

IN DEFENSE OF INDUSTRIALISM

In this essay an endeavor will be made to sketch the place of the individual in the culture of industrialism. The conclusions to be drawn cannot be other than tentative, for we live at the beginning of a new period in world history which we shall call that of industrialism, and our experience with it has been limited. Nonetheless, the subject bears such vital significance for our future that the temerity of the attempt may be justified. Since industrialism emphasizes speedy change, we must continuously check on the direction which it is taking. One of the most revealing indicators is that of the position of the individual; and on that problem a comparison of the role of the individual, actual and potential, in this culture with his role in pre-industrial societies may throw some light. In so brief an essay it is impossible to attempt to explain the change in the position of the individual or to condition general statements by the discussion of exceptions. The interest is concentrated upon the broad lines of the historical process.

The concept "personality" will be used to designate the product of some conscious capacity and effort to shape one's life in freedom. The individual must have opportunities and facilities enabling him to choose from among many ways those which in his judgment seem best suited to encourage the cultivation of his natural talents. He must be able to exercise the right of continuous selection of experience whereby, depending upon organic capacity, he can develop his innate gifts or acquired faculties.

In Defense of Industrialism

The overwhelming masses of mankind have never enjoyed a personality of the type defined. They lived in conditions which deprived them of the freedom and of the opportunities essential to learn what they could do or become. The majority were peasants, whose experience was usually restricted to the village in which they were born, whose gait was normally set by the oxen they drove, if they were sufficiently fortunate to have oxen, and whose sole goal, stated most optimistically, was to be a possessor or occupant of a little piece of land to till. As human organisms they grew in body and soul; but they were levelled off and rendered uniform by the common narrow limits of their experience. In major attributes, irrespective of differences in wealth, in nationality, in geographic location, even of age, they were all alike. A Chinese peasant and a French peasant, upon being brought together and blessed for a time with the gift of a common language, would have talked about their similar problems with immediate understanding. Devoid of the need and of the facilities to become literate, they remained essentially immobile; and they adjusted themselves to the rhythm of the seasons and to the whim of the lord. They reflected an animal's acceptance of a nature largely beyond their control and served as subordinates to a master frequently possessed of the real power of life and death. Until change came from the outside the peasants had little or no chance to develop personality in freedom, with a choice of opportunities to give conscious shape to their lives. Each possessed some distinguishing qualities, just as a dog or ox or a field did; but he, or she, could rarely overcome the limitations which were fixed by a localized culture.

For the other two classes in pre-industrial society, the burghers in the towns and the nobility, the handicap of immobility was much less pronounced. Nonetheless, they suffered from the class uniformity of a standardized and generally static environment. They frequently stressed values which revealed their power in the milieu, but which were devoid of creative significance. The portrait of Louis XIV dressed in armor, a long, curly wig and garments of weight and richness, and psychologically inflated by an artist who knew how to please, expresses a degree of class differentiation and of personal exaltation which could only exist in a society of sharply restricted mobility. A king, a nobleman, or even a few upper-class burghers, each to an accepted degree, could expose such notions of personal grandeur to a society in which relatively few shared the opportunity to check on the validity of their claims. Even in their cases the quality of their personality was short on many counts. Like the peasant, but in different ways, they could rarely surmount the handicaps of their culture. They

exercised too much power over the lives of others; they possessed certain kinds of potential ability and understanding for which they found no outlet. They lived usefully within the limits of their culture; but judged from the standpoint of historical evolution they shared the shortcomings of too few challenges to intellectual and spiritual growth. Energy which under industrialism would be put to creative purposes was expended on such excesses of display as the court of Versailles and dynastic wars.

The society of industrialism develops and utilizes personality in more people and to a greater degree than any other culture known in history. For the first time man has created the conditions conducive to the flowering and the universalizing of that humanism of which philosophers have dreamed. For the first time personality may be achieved by everyone. No longer restricted to a small élite, it has become a democratic objective and a democratic necessity. Every individual must cultivate his or her abilities in freedom, or we shall again succumb to the traditional turn of history and our civilization will give way to another age of darkness.

In discussing the relation between personality and industrialism we must assume that man is diverse in his physiological and nervous constitution and that he can adjust to a wide variety of conditions. We must postulate that in view of this diversity the human race will be most completely itself and will prosper emotionally, intellectually, and physically under conditions which encourage the utilization of the enormous range of difference. The utilization must encompass both sexes at all ages and it must be continuous; the kinds of opportunities must vary to suit physiological and psychological changes. If one assumes that humans are created in order, among other things, to realize their own potentialities, then that culture suits them best and is most economical and efficient from an ethical or a cosmological point of view which offers the widest range of opportunities for unfolding and utilizing these potentialities. In the light of history there is only one claimant for the title, the society of industrialism.

The qualities of personality which industrialism evokes and stimulates may be briefly summarized. They are in the main common to everyone, for the demand in this culture is universal; but the extent to which they develop will vary according to the capacity of the individual. The essential traits are as follows: The individual must be intelligent and imaginative; he must be cooperative and responsible; he must have initiative and must be willing to assume risks; he must be reasonable, understanding, and considerate of others; he must be able to draw a plan and to execute it; he must be self-reliant, and at the same time he must appreciate his dependence

In Defense of Industrialism

upon others; he must believe in himself and in others and have the courage to play his part in a dynamic society; and he must cultivate his natural aesthetic sense. He must, in short, possess those attributes which are essential for the success of the society in which he lives.

The assertion that man tends to adopt as personal characteristics the basic qualities of the society in which he lives is true of all cultures. Since the culture of one age will vary from that of another, the type of basic personality will likewise change. One should not expect, therefore, to find in an age of industrialism the essential characteristics of society and of personality which one has associated with other cultures. The changes are so profound that the correlation between culture and personality in our society requires analysis. Let us consider the main basic qualities from this point of view.

Education and learning may be called vicarious experience, the trial run before responsibility for action is assumed. In a society of ox power they may have seemed largely decorative or subjectively satisfying; in a culture of industrialism they are vital. The machine must be placed alongside the book as a depository of experience and knowledge; the user must know something beforehand about the machine or he will wreck it and possibly injure himself. With millions of people constantly utilizing and dependent upon this new kind of book the workers must share the qualities of intelligence and imagination along with everyone else. Some personalities will possess these qualities in greater degree than others and will become the leaders; but the machine process requires the democratic spread of them among all.

Cooperation and a sense of individual responsibility are to a certain extent inculcated by the organization of the family and are present in a peasant community. The need for them in rural life has previously been limited by the fact that all agricultural workers, whether owners or day laborers, have performed about the same tasks. A wide-scale division of function must prevail before the participants learn that for the sake of the safety and advantage of each they must all cooperate. Since each assumes a different duty in the common enterprise of turning out an automobile or of operating a free parliament or city government, each participant must appreciate the need to contribute his share with efficient conscientiousness. Lives will depend upon his acting responsibly; since he in turn uses machines, to cite the material example, his own life will depend upon the presence of a similar feeling in colleagues known and unknown to him at all stages of the process. By the nature of its material and institutional interdependence in-

dustrialism has begun to inculcate in us a standard of ethics which, except in the primary institutions, no previous society would have found necessary and have been able to enforce. The difference in the attitude of people toward taxation confirms this argument. In countries which remain largely or even in considerable part pre-industrial, the people attempt to avoid the due payment of taxes; they are not disciplined by the processes of an industrial society. In those where industrialism has trained the public in ways of self-discipline, the payment of taxes, even the direct income tax, becomes an accepted obligation of a citizen.

Since individual initiative implies the assumption of calculated risk, the two qualities of the industrial personality may be regarded as facets of a whole. In a sense the people of the Old Regime ran more risks than we do; but since they exercised far less control over the forces of nature, they did so not from choice but from compulsion. Personal initiative of significance to considerable numbers of people was almost entirely confined to the relatively few individuals in positions of power. The opportunities for the masses to try something new were limited by the dire shortage of facilities. In our industrial culture we have become so accustomed to individual initiative and risk that unless we consider them in historical perspective we lose sight of the mass expansion of initiative during the past hundred years. The creation of parliamentary government based on competitive political parties has opened the field of public life to great and small and has given them the possibility of attaining the highest and most powerful offices in the state. Science and technology have supplied individuals with the potential means to destroy or save millions of lives and to destroy or create millions of dollars worth of property. Industry provides channels from bottom ranks to top, a system which with aid from education permits an individual to reach that level of influence appropriate to his ability. A trip to a national park has become so easy that we forget how much enterprise and how great a risk are involved. When contrasted with the acquisition of a pan, a dress, or a piece of furniture in the Old Regime, our annual rate of purchase of consumers' goods expresses in physical terms the profound change that has occurred in our reaction to the tenor of life. We are constantly creating new desires, trying new things, catering to new wants; we are constantly forced to take initiative, and we do so at our own and indirectly at society's risk. The peasant and pre-industrial worker accepted hazards, limited in variety, because they had no alternative; the élite assumed them in many cases as an act of will. We have so greatly augmented the number of actions of initiative and uncertainty that at present in the

In Defense of Industrialism

course of a year the ordinary worker shows more initiative and runs more risk in a greater number of aspects of life than most nobles or other members of the élite did in the Old Regime.

Reasonableness, understanding, and consideration of others have characterized some individuals in every age of history. They are ethical ideals which apply to all times and to all places; even when, as in war, they appear to be temporarily violated, the persons who preserve them have usually acted as leaders and have proved to be most effective at the temporary art of destruction. Our question is whether the culture of industrialism places an unprecedented premium upon the possession of these qualities and has transformed them from standards of a small élite to values for the entire mass of the population. The evidence justifies an affirmative answer. We live in such close proximity to each other that we are induced to cultivate the habit of reasonableness; otherwise our civilization will fly to pieces. Where millions of persons dwell in urban communities and thousands work together in factories or offices, the objective faculty of reason must be used as a means of establishing rapport with colleagues in the pursuit of a common goal; the display of emotionality must be curbed as a force too subjective in nature for others to be able quickly or even at all to understand its meaning and to act in accordance with its intent. Nor can solitude and silence offer an escape to the extent they did in the Old Regime. Since nothing human is devoid of some degree of emotionality, persons in our culture must endeavor to understand their immediate colleagues and possibly through them the many individuals with whom they come into contact or with whom they transact business. Let anyone, even a present-day farmer, think of the number of people to whom he has to respond during any twenty-four hours, either actually or vicariously by way of the newspapers and other media of information, and compare the number and intensity of these contacts with those of almost any individual, peasant, burgher, or noble, of the Old Regime. The extent to which and the ways in which our institutions inculcate in us some understanding of others and some consideration of others become evident. The popularity of books on etiquette, on the ways to win friends, on the methods of salesmanship, and on the art of managing people signifies a mass effort to conduct interpersonal and intergroup relations on a basis of greatest effectiveness. The society of large numbers has created institutions and instilled ways for enabling these masses of people to live together. Reasonableness and the understanding and consideration of others are cultivated as ethical guides to that end.

Planning was restricted in the case of every social group in the Old Regime. For the peasantry the plans were set by nature, tradition, or the local lord. Those for the burghers conformed less to the demands of these three powers, but they were limited by the facilities of transportation and communication and the resulting shortage of incentives. The nobles could aim toward a career as official or officer or even as landlord, but they suffered from the same material deficiencies as the burghers and from the inhibitions of class. The absence of a unified exchequer and a clearly defined public budget in the central government reflected the general inattention to the probable course of future events. The habit of relating intimately past, present, and future has first gained general acceptance in our industrial society. Arguments arise over the question of who shall formulate and execute the plans; but from the young housewife who budgets the month's salary to the family which expects to visit Yellowstone Park, not to speak of the political candidate who wants to be elected, we all estimate our present material and spiritual resources and anticipate the use of future ones. The individuals in a society like ours, built on interdependence of its parts and ordering the interchange of its goods and services by means of a common medium of exchange, have every inducement to learn to plan. The old peasantry had to be sure that the food supply lasted until the next crop; but how simple were the calculations required for that purpose in comparison with those of a modern family facing a market of abundance, a modern teacher struggling over the choice of the most valuable subjects for training young people, or a modern worker weighing the arguments for and against settling down in a particular industrial community. Since these people, who scarcely wield the influence in society of big institutions like the government, the corporations and the trade unions, share in the same practice of planning as the latter, one can be sure that to a greater or lesser degree our culture inculcates this quality of rational anticipation and practical implementation in each of us. Or perhaps we should regard the process as a mutual one: the industrial culture and the individual become habitual planners *pari passu*.

The need for self-reliance has increased with the expansion of interdependence, not as a defensive measure bordering on defiance of others, but as a characteristic essential to the functioning of a complicated society. In a culture adjusted to the rate of movement of an ox or a horse, and measuring time not by the minute or hour but by the season, decisions could be left to the few élite and actions would be restricted largely to repetition of the original. The overwhelming mass of human beings followed orders or

In Defense of Industrialism

walked in the grooves of custom. Apart from the attention to elemental needs like personal safety, most people were unable and were unfitted to be original in thought or behavior; and when industrialism transformed the tempo and structure of society, it created the demand for a kind of individual with characteristics the opposite of those of our mass ancestors. When the tempo is accelerated to that of a machine, human beings must think and act in a comparable way. They are in positions of control over instruments of power, mechanical and social, and they must have the ability to assume the initiative in case of any interruption of the process. Except on crucial matters of policy they cannot wait for orders from above; they must decide issues and act on their own responsibility at once. The lives of too many other persons depend upon the orderly continuation and improvement of the process for one individual to avoid the unspecified as well as the specified obligations of his job. Industrialism functions with unprecedented speed and efficiency because it evokes and stimulates the exercise of initiative and self-reliance in the millions of individuals of which it is composed. It succeeds in doing so not merely because it excites the motives of selfishness, but because it arouses an appreciation of social interdependence. With the machine process, the parliament, the large civic organizations that characterize our society, the ethical standard, in which private initiative and self-confidence on the one hand and responsibility for the welfare of society on the other supplement each other and form an integrated whole, has become widespread. This standard is fixed in each of us, again to a greater or lesser degree; but none deny that in the course of his work the driver of a truck or an urban scavenger will have to contend with more unexpected situations and will have to take more care for the fate of other people than any pre-industrial peasant, worker, and most burghers and even nobles.

The extension of responsibility to all individuals has entailed the growth of faith in oneself and in others which has given to the members of a democratic society their buoyancy and optimism. Our dynamic culture has released the energy of millions of free individuals. It has enticed them on with the belief that by their own effort and with the aid of others, help to which they are entitled and of which they feel sure, they can emulate the dynamics of industrial process, in the economy, in politics and government, in education, in social activity, and advance as far as their ability, aided by a certain amount of good fortune, will reach. Except possibly in frontier conditions with their emancipating effects, the mass of pre-industrial individuals never knew such optimism; the members of the pre-

industrial élite felt it only in the limited number of fields at their disposal; they lack the means for participating in the surge of a whole society of dynamic individuals. The contrast may be seen by comparing the lack of interest shown by pre-industrial man in extending his culture to other peoples with the faith which the free personalities of an industrial society show in the essential value of theirs for all peoples.

In a culture like that of industrialism, which has been so largely man-made, aesthetic appreciation or creativeness, innate in each one of us, should flourish. Even apart from the manifest significance of city and regional planning and the enormous expansion of the professions of architect and interior decorator, we witness a growing interest in aesthetic expression that includes the training of children, the support of concerts and exhibits, the collecting by private individuals of works of art and music. We encourage the development of persons aesthetically creative to such an extent that one may doubt whether any previous society even in proportion to the size of the population has cultivated the enjoyment of things aesthetic on a similar scale. Our industrial society has its Cosimos de' Medici. They may not read Latin authors, but many of them read and speak the equivalent in one or more modern languages, and they collect works of art and support creative individuals to as great extent as Maecenases have in the past. When in the late afternoon a banker of a small city breaks away from his colleagues at their annual meeting in New York and visits the art galleries on 57th Street, one may be justified in believing that the fundamental employment of the creative sense in banking and industry is arousing an interest in and a respect for creativeness in aesthetic lines. The banker may belong in the tradition of the upper-class collectors; but if a president of the United States plays or paints, we know that the society will produce many amateurs who carve wood, work in metal, cut and polish stones, or express themselves in some other way. Whether the peasants and the middle class of the Old Regime achieved more or less than we do cannot be accurately gauged; one can say that in a culture like ours which is so largely the product of man we should expect the mores to include the encouragement of aesthetic self-expression.

The relation of the individual to nature may be used as evidence. Has the machine destroyed our intimacy with nature? The contrary appears to be true. In our society people have the opportunity and the leisure to enjoy living in nature without the compulsion of physical drudgery. A gifted peasant could rarely have felt a warm response to nature; he was too tired, too handicapped in the exercise of his imagination. Within a few minutes

In Defense of Industrialism

or hours the relaxed descendant of the peasant can be in open fields or woods; he can be stimulated by the sight of our national parks. He can contrast the new beauty of the machine with that of outdoor nature, the man-selected sharp lines, neat proportions and cool surfaces of the one with the wild array of animate and inanimate objects of the other.

The distinction often made that the outdoors inspires man with the sense of organic growth whereas the machine is dead has become too simple to be adequate. Organic nature and inorganic nature have in our culture taken on close kinship. A flower remains a flower, but it also has gained the status of an object of scientific research. We can transform it into another shape, size and color. We can achieve similar or possibly even more changes in a mineral, for it is subject to human control to a greater extent than the flower. We can make it into objects of differing beauty. We have a close personal relation to a piece of asbestos, to silica, to iron pyrites which one brought up in a pre-industrial society could not possibly have felt. To him a stone offered material for sculpture and building; to us it has become vastly diverse in quality, and it serves so many kinds of ends that we consider it one of our most flexible and adaptable earth compatriots. Sculptors have always appreciated the individuality of each type of stone; in this respect even when we make aesthetic mistakes we are all more or less sculptors. The concept of nature has expanded so widely in our industrial society that a Shelley would be as excited over the wealth of inspiration as an Auden, and the individual personality benefits from this enormous increase of aesthetic stimuli.

We may summarize at this point by concluding that the opportunities for and the incentives to a varied experience are far greater for the individuals in our modern industrial society than they have ever been in any other culture. The entire area of politics and government is open to the common man; the economic life challenges him to strive as high as he will; the division of function affords an opportunity for the utilization of the most varied abilities.

Even the military, that stronghold of rigidity, has had to adjust itself to the requirements of industrialism. As a cross-section of society, it has been taking over the standards of its society, as far as its purpose will allow, among them the use of the particular capacities of the individual. It has done so for the sake of efficiency in war, the most dangerous competitive enterprise in the world. The common foot-soldier has become an expert in his line; he must be trained in ways of initiative and leadership within and beyond his normal role. At any moment in combat he may be expected to

assume the responsibilities of leader; he may be forced by circumstances to use his wits in fending for himself without the aid of the drill book; he may need to recognize the value which some information accidentally acquired may possess for others. He is far from the type of soldier of the armies of absolutism. He is no longer a near or actual criminal, coerced into military service and guarded and treated like a convict; he responds as a self-respecting citizen who performs his duty to an ideal become reality. As a soldier, whether private or officer, he must be a personality.

Every culture manifests both constructive and destructive aspects, the presence of the one seeming to entail that of the other. Difficulties arise which may amount to neuroses on a mass scale. These may eventually act as stimuli to new forms of creativeness, but at the time they may loom sufficiently large to require special attention. Adverse critics maintain that industrialism sets an inhumanly fast pace, that in consequence it wears out a human being too quickly, that it transforms him into a superficial person leading a trivial, artificial, materialistic life. These complaints, usually made by novelists, are undoubtedly justified in many cases; but are they valid for the nature of the culture as a whole? Has industrialism weakened so many personalities and produced so many neurotics that society as well as personality will go to pieces?

When considered over the stretch of time the evidence appears to counter the accusations. Anthropology shows that individuals have adjusted to many kinds of institutions and social conditions. It justifies the conclusion that instead of becoming the slaves of the machine they will succeed in controlling the machine for their own needs. The effectiveness of trade unions in reducing the speed of the machine to a pace suitable to its human tenders illustrates a main characteristic of the machine process: the individuals can set the latter at any speed they wish—in emergencies at a fast pace, in normal times at that pace which suits them best. It may be true that in proportion to the size of the population this swiftly changing culture renders more people insecure and subject to neuroses than any of its predecessors. We lack data to maintain or to deny the accusation. It can certainly be claimed that this culture takes more care to assist individuals in finding a proper place in it than any previous one has done. In addition to its achievements in the medical fields, it must be credited with the first systematic attempt to study personality for practical purposes. It has developed the science which deserves the honor of being called democratic, namely psychology, a field of knowledge which, in all its many ramifications, emphasizes work with the individual. It practices one Christian teaching, to

In Defense of Industrialism

be one's brother's keeper. While it treats the marginal or abnormal person, it likewise attempts to find norms for what the individual should be and for ways of improving him. If one asserts that man has never felt such need for psychology as at present and that our concern with that subject betrays the fact of our own disintegration, we may counter by inquiring about the behavior of the flagellants, the inquisitors, the types of persons portrayed in the novels of Dostoevsky and Gogol. We may claim to be unique in history in our systematic efforts to help people like these to recover, to prevent a repetition of such conditions and to offer the victims of mental as well as physical disorders the prospect of a good life. We practice psychology and institutionalize it in many ways. The priest and the pastor have acquired allies in the psychiatrist, the personnel officer, the social service worker and the members of numerous other professions utilizing psychology in the work-a-day processes of life.

The objectives of the aids to personality have come within the range of realization because of the multiple opportunities which industrialism provides for finding suitable tasks for each individual, because of the wealth which makes possible the support of the assistance, and above all because of the importance gained by the individual in this culture. If a person does not fit into one occupation he can move to another; in the Old Regime he would have exhausted his life in frustration. If one job gives out, the individual may be retrained quickly for another. If ambition stirs him, he can receive public education to equip him for the position of his choice. The easy transfer from one occupation to another has become a mark, not of incompetence as in pre-industrial societies, but of alertness to opportunities. Our culture is so integrated that an individual can move about and always remain within the institutional framework of a functioning whole.

Since anything that changes or grows is subject to trial and error, our industrial society cannot advance into the future and create new conditions without at the same time bringing about some situations with adverse effects. Undoubtedly we run the risk of becoming relativists, of being devoid of fundamental moral and aesthetic beliefs, of lacking a sense of belonging; but the evidence against the acceptance of any overall pessimistic judgment to that effect seems to be decisive. The goals are institutionalized in the economy, the society and the government; and those individuals who are not fully conscious of the objectives (and few take the time to define them clearly) are aware of their membership in large, well-organized units of society with well-defined aims as to present and future. Uncertainty arises over the short-range plans for achieving the ends. The

nature of the dynamic process of industrialism is such that the awareness of the general purpose will be accompanied by the uncertainty and risk necessary for creativeness and growth. Nonetheless man is adjusting to this kind of culture, to its demands for both creativity and conformity; and the development of qualities of a total personality, within the degree organically possible for each individual, is rapidly providing us with the kind of basic personality structure essential for making industrialism succeed. Novelists and many other creative individuals, not merely in France but in Great Britain, the United States and elsewhere, are frequently if not usually confused in their views by the fact that they live in a period of transition in which the psychological imprint of agrarianism or of early industrialism with all its ugliness and brutality persists strongly in persons of special sensitivity. Lacking experience in constructive social science and misled by an unjustified assumption of a direct causal relation between industrialism and war, the creative aesthetes either tend to judge, often unconsciously, the contemporary conditions of the individual and society by agrarian standards—the fertile field, the green trees, the slowly moving seasons, peace and fruitfulness; or, while acknowledging that Jefferson's world of the small farmer cannot be restored, they condemn the present and select for treatment in their works the repulsive aspects. Together with many social scientists they fix their attention too narrowly upon the present and neglect the perspective which a study of history provides. They misinterpret this culture by being unable or unwilling to comprehend the trends into the future which it is broadly setting. Their bias discloses the difficulty of understanding a society in transition. They have not attained the type of personality which expresses the new culture. In this respect they lag behind those individuals, especially the business leaders, the technicians, the professional people and the workers, who are actively engaged in creating industrialism.

If we were drawing conclusions about the sociology of creativeness we might venture the assertion that active participation arouses more appreciation, even though unformulated, of the general significance of a process than aesthetic contemplation does. To a certain extent the statement is true; but anyone acquainted with contemporary art perceives that some of these creators have expressed in symbolic forms the beauty of industrialism and the ability of this new culture to serve man. Whether these artists like the association or not, they are to be placed, at least for these particular works, in the same category with the enthusiastic business leader prophete-

In Defense of Industrialism

syng before the local chamber of commerce the glories of the industrial future.

Since we live at the beginning of the creation of an industrial society, we are handicapped in delineating the full expression of the present potentialities. Nonetheless it seems evident that within a few generations we should be living in an economy of abundance and that the type of personality suited to it should by that time be further developed. Since the United States, Canada, Great Britain, the Scandinavian and some of the other small countries of Western Europe have advanced farthest in this direction, we have to take our signs from their experience. What will be the relations between personality and society in a world of abundance?

As material goods become more numerous, the basic wants for a high standard of living will be satisfied for everyone. We know from experience that these conditions entail a great increase in personal services. The professions become more numerous as to division of function and as to personnel. The individual will be able to afford this personal attention, and the training of experts will keep pace with the expansion of the market. Education will continue to flourish as the indispensable means of helping individuals to prepare for roles in a highly intellectualized and mobile society; and research, scholarship, and learning will provide the vital knowledge for the speedy rate of development. All individuals will continue to share in this educational process, some more than others as befits their nature, but all with a basic minimum far above any that history has as yet known.

Since man grows, compares and competes, we can anticipate that upon satisfying his need for material things like cars and refrigerators, each will endeavor to differentiate himself from others by some more subtle means. Abundance should enable him to do so by cultivating his aesthetic taste. He should be distinguished from all the other owners of universal equipment by the kind of art he possesses, the kind of books he reads, the kind of music to which he listens, possibly or even probably the kind of aesthetic creativeness in which he himself participates. These objects or activities should be within the financial reach of everyone, and we should experience an age in which good living and sensitive refinement of taste may characterize not merely the élite, as in the past, but everyone. Personality will have been achieved, always of course on a differentiated scale, by each individual, and we may be able to realize the ideal of a democracy.

The differentiation among individuals not merely by material accomplishment and the exercise of social prestige but above all by the refine-

ment of taste and the level of intellectual and spiritual attainment will not cause the disintegration of society. The qualities of personality which we recognize at present as essential for the success of industrial culture will persist. Interdependence will become greater as the culture of abundance brings with it increased complexity of organization. The competitive spirit will keep the individuals striving at the frontier of further achievement, and freedom must enable the individuals to work effectively in the dynamic process. Rationality and self-control will maintain the possibility of mutual understanding and mutual respect. A degree of asceticism and want will remain essential as stimuli to criticism and to creativeness in the arts as well as in the material fields; but the asceticism may pertain to the desire for the possession not of present basic material goods but of improved ones, of novel ones, those of greater and greater refinement. In the arts it may concern the wish for those products that show unusual understanding of man, society and the world. Although mystery will persist and will excite the imagination and stimulate the ambition of individuals for action and reform, in a culture essentially man-made it should no longer overwhelm the personality and cause bloody sacrifices to inhuman deities and wild rites of self-destruction. We can expect a certain amount of evil to persist; but wherever traits inimical to personality and society, like greed or cruelty, appear, instead of following the traditional practice of ignoring them or attempting to suppress them by physical force we shall possess the institutionalized means for speedily correcting them. Rejecting any implications that we are stupid, wicked animals, we shall remain steadfast in our optimism about man's ability to control and refine nature, including his own. We shall be aiming at the goal of enabling every individual to develop for himself the finest ideal of personality that a rich tradition and a dynamic present can offer.

Our major reason for believing that the democratic ideal of personality can be achieved arises from the similarity between the major characteristics of industrialism and the nature of the human being. Never before has a total culture reflected so many of the attributes of man. Our machine economy, our free parliamentary government and our mobile social organization all express the natural fact of man's biological growth and intellectual and spiritual development. They permit him more opportunities to live in action and to enjoy recreation as nature intended than any simple agrarian economy, any authoritarian government, or any rigid caste or class society ever allowed. Our multiplicity of occupations and ease of transportation and communication, our popular facilities for education

In Defense of Industrialism

and easy access to them, have for the first time in history provided the means for the enormous diversity of nervous systems, of intellectual and spiritual faculties in mankind to receive a stimulus and find an outlet for the particular makeup of each individual. Rich and poor, so-called upper-class and lower-class, all benefit from the development of institutions proper to the nature of the mind and soul of the individual. If the mind is called the distinguishing organ of man, there has never been a culture in which it was as carefully cultivated, as widely used, and as essential for the entire way of life, as at present. If the soul is considered the unique gift of man, we excel over all previous cultures in the extent to which we must and do encourage the use of our ethical and aesthetic faculties. No age in the past can compare with ours in the number and size of urban communities, where man must create his own beauty and instill his own standards of ethics. In this environment he cannot depend upon natural beauty or natural goodness, for in a large urban center the one scarcely exists and the other must be so organized as to be advantageous to all. The arrangement of streets and buildings cries for aesthetic guidance; the dependence of each person upon the safe and continuous flow of gas, electricity and water requires the presence of a feeling of personal responsibility which no external police power can supply. Aesthetics and ethics face a social demand the dimensions of which lack a precedent. The quality will vary according to the ability of the creator and the degree of appreciation of the group; but in this man-made environment some aesthetics and some ethics will be applied. Since man has shown an inclination toward competition as well as toward criticism, and response to need and opportunity, there is reason to assume that he will make the good life possible even in the towns and cities. To think otherwise would be to deny belief in the essential goodness of man, a belief upon which our culture is founded.

The fact that man is characterized by growth, to which should be added mobility, clearly calls for the practice of experimentation, of planning and of trial and error. Lack of opportunity has hitherto prevented the exercise of these practices by the overwhelming mass of mankind to any other than a minor degree, and by even the rest of mankind to any great extent. Our industrial culture is again the first to require the inclusive cultivation of these faculties. Whether one is concerned with industry, science, housing, family or group living, and so on, one must in our age show initiative, attack novel situations, assume some risk, and cultivate an interest in development which allows expression to natural qualities of the human organism. The amount will vary from person to person, but to some extent

each must participate in the work of entrepreneur, and the opportunities exist in every field and are almost limitless.

Our industrial culture requires the presence of personalities or it may end in self-destruction. In a localistic society of oxen and peasants, of horses and lords, and of a few townsmen, the course of nature could be allowed to run without much guidance. Personalities of distinction were necessary in small numbers; many tended to cultivate their talents in private; most of mankind had about the same characteristics as the animals and plants. In our society individuals must assume responsibility for the functioning of the parts and of the whole, adequately for the present, imaginatively and creatively for the future. The big industrialist, the mechanic, the night watchman, the general, the private, the pastor, the teacher, each will confront novel situations in which he must decide issues of significance which we associate with an industrial society. The demand for personalities in our culture is universal, and institutions and ways are developing to inculcate the necessary attributes—intelligence, imagination, creativeness, rationality, experimentalism, entrepreneurship, reliability, a sense of social interdependence and responsibility, and an appreciation of fineness in people, things and situations. These may be regarded as the qualities of the modern many-sided man, the total personality, the kind of individual best suited to the dynamic democratic culture of which we are the bearers.