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Achieving American Retirement Prosperity by Changing Americans’ Thinking About Retirement*
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Abstract: There are many decisions that Americans have to make about retirement before, at, and after retirement. For example, Americans have to decide when to start saving for retirement, how much to save, how to invest those savings, when to retire, when to claim social security, and how to take required minimum distributions from 401(k) plans or Individual Retirement Accounts. Different things can go wrong at each of these decisions for different reasons. Many Americans, for various reasons, including insufficient energy, money, motivation, time, and understanding, do no retirement planning. Some Americans do some retirement planning, yet worry they are doing insufficient or ineffective retirement planning. A few knowledgeable or wealthy Americans do, or have done for them, sufficient and effective retirement planning. Insufficient or ineffective retirement planning causes Americans to experience decreased financial wealth, health, objective living standards, and subjective well-being in addition to suffer increased anxiety, depression, stress, and worry. Our American economy also has to deal with the resulting negative externalities of many Americans retiring into poverty. This Article analyzes how Americans can achieve retirement prosperity by changing their thinking about retirement. This Article advocates the American federal government educate Americans in thinking about retirement to utilize more thinking tools, think more mindfully, and think more societally. This Article’s proposals are based on and introduce to retirement planning the field of cognitive economics.
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INTRODUCTION

In a November 29, 2015 Wall Street Journal article about the key to retirement savings, Robert Powell’s final question to behavioral economist Richard Thaler was: “Peter Huang, a professor at the University of Colorado Law School in Boulder, suggests in a recent paper, Empowering People to Choose Wisely by Democratizing Mindfulness and Thinking Tools, that law and policy can and should empower people to choose wisely for themselves by educating people. What say you?” Thaler’s answer was “I’m all for empowerment and education, but the empirical evidence is that it doesn’t work. That’s why I say make it easy.”

While it is ironic for an educator to state the empirical evidence is that education to empower people does not work, current empirical data on the efficacy of traditional financial literacy education is at best mixed. Naturally, education can take on many forms, including not being about traditional financial literacy. Experiments “suggest that offering investor education, even in the form of a simple instruction, can make a substantial difference.” Also, making it easy may cause individually and socially undesirable outcomes for such financial decisions as applying for mortgages. Additionally, if something is easy, people may not do it because it lacks immediacy.

How about making retirement planning engaging and fun? A study of 1,031 South Africans employed a symmetric encouragement design to randomly assign people to watch a television soap opera “Scandal!” with scripted, targeted financial messages about debt management and gambling versus “Muvhango” a similar soap opera without financial messages. The soap operas had similar past viewership profiles and


overlapped in evening primetime. The financial storyline lasted two consecutive months, involved a leading character borrowing excessively and irresponsibly, gambling, and falling into a debt trap; and eventually seeking help to responsibly manage her debt. Scandal! viewers had significantly more financial knowledge about financial concepts and issues included in the program’s storyline, especially messages the lead character delivered; were less likely to enter into retail credit or gamble; and were more likely to borrow from formal sources and for productive purposes, in comparison with Muvhango viewers. Qualitative and quantitative analyses demonstrated the importance of emotional connections with the soap opera’s lead character in motivating behavior change. Entertainment mass media provide highly accessible, cost-effective ways of delivering some financial education messages that resonate with millions of viewers.

The non-profit Doorways to Dreams Fund designed six financial literacy video games to improve the financial capabilities and positively affect the economic lives of low- to moderate-income Americans. To boost 401(k) participation and financial wellness, the office supplies retailer, Staples, offered its employees opportunities to play Bite Club, an online game in which players take on the roles of vampires managing a nightclub, and found in two districts 80% of targeted employees engaged with Staples’ game portal webpage.

Playing an entertaining video game can be challenging instead of easy and yet people are self-motivated to play. Motivation is a key to successful teaching and learning. Adrenaline, arousing brain reward centers, dopamine, engagement, excitement, positive affect, and stimulating competitive instincts are important ways

7. Id. at 3, 15.
8. Id. at 3.
9. Id. at 18-23.
10. Id. at 5, 23.
11. Id. at 5-9, 24; Eliana La Ferrara, Mass Media and Social Change: Can We Use Television to Fight Poverty, 14 J. EUR. ECON. ASS’N 791, 813-18 (2016).
to get people to become motivated to learn. Infusing retirement planning with aspects of play can involve and connect people. Prize-linked or lottery-linked savings accounts can spur people to save for retirement.

A single 30-minute training intervention of playing a fun CSI-type film noir video game improved decision-making by military intelligence analysts and college students immediately and lastingly. The new field of positive computing develops technology to support human potential and well-being. People who started using a mobile financial app with a dashboard of net worth, income, and spending in real-time decreased their spending 15.7% on average during the four months after the app was installed relative to the three months before.

Although most Americans would like to retire when they choose to do so and enjoy a financially secure retirement, unfortunately this is unlikely to happen for many Americans. Many Americans find retirement planning and managing household finances boring, emotionally stressful, painful, and unpleasant. Although many

people find thinking about retirement to be negatively affective, the negative affect ironically is not enough to cause people to be afraid of being poor in old age. This empirical finding implies many Americans likely will engage in little or suboptimal retirement planning due to procrastination and then rush to minimize their anticipated, experienced, and remembered unpleasantness. A large body of empirical and experimental research demonstrates that anticipated and experienced emotions influence financial decisions.

Effective retirement planning in America currently involves many decisions that require various types of expertise, knowledge, and reasoning abilities. There are many decisions that Americans have to make about retirement before, at, and after retirement. For example, Americans have to decide when to start saving for retirement, how much to save, how to invest those savings, when to retire, when to claim social security, and how to take required minimum distributions from 401(k) accounts.


28. Id.


plans or Individual Retirement Accounts.\textsuperscript{31} Different things can go wrong at each of these decisions for different reasons.

Effective retirement planning also requires certain amounts of critical thinking, curiosity, energy, money, motivation, time, and understanding. Many Americans lack sufficient amounts of these scarce resources and consequently do no retirement planning. Some Americans do some retirement planning yet are anxious and stressed over whether they are doing insufficient or ineffective retirement planning.\textsuperscript{32} A few knowledgeable or wealthy Americans do, or have done for them, sufficient and effective retirement planning. Insufficient or ineffective retirement planning imposes on individuals the costs of decreased financial wealth, health, objective living standards, and well-being in addition to increased anxiety, depression, stress, and worry. Insufficient or ineffective retirement planning leads to social costs of public expenditures to prevent many Americans from retiring into poverty. This means government spending to provide retirees with a financial safety net beyond our Social Security\textsuperscript{33} and Medicare\textsuperscript{34} benefits that include coverage of medical care\textsuperscript{35} and long-term nursing home care.\textsuperscript{36}

The U.S. Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) Office of Investor Education and Advocacy\textsuperscript{37} maintains a user-friendly, well-designed website,\textsuperscript{38} which provides useful

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{34} Social Security Administration website, \textit{Medicare Benefits}, https://www.ssa.gov/medicare/.
\end{thebibliography}
information about investing in stock markets, the basics of investing, managing and researching investments, information for seniors, retirement resources, information for students, and publications, including: “Questions You Should Ask About Your Investments,” available to be downloaded in English and Spanish. The cover of this publication displays prominently the statement: “Information is an investor’s best tool.” A problem with this well-intentioned statement is that most Americans neither collect nor study any information about investments. How helpful and what good realistically and ultimately can information be as a tool if most Americans are cognitively unprepared to process much information before investing?

The average American investor is not Star Trek’s iconic Mr. Spock. American investors are mostly humans instead of Vulcans. These unmistakable observations mean that mere possession or provision of information does not ensure comprehension of all the logical implications of that information. If that were the case, just disclosing financial risks would be all that is necessary to protect investors. Empirical survey evidence and experimental data reveal that some people, especially overconfident ones, disregard much relevant and readily available information when making financial decisions. Emotional and psychological factors also limit how much people utilize relevant information in financial decision-making.

This Article’s central theme is that much of current and proposed American retirement policy is premised on a cognitively misleading and unrealistic model of people who have the ability, energy, motivation, time, and understanding to make informed, thoughtful retirement decisions. This is counterfactual and clearly so. Most Americans are simply too busy, confused, exhausted, misinformed, and overwhelmed

47. Id.
49. Id. at 23.
to make informed, thoughtful retirement decisions. Most Americans are neither lazy nor stupid. Instead, most Americans realistically live in a world of information overload and being overcommitted between family and work obligations.

Our society neither advocates nor assumes that Americans be their own dentists, primary care physicians, or trauma surgeons. That would be ludicrous because dental and medical professionals acquire, through cognitively costly efforts and years of study, expertise and specialized knowledge about dental health and medicine. Indeed, the same is true of any professional, whether it be an accountant, architect, city planner, doctor, economist, financial expert, lawyer, or scientist. It makes no sense for American society to leave Americans to fend for themselves when it comes to retirement planning because planning in an effective and informed manner for retirement requires a body of expertise and specialized knowledge about, among other areas, asset allocation, federal securities regulations, federal tax law, financial markets, investments, modern portfolio theory, state tax laws, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).52

This Article advocates designing American retirement policy reform based on a cognitively realistic appreciation of how people behave, namely under binding and heterogeneous constraints on their energy, interest, and time. Many decisions that households make before, at, and after retirement involve behavioral or psychological considerations.53 For example, many Americans do not engage in much or even any retirement planning due to fears about and a desire to avoid thinking about their own mortality.54 Especially in Western culture, thinking about death can be challenging when people are anxious about death.55 Retirement planning involves thinking about death because we lack knowledge about our date of death. Financial economists use the phrase longevity risk to describe this ignorance. People can estimate their longevity risk by entering personal demographic information into an online life expectancy calculator.56 People can see how changes in education, exercise, healthy eating, income,
and mood change their life expectancy. Nonetheless, these are just estimates of unknowable probabilities.

Americans may outlive their savings unless they can hedge or insure against longevity risk by for example receiving their retirement income in the form of an annuity. Although people know that death is the last part of life, it is one thing apparently to know about death, it is another thing to think about decisions related to death, such as those involving aging, disability, long-term health care, and retirement. Interestingly, mindfulness reduces defensive responses to mortality salience. Recent psychological research finds mortality salience increases power seeking by men, though not women, while feeling powerful reduces death anxiety in both men and women. This last finding implies that a way to reduce fear of death is to feel powerful from effective and well-informed retirement planning.

Most people have no desire to learn even the most basic concepts of financial literacy necessary to make optimal financial retirement decisions within our current private retirement system under ERISA. These key fundamental concepts include compound interest, diversification, inflation, and present discounted value. Many people’s retirement behavior suggests they do not appreciate the power of compound interest. The rule of 72 heuristic states the number of years required to double an investment is approximately equal to 72 divided by the compound annual interest rate, expressed as a percentage. This mental shortcut may help people better visualize and understand compound interest and exponential growth, concepts that are counterintuitive because most people think linearly about accumulating money. Most people are shocked to learn that if their savings compounds at the constant annual interest rate of r percent, then half their retirement savings are generated in the first 72/r years of their working career and hence the importance of starting early to save for retirement. In other words, “relatively few years of contributions to your

57. Id.
60. Id. at 702.
63. See, e.g., HOWARD WAINER, TRUTH OR TRUTHINESS: DISTINGUISHING FACT FROM FICTION BY LEARNING TO THINK LIKE A DATA SCIENTIST 14-18 (2015) (discussing the rule of 72 and its applications).
retirement plan made early in your career are equivalent to many more years of contributions made late in your career." To make this point more numerically and memorably, if one starts working at age 25 and retires at age 65, and if the investments in her 401(k) plan earn a nominal return of 7% per annum, half the terminal value of her retirement savings will be attributed to contributions she made prior to her 34th birthday, an age by which most people have not even begun to think about saving for retirement.

This Article advocates achieving American retirement prosperity by defaulting Americans into a low-fee diversified, retirement portfolio which tracks a broad-based stock index, such as the S&P 500. This Article advocates doing so because most Americans are not motivated to learn how to make financially optimal retirement decisions on their own. Additionally, most people do not care to even think about retirement because it is perceived as being emotionally unpleasant. Most young people just see retirement as being so distant in time from their daily lives. Giving Americans full-time jobs of being their own retirement planners is cognitively nonsensical and unrealistic. Designing statistically proven best practices to just communicate about retirement needs and the importance of retirement planning and saving to people is a daunting and challenging task just by itself.

This Article advocates the American federal government help Americans achieve retirement prosperity by educating Americans about how to think more effectively, mindfully, and societally about retirement planning. Education entails the provision of information. A way to think about information is as the negative of ignorance or misinformation. A complementary way to think about information is that it is an aid to forming judgments and making decisions. Economists call information a public good, meaning that its consumption exhibits aspects of non-exclusion and non-rivalry. It is difficult to exclude someone from information and more than one person can utilize the same piece of information simultaneously. The production of information tends to have high fixed costs and low marginal costs of distribution, reproduction, or utilization. Many problems exist with markets for public goods as opposed to private goods for which there is both exclusion and rivalry in consumption. These market failures explain why governments publicly provide through expenditures and fund through taxation many public goods, such as information.

The private sector may not find profitable to educate Americans about how to achieve retirement prosperity for at least two reasons. First, it often is more profitable

66. Id. at 1.
67. Id. at 4.
to exploit people's cognitive biases than educate them about correcting them. Second, the private sector may not be able to capture many of the benefits of Americans achieving retirement prosperity because some of those benefits are uncertain, delayed, and spillover into other domains. Even if the private sector found it profitable to educate Americans about how to achieve retirement prosperity, there are still affordability, distributional, equity, and fairness reasons for the American government to provide such education. Finally, there are positive externalities to Americans achieving retirement prosperity (such as better physical health and mental health) and correspondingly negative externalities to Americans not achieving retirement prosperity (such as when governments have to use tax dollars to deal with the individual and societal consequences of Americans retiring into poverty).

Educating Americans to change how we think about retirement should increase support for the American federal government to adopt a universal retirement planning program across all Americans. This program should offer all Americans the same small menu of retirement plans consisting of inexpensive, passively managed broad-based index funds. Such a standardized menu protects employees from too many choices, most of which are dominated in terms of price and/or performance, and protects employers from having to select prudent investments in addition to monitor and remove imprudent ones. Americans can still invest in more actively managed and expensive funds if they really so desire because those will not be banned. American employees and employers will contribute required tax-advantaged minimum amounts into this program. Americans can still save more for retirement above minimum required amounts. Finally, Americans will still have many other choices to make that involve personal tastes about retirement, such as how, when, where, and with whom to retire. In choosing among retirement plans, people should prefer lower fees to higher fees, all other things being equal. Americans can still accommodate individual differences in their beliefs over the future, intertemporal preferences, risk tolerances, and worldviews by other financial (and non-financial) choices they make.

This Article should be of interest and relevance to Americans who are retired, soon retiring, or eventually retiring (that is, all Americans), people who believe a dignified and prosperous retirement is a privilege that all Americans deserve; and policy makers. This Article proceeds in three parts. Section I examines America's

---


73. All other things are not equal in the sense that lower fee, passively managed, broad-based index funds historically, typically outperform higher fee, actively managed funds.
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looming retirement crisis. Section II briefly surveys some existing and proposed American retirement policies. Section III advocates and analyzes changing Americans' thinking about retirement by encouraging Americans to adopt the thinking tools of thinking architecture and thinking technology, think more mindfully, and think more societally about retirement. Existing and proposed policies to improve American retirement are based on insights from economic theory and behavioral economics. This Article's proposals introduce cognitive economics to retirement planning and in so doing, also economic analysis of law more generally. A conclusion summarizes the Article.

I. America's Retirement Crisis

A number of recent financial crises, turmoil, and volatility are salient reminders that retirement planning entails daunting and overwhelming tasks for most people by themselves and even with assistance from others. Although there is a retirement planning marketplace consisting of advice, books, courses, insurance, investments, online services, planning, and software among other products; most Americans are unsure about who is trustworthy or even competent and knowledgeable about retirement planning. The benefits of personalized financial advice vary over an individual's life and outweigh the benefits from costly simple portfolios, including Target Date Funds (TDF), also known as lifecycle, dynamic-risk, or age-based funds, which are mutual funds whose asset allocation adjusts to be more conservative over time as the target date, usually at retirement, approaches.74

People's actual consumer and financial decision-making differs from normative models in general and in particular markets.75 There is field and laboratory experimental evidence that people display systematic cognitive biases and hold incorrect beliefs in many settings.76 A branch of microeconomics known as behavioral industrial organization analyzes how markets with imperfectly competitive firms and imperfectly rational consumers result in what are termed "behavioral market failures,"77 such as firms engaging in excessively complex pricing plans and spurious


77. See generally RAN SPIEGLER, BOUNDED RATIONALITY AND INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION (2011) (providing behavioral economic models of industrial organization). See also DellaVigna, supra note 76, at 361-62 (2009) (same); Glenn Ellison, Bounded Rationality in Industrial
product variety. In particular, many consumers exhibit apathy, confusion, context-dependency, dynamic inconsistency, and inertia of decision-making in the markets for cell phones, credit cards, and mortgages.

Behavioral economist and 2001 economics Nobel Laureate George Akerlof and economist William Dickens operationalize the psychological theory of cognitive dissonance in an economic model with three features. First, people have preferences about their beliefs related to possible futures. Second, people have partial control over their beliefs in the information sources to which they choose to selectively pay attention and use in updating their beliefs. Third, once people choose their beliefs, those beliefs have the inertia to persist over time. Akerlof and Dickens apply their model to explain that a desire to avoid cognitive dissonance implies that some people "would simply prefer to not contemplate a time when their earning power is diminished, and if the very fact of saving for old age forces persons into such contemplations, there is an argument for compulsory old age insurance."

In today's vast financial marketplace of products related to retirement, many of us face a dazzling plethora of bewildering alternatives. Because we also typically do not like to admit being financially challenged and perplexed, we may end up baffled and confused by so many financial choices related to retirement, not seeking help from professional financial advisors with retirement planning. When we seek advice, we often are overly trusting and unable to discern the independence and quality of advice. There is also experimental psychological research finding that people's incidental moods affect whether people take advice they receive.

As a society, we should not expect most Americans will plan well for their retirement left on their own because doing so entails a non-trivial set of difficult cognitive tasks and it is unclear who is a trustworthy advisor. We also should not be surprised when some Americans fall victim to financial scams because being vigilant

Organization, in 2 ADVANCES IN ECONOMICS AND ECONOMETRICS: THEORY AND APPLICATIONS 142 (Richard Blundell et al. eds., 2006) (surveying early literature).

78. SPIEGLER, supra note 77, at 7, 183-85.
82. Id. at 317.
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is cognitively demanding. There are visceral horror stories about elderly people being tricked by con artists into buying complicated, excessive risky, inappropriate, and
overpriced financial products, including annuities and life insurance. Many people,
including actress Kyra Sedgwick and her actor husband Kevin Bacon, lost part of
their life savings from being the victims of securities fraud that Bernie Madoff, a
charismatic and charming con artist, masterminded in an estimated $65 billion Ponzi
scheme.

A. A Broken Three-Legged Stool

Retirement planning is more challenging and risky in America than ever before
due to changes in what has been termed retirement’s three-legged stool, consisting
of Social Security benefits, pension plans, and private savings instruments. The first
change involves America’s often maligned and more often misunderstood Social
Security system, also known as the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance
federal program. America faces large demographic changes as 77.3 million baby
boomers, born between 1946 and 1964, have started to retire. The U.S. Census Bureau
projects the group of people who are sixty-five and older will grow by 50% between
2015 and 2030. There are proposals to expand Social Security.

The decision of when Americans begin to claim their Social Security benefits is an irreversible, one-time decision that almost half of Americans choose to be as early as is legally possible,\(^\text{92}\) which is likely too soon because Americans "are retiring earlier, living longer, and not saving enough for retirement."\(^\text{93}\) In 2012, the average Social Security monthly benefit of $2,051 for a retiree and spouse replaced on average just 17% of pre-retirement income.\(^\text{94}\) Determining the optimal claiming age is complicated\(^\text{95}\) and requires choosing a rate to discount future money into current dollars.\(^\text{96}\) The General Accounting Office (GAO) issued a report finding that many people do not fully understand important details about Social Security rules affecting retirement benefits,\(^\text{97}\) despite the Social Security Administration (SSA) providing a lot of information in its webpages and publications,\(^\text{98}\) including eleven interactive calculators.\(^\text{99}\) The GAO report made six recommendations to the SSA about improving the information provided in-person and online during the claims process.\(^\text{100}\) The SSA generally concurred with the recommendations of the GAO report.\(^\text{101}\)

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) provides a user-friendly, well-designed website, "Planning for Retirement," that, once you enter your date of birth and highest annual work income, calculates your full benefit claiming age, at which you will receive your full Social Security benefit without any reductions, and colorfully displays bar graphs depicting how changing your choice of claiming age affects your Social Security retirement benefits monthly and annually.\(^\text{102}\) This is a wonderful resource and terrific example of how to help Americans make a more informed choice.

---

98. Id. at 20-21.
99. Id. at 21-22, 43.
100. Id. at 32-33.
101. Id. at 44-48.
about retirement. It is also an example of helping people make better use of existing information by reframing or repackaging it.\textsuperscript{103}

The second change is the dramatic reduction in what are known as defined benefit (DB) pensions, which promise some defined monthly retirement benefit that is a fixed amount or determined by a formula based upon an employee's age, earnings history, and employment length. To raise profit margins or avoid bankruptcy,\textsuperscript{104} most American corporations discontinued DB pensions, which resulted in a widening of American economic inequality.\textsuperscript{105} The majority of current American DB pensions are in the public as opposed to the private sector. Unfortunately, most state and local governments have underfunded their DB pensions because of unreasonably and overly optimistic promises to employees.\textsuperscript{105} In 1935, the original intent of the Social Security Act\textsuperscript{107} was merely to supplement DB pensions and individual savings. Over time, with the disappearance of DB pensions and reduced individual savings due to increasing economic insecurity, many Americans now intend to rely on Social Security benefits as their sole retirement income source.\textsuperscript{108} In a national telephone survey of 800 Americans age twenty-five or older, 77\% believe the disappearance of pensions makes it more difficult for workers to achieve the American Dream.\textsuperscript{109}

The third change is the massive proliferation of what are known as defined contribution retirement (DC) plans, which are funded by periodic, known contributions by employees, employers, or both into accounts with the returns in retirement being uncertain, unguaranteed, and based on earnings from investments of the funds in those accounts. Familiar examples of DC retirement plans are Individual Retirement Accounts, corporate 401(k) plans, 403(b) Tax-Sheltered Annuity plans available for certain employees of public schools, employees of certain tax-exempt organizations, and certain ministers, and 457 plans available for certain government employees and non-government employees, including independent contractors. The 401(k), 403(b), and 457 plans are named after sections 401(k), 403(b), and 457 of the United States federal tax code, respectively. All three of these plans are tax-

\textsuperscript{103} Jack B. Soll et al., \textit{A User's Guide to Debiasing}, in \textit{II WILEY-BLACKWELL HANDBOOK OF JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING} 924, 925, 944 (Gideon Keren & George Wu eds., 2016), https://faculty.fuqua.duke.edu/~jpayne/bio/Debiasing%20SollMilkmanPayne%20R2%20FINAL.pdf.


\textsuperscript{106} FOROOHAR, \textit{supra} note 87, at 242, n.7; LOWENSTEIN, \textit{supra} note 104, at 81-219.

\textsuperscript{107} Trust Funds 42 U.S.C. § 401 (2010).


\textsuperscript{109} Perlman, \textit{supra} note 32, at 4, 11, 12 fig.10.
advantaged, employer-offered retirement vehicles, with the primary difference among them being the nature of the employer who can sponsor the plans. As of June 30, 2014, $4.4 trillion or 18% of the $24 trillion of Americans’ retirement assets are located in DC retirement plans. While the average American 401(k) balance is an encouraging $72,383, the median American 401(k) balance is much lower at only $18,433.

In a recent, informative, and thoroughly researched book, William Birdthistle, a law professor at Chicago-Kent College of Law, explains how America’s current retirement system is effectively a large national experiment with our personal finances. He points out how the implicit hypothesis of this unprecedented social financial experiment is that Americans will provide for retirement by ably managing 401(k) plans. He observes the current evidence suggests this hypothesis is grossly false. He notes as 10,000 baby boomers retire each day for the next fifteen or so years, we will know if this grand experiment failed. If there are financial shortfalls, “millions of Americans will suffer impoverished futures that will trigger severe individual and societal challenges for the United States.”

Birdthistle identifies three obstacles to Americans being successful at retirement planning. First, mutual funds are structured to reward asset accumulation instead of portfolio returns because investment advisors are paid a percentage of the assets under their management. Second, most of the 90 million Americans who utilize mutual funds as their retirement investment vehicle have neither the time nor the training to adequately plan for their retirement. Third, some mutual fund industry...

118. Birdthistle supra note 113; BIRDTIUSLE, supra note 112, at 2.
119. Birdthistle supra note 113; BIRDTIUSLE, supra note 112, at 50-54.
120. Birdthistle supra note 113; BIRDTIUSLE, supra note 112, at 9-11, 207.
members engage in unethical, if not illegal behavior, such as high fees,\textsuperscript{121} soft dollars,\textsuperscript{122} unfair valuations,\textsuperscript{123} late trading,\textsuperscript{124} market timing,\textsuperscript{125} and selective disclosures.\textsuperscript{126}

Paul Secunda, a professor who is the director of the labor and employment law program at Marquette University Law School,\textsuperscript{127} recently criticized America's dependence on 401(k) plans because 401(k) plans are consumer-driven, employer-centered, expensive, inaccessible, and voluntary.\textsuperscript{128} Secunda called 401(k) plans "a type of corporate-inspired form of elder abuse in America."\textsuperscript{129} Secunda cites Australia's Superannuation Guarantee as a successful paternalistic workplace retirement model that provides a comparatively inexpensive, mandatory, private, and universal workplace retirement system.\textsuperscript{130} Secunda outlines "a vision for transformation of American 401(k) retirement system into an efficient and sustainable superannuation model based on behavioral economic insights from the Australian workplace retirement system."\textsuperscript{131} Dana Muir, the Arthur F. Thurnau Professor of Business Law at the Stephen M. Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan,\textsuperscript{132} also believes that Australia's retirement system provides lessons from which American regulators can learn.\textsuperscript{133} It is instructive to examine how America compares with other countries

\textsuperscript{121} Birdthistle, supra note 112, at 71-88.
\textsuperscript{122} Birdthistle, supra note 112, at 89-98.
\textsuperscript{123} Birdthistle, supra note 112, at 99-111.
\textsuperscript{124} Birdthistle, supra note 112, at 112-21.
\textsuperscript{125} Birdthistle, supra note 112, at 122-32.
\textsuperscript{126} Birdthistle, supra note 112, at 133-38.
\textsuperscript{127} Marquette University Law School, Paul M. Secunda, https://law.marquette.edu/faculty-and-staff-directory/detail/5431766.
\textsuperscript{129} Id. at 505.
\textsuperscript{130} Id. at 505.
\textsuperscript{131} Id. at 505-06.
\textsuperscript{132} University of Michigan's Ross School of Business Website, Dana M. Muir, https://michiganross.umich.edu/faculty-research/faculty/dana-muir.
in crafting social policies about retirement.\textsuperscript{134} America ranked nineteenth for three consecutive years in an international survey of comparable retirement security.\textsuperscript{135}

It would be wonderful if American employees were able to trust that our choice-centric, private-sector DC system would lead them into retirement prosperity, instead of retirement poverty. Unfortunately, the lucrative business of DC retirement plans is rife with financial conflicts of interests and so American households often are advised and misled to hold high-cost actively managed mutual funds that underperform low-cost and no-cost index funds.\textsuperscript{136} A 2013 PBS \textit{Frontline} documentary, \textit{The Retirement Gamble}, "raises troubling questions about how America’s financial institutions protect our retirement savings."\textsuperscript{137} In a national survey conducted from December 14 through December 30, 2010 of 803 American 401(k) plan participants ages twenty-five and older living in households with telephones, 77\% were unaware they pay any fees to their 401(k) plan provider and when informed of these fees, 62\% were unaware of the fee amounts they are paying for maintenance of their accounts.\textsuperscript{138} Typical 401(k) fees are around 1\% of the total assets under management, which may not sound like much,\textsuperscript{139} except for the fact 401(k) fees compound over time just like and at the same rate as 401(k) portfolio returns do.\textsuperscript{140} It is easy to see how 401(k) fees reduce 401(k) returns by utilizing an online investment fee calculator.\textsuperscript{141} A 401(k) fee of 1\% over 40 years could reduce 401(k) returns by $590,000.\textsuperscript{142}
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William F. Sharpe, a 1990 economics Nobel laureate, estimated that under plausible conditions someone who chose low-cost retirement funds could have a 20% higher living standard in retirement than a comparable retiree who chose to hold and pay for high-cost retirement funds. John C. Bogle, who created the first index mutual fund in 1975 and is the founder and retired CEO of the Vanguard Group, estimates that over time, low-cost index funds return 65% more wealth to retirement plan investors than high-cost actively managed funds. Yale Law School professor Ian Ayres and University of Virginia Law School professor Quinn Curtis computed that for 16% of their sample of 3,534 401(k) plans with $120 billion in total assets, the higher fees of actively managed funds in excess of low-cost index funds exceeded the lifetime tax savings from holding 401(k) plans over a 35-year working career. They also documented that much of the menu of mutual funds being offered to Americans do not substantially add to diversification and charge significantly higher fees than comparable, existing funds.

Warren Buffet, "arguably the best stock picker of all time, . . . said has some harsh words to say about hedge funds and investment consultants, saying they are often detrimental for anyone who follows their advice." Buffet has consistently advised "that most investors' best bet is to put their money into a low-fee S&P 500 index fund that will simply match the market's performance over time." The rationale underlying Buffet's advice is that although the marketing phrase "actively managed" may sound like a team of managers and other professionals are watching over and taking care of your investments 24/7, there are high costs that you pay for that over just passively buying a broad-based index fund that has low costs. "Buffett's point is that passive investors can do better than "hyperactive" investments, whose managers and other professionals charge hefty fees. Over time, these fees can lower your potential returns by thousands of dollars." Empirical research finds actively
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managed funds charge higher fees than and perform worse in terms of returns than index funds.\textsuperscript{152} Buffet’s general point is that a passive S&P 500 investor is going to do just as well as American industry does, which, throughout history, has done pretty well. Over the long run, and over multi-decade time periods along the way, the S&P 500 has averaged total returns of nearly 10% per year.\textsuperscript{153}

Actively managed funds charge high fees in comparison to passively managed index funds. The difference can be 2\% versus 0.02\%, in which case that actively managed fund charges a fee, also known as an expense ratio, 10 times as high as that passively managed index fund charges. Mutual funds are one of the few items most Americans buy without knowing the item’s price!\textsuperscript{154} Another item that Americans “consume” without knowing its price is medical care, e.g., ambulance transportation, emergency room visits, intensive care, surgical procedures, and x-rays. Medical insurance usually partially covers the cost of medical care. Amino,\textsuperscript{155} a new smartphone app,\textsuperscript{156} provides real-time price estimates for medical procedures to help consumers worried about out-of-pocket costs. Economics Nobel Laureate Kenneth Arrow\textsuperscript{157} wrote a seminal article,\textsuperscript{158} explaining why the free market system fails to allocate medical care optimally\textsuperscript{159} and in so doing, created the field of health economics.\textsuperscript{160} Uncertainties associated with retirement planning are similar to uncertainties associated with medical care because individuals are uncertain about how much and when they will have to spend possibly large amounts on medical care and retirement. Americans face large risks over the size and timing of medical care and retirement expenditures. Also, a large part of retirement spending is on expensive medical care, especially disproportionately large, near end-of-life healthcare costs.\textsuperscript{161}
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Achieving American Retirement Prosperity

In 2012, Robert Hiltonsmith, a policy analyst in the economic opportunity program at Demos, a non-partisan public policy research and advocacy organization founded in 2000, wrote a policy brief about hidden and excessive fees of American individual retirement savings accounts.\(^{162}\) Hiltonsmith estimated that, “over a lifetime, fees can cost a median-income two-earner family nearly $155,000 and consume nearly one-third of their investment returns.”\(^{163}\) Hiltonsmith points out how: “Financial services companies can get away with charging higher-than-necessary fees for a number of reasons, namely: the savers’ lack of information, the inefficiency of financial markets and individualized investing, and the substantial costs—both in money and time—associated with switching between investment brokers.”\(^{164}\) Hiltonsmith also “argues for a wholesale reform of this country’s broken private retirement system.”\(^{165}\)

In a blog post, Hiltonsmith notes that during the financial crises in 2008, “the securities industry lost over $2 trillion in workers’ hard-earned 401(k) and IRA savings”\(^{166}\) and “the number that really drives home the need for reform is the more than $120 billion that the industry took home in compensation and commissions the same year it lost $2 trillion in savers’ wealth.”\(^{167}\) In 2010, Hiltonsmith wrote another policy brief advocating replacing instead or merely reforming America’s current broken 401(k) system.\(^{168}\)

A coalition of organizations concerned about the future of retirement in America, Retirement USA, “enumerated twelve principles that any retirement reform should satisfy to be a sufficient replacement for the traditional pension. Three of these are ‘core principles’, vital aspects of any retirement reform— universality, security, and adequacy.”\(^{169}\) Universality means all American retirees are covered by a retirement plan supplementing Social Security benefits.\(^{170}\) Security means retirees do not bear longevity risk or market risk because they will receive a lifetime stream of retirement income.\(^{171}\) Adequacy means retirees get enough income to maintain pre-retirement standards of living.\(^{172}\)
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The nine remaining, supporting principles are:\textsuperscript{173} (1) shared responsibility for retirement among employees, employers, and the government; (2) required contributions by employees, employers, and the government; (3) mandatory contributions that are pooled and professionally managed to minimize costs and financial risks; (4) payouts only at retirement, meaning no loans or early withdrawals, except for permanent disability; (5) payouts that are made over the whole lifetime of retirees and their surviving spouses, domestic partners, and former spouses; (6) portable benefits when workers change jobs; (7) additional voluntary savings, including reasonable limits for tax-advantaged contributions; (8) efficient, transparent administration by a government agency or non-profit, private institutions that are governed by a board of trustees that includes employee, employer, and retiree representatives; and (9) effective oversight by a government regulator dedicated only to promote American retirement security.

Hiltonsmith analyzes proposed retirement reform policies that have received the most attention:\textsuperscript{174} the Urban Institute’s “Super Simple Savings Plan,”\textsuperscript{175} the ERISA Industry Committee’s “New Benefit Platform for Life Security,”\textsuperscript{176} the Obama administration White House Middle Class Task Force’s “Automatic IRA” proposal,\textsuperscript{177} and the Economic Policy Institute and Bernard Schwartz Center for Economic Policy Analysis at the New School’s “Guaranteed Retirement Accounts.”\textsuperscript{178} Hiltonsmith concludes that while all four proposed reforms are improvements over America’s current, broken retirement system, only the last reform, Guaranteed Retirement Accounts, meets all twelve of the reform principles that Retirement USA establishes.\textsuperscript{179}
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B. Retirement Survey Data

In July of 2016, the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) Investor Education Foundation released Financial Capability in the United States 2016,180 a report drawing on data from the 2015, 2012, and 2009 National Financial Capability Study State-By-State Surveys, each of which were nationwide online surveys of more than 25,000 American adults. The report found that only 39% of respondents have tried figuring out their retirement savings needs;181 56% surveyed worry about running out of money in retirement;182 43% of Social Security beneficiaries have some difficulty making financial ends meet;183 only 37% of respondents correctly answered at least 4 of 5 financial literacy quiz questions, which is down 2% from 2009;184 only 14% answered correctly all 5 of those questions;185 and 76% rated their financial knowledge as high, up 3% from 2009.186

The Consumer Federation of America and the Financial Planning Association surveyed 1,000 Americans in 2006 and found that 20% of those surveyed were counting on winning the lottery for their retirement.187 In 1999, the Consumer Federation of America and the financial services firm Primerica found in a survey that 40% of those Americans who were surveyed with incomes between $25,000 and $35,000, and almost 50% of those surveyed with an income of $15,000 to $25,000 stated that winning the lottery would provide their retirement nest egg. Overall, 27% of those Americans surveyed stated that their best chance to accumulate $500,000 in their lifetime is by winning the lottery or a sweepstakes.188 Americans are not unique in this regard; from November 18 to November 22, 2013, the Bank of Montreal conducted an
online poll of 1,003 Canadian adults and found 34% of those surveyed hoped to win a lottery, with 14% “saying they were counting ‘heavily’ on a lotto windfall.”

The above survey data are sobering because winning a significant amount of money, as opposed to another lottery ticket or cash prizes of $2 or $3, in the many U.S. state-run lotteries is an extremely low probability event. Most economists view the various U.S. state-run lotteries as exploitative, inefficient, and regressive taxes. In 2014, Americans spent, in the forty-three states where lotteries are legal, $70 billion on lotto games, which is more “than Americans in all 50 states spent on sports tickets, books, video games, movie tickets, and recorded music sales.” U.S. state-run lotteries are exempt from the Federal Trade Commission’s truth-in-advertising regulations. Evidence reveals that U.S. state-run lotteries are disproportionately played by low-income households and households with problem gamblers, are intentionally targeted at minority and low-income communities, and result in low-income families paying for lottery tickets by substantially “spending less on non-gambling items, including clothing, food, and rent.”

According to a poll the Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research conducted from April 14 to April 16, 2016 from online and telephone interviews of 1,008 adults, 54% of working American households said they are not very or not at all confident they will have enough savings to retire when they want, while 14% said they
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are confident they will have enough savings to retire when they want.\textsuperscript{199} The same poll found that 75% of American households making less than $50,000 a year, 66.6% of American households making between $50,000 and $100,000 annually, and 38% of American households making over $100,000 per year said they would have problems coming up with $1,000 to cover an unexpected bill, such as for the repair of a broken home appliance or an emergency medical bill from a car accident.\textsuperscript{200} In another poll conducted by the Brookings Institution, over all income levels, including households earning $100,000 to $150,000 annually, over 25% of American households said they could not come up with $2,000 within 30 days to pay for an unexpected expense.\textsuperscript{201} Another 19% said they could only do so by selling off possessions or taking out payday loans.\textsuperscript{202} The Federal Reserve Board found in another study that 47% of those surveyed could not cover even a $400 emergency without borrowing money or selling off their possessions.\textsuperscript{203} Nearly 50% of American households are “financially fragile”\textsuperscript{204} in the sense that a single unexpected financial emergency can send that household into unplanned borrowing and/or dissaving. Unplanned borrowing might come from a payday lender possibly resulting in a downward financial spiral.\textsuperscript{205} Unforeseen dissaving from a retirement fund may incur tax penalties for early withdrawal.

In another poll the Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research conducted from March 8 to March 27, 2016 of 1,075 Americans aged 50 and older,\textsuperscript{206} the key findings included these: just 34% of those who are currently working said they feel very or extremely well prepared financially for retirement; 34% of those working
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are not saving money for retirement; a substantial minority of 44% said that Social Security is or will be their household’s biggest source of retirement income; and over 50% said they feel more anxious than secure about how much they have saved for retirement. In an earlier survey from 2013, the Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research conducted interviews with a nationally representative sample of 1,075 Americans aged 50 and older, finding that 55% of those surveyed plan to work past the age of 65 or have already done so; about 66.7% of those who are working past age 65 said they made this decision primarily due to financial reasons; 25% of those not retired said they never plan to retire.

In June 2015, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) released an in-depth report about retirement security. The GAO found the median American household aged 55 to 64 had total retirement savings in the range of between $10,000 and $20,000, with 41% having no retirement savings at all. Of the 59% with positive retirement savings, 87% own homes (27% with no mortgage), 45% have a DB pension, median non-retirement financial resources are $25,000, and median net worth is $337,000. Of the 41% with zero retirement savings, 56% own homes (22% with no mortgage), 32% have a DB pension, median non-retirement financial resources are $1,000, and median net worth is $21,000. Perhaps most concerning are the 27% with neither a DB pension nor any retirement savings, with a median home equity of about $53,000, median net worth is $9,000, and of whom 91% have less than $25,000 in financial assets. Of American households aged 65 to 74, 52% have no retirement savings, Social Security is the primary source of retirement income (on average 44%), median annual income is about $47,000, and 27% have neither a DB pension nor any retirement savings. Of American households aged 75 and older, only 29% have retirement savings, Social Security is the primary source of retirement income (on average 61%), median income is about $27,000, and 35% have neither a DB pension nor any retirement savings. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, about 43% of
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Americans aged 65 and older would be living below the poverty level without Social Security. What exactly these and many related statistics about retirement savings adequacy mean in human terms is unclear because Americans differ vastly in their financial mindsets and frames of reference.

Between July 6 and July 24 of 2015, the Transamerica Center for Retirement Studies commissioned the Harris Poll to conduct a 24-minute online survey of a nationally representative sample of 2,012 retirees. All retirees were U.S. residents age 50 or older, fully (N=1,741) or semi-retired (N=271), and for the majority of their careers worked at for-profit companies employing at least 10 people. A colorful 118-page report collects the survey results, including over 50 indicators of retirees’ health and wealth. The estimated median annual household income of retirees is $32,000, with a sizeable difference between those who are married ($48,000) and unmarried ($19,000). The most frequently cited sources of retirement income are Social Security (89%), other savings and investments (48%), corporate pensions (42%), and 401(k)/403(b)/IRAs (37%). For those collecting Social Security benefits, the median age they began to collect benefits was 62, meaning sizeable reductions in benefits, and only 1% waited until age 70 to collect benefits in order to maximize the total benefit amount. The estimated median current household savings of retirees is $119,000 with a sizeable difference between those who are married ($224,000) and unmarried ($40,000). Just 12% of those who retired sooner than planned did so because they had saved enough to afford retirement. An overwhelming majority of retirees are generally happy (94%), enjoying life (90%), and have a strong sense of purpose.
Nonetheless, everyday activities are more difficult for some (31%) and some are having difficulties making ends meet (28%). Sadly, some feel isolated and lonely (11%). Retirees' greatest fears are declining health requiring long-term care (44%), reduction or elimination of Social Security (44%), and outliving retirement income (41%). While about half of retirees (54%) have a retirement plan, very few (10%) have the plan in writing. Even fewer (7%) have contingency plans for earlier than expected retirement and/or saving shortfalls.

C. Elder Financial Abuse

There is financial, medical, and psychological evidence that older Americans are particularly cognitively vulnerable to making financial decision errors. Americans have to make complicated financial decisions before (e.g., portfolio asset allocation, saving or investing versus consuming), at (e.g., when to retire), and after (e.g., receiving a lump sum payment versus periodic distributions) retirement. In addition to facing many complex decisions, the 57 million Americans, who are 60 and older, are victims annually of an estimated $36 billion in financial fraud. A survey identifies how banking and wealth advisory firms are detecting, preventing, and responding to elder financial victimization and the current regulatory landscape. A study by the American Association of Retired Americans Banksafe Initiative found that financial exploitation to be the most frequently reported type of abuse against adults with one in five adults having been financially exploited, and victims losing $120,303 on average. The CEO of the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a), Sandy Markwood, observed that for each reported case of financial fraud, another 23
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go unreported because of embarrassment, fear, or the lack of evidence.\textsuperscript{238} The n4a Answers on Aging\textsuperscript{TM} Financial Exploitation initiative has a information website at http://www.n4a.org/financialexploitation and provides a brief (at seven pages) consumer brochure containing helpful resources, tips and tools for elderly Americans and their families to avoid becoming the victims of financial abuse or fraud at http://www.n4a.org/Files/financial-fraud-access508.pdf. International mail fraud schemes defrauded more than $18 million dollars annually since 2012 from elderly and vulnerable American victims.\textsuperscript{239} Scam artists increasingly try selling annuities and life insurance to defraud elderly Americans.\textsuperscript{240} The National Council on Aging compiled a list of the top 10 financial scams targeting seniors.\textsuperscript{241}

A novel economic model of elder fraud analyzes the behavior of households who, before they know whether they will suffer from cognitive decline, can protect themselves against making bad financial decisions by buying insurance to constrain their subsequent choices.\textsuperscript{242} In this model’s equilibrium, more households insure against cognitive decline if such insurance has low costs, households have high risk aversion, the probability of cognitive decline is high, the probability of households being offered a suitable financial product is low, the search costs to sellers of finding consumers are low (e.g. through online phishing\textsuperscript{243}), and many sellers enter the market.

On the other side of the market, more sellers enter the market when the search costs for finding consumers are low, profit margins are high, the probability of cognitive decline is high, households have low risk aversion, and the costs to households of insurance against cognitive decline are high. If more households insure, then fewer sellers choose to enter the market. This means that when the probability of being offered an unsuitable financial product is high, households who insure against cognitive decline provide a positive externality to other households. Because households ignore this externality in their individual decision-making, in the market
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equilibrium outcome, households buy less insurance against cognitive decline than is the socially optimal amount. The equilibrium amounts of cognitive insurance coverage purchased being less than socially optimal implies that government regulation can raise individual and social welfare. For example, regulators could mandate the purchase of the socially optimal amount of cognitive insurance coverage. Alternatively, the government could incentivize households to buy socially optimal cognitive insurance coverage by subsidizing purchasers or taxing non-purchasers.

A number of U.S. federal government agencies target elder financial abuse. For example, the Federal Bureau of Investigation maintains a webpage titled *Fraud Target: Senior Citizens*. The United States Department of Justice *Elder Justice* website provides a wealth of information about financial exploitation for victims, their families, practitioners, law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and researchers. The Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force, a broad coalition of American law enforcement, investigatory and regulatory agencies, which was established in November 2009, maintains a webpage dedicated to combating elder fraud and financial exploitation.

The CFPB released in March 2016 recommendations to banks and credit unions about how to better protect their older customers from Elder Financial Exploitation (EFE) attacks, in which perpetrators take over bank accounts or misappropriate funds by targeting such common vulnerabilities of elderly victims as cognitive impairment and lack of technological sophistication. The CFPB suggests that bank and credit unions “implement predictive analytics to detect suspicious activity that could indicate EFE (e.g., adding additional authorized users to accounts) and offer enhanced protection services to elderly clients (e.g., withdrawal limits).”

Notice that “the CFPB’s recommendations focus on best practices for banks and credit unions to prevent and detect EFE, while FINRA’s proposal focuses on ways that
broker-dealers can respond to potential EFE attacks." Notice also that although "the CFPB’s recommendations are voluntary best practices (and not requirements), banks and credit unions that do not implement a robust EFE program could be targeted by the CFPB for engaging in unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts or practices (UDAAP)" under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

II. American Retirement Policies

There are many federal and state government policies towards Americans’ retirement planning, ranging from laissez-faire to various forms of mandates. The Social Security system President Roosevelt signed into law in 1935 means the United States federal government does not have a laissez-faire approach to Americans’ retirement planning. John Y. Campbell, who is the Morton L. and Carole S. Olshan Professor of Economics at Harvard University, as part of his Richard T. Ely Distinguished Lecture during the 2016 meeting of the American Economic Association, makes a compelling case for government intervention in American consumer financial markets, including asset allocation in retirement saving.

Campbell reviews the vast extant literature documenting household financial mistakes, including "the failure to contribute to 401(k) plans with employer matches and immediate penalty-free withdrawals for older employees." Because there is evidence that Americans are often making objectively poor choices about retirement planning, American policy makers must decide how to respond to Americans’ doing no or poor retirement planning. How policy makers respond depends on to what extent “self-reflection, experience, learning, feedback, routines, assistance,
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supervision, oversight, and a full array of punishment and rewards" can overcome the presence and extent of cognitive errors.262

A. Legislation: The Fiduciary Rule and More

On September 15, 2015, President Obama signed an Executive Order titled Using Behavioral Science Insights to Better Serve the American People.263 This Executive Order directs executive departments and federal agencies to base the design of policies and programs on research in behavioral economics and psychology about how people make decisions. The Executive Order specifically directs federal agencies to carefully design how choices are presented and structured, otherwise known as choice architecture, to empower people to make the best choices for themselves and their families. The Executive Order also specifically directs federal agencies to improve how the federal government presents information by devoting more consideration to the format, medium, and timing of information, otherwise known as information architecture, affects the understanding of that information by consumers, borrowers, and federal program beneficiaries. Choice architecture and information architecture are two popular types of policies among American and British policy makers.264

A blog post titled Educate, Automate or Legislate? A View From The UK DC Market notes that a good DC “outcome rests on several pillars: participation, contribution, investment, fees, and retirement income choice.”265 That blog post evaluates how the United Kingdom addresses each of these pillars by automation, legislation, and education. As to participation, the blog observes that because of historically low enrolment levels for U.K. DC plans, in 2012, legislation mandated all employers and employees to contribute to a DC plan.266 As of 2014, this legislation conscripted four million new DC savers, with less than 10% opting out.267 As to contribution, in addition to auto-enrolment, there is a mandated minimum contribution of 8% of qualifying
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earnings, with a tax break for employee contributions. The blog post notes while this is an improvement over not saving, the government must encourage higher savings rates or increase the compulsory minimum contribution level as Australia did. As for investment, default funds are the norm, mandatory for automatic enrollment plans, and typically employ what is known as a “glide path” to invest in more conservative assets as retirement approaches. The predominant view in the U.K. is that when people make individual choices about complex investments alternatives, the results are suboptimal. As to investment fees, there is a legislatively imposed cap on fees, including record keeping. As to retirement income choice, in 2014, so-called “Freedom and Choice” legislation ushered in more complexity and more demand for information by no longer effectively mandating conversion of retirement proceeds into annuitized income. The U.K. government also proposed a “Guidance Guarantee” that provides free personalized guidance to everyone. As for an overall evaluation, the U.K. seems to “legislate in the short term, automate where effective and be ambitious about financial education over time.”

Evaluating America’s current DC outcome according to the same pillars finds low participation, low contribution, suboptimal investment, high fees, and too complex, suboptimal retirement income choice. This unfortunate state of affairs is unsurprising and unnecessary. As the author of the above blog post cogently observes: “We must remember that in their own minds they are often exactly that – savers not investors. Research consistently shows that DC participants on both sides of the Atlantic don’t typically expect or wish to make complex financial choices.”

Existing and proposed American retirement policies can also be categorized as legislation, automation, and education. For example, law professor Birdthistle proposes three fixes to America’s current flawed retirement system, each requiring the passage of new legislation or enforcement of currently under-enforced legislation.
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First, he advocates letting all Americans participate in the Thrift Savings Plan currently available to federal employees and members of the uniformed services. Second, he urges the SEC, under the authority of section 36 of the Investment Company Act, to bring enforcement actions against mutual funds charging the highest fees. Third, he suggests requiring that Americans wanting to invest in funds that are not Qualified Default Investment Alternatives (QDIAs), such as large, passively managed, diversified funds are, must get a financial license.

In America, there is already plenty of legislation about retirement planning, enforced by various regulators. American regulators with jurisdiction about retirement include the Internal Revenue Service of the U.S. Treasury, the SEC, and the Department of Labor. On April 8, 2016, the United States Department of Labor announced its highly anticipated final fiduciary rule, also known as the Conflict of Interest Final Rule. This rule is designed to protect investors by mandating that providers of retirement investment advice to retirement plans and individual retirement accounts must abide by a fiduciary standard, meaning placing their clients’ best interest before their own profit. It might surprise many Americans that before this rule, financial advisors were not held to a fiduciary standard in providing retirement advice. Anyone can call herself a “financial advisor” because there is no commonly accepted or legally defined term known as “financial advisor.” This contrasts with, for example, being a Chartered Financial Analyst, who must earn a professional credential that requires passing three six-hour examinations upon mastering a curriculum about corporate finance, economics, ethics, financial reporting and analysis, portfolio management, quantitative methods, and securities analysis. On June 8, 2016, President Obama vetoed a Congressional resolution to block the

284. Birdthistle, supra note 113; BIRDTHISTLE, supra note 112, at 215-16.
285. Birdthistle, supra note 113; BIRDTHISTLE, supra note 112, at 207-12.
implementation of this rule.\textsuperscript{289} Until this rule goes into effect April 2017,\textsuperscript{290} the SEC’s current and much weaker suitability standard governs.\textsuperscript{291}

Policy analyst Robert Hiltonsmith “estimated that retirement savers paid a total of $73 billion in fees in 2013, or an average of 0.6\% of their total assets. Under the fiduciary rule, these fees would plummet . . . . that would translate to a savings of nearly $25 billion from lower fees” (boldface in original).\textsuperscript{292} Hiltonsmith also estimates the fiduciary rule “would also translate into higher returns: given that . . . passively-managed funds outperformed actively-managed funds by more than 3.5\% last year, if we predicted that the fiduciary rule even leads to 0.5\% higher annual returns, that would translate into an additional $60 billion earned by people with 401(k)s and IRA(s).”\textsuperscript{293}

B. Automation: Nudging and Mindless Retirement Planning

Behavioral economics is very much in vogue among legal scholars and policy makers.\textsuperscript{294} This popularity is partly because behavioral economics provides more descriptively accurate depictions of human behavior over time and under risk than does neoclassical economics. Many in the policy arena, popular media, and public are fascinated by experimental discoveries from behavioral economics. This fascination is partly because of the compelling narrative and rhetorical nature of irrationality,\textsuperscript{295} in addition to the persuasiveness and visual power of brain scan images.\textsuperscript{296} Applying behavioral economics to design retirement policy has been very popular for quite some time.\textsuperscript{297} Behavioral economics incorporates cognitive and social psychological findings into economics models of retirement planning.\textsuperscript{298}


\textsuperscript{293.} Id.


\textsuperscript{296.} See, e.g., Deena Skolnick Weisberg et al., The Seductive Allure of Neuroscience Explanations, 20 J. COGNITIVE NEUROSCI. 470, 470 (2008).


People can become overconfident from biases in learning about their trading abilities.\textsuperscript{299} Empirical field research documents retail investors avoid stocks whose prior purchase led to negative emotions and rebuy stocks whose prior purchase led to positive emotions.\textsuperscript{300} People tend to remember information consistent with their preferences and forget information inconsistent with their preferences.\textsuperscript{301} People often act impulsively and based upon inaccurate beliefs.\textsuperscript{302} People also face cognitive limitations in processing too much complex information.\textsuperscript{303} Some people confuse payoff-relevant information with payoff-irrelevant information or noise.\textsuperscript{304}

That many investors misinterpret and overestimate their prior investment performance is documented and illustrated by empirical surveys of American mutual fund investors\textsuperscript{305} and German online broker investors\textsuperscript{306} in addition to experimental research about Master’s in Business Administration (MBA) students playing an online investment simulation game.\textsuperscript{307} Imperfect emotional and factual memories imply that people will find it difficult to learn from their financial experiences.\textsuperscript{308} Imperfect and incomplete memories of past financial pain imply significant limitations to learning from experience which may in turn explain why some people fall prey repeatedly to predatory financing and repeatedly participate in investment scams and securities bubbles.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{299} Simon Gervais & Terrance Odean, \textit{Learning to Be Overconfident}, 14 REV. FIN. STUD. 1, 1 (2001) (presenting a formal theoretical model demonstrating this phenomenon).
\item \textsuperscript{300} Michal Ann Strahilevitz et al., \textit{Once Burned, Twice Shy: How Naive Learning, Counterfactuals, and Regret Affect the Repurchase of Stocks Previously Sold}, 48 J. MARKETING RES. S102, S102 (2012) (providing this evidence).
\item \textsuperscript{301} Garcia, supra note 50.
\item \textsuperscript{302} \textit{Id}.
\item \textsuperscript{303} \textit{Id}.
\item \textsuperscript{304} Fisher Black, \textit{Noise}, 41 J. FIN. 529, 529, 530-34 (1986) (analyzing the concept of noise in finance).
\item \textsuperscript{305} William N. Goetzmann & Nadav Peles, \textit{Cognitive Dissonance and Mutual Fund Investors}, 20 J. FIN. 145, 145 (1997) (finding that mutual fund investors overestimate their actual past returns and performance relative to the whole market).
\item \textsuperscript{306} Markus Glaser & Martin Weber, \textit{Why Inexperienced Investors Do Not Learn: They Do Not Know Their Past Portfolio Performance}, 4 FIN. RES. LETTERS 203, 203 (2007) (concluding that investors do not know or remember their investing mistakes).
\item \textsuperscript{307} Don A. Moore et al., \textit{Positive Illusions and Forecasting Errors in Mutual Fund Investment Decisions}, 79 ORG. BEHAV. & HUMAN DECISION PROCESSES 95, 95 (1999) (finding that most players consistently overestimate past and future performance of their investment portfolios).
\item \textsuperscript{308} See generally NOFSINGER, supra note 24, at 40-45 (summarizing how emotional memory interacts with investment decisions). \textit{See also} JOHN R. NOFSINGER, \textit{INVESTMENT MADNESS: HOW PSYCHOLOGY AFFECTS YOUR INVESTING . . . AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT} 100-106 (2001) (same).
\end{itemize}
A large body of psychological research finds that people are overconfident in the accuracy of their memories.\textsuperscript{309} Recent research provides evidence that older individuals exhibit a positivity bias and also a recency effect in their memories.\textsuperscript{310} This research implies that older folks may take on excessive financial risks during a bull market.\textsuperscript{311} Financial autopilots provide one way for older people to protect themselves from their positivity bias.\textsuperscript{312} It is human nature for people to maintain positive self-images of their financial decision-making in spite of disconfirming evidence from their past portfolio performance. People can alter their financial decision-making in several ways to preserve their positive self-images:

First, people may fail to make important decisions because it is too uncomfortable to contemplate the situation. For example, when considering the thought of saving for future retirement, some younger people may conjure an image of a feeble person with low earning power. To avoid the conflict between their good self-image and the contradictory future self-image, they avoid saving entirely. Second, the filtering of new information limits the ability to evaluate and monitor our investment decisions. If investors ignore negative information, how are they going to realize that an adjustment in their portfolio is necessary?\textsuperscript{313}

As behavioral finance scholar John Nofsinger cogently states:

People want to believe that their investment decisions are good. In the face of evidence to the contrary, the brain’s defense mechanisms filter contradictory information and alter the recollection of the decision. It is hard to objectively evaluate the progress toward investment goals or the need for an investment advisor when the recollection of past performance is biased upward.\textsuperscript{314}


\textsuperscript{310} Alan D. Castel et al., I Owe You: Age-Related Similarities and Differences in Associative Memory for Gains and Losses, 23 AGING, NEUROPSYCHOL. & COGNITION: A J. NORMAL & DYSFUNCTIONAL DEVELOP. 549, 549 (2016).
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\textsuperscript{313} NOFSINGER, supra note 24, at 41.

\textsuperscript{314} Id. at 45.
A number of behavioral science professors and law professors advocate policies and regulations known as forms of soft paternalism. Examples of soft paternalism are defaulting people into 401(k) retirement plans and cooling-off periods before marriage or divorce and for home-solicitation sales. Types of soft paternalism include libertarian paternalism, which endeavors to preserve people’s freedom of choice, while intending to influence people’s choices to make them better off; asymmetric paternalism, which strives to produce large benefits to people who are prone to decision-making errors, while imposing little or even no costs on those who are not prone to decision-making errors; cautious paternalism, which requires that policymakers determine conditions under which policy benefits outweigh costs; and light paternalism, which attempts to enhance individual choice without restricting it.

There is empirical, experimental, and field evidence that people choose poorly in many settings because of systematic, unconscious cognitive biases. As an economist stated: there is “a great deal of evidence of large and costly errors that people make in important choices.” This data is behind the popular idea of nudges, which acknowledge or even use cognitive biases to design choice contexts and information provision to influence choices to reach outcomes that mitigate people’s cognitive biases. The policy tool of nudging people has become very popular among certain regulators ever since the concept of nudges was introduced and proposed by

319. See generally George Loewenstein & Emily Celia Harris, The Economist as Therapist: Methodological Ramifications of “Light” Paternalism, in THE FOUNDATIONS OF POSITIVE AND NORMATIVE ECONOMICS: A HANDBOOK 210, 210 (Andrew Caplin & Andrew Schotter eds., 2008).
behavioral economist Richard Thaler and legal scholar Cass Sunstein. Nudges have generated much debate and controversy over their ethical nature. Some argue that some nudges are at best ineffective and at worst even counterproductive. Some nudges are quite effective in changing people's behavior. For example, behavioral economics research finds that inertia is a powerful force in retirement planning, implying that automatic enrollment in retirement plans can be a policy default that is very effective in changing people's behavior. Based upon research about loss aversion, inertia, and defaults, two behavioral economists, Shlomo Benartzi and Richard Thaler, designed a well-known program, Save More Tomorrow, that helps people start and continue to save more for their retirement. Defaults can be one-size-fits-all or tailored to individuals. Defaults do not always work though. Defaults work best when three conditions hold: (1) people's main mistake is that of inaction as opposed to poor action, (2) people share sufficiently homogenous preferences and they...
prefer the default option to what the average person would have chosen, and (3) opt-out or switching costs are small.\textsuperscript{332}

A problem with nudging is that it accepts, takes advantage of, and perpetuates mindless retirement planning. The Pension Protection Act of 2006\textsuperscript{333} facilitated American employers adopting automatic enrollment plans.\textsuperscript{334} The U.S. Department of Labor promulgated regulation that made TDFs eligible to be QDIAs.\textsuperscript{335} The growth of TDFs in the U.S. accelerated after both of these legal changes. By December 2015, the assets managed in American TDFs had mushroomed to $763 billion.\textsuperscript{336} In a February 2015 speech,\textsuperscript{337} SEC Commissioner Luis Aguilar described “the relentless growth” in TDFs as “troubling” and noted “investors, and industry professionals alike, do not fully appreciate the risks” of TDFs. He was concerned that in an online survey study the SEC sponsored in 2012, out of 1,000 individual investors from a national consumer panel, only 30% understood the meaning of the year in a TDF’s name,\textsuperscript{338} only 36% understood that TDFs do not guarantee any retirement income,\textsuperscript{339} 54% failed to realize that TDFs having the same year in their name do not necessarily have the same mix of bonds and stocks at the target date,\textsuperscript{340} and 41% of those who invested in a TDF stated they did so because “it seems like a safe investment for retirement.”\textsuperscript{341} Nudging people by defaults into TDFs has additional problems because of the high fees TDFs charge and the above troubling empirical data finding that people misunderstand what TDFs are, mistakenly believing TDFs are risk-free.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[334.] \textit{Id.}, at § 902: Increasing Participation Through Automatic Contribution Arrangements.
\item[339.] \textit{Id.} at 15, 26-28.
\item[340.] \textit{Id.} at 29.
\item[341.] \textit{Id.} at 20.
\end{footnotes}
C. Education: Financial Literacy?

Campbell distinguishes among five types of financial ignorance: ignorance about financial concepts, ignorance about financial contract terms, ignorance about financial history, ignorance about people’s own financial behavior, and ignorance about incentives other people face in financial markets and how such incentives affect other people’s strategic behavior and financial market equilibrium. Campbell points out how a “natural response to financial ignorance is to try to cure it through financial education or disclosures.” Campbell observes that disclosures and financial education “are variants of the same strategy, empowering individuals to understand financial problems better and thereby to make better decisions. The difference is that financial education is more general, particularly when offered early in life, while disclosures are specific to particular financial problems.” Campbell also analyzes the limitations of and problems with disclosures and financial education. Disclosure has its limits, even for sophisticated investors. Effectiveness of disclosures can be improved by simplifying disclosures, standardizing disclosures, making disclosures more vivid, and mandating that disclosures contain particular information.

As educators, law professors realize that for our students to learn, they must pay and focus their attention. Attention is a scarce resource and psychological research finds people do not consciously decide to allocate their attention. Instead certain things are salient to and capture the attention of certain people; other things go unnoticed and fade into the background. People also tend to exhibit an “ostrich effect” meaning that they prefer to pay attention to information they like to think about and
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avoid information they do not like to think about. American and Scandinavian investors tend to check their portfolio values more frequently after financial market rises than when financial markets are flat or falling, leading to investors to put their heads in the sand. In the above financial contexts, people often prefer to maintain positive illusions regarding their financial situation or physical health rather than learn information that contradicts their being able to hold onto comforting illusions. Additionally, people display a learning asymmetry in which they update “their beliefs more in response to information that was better than expected than to information that was worse.” People are more motivated to learn about positive things and things that they like.

There is disagreement over whether Americans lack financial literacy, partly because there is disagreement over how to define financial literacy. In 2014, Standard & Poor’s Ratings Services Global Financial Literacy Survey collected as part of Gallup’s World Poll data from over 150,000 people aged 15 and older in 148 countries and found worldwide 2 in 3 adults are financially literate in the sense of not being able to answer correctly 3 out of 4 straightforward questions about compound interest, inflation, numeracy, and risk diversification. Another viewpoint is that Americans have a financial behavior or wellness problem instead of a financial literacy problem, where financial wellness is defined to be “a field that encourages people to make healthy financial decisions.”

A popular policy response to financial decision errors is and has been financial literacy education. Traditional financial literacy education is problematic, having at best limited success and mixed efficacy. One problem is that perceived, instead

357. Niklas Karlsson et al., The Ostrich Effect: Selective Attention to Information, 38 J. RISK & UNCERTAINTY 95, 104-10 (2009) (presenting this evidence).
358. Tali Sharot et al., How Unrealistic Optimism is Maintained in the Face of Reality, 14 NATURE NEUROSCI. 1475 (2011).
361. Id.
of actual, financial literacy may drive good financial behavior. Another problem is due to whether financial literacy is manipulated by experimental and quasi-experimental manipulations, or is measured instead by the percentage of correct answers on particular tests of financial knowledge. Professors Daniel Fernandes, John G. Lynch, Jr., and Richard G. Netemeyer conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship of financial literacy and of financial education to financial behaviors. They found that interventions to improve financial literacy explained only 0.1% of the variance in financial behaviors that were studied, with weaker effects in low-income samples. The financial behaviors they studied included putting aside savings for an emergency fund, figuring how much savings is required for retirement, investing in individual stocks or mutual funds, buying savings bonds or other bonds, and not incurring check bouncing fees and late credit card payment fees. As with other types of education, the benefits of financial education also decayed over time. Even a large number of hours of financial education have negligible effects on behavior 20 months or more afterwards. The authors of this research also conducted three empirical studies and found “that the partial effects of financial literacy diminish dramatically when one controls for psychological traits that have been omitted in prior research or when one uses an instrument for financial literacy to control for omitted variables.”

The four traits analyzed were numeracy, propensity to plan, confidence in information search, and willingness to take investment risks. The instrumental variable used to control for omitted variables was Need for Cognition, “a stable personality trait referring to a person’s tendencies to engage in effortful thought, to entertain and evaluate ideas, and to ignore irrelevant information.”

Fernandes, Lynch, and Netemeyer cautioned that:

Our conclusions are about forms of financial education that have been subjected to empirical evaluation. Those wishing to draw policy conclusions from our work must understand that many innovative forms of financial education have never been studied empirically. That said, our findings for the interventions studied so far make clear that different approaches to financial education are required if one
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expects to produce effects on behavior larger than the very small effects we found.\textsuperscript{374}

Different and novel approaches to financial literacy education include "interactive games and tutorials, peer-to-peer mentoring, and financial literacy contests."\textsuperscript{375} A non-profit foundation advocating for consumers, the FoolProof Foundation, developed a novel and broad form of financial literacy education at its website, FoolProofMe.com,\textsuperscript{376} which teaches defensive thinking. This foundation also initiated the Walter Cronkite Project,\textsuperscript{377} providing a free, turnkey-for-teachers, advertising-free, and web-based 22-hour financial literacy curriculum, which teaches caution and defensive spending skills. It would be interesting to empirically study these innovative versions of financial literacy education.

Fernandes, Lynch, and Netemeyer also propose JIT or "Just In Time" financial education tied to help specific behaviors,\textsuperscript{378} "such as buying a car or a home or making an asset allocation decision in a defined contribution retirement plan."\textsuperscript{379} They also suggest teaching "soft skills like propensity to plan, confidence to be proactive, and willingness to take investment risks more than content knowledge about compound interest, bonds, etc."\textsuperscript{380} This Article advocates and analyzes teaching people about adopting thinking technologies and practice mindfulness, both of which are related to such soft skills.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{374} Id. at 1873.
\item \textsuperscript{376} http://www.foolproofme.com/about.
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\end{itemize}
III. Changing Americans’ Thinking About Retirement

In an interview on a WNPR show, which featured Nobel economist Robert Shiller and the third edition of his best selling book, Irrational Exuberance, I remarked that we, as kids, were often told to put on our thinking caps (especially when we were solving arithmetic or algebra problems) and asked why do we ever take off our thinking caps. Today, people can put on a literal thinking cap that is a transcranial direct current stimulation device. Yet, in a survey of time use, 83% of American adults reported spending no time whatsoever “relaxing or thinking.” Evidence from eleven experimental studies finds that college students “typically did not enjoy spending 6 to 15 minutes in a room by themselves with nothing to do but think, that they enjoyed doing mundane external activities much more, and that many preferred to administer electric shocks to themselves instead of being left alone with their thoughts.” Apparently, some “humans tend to be cognitively lazy and often try to avoid thinking altogether” and for some, “thinking smartly—or even at all—is a challenge.” What is the optimal amount of thinking and what are the optimal number of factors to consider in thinking are two central questions that machine learning researchers and statisticians analyze in studying the problem they call “overfitting.”

Different kinds of assumptions about how people typically behave and what motivates people’s behavior imply different roles government should have in Americans’ retirement planning. This Article adopts the conventional view of many economists, in which finance “is sometimes defined as the subfield of economics
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concerned with intertemporal and portfolio decisions.”

In other words, finance is the subfield of economics that analyzes human behavior over time and under risk. This Article uses the phrase behavioral sciences to mean behavioral economics, behavioral finance, neuroscience, and psychology. Existing or proposed government policies to help Americans plan for and save towards retirement are based on economic theory and the behavioral sciences.

This Article introduces a cognitive approach to achieving retirement prosperity by drawing on cognitive economics, defined as “the economics of what is in people’s minds.” Cognitive economics differs from, and is narrower in scope than, behavioral economics. This Article exemplifies a new field, namely that of cognitive law and economics, to analyze how and why law can and should take into account people’s cognition in designing retirement policy. Behavioral law and economics, true to its name, focuses on how and why law can and should change people’s behavior to improve the outcomes of their decision-making, without necessarily changing or improving people’s cognition or decision-making processes.

A central theme of cognitive economics is finite cognition, where cognition is defined as “all of the other operations of the human mind besides the bare recording and accessing of information.” The finiteness of cognition “means something more than just imperfect information—it means finite intelligence, imperfect information processing, and decision-making that is costly.” Human cognition being finite has “enormous practical consequences and policy implications. In particular, finite cognition implies that even in the absence of externalities, welfare can often be improved by economic education, setting up appropriate default choices for people, or providing disinterested, credible advice.” The notion “that human intelligence is finite and that finite intelligence matters for economic life (scarce cognition) is not really
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Lawyers, certified financial analysts, and accountants are all able to earn livings because people do not have infinite, unlimited intelligence. In fact, the same is true of engineers, physicians, surgeons, teachers, professors, and other professionals possessing expertise and specialized knowledge. Among "the most important economic manifestations of finite intelligence is the expensive and time-consuming acquisition of human capital." Finite cognition also means that people "can't be expected to recognize and analyze all the aspects in each person, event, and situation" Thus, finite cognition implies that "people can't analyze every decision fully; it's just not possible: people need heuristics to get through life."

People in reality differ from Keanu Reeves' fictional character, Neo, in the futuristic science fiction movie The Matrix, who stated "I know kung fu" mere seconds after that martial art is uploaded into his brain. Another central theme of cognitive economics is that "[h]eterogeneity across individuals in preferences and cognitive ability is not at all controversial." A particular implication of this theme is that people differ in how finite their cognition is and how much they enjoy learning. An individual's willingness to learn depends on whether that individual believes their intelligence is fixed or malleable. Educational research about learning underscores the importance of people adopting growth rather than fixed mindsets about decision-making skills, including mathematical thinking.

Co-founder of the Civility Project at Johns Hopkins, Professor Forni advocates for cultivating the art of thinking because changing how people think can improve their daily lives. Forni quotes Norman Cousins, a political journalist, author, professor, and world peace advocate: "We in America have everything we need except the most
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important thing of all — time to think and the habit of thought.” Forni laments the lack of instruction about decision-making:

I wish I could tell you that I had the good fortune of undergoing a solid home training in decision making, but I did not. I wish that just one of my teachers had managed to impress upon me and my schoolmates that being happy depends upon making sound choices, that he or she had taught us how to choose well, and that we had gotten it, really gotten it. What a legacy that would have been!

The Decision Education Foundation, which is a non-profit organization in Palo Alto, California, works with students, teachers, and schools to provide training in decision skills. A number of psychologists and decision theorists have proposed various programs to teach adolescents how to improve their decision-making skills and expand their understanding of how other people make decisions. Larry Summers, an economist, former Harvard University president, and former United States secretary of the Treasury, stated, “when many people were involved in surveying land, it made sense to require that almost every student entering a top college know something of trigonometry. Today, a basic grounding in probability statistics and decision analysis makes far more sense.”

Gerd Gigerenzer, director of the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, director of the Harding Center for Risk Literacy, and psychologist, and his co-authors advocate that societies “increase physician statistical literacy through training in medical school and continuing medical education.” In a book chapter titled Teaching Clear Thinking, Gigerenzer advocates teaching statistical thinking to teenagers, utilizing “intuitively understandable representations of numbers.” Gigerenzer advocates reforming schools and universities to improve kid’s numeracy skills and
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basic statistical literacy: "we need to change school curricula. Our children learn the mathematics of certainty, such as geometry and trigonometry, but not the mathematics of uncertainty, that is, statistical thinking. Statistical literacy should be taught as early as reading and writing are." More recently, in another book chapter titled Revolutionize School, Gigerenzer advocates teaching a risk literacy curriculum, that includes these three topics: health literacy, financial literacy, and digital literacy, and these three skills for mastering each topic: statistical thinking, rules of thumb, and the psychology of risk.

Professor Richard Nisbett, psychologist and co-director of the Culture and Cognition program at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, wrote a book titled Mindware: Tools for Smart Thinking. His book demonstrates how people can avoid reasoning errors by applying to everyday life such principles and concepts as cost-benefit analysis, sunk costs and opportunity cost, dialectical reasoning, and statistical reasoning. There is experimental evidence that even a 25-minute training session on statistical reasoning (specifically, the law of large numbers) significantly increased the frequency and quality of people applying statistical reasoning to a wide range of everyday life problems that were outside the context of the training.

Recent experimental research studies provide evidence that numeric ability is a "robust predictor of superior decision-making across multiple tasks and outcomes." A study found only a third of Americans understand how compound interest works. Not appreciating how compound interest works in contrast with simple interest can lead households to save too little and too late for retirement in addition to pay too much in 401(k) fees.
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Most law students in my courses titled Economic Analysis of Law, Financial Decision-Making, and Legal Ethics and Professionalism: Business Law Issues are surprised when they learn about how early they should start saving for retirement because of the nonlinearity of compound interest and exponential growth. An experimental study of law students found that substantive legal analysis, legal judgment, and legal advice can vary significantly with numeracy. Law professor Lisa Milot documents how many lawyers misapply mathematical principles, explains why lawyer innumeracy matters, differentiates objective innumeracy (due to a lack of mathematical competence) from subjective innumeracy (due to a lack of mathematical confidence), and advocates practical ways that law professors, law students, law schools, and lawyers can overcome legal innumeracy.

Actress Danica McKellar wrote a series of New York Times bestselling books teaching mathematics in a fun and relevant way to teenage girls. This Article supports requiring all middle school and high school students take a course in financial decision-making. McKellar’s and others’ efforts to teach people in general and such particular audiences as teenagers, medical students, and law students in particular about mathematical reasoning and numeracy are laudable. Teaching people to be more numerate is not a panacea for thinking errors because of motivated numeracy. Because of math anxiety and the myth that some people are just not math people, there has been and will be resistance towards efforts at increasing people’s numeracy and statistical literacy. There should be less resistance towards efforts at increasing people’s appropriateness, quality, and quantity of thinking because few people are likely to claim they are just not thinking people.
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Two economics Nobel laureates, George Akerlof442 and Robert Shiller,443 analyze the economics of deception and manipulation.444 They explain that if people have a weakness from which businesses can earn unusual profits, then at least one business will do so.445 They provide the memorable and visceral example of people's irresistible attraction to the scent of cinnamon explaining the smell of Cinnabon pastries wafting through many shopping mall food courts.446 Businesses in unregulated free markets can and will profit by catering to people's weaknesses and satisfying their perhaps endogenously manipulated preferences. For example, in dealing with their personal finances, people fall prey to among other practices these three: "[m]isleading accounting, media hype, investor sales pitches."447 Some practices, such as misleading accounting, are deceptive, fraudulent, and regulated by securities law. Other practices, such as manipulation, have many shades and often are not regulated.448

In addition to regulating businesses, governments can and should empower people to become more resistant to even legal manipulation. In the movie Star Wars Episode IV: A New Hope,449 Obi-Wan Kenobi famously says "[t]hese aren't the droids you're looking for" and "[t]he Force can have a strong influence on the weak-minded." In Star Wars Episode VI: Return of the Jedi,450 Jabba the Hutt scolds an underling for being susceptible to a Jedi mind trick.451 People can adopt thinking tools, practice mindfulness, and change social norms to counter and repel the attempts of any business, group, organization, or person intending to deceive, defraud, or manipulate people by using mind tricks. This section of the Article advocates and analyzes changing Americans' thinking about retirement.
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A. Thinking Architecture

A reason for poor or no retirement planning is a lack of careful or clear thinking, which in turn leaves one vulnerable to impulsiveness, short-sightedness, neglect of probabilities, and many other cognitive biases. In the movie, *Bridge of Spies*, a character says: “Sometimes people think wrong. People are people.” People can utilize thinking tools to help them think better and more systematically about retirement. Pens, pencils, sheets of paper, electronic tablets, and smartphones are familiar examples of thinking tools. A humorous television commercial states: “[t]he wrong tools can only take you so far.”

Thinking tools that people may be unfamiliar with are thinking architecture and thinking technologies. Professors Shlomo Benartzi and John Payne define the phrase thinking architecture to be “a structured process that allows us to break down a complex problem, such as what to do in retirement, into a series of manageable thinking steps, so as to improve outcomes.” They explain that what makes thinking architecture different from traditional checklists is that each of the steps in thinking architecture “is designed to deal with a particular behavioral challenge or mental blind spot . . . to fortify the weakest parts of the mind.”

An example of thinking architecture is Benartzi’s Goal Planning System (GPS), which consists of a sequence of cognitive strategies: (1) identify your goals, (2) discover blind spots, (3) prioritize your goals, (4) think beyond one future, (5) recognize the limits of forecasting, (6) consider others’ perspectives, and (7) reprioritize goals. Each of these seven decision heuristics is designed to address and mitigate a particular thinking trap, namely: (1) fast thinking and narrow framing, (2) insufficient breadth and depth of cognitive processing, or narrow and shallow
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thinking, (3) cognitive and emotional difficulties of making trade-offs, (4) overconfidence in abilities to predict the future, (5) difficulties in predicting future emotions, tastes, and preferences, (6) focusing on our uniqueness and overconfidence in abilities to predict our future, and (7) anchoring and status quo bias.

Identifying your goals helps you avoid focusing on alternatives that you are faced with and instead helps you to focus on your underlying true core values. Discovering blind spots helps you find important goals missing from step (1). Prioritizing your goals helps you make trade-offs by dividing your goals into most important, moderately important, and least important. Thinking beyond one future helps you to avoid narrow thinking in prediction and can be accomplished by the thinking tool of prospective hindsight, which asks you to assume that some future event has already occurred and think of reasons why it happened. Recognizing the limits of forecasting helps you become aware of how much your feelings, tastes, and preferences can change. Considering others’ perspectives helps people to expand their thinking process about their many possible future selves and future preferences. Reprioritizing goals helps people not be anchored to their prioritization of goals in step (3) by starting fresh with a clean slate. Benartzi and Lewin detail how to apply the series of seven decision heuristics in Benartzi’s GPS thinking architecture to improve retirement planning.

Benartzi and Lewin also illustrate how to apply the series of seven decision heuristics in Benartzi’s GPS thinking architecture to make decisions about buying a home and choose about where and with whom to live. An additional benefit of teaching people about how to utilize thinking tools is that doing so is likely to promote metacognition, which is the ability to think about our knowledge acquisition and thinking. Metacognition is a skill that educators often hope to transfer to learners and forms an important part of being a self-learner. An example of metacognition is provided by these lyrics from the song Love Me Like You Do from the movie Fifty Shades of Grey: “I’ll let you set the pace. ’Cause I’m not thinking straight. My head’s spinning around I can’t see clear no more.”

Another example of thinking architecture, due to Stanford business School professor Chip Heath and Duke University professor Dan Heath, is known as the
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WRAP decision process, which consists of these four heuristics: (1) Widen your options, (2) Reality-test your assumptions, (3) Attain distance before deciding, and (4) Prepare to be wrong. Each heuristic is designed to address and mitigate a particular well-known cognitive bias, namely: (1) narrow framing of a decision problem; (2) confirmation bias of gathering biased and supportive information; (3) temptation of short-term emotions; and (4) overconfidence about abilities to predict our future. The Heaths offer multiple ways of implementing each step in their WRAP procedure. A way to widen your options is via the Vanishing Options Test, where you ask what else can you do if your current options all vanish. A way to reality-test your assumptions is to specifically consider the opposite of your initial beliefs. A way to attain distance before deciding is by utilizing the 10/10/10 rule, which asks you to consider how you will feel about some decision in 10 minutes, 10 months, and 10 years. Many people found the 10/10/10 heuristic very helpful in diverse situations: “Heartfelt emails and letters soon poured in” from those who applied 10/10/10 “in decisions large and small and in-between, at home and at work, and in love, friendship, and parenting.” Another way to attain distance before deciding is to ask what you would recommend to your best friend. A way to prepare to be wrong is to mentally rehearse what could go wrong and simulate how you would respond. The Heaths illustrate all of the above and other ways to apply their WRAP process to many professional and personal situations, demonstrating the efficacy, generality, and scope of the WRAP thinking architecture.

Each of the thinking heuristics of the WRAP process is applicable to retirement. For example, widening your options prompts one to actively think about some of the
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many ways to spend time in retirement.\textsuperscript{484} Reality testing assumptions reminds one to ask whether beliefs about retirement investments are overly optimistic. Attaining distance before deciding may help one avoid impulse purchases and so consume less today and save more for tomorrow. Preparing to be wrong may cause one to plan for an economic downturn just before retirement.

B. Thinking Technology

Thinking architecture is a low technology version of thinking technology. Other examples of thinking technologies include computer hardware, software, and video games that assist human thinking processes. Examples of thinking technology that can improve retirement planning includes utilizing financial entertainment computer video games to help people learn basic financial skills\textsuperscript{485} and utilizing what are known as serious games to help people learn about cognitive biases and improve their decision-making. The play aspect of both of these categories of games may also make it more likely that people are both able to acquire trained skills and motivated to utilize trained skills. Technological decision support can take the form of thinking architecture apps.\textsuperscript{486} Mobile apps could provide checklists, record and remind people about their own predicted versus actual behavior, and help people have greater awareness of various aspects of choices they face. There is a free iPad app version of Shlomo Benartzi’s GPS thinking architecture applied to retirement planning.\textsuperscript{487} Benartzi and psychologist John Payne also created a Loss Aversion Calculator that measures how much more strongly one experiences losses relative to gains.\textsuperscript{488} Yaron Levi and Shlomo Benartzi found that after people started using a mobile financial app that provides a real time dashboard with a user’s net worth, income, and spending, people’s spending decreased 15.7% on average during the four months after the app was installed relative to the three months before the app was installed.\textsuperscript{489}

A humorous television commercial states that while you are likely to see taxes as being negative, like getting punched in the face by a person wearing a red boxing glove, qualified professionals from an online tax service see taxes as being positive, 

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{484} See also Soll et al., supra note 103, at 944 fig.33.1.
\item \textsuperscript{485} Shefrin, supra note 15, at 22.
\item \textsuperscript{486} Shlomo Benartzi with Jonah Lehrer, The Smarter Screen: Surprising Ways to Influence and Improve Online Behavior 202--4 (2015); see also Benartzi & Lehrer, supra note 278, at 199--207 (providing details).
\item \textsuperscript{487} Benartzi & Lehrer, supra note 486, at 204--7; see also Retirement Goal Planning System iPad® App, Allianz Global Investors, http://befi.allianzgi.com/en/retirement-goal-planning-system/Pages/Goal-Planning-System-Application.aspx. ([date accessed]).
\item \textsuperscript{488} Benartzi with Lehrer, 202--4 (2015); Benartzi & Lewin, supra note 387, at 123--24; http://www.digitai.org/#lab.
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like images of puppies and unicorns.\textsuperscript{490} Another television commercial states: “Not having your taxes done taxing you? Live More. Tax Less.”\textsuperscript{491} The logic of this marketing strategy leads to the conclusion that societies should strive to make financial and retirement planning less emotionally negative. Societies can accomplish this by providing or subsidizing financial, investment, and retirement planning advice that large employers and retirement plan providers currently receive from such firms as Financial Engines,\textsuperscript{492} which was co-founded by 1990 economics Nobel laureate William Sharpe.\textsuperscript{493} Societies can also subsidize the use of financial/retirement planning software, such as ESPlanner (Economic Security Planner).\textsuperscript{494}

People’s current lifestyle experiences are easily accessible and tangible in contrast with their future retirement lifestyle experiences, meaning a tangibility gap exists.\textsuperscript{495} Shlomo Benartzi proposed a future lifestyle imagination exercise to close this tangibility gap.\textsuperscript{496} In the first two minutes, people imagine a financially secure future. In the second two minutes, people write down whatever comes to mind in terms of their tangible lifestyle and their emotional reactions. This imagination exercise takes people who are too present-focused back to the future. Neuroimaging research supports the future self-continuity hypothesis,\textsuperscript{497} that people perceive and treat their future selves differently from their present selves, and therefore may not save for their future.\textsuperscript{498} People’s current selves do not identify with their future selves, meaning an identity gap.\textsuperscript{499} People’s current selves also place more weight on their current feelings than the feelings of their future selves, meaning an empathy gap.\textsuperscript{500} A new thinking technology involving age morphing digital technology applied to people’s faces helped people’s current selves identify and empathize with their future selves.\textsuperscript{501}

\textsuperscript{490} https://www.facebook.com/taxbrainfans/videos/10150202831887354/.
\textsuperscript{491} Bay Tiger, TaxBrain TV Commercial, YouTube (May 26, 2010), http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bWMr5NfdKQA.
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experimental studies found that people who interacted with realistic age-morphed virtual computer renderings of their future selves were willing to hold out for larger, later monetary rewards instead of accepting smaller, immediate ones. Virtual reality simulations can improve the accuracy of people’s perceptions of their future selves by helping people learn how their current decisions and behavior shape their future selves.

In the movie WarGames, a United States military supercomputer known as WOPR (War Operation Plan Response), that is also nicknamed Joshua, famously asks a young hacker named David Lightman: “Shall we play a game?” Playing video games can have educational benefits. By playing video games, children can improve their problem solving abilities and learn to think in novel ways. Games, video and otherwise, can enable people to lead more joyful and productive lives.

Intriguingly, playing video games may help improve people’s financial confidence, decision-making, knowledge, self-efficacy, and initiating financial actions. In the video game, Bite Club, a player takes on the role of a vampire who manages a bar for other vampires and saves money for their own retirement. A randomized control trial found that Bite Club players learned as much financial knowledge as those who had been assigned to read an informational pamphlet. Other financial video games include: Celebrity Calamity, where players are money managers who try to keep a Hollywood starlet happy by keeping her out of debt; Farm
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Blitz, where players harvest crops from a farm while staving off ravenous rabbits which represent debt, and Refund Rush, where players are financial advisors who help clients decide what to do with their tax refunds. These examples demonstrate that it is possible to design engaging and fun video games that draw upon popular culture to teach players decision-making principles and financial concepts.

Serious games “have an explicit and carefully thought-out educational purpose and are not intended to be played primarily for amusement.” Several research groups have designed serious games that train players to recognize and mitigate three cognitive biases in decision-making. One of these biases is the confirmation bias, which can occur in retirement planning, as discussed earlier. Another of these biases is bias blind spot, which is a tendency people have to see biases in others and not in themselves. The bias blind spot can show up in many contexts including retirement planning when people can see others being biased in their retirement planning and can not see themselves being biased in their retirement planning.

One group designed a video adventure game called Missing: The Pursuit of Terry Hughes, that combines the rich, immersive qualities of entertainment software with a host of training activities on cognitive bias recognition and mitigation incorporated into game play. Players “can examine different objects, meet and question non-player characters, use a smartphone to take pictures and communicate, and navigate in the scenario.” A study found that playing Missing effectively trained adults to identify and mitigate confirmation bias, bias blind spot, and fundamental attribution error (“assuming that another person’s behavior must stem from personal characteristics while overlooking the potential impact of situational influences”). This game “allows players to generalize their learning across different problems and portions of the game to other biases.” An independent validation and verification team unaffiliated with the game’s designers conducted external tests on college students and intelligence analysts. This game was significantly more effective at
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teaching students and analysts to recognize mitigate cognitive biases when compared to control groups that watched an educational video about cognitive biases. Of the players who completed follow-up testing after eight weeks, this effect continued for students and not for analysts.

Another version of the game, Missing: The Final Secret gave players to recognize and mitigate three different cognitive biases: anchoring bias ("overweighting the first information primed or considered in subsequent judgment"), representativeness bias ("using the similarity of an outcome to a prototypical outcome to judge its probability"), and social projection bias ("assuming others' emotions, thoughts, and values are similar to one's own"). This version followed a similar genre, narrative arc, and structure as Missing: The Pursuit of Terry Hughes. Playing this version of Missing produced immediate medium to large debiasing effects that persisted at least 2 months later and greater effects than watching instructional videos immediately and 2 months later. These results "suggest that even a single training intervention... can have significant debiasing effects that persist across a variety of contexts affected by the same bias." The anchoring bias occurs in the retirement context whenever people do not sufficiently weigh subsequently primed or considered information when making retirement plans. The representativeness bias occurs in the retirement context whenever people misjudge the probabilities of retirement outcomes based on their similarities to some prototypical retirement outcome.

Another set of researchers designed Hueristica, a 3D immersive serious game in which players compete to command a space station on which there is tension between androids and humans. Hueristica players improved their abilities to learn and mitigate confirmation bias, fundamental attribution error, and bias blind spot. Heuristica players also improved their abilities to learn and mitigate anchoring bias,
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representativeness bias, and social projection bias.\textsuperscript{531} \textit{Hueristica}, which is based on Gigerenzer and Todd’s work on simple heuristics, focuses on training players to recognize situational cues, such as ambiguous information and limited information, rather than warning players about each bias. Because \textit{Hueristica} occurs in an outer space setting, its training should apply to general audiences. A third group of researchers designed a single-player, 30-minute puzzle serious game, CYCLES Training Center,\textsuperscript{532} to teach players to recognize and mitigate cognitive biases.\textsuperscript{533} An interesting question is whether playing these serious games helps people plan better for and save more for their retirement.

C. Thinking Mindfully

A reason why some people do no retirement planning is that when they are young, they behave mindlessly and without much awareness, as if their behavior were on automatic pilot. Psychologist Jonathan Baron makes the case “that one main problem with our thinking and decision making is that much of it suffers from a lack of \textit{active open-mindedness}. We ignore possibilities, evidence, and goals that we ought to consider, and we make inferences in ways that protect our favored ideas.”\textsuperscript{534} This problem suggests thinking mindfully would help retirement planning. Many decisions affect people’s retirement, including how much people consume, save, and invest when young; when people retire; and how, where, and with whom people spend their retirement. People can make all of these decisions mindfully. Mindfulness can help one to align spending with values\textsuperscript{535} and keep to a budget.\textsuperscript{536}

\begin{itemize}
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Professors Natalia Karelaia and Jochen Reb analyzed how, when, and why mindfulness can improve people’s decision-making. They divided decision-making into four stages: (1) Decision Framing, (2) Information Gathering and Processing, (3) Making Conclusions, and (4) Learning from Feedback. Mindfulness can improve people’s personal financial decision-making processes. Huang explains how thinking mindfully offers real options in any situation, including retirement planning, to consciously, deliberatively, and thoughtfully respond instead of automatically, reflexively, and unconsciously react. Thinking mindfully is related to the Heath brothers’ WRAP decision-making heuristics. In the language of simple heuristics, mindfulness provides its practitioner with real options to determine if the decision heuristics being employed are appropriate for the environment one is facing and if not to employ other more appropriate decision heuristics.

A basic question is how can people improve their decision-making. In an insightful user’s guide to debiasing, decision researchers and professors Jack B. Soll, Katherine L. Milkman, and John W. Payne refer to decision readiness as “whether an individual is in a position to make a good decision in a particular situation.” They describe a person as being decision ready when a person’s slow or system 2 thinking is ready to monitor a person’s fast or system 1 thinking, suspend wrong judgments, and correct wrong decisions. Soll, Milkman, and Payne emphasize three determinants of decision readiness: fatigue and distraction effects that limit capacity, visceral influences related to one’s physical and emotional state, and individual differences in ability and thinking style. Being mindful addresses each of these aspects of decision readiness because practicing mindfulness helps people be aware of their being fatigued or distracted, be aware of visceral influences upon them, and be more likely to adopt a more reflective thinking style.

These researchers also divide efforts at debiasing people’s decision-making into modifying people, modifying decision-making environments, or modifying both.
Modifying a person occurs through teaching that person or providing her with strategies and tools, while modifying an environment aims to have a better match to what people normally do without assistance, or encourages better thinking. The first approach equips people with knowledge and tools to mitigate cognitive limitations and emotional dispositions. This approach includes educating people and introducing people to formal (meaning mathematical) decision aids, heuristics, and thinking strategies. Educating people about utilizing thinking tools, practicing mindfulness, and new social norms modifies people.

The second approach changes decision-making environments to better match decision strategies people naturally apply or encourage better thinking about what decision strategies to use. This approach accepts the existence of a cognitive bias and attempts to alter decision-making environments so that cognitive bias becomes irrelevant or perhaps can even be used to achieve a better outcome. Exemplars of this approach are choice architecture and information architecture, which may even use one bias to combat or offset another bias. Proponents of modifying decision makers are more optimistic about people's abilities and motivations to learn decision-making skills than proponents of modifying decision environments.

A famous episode of the iconic Star Trek: The Original Series, Space Seed, introduced a fictional character named Khan, a genetically engineered superhuman, who became the central villain in the movie Star Trek II. Khan argues to Captain Kirk that genetically modified, improved, and enhanced humans are superior to genetically unmodified humans equipped with modified, improved, and enhanced technology. In comparing modifying decision-makers to modifying decision environments, we do not have to deal with the many thorny ethical, legal, and social issues that genetic engineering raises. Modifying decision-makers can be substitutes or complements to modifying decision environments.

Neuroscientist Richard Davidson, founder of the Center for Investigating Healthy Minds, and Kurt Squire, director of the Games Learning Society Initiative, are designing and testing prototypes of two types of games “to help eighth graders develop beneficial social and emotional skills — empathy, cooperation, mental focus, ...
and self-regulation." The first type of game focuses on "improving attention and mental focus, likely through breath awareness." This type of game can help individuals think more mindfully. The second type of game focuses "on social behaviors such as kindness, compassion, and altruism." In a version of the second game called *Crystals of Kaydor*, a player is "an advanced robot created to explore and learn, who crash lands on an alien planet" discovering "flora, fauna, and local residents" helping "them solve problems by interpreting body language and nonverbal cues" such as facial expressions and body language. The game "[m]issions reward cooperation and generosity to facilitate the development of prosocial behavior." This type of game may help individuals become more self-compassionate and emotionally intelligent, which in turn may lead to more mindful retirement decisions.

D. Thinking Societally

America’s current Do-It-Yourself (DIY) highly individualistic approach to retirement planning is most likely to result in a financial and well-being crisis for all but a very few knowledgeable or wealthy Americans. Professor Birdthistle cogently notes America’s retirement system has undergone "a massive change with almost zero commensurate change to educate people about how to do this. . . . A lot of people won’t do well in this system and all the studies have suggested it’s not going well.” Birdthistle notes “[e]ven if you were an incredibly well-informed investor and paid a great deal of attention, it’s very hard to succeed in this system.”

Many Americans like the idea of DIY retirement planning because it resonates with many emotionally reassuring notions in American popular culture, including American exceptionalism, American individualism, autonomy, empowerment,
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freedom of choice, self-sufficiency, and the iconic picture of the lone Marlboro Man, who looked self-reliant and rugged (all while he smoked his way to cancer). People love to feel they have competence about and are in control of their lives, including the financial aspects of their lives. Many people's relationships with money are rooted in their personal emotional histories and psychological experiences.

Unfortunately, there are many predictable difficulties with DIY retirement planning. First, people often rely on their financial intuitions instead of financial knowledge. While people shop for low priced bargains, when it comes to mutual funds people wrongly believe that being charged higher fees are a signal of better quality management and higher portfolio returns. As Birdthistle states, "mutual funds are a very unusual market; it's one of the only types where price and performance are inversely correlated. That's hard to get your head around."

Second, people like lots of alternatives from which to choose, as is the case with buffets. Empirical research finds that having lots of mutual funds from which to choose in an employee's 401(k) plan is likely to lead to suboptimal investing. A third problem is that unlike all-you-care-to-eat food buffets, employees pay fees for each mutual fund in which they invest. Another problem is the high fees that about 90% of mutual funds charge. Birdthistle observes that "of the 8,000 funds, about 7,700 are actively managed. And anything with active management is a disaster for investors [due to higher fees and their inability to outperform the market consistently]." Birdthistle cautions that, "you should immediately remove about 90% of funds from a prudent investor's retirement portfolio." An apt analogy is that if 90% of the food choices on the menu of a restaurant are overpriced and/or dominated by the other 10% in terms of taste or nutrition, then should not society remove those menu alternatives to ensure that customers do not mistakenly choose them? Should a society in the name
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of autonomy, competitive markets, free enterprise, and personal freedom let people unknowingly buy dominated and overpriced food or mutual funds?

The above paragraph begs the question of why anybody would knowingly invest in actively managed mutual funds.\textsuperscript{579} The answer is that people like the idea of "active management" because it sounds like a team of experts is taking care of your mutual fund investment 24/7. People do not like the idea of "passive management" because it sounds like someone is sleeping on the job or being sluggish in taking care of your mutual fund investment. The reality is that active fund managers are guessing at picking winning investments because nobody knows the future, except for time travelers. Although many Americans now heed the advice to invest in index funds,\textsuperscript{580} misconceptions about index funds persist.\textsuperscript{581} Additionally, many Americans are investing in TDFs, some of which those Americans may not realize contain actively managed funds.\textsuperscript{582}

Before the passage of Social Security, the American social norm about retirement was one in which Americans were individually responsible for planning and saving towards retirement. The current American social norm about retirement is one in which Americans mandatorily participate in the Social Security system and are otherwise individually responsible for planning and saving towards retirement. This social norm is rooted in a libertarian philosophy of free choice and individual autonomy with a social safety net. This social norm leaves retirement planning up to individual decision-making after mandatory participation in Social Security. Realistically, most Americans will not achieve prosperity under a social norm of "lone wolf" retirement planning plus Social Security. The odds are just stacked against ordinary Americans. In addition to retirement planning and investing being complicated and sometimes counterintuitive, the retirement planning and mutual fund industries actively engage in emotional advertising and opaque disclosures. Unfortunately, there is a lot of money to be made from potential investors being financially confused and mindless. There is less money to be made from potential investors being financially knowledgeable and mindful. What is even worse is that people typically do not know they do not know enough to realistically and sensibly plan for retirement. Most Americans have no desire to learn any of the intricacies of theoretical, empirical, and experimental financial economics.

\textsuperscript{579} BIRDTHISTLE, supra note 112, at 26.
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A third social norm is that of societally responsible retirement as opposed to individually responsible retirement. Effective retirement planning is a public good. Ineffective retirement planning is a public bad. There are well-known economies of scale in retirement planning. Although the norm of individually responsible retirement planning is a charming and quaint notion, it likely will result in most Americans retiring into poverty and suffering. The belief that people should be individually responsible for their retirement planning is misguided and contradicts empirical data and experimental evidence about human behavior. Evidence from neoclassical finance and behavioral finance supports buying and holding a well-diversified portfolio, such as an index fund, dominates trying yourself to, and/or paying a lot of money to active fund managers to try to, pick winning stocks and avoid losing stocks. A norm of societally responsible retirement planning implies the American federal government should introduce a universal, mandatory, employee- and employer-financed, and societally managed retirement savings program. Such a program can and should learn from the experiences of Australia’s Superannuation Guarantee retirement system and experiences with individual retirement accounts of such other countries as Canada, Chile, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Such a program could also require only that employers facilitate their employees’ contributions by payroll withholding and even eliminate employers as intermediaries in creating and administering retirement plans. Such a program could and should replace our anemic Social Security system.

CONCLUSIONS

This Article analyzed three causes of the looming American retirement crisis and many existing and proposed policy responses. There are many ways in which people can mess up retirement, including saving too little, investing non-optimally, claiming Social Security too early, and outliving their savings. The reasons things can go wrong are varied also, including finite cognition, information overload, and outright fraud. Because of this multiplicity of retirement problems and causes, no one magic bullet policy prescription can or will fix all the possible problems by addressing all the possible causes. Additionally, because people differ in many ways, including

586. Id. at 678.
Achieving American Retirement Prosperity

education, income, and technological access, some policies will help some more than others retire better.

Legislation that can help some Americans retire better includes the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule, banning (or the SEC pursuing enforcement actions against\textsuperscript{587}) high-fee index funds, credentialing financial advisors, mandating employers to provide a day of time off annually for employees to engage in retirement planning, and requiring financial licenses for those who desire to choose non-QDIAAs as retirement investments.\textsuperscript{588} Automating, defaulting, and nudging certain decisions can help some Americans retire better including standardizing retirement investment alternatives, fees, forms, and policies.\textsuperscript{589} Education that can help some Americans retire better includes the federal government engaging in public informational campaigns about how Americans can better think about retirement; funding research, development, and testing of educational thinking apps and serious games; the Department of Education providing such apps and games to schools; and the Department of Education changing American middle school and high school mathematics curricula to require teaching decision-making and probability/statistics in place of geometry and trigonometry.

This Article advocates the American federal government help Americans improve their decision-making and thinking about retirement by educating Americans about and subsidizing: (1) thinking architecture, such as Shlomo Benartzi's Goal Planning System process and Chip Heath and Dan Heath's WRAP heuristics procedure, (2) thinking technologies, such as thinking apps, financial entertainment games, and serious games about decision-making, (3) thinking mindfully about how to become financially ready for, and what to do in, retirement, and (4) thinking more societally about retirement planning to change the social norm in America from individually responsible retirement planning to societally responsible retirement planning.

It may seem there is a tension among the last of the above policy proposals and the other three because thinking more societally about retirement planning leads to paternalistic retirement planning based upon the reality that most Americans are neither cognitively equipped to, nor motivated to learn about how to, pursue effective individual retirement planning. And yet all three other policy proposals aim still to improve Americans' cognitive skills. There is no contradiction because this Article does not advocate educating everybody to become (applied) mathematicians, (financial) economists, and (business or tax) lawyers. Because the Article does not advocate such unrealistic goals, this Article advocates the American federal government have professionals do the mathematical, economic, legal, and tax aspects of retirement planning. This Article does advocate educating everybody to become able to think more effectively and systematically by utilizing the thinking tools of
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thinking architecture and thinking technology in addition to think more mindfully. The reason this Article advocates doing so is that people still have to make many personal and qualitative decisions about how they want to live in retirement when experts deal with the legal and quantitative aspects of retirement planning.

The first three of the above policies aim to educate Americans about how to better think individually about retirement planning, retirement, and many other issues. The fourth of the above policies aims to educate Americans to think more societally about retirement planning, not necessarily retirement and many other issues. Most individuals do insufficient or ineffective retirement planning because of a confluence of reasons. First, retirement planning requires financial literacy. Second, retirement planning requires quantitative reasoning. Third, retirement planning has perceived immediate costs (of reducing consumption to fund increased savings) in exchange for distant, uncertain benefits. Fourth, retirement planning has public bad or negative externalities and public good or positive externalities aspects. Fifth, societal retirement planning can insur[e] people against individuals' longevity risks by pooling across people. In these important ways, retirement planning differs from other complex decisions, such as what car to drive, whether to attend college and if so, what college to attend and what subject to major in, where to work and live, whom to marry, and whether to have children.

Finally, it may seem strange this Article advocates and analyzes changing Americans' thinking about retirement instead of changing Americans' behavior and planning about retirement. The reason for this Article's emphasis on changing thinking is akin to economics Nobel Laureate, Kenneth Arrow's insightful discussion about "the real value of putting an item on the agenda." Arrow observed how the Employment Act of 1946 "amounted to nothing more than a statement that full employment was at last on the Federal agenda; and many felt that this was a hollow victory indeed. But those who opposed it so violently were not deceived; in the long run, this recognition was decisive." Similarly, if enough Americans change their thinking about retirement, especially with so many Baby Boomers retiring in the near future, then legislative and regulatory actions that reflect Americans' changed thinking about retirement is likely to follow. After all, as economist John Maynard Keynes famously wrote in his magnum opus:

[T]he ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed, the
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world is ruled by little else. Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually slaves of some defunct economist.  
