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Is Welfare the Best Way to Eliminate Poverty?

Poverty is an issue that is persistent and prevalent in many parts of the world. In America, more than 48 million people live a life of poverty and that includes one in every child. Only 1/3 of the people that are born in the abyss of the income ladder make it to the middle rung. In The work responsibility reconciliation act of 1996 basic changes were made in the federal system of public assistance in America. It particularly bound the admissibility of refugee families to obtain many sorts of assistance. In the country many of the welfare programs run as in the rest of the countries, to assist the poor. These programs extend aid and assistance to the poor, low-income families and individuals. Though the programs aim at reducing the poverty and to help the poor, however, there still is a question that raises from many fractions of the society, and that is whether or not the welfare helps remove poverty. The answer is that welfare though provides the temporarily support to the needy and the poor people yet for the long term benefits it does not seem to work.

There is considerable proof that welfare obstructs development against insufficiency. In a lot of the countries, the welfare programs actually increased the rates of poverty than to decrease them. The policy of those governments needs to be revised as they are not meeting the requirements. As Walter Williams says, lecturer of economics at George Mason University, that sentiments based strategy needs unemotional study of effects of policy. Examination of welfare displays it to be problematic for poverty, instead of a solution.

Many of the social scientists, politicians, and people who support the welfare government rely on the welfare programs in some measure since they consider social-welfare plans benefit to decrease the occurrence of poverty. However, a mounting sum of critics emphasizes that these programs in actual fact flop reduce poverty, as too trivial a part of transfers essentially stretches to the poor, or for the reason that these programs make a welfare/poverty con, or because they deteriorate the economy (Kenworthy).

Afore becoming the leading contender for the Republican presidential nomination, Ben Carson showed up on The View to talk welfare modification a matter that carries on to be discussed in GOP spheres on and off the movement track. He claimed that the social security net could create dependence on America's deprived class. the good thing is that mounting proof all around the world proposes there is a modest proposal for a safety-net scheme that might not cause reliance and can aid boost folks up and out of poverty.

There are three basic problems regarding the issue of poverty. The first one is that poverty can only be overcome when people are self-sufficient. Even if they live temporarily in the acceptable standard of financial status and are dependent upon the assistance provided by the others, it is not the permanent solution. The second thing is that the production brings prosperity. The yield or production needs to be produced and increased constantly for the prosperity and the development to come to the door. If the process of increase in the production stops, the way to prosperity and the higher level of overall well-being also stops. The third and the last thing is that the way to prosperity demands long-term strategy and the methods that are not temporary and have short term effects. When we apply this very ides to the programs that are offering the welfare to the poor people, we come to realize that these programs make the people less self-sufficient and more dependent, which the way that further pushes them away from the path of prosperity (Jr).

The 1st failure of welfare plans is to errand help with existing depletion while employing practically no stress on job preparation or whatsoever new that may let today’s deprived people become independent in the upcoming. Most of the states have been safeguarding renunciations from the Obama management so as to people on numerous welfare plans (such as SNAP, what used to be called food stamps), is not required to either the work or go to occupation training courses with the intention of continuing to obtain assistance. It is short-sighted as it makes individuals reliant on government welfares (Dorfman). The 2nd failure of government welfare schemes is the shared condition to have negligible possessions to be qualified for aid. Even though a lot of states have eradicated their asset assessments, still they continue in nearly one dozen states and can be so low as $1500. Although it gives the impression to be sensible to refute well-being profits to, say, a superannuated pair with fewer earnings but 2 million dollars in belongings, it does not seem right to push individuals to run through almost all their possessions afore giving them assistance. By making the receivers of welfare so fiscally insubstantial, we guarantee that slightly petite unanticipated economic holdup will be very destructive. The 3rd weakness in these welfare schemes is the way that assistance ends when the receiver’s salary rises. As a family’s salary reaches the deficiency mark and increases above it, families on numerous welfare schemes may essentially face real peripheral tax amounts of 50 or 60 %. Which actually means that the mixture of levies allocated on new wages and aids have gone for the reason that of the growing salary makes the household to lose 50 to 60 % of its original salary gain to the centralized government.

To put it simply, a deprived domestic trying their best to avoid poverty pays an operative border line levy rate that is significantly greater than a middle class domestic and greater than or approximately equivalent to the bordering income tax rate of a household in the highest one %. Keeping these facts our central income tax organization is supposed to advance, meaning higher earnings people pay a higher proportion of that salary in levies, it is ridiculous to force such extraordinary tax rates on folks in poverty.

Life is not the same for every one of us, as some of us are more fortunate than the others. Not everyone gets to seek the same level of education nor all of us live the same life, as the discrimination prevails and it is the reality of life. Every so often the persons we blame for 'taking advantage' of welfare have in fact beforehand been unsuccessful by our people. Some of these people may be of the kind that take the advantage of the others, but not all of them are alike and everyone is definitely not the same. We should not punish all of them for just a few people. The fact is that the welfare is given to those who actually need that, so we should not be judgmental, but it is not beneficial for them even. As they need our long term help and for that they need to be trained to work and to get the job trainings so that they can have a prosperous life ahead (*Debate Topic: Welfare Should Be Abolished | Debate.Org*).

At the beginning of the American welfare state president, Franklin D. proposed social security and aid to the poor children. After 60 years the dependency of the deprived still continues and the failure of the program is evident. Welfare is the consequence as well as the cause of many of the conditions, that are known as social pathologies (Niskanen). America every year spends about 1 trillion$ for the fight against poverty. The spending on the welfare programs increased in the era of George W. Bush, and even more, raised in the regime of Obama. Despite the increase in the welfare programs, the rats often poverty are the same almost as they were when the programs started. This clearly shows that the state is throwing the resources in the wrong direction (Tanner).

Poverty is one of the major issues as it directly affects society and gives rise to many other problems, such as crimes. The stats show that the welfare programs that are offered for the reduction of the poverty actually do nothing but to give the temporary relief and in long term they actually deteriorate the situation, as the people become lazy and dependent on the state. To sort out a long-term solution for the prosperity the government needs to take the steps to make the people self-sufficient rather than just providing them.
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