Retirement Lifestyle Advocates

RADIO PROGRAM

Expert Interview Series

Guest Expert: Dennis Tubbergen (Special Report)
Retirement Lifestyle Advocates

Date Aired: December 5, 2021

Produced by:

Retirement Lifestyle Advocates
961 Four Mile Road, NW
Grand Rapids, MI 49544

Phone: (866) 921-3613
Email: info@plplanners.com
Website: www.RetirementLifestyleAdvocates.com

Segment One:

This is the Retirement Lifestyle Advocates Radio Program. I am your host, Dennis Tubbergen. Glad you decided to listen in today. Hey, today's program is going to follow a little bit different format than is normal. I am going to spend today's program talking to you about the three choices the Federal Reserve has, they're all bad, incidentally, and how it might affect you and your dreams of a comfortable retirement.

Now, this is the topic of my December special report that will be going out to clients, and I'd like to invite you to request a copy of the report, if you would like. All you have to do is go to RequestYourReport.com and I will be glad to send you a copy of this report along with some bonus information. Again, the website RequestYourReport.com, let me know where to mail this report and I'll be very glad to do so.

Well, some of you this past week may have noticed that the Federal Reserve Chairman, Jerome Powell, changed his tune a bit. Now, for new listeners, the Federal Reserve is a private group of bankers that have controlled the U.S. monetary policies since 1913. Jerome Powell is the chair of the Federal Reserve and when inflation first became noticeable last year, Mr. Powell used the word 'transitory' to describe it.

Now, what did he mean by that? Well, he meant that this is going to be temporary. This is simply a symptom of the economy opening back up. Well, I suggested at the time that Mr. Powell's assessment of inflation was wrong and inflation was here to stay, and I just came to that conclusion for one simple reason. Inflation doesn't go away until the policy of creating massive amounts of new currency goes away. They go hand-in-hand and should this policy of currency creation or quantitative easing, it means the same thing, should it stop, it'll still take some time for inflation to subside given that here on the program we've had a number of guest experts who all agree there's a time lag between the time currency is created and the inflation emerges.

They may differ slightly on how long that time lag is, but generally speaking, it's 18 to 24 months. So from the time currency is created, it takes 18 to 24 months for price inflation, a symptom of this money supply expansion to emerge.

Now, Danske Bank did an analysis of Mr. Powell's statements this past week, and here's what they said. "We believe Fed Chair; Jerome Powell's comments today and yesterday mark a policy U-turn. Powell said some very important things. First of all, he blamed the COVID-19 outbreaks for inflation. He said they're inflationary in nature, as they reduce people's willingness to work, which causes a prolonged period of supply chain disruptions." Well, it wouldn't be probably expected for Mr. Powell to say, "Hey, we've been creating too much currency." Now, the Consumer Price Index, which as we've talked about here on the program in the past, is the most commonly used measure of inflation, although it is severely flawed due to the fact that it's been changed over the years so that the inflation numbers that are reported are more favorable.

Well, in October, the Consumer Price Index, despite all its flaws, hit 6.2% year-over-year. That's the highest in more than 30 years, and the University of Michigan does a consumer survey and long-term inflation of expectations are now above the 2004 to 2007 average. So, Mr. Powell, in light of these circumstances said, "I probably need to retire the transitory term." He didn't come out and use those words, but that's essentially what he said. Now, let me give you a quote from Mr. Powell. "It is, therefore, appropriate in my view to consider wrapping up the taper of our asset purchases, perhaps, a few months sooner." Now, what does that mean? Well, taper just means we're going to slow the rate at which we're creating currency, because the Fed creates currency, and the Fed goes out and buys government bonds from banks and mortgage-backed securities from banks. So, Mr. Powell now said, "You know what? We probably need to slow this down a little bit faster than we were originally thinking." Now here's the big question for you?

Will the Fed really taper as the chair has indicated, and if so, what will be the impact on your 401k and your IRA? Now, let me tell you, I'm going to go out on a limb here and say that I have my doubts the Fed will really taper, and I'm going to spend today's program talking to you about the reasons why. If you're just joining me, I would invite you to get this month's special report, which outlines the Fed's choices, they have three choices as we'll talk about on today's program. They are all bad choices in my view, but in this monthly report, we analyze these choices and what they might mean for you. You can go to RequestYourReport.com and request your copy of this report. I'll be very glad to send you a copy along with some bonus information.

So let me discuss with you my skepticism. Why do I think the Fed will probably not taper to the extent that they say?

Well, the first thing you have to do is really step away from the rhetoric, and there's no shortage of rhetoric, and you have to look at the math behind currency creation. Now, when you do that, you reach what I believe is an inescapable conclusion. Should the Fed follow through on the taper and cease currency creation or quantitative easing, again, they mean the same thing, a deflationary period unlike any of us have ever seen will quickly materialize.

Now in the book, Revenue Sourcing, that I released last year, we talk about the fact that we really have to have two classes of assets in our portfolio. I discussed this in this month's report as well. You need one class of assets that are stable with the goal of protecting those assets from the deflationary environment that will have to emerge, for reasons I'll talk about on today's program. Now, maybe the term 'deflationary environment' doesn't mean anything to you, but the last period of time that was significant deflationary was in the 1930s. We now refer to that timeframe as The Great Depression.

What happens to asset prices in a deflationary environment? They collapse, they crash. Stocks go down in value. Real estate goes down in value. Some commodities go down in value. So we believe you should have a class of assets that are stable and the goal of these assets, the job of these assets, if you will, is to protect those assets from the price reset that happens in a deflationary environment.

Now, to be fair, there's no perfect strategy. You have to just do the best you can. Again, if you get this month's report by going to RequestYourReport.com, you'll get some ideas. Now, you need to have a second class of assets also, to protect your purchasing power from inflation, so let me frame this conversation properly. To do that, I want to define inflation and I want to define deflation and the definitions of these terms are really very simple, but they're often not understood. Inflation is simply an expansion of the money supply. Rising prices are a symptom of inflation, but inflation is the expansion of the money supply. Deflation is a contraction of the money supply and collapsing prices are a symptom of deflation.

So again, inflation is an expansion of the money supply, deflation is a contraction of the money supply. Now, you might be wondering how can the

money supply contract? Well, to give you a little background on this, to go back to 1971 when then President Richard Nixon eliminated the link between the dollar and gold, if you've been a long time listener to the program, that's a date we talk about frequently here on the program. But at that time, the U.S. dollar went from being an asset to being debt.

Now, that's hard to get your arms around, but through 1971, up until August 15th, 1971 dollars were redeemable for gold. Gold is a tangible asset. If you had a paper receipt known as a U.S. dollar, you could exchange those dollars for gold at a rate of $35 an ounce. Now, why did Mr. Nixon see fit to temporarily suspend the redemptions of dollars for gold? Incidentally, he said that he was going to temporarily suspend these redemptions, but we all know that suspension was permanent.

Well, when The Bretton Woods Agreement was put in place in 1944, which made the dollar the world reserve currency, which made the dollar redeemable for gold the United States had a lot of gold more than 21,000 tons of gold. By the time Mr. Nixon closed the gold window, the United States had about 8,000 tons of gold, which we allegedly still have.

So what happened? Well, during the '60s with all the government expenditures going on, the United States and the Federal Reserve created more dollars than there was really gold to back and foreign investors were no dummies. They said, "Take my dollars and give me my gold," and the United States really risked running out of gold. So since August 15, 1971, dollars have been loaned into existence, and this is done through the fractionalized banking system. If you go put money in the bank, your banker reserves a percentage, currently 10%, but can loan out the other 90%. So money is loaned into existence and the more borrowing that takes place, the more money that is created.

Well, you may recall that in 1980, and maybe you don't recall, maybe you've just read about it if you're a young listener, but at that point, the Federal Reserve raised interest rates to nearly 20% to combat inflation. Since that time from 1980, all the way until the time of the financial crisis in 2008, interest rates had been declining. by 2010 interest rates were zero, but money wasn't being loaned into existence, so what happened?

The Fed began the temporary emergency measure of quantitative easing or currency creation. I said at the time, and I wrote about it in my book,

Economic Consequences in 2011, that this is a slippery slope. This is a slope that history tells us once we're on it, we're not going to get off this slope. It's going to accelerate and, unfortunately, that is exactly what's happened, and that has left the Fed with three choices. That's our topic of today's program. All of these choices as we'll discuss are bad.

If you'd like to learn more about these choices and how you could be affected, just go to RequestYourReport.com, request your free report. I'll be very happy to send you a copy along with some bonus information. That is RequestYourReport.com. I'll be back after these words.

Segment Two:

I'm Dennis Tubbergen. This is the Retirement Lifestyle Advocates Radio Program. Glad you're listening in today. Hey, a little different format today. I'm talking about the three choices the Federal Reserve has, why they're all bad, and how you might be affected. If you're just joining me, I'm offering a free report during the month of December that talks these three choices and how you might be affected. All you need to do to get your copy of the report is visit the website, RequestYourReport.com. The website, again, RequestYourReport.com and I'll be very glad to send you a complimentary copy as well as some bonus information.

Well, in the first segment, I suggested that Mr. Jerome Powell, the chair of the Fed decided to retire the term 'transitory' when describing inflation, because inflation now is likely here for a while. I talked about the fact that starting in 1971, the U.S. dollar really became debt, and if the Fed wanted to create more money, they would simply reduce interest rates. That would mean people would be incentivized to borrow, if you will. They'd go out and borrow, and as they borrowed, and as money moved from bank to bank, more money was created. When interest rates were reduced to zero after the financial crisis, borrowing did not pick up to any big extent, so the Fed began this program of quantitative easing or currency creation.

Now, when this currency creation starts, it seems that prosperity is everywhere, but currency creation has a limit. I've often quoted economist, Herbert Stein. I should say the late economist, Herbert Stein, who said very profoundly, "If something cannot go on forever, it will stop," and certainly that describes currency creation.

Now, if we go back in history and take a look at the last major deflationary period, it was the 1930s. It was known as The Great Depression as I talked about in the first segment. Now deflation occurs when debt levels are so high that they cannot be sustained, when debt goes unpaid, because money today is debt, then you see the money supply contract.

Everybody knows what happened in the 1930s. The stock market crashed, real estate prices crashed, stock prices fell 90%, unemployment soared, but what's not often discussed about the 1930s is the period of time that preceded it. That's known now, historically, as The Roaring Twenties, but the environment of prosperity that seemed to exist in the 1920s was artificial and illusionary and you don't really hear that from too many people. But if you look at what actually happened, the Federal Reserve was in 1913. When that happened, when the Fed was actually implemented, the U.S. dollar was backed by gold 100%. At that time, a $20 gold piece circulated, a $20 gold piece had an ounce of gold in it and it had $20 in purchasing power.

The Fed began to issue Federal Reserve notes that were redeemable for gold. If you look at a Federal Reserve note from 1913, it says that it's redeemable in $20 of gold to the bearer on demand, it's redeemable for gold, but the Fed reduced the backing of the dollar by gold from 100% to 40%. When that happened, a little math tells us the currency supply increased by 250%. That led to easy credit and massive levels of debt in a period of time that we now know as The Roaring Twenties.

Now, despite modern day Keynesian economists insistence to the contrary, despite what the modern monetary theorists will tell you, debt simply cannot accumulate indefinitely. At a certain point, debt levels reach the point that they simply can't be serviced. Now, back in 2011 in the book, Economic Consequences, I made this point by an example. Let's say you and your neighbor are both in the market for a new car. You go to the dealership and pay cash for your car, but your neighbor finances her car. You, by paying cash for your car, are spending past production.

To have the cash to purchase the car, what'd you have to do? Well, you had to go to work, you had to produce, and then you had to save some of that production so you could deploy it later and you saved it in the form of currency. So when you went to the dealership and paid cash for your car, you were spending prior production.

Now your neighbor, by financing her car, now has to go to work and produce. She has to make payments on the car. When purchasing her car, your neighbor is spending future production. She's spending currency she doesn't have yet. She's got to go earn it. Now, the end indisputable economic fact is this, and if you think about it, this is common sense, which seems to be sorely lacking today. Future production is limited or finite. I can only produce so much. I can't produce an infinite amount of whatever is that I produce to get currency.

So debt accumulation also has to be limited or finite, because I can only earn so much. At a certain point, the debt that I've accumulated is more than I can service, and that is when the trend reverses. So if you go back to the 1920s, which is what we're talking about here, this prosperity illusion continued until debt accumulated to the limit. Once debt accumulation could no longer be supported by future production, the deflationary period ensued. It all got unwound, and there was a lot of economic ugliness that accompanied that unwinding.

Now, at the time of the financial crisis, to fast forward to present times, at the time of the financial crisis, which is about a dozen years ago, it seems obvious to me that we had reached the limit as far as debt accumulation was concerned. As I mentioned, interest rates were reduced to zero and not enough new currency was created. So the Fed began this temporary program of quantitative easing. Now a period of prosperity followed, not unlike what happened in the 1920s, but now we are beginning to see inflation emerge and it's threatening to pop this prosperity illusion bubble.

Now, Mr. Powell has decided to change the narrative. Now, I want to discuss with you today the economic math, and it's sobering, and I would encourage you to stay tuned for the entire program today. But if you go to the website, usdebtclock.org, you'll see what the current national debt is, you'll see what current federal spending is, and you'll see what the current deficit is. Now, the actual U.S. federal operating deficit right now is about $3 trillion. Spending is $7 trillion, as remarkable a number as that is and tax revenues are 4 trillion, I'm rounding.

Now, what does that mean? It means $3 trillion, we have $7 trillion in expenditures, we've got 4 trillion in tax revenue or income, so 3 trillion needs to be borrowed to allow the Federal Government to operate.

Now, many are still believing, incorrectly, that the operating deficit is being funded by borrowing from Japan, China, and other countries around the world. Well, that was once true, but it's not anymore. Total U.S. debt owned by Japan is now about one-and-a-quarter trillion. China owns just under that.

So a total debt owned by the two countries is between 2.3 and 2.4 trillion. That's enough to fund the deficit for own the eight months. I'm going to talk more about the economic math in the next segment. If you've not yet gone to the website, RequestYourReport.com to get your free report for the month, I would encourage you to do so. Again, the website is RequestYourReport.com and I'll be back after these words.

Segment Three:

I'm Dennis Tubbergen. You are listening to the Retirement Lifestyle Advocates Radio Program. We are talking today about the Fed's three choices as it relates to monetary policy and how it affects you. I have done a detailed analysis of this, and I'm offering that analysis in a report this month. If you'd like to get a free copy of the report along with some bonus information, visit RequestYourReport.com, and I will be glad to send you out a copy.

So in the last segment, I noted that the United States presently has an operating deficit of about $3 trillion.

Spending is remarkable, if that's the word to use, $7 trillion annually and tax revenues are $4 trillion a year, that means that $3 trillion needs to be borrowed each year to allow the Federal Government to operate. Now, many still believe that the operating deficit is being funded by borrowing from Japan, China, and other countries around the world.

That was once true, but it is no longer. In fact, total debt owned by Japan and China is between 2.3 and 2.4 trillion. It's amazing that the amount of debt owned by China and Japan will only fund the United States operating deficit for about eight months. Given the state of us finances presently, it probably comes as no surprise is that China, Japan, and other countries who have traditionally been purchasers of U.S. treasuries are no longer lined up to buy them. Asia Times commented on an article that was published in the past week.

I quote, "A specter is haunting the markets. The specter of a U.S. 4 trillion treasury funding requirement for 2021. The Fed is now the last buyer standing in the world's biggest fixed income market, buying virtually all of the massive issuance of federal debt as we noted previously. The deficit hasn't been this big since World War II, but there's a difference. The American public financed the deficit of the 1940s with Liberty bonds.

Now, the Federal Reserve is financing on its own balance sheet. Foreigners who took up a great deal of treasury debt during and after the global financial crisis of 2008 and 2009 have stopped buying treasuries. China, one of the largest holders of us government bonds, isn't motivated to bail out America at the moment. Japan is out of the market. Private investors don't want to own U.S. bonds because it's dicey to hedge the currency risk. The problem erupted last March as Asia Times reported at time and foreigners have shunned the treasury market since. The falling dollar hasn't helped matters.

With the Fed acting out not only as the buyer of last resort, but the only big buyer liquidity is vanishing in the treasury market and that's dangerous," and that's the end of the quote from the article. Now, the very important point here is that the Fed is now the only large, significant buyer of us government debt. Now, how does the Fed get the money to buy U.S. treasuries? Well, as you all know, the Fed simply creates the currency to buy the debt.

Now, the banks mentioned in the article are the intermediaries. So the way it works is banks buy U.S. Government debt and the Fed buys a debt from the banks. But here is the big question. If the Fed tapers, if the Fed slows the rate of currency creation or stops creating currency and they taper, where will the funding for the operating deficit come from? That's the $3 trillion question, isn't it? See, there are no buyers for us government debt.

Now, if there are no lenders other than the Fed and the Fed tapers to get inflation under control or to attempt to get inflation under control, then the only alternative, the only option left is to cut spending and finally with the debt, which will hurl the country into the deflationary environment that I have been talking about on today's program.

Now, this brings me to the three choices to deal with the operating deficit. As I mentioned, the Fed has three choices and they're all bad, but here are

the choices. One, they can raise taxes. Two, the Washington politicians could cut spending, or three, they can just keep on creating new currency. Well, let's take a look at the raising taxes option.

Now, if you were to raise taxes to close the budget deficit, which would then allow the Federal Reserve to proceed with a taper as I see it, here are the numbers. We've got an operating deficit of $3 trillion. We have 126 million taxpayers, 3 trillion divided by 126 million means that the deficit per taxpayer is $23,810 per year. Now, the current average federal tax liability per tax return is about $9,118.

The current federal operating deficit is 3 trillion. Dividing the operating deficit by the number of tax returns, one arrives at the conclusion that each taxpayer would have to ante up and an additional $23,810 annually to close the budget gap and balance the budget. Think about that. You need to ante up, in addition to the taxes you're paying now, in addition to the Social Security taxes, in addition to the Medicare taxes, in addition to the state income taxes, if your state has an income tax, and in addition to the Federal income tax you're already paying, another $23,810.

Now, if we just take this average tax liability per tax return of $9,118, a tax liability of $9,118 if you're married and you file a joint tax return, would require taxable income of $79,300. Now, assuming a standard deduction on this tax return, again, married, filing jointly, that would mean an adjusted gross income of about 104,000. So out of this 104,000, the taxpayer is paying Social Security and Medicare tax of about $8,000, federal income tax of the 9118, 9,118.

In my home state of Michigan, in there would be an additional $3,370 in state income tax, so we've got total tax of about $20,500. To balance the budget. This tax period would need to increase total tax payments from about 20-and-a-half thousand to about 44-and-a-half thousand, but here's the sad truth. Even tax increases of this magnitude, which you could only describe as draconian, won't solve the fiscal problems. There's still debt to pay down in other government programs that are severely underfunded.

We're just talking about the deficit. What we're not talking about is the fiscal gap. The fiscal gap includes the underfunding of Social Security, the underfunding of Medicare. Professor Lawrence Kotlikoff, a past guest on this radio program has stated that the fiscal gap of the United States is more

than $200 trillion. If we take the $200 trillion fiscal gap and divide by the 126 million tax returns filed each year, we conclude that each taxpayer has an additional liability of about $1.6 million to pay down the debt and bring these programs to full funding. So think about it.

To balance the budget, this hypothetical taxpayer earning $104,000 a year and paying tax of 44,285 now needs to pay down their share of the fiscal gap. If we were to amortize that liability of a $1.587 million over 30 years at 3%, the resulting annual payment would be about $80,000. If you add the 80,000 to the 44, you can see that it takes all this taxpayer's income and then some to solve the problem.

Now, that was a lot of math. My point is simply this, this problem cannot be solved via tax increases. The fiscal gap and the operating deficit have grown into monsters that simply cannot be tamed, and there's a lot of political rhetoric about a billionaire tax and taxing the wealthy. These are not workable policies, it's just rhetoric. If we confiscated all the wealth of us billionaires, we could cover the deficit for about 1.3 years and we would do nothing to pay down the debt. So from this brief discussion, we can safely conclude that these fiscal problems cannot be solved via tax increases alone. I haven't even touched on the economic damage that tax increases of this level would cost.

That brings us to the second choice, cutting spending. I'll talk about that after the break. If you're just joining me, I'm offering a free report on this topic this month. All you need to do to request it is go to the website, RequestYourReport.com. The website is RequestYourReport.com. Let us know where to mail your report. We'll get you out the report as well as some bonus information. I'll be back after are these words.

Segment Four:

Dennis Tubbergen here. You are listening to the Retirement Lifestyle Advocates Radio Program. Glad you decided to listen in today. Hey, we're talking about the three choices that the Fed has and how none of them are great choices. In the last segment, I talked about the fact and walked you through some math that concluded that fiscal problems of the United States cannot be solved by raising taxes. In this segment, I want to talk about the next two choices, and the second choice, of course, is cutting spending. That's a topic we don't hear too much about these days.

Now, we did talk about, in the last segment, that Japan, China, and other countries that have traditionally purchased debt from the United States are no longer buying it, and the Fed is the buyer of last resort. So the Fed is essentially creating currency to fund, via banks, the deficit spending of the so the only way the Fed can taper significantly, the only way the Fed can slow the rate of currency creation or stop it all together is to have the Washington politicians cut spending.

Now remarkably, 3 trillion deficit on 7 trillion in spending is about a 41% deficit rate. So that means that for every $100 the government spends, it collects tax revenues of just $59, and that means the other $41 has to come from a lender. As I just stated, that lender is now largely the Federal Reserve.

Now, think for a minute about the impact of a decrease in government spending of 41%. For discussion's sake, let's just assume this cut was across the board. That's a 41% cut in government, healthcare spending, Social Security, military education. Let's just look at Medicare spending alone.

Medicare had $696 billion in spending in fiscal year 2021, so a 41% cut would be a cut of about $285 billion. Now we could continue this discussion in every category of spending, but you get the idea. Over the years, collectively and over many years, the Washington politicians overspent and over promised. This will make the coming deflationary period, in my view, painful.

Now, I would be remiss if I didn't briefly discuss private sector debt, too. Fed policy, as well as similar easy money policies pursued by other world central bankers have allowed private sector debt levels to increase to nosebleed levels just like government debt. Private sector debt worldwide now, according to the Institute for International Finance, is a mind-boggling $300 trillion. When this mammoth debt bubble unwinds, it will make the deflationary climate that much more intense. Let's just assume for a minute that spending is cut across the board by 41% and the budget is balanced. That just balances the budget. It doesn't do anything to pay down debt or solve the fiscal gap.

If we take the $200 trillion fiscal gap that we have been talking about, if we just assume we're going to pay this off and fund everything that needs to be funded over a 30-year timeframe at 3% interest, one concludes that annual

payments of $10 trillion are required. There's $4 trillion in tax revenues presently, there's a $3 trillion operating deficit, where does one find another $10 trillion each year to pay down the debt and solve the fiscal gap problem? The short answer to this question is that promises made will not be promises kept. The math just doesn't lie.

Now, if raising taxes can't solve all these problems, and if spending cuts would quickly cause a deflationary depression, the Fed is down to the last option, continue currency creation, which is what I believe they will do. I think the math dictates that they're going to have to do that. This will likely lead to something called a crack-up boom. Now, a crack-up boom was first described by Austrian economist, Ludwig von Mises.

Now, there is a piece that the editorial board at Coin Stove wrote that explains a crack-up boom quite nicely. A crack-up boom is the last stage of a fiat currency before it dies. During this stage, a government is not able to balance the budget and there's severe debasement or currency printing. As a result, there is hyperinflation of the currency and drastically higher prices for everyday goods. From the outside things look fine, almost great if you had to look exclusively at charts; however, being on the ground gives an entirely different picture on what is truly going on.

It looks good because everyone is buying and selling. It gives the illusion of prosperity and a booming economy, but this couldn't be further from the truth. The economic activity is not for production, which would imply a healthy economy. The population would be buying in selling basic goods like food to survive. This is really an uneconomic activity. A crack-up boom, just doesn't happen overnight. It can take years or even decades to get to the point where there is suspicion of its beginnings.

It only happens to fiat currencies when they're not anchored to anything like, for example, a gold standard. There is no record of a fiat currency ever surviving. Additionally, governments and central banks work together and set out executing some ill-conceived financial decisions that ultimately lead to a currency's demise. A crack-up boom is not necessarily linear. There could be short timeframes when there is some relief from the high inflation.

The first part of the boom starts to happen slowly until the last stage when inflation goes parabolic. For example, Weimar, Germany's hyperinflation spanned 10 years from 1913 to 1923, and the worst of it was in the last two

years. Usually, there are signs of the beginning stages of a crack-up boom. There's usually a mania where rationality gets thrown, overboard and assets are bought for insane prices.

Now that does a really good job of explaining a crack-up boom, and we're starting to see signs of this in my view. For example, according to Hagerty, a classic car insurer, the average price for a 1960s muscle car manufactured in the United States has nearly doubled since 2014. A lot of millennials, when they were in school, collected Pokémon cards in the late '90s and early 2000s. A sealed box of Pokémon cards from the early 2000s retailed for $100. That same box today, between 20 and $50,000. Absolutely crazy.

Since the Federal Reserve began the process of quantitative easing or currency creation, the Dow has nearly tripled in value moving from about 12,000 to about 34,000, so the crack-up boom is now looking more and more likely. So in to summarize, the math doesn't lie. This problem cannot be solved by raising taxes. It won't be solved through cutting spending and taper talk may be just that, it may just be talk.

I would invite you to learn how to protect yourself. To that end, I would like to invite you to get the report from which I took a lot of the information for today's program. You can go to the website, RequestYourReport.com, and I'd be glad to send you a complimentary copy of the report along with some bonus information.

Also, if you're not participating in my weekly Headline Roundup Webinar, that happens every Monday, you can go to retirementlifestyleadvocates.com to see the replays. If you look at the replay from November 29, I talk about this in depth as well.

So again, the report is available from the website, RequestYourReport.com and also, it invites you, as I said, to visit the retirementlifestyleadvocates.com website to check out all of our free resources there. That's my program for this week. I hope you got something you can use and I'll be back again next week.