

MASTERS

When Arizonans learn about Blake Masters, they should see and hear him in his own words, with plain and straightforward facts. The truth is that Masters is not like you – he has dangerous beliefs that are both deeply out of step with Arizona and harmful to Arizona families. As his direct quotes and comments on video show, he is a risk Arizona can't take.

Arizona women just lost their right to an abortion, which Blake Masters celebrated. Masters supports a national abortion ban that would ban abortion entirely in this country, without exceptions for rape or incest. That could mean jail time for women who need an abortion to save their own life.

His anti-abortion comments stand on their own: "The federal government needs to step in and say...no state can permit abortion" and abortion rights are "a religious sacrifice to these people. I think it's demonic."

ARIZONA WOMEN JUST LOST THEIR RIGHT TO AN ABORTION, WHICH BLAKE MASTERS CELEBRATED.

HEADLINE: Supreme Court overturns Roe v. Wade, ending right to abortion upheld for decades [NPR, [6/24/22](#)]

The Supreme Court Overturned Roe V. Wade, A Nearly 50-Year-Old Precedent, Thereby Eliminating The Constitutional Right To An Abortion. "In a historic and far-reaching decision, the U.S. Supreme Court officially reversed Roe v. Wade on Friday, declaring that the constitutional right to abortion, upheld for nearly a half century, no longer exists. Writing for the court majority, Justice Samuel Alito said that the 1973 Roe ruling and repeated subsequent high court decisions reaffirming Roe 'must be overruled' because they were 'egregiously wrong,' the arguments 'exceptionally weak' and so 'damaging' that they amounted to "an abuse of judicial authority." The decision, most of which was leaked in early May, means that abortion rights will be rolled back in nearly half of the states immediately, with more restrictions likely to follow. For all practical purposes, abortion will not be available in large swaths of the country. The decision may well mean too that the court itself, as well as the abortion question, will become a focal point in the upcoming fall elections and in the fall and thereafter." [NPR, [6/24/22](#)]

HEADLINE: Providers in Arizona are suspending abortion services [AZ Family, [6/24/22](#)]

Arizona Abortion Providers Suspended Services Because Of Legal Uncertainty Following The Overturning Of Roe V. Wade. "At least three providers in Arizona are putting abortions on hold due to Friday's U.S. Supreme Court decision to overturn Roe v. Wade. Planned Parenthood Arizona and Family Planning Associates Medical Group said just hours after the decision they will be pausing all abortions. It was later confirmed Desert Star Family planning in Phoenix made the same decision. Family Planning Associates said all appointments will be canceled until further notice. Those who got an abortion before Friday can still attend their follow-up appointments. Since all seven Planned Parenthood health centers in Arizona stopped providing abortion services Friday, dozens of patients were sent home. 'I know in our Tempe health Center location there were over 30 patients scheduled for abortions today and they all had to be turned away and other health center locations we also had to turn patients away,' said CEO Planned Parenthood Arizona Brittany Fonteno. PPA blamed politicians for the confusion. 'We are working with our attorneys to understand Arizona's tangled web of conflicting laws so we can ensure patients know what our rights are and how to access legal abortion,' said Fonteno. FPA also said it's assessing the legal landscape of what the ruling means for Arizonans and what laws are now on the books. The confusion arises because, during the 2022 legislative session, state lawmakers passed a law banning abortion after 15 weeks. But Arizona already had a law on the books from 100-plus years ago that banned abortion altogether. That measure calls for a mandatory prison sentence of two to five years for those who perform the procedure." [AZ Family, [6/24/22](#)]

May 2022: Masters Tweeted, "Bye Bye Roe." [Twitter, @bgmasters, [5/2/22](#)]

Masters Said Roe Being Overturned Was A "Huge Victory." MASTERS: "This is a huge victory for children across this country. For decades, we allowed a terrible Court ruling to justify an abortion regime. That ends today ... but the pro life fight has to continue in the states. Mark Kelly — and nearly every other Democrat in the Senate — voted to legalize abortion up until the moment of birth. That's disturbing, and these radical progressives must be held accountable. That's exactly what we're going to do in November." [AZ Republic, [6/25/22](#)]

MASTERS SUPPORTS A NATIONAL ABORTION BAN THAT WOULD BAN ABORTION ENTIRELY IN THIS COUNTRY, WITHOUT EXCEPTIONS FOR RAPE AND INCEST.

HEADLINE: GOP Senate Candidate Blake Masters Embraces National Abortion Ban [Huffington Post, [3/9/22](#)]

Politifact Rated Mark Kelly's Statement That Blake Masters "Wants To Pass A National Ban On Abortion" Mostly True. Kelly said Masters "wants to pass a national ban on abortion." "Masters repeatedly backed a federal personhood law, which is often viewed as a near or total ban on abortion, during his GOP primary. He was often vague about when during a pregnancy a ban would take effect, saying Congress should set the cutoff. Masters softened his position after winning the Republican nomination, though he still supports a federal ban. Now, he is saying he would ban abortion nationally only during the third trimester. Kelly's statement is accurate but needs clarification. We rate it Mostly True." [Politifact, [8/26/22](#)]

Masters Said Overturning Roe V. Wade Did Not Go Far Enough And He Favored A Federal Personhood Amendment. "Three days after Politico published the draft, Masters said that the Roe decision was 'absolutely horrible' and noted that the Constitution 'does not mention abortion.' He said that 'at a minimum,' abortion should be left up to the states. But, he added, 'I actually think we should go further than that though. 'I think the 14th Amendment says you have the right to life, liberty and property,' he said at an event in Carefree, Arizona. 'You can't deprive someone with that without due process. Hard to imagine a bigger deprivation of due process than killing a small child before they have a chance to take their first breath. So I think you do need a federal personhood law.'" [Huffington Post, [3/9/22](#)]

Masters: "Roe V. Wade Should Be Reversed. And My Competitors Say Leave It To The States, While I Think The Right To Life Supersedes State Rights. Letting California Have One Policy And Texas Another Is Also Wrong. We Need A Life Amendment. "Q: "Roe v. Wade was a seismic shift in textualism for SCOTUS and the injection of the concept into the social order that there exists a life not worth living. Please talk about life?" MASTERS: "That's right. Abortion is horrible. I oppose it. The Court invented a right that doesn't exist. The Court facilitated a policy demand. It is the power for society to decide who gets to live and who will be killed. Roe v. Wade should be reversed. And my competitors say leave it to the states, while I think the right to life supersedes state rights. Letting California have one policy and Texas another is also wrong. We need a life amendment, and that is what the next generation of conservatives needs to fight for. In the act of abortion, there are two lives, not one. It's not just about the woman or things like reproductive rights. There is a limitation on the government's authority to determine life." [iVoteArizona, [3/21/22](#)]

Masters Said A Healthy Country Would "Get Rid Of Roe" And Create A Personhood Amendment. MASTERS: "I think in a healthy country, we get rid of Roe, and we understand that at a certain point, the federal government needs to step in and protect life. And if we got a personhood amendment, even if it was at, you know, two months or three months, even if it was nowhere near what Texas chose to do, and I think Texas should have the right to do what they did, it would still save hundreds of thousands of lives a year, millions of lives over a multiyear span." [Twitter Space, Dr. Andrew Jackson hosts Blake Masters, [2/20/22](#)] (AUDIO)

Masters Called For A "Personhood" Amendment That Would Recognize A Fetus As A Person Before It Was Born. HOST: "Well, you know, if Roe is overturned, Arizona, it does have a state law which predates the decision and bans all abortions, would you support a similar statute on a national level?" MASTERS: "Yeah, I think life is always worth protecting. And, you know, I understand people have different views on this, but to me, you always choose the side of life. You know, I think certainly I'm running for U.S. Senate at the federal level. I think Roe v. Wade needs to be overturned. And I do think we need a personhood amendment that

recognizes it's a baby, it's a baby even before it's born, you know? Left wingers want to say well conservatives only care about babies when they're in the womb. And I think we got to care about babies when they're in the womb and then also once they're born. And so I think conservatives do have to work harder to make sure we have pro-family policies that kids are safe and happy and healthy in this country. I think it starts before birth and it continues after birth." [OANN, 12/3/21] (VIDEO)

Blake Masters Said, On His Website, That He “Support[s] A Federal Personhood Law (Ideally A Constitutional Amendment) That Recognizes That Unborn Babies Are Human Beings That May Not Be Killed.” “Support a federal personhood law (ideally a Constitutional amendment) that recognizes that unborn babies are human beings that may not be killed.” [Blake Masters for Senate, accessed [5/18/22](#)]

A Personhood Amendment Would “Criminalize All Abortion, With No Exceptions, And May Also Ban Some Forms Of Contraception.” “A federal personhood law would classify fertilized eggs, zygotes, embryos, and fetuses as persons and give them full constitutional protections. It would criminalize all abortion, with no exceptions, and may also ban some forms of contraception.” [Huffington Post, [3/9/22](#)]

THAT COULD MEAN JAIL TIME FOR WOMEN WHO NEED AN ABORTION TO SAVE THEIR OWN LIFE.

Fetal Personhood Laws Could Put Women Who Self-Induce Abortion Or Miscarry At Risk For Criminal Prosecution. “Establishing fetal personhood could put people who self-induce abortions at risk for criminal prosecution, says Jolynn Dellinger, a senior lecturing fellow at Duke Law School. It could also impact people who miscarry. Leslie J. Reagan, a professor of history at University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, says prior to Roe, if someone went to the hospital or called a doctor about a miscarriage, they were often questioned on whether they had induced an abortion. Reagan’s research found that beginning in the early 1900s and running up until Roe in the 1970s, doctors and nurses sometimes functioned as the arm of the police, even threatening to deny care to patients if they did not provide information.” [TIME, [6/28/22](#)]

Washington Post: “Many Red States Have Laws...That Make Abortion A Crime Potentially Punishable By Years In Jail.” “Despite the committee’s claim, many red states have laws — including so-called trigger laws that will go into effect if and when Roe is overturned — that make abortion a crime potentially punishable by years in jail. The vast majority of these laws aim punishments only and expressly at the provider, carrying sentences that range between two to 15 or even 20 years. But some of these laws leave that unclear. And some states have pursued laws that punish women seeking abortions as well — punishments that could be difficult for the GOP to avoid, given its rhetoric on the topic (which we’ll come back to).” [Washington Post, [5/11/22](#)]

Washington Post: “Some States Have Pursued Laws That Punish Women Seeking Abortions.” “Despite the committee’s claim, many red states have laws — including so-called trigger laws that will go into effect if and when Roe is overturned — that make abortion a crime potentially punishable by years in jail. The vast majority of these laws aim punishments only and expressly at the provider, carrying sentences that range between two to 15 or even 20 years. But some of these laws leave that unclear. And some states have pursued laws that punish women seeking abortions as well — punishments that could be difficult for the GOP to avoid, given its rhetoric on the topic (which we’ll come back to).” [Washington Post, [5/11/22](#)]

Politico: “Abortion Bans Set To Take Effect If Roe v. Wade Is Overturned Could Mean Lengthy Prison Sentences For People Who Have An Abortion, The Physicians Who Perform Them Or Those Who Help People Access The Procedure.” “Abortion bans set to take effect if Roe v. Wade is overturned could mean lengthy prison sentences for people who have an abortion, the physicians who perform them or those who help people access the procedure. The penalties vary widely by state, and also can include hefty fines or the suspension of a medical license.” [Politico, [5/06/22](#)]

Politico: “Medical Groups And Legal Experts Are Also Warning That [Antiabortion] Laws May Extend Beyond People Who Abort Their Pregnancies - To Charges Against People Who Experience Miscarriages And Stillbirths, Use Drugs During Pregnancy, Use In-Vitro Fertilization, Use Emergency

Contraception Or Who Have An Intrauterine Device Implanted.” “Activists, medical groups and legal experts are also warning that such laws and punishments may extend beyond people who abort their pregnancies — to charges against people who experience miscarriages and stillbirths, use drugs during pregnancy, use in-vitro fertilization, use emergency contraception or who have an intrauterine device implanted.” [Politico, [5/06/22](#)]

Politico: “People Have Been Arrested And Jailed For Ending A Pregnancy In States As Diverse As California, Texas, Georgia And Indiana – A Trend Legal Groups Expect To Increase Exponentially If The Supreme Court” Overturns Roe v. Wade. “Even when laws don’t explicitly call for criminal charges against patients or providers, some local prosecutors are taking matters into their own hands. People have been arrested and jailed for ending a pregnancy in states as diverse as California, Texas, Georgia and Indiana — a trend legal groups expect to increase exponentially if the Supreme Court adopts the draft opinion.” [Politico, [5/06/22](#)]

USA Today: “Online Data, Medical Records Could Be Used To Put Women In Jail under New Abortion Laws” [USA Today, [6/12/22](#)]

USA Today: “Because Some States Have Passed Laws Redefining ‘Personhood’ To Include An Unborn Child, People Who Seek Abortions Or Anyone Who Helps Them Could Face Charges Of Feticide Or Aggravated Assault.” “Because some states have passed laws redefining ‘personhood’ to include an unborn child, people who seek abortions or anyone who helps them could face charges of feticide or aggravated assault, the report said. Most of the rhetoric around penalizing abortions has targeted health care workers who help people obtain abortions rather than pregnant women, said Brietta Clark, a health law and reproductive justice professor at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles. She said that unless laws clearly state women won’t be prosecuted for the outcomes of their pregnancy, they are at risk.” [USA Today, [6/12/22](#)]

HIS ANTI-ABORTION COMMENTS STAND ON THEIR OWN: “THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO STEP IN AND SAY...NO STATE CAN PERMIT ABORTION” AND ABORTION RIGHTS ARE “A RELIGIOUS SACRIFICE TO THESE PEOPLE. I THINK IT’S DEMONIC.”

Masters: “The Federal Government Needs To Step In And Say, We Recognize Life Here And No State Can Permit Abortion.” [32:31] MASTERS: "I think 90 percent of Americans can agree that a fully formed baby many months in the womb is a human being. And the federal government needs to step in and say, we recognize life here and no state can permit abortion. That's what I think playing office on pro-life looks like." [Masters at Queen Creek San Tan Valley Republican Women, [2/08/22](#)] (AUDIO)

Masters On Abortion: “In The 90s, They Promised They Just Wanted Abortion To Be Safe, Legal And Rare. And Now It’s Like You Have Activists Wearing Their Shirts With Tally Marks On How Many Abortions They’ve Had. And This Is The Cultural Thrust Of It. It’s A Religious Sacrifice To These People. I Think It’s Demonic.” [25:22] MASTERS: “The abortion thing has turned into this religious totem for the left, right in the 90s, they promised they just wanted abortion to be safe, legal and rare. And now it's like you have activists wearing their shirts with tally marks on how many abortions they've had. And this is the cultural thrust of it. It's a religious sacrifice to these people. I think it's demonic. And I think we've got to put a stop to it.” [The Relatable Podcast, Allie Beth Stuckey, [9/23/21](#)] (VIDEO)

Blake Masters supports cutting taxes for billionaires who don't pay their fair share. At the same time, he wants to change Social Security as we know it: privatizing the program and cutting benefits for people who have paid into Social Security their entire lives. Voters should see Masters say in his own words that he wants to “cut the knot” and “privatize Social Security.”

BLAKE MASTERS SUPPORTS CUTTING TAXES FOR BILLIONAIRES WHO DO NOT PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE.

Masters: “I Like Low Taxes. I Want Low Corporate Taxes. I Like Low Individual Taxes And The Government Already Sort Of Taxes Too Much And Spends Too Much.” “We have to fight that battle. You

can't just have Chamber of Commerce style Republicans, right? Paul Ryan was allergic to culture wars. He pretended like all you had to offer the people was a low corporate tax rate and like, don't get me wrong, I like low taxes. I want low corporate taxes. I like low individual taxes and the government already sort of taxes too much and spends too much." [Twitter Spaces, Blake Masters, 1/16/22] (AUDIO)

Masters Called The Tax Cuts And Jobs Act “Pretty Good” And Trump’s “Signature Legislative Achievement.” “You saw you know, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in 2017, it was the sort of signature legislative achievement in the first year of the Trump administration. And I think it was a pretty good, but look at how hard it was to even get that done. I think tax reform is a huge, huge issue. And I would love love to see a lot of progress, but I think it might take five or 10 years, to be honest.” [Twitter Spaces, Blake Masters, [3/27/22](#)] (AUDIO)

The Tax Cuts And Jobs Act Lowered The Top Tax Rate From 39.6 Percent To 37 Percent, Giving The Richest Americans A Significant Tax Break. “Overall, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act represents the largest one-time reduction in the corporate tax rate in U.S. history, from 35 percent down to 21 percent. [...] The final plan lowers the top tax rate for top earners. Under current law, the highest rate is 39.6 percent for married couples earning over \$470,700. The GOP bill would drop that to 37 percent and raise the threshold at which that top rate kicks in, to \$500,000 for individuals and \$600,000 for married couples. This amounts to a significant tax break for the very wealthy, a departure from repeated claims by Trump and his top officials that the bill would not benefit the rich.” [Washington Post, [12/15/17](#)]

AT THE SAME TIME HE WANTS TO CHANGE SOCIAL SECURITY AS WE KNOW IT: PRIVATIZING THE PROGRAM AND CUTTING BENEFITS FOR PEOPLE WHO HAVE PAID INTO SOCIAL SECURITY THEIR ENTIRE LIVES.

Masters: “We Need Fresh And Innovative Thinking, Maybe We Should Privatize Social Security. Private Retirement Accounts, Get The Government Out Of It.” “A Trump-backed Republican Senate candidate in Arizona suggested privatizing Social Security on Thursday, arguing the safety-net program will be long gone by the time he reaches retirement age. ‘We got to cut the knot at some point though because I’ll tell you what, I’m not going to receive Social Security,’ GOP Senate primary candidate Blake Masters said at a primary debate hosted by the conservative group FreedomWorks. ‘I’m a millennial.’ Masters argued it was time to overhaul the popular program. ‘We need fresh and innovative thinking, maybe we should privatize Social Security,’ he said. ‘Private retirement accounts, get the government out of it.’” [Business Insider, [6/24/22](#)] (VIDEO)

- **HEADLINE: “A Trump-Backed Arizona Senate Candidate Suggests He Wants To Privatize Social Security.”** [Business Insider, [6/24/22](#)]

Masters Said He Wanted “Something Totally Separate” For Social Security To Allow Younger People To Invest Tax-Free. “AUDIENCE: And then I just had a quick question, I was at the last debate too, how social security and how kids like me we’re not actually gonna see any of it. MASTERS: Everybody knows that, but if you say it you get crucified. AUDIENCE: Ahh, I know, but you talked about like privatizing it and I think that’s a fantastic idea. MASTERS: Yeah here’s what I think we should do, and I shouldn’t have said privatize. I don’t think we should like mess with social security, keep it, but for young people should we hesitate to think about new savings programs that they can actually rely on? No. So like why, for you, how old are you? AUDIENCE: I’m 19 MASTERS: Perfect, so if you’re under 25 we’re gonna make all ROTH IRA contributions under whatever, 30 grand, tax-deductible, like let you build a big ROTH and a nest egg and invest over time, right, why wouldn’t you do that? AUDIENCE: So making a new social security or something totally different? MASTERS: No something totally separate, but something cause like I meant what I said, from a young person’s perspective social security is already threatened. You never expect to receive it, I probably won’t even receive it. I’ll pay millions into the system, I’ll never receive it so why wouldn’t we allow and incentivize young people to invest more right? Remove the caps, let people invest tax-free, cause wouldn’t it be nice to have your generation someday be able to pay for your own retirement, that’s all I’m saying. But I’m deadly serious that we cannot cut benefits for anybody, can’t do it.” [Masters on Social Security Post-Newsmax Debate, 7/13/22]

Masters Said “We Have To” Cut Entitlement Spending And Acknowledged It Was An Intricate Problem, Calling It A “Gordian Knot.” “Meanwhile, Blake Masters—the GOP candidate in Arizona backed by Tucker Carlson and Peter Thiel—was asked at an event in January if he supported cutting entitlement spending. ‘Well, we have to do it,’ Masters said, acknowledging the issue is a ‘Gordian knot.’” [The Daily Beast, [4/5/22](#)]

Researcher’s Note: Masters posted a video claiming he did not want to cut entitlement spending immediately, but it will have to happen eventually. [Twitter, @bgmasters, [4/5/22](#)]

Masters Said “We’re Going To Have To Draw A Line, And That Line Probably Goes Through The Millennial Generation,” And Argued That The Country Was Going To Be “Completely Broke” By 2030. “Striking a similar note to McCormick, Masters signaled that benefits should be untouched for retirees or those above the Medicare eligibility age of 65—less so everyone else. ‘We’re going to have to draw a line, and that line probably goes through the millennial generation,’ said Masters, arguing that the country is going to be ‘completely broke’ by 2030. McCormick and Masters’ campaigns did not respond to requests for comment on how they would propose restructuring entitlements for future generations, or if they would welcome Scott’s proposal to put them on the negotiating table twice every decade.” [The Daily Beast, [4/5/22](#)]

Masters Claimed He “Thought Rick Scott’s Plan Was Mostly Good,” And Came Out Against Its Tax Plan, But Did Not Speak Against Its Plan For Medicare And Social Security. MASTERS: “I thought Rick Scott’s plan was mostly good. The mistake in releasing it was it had that provision, and I understand what Scott was trying to do, but it basically just reads as a tax increase on like half the country. You know, most workers, they definitely pay, you know, Social Security tax, stuff is being withheld from their paycheck. But they might not technically pay income tax if their income is lower than a certain threshold. And Rick Scott said, no, they have to pay income tax. Everybody has to pay at least whatever it is, 50 dollars in income tax. And because that’s not the case right now, it gave the Democrats a gift, and I’ve been asked this by journalists. They’re like, So do you support Rick Scott’s plan? Republicans are going to raise taxes on 50 million Americans, and it’s like that was a little bit of an own goal, wasn’t it? Like, no, I don’t support that. But then like, that’s all of a sudden the Republican plan is to raise taxes on working class people. I don’t think we should be raising taxes. But if you look at the other bullet points from Rick Scott’s plan, I think most of it is pretty good. So it’s the perils of raising a positive agenda is it can be seized by the other side. That said, I admire the admire that, you know, the proactivity because Republicans do need a positive agenda. You know, it may be enough in 2022 just to say the Democrats are blowing it because look how bad everything is and, you know, ride the red wave to victory and I hope for a red wave. But we can’t just be content with winning elections because the other side sucks. If we really want to win elections and then more important, if we want to make this country great again, you have to have an affirmative vision. So I applaud Rick Scott, but that tax point should have been deleted.” [HD Group Webinar, Dallas Baldri, 3/10/22] (VIDEO)

- **Rick Scott’s Plan Included The Plank Of Letting Social Security And Medicare Expire Every Five Years And Be Subject To Reapproval By The Congress, Which Masters Refused To Comment On When Asked.** Striking a similar note to McCormick, Masters signaled that benefits should be untouched for retirees or those above the Medicare eligibility age of 65—less so everyone else. ‘We’re going to have to draw a line, and that line probably goes through the millennial generation,’ said Masters, arguing that the country is going to be ‘completely broke’ by 2030. McCormick and Masters’ campaigns did not respond to requests for comment on how they would propose restructuring entitlements for future generations, or if they would welcome Scott’s proposal to put them on the negotiating table twice every decade.” [The Daily Beast, [4/5/22](#)]

VOTERS SHOULD SEE MASTERS SAY IN HIS OWN WORDS THAT HE WANTS TO “CUT THE KNOT” AND “PRIVATIZE SOCIAL SECURITY.”

Masters: “Maybe We Should Privatize Social Security. Right. Private Retirement Accounts, Get The Government Out Of It Past A Certain Point Because The Government Is Just Too Big. QUINTERO [00:47:17] All right. Thank you very much, Mark. We are on to question number two. Mark, take a sip because we are going to start with you next. Here is question number two. With government spending being one of the biggest drivers of inflation and with reports that Medicare and Social Security will be insolvent by 2026 and

2033, respectively, what should be done to keep the promise that the federal government made to current beneficiaries? What should retirement security or financial freedom look like for the next generation, Mark? [...]

“MASTERS [00:53:13] The federal government spends way too much money. I was thinking about it. You think it's 10,000 times or 100,000 times bigger than Thomas Jefferson ever could have imagined? Right. [00:53:23]We don't have a revenue problem. The federal government has enough money. We have a spending problem. Right. [00:53:29]But I've actually heard I won't name names because that would be rude. But I've actually heard some of my competitors up here take the undisciplined, easy way out and just say, we've got to slash entitlements. We got to cut, cut, cut, because that's where the money is. And here's the thing. We do need entitlement reform, but we can't just slash entitlements. It's more complicated than that. Right. We can't pull the rug out from seniors who are currently receiving Social Security, who are currently receiving Medicare. Right. People have built their financial lives around these programs. And so how to reform the system in a way that doesn't actually hurt the people who paid into it. All right. We've got to cut the knot at some point, though, because I'll tell you what, I'm not going to receive Social Security, all right? I'm a millennial, a little bit younger than my competitors here. I think that's a good thing by the way. I think the Senate could use a dose of energy. But my kids, they're not going to receive Social Security. And we need fresh and innovative thinking. Right. Maybe we should privatize Social Security. Right. Private retirement accounts, get the government out of it past a certain point because the government is just too big. I think we need to shutter entire departments.” [Blake Masters at Freedomworks Debate, 6/23/22] (VIDEO)

Masters Argued For Privatizing Social Security, Saying, “We’ve Got To Cut The Knot At Some Point.”

“A Trump-backed Republican Senate candidate in Arizona suggested privatizing Social Security on Thursday, arguing the safety-net program will be long gone by the time he reaches retirement age. ‘We got to cut the knot at some point though because I'll tell you what, I'm not going to receive Social Security,’ GOP Senate primary candidate Blake Masters said at a primary debate hosted by the conservative group FreedomWorks. ‘I'm a millennial.’” [Business Insider, [6/25/22](#)]