

Letter to the Editor of the Los Angeles Times (1/27/2005)

Unpublished:

Dear Editor:

Benjamin R. Barber in his recent op-ed (["Privatizing Social Security: 'Me' over 'We.'" January 27](#)) states that Social Security privatization is a "reverse social contract," which would destroy a common bond that holds our society together. But I would suggest that if the basis of our society rests on such an unstable Ponzi scheme, we are in much more trouble than Dr. Barber can imagine.

In the year 2042 I will be 65 years old and ready to retire. This is the same year that the Trustees of the Social Security trust fund estimate that my promised benefits will have to be drastically cut. That, or taxes must be raised on younger workers.

This option would be unfair to my future children and the younger generation as a whole. Why not let me set aside a portion of the 12.4% of my income that currently is taken for social security? This way, I'll be able to rely on my own savings for retirement, instead of forcing younger workers to pay even more into a system they may not collect from themselves.

Ultimately, what bonds us together is not our broken Social Security system, but the principles that this country was founded on, namely, a respect for each individual's right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." A mutual understanding of that concept is what makes a "we" truly possible.

Peter Mork
San Diego, CA