Twitter Thread by A.R. Moxon



A.R. Moxon
@JuliusGoat

If you ever want to consider how committed our society is to the foundational lie that life must be earned, and those who fail to earn it must die, consider that the proposition “giving everyone money to spend would be bad for the economy” is widely accepted as truth.

> A new study found that giving low-income workers money upfront in their work period helped alleviate the mental burden of their financial problems and allowed them to be more productive \u2014 echoing other findings on the psychological impacts of poverty.https://t.co/zdxItTLDLZ
>
> — NPR (@NPR) February 3, 2021

“Giving money to people in poverty solves poverty” is an obvious truth, which needs (another) study for proof, for the same reason that this finding will be ignored (again).

We don’t want to fix poverty, even if doing so helps everyone—not if it means life for the “undeserving.”

It’s not about saving money.

There's a great fear in this country that a single dollar might go to someone who might not deserve it; or that a single given dollar might be spent on something we deem unworthy.

We'll spend five dollars to prevent the waste of that one dollar.

The manifestations are everywhere. From the overt, gleefully cruel hostility of conservatism toward people in poverty, of course. But also hidden in almost everyone's assumptions.

Our use of charity as a way of controlling who gets helped, for example. https://t.co/Ax6Av9J5vb

> Charity isn't primarily an act.
>
> Before the act comes an alignment.
>
> Charity is the natural fruit of a deep alignment with the virtue of generosity.

> It sure shouldn't be a delivery mechanism for one's own beliefs about worthiness.
>
> — A.R. Moxon (@JuliusGoat) November 10, 2019

Even the reversal—a desire to prevent aid from going to "undeserving" wealthy who don't need it (true)—leads us to create obstacles to aid people in poverty often can't overcome, but wealthy people can.

Which is why wealthy people like means testing.

https://t.co/bgLKviRjVq

> Whenever someone proposes a means-testing solution, it's an indication they've internalized the lie, foundational to the United States, that some people deserve life and others don't.
>
> It's an expensive lie.
>
> — A.R. Moxon (@JuliusGoat) December 18, 2020

People of the lie love means testing because it keeps the conversation within the framework of the lie—which is that some people deserve the social contract and others don't.

As long as people go on believing the lie, it benefits them even if it targets them.

They don't care if the social contract goes away, because—as has been pointed out!—they don't need it.

But if you want to spend money trying to administrate it away from the "undeserving" they're happy to exploit it.

These are all expensive lies. https://t.co/WPixtkxACi

> To be clear, this lie\u2014that we can't afford to house the houseless\u2014is an *expensive* lie. Not just the considerable moral cost of living in a heartless society: cash on the barrel.
>
> We believe this expensive lie because we believe a deeper lie: that life is something earned.
>
> — A.R. Moxon (@JuliusGoat) December 18, 2019

Things like this will help wealthy people, not people in poverty, because they are at the heart a reinforcement of the big lie, that some people deserve and other people don't.

Which benefits those who benefit from the lie. https://t.co/ZhU0Y3fhwT

> UPDATE: Some senior Dems are looking at lowering threshold on stimulus payments so they start phasing out above $50K for single taxpayers; $75K for heads of households; & $100K for married couples
>
> Stressing here: Talks fluid, conversations are ongoinghttps://t.co/0lZ8MKuqbt
>
> — Jeff Stein (@JStein_WaPo) February 2, 2021

If you accept the framework of the lie, people of the lie will exploit it.

Here we see one of the most malicious servants of greed ever born, using our desire to see help go only to the deserving, in order to prevent any help from going to anybody at all. https://t.co/8mM67pXpj1

> JUST IN: Sen. Mitch McConnell blasts #CASHAct, refutes Sen. Bernie Sanders: "Our colleague from Vermont is dead wrong on this...\xa0Borrowing from our grandkids to do socialism for rich people is a terrible way to get help to families\xa0who actually need it." pic.twitter.com/k6QfgDdNxq
>
> — The Hill (@thehill) December 31, 2020

The reason McConnell is using rhetoric certainly isn't because McConnell doesn't want to send money to the wealthy.

It's because he knows that as long as we stay in a framework where some deserve and others don't, money will go to the wealthy either way.

https://t.co/359PyMEgzl

> The Democratic party has an obsession with making sure that programs don't help people who "don't need it." This creates hurdles that actually exclude people who need it.
>
> The better way to implement a program is to make it universal, then claw it back from the rich via taxes.
>
> — Lee J. Carter (@carterforva) December 30, 2020

Here we see again: Crenshaw is deploying this rhetoric specifically to *keep* money from going to unemployed people. He's trying to prevent the relief bill!

He's not standing up for unemployed people. He's defending the lie that life is for the deserving. https://t.co/iHXbGYqb6Q

> Trying to figure out how anyone justifies payments to over 100 million people that have *not* lost their job?
>
> Focus our taxpayer dollar funded relief on the unemployed & those with their hours cut, not the fully employed just working from home all year.https://t.co/OvPXzzKQuY
>
> — Dan Crenshaw (@DanCrenshawTX) December 19, 2020