wage earner isn't even allowed to see his money, how can he see that he might have used those withholdings to purchase property which could yield him a retirement income?

The deception is aggravated, of course, by the employee's impression that half of the cost of his social security is coming out of the pocket of his employer. But the employer is obliged to treat those matching contributions to the social security fund as just another current cost of labor. If that 2 per cent were not taxed out of his pocket, then competition would have drawn it out anyway, either in the form of higher current wage rates to employees or in the form of lower prices to consumers. So the net result is that *the employee, in reality, stands the burden of the full social security tax,* including the share he might have thought the employer was paying. It cannot truthfully be said of any part of the social security program that it is a method of soaking the rich to help the poor. Social security is a feature of the broad socialistic pattern—a special feature which is designed to get at the private property of the man who works for an hourly wage.

Earning Power Is Private Property

Far too many American citizens have taken the attitude that defending private property is

the rich man's job; let *him* worry about his property rights! But such a shortsighted view misses the vital point that an individual's earning power is also a form of private property, particularly to be cherished and defended by any person who has failed to acquire property in other forms. To endorse a principle which allows the government to tax away ever-increasing proportions of privately owned property is to forfeit the only chance man has for independence. A government which can take a man's property, including his wages and other current earnings, can control that man's life. The person who desires freedom is obliged to limit the scope and power of his government.

The social security tax was initiated in 1937 at the comparatively low level of 2 per cent of an employee's wages, the employer and the employee each to bear half of the amount. By January 1, 1954, the total tax had risen to 4 per cent, which is still low in contrast with some of the prevailing corporate and personal income tax rates. It may be recalled, however, that the early advocates of income taxes also scoffed at the idea that such taxes could ever amount to as much as 10 per cent of a person's income. The ironic truth is that federal income tax rates have "progressed" upward to take as much as 92 per cent of personal income in some instances.