

I INEQUALITY

- A. Once historically necessary, in times when society was in regular want; to guarantee the survival of society as a whole, one class was assured its perpetuity and the rest had to risk the chance of exténction.
- now, however, it is possible to eliminate inequality, due to improvement of technology:
 - At any given time, no one need starve
 - Perpetuation of all means no special care to preserve an elite unity
 - therewith, the historical rationale for the class structure perpetuated over time is eliminated.
- B. Existentially, however, the proclivity towards inequality is always there.
- Differences exist between peoples, whether genetically or environmentally induced n'importe pas.
 - An elite always appears in the form of the publicly responsible and the economically successful.
 - the socialist answer is to subordinate the private emoluments from this and make the president and the postman equal as subjects of the state ideology
 - the capitalists answer is to allow the talented to have the full enjoyment of the power and the riches they acquire. Also, in the main, they are allowed to transmit it by heredity.
- C. The toleration of inequality for historical reasons, as (A) above, having been eliminated by technology, socialist and capitalist attacks upon equality are both somewhat temuous.
- Socialist, developed in a time just before the rise of the affluent society, or just in its first phases, rushes to level people ~~whom~~ ~~inxfact~~ because the idea that any should not survive is abhorrent; but within a short while all can survive and yet there be still a great difference within the ~~ex~~ level of peoples at a given moment. In other words, Marxism rose as a well-meaning altruistic philosophy seeking to rectify the grim historical necessity for inequality; it arose in the early phases of the aff era of affluence, and was more conditioned by zeal to rectify the horror of something that had in fact expired (and with it, presumably, also its horror) than to devise something adequate to the new affluent conditions. So, it declared the leveling of class distinctions, out of spite for the hated historical conditions as much as for the good of the lower classes--for the betterment of all classes was already just around the corner, and whatever minimal condition Marx would have wanted for everyman would be achieved best (in fact achieved alone) in countries which were capitalistic to the fullest extent. Where Marxism has been historically effective is in underdeveloped countries where survival of all peoples requires immediate and drastic leveling, i.e., a total social revolution.
 - Capitalism allows the inequality of peoples to be perpetuated over time by hereditary economic class divisions. This was once justified by historical conditions, but is no longer so.
- D. The answers of socialism & capitalism to the existential proclivity differ:
- Socialism ignores it, and denies it, and forces equality.
 - capitalism indulges it, indeed lets it flourish as much as in the pre-affluent days, though the rationale of pre-affluent days for inequality has disappeared.

[ca 20 Oct 72, typed & revised 2 Feb 73]

- D. The Middle Way: To allow the existential proclivity for inequality to express itself without allowing it to disrupt the right of all to basic decent life; but, to limit ~~it~~ this to the individual according to his genetic or environmental character and not to anything he inherits in form of "social power"--i.e., money, office, or the like.

II. HISTORICALLY NECESSARY INEQUALITY

- A. Assumes that survival of the society (defined best as a political unit) is the highest good. True from primitive societies onwards.
- Whatever is necessary to preserve the corporate survival is necessary
 - In terms of choosing which individual should survive if not all can, the leaders must come first
 - The existential urge to provide for one's own progeny makes quickly for an hereditary caste of the leaders.
- B. Change from one caste or class to another over time comes in response chiefly to economic changes in basis of power in society
- In modern times, the change to commercial society gives power to the bourgeois
 - can operate as a separate class (England)
 - can aspire to join the previous nobility (France)
 - If we are still in an historical necessary inequality situation, the new group is guaranteed family perpetuity
 - for a while there is mobility, as new families rise
 - if talent ~~xxx~~ consistently an issue in perpetuity, the power group can regularly have some changeover
 - but the same thrust as before regarding progeny's guaranteed survival tends to make the new ruling class become stable-- chiefly by perpetuation of inherited wealth, sometimes by office or privilege.
- C. In its last phase, historically, the situation understood
- Malthus the best "scientific" analysis of reason to accept ~~xx~~ historical inequality
 - But within a generation or two of his time the historical basis was overthrown by technology and the industrial revolution.
 - The moral response by Marx is equally soon outmoded, for the kind of thing he sought was soon to be realized in capitalistic society by the elevation of everybody beyond the marginal level.
 - The moral imperative of Marxism to level society is not historically sound anymore, except in reference to superseded social arrangements.
 - On the other hand, the capitalist preservation of inequality on basis of inherited wealth ~~ix~~ has lost its historical basis, and if it cannot be justified on ~~new~~ new grounds, ~~must~~ must be abandoned in favor of the greater moral equity of equal distribution of wealth. The "sop to the masses" thesis works just so long, and then the truth of locked in inequality on the basis of inherited wealth reveals a sick society.

SW on 2 Feb 73]

III. Existential proclivity towards inequality.

Three bases of argument: genetic
environmental
life choice

A. Genetic.