

Most of us are at an age where we don't have to really worry about important things, like taxes or college, but we are extremely close to that, and in order to do that, you need money, and a lot of it. Having a lot of money is a scarce situation, especially if you aren't part of the top 1%, which I'm sure most of us aren't in.

The current issue at foot here is that there is a massive divide in wealth amongst the citizens in the U.S. Quite a few people are sitting at the top of the economy, fueling their multi-million dollar cars with liquid gold, while a huge amount of people at the bottom are left with basically nothing. In 1984, while the entire government is structured very differently to the one we live in, there is still a clear divide as to who gets what when it comes to lifestyle, as the members of the Inner Party (the top 2%) have access to a lot of nice and comfortable items that nobody else has, such as helicopters, servants, wine, the ability to turn off the telescreen, and more, while everyone else has all the Victory stuff, and we all know how top tier those things are. Is the economic divide in our nation today beneficial? I believe that it isn't, as there are a lot more people suffering due to this divide, as opposed to thriving.

(This part is just examples of why it isn't beneficial. I wanted this part of my speech to be a bit improvised)

1. Jonathan Rauch, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a research group that looks into social sciences, like economics, states that "saving and spending should eventually re-equilibrate. But "eventually" can be a long time."
2. "According to a recent Congressional Budget Office report... while the average income for the top 1 percent more than tripled, the bottom 80 percent saw only feeble income growth, on the order of just 20 percent over nearly 30 years."

3. Michael I. Norton, the Harold M. Brierley Professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School, had conducted an experiment with 5,000 random citizens of America, and had come to a conclusion that “A large majority of every group we surveyed—from the poorest to the richest, from the most conservative to the most liberal—agreed that the current level of wealth inequality was too high and wanted a more equitable distribution of wealth. In fact, Americans reported wanting to live in a country that looks more like Sweden than the United States.”  
Yes, Sweden’s wealth distribution isn’t as equal as some may think, but they still do a much better job than the U.S.

But, is the fact that some people have more money than others really a bad thing? Richard A. Epstein, the James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor at the University of Chicago Law School, states that “if a person at the middle of the income distribution loses a dollar in income, the federal government loses nothing in income tax revenues. Let a rich person suffer that decline and the revenue loss at the federal level is close to 40 percent, with more losses at the state level... Our current political economy makes the bottom 99 percent hostage to the continued success of the rich.” This is an extremely important detail that seems to justify our current situation, but I think it shouldn’t. In 1984, the party’s goal was to achieve power. Power that would go on and live forever, and they would understandably want everyone in the nation to follow that goal. They took many actions to ensure that, and one of them is the distribution of doubleplusgood items. Constantly shoving only Victory Gin down the citizen’s throats means that they will never try anything better, and when they aren’t exposed to anything better, they think that this is the best life has to offer, and when they realize that life can be better, the inevitability of a revolution skyrockets. This isn’t good for the prosperity of the government, and the party doesn’t want that to happen. In today’s world, I do agree that the rich have a significant impact on the nation. The rich

allow the economy to prosper, and make the country look better. You look at America, and you might see a wondrous free land, which would seem to have an amazing economy, but you are still left with a complex situation where a huge amount of people are struggling to live properly. You ask the average person here how they are doing financially, and you will realize that the 2 pictures don't match.

When it comes to the big picture, yes the divide in wealth can be a good thing in some places, but for the sake of the individual, the economic divide is extremely detrimental.

## Works Cited

- Rauch, Jonathan. "The Wealth Divide Between Rich and Poor Harms the US Economy." *The Wealth Divide*, edited by Noël Merino, Greenhaven Press, 2015. At Issue. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ3010937202/OVIC?u=moun43602&sid=OVIC&xid=f1fd105d>.
- Norton, Michael I., and Dan Ariely. "Americans Want Less Wealth Inequality than Currently Exists." *The Wealth Divide*, edited by Noël Merino, Greenhaven Press, 2015. At Issue. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ3010937212/OVIC?u=moun43602&sid=OVIC&xid=ad9cb245>.
- Epstein, Richard A. "The Unequal Wealth Created by the Rich Is Essential for the Economy." *The Wealth Divide*, edited by Noël Merino, Greenhaven Press, 2015. At Issue. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ3010937214/OVIC?u=moun43602&sid=OVIC&xid=dad5b0d2>.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. Signet Classic, 1961
- Articles by Jonathan Rauch, [www.jonathanrauch.com/about.html](http://www.jonathanrauch.com/about.html).
- Norton, Michael I. "Faculty & Research." *The HBS Case Method - MBA - Harvard Business School*, [www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/profile.aspx?facId=326229](http://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/profile.aspx?facId=326229).
- "The University of Chicago The Law School." *The Socratic Method | University of Chicago Law School*, [www.law.uchicago.edu/faculty/epstein](http://www.law.uchicago.edu/faculty/epstein).