

# The principles of economic equality and economic freedom: different viewpoints

[Philosophy](#), [Freedom](#)



The first source is one that advocates for a society in which people are treated differently based upon their ability, it goes against liberalism because in it says that the government should treat a handicapped mother and an able bodied man differently. These two people are different in that the mother will have a much more difficult time living than the able bodied man who is able to work, the source says that the government should account for these differences and base government policy off of these differences. It promotes economic equality as the government should help those that struggle to live and redistribute the wealth from those that do not struggle, in this case it is the mother getting help in the forms of social programs like daycare or direct money transfers like unemployment checks. These programs would all be funded by the rest of society who are able to do as they wish, the source dismisses classical liberalism and instead embraces modern liberalism for the fact that modern liberalism means everyone is able to achieve their goals while classical would only mean equality of opportunity. The source says that equality of opportunity is not enough for those disadvantaged to fulfill their own self interests, to expect a disabled mother to be able to do the same as an able bodied man because they have the same opportunities is something the source disagrees with. The speaker in the source again advocates for economic equality when it references that politicians should attempt to combat poverty and that the taxes that would be used to pay for it should also distinguish between people, this means the source is advocating for progressive taxation rather than a flat tax. Those that make more should be taxed more, in this case the handicapped mother should not be taxed and instead should be receiving help just like the man.

The way that taxation is based off how much a person is making is just like the way the source advocates the amount of help a person receives should be based off the ability of that person, it embraces modern liberalism and the approach it takes to combating economic inequality but sees ways in which there should be further distinguishments for the amount of help people recieve.

The second source shows three different countries which all have differently structured societies, the US is a nation which focuses on individual freedoms and worth, Canada which is a mix of collective beliefs mixed with capitalist beliefs, and Sweden which is a country which stresses collective interests and socialism. In all three countries it shows what percentage of a families wage is for income tax, one for before children and one for after. In Canada and the US the family pays less income tax when they get have children while in Sweden they still pay the same amount, the more self interest focused a country is the sharper the drop in income tax is once they have children. The source is showing how the different countries have their tax amounts change for when people have children and how these different changes are because of how each country values individuals self interests and economic freedom. In the US and Canada the government lets the parents do as they wish with a larger percentage of their money because they now have children to take care of, the government gives these families a larger amount of economic freedom to do as they wish with their money and use it as they wish to raise their children. In Sweden the amount of income tax remains the same because economic freedom is not valued very strongly, the income tax percentage paid before and after remain the same

because the government rather than giving those families more economic freedom instead uses that tax money to fund national programs like subsidized daycares or education that those children will one day need. Those tax drop offs in the more capitalist countries are due to the fact that the government lets the families use that money to raise their children and give their children the life that their parents want them to have, in Sweden the non changing tax percentage is because the government is using that tax money to provide services which the child will use in the future. Rather than let the parents make choices on whether the money will be spent on education or toys the swedish government makes choices on what they believe is best for the child's future by heavily subsidizing things like post secondary education, daycares, and other programs that the child might need in the future. Sweden values the principle of economic equality much more than Canada and the US and that is the reason for the same tax percentage even after the family has children, the government will use the money and decide what is should be used on rather than the parents using the money to make their own choices.

The third source shows a doctor that says they do offer patients different choices, those choices only being the whether they want to pay through visa or mastercard. It is criticizing canadian healthcare because patients have no choice for what they want to pay for or whether they want to pay for healthcare at all, everyone has to pay for healthcare even if those people never use it. It sees the government as overbearing and too involved in people's lives by not letting people have different choices in health care like

using private companies that could end up costing them much less. The medical bill being blank also means that doctors are not being allowed to charge depending on how much their services are in demand and what they think they should be paid, the law of supply and demand is not being used as the government pays doctor salaries and does not allow any fluctuation. The doctor wanting to offer patients a choice in the different ways in which they can pay and the different treatments they want to pay for but instead everyone has to pay through taxation for health care and the doctors cannot use their skills in the private sector and bill what they think they are worth. They are being forced to work for the government and being paid salaries that the government dictates for them rather than having the economic freedom to set up their own business where they charge whatever they wish to charge be able to practice in their own ways, the source criticizes this as the doctor is annoyed when presenting the bill to the patient because they are not able to charge as they wish to, whether that would be more or less than what the government dictates. Doctors are being shown like tradesman in that they have skills or knowledge that they themselves want to be free to charge for as they wish, instead the government regulates and controls the healthcare industry heavily not allowing the sort of private practise that some doctors want; the government does not let economic freedom exist in the healthcare industry.

All three sources have a relationship in that they all are connected with the principles of economic equality and economic freedom. The first source shows economic equality in that that government should be helping those in

poverty and financial trouble while also distinguishing more based upon ability, government policies that are put into place should represent this distinction between abilities and provide both the mother and the man in the source with equal opportunities to achieve their goals whatever they maybe. The second source connects to both economic freedom and economic equality in that the percentage that the government charges for income tax changes or doesn't change for single people and for children, the less steep the tax drop off is the more each country values economic equality as Sweden has no drop and Canada has a drop off that is much less harsh than the US's. In these countries with low drops the government is making more of a decision in what childhood the children will live in their families, they use the money to subsidize post secondary education or daycares which the government believes are things the money would be better used for than what parents would spend it on. This way those poorer families with children are still able to afford an education because everyone pays a higher tax in the end which ends up making different government programs much more accessible to people. The third source shows economic equality again except this time in a negative light as doctors are only being paid as the government dictates and are not allowed to charge as they wish, they wish to provide more choices to the people but the government doesn't allow this as the healthcare industry is heavily regulated and controlled so everyone has access to it. All three sources can also relate to the issues of how much control should a government have over the lives of its citizens, the first source says just enough that everyone has a realistic chance to achieve what they wish to, the second source shows how different countries have

income tax percentages that reflect how much the government believes they should be involved in the lives of their citizens, and the third source shows how doctors believe that government is much too heavily involved in the healthcare industry not allowing doctors to have the freedom to do as they wish.