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CHAPTER VII
THE PROCESS OF CREATIVE DESTRUCTION

THE theories of monopolistic and oligopolistic competition and their popular variants may in two ways be made to serve the view that capitalist reality is unfavorable to maximum performance in production. One may hold that it always has been so and that all along output has been expanding in spite of the secular sabotage perpetrated by the managing bourgeoisie. Advocates of this proposition would have to produce evidence to the effect that the observed rate of increase can be accounted for by a sequence of favorable circumstances unconnected with the mechanism of private enterprise and strong enough to overcome the latter’s resistance. This is precisely the question which we shall discuss in Chapter IX. However, those who espouse this variant at least avoid the trouble about historical fact that the advocates of the alternative proposition have to face. This avers that capitalist reality once tended to favor maximum productive performance, or at all events productive performance so considerable as to constitute a major element in any serious appraisal of the system; but that the later spread of monopolist structures, killing competition, has by now reversed that tendency.

First, this involves the creation of an entirely imaginary golden age of perfect competition that at some time somehow metamorphosed itself into the monopolistic age, whereas it is quite clear that perfect competition has at no time been more of a reality than it is at present. Secondly, it is necessary to point out that the rate of increase in output did not decrease from the nineties from which, I suppose, the prevalence of the largest-size concerns, at least in manufacturing industry, would have to be dated; that there is nothing in the behavior of the time series of total output to suggest a “break in trend”; and, most important of all, that the modern standard of life of the masses, evolved during the period of relatively unfettered “big business.” If we list the items that enter the modern workman’s budget and from 1899 on observe the course of their prices not in terms of money but in terms of the hours of labor that will buy them - i.e., each year’s money prices divided by each year’s hourly wage rates - we cannot fail to be struck by the rate of the advance which, considering the spectacular improvement in qualities, seems to have been greater and not smaller than it ever was before. If we economists were given less to wishful thinking and more to the observation of facts, doubts would immediately arise as to the realistic virtues of a theory that would have led us to expect a very different result. Nor is this all. As soon as we go into details and inquire into the individual items in which progress was most conspicuous, the trail leads not to the doors of those firms that work under conditions of comparatively free competition but precisely to the doors of the large concerns - which, as in the case of agricultural machinery, also account for much of the progress in the competitive sector - and a shocking suspicion dawns upon us that big business may have had more to do with creating that standard of life than with keeping it down.

The conclusions alluded to at the end of the preceding chapter are in fact almost completely false. Yet they follow from observations and theorems that are almost completely 1 true. Both economists and popular
writers have once more run away with some fragments of reality they happened to grasp. These fragments themselves were mostly seen correctly. Their formal properties were mostly developed correctly. But no conclusions about capitalist reality as a whole follow from such fragmentary analyses. If we draw them nevertheless, we can be right only by accident. That has been done. And the lucky accident did not happen.

The essential point to grasp is that in dealing with capitalism we are dealing with an evolutionary process. It may seem strange that anyone can fail to see so obvious a fact which moreover was long ago emphasized by Karl Marx. Yet that fragmentary analysis which yields the bulk of our propositions about the functioning of modern capitalism persistently neglects it. Let us restate the point and see how it bears upon our problem.

Capitalism, then, is by nature a form or method of economic change and not only never is but never can be stationary. And this evolutionary character of the capitalist process is not merely due to the fact that economic life goes on in a social and natural environment which changes and by its change alters the data of economic action; this fact is important and these changes (wars, revolutions and so on) often condition industrial change, but they are not its prime movers. Nor is this evolutionary character due to a quasi-automatic increase in population and capital or to the vagaries of monetary systems of

1. As a matter of fact, those observations and theorems are not completely satisfactory. The usual expositions of the doctrine of imperfect competition fail in particular to give due attention to the many and important cases in which, even as a matter of static theory, imperfect competition approximates the results of perfect competition. There are other cases in which it does not do this, but offers compensations which, while not entering any output index, yet contribute to what the output index is in the last resort intended to measure - the cases in which a firm defends its market by establishing a name for quality and service for instance. However, in order to simplify matters, we will not take issue with that doctrine on its own ground.

which exactly the same thing holds true. The fundamental impulse that sets and keeps the capitalist engine in motion comes from the new consumers’ goods, the new methods of production or transportation, the new markets, the new forms of industrial organization that capitalist enterprise creates.

As we have seen in the preceding chapter, the contents of the laborer’s budget, say from 1760 to 1940, did not simply grow on unchanging lines but they underwent a process of qualitative change. Similarly, the history of the productive apparatus of a typical farm, from the beginnings of the rationalization of crop rotation, plowing and fattening to the mechanized thing of today - linking up with elevators and railroads - is a history of revolutions. So is the history of the productive apparatus of the iron and steel industry from the charcoal furnace to our own type of furnace, or the history of the apparatus of power production from the overshot water wheel to the modern power plant, or the history of transportation from the mail-coach to the airplane. The opening up of new markets, foreign or domestic, and the organizational development from the craft shop and factory to such concerns as U. S. Steel illustrate the same process of industrial mutation - if I may use that biological term - that incessantly revolutionizes 2 the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one. This process of Creative Destruction is the essential fact about capitalism. It is what capitalism consists in and what every capitalist concern has got to live in. This fact bears upon our problem in two ways.

First, since we are dealing with a process whose every element takes considerable time in revealing its true features and ultimate effects, there is no point in appraising the performance of that process ex visu of a given point of time; we must judge its performance over time, as it unfolds through decades or centuries. A system - any system, economic or other - that at every given point of time fully utilizes its possibilities to the best
advantage may yet in the long run be inferior to a system that does so at no
given point of time, because the latter’s failure to do so may be a condition
for the level or speed of -long-run performance.

Second, since we are dealing with an organic process, analysis of
what happens in any particular part of it - say, in an individual concern or
industry - may indeed clarify details of mechanism but is inconclusive
beyond that. Every piece of business strategy acquires its true significance
only against the background of that process and

2 Those revolutions are not strictly incessant; they occur in discrete rushes which
are separated from each other by spans of comparative quiet. The process as a
whole works incessantly however, in the sense that there always is either
revolution or absorption of the results of revolution, both together forming what
are known as business cycles.

within the situation created by it. It must be seen in its role in the
perennial gale of creative destruction; it cannot be understood irrespective
of it or, in fact, on the hypothesis that there is a perennial lull.

But economists who, ex visu of a point of time, look for example at
the behavior of an oligopolist industry - an industry which consists of a
few big firms - and observe the well-known moves and countermoves
within it that seem to aim at nothing but high prices and restrictions of
output are making precisely that hypothesis. They accept the data of the
momentary situation as if there were no past or future to it and think that
they have understood what there is to understand if they interpret the
behavior of those firms by means of the principle of maximizing profits
with reference to those data. The usual theorist’s paper and the usual
government commission’s report practically never try to see that behavior,
on the one hand, as a result of a piece of past history and, on the other
hand, as an attempt to deal with a situation that is sure to change presently
- as an attempt by those firms to keep on their feet, on ground that is
slipping away from under them. In other words, the problem that is
usually being visualized is how capitalism administers existing structures,
whereas the relevant problem is how it creates and destroys them. As long
as this is not recognized, the investigator does a meaningless job. As soon
as it is recognized, his outlook on capitalist practice and its social results
changes considerably. 3

The first thing to go is the traditional conception of the modus
operandi of competition. Economists are at long last emerging from the
stage in which price competition was all they saw. As soon as quality
competition and sales effort are admitted into the sacred precincts of
theory, the price variable is ousted from its dominant position. However,
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any other) results, unless we happen to adopt a moral system such as utilitarianism
which makes moral approval and disapproval turn on them ex definitione
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so much more important that it becomes a matter of comparative
indifference whether competition in the ordinary sense functions more or
less promptly; the powerful lever that in the long run expands output and
brings down prices is in any case made of other stuff

It is hardly necessary to point out that competition of the kind we
now have in mind acts not only when in being but also when it is merely
an ever-present threat. It disciplines before it attacks. The businessman
feels himself to be in a competitive situation even if he is alone in his field
or if, though not alone, he holds a position such that investigating
government experts fail to see any effective competition between him and
any other firms in the same or a neighboring field and in consequence
conclude that his talk, under examination, about his competitive sorrows is
all make-believe. In many cases, though not in all, this will in the long
run enforce behavior very similar to the perfectly competitive pattern.

Many theorists take the opposite view which is best conveyed by an
example. Let us assume that there is a certain number of retailers in a
neighborhood who try to improve their relative position by service and
“atmosphere” but avoid price competition and stick as to methods to the
local tradition - a picture of stagnating routine. As others drift into the
trade that quasi-equilibrium is indeed upset, but in a manner that does not
benefit their customers. The economic space around each of the shops
having been narrowed, their owners will no longer be able to make a
living and they will try to mend the case by raising prices in tacit
agreement. This will further reduce their sales and so, by successive
pyramiding, a situation will evolve in which increasing potential supply
will be attended by increasing instead of decreasing prices and by
decreasing instead of increasing sales.

Such cases do occur, and it is right and proper to work them out.
But as the practical instances usually given show, they are fringe-end cases
to be found mainly in the sectors furthest removed from all that is most
characteristic of capitalist activity. 4 Moreover, they are transient by
nature. In the case of retail trade the competition that matters arises not
from additional shops of the same type, but from the department store, the
chain store, the mail-order house and the supermarket which are bound to
destroy those pyramids sooner or later. 5

4. This is also shown by a theorem we frequently meet with in expositions of the
theory of imperfect competition, viz., the theorem that, under conditions of
imperfect competition, producing or trading businesses tend to be irrationally
small. Since imperfect competition is at the same time held to be an outstanding
characteristic of modern industry we are set to wondering what world these
theorists live in, unless, as stated above, fringe-end cases are all they have in mind.

5. The mere threat of their attack cannot, in the particular conditions,
environmental and personal, of small-scale retail trade, have its usual disciplining
influence, for the small man is too much hampered by his cost structure and,
however well he may manage within his inescapable limitations, he can never
adapt himself to the methods of competitors who can afford to sell at the price at
which he buys.

Now a theoretical construction which neglects this essential element of the
case neglects all that is most typically capitalist about it; even if correct in
logic as well as in fact, it is like *Hamlet* without the Danish prince.