wealth. In a capitalist society, based as it is on the private ownership of property, a fierce contest is at all times raging for each member of society to annex as much of this wealth as possible. But by the very nature of the game it calls into existence two mutually opposing classes. Both, *while capitalism lasts,* necessary to each other, yet diametrically opposed in interests. Gravitated at one pole are those who, by the rules of the game, sanctioned by the Law, Church, Tradition and Custom, have acquired possession of the machinery of wealth production, and by means of this ownership exact tribute from the rest of society. These persons, although at war among themselves, are knit into a cohesive unit in a common resolve that the rules governing the private nature of property shall not be changed. But by their similarity of economic interests they form a category which we variously call the capitalist, master, ruling or dominant class.

The opposing economic pole is composed of those who, by the very nature of the game, are excluded from participation in the ownership of the means of wealth production. Capitalism *can only be capitalism* where this sharp cleavage exists. These compose that heterogeneous mass known as the proletariat (from the Latin, meaning children of the soil), wage-slaves or working class. They are the overwhelming majority in modern society and are doomed by an ineluctable law of capitalistic development to be swamped in the mire of poverty and whipped by the scourge of necessity to offer their only possession — their power to labor — to the owners of creation. How well Marx describes this "free" transaction: "the possessor of labor-power follows as his (the capitalist's) laborer. The one with an air of importance, smirking, intent on business; the other timid and holding back, like one who is bringing his own hide to market and has nothing to expect but — a hiding."

This brief synopsis should give you a fair understanding of economic class distinction. Do not confuse it with social, cultural, political or educational differences. These latter may be, and often are, explicable on the basis of different economic levels; but they are effects only, reflections of the actual parts men and classes play in the scheme of the economic system. The wealth of society is represented as a vast accumulation of commodities, and an incessant struggle obtains between the two class divisions over the share each shall possess. On the economic field this conflict is known as the *class struggle.* But we live in a political society in which the diverse economic groups strive to achieve their ambitions through the control of the state power. This contest for political supremacy is the ground on which is fought the battle for economic mastery. Whichever group succeeds in capturing the state imposes its economic will on the rest of society. Now the strongest economic class today is the capitalist. They dictate the policies of state and directly control the functions of the state, i. e., the police, judiciary, armed forces, primary education, etc., and indirectly, by reason of wealth and influence, the prevailing ideology (this word means, roughly, reflected ideas from a system or social order) of the people. Writers, preachers, scientists, educators, philosophers, dance to the tune called by the Cæsars of commerce and industry. The ruling class permits the dissemination only of those ideas which tend to perpetuate the existing order. This viewpoint is class biased and serves to vitiate the teachings of history, science and philosophy and bend them to the support of entrenched privilege.

And this interest, as we have shown, is contrary to the true interests of the working class. Consequently the enlightened, class-conscious element among them, the socialist, must, to achieve its economic and political emancipation, correct the distortion in the world of ideas and supplant error and prejudice with true proletarian knowledge.

WILLIAM CHILD CURREY

ADVANCED MANAGEMENT

ADVANCED MANAGEMENT is the quarterly Journal of The Society for the Advancement of Management and the successor to the Bulletin of the Taylor Society (of speed-up efficiency ame) and also the Bulletin of Industrial Engineers. Surely, this magazine can not be accused of being a socialist journal "spreading irresponsible demagogy" to the effect (1) that it has become relatively difficult for a new comer to enter the ranks of the capitalist class; (2) that the schools are turning out an overproduction of qualified men for whom there are no prospects for jobs, and (3) that modern machines have greatly diminished special skills or trained workers.

Socialist speakers continuously have to face hecklers who insist that any poor boy can become a capitalist if only he works hard enough and has enough brains. The editorial in ADVANCED MANAGEMENT, June 1948, becomes worthy of preserving for the record.

The conclusions of the editorial call for a frank facing of the issue by managers in terms of the contradictory nature of the system. The lesson we find below is the impossibility of capitalist managers to reconcile the facts of technology and the status of the workers under the system.

COMMENT

Occasionally it is valuable, if not essential, to stand well away from the operating picture and consider where we are headed in terms of the several social influences which have an impact on the conduct of industry.

Three such considerations seem important to raise at this time and they are clearly interrelated. One of these is the extent in our society of what the sociologists are calling "social mobility." In other words, is it relatively easy for individuals to move up in the social and economic scale of living more readily than in previous times? Or is our society becoming increasingly characterized by a horizontal stratification which implies an increasing rigidity in our class structure?

A second vital sociological fact is the steadily increasing fraction of our young people who attend and graduate from high school.

And a third consideration is as to whether there is occuring a significant trend in the transfer of skill from men to machines. In other words, does our advancing technology make relatively greater or less demand for workers who are highly skilled and highly trained?

The problem obviously posed is that, if social mobility seems to be decreasing as more education is being received by more people and if less training are required to do the factory work of our society, what new challenges may this create for those who are responsible for the management of these organizations?

The problem obviously posed is that, if social mobility seems to be decreasing as more education is being received by more pople and if less education and less trained are required to do the factory work of our society, what new challenges may this create for those who are responsible for the management of these organizations? Is a new difficulty being created with respect to the possibility of large numbers of people getting both the satisfaction of creative expression and the sense of potential growth and progression in and through their relations to work?

Conclusive evidence which can lead to constructive answers to whatever conditions may be the fact is not easy to obtain. Yet, there is reason to believe that our underlying social situation increasingly shapes itself in a direction which may contain the seeds of serious maladjustment of individuals to society unless we consciously address ourselves to the discovery of appropriate remedies.

The extent of social mobility or class rigidity in our society can be appraised economically in terms of family income data. And, psychologically, some evidence of importance may be obtainable through a greater knowledge of personal attitudes about the sense of individuals as to their