

The contemporaneity of “The right to be lazy”, by Paul Lafargue

Davi de Pinho Spilleir

Center for Economics and Administration, Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas, Post-Graduation Program in Sustainability

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2582-0489>

Email: d_spilleir@hotmail.com

Waleska Miguel Batista

Master in Sustainability from Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas, and PhD candidate in Political and Economic Law at Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6700-9577>

Email: mbwaleska@gmail.com

Abstract

In the article, we seek get the thinking of the Paul Lafargue, in his work “ The right to be lazy” comes to question by proposing a different perspective, a new direction to human life that will only be achieved with the end of the exploitation of the individual by the individual. The objective of this work is to verify the contemporaneity of Lafargue's writings, comparing whether his analyzes are consistent with the reality of workers in the 21st century.

Keywords: Paul Lafargue; The Right to be Lazy; Work..

1. Introduction

Work occupies a special place in the life of each and every citizen. Since Greek times, philosophers have occupied themselves with discussing questions about what work is, what is its relevance and what materiality space should be given to this event in man's life.

It is true that the conception of work has changed significantly over the centuries. If before the Greek philosophers had a deep aversion to the term work, even its etymological origin comes from "triplalium", which was an instrument of torture, in which the person was hung and supported by three sticks that formed an "x", today, in view of the enormous significance that the theme “work” has in the lives of all citizens, it is unlikely that people see work in this way (PEDROSA, 2007).

However, I inquire if work, by itself, is not a structure of torture, of domination? And if so, why does it look like that today? What aspects have led us to have such a work character, like the one we have today, which is capable of leading millions of people to work informally and millions more to fulfill an exhausting ritual in the so-called business hours, from 8 am to 6 pm, subjecting people to degrading transport situations and always imposing a big question about the continuation of their job or not? For what reason, despite all technical development, the working class is still subject to insufficient wages that do not

guarantee minimum conditions for survival?

The analysis will be conducted in the light of the work “The right to be lazy”, by a prominent Cuban journalist and thinker of the 19th century, Paul Lafargue, who closely followed several social upheavals that took place in the world in the second half of the 19th century. Lafargue spent a good part of his life in Europe, especially in France, England, and Spain, where, in addition, he was a contributor to the important newspaper “L’Egalité”.

As if abilities weren't enough, Lafargue was also married to Jeny Laura Marx, the second daughter of Karl Marx, to whom he based a significant part of his work, on socialist themes. And both his life and his death were very intense. Exactly on their 70th birthday, in 1911, Paul and Laura commit suicide with a hypodermic injection of hydrocyanic acid, because they understood that they would not be able to enjoy life with the same way as before.

Paul Lafargue's best known work is “The Right to be lazy”, published in 1880, in Paris, at the peak of conditions of labor poverty. His serial was especially notorious at that time because he confronted a central issue that was the sanctification of work, that caricatured image of work as a dignified human condition, an idea totally merged in all of society and that, as we shall see later on, it ended up causing severe problems and distortions in nineteenth-century societies, which ended up with inhumane conditions of free and paid work¹.

It is at a time of profound tension and enormous changes that Lafargue claims the “Right to be lazy”. A more concrete analysis of the moment the work was written is necessary to follow Lafargue's flow of thought.

2. The workers' movement and working conditions in the 19th century

The working conditions in Europe in the 19th century were precarious because there was a demand for quantitative and qualitative productivity, insufficient wages for subsistence and without any safety measure, in addition to the indiscriminate use of children and adolescents. In the book “The condition of the working class in England” (1845), Friedrich Engels carries out a detailed analysis of the conditions of the proletarians during this period and in a blunt way demonstrates the forms of this shameless, direct, and brutal exploitation.

A truly humiliating situation for the working class, which, on the one hand, reaped structural unemployment due to technical development and the new machinery introduced, which increased industrial production in a way that had never been seen before, those who managed to maintain the working day were subjected to abusive journeys that could exceed fourteen hours a day, exploitation of female labor that, tormented by the specter of imminent unemployment, submitted to situations analogous to prostitution, with the "acquired right" that the contracting entrepreneur could have sexual relations with their employees (ENGELS, 2010).

The level of exploitation was accepted in that society, which aimed to accumulate wealth and

¹ It is important to mention that the nineteenth century in Europe is marked by the impacts of technological and industrial advances, while the forces of domination over colonies are maintained with the use of slave labor. In Brazil, despite the interruption of the *Negreiro* traffic, the Commercial Code was published in 1850, which endorses the use of slaves in the logic of industries in development in urban cities and metropolises.

promote conditions for the reproduction of the capital and labor relationship Lafargue (2016), in an anonymous newsletter linked by commerce named "An essay on trade and commerce", in 1770, proposed that workers be imprisoned in what he called "ideal workhouses", where they could spend fourteen hours of their days working, with small spaces for food.

The serials also questioned this false idea of privilege in the minds of workers. The privilege he mentioned? That of being "freer and more independent than the workers of any other country in Europe" and the proposed solution to the issue was especially cruel: more work! And they should accept to work two more days, for the same amount they earned at that moment, because by working, they would be less exposed to these vices.

The consolidation of work, while this strenuous and degrading form of human life did not take place without struggles, without the resistance of the proletariat, which aimed at better conditions not only for the performance of their functions, but also for existence, such as the reduction of the working hours and the abolition of child labor, which were only made possible by the gathering of these workers in the form of unions and by the demand for rights.

When noticing that there is the realization of supposed rights, it would be convenient to ask then the role of the State, in face of this scenario of class antagonisms. Marx, in his writing "The Civil War in France", leaves no room for dubious interpretations:

"At the same pace as the progress of modern industry developed, widened, and intensified the class antagonism between capital and labor, state power increasingly assumed the character of the national power of capital over labor, of an organized policy force for social enslavement, of a simple machine of class despotism. After every revolution that marks a progressive phase in the march (development) (course) of class struggle, the purely repressive character of state power reveals itself as more merciless and more undisguised" (MARX, 2011: 182 - 183 [1871]).

Therefore, the role of class mediation, which is characteristic of the State, only placed it at the disposal of bourgeois interests, relegating to the proletarians their condition of subordinates and in many cases undermining their possibility, even of association.

Lenin (2017) exemplifies that during the government of Otto von Bismarck, in 1878, in Germany, the infamous law of exception was signed, which prohibited all workers' organizations and workers' presses. His books were seized, and the Social Democratic parties became clandestine.

Regarding the reduction in workloads and other improvements achieved, Lafargue was especially critical. He did not see the consolidation of these rights as effectively "rights", but rather small concessions, or as an attempt to balance social tensions. When analyzing, for example, the events arising from the French Revolution of 1848, which deposed the French monarchy and established the Second Republic, in a genuinely popular movement, with a significant presence of the people on the streets, he says:

"And to say that the children of the Terror heroes allowed themselves to be degraded by the religion of work to the point of accepting after 1848, as a revolutionary conquest, the law

that limited factory work to twelve hours; proclaimed, as a revolutionary principle, the right to work. Shame on the French proletariat! (...)

And if the pain of forced labor, if the tortures of hunger befall the proletariat, more numerous than the locusts in the Bible, it was called by them.

This work, which in June 1848 the workers complained about with weapons in their hands, they imposed on their families; they handed over their wives and children to the barons of industry. With their own hands they demolished the home (...) with their hands they spoiled the life and vigor of their children! Proletarians be ashamed! (LAFARGUE, 2006: 13 [1880]).

And such contestation is simply intelligible. In what way does the proletariat, which is numerous, accept to be subjected to such a question of analogous servitude? If they have political ways to change their situation, should they then accept the mere quantitative easing of hours? This seems little and hardly alters their condition of submission.

On the contrary, all that is collected is an alienated and reified sense of living. Chauí (2018) explains the terms of this alienation, that the worker alienates his labor power to the bourgeois, therefore, the labor power also becomes a commodity. Soon, becoming a commodity that produces more goods, it does not, therefore, fulfill any human capacity of the worker himself, but exclusively the demands imposed by the capitalist market.

A production means is not just a technology, but a social organization of productive activity; and a mode of exploitation is a power relationship. Furthermore, the power relationship that conditions the nature and extent of exploitation is a matter of political organization within and between the contending classes. Ultimately, the relationship between appropriators and producers is based on the relative strength of classes, and this is largely determined by the internal organization and political forces with which each enters into the light of classes (WOOD, 2011: 33).

Antunes (2006), states that for the working class, the use of labor is the generation of goods whose purpose is to create exchange values, to the detriment of use values, and discusses what he understands to be a crisis in society of abstract work:

In this aspect, however, it is possible to see two very different ways of understanding the so-called crisis of the abstract labor society: the one that thinks that the being who works no longer plays the structuring role in the creation of exchange values, in the creation of goods, (...), and the one that criticizes the society of abstract work due to the fact that it takes the form of work that is estranged, fetishized and, therefore, non-effective and unfulfilling autonomous human activity². (ANTUNES, 2006: 85-86)

² Highlighting the issue of estranged work as "non-effective and unfulfilling", Antunes (2006) later explains that "under capitalism, the worker is not satisfied at work, but degrades; he does not recognize himself, but denies himself." and quotes Marx apud Fernandes (1983), "Hence the worker only feels with himself outside work and out of his mind at work. He feels at home when he doesn't work and when he works, he doesn't feel at home. His work is not, therefore, voluntary, but compulsory, forced labor. Therefore, it is not the satisfaction of a need, but only

In this sense, the alienation process directs the interactions between capital and labor, since the market conditions that force the worker to sell their labor for a much lower value, so that the greatest return can be extracted from it, that is, earning up profit, in the so-called surplus-value; the inaccessibility of the acquisition of labor products by the proletariat is normal and natural and there is a lack of recognition of what is produced for its use value.

So, workers know that they need to survive, and that this is only possible if they are inserted in the logic of the capitalist system as workers, otherwise they become disposable bodies, which is why they are forced to accept any work, even if intermittent, without social guarantees, just to survive another day.

The executioner is not the standard, but the social structure that naturalizes this relationship, and makes workers find themselves in increasingly precarious situations, as they cannot absorb the high demand from the unemployed.

Workers once claimed rights, but just as they were granted to balance market tensions, they were also mitigated to avoid tensions with the financial system. At no time were labor rights intended to protect workers, in fact, their form is contaminated with specific conditions that stabilize disparities.

For Pachukanis (2017), law has a necessary form that imposes itself in the form of capitalism, so that struggles for law tend to reproduce the same structure of domination, with the difference of having some benefits. Law is the instrument by which capital belongs to the capitalist and the worker can only sell his labor power.

Thus, a much larger contingent of workers is formed than there is actually available work. And these employees produce at extraordinary levels, not caring, therefore, whether or not they want to consume the result of this labor, or if they will find people who consume the result of their work.

The market hides the social relations that sustain it: capitalism is the extraction of value from workers, and, for that, it is always necessary more workers, produced by permanent processes of expropriation. It is about the incessant production of social beings needy enough to sell their labor power. (...). The other pole of this social relationship is the concentration of wealth, carried out through robberies, looting, public debts and deepened through the continuous extraction of surplus value from the growing masses of workers (FONTES, 2017: 412).

However, Lafargue's reflections are directed at what to do with overproduction, since the working class is prohibited from accessing what it generates and the bourgeois class, which is few in number, produces nothing, only despoil, but holds capital.

3. Overproduction, technique development and the social paradox

The answer presented in “The Right to be Lazy” is simple, if workers and the bourgeoisie are

a means to satisfy needs outside of it" (MARX. In: FERNANDES, 1983: 153) (ANTUNES, 2006: 216. Thus, what Antunes (2006) expresses is that the product cannot be close to the one who produces it, given that it is not carried out based on its usefulness and will, but exclusively for sale. Often workers are not even able to access what they produce, given their low pay, which is called de-effective and unfulfilling condition.

quantitatively insufficient to consume all the overproduction, the solution is to generate more need, seeking consumers and generating fictitious needs in them. This is what explains the exports of products with low use value to all corners of the world and, to ensure the continuity of their sales, they include low quality products in these products and deliberately program the durability of these goods always for less time than they would normally last (LAFARGUE, 2006).

However, even with new markets and renewed fictitious needs, it is not always possible to resolve the absorption of all goods, it is exactly this imprecision, or rather, imbalance between production and consumption in competitive markets that ends up shaping one of the most notorious characteristics of capitalism: the constancy of crises³.

In the communist manifesto, Marx and Engels will call the constancy of crises in the capitalist system creative destruction and will address the theme as follows:

For decades, the history of industry and commerce has been nothing but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern relations of production, against property relations that condition the existence of the bourgeoisie and its domination. (...). Each crisis regularly destroys not only a large mass of manufactured products, but also a large part of the productive forces already created. An epidemic, which at any other time would have seemed a paradox, collapses on society – the epidemic of overproduction (...) And how does the bourgeoisie manage to overcome these crises? On the one hand by the violent destruction of a large number of productive forces, on the other hand by the conquest of new markets and the more intense exploitation of the old ones. What does that lead to? To prepare for more extensive and more destructive crises and to reduce the means to avoid them (MARX and ENGELS, 2010: 45 [1848]).

These overproduction crises, reinforces Fontes (2017), renew the production of misery and inaugurate new cycles of exploitation of the proletarian class, because, once they are not consumed, the goods that have not been converted into merchandise are either destroyed, or accounted for as a loss. Without capital present, or with a reduction in profit rates, it ends up in the phenomenon of unemployment, which has been a constitutive element of this social dynamic, which, on a more modern scale, imposes itself as a heavy form of labor exploitation, especially without contractual mediation, without rights, without working hours and impoverished.

Mészáros (2011a) comes to a similar conclusion:

In the course of human development, the function of social control was alienated from the social body and transferred to capital, which acquired the power to unite individuals into a hierarchical structural and functional pattern, according to the criterion of greater or lesser participation in production and distribution control. (MÉSZÁROS, 2011a: 55).

³ In addition to this definition, Almeida (2020) discusses the social character of the constancy of crises. For the author, crises are, therefore, structural elements, circumscribed in capitalist sociability that manifest the historical and social limits of the relationship between the institutions and norms in a given place and at a given time, with the economic processes of that society. That is, crises denote the conflict between the accumulation regime and the forms of regulation, values, and integration between institutions.

Because they need capital so that their basic needs are met and that their salary is obtained, workers are obliged to produce. They produce beyond what is necessary for their subsistence, as long as there is, in the future, the creation of fictitious needs in consumers, in such a way as to take care of their surplus. It operates in the metaphysical sphere of stimulating desire. If the sale takes place and there is an increase in the need for production, workers will be forced to subject themselves to greater workloads in order to be able to meet the demand.

If there is no such realization, the working class, which produced at the behest of the bourgeois, will suffer either with worsening of their working conditions (withdrawal of benefits, reduction of wages and working hours) or with unemployment, which is already a structural condition for the survival of the model and, to remedy this loss, the worker will either have to work more, including dividing himself between two or more services, or he will have to look for new jobs that, taking advantage of the unemployed condition and the despair caused by lack of money, will propose minors wages and conditions even more precarious for the execution of the work⁴.

This is a social paradox, despite the result, more work will always be required and working conditions will worsen. It is the full subjection of the social to capital.

In this respect, it is possible to deal with parallels with the Gramscian conclusion, that under capital, society will be conditioned to the training of the working class, through mechanisms of coercion and persuasion, which will settle in the collective mentality, puritan ways of behaving, whose only main purpose will be the reproduction of capital and suitable forms for the exploitation of the working class. This puritanism, the author describes, penetrates individual fields, forcing people's voluntary adherence, aiming to guide, above all, individual actions in the name of a psychophysical health of workers that serves the reproduction of the subjection of the working class and the maintenance of capital. In this way, customs are based, the expected aspect of morality is defined and roles of hierarchization will delineate, among other things, what is conventional for sexuality and for the family constitution⁵ (GRAMSCI, 2001).

It is not difficult to conclude that more work means less time to have moments of meaning, less time to go to the bar, to see movies, to read, to be with the family and, above all, to engage in political and social fights. Therefore, more work is synonymous with greater alienation and reification.

Unemployment figures as a *si ne qua non* condition for the maintenance of the capitalist system, for some reasons, among them, is that with a high rate of unemployment, workers lose their bargaining power for fear that, when they band together or fight for better working conditions and wages, they can lose their source of earnings, after all there are many unemployed people, therefore, in need of employment. The reserve army increases every day. What does not happen in a full-employment economy⁶.

Marx explains that for capitalism there is an urgent need for a permanent unemployed surplus: “[...]”

⁴ This is what happens in the Brazilian reality after the approval of Law n. 13.467/2017, called Labor Reform, which removed workers' rights and reduced wages. "The new intermittent employment contract, as you can see, is among the most disruptive innovations of the so-called labor reform, for instituting modalities of hiring workers, via CLT, without several of the protections, advantages and guarantees structured by Labor Law" (DELGADO, 2020: 686).

⁵ Regarding this point: "The new industrialism wants monogamy, wants the working man not to waste his energies in the disorderly and exciting pursuit of occasional sexual satisfaction: the worker who goes to work after a night of " orgies" is not a good worker; passionate exaltation cannot fit the timed movements of productive gestures linked to the most perfect automatisms" (GRAMSCI, 2001: 269 [1934]).

⁶ Before there was the exchange of workers, but the market with the crisis of capital, even more so in neoliberalism, means that there is no absorption of the reserve, which tends to increase, and finally, to die for lack of sustenance.

capitalist accumulation always produces, and in proportion to its energy and extension, a relatively superfluous working population, that is, which exceeds the average needs of capital expansion, thus becoming surplus” (Marx, 2002: 731).

However, asks Lafargue, given the stage of development of the technique, why is it required so much production, so much exploitation of labor? Wouldn't it be time for technology to work to the detriment of the population? How to fight this conception necessary for the system itself, which is the existence of unemployment, in order to balance wages, create an army of reserve army and reduce the urge to demand workers? When will the population be able, instead of claiming the right to work, to claim for the right to laziness?

Lafargue (2006) recalls that since ancient Greek times, there was a false impression of technique as liberating. He reports that in the time of Cicero, the poet Antíparos believed that, with the invention of the watermill, slave women would be freed. This, of course, did not happen. It didn't happen with the Greeks, nor did it happen at any other time in history, the technique, associated with the introjected passion for work, only transformed the machine that was supposed to free into an instrument of subjection.

It is the same technique that should help humans in their most significant condition of life and realize values, which ends up being the driver of overproduction and which works to maintain the structural condition of unemployment, as the use of this enables a sensible increase in production and the bourgeois then starts to need fewer people working and associates this with a reduction in costs and an increase in profits, maintaining exclusively that extraordinarily necessary contingent for the maintenance of its operations⁷.

However, emphasizes Antunes (2018), despite this apparent possibility of extinction of work, it is false. Society remains, even today, intrinsically dependent on the sale of its workforce and, of course, income. What emerges are new forms of its exploration and depletion, as will be discussed in the next subchapter, but never its full extinction.

However, the fear of unemployment and overproduction end up taking away the ability to carry out the work, precisely because it removes the sense of usefulness in what it produces. Because, as Antunes (2006) explains, with the expansion of the technique, the reality of the producing class, assuming that the creation of exchange values supersedes the purpose of the use value, and that for this it uses the relationships between live work (humans) and dead labor (machines), it remains “only as a necessary condition for the integration of the capital appreciation process, (...) with the result that the concrete dimension of work is entirely subordinated to the abstract dimension” (ANTUNES, 2006: 85).

That is, from the use of the workforce aided by the technique for production, the result is primarily the creation of products arising from the expenditure of productive, physically, and socially determined human force that, since they do not have an organic character of socially necessary utility, assume a recognition alienated to the worker. Thus, work becomes strange and fetishized (ANTUNES, 2006).

It is important to emphasize the influence of religion in this propagation of passion for work. Contrary to explicit biblical passages that demonstrate the relevance of rest to the human being, including as a way of elevating the condition of the being, religions, and in particular the moral asceticism of

⁷ Ellen M. Wood asserts that capitalism does not guarantee any kind of peace, nor human emancipation, so that “given the dangers of capitalism, no rational person should support it; but we know that's not how things work” (WOOD, 2011: 228).

Protestant Calvinism, are challenging these values of current use, to establish a new moral and social order, based on work as a rationalizing activity, a means by which it is possible to earn profit, have income, pay debts and, therefore, be a righteous citizen, as well as an example of a person blessed by God. The work and wealth for this religious current manifested spiritual growth and blessings.

From a bourgeois perspective, Weber (2014) analyzes in “The Protestant Ethic and the “Spirit” of Capitalism”, that this change in perception not only coincides with the genesis of capitalism but puts into effect the foundations of modern Western capitalist rationality.

Thus, under capitalism, the new purpose of work becomes the production of money and prosperity as superior symbols to happiness, being status signs. And that despite the possibility of virtuous generation of income, the working class continues to be exploited, left behind.

In Weber's words:

Above all, this is the summum bonum of this "ethics"/earning money and always more money, in the strictest protection of all immediate enjoyment of the money earned, something so completely stripped of all eudemonistic or even hedonistic points of view and thought so exclusively as an end in itself, which, in comparison with the individual's “happiness” or his “utility”, appears in any case as entirely transcendent and simply irrational. The human being in terms of gain as the purpose of life, no longer the gain in function of the human being as a means to satisfy their material needs. This inversion of the “natural” order of things, totally meaningless to the naive sensibility, is as manifestly and unreservedly a Leitmotiv of capitalism as it is strange to anyone who has not been touched by its breath (WEBER, 2004: 46-47 [1905]).

Now, to the reality of the bourgeois perspective, which exploits the labor of others and gather the results of added value, such thinking makes total sense and serves as a driving force to impose more strenuous cycles and more exploration, but little is asked how such a mentality was able to permeate the proletarian mentality.

This is precisely the role of the right to be lazy. In his conclusion on how to face this reality, Lafargue (2006) provides laziness as a solution, that is, the reappropriation by workers of time off work for the development of non-productive potentials, or, as Albornoz (2008: 10) says, would be laziness “the best use of resources that technology makes possible, through the integration of human living work with the productive power of machines and, thus, by the drastic reduction of the common workday”. At no point is the claim to laziness presented against the form of work, but rather as a way to promote the right to leisure and rest. Nor is it mentioned in his work, the struggle against the capitalist mode of production or the presentation of a new social form.

Initially personified in the reduction of working hours to three a day, Lafargue argues that this way there would be the possibility of full employment, because with shorter hours, everyone could work and, by having more free time, they could develop their full creative potential and liberators. However, it is known that it is possible to adopt this practice, without any salary reduction, however, the profit would be smaller, and this is an unacceptable reduction by the market. It is important that the accumulation of capital expands, even if this requires the disposal of some people, mass layoffs, for example.

The workload reduction proposal, as described by Lafargue, touches on a relevant point, which is the resumption of work as the essence of satisfying vital needs and executing creative capacity, not as a field of alienation, as when transforming work into merchandise and therefore, subject to purchase, man and woman gradually lose their human condition and become a marketing form. Laziness as thought by Lafargue is the denunciation against exploitation and alienation, through the recovery of its other potentialities. However, this final condition of recovering capabilities will never be possible within the capitalist system, because, even if there are reforms, exploitation of the working class is the driving force of this system. Thus, there seems to be no possibility of giving new meaning to work, calling into question its alienated condition, without replacing the capitalist system.

4. The contemporaneity of “The Right to be Lazy”

After almost a century and a half since the writing of *The Right to be lazy*, it is worth questioning the contemporaneity of the work, is it still relevant? Which points have been refuted and which corroborated, under the history?

Looking at the current world situation, it is possible to notice that there has been a worsening in the conditions of workers, the technique remains even more predatory, contrary to the proletariat, and laziness remains an impossibility due to issues of social arrangement.

With the qualitative leap in production by Fordism in the first half of the 20th century, with the introduction of Toyotism, with the just in-time model, from the 70s and with the explosion of the Internet, the working class sees itself to new types of predatory and depleting relationship. The advent of neoliberalism, an extremely conservative agenda, with the reduction of the State's role as an inducer of social well-being, all that did was to exponentialize these damages (ANTUNES, 2006).

Social statistics show, in addition to the sharp inequality, how much welfare has been undermined in Brazil. 13.5 million people survive on less than R\$145 per capita per month and 53.5 million people on less than R\$420 (IBGE, 2019).

In this scenario, unemployment continues to be a structuring element of the system. The Brazilian reserve army constituted 12.2% of the population, therefore 12 million people.

In Brazil, and this is not an exclusive phenomenon, but present in all countries that submit to this neoliberal agenda, workers and work have worsened in such a qualitative order, which led to the coining of a specific term: “precarious”. This precariousness is characterized by a very notorious presence in the service sector, therefore non-productive, carrying out work of low technical specification, with few (or no) rights, typically informal and which are mainly victims of a marked process of outsourcing and deregulation of its activities (BRAGA, 2012).

In fact, the precariat is very much driven by the action of the State, which increasingly deregulates labor activities, unprotects workers and leaves them at the mercy of their employers, claiming that what was agreed is valid over the legislated. Among the precariousness, a false idea is being sold that it is fighting unemployment and that the measures are, therefore, to create more jobs. However, they despise that unemployment is a structural condition of the capitalist form and that such flexibilization does not increase employment, on the contrary, it only serves to consolidate exploitation without workers' rights.

If we take outsourced workers as an example, which are one of the main components of this stratum, the conditions of their rights and wages are of a considerable order of magnitude, when compared to regular non-outsourced workers.

In 2014, outsourced workers represented approximately 25% of formal workers in the country, however with an average turnover rate twice as high as that of typically contracting activities (outsourced workers always fluctuate an average of 60%, while non-outsourced workers, 27%), the formal duration of their records represented half the time of non-outsourced workers (34 months, against 70) and an average remuneration around 27% lower than non-outsourced workers (PELATIERI, 2018).

In a technical note issued by Dieese (2017), it is seen that in companies with more than 1000 employees, the difference in remuneration between outsourced and non-outsourced workers reaches up to 47%, in addition to having working hours on average more strenuous than contractors (85.6% work 41 – 44 hours a week, while among hirers this number drops to 61.6%).

There is also enormous insecurity at work, Antunes (2018) describes the emblematic case of Petrobrás, in which during the period 1995 to 2013, 84% of fatal accidents happened with outsourced workers. Mentioning the annual average of fatal accidents at work between 2000-2013, it is correct to say that this number was 8.6 per 100,000 among outsourced workers, against 5.6 per 100,000 among those directly hired.

On the logic of the fictitious creation of needs, this one remains more contemporary than ever, aided by online sales channels that connect the world and that contain sophisticated logistical networks for the flow of goods. Borders are neglected, consumers and bourgeois are brought closer together. Extremely high consumption standards are imposed and mislead so that they are understood as the very source of happiness. Low durability is already a constituent part of the consumer goods that are generated, including those called “non-durable goods”.

In this way, the cycle of overproduction becomes effective and feeds back more and more lastingly.

5. Final Considerations

The last considerations on “The right to be lazy” could not diverge from the rest of the text: the conditions of consumption and overproduction that were designed a few centuries ago, continue to imprison the working class in degrading conditions of survival, with high dependence on work for the realization of income, fetishization of the products produced and great presence of dead work.

Technical development, associated with large profit margins and lean production structures are the new world order, designed through neoliberal commands. In this system, the role of the worker has never been so far removed from well-being: it survives through informal or outsourced, unregulated work, with high workloads, few benefits, and low wages.

The acceptance of this situation is coercive. Haunted by the constant ghost of the unemployed, which makes the maintenance of survival unfeasible, and relegated to low wages, workers have no other way than to accept such conditions, often dividing their time between two or more services.

The State, which could act as a mediator of class conflict, ends up serving to maintain bourgeois interests, giving force of law to the flexibilization and precariousness pleaded by the bourgeoisie and

dismantling social protection structures, under the motto that this will generate more jobs.

The bourgeoisie, if for a start had to give up some conditions and accept, among other things, the eight-hour workday and the end of child labor, on the other hand knew how to take advantage of the opportunity cost and extract extreme profits with the creation of mass consumption, taking class domination and conflict to other levels.

Activities that again brought a fulfilling centrality to the work were ignored and even discouraged over time. Laziness, an essential condition to this resignification movement, was not only cursed, but taken as an affront to customs, considered reprehensible.

The perverse perception of how work has become unfulfilled by human activity is the sad conclusion that one obtains from observing Lafargue's work, with the unfortunate observation that the working class has never been granted the right to be lazy. However, in addition to “perform palliative actions” on rights and to balance tensions between dominators and dominated, it is essential to end the exploitation of the individual by the individual, and this to stop the capital and labor relationship.

6. References

- S.G. ALBORNOZ. Sobre O direito à preguiça de Paul Lafargue. “Cadernos de Psicologia Social do Trabalho”. vol. 11, n. 1, 2008, p. 1-17.
- S.L. ALMEIDA. Capitalismo e crise: o que o racismo tem a ver com isso? “Blog da Boitempo”. 24 jun. 2020. Available in: < <https://blogdaboitempo.com.br/2020/06/23/capitalismo-e-crise-o-que-o-racismo-tem-a-ver-com-isso/> > Access on: 05 Mar. 2021.
- R. ANTUNES. “Adeus ao trabalho? Ensaio sobre as metamorfoses e a centralidade do mundo do trabalho”. 11ª. Ed. Campinas: Editora Unicamp, 2006.
- _____. “O privilégio da Servidão e o novo proletariado de serviços na era digital”. 1ª. Ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2018.
- R, BRAGA. “A política do precariado do populismo à hegemonia lulista”. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2012.
- M. CHAUI. “Introdução a *O direito à preguiça*, de Paul Lafargue”. In: CHAUI, M. *Contra a Servidão Voluntária*. 2ª. Ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2014.
- M.G. DELGADO. “Curso de direito do trabalho”. 8. ed. São Paulo: LTr, 2020.
- DIEESE. “Terceirização e precarização das condições de trabalho”. Condições de trabalho e remuneração em atividades tipicamente terceirizadas e contratantes. Available in: < <https://www.dieese.org.br/notatecnica/2017/notaTec172Terceirizacao.pdf> > Access on: 05 May. 2020.
- F. ENGELS. “A situação da classe trabalhadora na Inglaterra”. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010.
- V. FONTES. “Capitalismo, crises e conjuntura”. *Serv. Soc. Soc.*, São Paulo, n. 130, p. 409-425, set./dez. 2017. Available in: < <https://www.scielo.br/pdf/sssoc/n130/0101-6628-sssoc-130-0409.pdf> > Access: 03 May 2020.
- A. GRAMSCI. “Caderno 22: Americanismo e fordismo”. In: GRAMSCI, Antonio. *Cadernos do Cárcere*. Vol 4. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2001. p. 241 - 282.
- IBGE. “Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística”. Extrema pobreza atinge 13,5 milhões de pessoas e chega ao maior nível em 7 anos. Available in: < <https://agenciadenoticias.ibge.gov.br/agencia->

[noticias/2012-agencia-de-noticias/noticias/25882-extrema-pobreza-atinge-13-5-milhoes-de-pessoas-e- chega-ao-maior-nivel-em-7-anos](https://www.ijer.in.br/noticias/2012-agencia-de-noticias/noticias/25882-extrema-pobreza-atinge-13-5-milhoes-de-pessoas-e- chega-ao-maior-nivel-em-7-anos) > Access on: 05 May 2020.

P. LAFARGUE. “O Direito à Preguiça”. 1ª. Ed. São Paulo: Edipro, 2016.

V.I. LÊNIN. “O Estado e a Revolução”. 1ª. Ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2017 (Arsenal Lênin).

K. MARX. “A guerra civil na França”. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011. (Coleção Marx-Engels)

_____. “O capital”. Livro 1, o processo de produção do capital. 20ª. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização brasileira, 2002

_____; F. ENGELS. “Manifesto Comunista”. 1ª. Ed. Revisitada. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010.

I. MÉSZÁROS. “A crise estrutural do capital” 2ª. Ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

_____. “Para além do capital”. 1ª. Ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

E. B. PACHUKANIS. “Teoria geral do direito e marxismo”. Tradução de Paula Vaz de Almeida, 1.ed. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2017.

M. PEDROSA. “Tripalium: o trabalho transformado em tortura”. Goiânia: Kelps, 2007.

P. PELATIERI. *et al.* “Terceirização e precarização das condições de trabalho”: condições de trabalho e remuneração em atividades tipicamente terceirizadas e contratantes. *in* Ipea. Terceirização do trabalho no Brasil: novas e distintas perspectivas para o debate. Organizador: André Gambier Campos. Brasília: Ipea, 2018.

G. STANDING. “O precariado: a nova classe perigos”. 1ª. Ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica editora, 2014.

M. WEBER. “A ética protestante e o ‘espírito’ do capitalismo”. 1ª Ed. São Paulo: Companhia das letras, 2004.

E.M. WOOD. “Democracia contra capitalismo: a renovação do materialismo histórico”. Tradução de Paulo Cezar Castanheira. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).