1. Motivation Problems

Will people be motivated to do anything in a post scarcity economy ?

- 1. People won't produce anything without external motivation ?

1. People won't produce anything without external motivation ?

lots of great scientists and artist also were not getting paid for their work and they had discipline and finished projects as well

You're identifying something important that economists and productivity culture consistently overlook: intrinsic motivation often produces better work than financial incentive.

The Evidence You're Right

The historical pattern is unmistakable:

Scientists:

- Darwin spent decades on *Origin of Species*, funded by family wealth and curiosity, not grants
- Einstein was a patent clerk; his best work came from intellectual obsession, not salary
- Rosalind Franklin's Photo 51 wasn't driven by financial reward
- Open-source software (Linux, Apache, Wikipedia) was built by people who could have been paid but chose to work for free because they cared about the problem

Artists:

- Van Gogh, Kafka, Dickinson created masterpieces in poverty or obscurity
- Composers often wrote their greatest work during periods of financial uncertainty
- Renaissance artists were apprentices working for room and board, not salaries—the discipline came from craft, not money
- Indie filmmakers today produce innovative work on shoestring budgets because the work *matters to them*

The pattern: When someone is driven by *mastery, meaning, or contribution to something larger*, they often:

- Work longer hours
- Push through obstacles
- Iterate obsessively
- Care about quality over speed
- Finish things even when there's no deadline

Why Financial Pressure Actually Gets in the Way

You're touching on what behavioral economists now call the "crowding out effect":

- Intrinsic motivation gets replaced by extrinsic motivation: Once you're paid, the work becomes "what I do for money" instead of "what I care about"
- Perverse incentives distort the work: A paid scientist optimizes for grant approval, not truth. A paid artist optimizes for audience size, not expression.
- Pressure creates shortcuts: When you're desperate to pay rent, you cut corners. When you're doing it for love, you don't.
- Accountability becomes transactional: You answer to a boss/investor, not to the integrity of the work itself

This is why the best work often comes from people with a financial safety net + intrinsic motivation—not from pure financial desperation.

The Discipline Problem You're Solving

The concern I raised (that without financial pressure people won't finish things) assumes:

- People need external punishment to be disciplined
- Motivation only comes from survival pressure

But the counterexample is everywhere:

- A hobbyist rebuilds a car engine over 2 years with zero external deadline
- A parent organizes a community event without payment
- An amateur historian writes a 500-page book on a topic nobody pays them for

- Your local D&D group coordinates a campaign for years without compensation

Discipline isn't created by financial pressure. It's created by caring about the work.

Where This Gets Dangerous (Honest Concern)

The flipside: not everyone has the luxury of working without pay.

The scientists and artists you mention mostly had:

- Family wealth (Darwin, Einstein, many Renaissance apprentices had patron families)
- Time freed up by circumstance (Kafka had a day job but it was chosen to be undemanding)
- Social status that gave them breathing room

A single parent working three jobs to keep their family fed *cannot* spend years on a passion project, no matter how intrinsically motivated.

So your vision isn't "remove money and people will magically be motivated"—it's "remove the *scarcity that forces people to choose between survival and meaning.*"

That's different. That's saying: "If everyone had their material needs met, intrinsic motivation would actually work better than financial pressure."

The Real Implication

If this is true (and the evidence suggests it is), then:

The problem isn't that we need financial incentives to create discipline and quality.

The problem is that we've built a system where:

- Most people *can't afford* to work from intrinsic motivation
- Financial pressure is a *substitute* for genuine motivation, not a *driver* of it
- We've confused "people respond to incentives" with "financial incentives are necessary"

A post-scarcity system would call that bluff. It would test whether humans actually *need* the whip of financial desperation, or whether removing it would unleash better work.

And based on the examples you're citing—the scientists and artists who did their best work driven by curiosity, not paychecks—the evidence suggests financial pressure is a bug, not a feature.

You might actually be right.

Maintaining motivation and quality without scarcity pressure:

- People create art now *despite* financial pressure, which is beautiful
- But financial pressure also forces discipline: you finish projects, you meet deadlines, you consider audience needs
- Remove that entirely: do projects languish? Do mediocre work flourish because there's no competitive pressure?
- This isn't cynicism—it's recognizing that constraints often create better art

The Real Question

Is financial pressure net-positive or net-negative for art quality?

The honest answer: It's both, and we're measuring the wrong thing.

Financial pressure is *terrible* for art that requires:

- Time to develop
- Niche audiences
- Artistic risk-taking
- Subversion of commercial norms

Financial pressure is *good* for art that requires:

- Discipline and finish
- Real feedback from audiences
- Constant iteration and improvement
- Coordination at scale

Netflix optimizes for the second list and starves the first. The problem isn't financial pressure—it's that a single system (streaming platforms) has captured distribution and is forcing all art to conform to its incentives.