

Z Y G M U N T
B A U M A N
the art of life



The Art of Life

The Art of Life

Zygmunt Bauman

polity

Copyright © Zygmunt Bauman 2008

The right of Zygmunt Bauman to be identified as Author of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published in 2008 by Polity Press

Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK.

Polity Press
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148, USA.

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN-13: 978-0-7456-4325-0

ISBN-13: 978-0-7456-4326-7 (pb)

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in 11 on 13 pt Sabon
by SNP Best-set Typesetter Ltd., Hong Kong
Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books, Bodmin, Cornwall

Every effort has been made to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to include any necessary credits in any subsequent reprint or edition.

For further information on Polity, visit our website: www.polity.co.uk

Contents

Introduction: What is Wrong with Happiness?	1
1 Miseries of Happiness	21
2 We, the Artists of Life	51
3 The Choice	93
Afterword: On Organizing and Being Organized	125
<i>Notes</i>	134
<i>Index</i>	140

You are not an isolated entity,
but a unique, irreplaceable part of the cosmos.
Don't forget this.
You are an essential piece in the puzzle of humanity.

Epictetus, *The Art of Living*

It is the wish of all men . . . to live happily,
but when it comes to seeing clearly what it is that makes life happy,
they grope for the light;
indeed, a measure of the difficulty of achieving the happy life
is that the greater the man's energy in striving for it,
the further he goes away from it
if he has taken a wrong turning on the road . . .

Seneca, 'On the happy life'

INTRODUCTION

What is Wrong with Happiness?

The question in the title would baffle many a reader. And it is meant to baffle – to prompt one to pause and think. To pause in what? In our pursuit of happiness, which – as most readers would probably agree – is on our minds most of the time, fills the greater part of our lives, cannot and will not slow down, let alone stop . . . at least no longer than for a (fleeting, always fleeting) moment.

Why is this question likely to baffle? Because to ask ‘what is wrong with happiness?’ is like asking what is hot about ice or malodorous in a rose. Ice being incompatible with heat, and rose with stench, such questions assume the feasibility of an *inconceivable* coexistence (where there is heat, there can’t be ice). How, indeed, could something be *wrong* with *happiness*? Is not ‘happiness’ a synonym of the *absence* of wrong? Of the very *impossibility* of its presence? Of the impossibility of *all and any* wrong?!

And yet this is a question asked by Michael Rustin,¹ as it has been by quite a few worried people before and probably will be in the future – and Rustin explains why: societies like ours, moved by millions of men and women pursuing happiness, are getting richer, but it is far from clear whether they are getting happier. It looks as if the human pursuit of happiness may well prove to be self-defeating. All the available empirical data suggest that among the populations of affluent societies there may be no connection

at all between rising affluence, believed to be the principal vehicle of a happy life, and greater happiness!

The close correlation between economic growth and enhanced happiness is widely believed to be one of the least questionable truths, perhaps even the most self-evident. Or at least, this is what the best-known and most respected political leaders, their advisers and spokespeople, tell us – and what we, who tend to rely on their opinions, repeat without pause for reflection or second thoughts. They and we act on the assumption that the correlation is genuine. We want them to act on that belief still more resolutely and energetically – and we wish them luck, hoping that their success (that is, adding to our incomes, to our disposable cash, to the volume of our possessions, assets and wealth) will add quality to our lives and make us feel happier than we are.

According to virtually all the research reports scrutinized and summed up by Rustin, ‘improvements in living standards in nations such as the United States and Britain are associated with no improvement – indeed a slight decline – in subjective well-being.’ Robert Lane has found that despite the massive, spectacular rise of American incomes in the postwar years, the self-reported happiness of Americans has declined.² And Richard Layard has concluded from a cross-national comparison of data that although the indices of reported satisfaction with life grow by and large in parallel with the level of national product, they rise significantly only up to the point where want and poverty give way to the gratification of essential, ‘survival’ needs – and stop climbing or tend to slow down drastically with further rises in affluence.³ On the whole, only a few percentage points separate countries with an average annual income per capita between 20,000 and 35,000 dollars from those below the barrier of 10,000 dollars. The strategy of making people happier through raising their income does not seem to work. On the other hand, one social index that seems to be growing most spectacularly in line with the level of affluence, indeed as fast as subjective well-being was promised and expected to rise, has so far been the incidence of criminality: of burglary and car theft, drug trafficking, economic graft and business corruption. And of an uncomfortable and uneasy sensation of uncertainty, hard to bear, let alone to live with permanently. Of a diffuse and ‘ambient’ uncertainty, ubiquitous yet seemingly unanchored, unspecified and for that reason all the more vexing and aggravating . . .

Such findings feel profoundly disappointing, considering that it was precisely an increase in the overall volume of happiness ‘of the greatest number’ – an increase led by economic growth and a rise in disposable cash and credit – that was declared, through the last several decades, to be the main purpose guiding the policies set by our governments, as well as the ‘life politics’ strategies of our, their subjects. It also served as the main yardstick for measuring the success and failure of governmental policies, and of our pursuit of happiness. We could even say that our modern era started in earnest with the proclamation of the universal human right to the pursuit of happiness, and from the promise to demonstrate its superiority over the forms of life it replaced by rendering that pursuit less cumbersome and arduous, while being more effective. We may ask, then, whether the means suggested to achieve such a demonstration (principally, continuous economic growth as measured by the rise in ‘gross national product’) were wrongly chosen? If so, what exactly was wrong with that choice?

The sole common denominator of the otherwise variegated products of human bodily and mental labour being the market price they command, the statistics of the ‘gross national product’ aimed at grasping the growth or decline of the products’ availability record the amount of money changing hands in the course of buying and selling transactions. Whether or not the indices of GNP acquit themselves well in their overt task, there is still a question of whether they should be treated, as they tend to be, as indicators of the growth or decline of happiness. It is assumed that as the spending of money goes up, it must coincide with a similar upward movement in the happiness of spenders, but this is not immediately obvious. If, for instance, the pursuit of happiness as such, known to be an absorbing, energy-consuming, risk-fraught and nerve-taxing activity, leads to a greater incidence of mental depression, more money is likely to be spent on anti-depressants. If, thanks to an increase in car ownership, the frequency of car accidents and the number of accident victims grow, so too does expenditure on car repairs and medical treatment. If the quality of tap-water goes on deteriorating all over the place, more and more money will be spent on buying bottled water to be carried in our rucksacks or travel bags on all trips, long or short (we will be asked to swill the contents of the bottle on the spot whenever we approach this side of the airport security check, and need to buy another bottle on the other side of the checkpoint).

In all such cases, and a multitude of similar instances, more money changes hands, boosting the GNP figures. This is certain. But a parallel growth in the happiness of consumers of antidepressants, victims of car accidents, carriers of water bottles, and, indeed, of all those many people who worry about bad luck and fear their turn to suffer might come – that is far less obvious.

All that should not really be news. As Jean-Claude Michéa recalled recently in his timely rewriting of the convoluted history of the ‘modern project’,⁴ as long ago as 18 March 1968, in the heat of the presidential campaign, Robert Kennedy launched a scathing attack on the lie on which the GNP-bound measure of happiness rests:

Our GNP takes into account in its calculations the air pollution, tobacco advertising and ambulances riding to collect the wounded from our motorways. It registers the costs of the security systems which we install to protect our homes and the prisons in which we lock up those who manage to break into them. It entails the destruction of our sequoia forests and their replacement through sprawling and chaotic urbanization. It includes the production of napalm, nuclear arms and armed vehicles used by police to stifle urban unrest. It records . . . television programmes that glorify violence in order to sell toys to children. On the other hand, GNP does not note the health of our children, quality of our education or gaiety of our games. It does not measure the beauty of our poetry and the strength of our marriages. It does not care to evaluate the quality of our political debates and integrity of our representatives. It leaves out of consideration our courage, wisdom and culture. It says nothing about our compassion and dedication to our country. In a word, the GNP measures everything, except what makes life worth the pain of living it.

Robert Kennedy was murdered a few weeks after publishing this fiery indictment and declaring his intention to restore the importance of things that make life worth living; so we will never know whether he would have tried, let alone succeeded, in making his words flesh had he been elected President of the United States. What we do know, though, is that in the forty years that have passed since, there have been few if any signs of his message having been heard, understood, embraced and remembered – let alone any move on the part of our elected representatives to

disown and repudiate the pretence of the commodity markets to the role of the royal road to a meaningful and happy life, or evidence of any inclination on our part to reshape our life strategies accordingly.

Observers suggest that about half the goods crucial for human happiness have no market price and can't be purchased in shops. Whatever your cash and credit standing, you won't find in a shopping mall love and friendship, the pleasures of domesticity, the satisfaction that comes from caring for loved ones or helping a neighbour in distress, the self-esteem to be drawn from work well done, gratifying the 'workmanship instinct' common to us all, the appreciation, sympathy and respect of workmates and other people with whom one associates; you won't find there freedom from the threats of disregard, contempt, snubs and humiliation. Moreover, earning enough money to afford those goods that can only be had through the shops is a heavy tax on the time and energy available to obtain and enjoy *non-commercial* and *non-marketable* goods like the ones listed above. It may easily happen, and frequently does, that the losses exceed the gains and the capacity of increased income to generate happiness is overtaken by the unhappiness caused by a shrinking access to the goods which 'money can't buy'.

Consumption takes time (as does shopping), and the sellers of consumer goods are naturally interested in tapering to a bare minimum the time dedicated to the enjoyable act of consuming. Simultaneously, they are interested in cutting down as far as possible, or eliminating altogether, those necessary activities that occupy much time but bring few marketing profits. In view of their frequency in commercial catalogues, promises in the descriptions of the new products on offer – like 'absolutely no effort required', 'no skills called for', 'you will enjoy [music, views, delights of the palate, the restored cleanliness of your blouse etc.] in minutes' or 'in just one touch' – seem to assume a convergence in the interests of sellers and buyers. Promises like these are covert/oblique admissions that the sellers of goods would not wish their buyers to spend too much time enjoying them, so wasting time that could be used for more shopping escapades – but evidently they must also be a very reliable selling point. It must have been found that prospective customers wish for quick results and only a momentary engagement of their mental and physical

faculties – probably to vacate time for more attractive alternatives. If cans can be opened with a less ‘bad for you’ kind of effort thanks to a new miraculously ingenious electronic can-opener, more time will be left to spend in a gym exercising with gadgets promising a ‘good for you’ variety of exertion. But whatever the gains in such an exchange, their impact on the sum total of happiness is anything but unambiguous.

Laura Potter embarked on her ingenious exploration of all sorts of waiting rooms expecting that she would find there ‘impatient, disgruntled, red-faced people cursing each lost millisecond’ – fuming at the need to wait for whatever ‘urgent business’ brought them there.⁵ With our ‘cult of instant gratification’, she mused, many of us would ‘have lost the ability to wait’:

We live in an era where ‘waiting’ has become a dirty word. We’ve gradually eradicated (as much as possible) the need to wait for anything, and our new, up-to-the-second adjective is ‘instant’. We can no longer spare a meagre 12 minutes for a pan of rice to boil, so a time-saving two-minute microwavable version has been created. We can’t be bothered to wait for Mr or Mrs Right to come along, so we speed date . . . In our time-pressed lives, it seems that the 21st-century Briton no longer has time to wait for anything.

Much to her surprise (and perhaps that of most of us), however, Laura Potter found a very different picture. Wherever she went, she sensed the same feeling: ‘the wait was a pleasure . . . Waiting seemed to have become a luxury, a window in our tightly scheduled lives. In our “now” culture of BlackBerrys, laptops and mobile phones, “waitees” viewed the waiting room as a place of refuge.’ Perhaps the waiting room, Potter concludes, reminds us of the intensely pleasurable, alas forgotten, art of relaxing . . .

The pleasures of relaxation are not the only ones to have been laid at the altar of a life hurried for the sake of saving time to chase other things. When the effects that were once attained thanks to our own ingenuity, dedication and hard-learned skills are ‘outsourced’ to a gadget requiring only a swish of a credit card and a push of a button, something that used to make many people happy and was probably vital for everybody’s happiness is lost on the way: pride in ‘work well done’, in dexterity, smartness and skill, in a daunting task performed, an indomitable obstacle over-

come. In the longer run, skills once obtained, and the very ability to learn and master new skills, are forgotten and lost, and with them goes the joy of gratifying the workmanship instinct, that vital condition of self-esteem, so difficult to replace, along with the happiness offered by self-respect.

The markets, to be sure, are keen to redress the harm done – with the help of factory-made substitutes for the ‘do-it-yourself’ goods that can no longer be ‘done by yourself’ because of your lack of time and vigour. Following the market’s suggestion and using its (paid-up and profit-generating) services, one would for instance invite a partner to a restaurant, treat children to McDonald’s burgers, or bring home takeaways instead of preparing meals ‘from scratch’ in the family kitchen; or one would purchase expensive gifts for loved ones to compensate for the dearth of time spent together and the rarity of the occasions to talk to each other, as well as for the absence or near absence of convincing manifestations of personal interest, compassion and care. Even the agreeable taste of the restaurant food or the high price tags and highly prestigious labels attached to the gifts sold in the shops will, however, hardly match up to the value in added happiness of the goods for whose absence or rarity they are meant to compensate: such goods as gathering around a table laid with food that has been jointly cooked with its sharing in mind, or lengthy, attentive listening by a person-who-counts to one’s intimate thoughts, hopes and apprehensions, and similar proofs of loving attention, engagement and care. Since not all goods necessary for ‘subjective happiness’, and notably the non-marketable goods, have a common denominator, their balances elude quantification; no increase in the quantity of one good can fully and truly compensate for the lack of a good of a different quality and provenance.

All and any offerings call for a certain sacrifice on the part of the giver, and it is precisely the awareness of self-sacrifice that adds to the giver’s feeling of happiness. Gifts that take no effort and call for no sacrifice, and therefore do not require resignation from some other coveted values, are worthless in this respect. The great humanist psychologist Abraham Maslow and his little son shared their love of strawberries. Their wife and mother indulged them with strawberries for breakfast; ‘my son’, Maslow told me, ‘was, as most children are, impatient, impetuous, unable to slowly savour his delights and stretch his joy for longer; he emptied his