

ment in our political structure, in the tax field and all other areas. They actually lie behind why we have not developed jobs-available statistics. The AFL-CIO does not want it. They do not want the Dictionary of Occupational Titles really kept up to date, and undercover, they fight it.

So if these theories of mine are right, it is indeed guaranteed opportunities that we need to talk about, and we need to think of the unemployed today, even the hard core, as our greatest underutilized economic resource.

(The prepared statement of Representative Curtis follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

THE GUARANTEED OPPORTUNITY TO EARN AN ANNUAL INCOME

The guaranteed annual income, like a guarantee of happiness, has a direct and simple appeal. The proponents imply that poverty can be wiped out in a single stroke by giving a subsidy to the poor. If poverty is a lack of income, then the solution is obvious; provide the income necessary to raise the poor family or individual above the poverty level. The beguiling simplicity of the idea is its most attractive—and dangerous feature. The writers of the United States Constitution resisted this simplicity and spoke of government providing for the pursuit of happiness, not happiness itself. So I think we must resist the present day simplicity and speak of providing for the opportunity to earn an income, not providing the income itself.

The trouble with this seemingly new theory is that the more we learn about poverty, particularly hardcore poverty, the more we realize that it is not just an economic problem. It is a problem with deep cultural, emotional, and political roots. In truth, hardcore poverty in the United States is as much a state of mind as a lack of money. Merely providing direct money payments to the poor will not solve the poverty problem. In fact, I believe that providing a guaranteed annual income would perpetuate poverty and might even make it worse.

As a matter of fact, the term "poverty" must be more clearly understood. In the United States today, it is definitely *not* subsistence-poverty which is the term developed in the western world over the past seventeen decades as a scientific word of art, which is used in the United Nations and applied with a real and practical meaning to most societies in the world today. The term *poverty* as used in the United States today can only mean comparative poverty—the disparities in income, food, clothing and shelter which are perhaps inevitable in a free society. This new concept has little relation to subsistence poverty, albeit it is descriptive of a very real and important bundle of social and economic problems. A very helpful study in this area is Rose Friedman's *Poverty: Definition and Perspective*, (Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1965).

In my opinion, the guaranteed income would harden the poverty subcultures in our society. It would make millions of individuals wholly dependent upon some new form of welfare check and give them the feeling that they had no chance to obtain more. This is why I am opposed to the guaranteed income and why I believe it would be a cruel mistake to adopt it as public policy.

There is a better, more realistic and more enlightened way to fight comparative-poverty. It is by guaranteeing opportunity. Or as Abraham Lincoln put it, by affording every man "an unfettered start in the race of life." But before explaining how I think we can do a better job of guaranteeing opportunity, I want to discuss why I think adoption of the guaranteed annual income would be a major mistake.

A complete evaluation of the guaranteed income requires the skills and insights of an economist, sociologist, philosopher, and psychologist. For some reason, the economists seem to have made the subject their own special province. Admittedly, economists can provide a part of the answer. They can tell us something of the cost and of the alternative uses to which we might put our resources. But economists can tell us very little about the social, cultural, and psychological effects of the guaranteed income. And, in my opinion, these are critical.

I suppose that is part of the reason why I am here. Just as I feel that war is too serious to be left to the generals, so do I believe that the outcome of the guaranteed income debate is too important to be left to the economists. As a