opinion

Ideas: Social Darwinism and Capitalism are not the same

To the Editor:

I would like to comment on an article by Mr. Tom Foo ("Stu- dents need sensitivity," March 3) regarding his appeal for a civilized society and against a capital- ist one. I maintain that Social Darwinism, Capitalism and neoconservative thought are not the same and that Capitalism rather than socialism will lead to wealthier, and therefore more "civilized" societies.

It is my impression that Tom believes Social Darwinists advoc- ate the principle of selfishness if it take it that selfishness means car- ing only about yourself. Tom implies that neoconservatives and Capitalists also advocate selfish- ness. This is not the case; Cap- italists advocate the private control of capital while socialists advocate the public or govern- mental control (and redistribution) of capital.

Although I believe that some Capitalists advocate selfishness, what Mr. Foo implies, and what other ultra-radical-left-wing ex- tremists generally, is that Capitalists necessarily advocate selfish- ness. For this to be true, private (or individual) control of capital must be a "bad" private control implies private property, and private property implies ownership; that an individual can de- cide what will be done with the property that she (or he) owns. But having the ability to decide how to invest (or spend) one's property (wealth) is not the same as caring only about oneself; it is caring only about deciding for yourself! Mr. Foo has con- fused assigning individual free- dom with advocating selfishness. Neoconservatives embrace cap- italism and individual freedom, but it is my impression that Tom believes civilized societies must include limited redistribution of wealth (government "welfare" "intellectualized") that severe austerity policies against forced redis- tribution (Reagan's course) are "uncivilized." Tom implies be- cause they will cause "poverty hidden-unemployed youth" that "take it up arms" and become crimi- nals resulting in uncivilized behavior. However, there is abundant evidence that the redistribution policies of the last twenty years have not reduced poverty; they have destroyed it by squandering wealth. The amount of wealth that the government redistributed increased dramatically during the last twenty years, not only

It is time to say "no" to our ugly side time to vote for a new social order.

To the Editor:

Last Friday, the recent snow collection into pools. The win- dow was open, the Institute, certain parts of the tennis court. What was going on inside. The plowed near the net where a cou- game myself, a bottle rocket ex- double anyone knew about it. It was perfect day to play tennis. I rolled around the Institute, ignoring the "no" to our ugly side time to vote for a new social order.

To the Editor:

It is time to say "no" to our ugly side time to vote for a new social order.

To the Editor:

It is time to say "no" to our ugly side time to vote for a new social order.

SUBSCRIBE

TheTech

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

US Mail - 1st Class: $65
2 years $135
Foreign - Canada/Mexico/air mail: $13
1 year $68
Institute Mail - $12
2 years $70

Call or write for brochure.