

Anomaly: Diachronic/synchronous resolution of the Heredity/Equality problem

The breaking of hereditary chain is the fundamental premise of the new paradigm to resolve the anomaly created by in our time of being able to guarantee minimum subsistence for all (and therefore not having to give some a perpetual advantage in order to have diachronic societal stability) and yet knowing that there are fundamental inequalities of men that no system can disregard and yet allow fulfillment of the individual human being. Up to now, we have allowed ~~the~~ hereditary privilege to continue to exist despite our basic condition of affluence, and this has meant that equality of opportunity for a given individual is compromised by the accident of birth ~~xxxx~~ in a certain class.

To resolve this, we must think of society separately in synchronous and in diachronic terms. Synchronously, we think of ~~the~~ the inequalities that develop according to the individuals alive at that moment: an elite has appeared among the mature, but those who are young should be given as nearly equal a chance to belong to the elite of their mature years as any of their ~~xxxx~~ age. The inescapable inequalities, such as in I.Q. or physical imperfections, cannot be manipulated too much, but the inequalities based on class at birth can be. By limiting sharply the advantages of wealth that are inherited, the equalities of opportunities of individuals when young will be greatly enhanced.

Diachronically, we think of equality that exist among the successive classes ~~xxxx~~ of the young (outside of ~~xxx~~ irremediable inequalities). There will be no "classes" in the traditional social or economic sense, for class in this sense means hereditarily perpetuated status (with minimal social mobility a minor deviation); elite, to the contrary, means an accidental emergence of leaders in a given time, according to individual talents they reveal and not derived from inherited advantages of ~~xxxx~~

power such as wealth.

The inequalities which we see in any synchronous view of society belong to individuals; they grow in their lifetime, but they die with them. Every individual, qua individual and belonging the class of individual over time, starts with relative equality on the life course. We have a classless society over time (for if there is no perpetuation of inequality by dint of some individuals starting with enormous advantage over another, there is no ~~xxx~~ class in the true sense of the word), but an élitist society in time (inequality which arises in discreet individuals in respect to others, but dies with that individual, so that a truly ~~xxxxxx~~ circulating elite ~~xxxxxx~~ develops).

The hereditary system, therefore, is not necessary to all paradigms of political/social organization, but only to those which are pre-affluent. One can conceive of an affluent society disposing of the hereditary principle, and we have seen it done in communistic countries where equality is enforced by authoritarian rule. But this system denies human freedom and fulfillment in a thoroughly unacceptable way. The question is, can one dispose of the hereditary principle-- the main source of class inequality over time--and yet allow for an open society where each individual expresses himself and fulfills himself largely on his own, which means that some will rise to more power than others? Does the possibility of ~~xxxxxx~~ universal survival of man require enforced equality among them, or ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ can ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ universal survival be declared to be a relatively minor share of the total wealth guaranteed to everyone--at a level arbitrarily said to constitute decent human existence--and the major share of the total wealth left open to exploitation of individuals on an unequal basis according to their talents, inclinations, ~~xxxxxx~~ and ambitions? The way to provide the latter is to break the chain of privi-

lege according to family, over time.

The final problem: can one outlaw hereditary privilege and still have an open society? The communistic answer would seem to be no: they ~~must~~ have an authoritarian system to <sup>prevent</sup> ~~inhibit~~ anyone ~~from~~ getting inordinate wealth in his lifetime because presumably he would inevitably want to see that his children got it. Equalitarianism, in this life, is chiefly a reaction to the threat of hereditary privilege. The alternative being proposed here ~~is~~ guesses that the ~~hereditary~~ urge to pass on one's advantages to one's children is not that overwhelming that it can only ~~be~~ countered by denying anyone any advantages to begin with, but that it can be legislated, and that people will obey and surrender their wealth to the public good, in some fashion or another, rather than insist that their children get it. Whether or not this system is feasible, or just a pipedream, lies in the answer to the question of the innate character of right to hereditary transmission of wealth. Is there something in the very nature of parenthood that will make the wealthy see to it that their progeny get the parental advantages despite any legislation? If such exists, it is clear that there is no via media between ~~classless communism and class capitalism~~ classless communism and class capitalism-- i.e., no possibility of classless capitalism such as proposed here