

## Why technology jobs belong in America

*Productivity is a powerful reason to hire American workers*

By Harley Lippman

Today up to one-third of all U.S. companies outsource work abroad to save money. Keep in mind there are plenty of hidden expenses with offshore outsourcing, and they add up quickly. Vendor contracts can be complicated and expensive to terminate, and in addition to paying salaries overseas, U.S. businesses still need local managers on hand to supervise work process and quality control. Operating across long distances also requires myriad accommodations, from hiring staff specifically to work off hours to funding frequent and lengthy travel abroad — all of which impact the bottom line while diverting attention and resources away from higher priorities. Regardless of political affiliation, it is hard to argue with President Trump's initiatives to bring jobs back to the U.S. A high priority must be placed on the jobs that offer the greatest longevity to build and sustain the U.S. economy, and those jobs do stem from the technology sector. The focus of Mr. Trump's efforts of bringing jobs back to America seem to center around manufacturing jobs, but instead should be on technology jobs. Corporations that include but are not limited to Apple, Bayer, Amazon and Ford Motors, have vowed to bring jobs back to the U.S. The U.S. must cooperate with these businesses to encourage the training and placement of American citizens in roles that offer strong and long-term jobs, especially those in technology. Technology jobs are the ones that are frequently outsourced. Outsourcing tech work overseas became standard practice for U.S. businesses in the 1990s because it allowed them to grow their labor pool while dramatically slashing payroll. Two decades ago, workers in countries like India cost a fraction of what they did in the United States — about 80 percent less according to Bundeep Rangar, chief executive of the advisory firm Indus-View. Today that differential has slipped to 30 to 40 percent, and it is constantly shrinking as the pay scale in India and throughout South Asia continues to rise. Even with lower labor costs, a powerful advantage to hiring American

workers is productivity. In the IT field, it takes one and a half to two off-shore workers to match the output of a single U.S. worker. This is consistent with a survey of Fortune 500 CIOs, published in the CIO magazine article [cio.com] "U.S. Workers Found to Outperform Offshore Staff," which rated Americans significantly higher on key productivity attributes, such as cultural and communication skills, taking initiative, and being innovative.

This is especially pertinent now as the advent of automated programming reduces the need to outsource repetitive process-oriented tech jobs, and there is growing demand for talent that is adept at abstract thinking and problem solving for business — areas in which American workers excel.

Another factor that favors American workers is that they stay in their jobs longer. High turnover is a chronic problem for businesses that outsource abroad, particularly in the tech field where it can take three to five months to train someone on a project. The 2017 Analytics India Employee Attrition Study puts the average annual employee turnover rate at 24.4 percent, though some sources cite even higher estimates in the 30 to 50 percent range. The knowledge drain from job-hopping is costly and disruptive, and it is little wonder that the likelihood of a project's failure is 30 to 50 percent higher when operating offshore. And of course, there is the paramount issue of security and protecting intellectual property. Data leaks increased 16 percent worldwide from 2015 to 2016 according to a report by InfoWatch, and it is unsettling indeed that many countries ranked low on Transparency International's 2016 Corruption Perceptions Index [transparency.org] are top destinations for IT outsourcing.

Ironically, through the H-1B visa program, our government enables 85,000 foreign nationals to come here every year and take mainly tech jobs even though at home we are experiencing a tech skills shortage. U.S. businesses must keep — or bring back — home-based tech jobs, and establish an environment that is conducive to technological innovation and growth for decades to come.

Harley Lippman is the founder and CEO of Genesis10.

## America's unfriendly skies

*Favors go to private and corporate jet owners over the legitimate interests of other aviators*

By Stephen Moore

Liberals love to portray the Republicans as the party of the rich and powerful. The GOP has tried valiantly to shed that criticism, but then why are so many in the party defending the special interest favors that go to private and corporate jet owners over the interests of all the rest of us? Do Warren Buffett and LeBron James really need a taxpayer subsidy to jet across the country? At issue here is the proposed modernization of the operations and pricing of America's air traffic control system. President Trump has proposed an ATC upgrade that would take the system out of the direct control of the government bureaucracy and convert it into a self-funded, non-profit group. The air traffic control system would become directly accountable to the industry and passengers — not politicians, five congressional committees, and the government bureaucracy. The Clinton administration proposed something very much like this 20 years ago. This would upgrade an air traffic control

» see MOORE | B3



## The Post deserves these four Pinocchios

Its 'fact check' of Jeff Sessions' statement on crime is neither factual nor fair

By Ian D. Prior

In a September 1 "fact check," The Washington Post claimed to evaluate Attorney General Sessions' comments about rising violent crime in the United States. Specifically, this "fact check" is of Mr. Sessions' repeated statements that "violent crime is on the rise in America, especially in our cities." The Post lists several examples of those statements, including, "across the country, violent crime is back with a vengeance," "As you have experienced ... violent crime is on the rise in America," and "As all of you know first-hand, our nation's violent crime rate is rising. In many of our urban areas, this increase is staggering." The factual claim made by Mr. Sessions is that violent crime is rising. Then, Mr. Sessions characterizes that rise as "staggering" and "with a vengeance," both of which are obviously subjective terms to express the astonishing rate of the violent crime increase. The Post immediately follows the attorney general's statements by tacitly admitting their accuracy, before arguing with his use of the word "staggering": "In 2015, the total number of violent crimes increased by 3.9 percent nationwide, and the violent crime rate increased by 3.1 percent nationwide, according to data from the FBI. The increases



ILLUSTRATION BY HUNTER

represent the largest single-year increase in the violent crime rate since 1991, but it is hardly a staggering rise." Despite the fact that the attorney general has traveled across the country talking with the United States Attorney community, members of law enforcement on the front lines, and victims and their families, The Washington Post apparently

believes itself a better gauge of what is staggering than those fighting violent crime or those that have been affected by it. After declaring that the increase in violent crime and its victims are not important enough to generate an opinion that the rise is "staggering," the so-called "fact check" twists Mr. Sessions' statement about crime rising — which is clearly

supported by the data — into a claim of a multi-year trend starting earlier than 2015. This is the definition of a straw man argument, but apparently that passes for "fact checking" at The Washington Post. The Post continues by arguing that one year of data cannot constitute a trend and that some criminologists "recommend using a minimum of three years

to understand crime trends." Let's break this down. In service of a "fact check," the Post admits the accuracy of the attorney general's data but then argues that what some academics recommend as a method of interpretation is equivalent to fact. It would also seem that The Washington Post is advocating that we should just let violent crime continue to rise for a few

more years before doing anything about it. Try explaining to the communities most impacted by skyrocketing homicide rates that they should wait a few more years until a criminology professor has enough data to write an academic article. If the increase in violent crime was merely "random noise in the fluctuations," or typical of "small increases month to month and year to year," as suggested by the Post, then there is no explanation for the fact that the 2015 increase in violent crime was the largest single-year increase in nearly 25 years, or the fact that the homicide increase of 10.8 percent in 2015 was the largest single-year increase since 1971. You might even call those increases staggering. In this case, the Post argues (incorrectly) that the attorney general's statements "are a distortion of the facts" and graded his statements "whoppers" or lies. Yet, what we know is that this is merely because the Post disagrees with the interpretation of the factual data. It's sad but increasingly understandable that a Gallup poll in September 2016 found that only one third of Americans say they have even a "fair amount" of trust in the media — an all-time low. And that's the truth. Ian D. Prior is principal deputy director of public affairs at the Department of Justice.