

Granting that modicum of truth in statements ~~that~~ that private ownership of land and capital ~~is~~ is responsible for the hereditary nature of political control, Mosca says that in ~~a~~ state control of the means of production the administrators, a minority, would surely use economic and political power "in such a manner as would advance the career of their own sons and protégés". In other words, it is not ~~economic~~ land & capital, but politico-economic power which allows ~~hereditary~~ hereditary ~~power~~ power.

The error here ~~is~~ is to screw up means and ends. The end is not political power, but hereditary perpetuation. It can be done by several means, appropriate to the society one finds oneself in. So, in capitalism private ownership of land and capital are indeed the main devices to achieve hereditary control, and in state capitalism or socialist it is political power so used.

A very useful paragraph: "On the other hand, the ~~democratic~~ democratic tendency could absolutely triumph only on condition that the sons would not inherit the means, contacts, and advantages in training which enabled their progenitors to capture all the choice positions". (Mosca's "final version of the theory of the ruling class" p. 389.) This is juxtaposed to the aristocratic tendencies which permit only a slow change in the composition of the elite over generations.