between Federal revenue and spending as part of the same equation that defines the size of the deficit. Instead, deficits can only be addressed by lowering spending and revenue is something the public provides based on the government's ability to justifying its need to receive. Absent that justification, taxpayers apparently are not obligated to pay any taxes they don't believe are justified. The recently passed tax bill was the most regressive tax cut in the last 50 years, a generous gift to wealthy at the expense of poorer Americans who will ultimately pay more in 10 year time. This leads to the following questions for Paul.

Questions

1. If less taxes produce greater economic opportunity and growth, ***would the Senator please explain how less social investment, fewer efforts to address social problems, less investment in infrastructure and greater inequality produce a better society instead of a worse one?***
2. Wealth is a reward, a gift from society in exchange for unique talents and abilities to provide something back to society. Wealth is not a "right", but a "responsibility", not an "entitlement", but an "obligation". The greater the social reward (wealth), the greater the responsibility and obligation to give back to society. ***Would the Senator like to explain why he feels the opposite? Why does he think wealth exists only to serve the wealthy, it belongs to them and that government and society in general should just let them have all they want?***
3. Estate taxes, which the tax bill cut and Paul supported, were established to ensure wealth was not a birthright. Wealth should be an individual achievement, based on one's talents and abilities to provide something to society in exchange for the application and use of those individual talents and abilities. Inheritance of large sums of money bypass the social requirement for any social exchange of wealth in return for social contributions. It not only makes wealth merely a condition on one's social status, but it adds to social inequality, inefficiency in the use of resources and furthers an entitlement mentality toward wealth. ***Could the Senator explain his justification for further enhancing social inequality over responsibility and obligation of the wealthiest Americans?***
4. Fundamental to understanding our place in the world, is to understand our relationship between ourselves and the society in which we live. ***Would the Senator explain what he thinks the relationship is between society and the individual? Does he believe society is***

Rand Paul Office Visit December 27, 2017

here to serve the interest of the individual, or the individual is here to serve the interests of society? (Hint -- which can exist without the other – society or the individual).

- 5. There is greater wealth stagnation, less social mobility and far less growth in median family incomes in the US today than 50 years ago. Does the Senator believe tax bills like the one he just passed will enhance or diminish that trend? Please explain based on evidence and not simply beliefs.***