Advancing a Retirement Income Security Agenda for All Generations
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Reject the Entitlement Crisis Frame and Language

Once a neutral budget term, “entitlement” has taken on new meaning in policy, media and even everyday discourse—one that diminishes the dignity of the old and contributes to the mis-framing of policy discussions about the economic consequences of the aging of America. Conference planners and participants should reject “entitlements” language and urge politicians and the press to do likewise. Here’s why.

Americans properly understand Social Security and Medicare as benefits they have earned through lifelong contributions from their (or a family member’s) earnings, not as a “hand-out.” Medicaid, in turn, ensures that the poor as well as many very sick Americans obtain needed health care. Subtle or not, “entitlement” terminology implies that somehow such benefit protections are not deserved. Intended or not, the language chips away at the self-esteem and reinforces negative stereotypes that somehow the old—like spoiled, overly entitled children or adults—are demanding and taking more than they deserve (Altman & Kingson, 2015).

The terminology of entitlement is functional for those wanting to scale-back or otherwise radically change—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Rather than directly attacking these popular programs, it allows them to obfuscate their intentions by attacking “entitlements.”
Lumping these programs together as a “unified entitlement problem” provides a convenient frame for advancing and reinforcing the claim that entitlement spending is the largest cause of federal deficits and the national debt, and that left unchecked this spending will bankrupt the nation. As William Greider writes in *The Nation*, the political consequences of this shift in meaning are not benign:

For many years, the smug elites of Wall Street have peddled “entitlement reform” as a sly euphemism for cutting Social Security. And Washington’s political elites, including President Obama, bought into the propaganda. Social Security, not to mention Medicare and Medicaid, was driving the nation into ruinous debt if government did not act to curb this venerable New Deal program. Think tanks and editorial writers, political reporters and TV talkers, wittingly embraced the big lie and promoted it as indisputable truth (Greider, 2014).

Equally problematic, the terminology of “entitlement,” “entitlement problem,” and “entitlement crisis” distracts attention from tax spending sprees (e.g., profligate tax cuts and expenditures primarily benefitting well-off constituencies), two wars paid for with credit cards, financial mismanagement leading to the near collapse of our economy, and widening inequalities of income and wealth. Whatever the problem, this frame offers cuts to spending on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid as solution.

**Promote Intergenerational Understanding of Social Security**

At any one point in time Social Security serves all age groups and, over time, all generations. Princeton economist J. Douglas Brown, an architect of the Social Security Act, spoke eloquently of Social Security as a covenant reaching across generations and arising from a commitment to mutual responsibility that undergirds civilization. This covenant “underlies the fundamental obligation of the government and citizens of one time and the government and citizens of another time to maintain a contributory social insurance system” (Brown, 1977, 31–32).

The most important source of income for retirees, Social Security is also working American’s most reliable disability insurance and the nation’s largest children’s program. Indeed, 3.4 million dependent young children and one million dependent adults disabled before age 22 receive benefits each month. The most significant source of income flowing into the homes of 7.4 million children being raised by grandparents or other older relatives, Social Security is also the most important life and disability insurance working parents have, protecting nearly all of the nation’s 74 million children. As important as Social Security is for today’s old, it is likely to be even more so for today’s young- and middle-aged workers. Indeed, it is they who have more at stake if benefits are cut or expanded (Altman & Kingson, 2015).

Unfortunately, in policy discourse Social Security is often presented——by both friends and foes—as if it is only a program for the old. And, the prime sponsor of this year’s WHCOA contributes to this mischaracterization.

The President’s 2007–2008 presidential primaries and general election campaigns and the White House website provide case in point. Unionists, women, religious groups, environmentalist, and the like were listed among the 25 or so groups providing special support for candidate Obama (e.g., “_____ for Obama”). “Seniors for Obama” was nowhere to be found on this list. Instead, seniors were assigned to the “Issues” section of the website under “Seniors and Social Security.”

The problem here is that “Seniors” are not issues, and, “Social Security” benefits and policy concerns everyone, not just seniors. A one-time occurrence would be of little concern. But in spite of requests by supporters engaged in the campaign and followed by similar requests at White House meetings, “Seniors” and “Social Security” remain joined under the “Issues” section of the website under “Seniors and Social Security.”

Like the contemporary use of the word “entitlement,” intended or not, defining seniors as “an issue” is, at best, inaccurate, and, at worst, disrespectful. And presenting Social Security narrowly as an issue primarily of concern to the old misframes policy discussions. So, it is time for the White House to push the “reset” button...

Language frames issues and conveys attitudes. Like the contemporary use of the word “entitlement,” intended or not, defining seniors as “an issue” is, at best, inaccurate, and, at worst, disrespectful. And presenting Social Security narrowly as an issue primarily of concern to the old misframes policy discussions. So, it is time for the White House to push the “reset” button with regard to how it talks about older Americans and Social Security. Failing this, the WHCOA delegates could perform an important service by raising such concerns.

**Highlight Economic Insecurity Among Today’s Seniors**

By virtually any measure, the economic status of the old has, on average, improved since the 1950s, with, for example, poverty rates declining under the official poverty measure from roughly 35% in 1959 to 9% today (15% when the Census Bureau’s new Supplemental Poverty measure
is used). But contrary to stereotypes, most seniors are not living on easy street. A small percentage is wealthy, while many more live in poverty or near the margin of economic insufficiency. Indeed 48% of seniors are economically vulnerable when 200% of the New Supplemental Poverty Measure is used as the standard. Others—including many among the one out of four senior households with annual incomes in excess of $50,000—are comfortable but often only one shock away from serious financial problems (Altman & Kingson, 2015).

Monthly Social Security benefits for seniors are modest, averaging just $1,328 in January 2015. Yet, two thirds of beneficiaries, 65 and over, receive at least half of their income from Social Security (U.S. Social Security Administration, 2014).

While the struggle to make ends meet is a burden many seniors face, this pattern of economic stress is generally more pronounced among particular demographic groups—notably Latinos, African Americans, unmarried women, and the oldest old—who are very much at risk for living in poverty based on their limited access to resources and societal limitations that have prevented many from accumulating wealth over their lifetimes. Also, a large numbers of older workers, with health limitations and/or little opportunity to work, accept Social Security retired worker benefits at early ages (e.g., 62), thus sustaining large, permanent reductions in their monthly benefits.

Social Security has helped maintain a standard of living for many families of color in America that may otherwise not be possible. People of color rely more heavily on survivor and disability benefits, reflecting lower educational attainment and higher incidence of poverty and morbidity (Martin, 2007). While non-Hispanic whites are more likely to possess wealth outside of their Social Security retirement benefits, many people of color rely solely on what they earned from Social Security for financial stability (Rockeymoore & Lui, 2011). Many people of color have also been unable to obtain wealth through their lifetimes due to past racial discrimination in American policies, yielding a disproportionate reliance on Social Security benefits to ensure that they are able to meet basic monthly expenses.

While acknowledging the heterogeneity of economic circumstance among today’s old, the 2015 WHCOA provides opportunity to highlight the very real financial insecurities facing the majority of seniors today, especially those who are most vulnerable.

**Sound the Alarm on the Looming Retirement Income Crisis**

American workers face a looming retirement income crisis, where far too many will find themselves unable to maintain their standards of living when they grow old.

Allianz Life Insurance Company reported, from its 2010 survey of 3,257 people, that “an overwhelming 92%” answered that they absolutely (44%) or somewhat (48%) believe that the nation faces a retirement income crisis, with “more than half (54%)” of persons ages 44–49 saying they are “totally unprepared” for retirement (Allianz Life Insurance Company, 2010). In their 2013 retirement confidence survey, the Employee Benefit Research Institute found that only “13 percent are very confident they will have enough money to live comfortably in retirement,” the lowest ever reported in the 23 years of conducting this annual survey.

This lack of confidence is not surprising as the past 35 years have not been good to most American workers. Only the top 10% of the income distribution have seen
of many among today's retirees, legislative proposals are
time to expand Social Security, but that should not stop
the WHCOA from recommending that very serious consid-
eration be given to such proposals. Whatever the outcome,
the nation will benefit from a full and open debate and the
WHCOA can serve as vehicle to facilitate such debate.

Conclusion
The 2015 White House Conference on Aging has the oppor-
tunity to delve into diverse issues affecting older Americans,
their families, and caregivers. As 2015 begins, we look
forward to the 80th Anniversary of the Social Security
Act as well as the 50th Anniversaries of Medicare and
Medicaid— institutions that have reduced poverty, helped
families sustain their standard of living and strengthened
the national community. Addressing the retirement income
crisis and significant income problems of today’s retirees in
a way that recognizes the importance of intergenerational
commitments and supports the expansion of the nation’s
most successful and popular domestic policy will resonate
most effectively with the American people.
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Consider Benefit Increases in Social Security as Critical Option
Responding to the looming retirement income crisis of
today’s workforce and tenuous economic circumstances
of many among today’s retirees, legislative proposals are
being advanced which increase Social Security’s modest,
though vital, protections while simultaneously strength-
ening program financing. These proposals include rev-
eue measures such as lifting the payroll contribution
ceiling, gradually increasing the contribution rate over
20 years, and diversifying trust fund investments. With
respect to today’s and tomorrow’s retirees, on the ben-
efit side, they include such proposals as modest across the
board increase in benefits, larger minimum benefit pay-
ments for low wage-workers, caregiver credits, and use
of the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to
calculate COLAs.

A poll by the National Academy of Social Insurance (NASI)
dicates that our Social Security system is sup-
ported across all political groups; self-reported Democrats,
Republicans, and Tea-Partiers alike agree that Social Security
benefits should be expanded because they understand the
importance of the system to their families and communities
(Tucker, Reno, & Bethell, 2013). Americans favor having
millionaires and billionaires pay the same rate by raising the
payroll contribution cap, currently set at $118,500 for 2015
(U.S. Social Security Administration, 2015).

Of course, many disagree with the proposition that it
is time to expand Social Security, but that should not stop
the WHCOA from recommending that very serious consid-
eration be given to such proposals. Whatever the outcome,
the nation will benefit from a full and open debate and the
WHCOA can serve as vehicle to facilitate such debate.

... the WHCOA has an important opportunity

... the WHCOA has an important opportunity
to sound the alarm on the retirement income crisis.
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