

The household is conditioned through interaction with other collectivities, which includes not only the standards of life, but includes discretionary styles for enhancing the life of the members of the household—religion, health, travel, leisure, and the realization of the basic values of the household structure.

A third function within the household centers in what is termed the integrative sector. It deals with the organization of the family's occupational roles. The roles in this sector of the household center around the improvement of occupational capacities through reorganization of the role of each family member—going back to school, for instance; taking job training as an example; consumption patterns and socialization techniques. It includes leadership for creating new occupational capacity or improving the old; it includes the valuation of innovation in family economic performance.

And such questions as who allocates household funds—these all enter into this particular function of how does the household spend its money in order to be able to meet this kind of change.

Now, within the household economy, the value sector functions to process motivation in the family. Roles are organized around the processing of appropriate motivation relative to economic performance, the developing of techniques in tension management, the integration of the techniques for the socialization and tension management by the division of labor among adults, or supplying supervision, nurture, and the whole question of valuation of motivation.

The point I wish to make is this, that these primary functions of the household require a continuous input of resources from the total social system. One of the most important ones is constant flow of income. And it is impossible, it seems to me, in the field of ethics to judge a family as being not motivated, as being unworthy when the very things we know from the behavioral sciences and from ethical analysis which motivate the family are not inputs into the family. And if we are going to really make secure the household in a rapid era of change, then these millions of families are going to need special transfer payments in order to be able to develop the very facilities necessary to process and to socialize persons in family structures.

The output, then, is the motivated person, and this is what we hope is achieved. Therefore, we do not get people locked into a social system of deprivation and poverty, but it is an investment in personality and into the household during periods of rapid social change.

The second point I wish to make centers around an ethical distinction between work and leisure. Because this constantly comes up in one form or another, sometimes disguised, when we are beginning to talk about incentives, let me pose a question. Does a person who is living from past investments represent a person who is working? Now, what is work? Work broadly defined means any human activity directed toward achieving objectives, whether or not any remuneration is involved.

Work narrowly defined is activity for the sake of specific economic gains. It is the exchange of labor for wages. Remember, narrowly defined, it is the exchange of labor for wages.

Now, then, a person who is able to make a claim upon a total social system because a father or a grandfather or a great grandfather made a good investment, is this person working? Then should this person