

*Capitalism*

Everyone concedes that the change from a barter to a capitalistic economy resulted in a change from feudal to bourgeois basis of power. No matter how much the bourgeois tried to ennoble itself, or the nobles maintain selves by getting a money basis, the fact is that the new basis of rule was wealth: not bourgeois makes the ruling class without wealth, and no nobleman stays in power unless he acquires it.

What, however, of the social change that should follow the change to a situation where the capitalistic system has socialized the basis of wealth in the sense that all land is owned, all resources exploited or protected for the common good by the government? There is no need any longer for individual capital investment, by a special class preserved over time to do it. Now, capital investment can be handled by corporate enterprises fully distributed by shares, all of them guaranteed perpetuity by law, and in fact most of them run by technically trained managers. The function once exercised by individual or family entrepreneurship is now fully in the hands of perpetual corporations run by trained technocrats. On what basis, therefore, should individual bourgeois capitalism over time be perpetuated?

The only problem is that the super-rich will no more easily give up their power as a class than ~~that~~ the noble class surrendered its power. The myth of eventual bourgeois family leveling--of the "land of opportunity"--is the only basis of letting those who have already made it, keep it. But this is the myth of the stage of individual bourgeois capitalism; if continued, this form of wealth ownership must work steadily against the common good.