Like most of my generation, I was brought up on the saying: ‘Satan finds some mischief for idle hands to do.’ Being a highly virtuous child, I believed all that I was told, and acquired a conscience which has kept me working hard down to the present moment. But although my conscience has controlled my actions, my opinions have undergone a revolution. I think that there is far too much work done in the world, that immense harm is caused by the belief that work is virtuous, and that what needs to be preached in modern industrial countries is quite different from what always has been preached. Everyone knows the story of the traveler in Naples who saw twelve beggars lying in the sun (it was before the days of Mussolini), and offered a lira to the laziest of them. Eleven of them jumped up to claim it, so he gave it to the twelfth. This traveler was on the right lines. But in countries which do not enjoy Mediterranean sunshine idleness is more difficult, and a great public propaganda will be required to inaugurate it. I hope that, after reading the following pages, the leaders of the YMCA will start a campaign to induce good young men to do nothing. If so, I shall not have lived in vain.
Before advancing my own arguments for laziness, I must dispose of one which I cannot accept. Whenever a person who already has enough to live on proposes to engage in some everyday kind of job, such as school-teaching or typing, he or she is told that such conduct takes the bread out of other people’s mouths, and is therefore wicked. If this argument were valid, it would only be necessary for us all to be idle in order that we should all have our mouths full of bread. What people who say such things forget is that what a man earns he usually spends, and in spending he gives employment. As long as a man spends his income, he puts just as much bread into people’s mouths in spending as he takes out of other people’s mouths in earning. The real villain, from this point of view, is the man who saves. If he merely puts his savings in a stocking, like the proverbial French peasant, it is obvious that they do not give employment. If he invests his savings, the matter is less obvious, and different cases arise.

One of the commonest things to do with savings is to lend them to some Government. In view of the fact that the bulk of the public expenditure of most civilized Governments consists in payment for past wars or preparation for future wars, the man who lends his money to a Government is in the same position as the bad men in Shakespeare who hire murderers. The net result of the man’s economical habits is to increase the armed forces of the State to which he lends his savings. Obviously it would be better if he spent the money, even if he spent it in drink or gambling.

But, I shall be told, the case is quite different when savings are invested in industrial enterprises. When such enterprises succeed, and produce something useful, this may be conceded. In these days, however, no one will deny that most enterprises fail. That means that a large amount of human labor, which might have been devoted to producing something that could be enjoyed, was expended on producing machines which, when produced, lay idle and did no good to anyone. The man who invests his savings in a concern that goes bankrupt is therefore injuring others as well as himself. If he
be enough to make leisure delightful, but not enough to produce 
exhaustion. Since men will not be tired in their spare time, they
will not demand only such amusements as are passive and vapid.
At least one per cent will probably devote the time not spent in
professional work to pursuits of some public importance, and,
since they will not depend upon these pursuits for their livelihood,
their originality will be unhampered, and there will be no need
to conform to the standards set by elderly pundits. But it is not
only in these exceptional cases that the advantages of leisure will
appear. Ordinary men and women, having the opportunity of a
happy life, will become more kindly and less persecuting and less
inclined to view others with suspicion. The taste for war will die
out, partly for this reason, and partly because it will involve long
and severe work for all. Good nature is, of all moral qualities,
the one that the world needs most, and good nature is the result
of ease and security, not of a life of arduous struggle. Modern
methods of production have given us the possibility of ease and
security for all; we have chosen, instead, to have overwork for
some and starvation for others. Hitherto we have continued to be
as energetic as we were before there were machines; in this we
have been foolish, but there is no reason to go on being foolish
forever.

spenthismoney,say,ingivingpartiesforhisfriends,they(wemay
hope) would get pleasure, and so would all those upon whom he
spent money, such as the butcher, the baker, and the bootlegger.
But if he spends it (let us say) upon laying down rails for surface
cardinsomeplacewheresurfacecarsturnoutnottobewanted,he
has diverted a mass of labor into channels where it gives pleasure
to no one. Nevertheless, when he becomes poor through failure
of his investment he will be regarded as a victim of undeserved
misfortune, whereas the gay spendthrift, who has spent his money
philanthropically, will be despised as a fool and a frivolous person.
All this is only preliminary. I want to say, in all seriousness, that
a great deal of harm is being done in the modern world by belief
in the virtuousness of work, and that the road to happiness and
prosperity lies in an organized diminution of work.

First of all: what is work? Work is of two kinds: first, altering the
position of matter at or near the earth’s surface relatively to other
such matter; second, telling other people to do so. The first kind
is unpleasant and ill paid; the second is pleasant and highly paid.
The second kind is capable of indefinite extension: there are not
only those who give orders, but those who give advice as to what
orders should be given. Usually two opposite kinds of advice are
given simultaneously by two organized bodies of men; this is called
politics. The skill required for this kind of work is not knowledge
of the subjects as to which advice is given, but knowledge of the
art of persuasive speaking and writing, i.e. of advertising.

Throughout Europe, though not in America, there is a third class
of men, more respected than either of the classes of workers. There
are men who, through ownership of land, are able to make others
pay for the privilege of being allowed to exist and to work. These
landowners are idle, and I might therefore be expected to praise
them. Unfortunately, their idleness is only rendered possible by the
industry of others; indeed their desire for comfortable idleness is
historically the source of the whole gospel of work. The last thing
they have ever wished is that others should follow their example.
From the beginning of civilization until the Industrial Revolution, a man could, as a rule, produce by hard work little more than was required for the subsistence of himself and his family, although his wife worked at least as hard as he did, and his children added their labor as soon as they were old enough to do so. The small surplus above bare necessaries was not left to those who produced it, but was appropriated by warriors and priests. In times of famine there was no surplus; the warriors and priests, however, still secured as much as at other times, with the result that many of the workers died of hunger. This system persisted in Russia until 1917, and still persists in the East; in England, in spite of the Industrial Revolution, it remained in full force throughout the Napoleonic wars, and until a hundred years ago, when the new class of manufacturers acquired power. In America, the system came to an end with the Revolution, except in the South, where it persisted until the Civil War. A system which lasted so long and ended so recently has naturally left a profound impress upon men’s thoughts and opinions. Much that we take for granted about the desirability of work is derived from this system, and, being pre-industrial, is not adapted to the modern world. Modern technique has made it possible for leisure, within limits, to be not the prerogative of small privileged classes, but a right evenly distributed throughout the community. The morality of work is the morality of slaves, and the modern world has no need of slavery.

It is obvious that, in primitive communities, peasants, left to themselves, would not have parted with the slender surplus upon which the warriors and priests subsisted, but would have either produced less or consumed more. At first, sheer force compelled them to produce and part with the surplus. Gradually, however, it was found possible to induce many of them to accept an ethic according to which it was their duty to work hard, although part of the surplus above bare necessaries was not left to them but appropriated by the warriors and priests. Since then, members of the Communist Party have succeeded to this privilege of the warriors and priests.

In a world where no one is compelled to work more than four hours a day, every person possessed of scientific curiosity will be able to indulge it, and every painter will be able to paint without starving, however excellent his pictures may be. Young writers will not be obliged to draw attention to themselves by sensational pot-boilers, with a view to acquiring the economic independence needed for monumental works, for which, when the time at last comes, they will have lost the taste and capacity. Men who, in their professional work, have become interested in some phase of economics or government, will be able to develop their ideas without the academic detachment that makes the work of university economists often seem lacking in reality. Medical men will have the time to learn about the progress of medicine, teachers will not be exasperatedly struggling to teach by routine methods things which they learnt in their youth, which may, in the interval, have been proved to be untrue.

Above all, there will be happiness and joy of life, instead of frayed nerves, weariness, and dyspepsia. The work exacted will
piness, and that we do not judge production by the pleasure that it
gives to the consumer.

When I suggest that working hours should be reduced to four, I
am not meaning to imply that all the remaining time should nec-
essarily be spent in pure frivolity. I mean that four hours’ work a
day should entitle a man to the necessities and elementary com-
forts of life, and that the rest of his time should be his to use as he
might see fit. It is an essential part of any such social system that
education should be carried further than it usually is at present,
and should aim, in part, at providing tastes which would enable
a man to use leisure intelligently. I am not thinking mainly of the
sort of things that would be considered ‘highbrow’. Peasant dances
have died out except in remote rural areas, but the impulses which
caused them to be cultivated must still exist in human nature. The
pleasures of urban populations have become mainly passive: see-
ing cinemas, watching football matches, listening to the radio, and
so on. This results from the fact that their active energies are fully
taken up with work; if they had more leisure, they would again
enjoy pleasures in which they took an active part.

In the past, there was a small leisure class and a larger working
class. The leisure class enjoyed advantages for which there was no
basis in social justice; this necessarily made it oppressive, limited
its sympathies, and caused it to invent theories by which to justify
its privileges. These facts greatly diminished its excellence, but in
spite of this drawback it contributed nearly the whole of what we
call civilization. It cultivated the arts and discovered the sciences;
it wrote the books, invented the philosophies, and refined social
relations. Even the liberation of the oppressed has usually been
inaugurated from above. Without the leisure class, mankind would
never have emerged from barbarism.

The method of a leisure class without duties was, however, ex-
traordinarily wasteful. None of the members of the class had to be
taught to be industrious, and the class as a whole was not exception-
ally intelligent. The class might produce one Darwin, but against

their work went to support others in idleness. By this means the
amount of compulsion required was lessened, and the expenses of
government were diminished. To this day, 99 per cent of British
wage-earners would be genuinely shocked if it were proposed that
the King should not have a larger income than a working man. The
conception of duty, speaking historically, has been a means used
by the holders of power to induce others to live for the interests
of their masters rather than for their own. Of course the holders
of power conceal this fact from themselves by managing to believe
that their interests are identical with the larger interests of human-
ity. Sometimes this is true; Athenian slave-owners, for instance,
employed part of their leisure in making a permanent contribu-
tion to civilization which would have been impossible under a just
economic system. Leisure is essential to civilization, and in former
times leisure for the few was only rendered possible by the labors
of the many. But their labors were valuable, not because work is
good, but because leisure is good. And with modern technique it
would be possible to distribute leisure justly without injury to civ-
ilization.

Modern technique has made it possible to diminish enormously
the amount of labor required to secure the necessaries of life for
everyone. This was made obvious during the war. At that time all
the men in the armed forces, and all the men and women engaged
in the production of munitions, all the men and women engaged
in spying, war propaganda, or Government offices connected with
the war, were withdrawn from productive occupations. In spite of
this, the general level of well-being among unskilled wage-earners
on the side of the Allies was higher than before or since. The sig-
nificance of this fact was concealed by finance: borrowing made
it appear as if the future was nourishing the present. But that, of
course, would have been impossible; a man cannot eat a loaf of
bread that does not yet exist. The war showed conclusively that,
by the scientific organization of production, it is possible to keep
modern populations in fair comfort on a small part of the working
capacity of the modern world. If, at the end of the war, the scientific organization, which had been created in order to liberate men for fighting and munition work, had been preserved, and the hours of the week had been cut down to four, all would have been well. Instead of that the old chaos was restored, those whose work was demanded were made to work long hours, and the rest were left to starve as unemployed. Why? Because work is a duty, and a man should not receive wages in proportion to what he has produced, but in proportion to his virtue as exemplified by his industry.

This is the morality of the Slave State, applied in circumstances totally unlike those in which it arose. No wonder the result has been disastrous. Let us take an illustration. Suppose that, at a given moment, a certain number of people are engaged in the manufacture of pins. They make as many pins as the world needs, working (say) eight hours a day. Someone makes an invention by which the same number of men can make twice as many pins: pins are already so cheap that hardly any more will be bought at a lower price. In a sensible world, everybody concerned in the manufacturing of pins would take to working four hours instead of eight, and everything else would go on as before. But in the actual world this would be thought demoralizing. The men still work eight hours, there are too many pins, some employers go bankrupt, and half the men previously concerned in making pins are thrown out of work. There is, in the end, just as much leisure as on the other plan, but half the men are totally idle while half are still overworked. In this way, it is insured that the unavoidable leisure shall cause misery all round instead of being a universal source of happiness. Can anything more insane be imagined?

The idea that the poor should have leisure has always been shocking to the rich. In England, in the early nineteenth century, fifteen hours was the ordinary day’s work for a man; children sometimes did as much, and very commonly did twelve hours a day. When meddlesome busybodies suggested that perhaps these hours were rather long, they were told that work kept adults from work, as it should be considered, a necessary means to a livelihood, and it is from their leisure that they derive whatever happiness they may enjoy.

It will be said that, while a little leisure is pleasant, men would not know how to fill their days if they had only four hours of work out of the twenty-four. In so far as this is true in the modern world, it is a condemnation of our civilization; it would not have been true at any earlier period. There was formerly a capacity for light-heartedness and play which has been to some extent inhibited by the cult of efficiency. The modern man thinks that everything ought to be done for the sake of something else, and never for its own sake. Serious-minded persons, for example, are continually condemning the habit of going to the cinema, and telling us that it leads the young into crime. But all the work that goes to producing a cinema is respectable, because it is work, and because it brings a money profit. The notion that the desirable activities are those that bring a profit has made everything topsy-turvy. The butcher who provides you with meat and the baker who provides you with bread are praiseworthy, because they are making money; but when you enjoy the food they have provided, you are merely frivolous, unless you eat only to get strength for your work. Broadly speaking, it is held that getting money is good and spending money is bad. Seeing that they are two sides of one transaction, this is absurd; one might as well maintain that keys are good, but keyholes are bad. Whatever merit there may be in the production of goods must be entirely derivative from the advantage to be obtained by consuming them. The individual, in our society, works for profit; but the social purpose of his work lies in the consumption of what he produces. It is this divorce between the individual and the social purpose of production that makes it so difficult for men to think clearly in a world in which profit-making is the incentive to industry. We think too much of production, and too little of consumption. One result is that we attach too little importance to enjoyment and simple hap-


lementary comforts can be provided for all, to reduce the hours of labor gradually, allowing a popular vote to decide, at each stage, whether more leisure or more goods were to be preferred. But, having taught the supreme virtue of hard work, it is difficult to see how the authorities can aim at a paradise in which there will be much leisure and little work. It seems more likely that they will find continually fresh schemes, by which present leisure is to be sacrificed to future productivity. I read recently of an ingenious plan put forward by Russian engineers, for making the White Sea and the northern coasts of Siberia warm, by putting a dam across the Kara Sea. An admirable project, but liable to postpone proletarian comfort for a generation, while the nobility of toil is being displayed amid the ice-fields and snowstorms of the Arctic Ocean. This sort of thing, if it happens, will be the result of regarding the virtue of hard work as an end in itself, rather than as a means to a state of affairs in which it is no longer needed.

The fact is that moving matter about, while a certain amount of it is necessary to our existence, is emphatically not one of the ends of human life. If it were, we should have to consider every navvy superior to Shakespeare. We have been misled in this matter by two causes. One is the necessity of keeping the poor contented, which has led the rich, for thousands of years, to preach the dignity of labor, while taking care themselves to remain undignified in this respect. The other is the new pleasure in mechanism, which makes us delight in the astonishingly clever changes that we can produce on the earth’s surface. Neither of these motives makes any great appeal to the actual worker. If you ask him what he thinks the best part of his life, he is not likely to say: ‘I enjoy manual work because it makes me feel that I am fulfilling man’s noblest task, and because I like to think how much man can transform his planet. It is true that my body demands periods of rest, which I have to fill in as best I may, but I am never so happy as when the morning comes and I can return to the toil from which my contentment springs.’ I have never heard working men say this sort of thing. They consider

drink and children from mischief. When I was a child, shortly after urban working men had acquired the vote, certain public holidays were established by law, to the great indignation of the upper classes. I remember hearing an old Duchess say: ‘What do the poor want with holidays? They ought to work.’ People nowadays are less frank, but the sentiment persists, and is the source of much of our economic confusion.

Let us, for a moment, consider the ethics of work frankly, without superstition. Every human being, of necessity, consumes, in the course of his life, a certain amount of the produce of human labor. Assuming, as we may, that labor is on the whole disagreeable, it is unjust that a man should consume more than he produces. Of course he may provide services rather than commodities, like a medical man, for example; but he should provide something in return for his board and lodging, to this extent, the duty of work must be admitted, but to this extent only.

I shall not dwell upon the fact that, in all modern societies outside the USSR, many people escape even this minimum amount of work, namely all those who inherit money and all those who marry money. I do not think the fact that these people are allowed to be idle is nearly so harmful as the fact that wage-earners are expected to overwork or starve.

If the ordinary wage-earner worked four hours a day, there would be enough for everybody and no unemployment — assuming a certain very moderate amount of sensible organization. This idea shocks the well-to-do, because they are convinced that the poor would not know how to use so much leisure. In America men often work long hours even when they are well off; such men, naturally, are indignant at the idea of leisure for wage-earners, except as the grim punishment of unemployment; in fact, they dislike leisure even for their sons. Oddly enough, while they wish their sons to work so hard as to have no time to be civilized, they do not mind their wives and daughters having no work at all.

the snobbish admiration of uselessness, which, in an aristocratic
society, extends to both sexes, is, under a plutocracy, confined to women; this, however, does not make it any more in agreement with common sense.

The wise use of leisure, it must be conceded, is a product of civilization and education. A man who has worked long hours all his life will become bored if he becomes suddenly idle. But without a considerable amount of leisure a man is cut off from many of the best things. There is no longer any reason why the bulk of the population should suffer this deprivation; only a foolish asceticism, usually vicarious, makes us continue to insist on work in excessive quantities now that the need no longer exists.

In the new creed which controls the government of Russia, while there is much that is very different from the traditional teaching of the West, there are some things that are quite unchanged. The attitude of the governing classes, and especially of those who conduct educational propaganda, on the subject of the dignity of labor, is almost exactly that which the governing classes of the world have always preached to what were called the 'honest poor'. Industry, sobriety, willingness to work long hours for distant advantages, even submissiveness to authority, all these reappear; moreover authority still represents the will of the Ruler of the Universe, Who, however, is now called by a new name, Dialectical Materialism.

The victory of the proletariat in Russia has some points in common with the victory of the feminists in some other countries. For ages, men had conceded the superior saintliness of women, and had consoled women for their inferiority by maintaining that saintliness is more desirable than power. At last the feminists decided that they would have both, since the pioneers among them believed all that the men had told them about the desirability of virtue, but not what they had told them about the worthlessness of political power. A similar thing has happened in Russia as regards manual work. For ages, the rich and their sycophants have written in praise of 'honest toil', have praised the simple life, have professed a religion which teaches that the poor are much more likely to go to heaven than the rich, and in general have tried to make manual workers believe that there is some special nobility about altering the position of matter in space, just as men tried to make women believe that they derived some special nobility from their sexual enslavement. In Russia, all this teaching about the excellence of manual work has been taken seriously, with the result that the manual worker is more honored than anyone else. What are, in essence, revivalist appeals are made, but not for the old purposes: they are made to secure shock workers for special tasks. Manual work is the ideal which is held before the young, and is the basis of all ethical teaching.

For the present, possibly, this is all to the good. A large country, full of natural resources, awaits development, and has has to be developed with very little use of credit. In these circumstances, hard work is necessary, and is likely to bring a great reward. But what will happen when the point has been reached where everybody could be comfortable without working long hours?

In the West, we have various ways of dealing with this problem. We have no attempt at economic justice, so that a large proportion of the total produce goes to a small minority of the population, many of whom do no work at all. Owing to the absence of any central control over production, we produce hosts of things that are not wanted. We keep a large percentage of the working population idle, because we can dispense with their labor by making the others overwork. When all these methods prove inadequate, we have a war: we cause a number of people to manufacture high explosives, and a number of others to explode them, as if we were children who had just discovered fireworks. By a combination of all these devices we manage, though with difficulty, to keep alive the notion that a great deal of severe manual work must be the lot of the average man.

In Russia, owing to more economic justice and central control over production, the problem will have to be differently solved. The rational solution would be, as soon as the necessaries and el-