

11/11/73 ✓

1967 ~~Handwritten~~

The main flaw of Young's system, perhaps, is that he assumes that high I.Q. will be the main element in the meritocracy--i.e., it will be an @ "eyequetocracy". This comes out in Schaar's article in Equality--Nomos IX--which adopts most of Young's premises in its attack upon the "equality of opportunity" syndrome. The fact is that the highest I.Q.'s have hardly ever had great power in society, nor are they likely to want it in any meritocracy. They will be the teachers and artists, as they have always been, since the fulfillment of the intellect and the aesthetic urge make them inclined to avoid political or commercial arenas where power is exercised. In a society where equality of opportunity operates as a method of approximating the chances at birth, there is no reason to believe that those who make a million as a salesmen will have any ~~more~~ higher regard for university professors than they do not. The kind of envy of the ignorant which Schaar poses as the disaster of a truly competitive meritocracy--for they will be mortified by their failure to excel--assumes that great intelligence will overwhelm all other criteria; he also assumes that the winners will roll in luxury and lord their success over the losers. Does he assume that this is what the ~~xxx~~ present winners, the super-rich, do? The real crux of the matter is security. The rich have it, and so can go on to self-fulfillment; the poor have it not, and so struggle their lives just to exist on a minimum basis. If security is given to all, ~~the~~ at birth, then ~~the~~ equality of opportunity will be in terms of equality for self-fulfillment. As many forms of this will exist as do now, and if the farmer is not envious of the university professors now, why should he be in the reformed society?

Schaar's answer is to regard society as just having different functions, which all regard as equal worth for the sake of the community. In effect, he has Luther's notion of ~~the~~ beruf. He links equality of opportunity to competitive spirit, which is evil in all but minimal operation; in fact, equality of opportunity at birth means that one can find his beruf, his function in society, instead of it being given him, be it as bank president or ditchdigger, according to family status at birth. ~~Schaarxxx~~

Schaar's own "democratic equality" is a feeble appeal to active citizenship & democratic political control, based on equal legal rights. It ignores totally the econ. basis of political control, and the differential in possibility to be an active citizen ~~base~~ according to whether one is born into wealth and privilege which is the source of political influence.