

THE CHALLENGE OF LEISURE
TO THE CULT OF WORK

R. C. LINSTROMBERG

Leisure is an attitude of mind and a condition of the soul . . . [it] has been, and always will be, the first foundation of any culture.

Josef Pieper

In the spring of 1964, the Ad Hoc Committee of the Triple Revolution submitted a report to President Johnson. The conclusions reached in this report can be summed up as follows: the technical ability of our society to produce goods and services has progressed to such an extent that increasing numbers of its members will find it impossible to obtain employment in economic production, and those who do obtain such employment will find their hours of labor considerably shortened. This hypothesis led the committee to include in its report the following statement. "Gaining control of our future requires the conscious formation of the society we wish to have. Cybernation at last forces us to ask the historic question(s). What is man's role when he is not dependent upon his own activities for the material basis of his life?"¹ According to at least two members of the committee, our society is on the verge of solving the economic problem of scarcity.² Put in a different way, we have developed tremendous capacity for production of leisure time.

Development of this capacity, however, is not an unmixed blessing. In spite of advances made in production of leisure time, we have not developed equally in ability to engage in leisure. In fact, many of the organizing institutions of our society are predicated upon the notion that leisure is inferior to produced goods.³ As a consequence, the necessity for increased leisure time will pose serious questions concerning the form and content of our future society. Many old goals will be rendered obsolete, and institutions whose function it was to coordinate those goals with others that are still relevant must change. For example, the whip of necessity has been an important force for social discipline. If it disappears, a replacement must be found.

Lack of social preparedness for leisure provides the backdrop against which the problem of leisure must be discussed today.⁴ Other ages discussed leisure, but the subject could be treated with detachment since only

a relatively few members of their society could afford leisure. In our time, if the Ad Hoc Committee is correct, large numbers of people will have a great deal of leisure time. This gives the question of leisure an urgency and a dimension missing under earlier conditions.⁵ It is the purpose of this paper to examine this question and some of its implications.

THE TRADITIONAL MEANING OF LEISURE

Since our oldest traditions have indicated that the purpose of work is leisure, it is somewhat surprising that the question of leisure should need to be raised. As Aristotle phrased it, "We are unleisurely in order to have leisure."⁶ Indeed, for Aristotle, leisure was the focal point of human existence, the point around which all other human activity revolved. It was man's supreme accomplishment, his mark of distinction differentiating him from other animals. Leisure was life itself, and man's function. As he put it most explicitly:

Life seems to be common even to plants, but we are seeking that which is peculiar to man. Let us exclude, therefore, the life of nutrition and growth The function of man is an activity of soul which follows or implies a rational principle.⁷

Activity of soul is leisure, and involves application of those attributes of mind and spirit that create civilization.

Closely related to the Aristotelian concept of leisure is what we would call contemplation, although this term connotes a passivity that narrows its applicability to only one side of the Greek idea. Perhaps a better distinction can be made by contrasting three kinds of human activity. The first is activity necessary for maintenance of the individual and the species as a biological form. This kind of activity involves economic output and related effort. The second type is that giving permanence and durability to the mortal individual by enabling him to comprehend and give expression to himself. Above all, this type of activity occurs when one develops and uses his faculty for speculation. The search for knowledge for its own sake is one such activity; expression of one's thoughts and feelings in any of the various art forms is another. The final type of human activity is that which creates and preserves institutions facilitating the first two types. Work, with its modern connotation, encompasses the first type of human activity. Leisure, at least as the Greeks understood it, involves the second and third types. Thus, the purpose of work is to sustain biological life; the purpose of leisure is to sustain spiritual, intellectual and social life.

In our society, leisure is frequently viewed (perhaps generally viewed) as the handmaiden of work because it revives and refreshes one for more productive labor. Work has been the focal point and, while the statement that the purpose of life is work may cause us to cringe, the opposite statement, that the purpose of life is leisure, strikes many of us as somehow

sinful. Time spent in leisure offers little measurable evidence of achievement, and in a pragmatic society the lack of evidence of achievement is proof of culpable failure.

THE WORK-LEISURE PARADOX

Throughout the ages attitudes toward leisure have been conditioned by scarcity. There appear to have been three stages in the history of the problem of scarcity (and, hence, in man's approach to questions of work and leisure).⁸ The first stage was that in which it was taken for granted that scarcity was inevitable, and covered the period of time up to the Reformation. During this stage, work was viewed as an inescapable part of the human condition. It was irritating, it was petty -- and man, in his search for human perfection (or ultimate salvation), was faced with the necessity of rising above it. The meaning of leisure and its proper form were major concerns of human inquiry, although it was taken for granted that leisure could be meaningful and available only for those intellectually and economically equipped for it.

The Reformation and the Industrial Revolution set in motion forces giving rise to the second stage. At first men hoped and then they came to believe that the problems posed by scarcity could be solved. However, this solution required total dedication to work. The cult of work began to develop, and speculation concerning leisure was relegated to the intellectual underground.⁹ Leisure came to be regarded as a sub-problem and, at least by implication, it was assumed that ultimate solution of the scarcity problem would create a utopia in which appropriate development of capacity to enjoy leisure would automatically evolve.

The third stage is that in which the solution of the problem of scarcity is held to have been discovered, with only application of known techniques required to bring poverty and drudgery to an end. It is a transitional stage -- lying between the work stage and a leisure stage yet to come. This is the stage we appear to be in currently, according to the Ad Hoc Committee. However, there is no surety that utopia will result, and even less assurance that capacity to enjoy leisure will be spontaneous. Mankind finds itself in a position analagous to that of an old man who, having looked forward to retirement throughout a lifetime of toil, suddenly finds himself apprehensive as the fateful day approaches. The habits of a lifetime spent wholeheartedly in labor do not prepare one for leisure. Suddenly a new awareness of the problem of leisure emerges.

STAGE I

The Greeks were familiar with the kind of work necessary for survival. For them as for their successors, it was an inevitable fact of life. Some historians have suggested that work was scorned by the Greeks because it was the normal activity of slaves. This misses the essential

point! The Greeks saw pre-occupation with fulfillment of biological needs as destructive of the whole man (and of human freedom). Thus, slaves were held to be inferior because they could not escape work rather than because they worked. For example, Aristotle and Plato pitied the slave who was coerced by misfortune to a life of labor; they were contemptuous of those who labored when they might be free. Exclusive concern with survival was the hallmark of the "natural" slave, an individual who allowed this overriding concern for survival to bind him, without appreciation for leisure, to the work process. These were the ones considered to be only a step removed from the animal, and fit to engage in nothing but economic activity. Thus, in the Republic, economic production and distribution was left to men such as these, leaving leisure to the philosopher kings.

The possession of leisure time was clearly to be in the hands of an elite, and it was to be an elite capable of both enjoying and using leisure. Individuals incapable of such activity were to be kept occupied with labor. No ethical questions were involved: the question was never asked whether exclusion from opportunities for leisure was just. It was simply taken for granted that leisure was impossible for those whose attitudes were materially oriented. Thus, leisure could not be a problem -- it held only the promise of civilization.

In the Middle Ages leisure came to be regarded as a kind of "silence," a receptivity of mind enabling man at leisure to perceive reality.¹⁰ Leisure became an attitude of non-activity, of inward calm, of openness to everything. Thomas Aquinas held that leisure was possible only when man engages in contemplative activities, and that the goal of contemplation is wisdom.

First run to thy house, and there withdraw thyself, take
thy pastime, and do what thou hast in mind . . .¹¹ when
I go into my house I shall repose with [Wisdom].¹²

Of course, to be wise was to know the ways of God, and so leisure implied a search for the purpose of man and for his relation to God. It also represented, however, an avenue of escape from the limiting boundaries of the economic world of scarcity, and it provided man with a purpose and a hope that helped obliterate the despair engendered by the "inexorable" law of scarcity. Only in leisure was man free. His body might be constrained to toil, but in leisure his mind and his soul would be unfettered and capable of infinite flight.

Since participation in leisure involved search for wisdom, it seems clear that leisure in the Middle Ages existed only for the relative few. The emphasis upon the search for God adds a universal element to leisure that seems to extend its potential to the masses. Upon closer examination, however, it is found that it is in Paradise that the masses find leisure. In life, labor remains an inescapable part of their condition. They were condemned to it, and are, therefore, unfree. It was only those intellectually or spiritu-

ally able to rise above or escape labor's constraints for whom "The final joy of man consists in the superlative activity of his supreme power, namely the activity of mind engaged with incomparable truth."¹³

There was, however, no missionary zeal to work. It was viewed as necessary and inevitable, but no glory was found in it. Leisure was the proper function of man as man; those for whom it was impossible were viewed with pity not unmixed with contempt. The structure of society was geared to leisure, and institutions to facilitate its exercise abounded.¹⁴

STAGE II

After the Reformation, and especially after the Industrial Revolution began, a new attitude developed concerning the scarcity problem. Men began to believe that the problem could be solved, or at least alleviated, that ultimately mankind could be relieved of poverty and, perhaps, even of the need to engage in economic labor.¹⁵ It required only concentration upon development of technology and production methods to harness resources, expand their capabilities and refine their qualities. This called, however, for radical change in man. He had to adopt the attitude that economic activity has dignity, is of central importance and is desirable in its own right. The transition period was a long one, and produced its own traumas, but man's attention did turn toward enlarging output -- and what had formerly been merely a means to life became an end of life, a purpose for living.

Increasingly, economic scarcity and its implications came to underlie intellectual inquiry. It became necessary for occupations to demonstrate their utility, and work began to occupy a place of special honor since its usefulness was obvious and demonstrable. Work was to be superior to leisure, but it was understood that this meant a kind of work resulting in a tangible product from which future revenues could be obtained -- for from those revenues would come the capital funds with which the machines that were to eliminate scarcity would be obtained.

There is one sort of labor which adds to the value of the subject upon which it is bestowed: there is another which has no such effect. The former, as it produces a value, may be called productive; the latter, unproductive labor. In the class [unproductive] must be ranked some of the gravest and most important, and some of the most frivolous professions: churchmen, lawyers, physicians, men of letters, opera-dancers, etc.¹⁶

It is clear from the list that, at least for Adam Smith, thoughts do not produce anything in themselves; hence, in the new atmosphere of utilitarianism, they became respectable only when they gave rise to a new product, a new technique for production, or improved the social and political framework within which work was carried out. And the criterion of improvement

was understood to be the prospects for an increased outflow of economic goods.

In the work-charged atmosphere in which the inevitability of scarcity was challenged this view was not unreasonable. Pure thought was frivolous. Since nothing "useful" emerged from the activities of man at leisure, he was idle. With its purpose in disrepute, leisure became an object of contempt. If leisure was at all desirable, it was solely as recreation -- as a restorative of man's productive capabilities. At this point leisure became "time free from work," and the truly important part of man's existence had become that spent in productive labor. Life became deadly serious, and asceticism became a part of the catechism. Where earlier scholars had glorified leisure and the search for God and man's meaning, in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries work was enshrined and man's meaning was found in it.

Acceptance of the new attitude toward work, however, was not immediately forthcoming. During the age of the artisan, a man who desired to indulge himself with a drink and conversation with his friends during the work-day could easily complete his unfinished work at a later time. Thus, in the sixteenth century, Benvenuto Cellini could say, "It so happened that I had been at work one morning more than three hours before daybreak, upon the trousseau of the bride I mentioned; then, while my shop was being opened and swept out, I put my cape on to go abroad and take the air."¹⁷ If, while taking the air, he should meet a colleague and spend the morning with him in conversation, so much to the good. The approach to work was casual, and people were accustomed to working at their own pace. Another quotation from the same source illustrates a different point. "M. Mattio del Nazara took the occasion of some feast day to invite me and my work-people to an entertainment in a garden."¹⁸ Prior to the Reformation there were about 160 Saint's days each year. All of these were holidays, and market days were usually free as well. Not only was the attitude toward work casual, even by contemporary standards the amount of time spent at it was small.

The machine, upon which the Industrial Revolution was based, required a kind of synchronization of effort foreign to previously accepted work patterns. For the worker tied to the machine, the day's work began and ended at its pleasure. And its pleasure was served throughout a long day. Dickens illuminated the point well.

The fairy palaces burst into illumination before pale morning showed the monstrous serpents of smoke trailing themselves over Coketown. A clattering of clogs upon the pavement; a rapid ringing of bells; and all the melancholy mad elephants, polished and oiled up for the day's monotony, were at their heavy exercise again.¹⁹

The day began in the early morning, ended late at night, and the machines

transformed work into a mindless routine that allowed no time for casual withdrawal from the work process. Men accustomed to the free and easy ways of the past were ill at ease with the new tempo of work, and, when they would work, were indifferent employees.²⁰ The widespread use of child labor soon created a supply of workers accustomed to the new pace, however; and work began with an intensity unknown to previous generations. By 1866, in some industries, men were working twelve hours a day, 365 days a year.²¹ Long before this time, however, sixteen hours a day for women and children were not unusual terms of labor. And even though pressure arose to reduce the length of the work day, most of it arose from a desire to "spread" work rather than from a desire for leisure time.²² The drive to work seems to have become firmly established by the turn of the nineteenth-century, and contentions favorable to leisure after that time came from "eccentrics."

It was in the United States that optimism concerning ultimate attainment of the solution to scarcity was highest.²³ The American mood has traditionally been utopian -- and the American utopia has had solution of the scarcity problem as its center. Americans have typically accepted the premise that their existing society is relatively unimportant, that the goal is development of a future society that is better -- and the aspect of the better society that distinguishes it is the abundance of economic goods it possesses.

It was also in America that such critics of the drive to opulence as Thoreau developed. Walden expressed a view of the losses of materialistic man. Development of production capability is possible only if goods produced can be sold. Consequently, in their drive to develop the future society, Americans were driven to require the things produced. Pressure toward consumption became as inexorable as those toward production. It was Thoreau's central point that his contemporaries had accepted the goal and its premises and conditions uncritically. They had become so intent upon the mechanics of producing wealth that they had forgotten not only how to live but why they live. It was his contention that goods and services, even when possessed in abundance, could never satisfy man's deepest needs. The pressures of economic society, under the influence of materialistic drives, he conceived to be destructive of the individual's intrinsic and personal life. The individual is pushed into mere subservience to his own possessions, and into a life of conformity. This occurs, according to Thoreau, because economic society emphasizes things rather than people, and because it demands work at the sacrifice of leisure; and it is in leisure that man realizes himself.

Thus, the point of Thoreau's experiment at Walden was two-fold. First he wanted to demonstrate that man could live well with less material goods. Second, he intended to illustrate that when a man was able to escape preoccupation with economic things he could become a self-identified indi-

vidual. It was a vivid expression of his opposition to the optimistic view of his time.

To Thoreau, the requirements of his neighbors for "superfluous glow-shoes and umbrellas, and empty guest rooms for empty guests" represented a search for a standard of comfort conflicting directly with the basic human need for leisure. But Thoreau's preachments were unavailing. The war on scarcity had only just begun; the momentum of the nation's drive toward economic growth was just commencing. And if "civilization has been improving our houses without improving the men who inhabit them"²⁴ the prevailing mood was for taking first things first -- and the houses of the period were in for a lot of improvement.

Thoreau was preaching an alien doctrine. The United States has had no indigenous bias toward leisure because its war on scarcity began early in its history. Leisure is not, and probably cannot be, a team sport. Most of the pressures accompanying economic growth militate against the kind of individuality required for it. If one combines overriding concern for solution of the scarcity problem with the complex set of interrelationships engendered by economic division of labor, the need for close and interdependent cooperation becomes evident. Add to this the unique requirements of the machine, which refines and accentuates the rationale of the division of labor, and the pressures toward interdependence and conformity become more intense. Hence, in the United States, a society developed that was committed to work and to play, but was unable to comprehend leisure, and Thoreau was out of context.

Both the objective and subjective institutions of this society were designed to implement the war on scarcity. Its dominant religion (Protestantism) gave powerful impetus to the work ethic. Property was placed in private hands to insure maximum utilization of that property in the economic process. Income was based upon contribution to the work process in order to insure that all available resources would be devoted to economic activity. Man was to work if he was to eat, and Smith's categorization of poets, artists, musicians, men of letters and so forth as unproductive labor was taken literally. First rank in the opinion of society was given to doers, not to thinkers.

STAGE III

One of the common complaints concerning the United States has been that it has no indigenous culture. If Josef Pieper is right in his contention that leisure is the basis of culture,²⁵ this lack is not surprising for we have had little genuine leisure. If Myrdal and Heilbroner are correct, then we may be on the threshold of cultural development on a scale never experienced by any society in any previous age, simply because our society will have more leisure time at its disposal than was ever available before.

Sociologists, however, are becoming concerned with the phenomenon of alienation, one aspect of which is man's estrangement from himself. We speak of the two-sidedness of man, one side Orphic (artistic), the other side Promethian (technical). During the second stage, man concentrated upon his Promethian side, allowed himself to become simply an instrument through which Promethian goals could be attained, and he became non-human. This raises a central human issue, namely, that a society so engrossed with economic development that it ignores other human goals is an incomplete one; members of such a society both lose and sense the loss of their humanity.

If this premise is true, it is not surprising that we are becoming aware that in spite of rising living standards something is wrong, that life is not becoming more meaningful but less. We are singularly ill at ease in the midst of plenty. As we approach an era in which the scarcity problem no longer commands our undivided attention we feel more and more keenly a loss of purpose. As we acquire more things we begin to realize that we have been entrapped by them into a way and a pace of life that leaves us unsatisfied. We must increasingly do things for our possessions, rather than simply having them do things for us. The dream was that man's solution of the scarcity problem would find him intellectually ready to use his new wealth. We are no longer so confident. Even worse, we face the possibility that the temporarily created Promethian man may have lost his Orphic capabilities, in which case wealth will have little meaning.

This forces us to ask whether both social and natural scientists of today may not succeed in making this possibility a reality by stressing aspects of man's Promethian side, and, by describing man as he behaves in a Promethian society, generalizing from that description to arrive at a statement of what man is. Using economics as an example, consider the theory used to describe and explain Capitalism. A basic assumption upon which that theory rests is that man is strongly oriented toward material things. The institutions that direct and channel component parts of the economy rely upon the validity of this assumption. Capitalism is goods oriented, and this is the major reason for its success in dealing with the scarcity problem. In effect, however, by presenting the system in terms of its goals, the economist is saying, "If you want this kind of system, you must be this kind of man." But he does not make this statement explicitly. That would render it necessary for his listeners to make a choice, yes to the man, yes to the system; no to the man, no to the system. The economist seldom indicates a possible choice and, in this sense he propagates and propagandizes Promethian ideals. In reality he gives the impression that he is saying, "This is man, now and inevitably." And he plays his part in the atrophy of man's Orphic side.²⁶

Stage III is a transitional stage, and the form taken by future societies depends to a large extent on the way we come to grips with special prob-

lems of this stage. Some of these problems are unique to this stage; others are a heritage bequeathed to us by past stages, especially by Stage II.

First, leisure requires development of human facilities of mind and soul. This means that some individuals may be unfit for leisure due to biological or physiological deficiencies.²⁷ Some socially and politically feasible method of separating the fit from the unfit will have to be found. At least one writer has raised the question of the ability of democracy to cope with abundant leisure time.²⁸ While it is possible to find grounds for optimism on this point, the problem of abundant leisure will call forth all the strength and understanding our system possesses for its solution. If people constitutionally unfit for leisure share extensively in available leisure time (and in a democracy they must), the manner in which they spend that time becomes a matter of social concern. Unlike the death Shaw's "short-livers"²⁹ died in Back to Methuselah, the death the non-leisure oriented might die in a leisure-oriented society would be figurative rather than literal. To allow such people to suffocate in crowded conditions and mass boredom would be to invite the destruction of society. Heretofore, leisure could be viewed as the exclusive preserve of an elite that could enjoy its leisure secure in the knowledge that work would discipline and occupy the non-elite. We may be faced with the fact that there is no long-run escape valve for the energies and desires of the excluded group to replace that formerly provided by work.³⁰ If such is the case, our ability to meet the challenge of leisure will be conditioned by our ability to reduce the number of people incapable of enjoying leisure.

Also, if technological change has laid the groundwork for solution of the scarcity problem, it has also cast doubt upon the efficacy of the existing structure of our system for distributing output. If the findings of the Ad Hoc Committee are correct, it will no longer be socially permissible to equate the amount of income an individual receives with the amount of his productive efforts. In a society committed to solution of the scarcity problem this equation was efficient and reasonable, efficient because it insured that all would work, reasonable because such a society has need for and can provide work for all. In a society in which the scarcity problem has been solved, and in which the labor of individuals may no longer be required, both the necessity for and the moral defense of such a distribution scheme disappear.

We have already recognized the validity of a change in the method of income distribution, at least by implication. Such supplementary techniques as old age security, unemployment compensation and medicare demonstrate understanding of deficiencies in the existing general method of income distribution. Further changes will be required in a leisure society. Already, formal proposals for a guaranteed minimum annual income have been advanced, and it is interesting to note that the tone of public and editorial

response to such proposals indicates a degree of acceptance in marked contrast to responses to proposals for social security in the 1930's.

However necessary such an income distribution scheme might be, it will raise definite problems for a democratic society. For example, its implications for political control appear to be obvious. Unless the income an individual is to receive is accorded the same protection as free speech, private property and the rest of our personal rights, the threat to withhold or withdraw the income unless the individual behaves in specified ways would be a potent threat to freedom. It follows from this that a constitutional amendment would be required to implement the proposal.

Finally, extension of leisure time will undoubtedly proceed more rapidly than ability to engage in leisure.³¹ Aimlessness, frustration and lack of individual purpose will generate social tension. As MacIver so beautifully expressed it, ". . . leisure becomes a void, and from the ensuing restlessness men take refuge in delusive excitations or fictitious visions, returning to their own earth no more."³² The pressures and strains this will place upon the existing social fabric will be intense. The ability of our society to deal with these pressures will depend upon its ability to provide a sense of purpose to its members.

It is interesting that one relatively recent development, greeted enthusiastically by young people and apparently renewing their sense of purpose, has been the Peace Corps, which enables them to retain continuity with our old scheme of values. It involves extension of economic progress to underdeveloped countries. And, of course, living standards in those countries must be raised. The goal of eliminating poverty was not an idle one. Perhaps this kind of activity, the process of equalizing opportunity and mass education will help. In the long run, however, a wholly different purpose must be found. Perhaps it will be the same as that of Stage I; the current excitement over the "God is dead" movement and rising interest in philosophy on the college campuses may be significant in this respect. But it may take a form impossible to identify at present.

CONCLUSION

One of the particular problems facing a society in transition is always that posed by lagging values. The society is changing, but the guidelines for human action are still those designed to facilitate attainment of previously dominant social goals. When a value system is consistent with contemporary social needs it provides the cement that holds the society to its goals. But, as the goals of society change, the value system consistent with old goals not only acts as an impediment to attainment of new goals, but actually interferes with our ability to perceive them clearly.

In addition, new goals frequently require social action and institutions diametrically opposed to those to which people are accustomed. For example, in a society committed to solution of scarcity, unearned income (that

is, income received without a corresponding contribution to the work process) was considered to be illegitimate, indeed, even sinful. Institutions were established which were designed to insure that such incomes were held to a minimum. In a leisure society, the existence of such incomes will be a necessity, and institutions designed to generate them will be required. But the old institutions and values are not unrelated to others, and it seems likely that it will be impossible to change one part of the old value system without necessitating at least a revision in other parts. For example, to what extent is the productivity concept of income distribution related to private property, and to Capitalism as an economic system? If the income concept is changed, what changes will this require in the others? What kind of an economic system will emerge as a result of these changes, and what will be its relation to our political institutions? Answers to these questions are not readily forthcoming. But it is already apparent that reciprocity exists between the institutions.

At the very least, we know that man's attitudes and reaction patterns concerning leisure changed once in response to requirements of the Industrial Revolution. New requirements will undoubtedly evoke another change. The real challenge will be to our ability to speed the process, ease the transition and insure that the changes made are appropriate and desirable. But this means that social scientists are going to have to become more obviously aware of the changes taking place in their society, and will have to devote special attention to the causes and consequences of those changes. A good beginning might take the form of examination of existing thought to determine the extent of its ideological content and its dependence upon value-based assumptions. Their objectivity and their ability are going to receive a severe test.

Bradley University

Footnotes:

¹ Ad Hoc Committee of the Triple Revolution. Report to the President, 1964.

² Gunnar Myrdal, Beyond the Welfare State (New Haven, 1960). Robert Heilbroner, The Future as History (New York, 1960).

³ For example, the profit system rejects leisure as an interference with income flows -- except as leisure refreshes the individual for more productive work -- and the work ethic rejects leisure as evidence of idleness.

⁴ At this point we are not concerned with the question concerning the ability of individuals to adjust to leisure. We are concerned simply with society's adaptability to leisure.

⁵ Since leisure was a relatively scarce commodity in previous ages, it was only the exceptional individual who possessed it. This meant, of course, that individuals biologically or physiologically incapable of enjoying leisure without frustration would be kept occupied with labor. Today, however, it may be that it is precisely the unskilled and the uneducated, the unimaginative and the dull-witted who will have the most leisure time.

⁶ Aristotle, Nichmachean Ethics.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ This is not to suggest that the stages are sharp and distinct. They shade into and blur one another, and there are definite overlaps among them.

⁹ The work of Weber and of Tawney in analysis of the impact of the Protestant Ethic is too well known to require extensive support of the thesis that the rise of Protestantism furthered development of the work cult.

¹⁰ Josef Pieper, Leisure: The Basis of Culture (New York, 1963).

¹¹ Aquinas, Ecclus, XXXII, 15.

¹² Aquinas, Wisdom, VIII 16.

¹³ Aquinas, Opusc. X, de Causis, 1.

¹⁴ For example, the institution of slavery, pressure upon the wealthy to act as patrons of the arts, the Church -- all served as agents for leisure, but only for selected members of society.

¹⁵ Even Classical insistence upon subsistence levels of income were not denials of this dream given the notion of variability in the definition of subsistence.

¹⁶ Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations (New York, 1937), 314-315.

¹⁷ Benvenuto Cellini, Autobiography (New York, 1927), 20.

¹⁸ Ibid., 335.

¹⁹ Charles Dickens, Hard Times (London, 1951), 61.

²⁰ The point here is not that work was less laborious prior to introduction of the machines, but that while labor was onerous it was engaged in more nearly on man's terms. It is also true that men had a tendency to be more concerned with work merely as a method of obtaining the means of life and, when sufficient had been obtained, they abstained from the work process.

²¹ Sebastian de Grazia, Of Time, Work, and Leisure (New York, 1962), 19.

²² The initial impact of technological change was to create unemployment, and the common reaction of workers to this phenomenon was to urge shorter hours of work -- and, in the case of women and children, the rationale was to attempt to provide jobs for breadwinners.

²³ This is exemplified by Mark Twain's Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court. Hank Morgan, innocent of sentiment, indifferent to culture, contemptuous of tradition, is determined to alleviate poverty by introducing an industrial revolution into sixth century Britain. He viewed himself as

the bearer of intellectual light and material well-being to the "downtrodden" masses, and he exemplified the American concept of progress.

²⁴ Henry David Thoreau, Walden (New York, 1950) 45; 43.

²⁵ Josef Pieper, Leisure.

²⁶ There is a reason for this, of course. Any discipline that has hope of being or behaving as a science attempts to free itself from the inhibitions consideration of goals would place upon it. The common statement is that goals are socially determined -- the scientist takes them as data. Then he tries to explain how they may be attained. But this means that society determines the appropriate areas of study and, to a large extent, the conclusions of the study. It also means that there is an ideological base to theory so conceived. Research results from other disciplines, such as psychology, seem to indicate that many of man's preoccupations are socially determined. Perhaps economic science ought to explain the implications of this for the system it describes.

²⁷ Of course, it may turn out that the number of individuals absolutely unable to engage in leisure will be smaller than one might imagine. Intelligence is not an either-or proposition, nor is imagination; hence individuals use leisure at different levels, as they use other things.

²⁸ Sebastian de Grazia, Of Time.

²⁹ George Bernard Shaw, Back to Methuselah (New York, 1921). The "short-livers" were those people unable to summon forth the will to live beyond the age of three score and ten, and who died of discouragement from inability to comprehend the wisdom of those who could.

³⁰ And, as Shaw indicated in Man and Superman (New York, 1925), even those capable of enjoying leisure possess "hellish" as well as "heavenly" energy. Perhaps this is a key! One solution for the problem of occupying those incapable of enjoying leisure might be access for them to sufficient variety of opportunities for recreation that they could escape boredom. This trend seems already to have started.

³¹ In the sixty-five years since 1900, the work week has shrunk from eighty-four hours to forty. Current predictions for a twenty hour work week run from 1980 to 2000.

³² "The Great Emptiness," in Eric Josephson and Mary Josephson, eds., Man Alone (New York, 1963), 149.