

As rapid technological change continues, skills change and become obsolete. No longer can a skill learned in the formative years assure lifetime employment. Training and retraining on or off the job are increasingly a part of the work pattern. The hard realities of training the unemployables are that they will not be capable of learning the higher skills demanded in the jobs newly created by automation, but those with jobs must be trained and willing to do so, to take the new jobs thus leaving their old but needed jobs available to those below them in the ladder of skills if they too will train. The unskilled and semi-skilled with training will fit into the jobs left vacant by those upgrading their skills.

This process requires understanding, study and constant research to identify the jobs going begging and the skills and training needed to fill them. Just as the rehabilitation program for the physically handicapped requires cooperation by employers to identify the jobs they may have which a one-armed man, for example, might productively fill, so the rehabilitation program for the comparative poor will require similar cooperation and understanding.

Let us consider for a moment the major objections to the guaranteed income.

First, to what extent will common agreement be possible in the support and implementation of a guaranteed income? Assuming both the economic and political feasibility of some plan of guaranteed income, would this assure sufficient and broad enough support to avoid disruptive conflict and social disorganization?

The value system of Western Man has for centuries associated work with income. It is a Judeo-Christian ethic with special emphasis incorporated in the Protestant norm in American society.

Specifically, can a right to income without work be adopted without creating deep cleavages and conflicts in our society? Is it possible to have a dual set of values and norms; one predicated on income for work and one on income without work? Isn't it possible that the existing gulf between the middle-class culture and the sub-culture of poverty will be deepened and problems of national cohesiveness and accommodation be aggravated? In fact, another serious rift may develop within the lower economic class: between the approximately one-third of all American families that earn income above the poverty line but below the national median and those families receiving government subsidies. At a time when many analysts discern a growing alienation of the poor from the mainstream of American society, the divisive tendencies fostered by income guarantees are clearly anathema.

Any special system is composed of many interrelated units and functions. Any drastic change in one part of the social system will affect the total in many unforeseen and unpredictable ways. We have never been able to predict the total impact of change. Increasingly and frequently we have learned that the treatment of a social problem may produce additional problems and, in the final analysis, the treatment may be worse than the disease. The "side effects" may leave the patient worse off than before.

For example, the adoption of a form of income guarantee would have serious and disturbing effects on the future of private philanthropy, perhaps leading even to the virtual elimination of the private sector's role in solving social problems. A "side effect" such as this would be quite serious. In 1966, American private philanthropy totaled \$13 billion, 8.6 times more than the expenditures for the OEO war on poverty that year. And as Richard Cornuelle points out in *Reclaiming the American Dream* (Random House: New York, 1963), private organizations excel in pinpointing and reacting to particular problems in specific areas. They have the adaptability and flexibility of response to these problems that government efforts have rarely shown and they are subject to the demanding discipline of the marketplace. If, however, the government guarantees sufficient income to meet basic needs, private charities would have a real task in convincing donors that any need for private efforts still exists and the valuable contributions of private charity could well be lost.

Second, the plan would help to perpetuate welfare as a way of life by sacrificing social services designed to eliminate the causes of need for an income guarantee. Proponents of guaranteed income plans fail to distinguish between those families and individuals who could and would make good use of an interim guaranteed income grant and those who would not. They also fail to distinguish between those in poverty and those who lead decent lives, although having no margin for waste or luxury. They would create a costly program—ranging from \$5 to \$24 billion a year—that would spread our resources . . . (cost estimates for programs from an article by Dr. Robert Lampman in *Social Action*, Nov. 1967).