

# Play, Idleness and the Problem of Necessity in Schiller and Marcuse

Brian O'Connor (University College Dublin)<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

The central concern of this paper is to explore the efforts of Schiller's post-Kantian idealism and Marcuse's critical theory to develop a new conception of free human experience. That conception is built on the notion of play. Play is said to combine the human capacities for physical pleasure and reason, capacities which the modern world has dualized. Analysis of their respective accounts of play reveals its ambivalent form in the work of both philosophers. Play supports the ideal of 'freedom from necessity', understood as a release from all external constraint. But it also appears to serve as a model for 'freedom as a higher necessity'. In the case of Schiller, the ambivalence encompasses idle play and an obligation to make ourselves worthy of freedom. For Marcuse, play represents a kind of libidinal idleness while also underpinning a non-alienated conception of labour.

## Keywords

play; necessity; idleness; Schiller; Marcuse; Kant; Freud

The notion that human beings are truly free only in the absence of necessity has informed a broad range of radical social theories, arguably from Romanticism to Critical Theory. It has prompted the effort to think of new conceptions of experience where freedom is found in the abolition of tension between what human beings desire and what they must do. Those demands – both internal and external – that create that tension are somehow to be abolished. No overriding ideals of 'must', duty or constraint are defended from within those conceptions.

Even within the radical stream of practical philosophy, though, unease can be seen at the idea that meaningful freedom is realized once necessity has been removed. No existing form of necessity can be endorsed of course, but perhaps a higher or better

---

\* In *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 22, No. 6 (2014) (pp. 1095-1117)

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Owen Hulatt, Fabian Freyenhagen, an anonymous reader and all participants at a University of Notre Dame colloquium in March 2014 for comments on earlier versions of this paper.

necessity is what a theory of true freedom requires. The basic thought is that without something outside the agent's immediate experience informing freedom's purposes freedom would amount to mere randomness or caprice. On that basis, free actions of a higher necessity gain a specified determinate character. The content of actions said to operate according to higher necessity includes the realization of an organic moral community, the production or maintenance of the self (i.e. self-constitution), a new way of living which realizes human potential.

The opposition between the ideals of freedom from necessity and freedom as a higher necessity might seem to be one way of disaggregating the radical tradition. The radical tradition has tended to think of human emancipation as a matter of the elimination of certain existing normative pillars (e.g. private property, contractually structured human relations, Judeo-Christian morality). Those theorists who emphasize elimination might be aligned with the ideal of freedom from necessity, whereas those who believe that a superior normative order is required can be seen as advocates of freedom as higher necessity. This division, however, is not quite so neat in practice. Those very alternatives can be found as an ambivalence or inner-conflict within single theories. This is exemplified in the two philosophical theories of play examined in this study, those of Friedrich Schiller and Herbert Marcuse. The appearance of this ambivalence or inner-conflict is not the result of careless thinking. Arguably, it is not very surprising. It comes about as a result of the effort to create theoretical harmony between what is uncontrolled – the latter being a basic connotation of freedom – and meaningful or even purposeful action.

Play may be characterized as an activity free of necessity – of prescribed rules or form – but its positive characteristics are harder to determine. One way of capturing it might be with a particular sense of idleness (a term which Schiller himself employs) or idle pleasure. By idleness here is meant experience that is not constrained by a project, that is doing nothing in particular, but in which the subject experiences her/himself wholly. Pleasure refers to the agreeable experience of the agent in actions of this kind. There is nothing productive in idle pleasure. It is certainly not useful. Within the classical German tradition idle pleasure has been interpreted as contrary to the rational enterprise of the self-construction of the autonomous agent. Furthermore, both Kant and Hegel, in their different ways, link idleness to uselessness and even to

primitiveness.<sup>2</sup> Idleness is experience of a lower order since the individual has no concern at all for his or her capacity to contribute to socially validated forms of productivity. Schiller and Marcuse take a quite different view of the value of usefulness. They do not value work for work's sake or as an instrument for any good. Their concepts of play do not accommodate work in any familiar sense. They might therefore be expected to be sympathetic to the notion of freedom as a kind of idle pleasure. As we shall see, Schiller appears to acknowledge this notion while developing a conclusive position on freedom as higher necessity, a position which ultimately excludes idle pleasure. Marcuse attempts to accommodate something like idle pleasure within a radically transformed concept of work, but that accommodation appears to have a paradoxical structure.

### 1. Schiller

The official programme of Schiller's *Aesthetic Education of Man* (first published in 1795) is to provide his contemporaries with some instruction on how they might move beyond the present set of social institutional arrangements. Schiller holds that although social arrangements may, as they stand, be orderly they cannot be regarded as truly free. In Schiller's metaphor, we live within a clockwork state which determines social participation 'with meticulous exactitude by means of a formulary which inhibits all freedom of thought' (AE, VI, 35). This absence of freedom directly entails the absence of the moral life.

For Schiller, following Kant, the moral life is the supreme exercise of freedom. There the affinity ends. Schiller does not adopt Kant's idea of moral duty, implicitly rejecting it as suited to the psychology of a 'barbarian' whose 'principle destroys feeling' (AE, IV, 21). A theory of morality based exclusively on duty is hostile to the totality of human action.<sup>3</sup> We might note, though, that Allison's account of practical action seems to suggest a capacity in Kant's position for a kind of reconciliation of feeling and rule or principle. He writes:

---

<sup>2</sup> See O'Connor, 'Idleness, Usefulness and Self-Constitution' for a discussion focused on the Kantian tradition of philosophical conflicts between social usefulness, self-constitution and idleness.

<sup>3</sup> See Miller, *Schiller and the Ideal of Freedom*, 51–54, for an account of Schiller's worries, throughout his philosophical writings, about the 'despotic' nature of moral law.

for Kant an inclination or desire does not of itself constitute a reason for acting. It can become one only with reference to a rule or principle of action, which dictates that we ought to pursue the satisfaction of that inclination or desire. (Allison, *Kant's Theory of Freedom*, 40)

But if this formulation does capture the reconciliation of rule and feeling, it does so by assuming that feeling can be subordinated to a rule. The separation of Kant and Schiller on this point can be explained as a difference in conceptions of the sources of moral necessity. For both philosophers, obviously enough, a theory of moral necessity must in no way place limits on the exercise of freedom. Kant's version of the theory, however, fails to satisfy what Schiller thinks of as the conditions of freedom in the fullest sense. Kant attempts to ground moral necessity exclusively within the rationality of the moral agent. In the second *Critique* he proposes 'that pure reason can contain within itself a practical ground' (Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*, 17, AA 5: 19). This practical ground must be nothing other than the capacity to produce reasons that have authority for us in how we might act. Were feelings to impose courses of actions on us we would, he claims, be subject to physical necessity. Kant wants to oppose the account which reduces human action to physical necessity with what Allison describes as 'a rational necessity stemming from "objective laws of reason"...not a causal necessity stemming from antecedent conditions' (Allison, *Kant's Theory of Freedom*, 40–1). Why rational necessity does not satisfy the position adopted by Schiller is that it locates the agential spontaneity – the source of necessity – at the level of rule giving. What it effectively maintains is that spontaneity in the serious sense is not to be located within the space of feeling. What Schiller's conception of necessity tries to capture is the Hellenic sense of acting that is not produced by reflection on the content of an agent's motivations. Rather, agents are formed in such a way that they would not wish to act other than the ways they do, and those actions are moral.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> On this point I take a different view from that of Deligiorgi who maintains that 'for Kant, and indeed for Schiller, morality is not just about managing to conduct oneself in certain ways that are considered to be morally agreeable. Rather the reasons that shape the behaviour matter' (Deligiorgi, 'The Proper Telos of Life', 498). Schiller, it seems to me, places the emphasis on agreeableness, even if he does not explicitly exclude the business of providing reasons.

A further worry that Schiller expresses about the theory that we ought to free ourselves of sensuous motives is that its realization requires self-deception. Because the senses cannot be dominated by the moral law they will continue to exert their demands even where individuals deem themselves to be free of them. In this respect, individuals become the unwitting ‘slave’ of the very senses they enslave (AE, IV, 21). Against Kant, then, Schiller insists that human beings in their fullness must be accommodated within any plausible conception of the moral life. Beiser neatly expresses this difference: ‘Kant subordinates humanity to morality whereas Schiller subordinates morality to humanity’ (Beiser, *Schiller as Philosopher*, 186).

Schiller proposes that if human beings are to attain a genuinely free and moral condition they will have to pass first through an intermediary phase. The psychological revolution that would transform beings moulded by the mechanical state into morally independent agents is simply beyond what can be realistically ascribed to human beings. Schiller proposes that the human capacity for ‘play’ might be developed to serve as a transitional step between human beings as they now are – creatures whose physical wants incline them towards an essentially material society – to what they can ideally be, namely, moral beings. This will enable human beings to elevate themselves from ‘physical necessity (*Notwendigkeit*) into moral necessity’ (AE, III, 11). As readers of *Aesthetic Education* quickly perceive, however, Schiller invests so much theoretical capital in his advocacy for play that it ceases to look like a transitional phase and becomes, instead, the highest phase of human development. That is captured in the famous line: ‘man only plays when he is in the fullest sense of the word a human being’ (AE, XV, 107). In Schiller’s text we see a number of concepts which stand under the general concept of hostile necessity, that is, of necessity which we experience as an unpleasantness: *Nötigung*, *Notwendigkeit*, *Zwang*. The prevalence of necessity or compulsion is, he claims contrary to Kant, an obstacle to the realization of truly free human experience. This seems to open up the question of whether Schiller is committed to a liberty of indifference, in which one, subject to no sense of necessity, is perfectly free to choose or reject the moral law.<sup>5</sup> But we should recall that – however complicated it will turn out to be – Schiller actually maintains the language of necessity himself. The only conception of necessity

---

<sup>5</sup> See Lavin, ‘Practical Reason and the Possibility of Error’, 446–449, for a discussion of the significance to Kant of the notion of a ‘liberty of indifference’.

that is compatible with genuine freedom is that which involves no inner struggle. The harshness of self-regulation is the experience of a human being that is not harmonious with itself. For such a being there is a continuous experience of self-alienation as one's feelings and one's rationality place competing demands on it.

In some of Schiller's articulations, play is said to act according to a higher form of necessity which combines and transcends existing forms of necessity. What Schiller claims is that play, in bringing together the forms of necessity that are specific to experiences of the moral law and of the material world, negates the negative quality of those experiences of necessity. When operating in separation each of those necessities disagrees with some feature of the whole human being: formal necessity is antagonistic to our sensuous being, material necessity to our moral character. In play each is released from one-sidedness and gains the quality of the other. Schiller actually has two views of this higher necessity: it becomes manifest in actual aesthetic/play experience, but it also has a teleological status, in that is a necessity which impresses itself as an end only on human beings who have learnt how to play in Schiller's sense. The switching perspectives of immanent and teleological analyses make for a challenging feature of Schiller's text.<sup>6</sup>

### 1.1. The Structure of Play

What marks out play as serviceable for a transitional phase is that it encompasses both physicality and formality. It is formal, negatively at least, in that it is neither structureless nor capricious. Because play reconciles what are taken to be the two fundamental drives of human beings – the sense or material drive and the formal drive – it is an exercise of freedom in a way that capricious material experience is not. What human beings gain from play, in Schiller's sense, is experience of formality – of structure which does not vitiate freedom – that will prepare them for the consummate point of moral existence: spontaneous but lawful agency. Schiller's notion of formality, then, identifies that part of human behaviour that freely operates according to rules of some kind, whether that is morality, sport or aesthetic creativity. From the perspective of Schiller's departure from Kant, this emphasis on 'formality' may seem

---

<sup>6</sup> Schaper notes it with regard to the very idea of aesthetic education: 'it is not altogether clear when Schiller speaks of "aesthetic education" whether it is education to the aesthetic, understood as the ideal state for man to attain, or through which ordinary living can be enhanced' (Schaper, 'Towards the Aesthetic', 156).

like a lapse. But what he is trying to develop is a notion of 'living form' in which, again, the agent is always already morally engaged (in contrast to the idea of the moral agent appearing only during the moment of rational reflection) (AE, XV, 101).

By drive, Schiller seems to mean a dynamic orientation towards the outer world. The orientation of the sense drive is sensuous engagement with the outer world, whereas the form drive involves its agents in bringing order to that world. Schiller draws a sharp contrast between the sense/material and formal drives. It follows from that contrast that a physical life – in some way determined as it is exclusively through the sense drive – is without form. The 'physical man', according to Schiller, can merely feel and desire (AE, XI, 77). His experience is 'nothing but world' understood as the 'formless content of time'. The absence of 'form' has a range of implications. Physical beings as 'nothing but world' are, according to Schiller, 'merely subservient to the laws of nature' (AE, XXIII, 165). The 'physical man' is therefore passive at the level of his engagement with the actual world. The lines of Schiller's thinking are, on this point, conventional and identical with those of his Jena friend and neighbour, Fichte: a material being is not an agent and is therefore determined. However, the fact that the sensuousness of the physical man comes about through a drive which orients him dynamically towards sensuous experience must mean that he is not an object of nature in the paradigm sense. The fact of the drive seems to say, rather, that the physical man deals with the outer world in a particular way. The way in which he deals with it is to surrender to it as though he were an object of nature. He does not conceive of himself as an agent, but as an effect of the outer world and this is because his relation to that world is determined by the sense or material drive. The moral judgement implicit in that Fichtean analysis raises the question of what the sense drive, which determines the sensuous man's experience, has got to do with the kind of pure sensuousness that excludes moral agency. Henrich rightly notes that 'the structure of moral affects has little in common with that of what we ordinarily call sensibility' (Henrich, 'Beauty and Freedom', 253). That both are run together in Schiller's theory might arguably be enough to debilitate that theory altogether. After all, the theory requires that we see some kind of isomorphism between that kind of sensuality that Kant identified with heteronomy and the data of sensory experience. This problem, serious as it might prove to be, will not be pursued here since it does not bear directly on the question of the two freedoms.

According to Schiller, the experience of passivity is that of ceaseless change, in that the individual simply receives but does not direct experience. Beings of this kind fail to realize themselves as totalities, living instead in the flow of time. Schiller holds that ‘everyone is outside himself as long as he does nothing but feel’ (AE, XII, 79n, translation adjusted). If the sense drive is passive then, contrastively, activity will be attributed to our formal capacities. Bringing form to matter is what counts as activity. The formal drive is an orientation towards law and unity. It is, according to Schiller, the source of transformative activity, in that it orders experience under the laws it takes to be appropriate. Acting under law stabilizes experience by determining its specific course. Schiller writes that the ‘formal drive insists on unity and persistence’ (AE, XIII, 85). The formal drive is synonymous with reason in Schiller’s analysis.

Schiller claims that the play drive can combine the sense and formal drives, using the term *aufheben* to capture the productive merger of those two drives. The status of this seemingly third drive is unclear. Schaper helpfully suggests that the play drive is not a ‘real’ drive, in the sense that the two fundamental drives are, but is ‘emergent’, becoming effective – in ways unexplained – when the necessities imposed by the two fundamental drives cease to ‘dominate’ (Schaper, ‘Towards the Aesthetic’, 164). Schiller argues that in this ‘emergent’ drive, the fullest exercise of the formal drive must be united with the fullest exercise of the sense drive. The latter opens us to the ‘infinite of phenomena’ and the former enables us to bring unity to that infinitude (AE, XIII, 89). Were the function of activity somehow appropriated by the sense drive, a human being, Schiller claims, would ‘never be himself’. He would never become a unity because his activity would be utterly formless. Were the function of passivity to be given to the formal drive, that man would ‘never be anything else’ (AE, XIII, 89) since he would thereby be no more than inert form.

The play drive is, in one respect, a theoretical posit: it is the conjectured unity of two drives. At the same time, this drive may be witnessed in the restricted sphere of the aesthetic experience of beauty. Both matter and form comprise beauty and hence, in some respect, both drives are operative in the experience of beauty. They must operate in complete harmony if beauty is to be perceived: matter is experienced in form, and form is discernible only in its materiality. This looks like an implicit



qualification of Schiller's claims about the prevalence of 'physical man'. What Schiller seems to have in mind is that the play drive exists in some privileged way in aesthetic experience. Aesthetic experience shows us that human beings are capable of formality: beauty is a kind of form. We can interpret Schiller as holding that the task of aesthetic education is to translate the broad structures of aesthetic experience into general experience and to bring to it the formality – free lawfulness – it lacks in reality.

### 1.2. *Willkür* and *Wille*

With the question of the two kinds of freedom before us, it is interesting to see that Schiller has an unthematized yet identifiable account of the kinds of action that are characteristic of *Willkür* and *Wille*, respectively. As might be expected, their differences follow the delineation of the drives, *Willkür* producing choices determined by the sense drive and *Wille* producing choices that take on the form of law.

Schiller uses the term *Willkür* with familiar connotations of caprice or unregulated desire or choice determined by desire. He argues, for instance, that the transition to a moral order involves, among other things, 'abstracting from man's physical character its arbitrariness (*Willkür*)' (AE, III, 15). Similarly, the cultivated, *gebildete* man is not an enemy of nature, but makes nature work for him by curbing 'her caprice' (AE, IV, 21). This conception of *Willkür* complements what Schiller has attributed to the sense drive: *Willkür* is directionless and what we experience in this mode is without structure. The passivity of the sense drive, though, is not that of a neutral and causally receptive faculty. The sense drive, in other words, is not or is only very generally analogous to an object determined by external impacts. The sense drive does act, but it acts without discrimination. It takes in the world as it finds it because its essence is to find it as a sensuous manifold. Hence, Schiller's characterization of 'natural man', i.e. the man without *Bildung*, as guilty of 'making a lawless misuse of his licence (*Willkür*)' (AE, VII, 46).

Schiller advances the notion of *Wille* as something like a capacity for choice in action. Acts of *Wille* elevate us and draw from under us 'the ladder of nature' (AE, III, 13). The *Wille* is free and may choose 'between duty and inclination' (AE, IV, 17). In this context, *Wille* is only loosely based on the legislative will of Kant's theory. Acts of

*Wille* do not necessarily have moral content. Through *Wille* we act under reason, which means only that we are not inevitably necessitated by nature. Actually, Schiller thinks we will act under the moral law when we act through *Wille*, but it does not seem that we will necessarily do so.

Given Schiller's synthesis of the two drives as the play drive, he is consistent in not developing a hierarchy of *Willkür* and *Wille*. Both are in evidence in the integrated self. Will should not be at war with caprice, once the division of experience is overcome. In an integrated self – the self that plays – desire becomes less capricious and acts of will, as he puts it, less 'sublime' (AE, XXIII, 169). That is, what now appears to demand too much of human beings in their present constitution – a capacity for free moral action – becomes realistic once the chasm between caprice and will is closed. As we have seen, it is closed by a productive merger of the two. Through education, the inclinations, in other words, will come ready packed in moral form. Notably, Schiller thinks about this integrated position, in which the mind 'is neither physically nor morally necessitated', as the only 'free disposition' without qualification (AE, XX, 141, translation adjusted).

### 1.3. Relationship of the Two Freedoms

The unhappy experiences of necessity that come with the two original drives disappear in the play drive just as it does in the experience of beauty. This drive, with its reconciliatory character, 'will exert upon the mind at once a moral and physical necessity (*nötigen*); it will, therefore, since it annuls (*aufhebt*) all contingency, annul all constraint (*Nötigung*) too, and set man free both physically and morally' (AE, XIV, 97). This formulation is perplexing. Why should the play drive both abolish all constraint and at the same time maintain necessity? It might seem that Schiller is trading on the perspectives of two methodologies: the phenomenological and the transcendental. In play experience, constraint is phenomenologically absent, but the condition of the possibility of that experience is the transcendental structure comprising moral necessity, physical necessity and a dialectic of the two. With regard to the latter, we note that Schiller himself says that it is 'on transcendental grounds' that the two drives – with their distinctive necessities – are combined (AE, XV, 103). It turns out, though, to be harder to explain the abolition and maintenance of necessity thesis by reference to different methodological viewpoints. Schiller, it seems to me, is

ambivalently committed – with differing degrees of strength – to the two ideals of freedom from necessity and freedom as higher necessity. And both of these ideals are supported by experiential material.

We can see Schiller's ambivalence quite clearly in a passage where he describes the Greeks and their unsurpassable conception of the art of living. This should be seen as highly significant as it is the only place in the text where Schiller offers a portrait of what experience of play would look like. He begins by telling us that play is 'capable of bearing the whole edifice of the art of the beautiful, and of the still more difficult art of living'. The art of living as play is described in this way:

Guided by the truth of that same proposition, they [the Greeks] banished from the brow of the blessed gods all the earnestness and effort which furrow the cheeks of mortals, no less than the empty pleasures which preserve the smoothness of a vacuous face; freed those ever-contented beings from the bonds inseparable from every purpose, every duty, every care, and made idleness and indifference (*Müßiggang und die Gleichgültigkeit*) the enviable portion of divinity – merely a more human name for the freest, most sublime state of being.<sup>7</sup> (AE, XV, 109)

This passage describes idleness and indifference to purpose as qualities of the highest form of freedom. The Gods are not required to work or to produce. Their lives of play, if anything, are the expressions of freedom without necessity or constraint. No identifiable norms frame their actions.

Freedom from necessity does not appear to imply a deeper, richer or superior necessity. Schiller, though, continues:

Both the material constraint (*Zwang*) of natural laws and the spiritual constraint of moral laws were resolved in their higher concept of Necessity (*Notwendigkeit*),

---

<sup>7</sup> In this context '*Gleichgültigkeit*' does not refer to the technical notion of indifference in the choice of the moral law, but rather to indifference to the pleasurable course of experience.

which embraced both worlds at once; and it was only out of the perfect union of these two necessities that for them true Freedom could proceed.<sup>8</sup> (AE, XV, 109)

This second part of the passage seems to offer a different picture of ideal freedom. Here, the necessities remain, even if in a different form: now as an immanent higher necessity. What this names, however, does not really support what is attributed to the divine art of living: its idle pleasures.

Idleness in this context names behaviour which appears purposeless yet free, valuable yet unproductive. The play of the Gods exhibits a life of caprice: their actions are their own, and they are freed from the constraints/ necessities/compulsions of morality and of the laws of nature. But does Schiller want us to think of caprice as the form of freedom – freedom from necessity – that underpinned the highest art of living? The account of the Gods’ art of living seems to oscillate between that caprice and a higher necessity that is not particularly obvious in their actions.

This ambivalence is perhaps more evident in a later passage where Schiller extols the uselessness of the play state of aesthetic experience, but then places that uselessness at the service of a higher necessity. He sees a resemblance between ‘aesthetic determinability’ and ‘indetermination’, in that ‘both exclude any determinate mode of existence’ (AE, XXI, 145). The absence of determinacy means, Schiller thinks, that the ‘aesthetic state’ is ‘completely indifferent and unfruitful as regards knowledge or character’. Beauty, he continues, ‘accomplishes no particular purpose, neither intellectual nor moral’ (AE, XXI, 145–7). The sheer absence of necessity gives individuals complete freedom to undertake whatever acts of self-determination they may or may not wish to undertake. In the absence of necessity we might think of the actions produced from indeterminacy as capricious. Roehr claims that the freedom of indeterminacy ‘is not empty’ because it is ‘full of content’, the content of the two drives (Roehr, ‘Freedom and Autonomy in Schiller’, 132). The drives may frame the possibilities of human action, but as they are, as Schiller seems to say, transcendental conditions, it is a puzzling idea that they might also have content. One way or the other, Schiller goes on to turn that indeterminacy towards some kind of teleological

---

<sup>8</sup> ‘Sowohl der materielle Zwang der Naturgesetze, als der geistige Zwang der Sittengesetze verlor sich in ihrem höhern Begriff von Notwendigkeit...’

higher necessity. The indeterminate space of freedom without necessity in fact permits the individual to ‘be what he ought to be’ (AE, XXI, 147). Schiller may not, as Beiser claims, be ‘imparting any specific direction to our activity’ (Beiser, *Schiller as Philosopher*, 155), but the ‘ought’ that comes into view once aesthetic indeterminacy has been achieved is surely a kind of determination.

What we ‘ought to be’ is not specified in this context, but the answer is hinted at earlier in the text. Schiller writes that each of us carries within us a ‘pure, ideal man’. He holds that it is our task to bring about some kind of unity between all our alterations (*‘Abwechselungen’* is the word Schiller uses) and the ‘unchanging unity of this ideal’ (AE, IV, 17). This unity is supposed to be a unity of the living with the ideal, and that unity is to be established in the context of a political entity Schiller calls the ‘state’. He suggests that the life of freedom in a state involves ‘wholeness (*Totalität*) of character’ (AE, IV, 23). We might set aside his hope for the state and ask, though, why any individual might be inclined to develop the kind of wholeness – the ‘what he ought to be’ – that can eventually be supported in a rational social reality. Savile offers a substantial interpretation of Schiller’s aim: Schiller’s ‘claim is... that men cannot rationally abjure concern for an ideal in their lives. Too often they do; but in doing so they fail of rationality’ (Savile, *Aesthetic Reconstructions*, 205). Schiller, on this point at least, appears after all to be an orthodox Kantian, implicitly supporting the notion that self-constitution is an obligation which will frame the forms of experience that are worthy of us. However, it is not to be confused for the rational necessity, which Schiller rejects in Kant: namely, the authority that principles are granted to direct our sensuous being. Savile claims that what Schiller is determined to establish is that it is ‘an a priori truth of practical reason that the self should be formed under some concept of the good’ (Savile, *Aesthetic Reconstructions*, 205).<sup>9</sup> Savile is interpreting the notion of ‘the Ideal Man’ as ‘the good’. This conception of Schiller’s project aligns it with the project of freedom as higher necessity. What this project excludes, according to Savile, is the choice to use one’s practical reason to idle pleasurably: ‘laid back Californian spontaneity’ in Savile’s interpretation exemplifies that abandonment (Savile, *Aesthetic Reconstructions*, 205). If avoidance of that kind of spontaneity as the highest form of life is what Schiller intends then we can infer

---

<sup>9</sup> Savile acknowledges (208n) that this account of Schiller may seem to be ‘fanciful’, but corroborates it with reference to claims found elsewhere in Schiller’s writings.

that whatever action follows in this effort at self-realization will be free of caprice. Self-realization will require the serious and not evidently playful action of the complementary powers of ‘maximum changeability and maximum extensity’ together with ‘maximum autonomy and maximum intensity’ (AE, XIII, 87).

The integration of the two drives is represented as overcoming both physical and moral necessity. There is, though, something not quite compatible between this systematized notion and the portrait of play Schiller has presented to us. The play of the Gods oscillates between idle pleasure and some immanent higher necessity, which abolishes pure physical and moral necessity. That is paralleled by Schiller’s account of indeterminacy, which ultimately opens us the prospect of a teleological higher determination: rational self-realization. What is in evidence as the play of the Gods and indeterminacy seems conceptually similar to the actions of *Willkür*. It is capricious, useless and carefree. And yet both moments seem to give way to a higher necessity that is in no way structurally implied in them.

## 2. Marcuse

In *Eros and Civilization*, Marcuse identifies Schiller’s concept of play as a model of experience that stands in critical contrast with the distorted practices of current social experience. He holds that transformative and fulfilling interactions between people have given way to purely transactional and competitive relations. In these relations, the interest of each party is supposedly instrumental. What obscures the possibility of a different kind of social relating is what Marcuse conceives as ‘surplus-repression’. Surplus-repression is a species of repression, which, Marcuse believes, has been generated solely by ‘social domination’. It is distinguished from basic repression, described in Freudian language as ‘the “modifications” of the instincts necessary for the perpetuation of the human race in civilization’ (EC, 56).<sup>10</sup> These modifications bring about the reduction in influence of the pleasure principle. Just as Freud claims that adjustment of the instincts through the reality principle produces repression, Marcuse claims that ‘surplus-repression’ (among whose real forms are listed the ‘monogamic-patriarchal family’ (EC, 37), the ‘hierarchical division of labor’ (EC, 37), ‘public control over the individual’s private existence’ (EC, 38)) is the effect of the

---

<sup>10</sup> Freud famously writes: ‘Under the influence of the ego’s instincts of self-preservation, the pleasure principle is replaced by the reality principle’ (Freud, ‘Beyond the Pleasure Principle’, 10).

‘performance principle’. Under the performance principle, ‘society is stratified according to the competitive economic performances of its members’ (EC, 44). Marcuse’s text suggests several options for understanding this principle: it may be the prevailing historical form of the reality principle, or it may be an extra layer of repression which sits above basic instinctual repression. The performance principle and the reality principle are not distinguished in terms of what they respectively inhibit. Both appear to obstruct the desire for what Marcuse refers to as ‘primary instinctual gratification’. And both, it would seem, can generate neuroses. The symptom of surplus-repression is, Marcuse writes, a ‘neurotic necessity’ to work (EC, 211).<sup>11</sup> This necessity, we can interpolate, has the characteristics of a repetition compulsion: its activity is no longer consistent with its conscious objective, that of survival. Play, in contrast with experience produced by surplus-repression, is the activation of spontaneous interactions, which have no predictable course or outcome.

In terms of theoretical economy, the case for surplus-repression depends upon its capacity to explain some kind of social neurosis that Freud’s original theory could not. It is worth noting that Freud himself mostly saw work as a painful pursuit that the large majority of people would gladly abandon. In *Civilization and its Discontents*, he wrote:

And yet, as a path to happiness, work is not highly prized by men. They do not strive after it as they do after other possibilities of satisfaction. The great majority of people only work under the stress of necessity, and this natural human aversion to work raises most difficult social problems. (Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents*, 80)

Marcuse largely shares this point of view, based primarily on his perception that alienated labour prevails. His two-level conception of repression seems, however, to allow him to develop the outlines of a solution. The stress of necessity, in the passage from Freud, would relate to surplus-repression. Release from surplus-repression is the release of libidinal pleasure. Freud, in contrast, had argued that libidinal pleasure is

---

<sup>11</sup> The phrase ‘neurotic necessity’ is quoted by Marcuse from C. B. Chisholm’s *The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress*.

repressed as a consequence of the reality principle.<sup>12</sup> Marcuse's theory suggests that adjustment to reality is consistent with pleasure when surplus-repression is absent. This leaves open the possibility that work undertaken outside the governance of the performance principle may cease to be as Freud had described it. The viability of Marcuse's psychoanalytic psychology-based solution to the problem of work will be revisited below.

We identified immanent and teleological perspectives in Schiller's account of play. Through play, Schiller seems to argue, we may yet realize our freedom as a higher necessity. A teleological dimension is absent from Marcuse's theory. His approach is to outline the possibility of an ideal of human behaviour. The task he sets for his project is that it should convince us that this ideal is not unrealistic, that it is behaviour of which human beings are capable under altered social conditions. That we ought to work towards that ideal is a practical implication of what Marcuse takes to be the truth of his theory, but it is not actually an element of the theory. The concept of play, in this respect, is presented as a kind of transcendent truth: it is not to be found among existing forms of behaviour, and nor is any bridge between existing behaviour and ideal behaviour developed. The ideal, rather, is a truth, which enables us to see what is deficient in the present.

Marcuse understands Schiller's conception of play as an implication of Kant's efforts in the third Critique to reconcile freedom with nature. Schiller himself did not characterize his project in those terms, though he gave his readers a blank cheque to fill in on his debt to Kant (AE, I, 3). Marcuse explains the Kantian background as follows:

---

<sup>12</sup> We should note that Freud explains the repressions that become evident in neurosis as the outcome of a two-tiered process: 'primal repression, a first phase of repression, which consists in the psychical (ideational) representative of the instinct being denied entrance into the conscious. With this, a fixation is established; the representative in question persists unaltered from then onwards and the instinct remains attached to it...The second stage of repression, repression proper, affects mental derivatives of the repressed representative, or such trains of thought as, originating elsewhere, have come into associative connection with it. On account of this association, these ideas experience the same fate as what was primally repressed. Repression proper, therefore, is actually an after-pressure' (Freud, 'Repression', 148). The second stage in which 'mental derivatives' emerge is not incorporated into Marcuse's theory.



A third ‘faculty’ must mediate between theoretical and practical reason – a faculty that brings about a ‘transition’ from the realm of nature to the realm of freedom and links together the lower and higher faculties, those of desire and those of knowledge. This third faculty is that of judgment. A tripartite division of the mind underlies the initial dichotomy. While theoretical reason (understanding) provides the a priori principles of cognition, and practical reason those of desire (will), the faculty of judgment mediates between these two by virtue of the feeling of pain and pleasure. Combined with the feeling of pleasure, judgment is aesthetic, and its field of application is art. (EC, 173–4)

The concept of play, Marcuse proposes, is derived from this synthesis of freedom and nature since it is this synthesis which underpins Kant’s conception of aesthetic freedom or play as ‘lawfulness without law’. Marcuse takes that precept, together with the idea of beauty as ‘purposiveness without purpose’, to point towards a Kantian ideal of ‘the free play of the released potentialities of man and nature’ (EC, 177).<sup>13</sup> It is not clear that Kant’s notion of the free play of the imagination in the experience of beauty speaks directly to the Schillerian idea of play as behaviour. Nevertheless, Marcuse sees that notion as the synthesis of motives of desire (nature) and motives of knowledge (freedom). The combination of opposites is expressed in the paradoxical formulation, ‘lawfulness without law’ and it represents, for Marcuse, a condition of freedom from repression. As we shall see, there are some difficulties in comfortably aligning the play complex as freedom from repression with the notion of play as lawfulness without law.

Marcuse follows Schiller closely when he invokes the notion of freedom from necessity. He writes: ‘Man is free only when he is free from constraint, external and internal, physical and moral – when he is controlled neither by law nor by need’ (EC, 187). Schiller’s idea of play, as precisely this freedom, contributes to the prospect of a ‘humane civilization’ of ‘play rather than toil’ (EC, 188). Play is experience released from neurotic necessity. Marcuse, as we shall see, sometimes suggests a state of something like idle freedom to capture the quality of this new experience.

---

<sup>13</sup> On this point, Marcuse might be seen to undermine Schaper’s claim that anyone ‘who looks for a deliberate continuation of the thought of the Critique of Judgment [in Schiller’s text]... looks in vain’ (Schaper, ‘Towards the Aesthetic’, 157). Schaper seems to be on safer ground in heeding Schiller’s own statement on the absence of any systematic connection between his theory and Kant’s.

## 2.1. Alienated Labour

Marcuse believes that alienated labour is determined by the ongoing power of the performance principle: 'Men do not live their own lives but perform pre-established functions. While they work, they do not fulfil their own needs and faculties but work in alienation' (EC, 45). This sounds like orthodox Marxism, but, in fact, Marcuse departs from a key element of Marx's original version of alienated labour. For Marx, the notion of 'alienated' or 'estranged' labour involves the miserable experience of the production of commodities. The cause of the misery is the exclusion from that productive process of expressive–affective possibilities. Workers cannot express their distinctive personalities in the mass objects they make. Experience is diminished, in that the blunted sensuousness of workers precludes the possibility of affective encounters with a complex outer world. Instead, the world and its objects stand against them as intimidating presences. The objects of the workers' labour are distributed to distant strangers, and this excludes a satisfying social dimension from productivity. For Marx, this fact that alienation is the source of a worker's misery is not necessarily apparent to the worker, even as the worker recognizes that the very process of labour is one in which he 'does not affirm himself but denies himself' (Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, 74). In this active self-denial, the worker 'mortifies his body (*seine Physis abkasteit*)' (Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, 74). The discipline of the workplace makes the need for this self-denial clear to the worker. Marx, however, identifies the experience of misery as the symptom of a morbid condition: he tries to explain why work is painful. Interpretation enters the empirical world of suffering, in that the true meaning of the worker's pain becomes apparent only when it is conceived as the effect of social arrangements. Otherwise, suffering is experienced as a kind of natural necessity.

Marcuse's analysis, by contrast, does not take suffering as a point of entry into the contemporary reality of alienated labour. This places the phenomenon of alienated labour within the scope of the theory of false consciousness, that is of the theory that individuals often take as real forms of social life that are both unnecessary and ultimately antagonistic to their deepest social needs. What that means is that analysis of the phenomenon needs no phenomenological content. Ultimately, this is because it is measured by reference to a standard of new experience, which lies wholly outside

the forms of experience under criticism (a transcendent truth). In fact, Marcuse even allows that what is described as alienated labour might sometimes make for agreeable experience. This underlines his exclusion of phenomenological evidence for the phenomenon of alienation. He writes:

Certainly there can be 'pleasure' in alienated labor too. The typist who hands in a perfect transcript, the tailor who delivers a perfectly fitting suit, the beauty-parlor attendant who fixes the perfect hairdo, the laborer who fulfills his quota – all may feel pleasure in a 'job well done'. However, either this pleasure is extraneous (anticipation of reward), or it is the satisfaction (itself a token of repression) of being well occupied, in the right place, of contributing one's part to the functioning of the apparatus. In either case, such pleasure has nothing to do with primary instinctual gratification. (EC, 220–221)

This false consciousness-based conception of alienated labour is notably thoroughgoing. Marcuse, in some of the examples we have just seen, downplays the value of the recognition that a worker may gain for the skilful completion of a task oriented towards another person. That is not the important thing to take from the passage cited, though. What the false consciousness conception of alienated labour produces is an identification of species of lower and higher pleasures. The lower version is connected with repression: it is the pleasure compatible with being a useful person within the current order of things. Higher pleasure is possible only when that order is removed. This means nothing less than the return of the 'pleasure principle', the principle of gratification prior to all repression. The name Marcuse gives to pleasure in this context is 'play'.

Marcuse carries forward the paradoxical formulation of play as 'lawfulness without law' or 'purposiveness without purpose' into his effort to establish a theory of human experience wholly free of alien necessity. He writes:

The problem of work, of socially useful activity, without (repressive) sublimation can now be restated. It emerged as the problem of a change in the character of work by virtue of which the latter would be assimilated to play – the free play of human faculties...Play is entirely subject to the pleasure principle... 'The

fundamental feature of play is, that it is gratifying in itself, without serving any other purpose than that of instinctual gratification'.<sup>14</sup> (EC, 214)

What, though, is play as work? Like others, including Schiller, who have pursued the question of how we might imagine an apparently non-repressive order Marcuse turns for support to mythic figures. These figures are evidence not of impossibilities, but of human ideals that have not yet been extinguished. Marcuse identifies Prometheus as the 'culture hero' of human toil (EC, 161). In Marcuse's myth set, Prometheus is opposed by Orpheus and Narcissus. The human potential they embody is described as follows:

...theirs is the image of joy and fulfillment; the voice which does not command but sings; the gesture which offers and receives; the deed which is peace and ends the labor of conquest; the liberation from time which unites man with god, man with nature. (EC, 162)

These figures, he tells us,

...recall the experience of a world that is not to be mastered and controlled but to be liberated – a freedom that will release the powers of Eros now bound in the repressed and petrified forms of man and nature. (EC, 164)

From the normative perspective of existing reality, Orpheus and Narcissus are useless characters who represent an impossible vision of human experience. For Marcuse, this uselessness is an index of the truth they embody: it is uselessness from the viewpoint of a surplus repressed reality. Were the 'life instincts' to take Orphic rather than Promethean form, Marcuse conjectures, language would become song and work would be play (EC, 171). When work is play, it is not subject to the driving temporal process that marks and measures performativity. That kind of human experience, which Schiller had described as 'idleness and indifference', seems to be what Marcuse has in mind. Marcuse posits that released from that performativity, play becomes 'unproductive and useless precisely because it cancels the repressive and

---

<sup>14</sup> The last line is a quote from Barbara Lantos.

exploitative traits of labor and leisure; it “just plays” with the reality’ (EC, 195). Marcuse stresses that play does not mean a kind of self-indulgent devotion to ‘aestheticism’. In fact, aestheticism is quickly dismissed by him as ‘irresponsible’, in that it refers only to individual existence (EC, 188). What Marcuse has in mind, by contrast, is a universal condition of play.

There is, though, an uncertainty in Marcuse’s text as to whether freedom from toil can mean freedom from all work. There is a conceptual difficulty in admitting the ongoing practical necessity of basic work into the altered reality of human play. It is easy to imagine the elimination of the sphere named as surplus-repression, which gives rise to the performativity manifest in the high value placed on work in the modern world. What is harder to see is how work can be maintained in the absence of all reality-oriented repression implied in the concept of play. How can this utopian ideal accommodate the demands of the reality principle that energy be diverted away from pleasure and towards practical forms of self-preservation? This might be construed as the question of whether work can be freed of the character of ‘necessity’. In fact, Marcuse holds a number of discordant positions: minimal work, automation, work as play.

*Minimal Work.* We may need to work and it is possible, if that work is kept to a minimum, that our libidinal transformation will not be reversed. Marcuse states:

No matter how justly and rationally the material production may be organized, it can never be a realm of freedom and gratification; but it can release time and energy for the free play of human faculties outside the realm of alienated labor. (EC, 156)

This seems to confirm Marcuse’s concession that there is an ineradicable part of life which must operate outside the direct motivation of the pleasure principle. Even within an ideal situation, an important part of human experience cannot be play. Work requires discipline, dedication to a process in which the worker is not always creatively involved. It is, as Marcuse writes elsewhere – commenting on a line from Marx’s *Capital* – ‘the realm of necessity. The realm of necessity itself forever remains a realm of unfreedom’ (Marcuse, ‘The Realm of Freedom and the Realm of

Necessity’, 22). However, work geared towards only what is essential should be kept to a vaguely specified limit: ‘reduction of the working day to a point where the mere quantum of labor time no longer arrests human development is the first prerequisite for freedom’ (EC, 152). What this sensible looking compromise needs to explain is how human beings can equally constitute themselves as creatures of the pleasure principle and of the reality principle. These principles, as Marcuse knows, are not options to be adopted as daily circumstances demand. The appearance of the reality principle dynamically alters the ‘self’. According to Freud, ‘the ego is that part of the id which has been modified by the direct influence of the external world’ (Freud, ‘The Ego and the Id’, 25). If the external world presents two realities, one of work – however minimal – and one of play, then it would seem to follow that the ego will take a different structure in each situation. This is not an extravagance Marcuse wants to argue for, but it looks like one to which his theory commits him.

*Automation and the disappearance of work.* Marcuse, in this line of thinking, suggests that the solution to the conflict between work and pleasure must be the abolition of work. The work that is required for the preservation of the species can pass out of the hands of human beings. The otherwise terrifying development of technology has provided us with the possibility of ‘total automation’ (EC, 156). Human beings freed from neurotic necessity would be satisfied never again to contemplate a return to what can now be undertaken by machines.<sup>15</sup> Were such a reality possible, it would be a space for play alone, as human beings would be continually freed from labour. This may be a coherent proposal, but it is hard to see any way of critically evaluating it. It is a story about a quite fictional reality and whatever worries we might have about its practicalities could, presumably, be met with fictional solutions.

There is one element of it, though, that should give rise to a standard philosophical worry. The claim that the solution to the problem of work lies in advanced technology comes with a moral complication, which Marcuse does not specifically address. As

---

<sup>15</sup> Marcuse later notes that this conception has its origins in Marx, and that Marx eventually dropped the idea. It is a pity that Marcuse does not explore Marx’s change of mind. Marx’s conception of ‘the relation between freedom and necessity’ in the *Grundrisse*, Marcuse writes, ‘envisages conditions of full automation, where the immediate producer is indeed ‘dissociated’ from the material process of production and becomes a free ‘Subject’ in the sense that he can play with, experiment with the technical material, with the possibilities of the machine and of the things produced and transformed by the machines’ (Marcuse, *The Realm of Freedom and the Realm of Necessity*, 22).

his position stands, it might arguably be aligned with those philosophies of history, which see damage and suffering gain a new significance, once an ideal or at least preferred stage of human history has been reached. Critique of the self-perpetuating destructiveness of technology is a core principle of the variety of Critical Theory with which Marcuse is aligned. Yet it is that technology, inseparable from the history of capitalist modes of production, which now promises the profoundest liberation. What are we to think of that history which, in this light, seems to have been required to take us to the point of liberation? Marcuse's gloss on Hegel's thesis on the slaughter bench of history seems apposite to his own case:

Individuals lead unhappy lives, they toil and perish, but though they actually never win their goal, their distress and defeat are the very means by which truth and freedom proceed. A man never reaps the fruits of his labor; they always fall to future generations. (Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution*, 233)

He then asks: 'But can this idea still be regarded as the incarnation of truth and freedom? Kant had emphatically insisted that it would contradict man's nature to use him as a mere means' (Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution*, 234). There is no explicit endorsement in Marcuse of a narrative of an inevitably violent progress, though Feenberg, one of his most supportive readers, argues that utopian arrangements might actually redeem the history of technology (Feenberg, *Heidegger and Marcuse*, 88, 96). Marcuse does not address issues of how the utopian use of technology, with its historical dependence on alienated labour – the 'more complete the alienation of labor, the greater the potential of freedom' (EC, 156) – is uncompromised by that history. Marcuse might be defended with the claim that a great many of the institutions and practices that human beings now value were originally gained under morally indefensible circumstances. Yet we move on when our practical mindedness overcomes a paralysing moral squeamishness about the legacy of the past. It is more than likely that Marcuse believes something along those lines, though a simple statement to that effect might not be enough to settle the matter. Alongside the conditions of the production of technology – alienated labour – there is also question of what it is that has prompted much of technological innovation. In *One-Dimensional Man* Marcuse argues that

the traditional notion of the 'neutrality' of technology can no longer be maintained. Technology as such cannot be isolated from the use to which it is put; the technological society is a system of domination which operates already in the concept and construction of techniques. (Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*, xlvi)

Marcuse is arguing, then, that technology is geared towards a kind of mastery of nature and that its methods have in some way infiltrated every day reason: the latter takes on a kind of technical character. In order to defend the utopian ideal of automation, then, Marcuse needs to address not only the legacy question but also the constitutive one; that of how technology, which is allegedly antagonistic to freedom, can serve freedom, given its characterization as a product of social domination.

*Work becomes play.* This requires a fundamental transformation of work, a transformation that Marcuse conceives in terms borrowed from psychoanalytic psychology. He writes: '...if work were accompanied by a reactivation of pregenital polymorphous eroticism, it would tend to become gratifying in itself without losing its work content' (EC, 215). Hence, it does not seem correct to conclude that it is Marcuse's position that the complete development of human capacities 'is in irreconcilable opposition to work' (Schoolman, 'Further Reflections on Work, Alienation, and Freedom in Marcuse and Marx', 302). This eroticism, though, implies the absence of the influence of the reality principle. Marcuse, in fact, thinks that pleasure can be regained in a world where all of the needs of self-preservation are met without effort.

The altered societal conditions would therefore create an instinctual basis for the transformation of work into play. In Freud's terms, the less the efforts to obtain satisfaction are impeded and directed by the interest in domination, the more freely the libido could prop itself upon the satisfaction of the great vital needs. (EC, 215)

This proposal is obviously quite different from the previous two. Here work and play are notionally reconciled. Furthermore, the contradictory self, acting under both pleasure and reality principles, is absent. The reconciliation, however, appears to conceal a paradox. The 'great vital needs' remain as pressing demands on our



energies. Indeed, the libido gains its direction from satisfying those needs. This simply means that these demands can be met through activity that is said to be playful, but it is no longer intelligible as play in the sense of idle pleasure. It acts on specific objectives. Marcuse would later frame this possibility in non-psychoanalytic terms. He held that technologically oriented work increasingly allowed the worker to become ‘supervisor, inventor and experimenter...subject to the free play of the mind, of imagination, the free play with the pleasurable possibilities of things and nature’ (Marcuse, ‘The Realm of Freedom and the Realm of Necessity’, 23). The evolution would somehow see work transformed as the ‘realm of freedom’ was brought to the ‘realm of necessity’ (Marcuse, ‘The Realm of Freedom and the Realm of Necessity’, 23–4). Arguably, this is explicable in terms of game playing where certain objectives structure participants’ voluntary and individualistic actions. But given that the objective is the satisfaction of the ‘great vital needs’, the activity is not to be characterized as ‘purposiveness without purpose’. Either play takes on a purpose, in which case it is no longer play in the sense of freedom from necessity, or work becomes playful, in which case it is no longer work. But Marcuse’s theory tries to hold both of these thoughts together at once.

### 3. Conclusion

The complexities in Marcuse’s position result from his determined commitment to the concept of play. He endeavours to maintain the ideal of freedom from necessity – the absence of all constraint and coercion, both internal and external – but nevertheless concedes that some necessity is inevitable for social reproduction. He attempts to capture this within the concept of play, but play ends up bearing too much of what he envisages for a transformed society. It becomes a new concept of work, and at that moment it slips from our grasp. Schiller takes a different approach to play even as he celebrates it as the essence of true humanity. As we have seen, Schiller’s idea of freedom from necessity gains its appeal as freedom from the kind of rational necessity, which seems antagonistic to feeling and pleasure. In this regard, it corresponds with the absence of necessity that is characteristic of idle experience. Play as freedom from necessity is ultimately subordinated by Schiller to a variety of different conceptions of higher necessity. The higher necessity to which we are subject is ultimately a form of rational necessity. It is not intended by him as the kind of necessity which aggresses against mere feeling. Higher necessity is to be the experience of freedom of those who

have reached what Schiller thinks of as the aesthetic ideal. Nevertheless, it is at that point that Schiller effectively withdraws from play the capricious quality that had seemed to recommend it.

#### Abbreviations

AE: Schiller, Friedrich. 1967. *On the Aesthetic Education of Man, in a Series of Letters: English and German facing*, trans. Elizabeth M. Wilkinson and L. A. Willoughby. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Work originally published in 1795.)  
References are given first to the letter number in Roman numerals and then to the page number.

EC: Marcuse, Herbert. 1956. *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

#### Bibliography

Allison, Henry E. *Kant's Theory of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Beiser, Frederick. *Schiller as Philosopher: A Re-Examination*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.

Deligiorgi, Katerina. 'The Proper Telos of Life: Schiller, Kant and Having Autonomy as an End'. *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy* 54, no. 5 (2011): 494–511.

Feenberg, Andrew. *Heidegger and Marcuse: The Catastrophe and Redemption of History*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Freud, Sigmund. "Repression". In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, edited and translated by James Strachey et al. Vol. XIV, 143–58. London: Vintage, 2001 (work originally published in 1915).

Freud, Sigmund. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle". In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, edited and translated by James

Strachey et al. Vol. XVIII, 1–64. London: Vintage, 2001 (work originally published in 1920).

Freud, Sigmund. “The Ego and the Id”. In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, edited and translated by James Strachey et al. Vol. XIX, 1–66. London: Vintage, 2001 (work originally published in 1923).

Freud, Sigmund. “Civilization and its Discontents”. In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, edited and translated by James Strachey et al. Vol. XXI, 64–145, 2001 (work originally published in 1930).

Henrich, Dieter. “Beauty and Freedom: Schiller’s Struggle with Kant’s Aesthetics”. In *Essays in Kant’s Aesthetics*, edited by Ted Cohen and Paul Guyer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Practical Reason*, translated by Mary Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997 (work originally published in 1788).

Lavin, Douglas. ‘Practical Reason and the Possibility of Error’. *Ethics* 114, no. 3 (2004): 424–57.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.

Marcuse, Herbert. ‘The Realm of Freedom and the Realm of Necessity: A Reconsideration’. *Praxis: A Philosophical Journal* 5 (1969): 20–5.

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. London: Routledge, 2002 (work originally published in 1964).

Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, translated by Martin Milligan. New York: Prometheus Books, 1988.

Miller, R. D. *Schiller and the Ideal of Freedom: A Study of Schiller's Philosophical Works with Chapters on Kant*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

O'Connor, Brian. 'Idleness, Usefulness and Self-Constitution'. *Critical Horizons: A Journal of Philosophy and Social Theory* 14, no. 2 (2013): 181–99.

Roehr, Sabine. 'Freedom and Autonomy in Schiller'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 1 (2003): 119–34.

Savile, Anthony. *Aesthetic Reconstructions: The Seminal Writings of Lessing, Kant and Schiller*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987. (Aristotelian Society Series, Vol. 8.)

Schaper, Eva. 'Towards the Aesthetic: A Journey with Friedrich Schiller'. *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 25 (1985): 153–68.

Schoolman, Morton. 'Further Reflections on Work, Alienation, and Freedom in Marcuse and Marx'. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 6, no. 2 (1973): 295–302.