



THE LEISURE SOCIETY THESIS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Between the mid 1960s and mid 1970s, the leisure society thesis was a boon in the important matter of forcing people to take leisure seriously. After the restructuring of the global economy following the OPEC oil crisis of 1973, it became a blight. Globalization and the deregulation, delayering and out-sourcing of labour markets in the West obliged renewed thinking on leisure and work¹. The 1970s witnessed the massive casualization of labour in the West (Schor 1992). Part-time and fixed-term labour contracts became commonplace, with the result that traditional rights to occupational welfare and holiday entitlements were reformulated. In addition, globalization transferred large chunks of manufacturing industry to the emerging world. Nowadays the leisure industry out-sources much of its business to suppliers where Western industrial relations legislation has weak torque or simply no purchase.

Globalization has also out-sourced the provision of many illegal leisure activities. Western gang cultures provide opportunist supply and distribution chains for demand in the market for illegal leisure forms and practices. However, underground Western criminal cartels control more sophisticated supply chains, with production centred in Africa, Latin America, South East Asia and the Balkans, while distribution, rigging of prices, extortion and market protection are organized at point of sale in the cash-rich metropolitan markets of the USA, Western Europe and Australia (Painter 1994; Renard 1995; Lim 1998; Mares 2005; Penntinen 2007; Glenny 2008).

Deregulation, globalization and outsourcing have combined to disrupt the leisure society thesis, making it seem shallow and irrelevant to today's conditions. The idea that progressive science, technology and ethical government will result in leisure-for-all now looks like a pipedream. This is not just a matter of the transformation in the traditional postwar attitude to work after the so-called Thatcher-Reagan revolution of the 1980s. The

emotional organization and presentation of the self has undergone fundamental revision. I referred to the axial importance of emotional intelligence and emotional labour in achieving personal competence and credibility in the last chapter. Before examining the leisure society thesis at greater length, let me expand upon the challenges that these new conditions provide to the study of leisure and lifestyle.

Emotional Intelligence, Emotional labour and Lifestyle

Lifestyle formation and effective interaction now requires the mobilization and application of significant emotional intelligence and emotional labour about issues of culture, medicine, environmental matters, recycling, trust, psychological and physical wellbeing, respect issues, personal presentation skills and time management. Hochschild (1983) was one of the first to comment upon this requirement. Her concept of *emotional labour* was developed to refer to the emotional competence and 'people skills' necessary for an economy in which the service sector (as opposed to agricultural and manufacturing labour) dominates the economy. The concept of emotional labour logically implies the refinement and continuous testing of emotional intelligence. The possession of people skills is a vital resource in creating the climates of trust and mutual respect that are conducive to healthy private life and profitable work relationships. Thus, the development and practice of emotional intelligence is a precondition of being recognized as an attractive, effective member of civil society and a credible member of the labour force. The skills that put a client at ease in the workplace are part of the same repertoire of emotional accomplishments and performance competencies that make one an acceptable member of social settings or an attractive mate.

Emotional labour refers to the preparation and application of emotional attitudes and competencies that are commensurate with the requirements of organizations and civic culture. Integral to the concept is the notion of labour performance. That is, the display of positive emotions, the repression of negative emotions, spray-on sincerity and 'can do' face-work, even when the individual is feeling the opposite. The acquisition of emotional labour competence is separate from the skills acquisition for 'doing the job'. It is not a matter of being certificated to have achieved a measured level of knowledge or trained to do this or that technical or professional function. Rather it is a matter of consistently displaying positive personal identification and competence.

As such, they pertain to general considerations of character formation and inter-personal conduct that relate directly to leisure forms and practice. The conventional notions of 'time off' and 'free time' have been eroded by the psychological coaching, drilling and pepping-up of emotions in work and non-work time to enhance abilities and competence in social management, self management, social awareness and relationship management (Goleman 1998). Achievement as a family member, student, worker and citizen is conditional upon emphasizing and practicing the virtue of informality over the rigidities of the bureaucratic personality and respect for cultural and ethnic difference (Sennett 1999, 2003, 2006). Being at ease in social and work settings is the pre-condition for personal and group goal achievement. The acquisition and practice of these accomplishments requires considerable *reconnaissance* and *monitoring* in a variety of settings.

Reconnaissance refers to the psychological checking of effective and innovative people skills in order to enhance the formation of character as a more attractive resource in the economic market and lifestyle relations. *Monitoring* refers to the practice of testing how people skills work in social settings and adjusting performance. Both imply that non-work practices such as watching television, reading newspapers and magazines, listening to the radio, mingling with others at dinner parties, conferences and many other social occasions involve acquiring and applying significant levels of emotional intelligence. The line between leisure forms and practices that generate pure pleasure and intelligence about the emotions that is necessary for the formation of attractive work and non-work character features is fuzzy. The concepts of reconnaissance and monitoring suggest that the application and refinement of emotional intelligence is inherent in leisure settings. This prejudices orthodox notions of 'free time' and 'time off' because it posits emotional labour as a general feature of character formation. The tone and pitch of emotional labour may differ in the workplace and leisure setting, but the practice is common to both.

Now one might quibble with Hochschild (1983) and Goleman (1995) who present emotional intelligence and emotional labour as defining features of modern life. There are plenty of historical studies that seize upon the same psychological mechanisms, types of awareness and social presentation skills in traditional society (Bailyn 1974; Elias 1983). These historical studies refer to what we would now call emotional intelligence and emotional labour but they examine them among the higher circles in society. For Hochschild (1983) and Goleman (1995) emotional intelligence and emotional labour are *generalized* features of contemporary citizenship. Knowledge about these matters and their practice is not

24 The Labour of Leisure

	Hours and minutes per day males/females	
Sleep	8.04	8.18
Resting	0.43	0.48
Personal care	0.40	0.48
Eating/drinking	1.25	1.19
Watching TV/DVD; listening to radio/music	2.50	2.25
Social life, entertainment/culture	1.22	1.32
Hobbies & games	0.37	0.23
Sport	0.13	0.07
Reading	0.23	0.26
All leisure	5.25	4.53
Employment and study	3.45	2.26
Housework	1.41	3.00
Childcare	0.15	0.32
Voluntary work	0.15	0.20
Travel	1.32	1.22
Other	0.13	0.15

Figure 2 UK time-use survey, people aged 16 and over (2005)

Source: UK National Statistics Office; www.statistics.gov.uk

confined or concentrated in elite circles. This has significant implications for how we think of 'time off' and practise 'free' choice.

Emotional Intelligence and Time Use

Traditionally, work has been conceptualized as disciplined time and leisure as free time (Haworth and Veal 2004). Some of the tensions in this simple bipolar model of time allocation were considered in the debates around time-use surveys. UK time-use data indicates that, with the exception of sleep, more time per day is spent in leisure than *any other* non-work activity, such as body maintenance, housework and voluntary care. The US data is organized differently by the *Bureau of Labor Statistics* (see Figures 2 and 3). Notwithstanding this, the pattern of leisure and other non-work activities in the UK and the USA is remarkably similar.

The three main activities carried out by adults in the UK are paid employment, sleep and watching TV and videos/DVDs, surfing the internet or listening to music. The average hours spent in paid employment per day are just under 7; in sleep about 8 and in leisure about 5. The distribution of activities varies during the week. At the weekend both men and

	Hours and minutes per day males/females	
Sleep	8.54	8.7
Household activities	1.35	2.27
Eating and drinking	1.30	1.19
Shopping	0.94	1.46
Educational activities	0.47	0.43
Watching TV/DVD/ listening to radio and music	2.58	2.80
Caring for household members	0.34	0.72
Social life and entertaining	0.75	0.71
Telephone calls/email	0.12	0.23
Sport	0.39	0.20
Volunteering	0.14	0.15
Organizational, civic and religious activities	0.27	0.35
All Leisure	5.7	5.0

Figure 3 USA time-use, people aged 15 and over (2005)

Source: US Bureau of labor statistics; www.bls.gov/tus

women spend more time sleeping and participating in leisure. On average men have 30 minutes more free time than women, although this is partly compensated for by the extra 20 minutes on average that women spend sleeping. Men are more likely to watch TV or listen to the radio and to take part in sport, entertainment, hobbies and using the computer. Women are more likely to spend time reading and socializing. Twelve per cent of household income was spent on leisure and recreation in 2006 compared with 9% in 1971. A further 12% was spent on leisure-recreation related activities (restaurants and hotels), compared with 10% in 1971.

The American Time Use Budget (2005) shows a similar picture (<http://www.bls.gov/tus/>) (see Figure 2). Employed persons work 7.5 hours per day on weekdays (men typically work 7.9 hours compared with 7.1 for women). Watching TV is the leisure activity that occupies most time (2.6 hours) although this is being challenged, and may already be overtaken by internet surfing. This is why global TV networks telecast news and some programmes on the internet. The destiny of the computer and the mobile phone is to be the main information/entertainment nexus for the population. The wide distribution of the internet, television and dvd and cd use in leisure points to the central importance of technology in the most popular Western leisure forms. The next most common leisure activity is socializing which accounts for 0.7 hours per day.

Men spend more time in leisure activities (5.7 hours per day) than women (5.0 hours). Leisure and sports typically account for 5.50 hours per day for men and 4.80 for women. Men spend approximately 8.54 hours sleeping and women 8.70. Students of time-use analysis have found the

distinction between leisure and cognate non-work activities, like eating, drinking, grooming and watching TV to be rather fuzzy. If I spend part of the evening watching a television show with half an eye on finding new material for my lecture tomorrow on Reality TV, does it qualify as leisure or work? Similarly, if I come home and prepare a low calorie, high fibre evening meal should it be regarded as an expression of free choice or as observance of how well I have been coached in the relationship between prolonged life, diet and the work-life balance? Students of time-use have found it tricky to apply categoric imperatives of work and leisure to cognate activities of this type.

Perhaps the solution is not to apply categories of work and leisure and tick trajectories of observed behaviour against them. After all, this or that research classification scheme designed to encapsulate time budget use is of limited value in revealing the meanings, motivations and feelings of actors. Jonathan Gershuny (2000) is a leading figure in the field of time budget studies. According to him, there is a progressive trend in the allocation of leisure time. As wealth increases people have a greater propensity to engage in what Bob Stebbins (1992, 2002) calls 'serious leisure'. That is, free time activities that involve choices requiring the development of a skill and a career. The corollary of this is that greater wealth reduces the incentive for paid employment and increases the propensity to spend surplus income on leisure goods. For Gershuny this, in turn, increases economic and social wealth because it increases the demand for labour in the leisure industries.

But this model of time allocation has little of the psychological insight that a writer like Veblen (1899) brought to the question of leisure a century before Gershuny's theory was committed to print. Veblen eschews rational models of the relationship between wealth and time allocation. His perspective of leisure concentrates upon the emotional significance of free time behaviour and the intentionality of the actor. Veblen's theory of conspicuous consumption proposes that greater wealth is not simply an incentive to developing superior skills in non-work activities and husbanding a leisure career. Crucially, it proposes in addition, that the acquisition of skill is driven by social display. Again, this stresses the import of questions of coding and representation in leisure forms and practice. The display of the commitment to voluntary abnegation from paid employment conveys superior social standing. Emotional intelligence is a useful bridging concept between Veblen's approach to leisure activity as caught up in social positioning and the ambivalence in the time-use literature about the motivation and meaning of non-work time distribution. Grooming, body maintenance, exercise, cooking, reading newspapers and magazines, watching television and listening to the radio can all be read as husbanding emotional intelligence in order to increase competence.

These non-work activities involve reconnaissance and monitoring work that enhance personal confidence and presentational skills. The display of competence is not simply required for work settings, it also applies to relations with parents, children, friends and leisure networks.

If pure leisure is the cultivation of a state of mind, as Pieper (1952) and De Grazia (1962) maintain, the resources required come from competence in emotional intelligence and emotional labour. To practise leisure as a state of mind you need to know and monitor data on social mores, totems and taboos. Reconnaissance and monitoring of some forms of knowledge may be more compatible with leisure settings since it is here that people let down their guard and engage in gossip and careless talk. The accumulation and sharpening of emotional intelligence and the management of emotional labour therefore does not stop when one leaves the workplace. It is a round-the-clock undertaking. By placing competence as the means and end of activity, the question of the centrality of emotional intelligence in building personal credibility arises. With it, old distinctions between work and leisure, disciplined time and time off, become untenable. Leisure and emotional intelligence go hand in hand, which acutely compromises traditional connotations of 'free time' and 'time off' in the literature on leisure forms and practice.

Why a Different Paradigm is Needed

Today, students of leisure need to reposition the debate about leisure forms and practice in relation to globalization, deregulation, emotional intelligence and emotional labour. This means taking on board a variety of issues pertaining to labour markets in the emerging and developing world, questions of global industrial pollution, the consequences of mass casualized labour for leisure participation and the role of international cartels and gangs in the provision of illegal leisure goods and services, the management of the emotions and personal presentation skills, that were scarcely considered at the height of the leisure society thesis. Twin corollaries of this are the construction of a more nuanced, multi-layered understanding of the context of location behaviour in leisure and the application of a wider canvas of agents participating in leisure forms and practice.

Forty years ago, during the era of the leisure society thesis, the field students of Leisure Studies/Leisure Sciences was disarmingly straightforward, not to say naïve, about questions of supply and demand in the leisure industry. The assumption that work was being displaced by leisure was widespread. The psychologist John Neulinger (1981b: 69) wrote:

Something is changing in our society and potentially all over the world ... The need for toil is on its way out. More specifically, the need for toil *for the average person* is on its way out. A select few had always managed to circumvent toil, labour without satisfaction, the endless routine of drudgery. But now for the first time in history, the possibility looms ahead that such may be the case for the majority of people, if not for all.

Neulinger (1981a; 1981b) presented this as the cornerstone of his case for boosting public and private resources for leisure counselling. The latter was portrayed as a professional service directed to providing individuals with guidance, either with respect to how to use their free time in more fulfilling ways or to provide positive responses to the chronic absence or relative infrequency of leisure experience.

Re-examined with the hindsight of emotional intelligence, emotional labour, globalization, deregulation, de-layering, the transfer of manufacturing jobs from the most advanced industrial economies to the emerging industrial world, and the literature on time-use, a number of things are clear about this position. To begin with, it addressed conditions in the metropolitan centres of the economically most advanced nations, and treated relations in the emerging and developing world as secondary. This was a very ethnocentric model of leisure, and it was largely confined to the professional class involved in the knowledge, communication and information sectors as opposed to blue-collar and office workers.

In addition, this approach to leisure carries with it the assumption of spontaneous adjustments to the demand for more free time. For example, Neulinger's belief that leisure is replacing work will result in more public funds allocated to train leisure counsellors to help those liberated from the work ethic cope with the challenges of the leisure-rich society. There is no realistic assessment of the roles of resistance and struggle in resource re-allocation. Instead, as day follows night, more leisure time and more resources for leisure forms and practice are assumed to follow from technological and managerial innovations in reducing the working week.

Similar linear, causal relationships are presumed in the rewards of leisure. In Neulinger's (1981a) leisure paradigm, intrinsic motivation and perceived freedom are submitted to produce life satisfaction in leisure. Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) discussion of flow also presents challenging activity that achieves goal attainment as engrossing, pleasurable and self-actualizing. Although Neulinger (1981b) allows that leisure counsellors are a requirement of the leisure age, he does not go into the forms of addictive, obsessional or harmful behaviour that come in the wake of more leisure; nor does he raise the difficult question of the corporate and state interests that benefit from appreciable sections of the leisure community subjecting themselves to forms of behaviour that are addictive, obsessional and harmful. The social psychological approach of

Neulinger and Csikszentmihalyi arbitrarily abstracts some leisure relationships from the life-world and boosts them with general significance. Power, division and the role of coding and representation in formulating perceptions and experience of leisure do not figure in these contributions. As a result, the question of the context in which work, leisure and personal goal attainment are positioned is massively underdeveloped. Instead, it is taken for granted that fulfilling leisure is the product of modernization, democracy and what might be referred to as the emergence of 'the good society'.

Typically, the issues of how industrialization and democracy are configured in relation to capitalist distributions of authority between elites and classes, no less than the topics of ideology, and the variations of the meaning of work and leisure between capitalist countries, are left fallow (Clayre 1974). The overriding presumption is that the absolute amount of free time in society is growing as a result of automation and that its distribution is becoming more equitable because of ethical management. The growth of leisure is interpreted as an unequivocal mark of social progress. Of course, the persistence of inequality and social conflict is acknowledged. But it is assumed that they will be subject to laws of 'natural' decline as technology, professionalization and ethical management form an unbeatable triple alliance to overcome and defeat the age-old problem of scarcity. In order to expose the limitations of this paradigm more explicitly and build the case for a new way of examining leisure forms and practice, it is necessary to go more systematically into the claims made by the leisure society thesis.

The Leisure Society Thesis

Max Kaplan (1960), surveying the 'recreation explosion in the USA' during the 1950s, was a pioneering advocate of this line of thought. An enthusiastic proponent of the hypothesis that leisure is the expression of voluntarism, he nevertheless listed associated variables of family, social class, subculture, community and religion and acknowledged their influence in providing variations in the perception and experience of leisure forms and practice. However, his treatment of these factors is uncritical and descriptive. His work is typical of the day in Leisure Studies, in omitting to integrate leisure forms and practice into a theory of the organization of scarcity and resource distribution. There is no engagement with the proposition that class, gender, race and status position individuals differently in relation to scarce resources. Just as there is no discussion of how the requirement of personal competence and credibility condition what it means to be free and self-determining. The

idea that emotional *positioning* and *coaching* structures leisure choice and the form and content of leisure is not seriously broached. 'Structure' would have been regarded as much too questionable a term to employ in relation to the question of positioning since voluntarism requires privilege to be assigned to the individual on *a priori* grounds.

Furthermore, Kaplan's (1960) work was glib about the relationships between the American leisure industry, the global division of labour and the shape of consumer culture. Instead, the progressive, creative aspects of leisure choice for individuals are forcefully stressed. Kaplan (1960: 22) lists seven essential characteristics of leisure; it

- is the antithesis to the economic function of work
- carries pleasant anticipation and recollection
- involves a minimum of involuntary social role obligations
- is associated with freedom and choice
- is closely related to the values of culture
- generally involves a play element
- stretches from activities of inconsequence to activities of significance

Kaplan's (1960) study played an important part in raising the profile of leisure among academics. He writes with the gusto of a person who believes that society is inevitably steaming into a new age produced by technological progress and ethical management: the leisure age, in which the ugly features of industrialization and urbanization will be corrected. This is typical of the majority of academic writers on leisure in this period. There is strong, unquestioning approval of science and technology in Leisure Studies thinking at this time. Science and technology are held to lead to an unprecedented progressive transformation of the world. The leisure society thesis, and the catalyst behind the development of Leisure Studies as a significant field of enquiry are bound up with an apocalyptic view of positive industrial transformation. Modern academic interest in leisure is inseparable from the proposition that scientific and technological development and the affluent society multiplies the range of choices and improves the quality of individual choice and freedom. The links between leisure and pollution, exploitation, repression crime, and social control belong to a subsequent, more querulous generation.

Joffre Dumazedier (1967, 1974) provided an influential European parallel to American studies of leisure. Leisure, he contends, involves the suspension of institutional obligations (to family, work and society) and forms of activity and experience that are associated with self-fulfilment. He hypothesizes that leisure is emerging as the main institution in society. By this he means that leisure forms and practices influence the jobs that people choose, the areas of the country in

which they live and the types of marital relationships into which they enter². Although he does not draw the comparison directly, it is clear that he regards society to be on the brink of exchanging the work ethic for the leisure ethic.

Kaplan and Dumazedier were in fact proposing early versions of the leisure society thesis. Yet fittingly for a field of study that had for so long played the role of Cinderella to the more powerful disciplines of Philosophy, Business and Social Science, the buds of the leisure society thesis sprouted from elsewhere. They emerged from writers interested in modern social and economic development, especially the capitalist form of industrial development.

One of the most cogent expressions of this position is to be found in the 'logic of industrialization' thesis developed by Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison and Myers (1962). According to this logic, the process of the maturation of industrialization inevitably increases the resource allocation to education, welfare and leisure. Kerr (1962) and his associates were chiefly interested in the subject of the consequences of industrial maturity for management-labour relations. In part their concept of a 'logic to industrialization' is polemical, since the inference is that the Soviet-style command systems of the day would be forced to modify their ideology once industrialization in their territories reaches an appropriate level of maturity. With the benefit of hindsight we can now see that this was the right answer to the wrong question. The Soviet-style economies were indeed obliged to deregulate labour markets and liberalize welfare, education and leisure arrangements. But they did so primarily because of ideological contradictions in the system and the inability of the economic substructure to support the communist empire in Eastern Europe, rather than as a result of obedience to the so-called logic of industrialization. Despite addressing the question of leisure *en passant*, Kerr et al. (1962) made bold predictions for it that were of foundational significance in the evolution of the leisure society thesis. Thus, they maintained that the future of leisure involved the radical diminution of work time, increasing pluralism, the efflorescence of creativity among the masses and the growth of tolerance for 'new bohemian' values.

Echoes of this rousing overture about the future of leisure can be found in the 'post-industrial society' thesis which succeeded the logic of the industrialism thesis (Touraine 1971; Bell 1974; Dumazedier 1974; Toffler 1980). This thesis repeated the emphasis on technology and ethical management as forces of liberation. Automation and the growth of the communication, knowledge and service industries were held to diminish the requirement for paid manual labour. Bell (1974) submitted that the centrality of knowledge is the 'axial principle' of the new society. In institutional terms, the University and the research lab are replacing the factory and the office as the hub of wealth-creation. If this is the

case, extensive redefinition of the meaning of power, work and leisure is required.

Traditional analysis of management-labour relations assumed antagonism between the two interests. The motivation of management is to control costs and increase profits. As to labour, the goal is to increase wages and control prices. By proposing changes in the class structure relating to the decline of manual labour and the rise of a new professional-technical-managerial class, exponents of the post-industrial society thesis maintained that the rules of the game are changing. The new class is in the same position as the traditional working class in lacking ownership over the means of production. But their experience of university education and central role in innovation and research gives them much greater influence in the management of society. By the same token, their leisure choices are moving away from collective systems emphasizing solidarity and stability to more plural, dynamic forms and practices. The post-industrial society thesis explicitly twinned the growth of leisure with social progress. In a formula that raises many eyebrows today, it equated the expansion of leisure with the age-old dream of human emancipation.

The significance of the leisure society thesis in raising the social profile and cultural relevance of Leisure Studies cannot be underestimated. Traditional debates about change and development in industrial society presupposed that leisure is residual to work. Anxieties about the expansion of leisure were tinged with Christian convictions about the significance of the work ethic and the poverty of idleness. Leisure could never be the focus of the masses, since work was the means of wherewithal. Leisure was regarded to be a matter of personal choice; work was the stuff of individual and social survival (Clayre 1974; Cross 1993; Hunnicutt 1988; Hill 2002).

The leisure society thesis changed all of this. Now, under the influence of the logic of industrialism thesis and post-industrial society theory, it was no longer scandalous, *à la* Dumazedier (1967, 1974), to nominate leisure as the pivotal emerging institution in society. What people did in their free time set the agenda for life choices relating to education, work, marriage and politics. Leisure, which for decades was dismissed as the poor relation in academic research, suddenly became the touchstone to the future.

Even sociologists who were sceptical about the full-blown versions of the logic of industrialism thesis and post-industrial society theory acknowledged that leisure must be taken more seriously. In Britain, the redoubtable Ken Roberts (1970: 9) commenced a major, influential career-long interest in the sociology of leisure with a canard against 'the great deal of polemical writing about the quality of man's leisure produced'

over recent years and a commitment to engage in 'value-free' research to 'describe and explain how people in particular social situations use their leisure'. Roberts advocated a pluralist approach to leisure that recognized distinctions of class, race, religion and gender but ultimately held fast to the notions of the priority of individual choice and voluntarism. Cognate approaches were pursued in the work of Stanley Parker (1983) and Tony Veal (1987).

On the whole, the British contribution to Leisure Studies in the 1960s and 70s was more parsimonious and qualified than that of the Americans. For example, Parker (1983: xi) took care to remark that not everyone is participating in 'the leisure boom'. Veal (1987: 68–9) is also circumspect in maintaining that changes to leisure attitudes are not equivalent, resources allocated to leisure forms and practices are still subject to the laws of scarcity and that talk of 'the leisure age' is premature. Nonetheless, the British contribution was clearly stimulated by the leisure society thesis and took the greater cultural profile of leisure forms and practices to be an important and transparent fact of postwar culture and society.

The Traditional Framework: State–Corporate–Consumer–Academic (SCCA)

Looking back, the framework of agents identified as central in the leisure society thesis is disconcertingly simple. The key agents in leisure forms and practice are scant and awareness of the frictions and tensions within them and between them is paltry. It is not really an exaggeration to propose that it is confined to a fourfold typology of agents operating in the context of industrial-democratic society:

- **The State**

The state is recognized to be an agent of intervention establishing 1) the legal context of leisure forms and practice through its control of licensing and policing; 2) the moral context by means of its articulation of good or desirable leisure forms, practices and values; and 3) the strategic context through its guidance and allocation of resources with respect to the work-life balance. The state is conceived of as a neutral agent which simply translates needs into resource allocation. While at this time, the bi-lateral and multi-lateral circumference of state activity was not excluded, the analysis of the interventionist state

was concentrated upon the formation and conduct of policies within territorial boundaries. Divisions and frictions within the state between the legislature and executive and different individual and group interests were underplayed. Of course changes in the operation of the state were recognized. The transition from a laissez-faire mode to an interventionist mode was at the heart of the post-industrial society theory of the state. In Bell's (1974) study, the emergence of knowledge as the new 'axial principle' in the economy combined with the ascendancy of a new 'intellectual and professional technocracy' assumes state intervention as a broker between competing interests and the chief means of protecting and advancing the public interest.

The analysis of the state in Leisure Studies at this time was curiously indifferent to the debates on the nature of state power in capitalist society (Miliband 1969; Althusser 1971; Poulantzas 1973, 1978). Yet these debates produced serious objections to the pluralist model of the state by demonstrating the relationship between state power and class interests. By neglecting to engage with these debates the traditional framework in Leisure Studies produced an inadequate reading of power and the relationship between class interests and the state in positioning leisure forms and practice.

The pluralist model of the state assumes that power is fragmented and diffused. The system of representative government provides a means of expression for a multitude of groups. The electoral process insures that populations are protected from being dominated by predominant classes or interests.

Critics challenge this view by revealing the connections between parliamentary systems and class-race-gender power.

• The Corporation

The leisure society thesis assumed a partnership between the interventionist state, corporations and universities. During the 1950s, mass society theory in the US argued that modern consumption exerted a levelling effect over leisure forms and practices. Commercialization and the organization of mass events in sport and recreation were held to produce passive consumers. In the work of C. Wright Mills (1956) the military-industrial-state complex controlled by a power elite rules work, leisure and society. Marcuse (1964) presented a stark analysis of consumer docility with his account of the 'totally administered, one-dimensional society' in which there is no effective working class opposition. The military-industrial-state complex condemns the masses to

a 'pacified existence'. In these historical circumstances, the best hope resides in marginalized groups such as students, feminists, the exploited and outcasts. Later Marcuse (1978) argued that aesthetics offered an additional front of resistance that could galvanize opposition. Nonetheless, the dominant theme in his analysis is the crushing power of predominant military, business and state interests. For Marcuse free time is categorically distinct from leisure time. 'The latter', he wrote (1964: 52), 'thrives in advanced industrial society, but it is unfree to the extent to which it is administered by business and politics.'

The leisure society thesis and post-industrial society theory abandoned this terrain. They recognized that corporations condition leisure forms and practice. The mechanisms by which this is achieved extend well beyond designing and marketing leisure commodities and services. Advertising, sponsorship and lobbying state officials and political parties are all part of the commercial leisure panoply. While the term 'globalization' is not used, the post-industrial society thesis presupposes that the emergence of the knowledge economy and the service sector widens the focal plane of the leisure industry from national and regional to international chains of demand and supply.

Instead of lecturing about the strength of corporate power and consumer passivity, the leisure society thesis and post-industrial society thesis pointed to the new freedom offered by technology and ethical management. The corporate power of *Disney*, *Coca-Cola*, *General Motors*, *British-American Tobacco*, *Sony* and other multi-nationals is envisaged in terms of a harmonious partnership between the university, the state and consumers. The pivotal force behind partnership is the new knowledge-communication class who exert influence by dint of their mastery over data and ideas. This class is dispersed throughout higher education, the state and business.

There is nothing in this work which points to the role of leisure in resisting corporate and state power. Instead, leisure tends to be presented as expressing personal freedom and social integration. No serious attempt is made to explain the dynamics of the business organization, especially the tendency of capitalist corporations to strive to engineer a monopoly over supply in order to make demand capitulate to aggressive price structuring. Nor is the regulatory role of the state in aiming for fair competition and consumer protection examined.

• Consumers

The leisure society thesis tended to present consumers as already possessing and executing full citizenship rights. Differences of class, race status and gender were recognized. But they were treated descriptively.

Nothing in the thesis suggests that elements in a class that has nothing might want everything; or that a race which is marginalized might want redress; or that a status group which is sidelined might wish to challenge and oppose the dominant power; or that gender might situate some people in relation to scarce resources in a way that makes their relation to the status quo insupportable. The subtext is very much along the lines that Cheek and Burge (1976), following the influential social systems sociologist, Talcott Parsons, articulated in the 1970s. Namely, that there is fundamental agreement between individuals and groups about the core values in society. These core values are transmitted to the population via the central institutions of normative coercion: the family, education, the judiciary, the police, medicine, social work and leisure and recreation.

If core values are successfully transmitted to populations on an inter-generational basis, how can social change occur? This is one of two of the main objections raised against the social system approach. The second objection is that the social system approach finds no place for social conflict. It over-eggs the pudding with a stress on consensus and solidarity. The subjects of difference and antagonism do not receive adequate treatment. Nor is this all. Looking back, the post-industrial society thesis took a remarkably optimistic view of the economic dynamics of post-industrial society. The distribution of leisure for all was predicted to increase. A mixture of the unprecedented bounty of science and technology and ethical government was to combine to make access to and participation in leisure more equal. If this is the case, the question is what incentive do scientists, technical personnel and state officials possess to ensure the reproduction of economic growth and social stability.

• Academics

The leisure society thesis had a rosy view of the part that academics would play in the post-industrial future. Bell's (1974) nomination of the 'axial' importance of knowledge and the university, logically implied a central role for university research staff. It was not clear how this role would integrate with state power or multi-national imperatives. The inference was that academics would fulfil the traditional role of intellectuals. That is, they would devote themselves to the disinterested pursuit of knowledge for the benefit of mankind. To this extent, it is safe to say that post-industrial society theory and the leisure society thesis appear to have operated with a latter-day version of Jean Jacques Rousseau's humanism, which regards humanity as basically good, decent and virtuous. Traces of this are also evident in

the work of those critics who take on some central aspects of the post-industrial society thesis, yet remain very assured that social conflict is endemic in capitalist society (Gorz 1978; Aronowitz and Di Fazio 1994). It is also evident in the approach of sociologists of leisure such as Ken Roberts (1970, 1978) and Stanley Parker (1983) who purport to adopt a 'value-free' perspective on leisure.

Given Bell's (1974) emphasis on the centrality of knowledge for matters of wealth creation, influence and power in the post-industrial leisure age, the idea of value-freedom was always going to be a challenging position to defend. Marxist writers on leisure rejected the notion of value-freedom on the grounds that it failed to deal adequately with the problems of class struggle and ideology (Andrew 1981; Clarke and Critcher 1985). Similarly, feminist authors argued that value-freedom is an expression of patriarchy that masks intractable male domination and the systematic subordination of women's perspectives (Wimbush and Talbot 1988; Aitchison 2003).

The leisure society has not come to pass. Some commentators argue that society has become addicted to consumption rather than leisure. Collective bargaining has focused upon the defence of jobs and overtime rights and workers have engaged in multi-employment regimes as guarantees of full family participation in the consumer market (Hunnicut 1988; Schor 1992). In parallel ways, the literature on emotional intelligence, emotional labour and the new capitalism maintains that individuals subject themselves to round-the-clock reconnaissance and monitoring to equip them with the necessary knowledge and skills to be competent in the management of personal relationships and the labour market (Hochschild 1983; Sennett 1999, 2004, 2006). Similarly, greater understanding of the relationship between the growth of leisure industries and consumption in the West and sweatshop labour and exploitation in the emerging and developing world, has established the proposition that one person's play is based upon another person's pain (Roberts 2004; Rojek 2005). The leisure society thesis presupposed perennial economic growth and the allocation of resources to education, leisure and welfare. The neo-liberal revolution of the 1980s emphasized the importance of personal and group solutions to questions of education, leisure and welfare and attacked the notion of the comprehensive welfare state. This shift in philosophy encouraged a focus upon special events rather than comprehensive management in leisure sponsorship and resource allocation.

These developments, combined with globalization, deregulation, outsourcing and delayering have changed the relationship between leisure and other areas of life. In the context of the debate around emotional labour it is difficult to argue convincingly that traditional notions of 'time off' and 'free time' with leisure remain unproblematic. A new, more complex

framework of Leisure Studies is required. Before coming to the task of sketching out its details, it is worth noting the major of the limitations of the Leisure Society thesis and SCCA Framework.

Criticisms of the SCCA Framework

The period between the early 1980s and the turn of the century was one of slowly abandoning some sacred cows in Leisure Studies and beginning the revisionist analysis of what leisure means in the context of globalization, deregulation, the casualization of labour and the increased longevity of populations in the West, with all of the implications for the provision of pensions and third age politics, and of course, the social and psychological prominence assigned to emotional intelligence and emotional labour. The prize sacred cow that was discarded was the leisure society thesis. This was a painful separation. The thesis was responsible for the high public profile that questions of leisure enjoyed between the mid 60s and mid 70s. Nonetheless, by the early 1980s, with the de-industrialization of cities in North America and Western Europe, the expanding awareness of globalization and the relationship between leisure consumption in the developed world, the provision of leisure services and commodities from the emerging and developing nations and the unequal positioning of multi-cultural and multi-ethnic groups in relation to scarcity, the old idea of a leisure dividend for all became untenable.

Revisionism in Leisure Studies focused mainly on questions of class inequality and gender domination (Andrew 1981; Clarke and Critcher 1985; Deem 1986; Green et al. 1990). As an aside, it should be noted that there was less published on the influence of ethnicity, occupation and subculture upon access to leisure resources. Revisionism took the form of attacking the realism of the leisure society thesis and post-industrial society theory. The persistent nature of class and gender inequality was prominently stressed. For example, Clarke and Critcher (1985) demonstrated the profound influence of class distinctions in leisure experience. Among other things, class is a key factor in determining if you have private or public housing; whether you have private transport or rely on public bus and rail services; and if you have regular long-haul holiday experience or local holiday experience. Their study also showed the limitations of the interventionist state in correcting class inequality. For example, public investment in the arts and museums is presented as benefiting the middle class more than the working class since the former make use of these facilities with an incidence that is disproportionate to their numerical size. Post-industrial society changed the context

in which these inequalities are played out, but it does not produce classless society. On the contrary, class inequalities change in accordance with the transformations in the context in which leisure forms and practice are located. It is not a question of class inequalities remaining the same or that they are invulnerable to egalitarian state policy. Rather, it is a question of the stubborn character of class to persist as a key allocative mechanism of leisure resources in capitalist society.

Feminism was especially important in making the issue of embodiment pivotal in the study of leisure forms and practice. The treatment of the female body as a type of property in male-dominated society raised a series of critical questions. Some of these pertained to the nature of leisure industries, notably cosmetics, fashion and women's magazines, in perpetuating ideals of the female body and, by implication, degrading body types that do not comply with these ideals.

Feminism also opened up the subject of the emotions and particularly the question of the relationship between the emotions and rationality. The latter concept is associated with the Enlightenment. Rationality was then contrasted with magic and myth to contend that clear, unambiguous, precise ways of being and living in the world are possible. By following this or that rational order of things, life is shorn of ambiguity and stress. The feminist concentration upon the emotions in everyday life exposed the repression involved in insisting on assigning priority to rationality. Rational approaches were associated with masculine attempts to assert power and deny difference. The (unintended) result of rationality therefore, is dehumanization, since it denies the central force of the emotions in existence and everyday life.

Poststructuralism and postmodernism supplied another turn in the revisionist moment. Perhaps the significance of this contribution was not fully apparent in the field until the start of the new century (Aitchison 2003; Blackshaw 2003). But its influence was felt much earlier as part of a reaction to both Marxist and Feminist critiques (Bramham 2002). Poststructuralism redefined the traditional politics of resistance by portraying power as discourse and disrupted traditional understandings of knowledge and representation.

Following the influence of Foucault (1975, 1980, 1981), leisure was reconceptualized as a field of discourse in which individuals and practices were positioned. By stressing the importance of discourse poststructuralism moved away from an approach to power that defined it as an external, constraining influence over individuals and groups to a standpoint that treated power as a condition of language and embodiment. For Foucault, power is not something that is imposed upon us by others, it is a constitutive part of practising and being recognized as a person. The focus of analysis therefore shifts from examining power as the expression of contending polarities to picturing it anew in terms of a

shifting continuum between interconnected parties. In addition, the question of control is supplemented with the issue of self-control. What we choose to do in leisure and other areas of life is not just a matter of the influence of this or that group. It is an issue of the expectations and event horizons that we bring to making a decision to become attached to a particular leisure form or practice. By choosing not to engage in blood sports as a leisure pastime I am drawing upon various ethical and cultural arguments, but I am also exercising power. This view of power is an advance on those positions that it criticized because it conveyed the important distinction that power is always and already enabling as well as constraining. The theoretical intersection between discourse and embodiment revitalized awareness of the micro-politics and diversity of resistance. Challenging received forms and practices of leisure was reconceptualized as a condition of bodily competence as opposed, for example, to the action of this or that class, gender or race.

Postmodernism directed similar arguments against the leisure society thesis and post-industrial society theory. It took issue with the notion of unity and solidarity, preferring instead to emphasize diversity, fragmentation and change. It adapted the poststructuralist argument that discourse and representation shape meaning by submitting that there is *no* meaning outside discourse and representation. Extreme forms of postmodernism propose that reality has disappeared. For example, in the work of Jean Baudrillard (1981, 2004) the mass media is treated as if it is a genie that has escaped from its bottle and fatally dissolves the shadow line between illusion and reality.

Postmodernism was successful in clearing away some ossified propositions in Leisure Studies. For example, after it, the proposition that leisure is freedom, or that class struggle is the key to understanding leisure forms and practice, do not hold water. It opened up a terrain for exploring questions of identity and meaning in leisure that assumed that neither of these things is fixed or uniform. Through postmodernism it becomes much easier to think in terms of the diversity of identity, the multiplicity of meaning, recognition and tolerance of difference. The *context* for thinking about leisure forms and practice was transformed.

With postmodernism came an emphasis in social and cultural analysis upon multi-culturalism, multi-ethnicity, the politics of difference and globalization. It was less successful in generating questions of leisure policy. It is one thing to build leisure policies around multi-culturalism, multi-ethnicity and globalization. It is much more difficult to tackle international state power and multi-national influence to create ethically sound policies to combat pollution, consumer manipulation and mephitic leisure forms³. This is because postmodernism lacked a coherent concept of society. In stressing diversity, difference and multiplicity it was not clear what collective forms were left to enhance leisure experience and social

wellbeing. Decentring meaning led to many important insights about manipulation and power. But perpetual decentring is a policy-maker's nightmare since it provides no clear way forward. Postmodernism and poststructuralism therefore each produced an impasse that has not yet been overcome. The probability is that it will be eventually filled by some version of a politics of will in which one vision of leisure and society is presented over others as the best way forward. However, we are not at a stage of thought and practice where a tenable vision of this type has emerged.

Does this mean that Leisure Studies *après* the postmodern turn has run into a blind alley from which it cannot escape? The evidence for this is weak. Leisure Studies is currently in a condition in which many of the old 'certainties' generated by the leisure society/post-industrial society moment have been discarded. New approaches to the question of leisure have been devised and implemented. These have not produced a new governing paradigm in Leisure Studies in which the majority agree on the meaning and agenda for leisure. However, they have redefined the key agents in the field and produced a much wider canvas for the investigation of leisure forms and practice.

A Framework for Leisure Studies Today (SCCASMIL)

Leisure Studies today retains a basic concern with the parts played by the state, the corporation, consumers and academics. Unlike the situation at the height of the leisure/post-industrial society thesis, these agents are no longer defined in essentialist terms. The influence of poststructuralism and postmodernism has left its mark. It is now normal to think of the state, the corporation, consumers, and academics in terms of frictions, divisions, process and multiple meanings. We are far more attuned to questions of differentiation, resistance, challenge, opposition and the market in illegal leisure activities. The central players of the SCCA framework remain. But their composition, status and terms of operation have been reformulated in important ways. This reflects the prominence now assigned to globalization in conceptualizing the context of leisure forms and practice. Let us work through this framework in more detail:

- **The State**

The state must still be analyzed in Leisure Studies as a central regulatory body. It controls the judicial parameters of leisure forms and practice, governs policing, allocates public resources, articulates a

public ethical agenda and represents public leisure interests abroad. Unlike the period of the leisure society/post-industrial society thesis, the state must now be considered in a significantly reformulated way. The old pluralist notion of a neutral agent, pursuing a publicly accountable 'honest broker' agenda of intervention which dominated post-war thinking is now untenable. *Internally*, the traditional divisions between the legislature, the executive and the judiciary remain pertinent. But the *pluralist* model of the state in which the three main sections of activity are held to be the mere tools of elected parties is now widely regarded as unduly simplistic. The state is recognized as performing an *ideological* function in massaging public opinion to take this or that view of issues of collective concern. This function answers to power *interests* that are not confined to questions of party, but extend to struggles between classes, races and public sphere elites. In short, the legislature, executive and judiciary are acknowledged to be not simply the servants of the people, but the instruments of social interests whose end is to present the activities of the state as being neutral or above sectional interest. Social interests leave their mark on the state and create the conditions of future resource exploitation and development. They do so through a complex interaction of bargaining, manipulation and alliance. Social interests are parts of the state, but the state is more than the sum of its parts. This is one reason why social interests struggle so keenly to acquire hegemony. The old leisure society model of the state as a sort of representative keyboard that translates popular will into public policy has been replaced by something more complex and realistic. The same applies to the other wing of state operations.

Externally, the state is held to retain geopolitical spheres of interest. For example, US policy on human trafficking and the international drugs trade is particularly vigilant in investigating supply chains from Central and Latin America. Similarly, European Union policy with respect to the regulation of the labour market and the provision of leisure commodities and services is alert to the significant internal supply market of cheap Eastern European labour which contravenes legislation on the minimum wage, rights in the workplace and therefore challenges traditional divisions between work and leisure. In a wired-up world in which the 24-hour marketplace obtains, the conventional notion of spheres of interest is too restrictive. Globalization presents a series of common risks to leisure practice in the shape of biochemical hazards, global warming, digital piracy and international cartels supplying illegal leisure resources. It follows that there is no assured territorial integrity for the state and that legislation and policing must now openly embrace a global dimension.

These issues are not confined to the fields of international relations, diplomacy and comparative sociology. Leisure Studies must pay heed to them. For leisure forms and practice between territorially defined boundaries is affected by them.

For example, one of the most contentious and urgent topics on the global agenda is climate change. The Kyoto Protocol (1997) committed signatories to implement a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2012. The agreement is thwarted by the decisions of the US and Australia to withdraw from the provisions of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The non-participation of the USA is particularly significant. According to UNFCCC, the US population, which consists of 4.6% of the world's population was responsible for 36.1% of carbon dioxide emissions in 1990. The European Union, with 6.3% of the world's population, was responsible for 24.2% of emissions in the same year. Australia, with a population of 20 million, has the highest emissions per capita in the developed world and is the 17th largest greenhouse polluter. The US and Australian governments base their non-participation on the argument that the Protocol is unfair to the industrialized countries and damages jobs in the domestic economy. The leisure sector in the US and Australian economies has been successful in lobbying government and public opinion that cutting carbon dioxide emissions in the automobile and travel industry carries unacceptable costs to lifestyle. Yet this self-interested isolationism has produced unintended consequences. For one thing American exceptionalism on the questions of global warming and tolerance for energy-inefficient transport as a leisure resource and lifestyle option, is widely condemned as arrogant and deluded. The plea for America to put its house in order is echoed domestically with the revitalization of eco-friendly groups such as Greenpeace America and KyotoUSA who have raised public awareness of carbon footprints and unregulated automated transport as a leisure resource. The traditional notion that the state possesses supreme legislative, executive and judicial powers over a geopolitically defined territorial unit still carries water. But the idea that state's go it alone and freely determine their policies on work, leisure and much more besides demands considerable caution. With respect to environmental issues and leading forms of illegal leisure activities, such as the trade in narcotics and sex trafficking, nation-states face common risks which require multilateral strategies, partnered legislation and co-operative policing. At both the internal and external levels then, the analysis of statecraft in the management of leisure forms and practice needs to be over-hauled and redefined.

• The Corporation

At the height of the leisure society thesis there were few in-depth studies of the leisure corporation. This is nothing short of astonishing given the emphasis in critical accounts of the manipulative influence of capitalism (Andrew 1981; Clarke and Critcher 1985). What were the critics of capitalism doing by attributing this or that effect to capitalism, without testing their attributions in the real-life setting of flesh and blood capitalist entrepreneurs and the corporations that followed their rule? Too often, the result was a shallow view of corporate capitalism in general. With respect to leisure, the role of the leisure corporation in governing an international division of labour and managing wage rates and conditions of work to ensure price competitiveness in the biggest, most lucrative markets of North America and the European Union was significantly under-researched. This resulted in considerable ambivalence over the question of what leisure corporations actually do to connect demand with supply.

The roots of the corporate involvement in leisure are still debated by historians (Cross 1993; Kammen 1999; Hill 2003). Some give primary emphasis to the commercialization of folk and amateur leisure forms. This was achieved through the commercial co-option of leisure supply and demand chains that traditionally involved no cash nexus. Gradually, pay became presented and accepted as the prerequisite for play. This pattern has been traced in forms of dance, theatre, music, sport and style (Russell 1997; Dunning and Sheard 2005; Roach 2007). Others give more weight to the argument that commercial leisure entrepreneurs seize upon technological and cultural innovations to package new forms to entice the masses to consume (Kasson 1978; Gartman 1994). However, scarcely any dissent from Roberts's (2004: 21) proposition that over the last one hundred years commercial leisure has become overwhelmingly, the main leisure provider.

What does it mean to provide leisure commercially? At the simplest level, it means the exchange of money for leisure commodities and services. The commercialization of leisure involves product research and development functions to either identify or implant leisure demands in the population. An accessory of this is the development of marketing and advertising to communicate data about leisure products to potential consumers and to finesse product image so that the desire to consume becomes compelling. In democratic societies commercialization also implies the development of statutory, advisory and monitoring bodies to protect the consumer from unscrupulous, false claims about products and services. As we will see in more detail later (pp. xx–xx), the

development of the counter-culture in the 1960s was extremely important in challenging irresponsible capitalism. The force of counter-culture arguments to take the interests of marginalized groups like ethnic minorities, the disabled and children seriously was designed to *replace* capitalism with a version of 'business for, and by, the people'. It is a matter of conjecture to say how much of this was connected with a grass-roots sentiment to transform society in favour of the collective ownership and control of the means of production, and how much reflected the desire of radicals to steer society in this direction.

Most observers now agree that the unintended consequence of the counter-culture was the *reform* of capitalism (Frank 1997; McGuigan 2006). By pointing to consumers that were excluded from the advertising, marketing and product development pitch of corporations, the counter-culture provided the incentive for these businesses to become more concerned with questions of 'relevance' and 'ethical responsibility' (Frank 1997). Admirable though these measures may have been, notably in taking social inclusion more seriously, their cumulative effect was to augment the appeal of capitalist corporations by making them seem 'realistic' about consumer needs. By comparison the state and traditional capitalist corporations were often presented as cumbersome, unwieldy and out of touch. This process of reform had the effect of increasing the monopolistic market share to which capitalist organizations aspire while at the same time appearing to take account of consumers who, hitherto, had been invisible or spoken with a muffled voice.

For students of leisure, the result is that we must pay attention to the skill of successful leisure corporations (and other branches of corporate capitalism) in maximizing their profit margins while claiming to respect consumer rights. Why this is quite a trick is that capitalism functions on the principle of producing goods and services in the cheapest market and selling them in the most expensive market. To put it differently, consumers must always pay more with respect to the price of a commodity or service than the cost incurred by the capitalist of market supply. This difference represents the margin of profit to the capitalist.

What writers like Frank (1997) and Sennett (2006) persuasively argue is that the 'new' capitalism has learned from the counter-culture. At its best it has adopted a socially significant critical edge to questions of social exclusion, injustice and intolerance while continuing to extract surplus value. I (2007: 115–34) refer to new capitalism as *neat capitalism*. By this term I mean a knowing, deliberate attempt by entrepreneurs to offer *smart* solutions to social, cultural and economic questions. The use of the term *neat* is intended to convey the self-approving manner in which neat capitalism is theorized and practised. Neat capitalism regards itself as presenting relevant, savvy

stateless solutions to the problems of society and the world. As such, it draws on the sentiments of the common man. Of course, it is expressed in the mouths of men and women who have much greater influence than ordinary men and women. I am thinking of business leaders like Richard Branson, Charles Saatchi, Steve Jobs and the late Anita Roddick. These are no-nonsense capitalists who regard most aspects of the state as unimaginative, petti-fogging and inefficient. The new Right term, *the nanny state* could have been invented for these figures. Traditional capitalists, such as Andrew Carnegie, Joseph Rowntree or J.P. Morgan, generally favoured patronage as the mechanism of social progress. They offered personal solutions, usually informed by Christian belief systems, to public questions that the state sector could not answer, such as poverty, homelessness, overcrowding and crime. Neat capitalists side with both 'the silent majority' and the voiceless and the victims of calamity. They act as moral entrepreneurs highlighting what is held to be ignored or fouled-up by the state machine. As such they are unelected political agents who offer stateless solutions to urgent social, economic and political issues on behalf of the silent majority. They do all of this and they still make vast amounts of money by extracting surplus value from labourers and charging the margin to consumers.

The example to which I often refer is Richard Branson's response to the *tsunami* in South East Asia in 2004. The *tsunami* was an ecological catastrophe in which thousands died and thousands more were made homeless. Branson caught the public mood of objection to the dilatory response of Asian and Western states to the tragedy. He offered a spontaneous practical solution in offering some of his Virgin Air Fleet to provide relief. This was applauded as a stateless solution to an urgent social problem. It also operated as free global advertising for Branson's Virgin group of companies. TV viewers were presented with the message that Virgin seeks relevant solutions that are more swift and flexible than the efforts of the state. The step between seeing Virgin as more relevant and regarding the Virgin brand as inherently good, is a small one. Branson's practical solution to the *tsunami* had an authentic philanthropic function of doing good. Yet it would be foolish to ignore or deny the business output which was to identify Virgin as a problem-solver *par excellence*.

- **Consumers**

Frank (1997) offers a convincing view of the model of consumer culture that animated advertising executives in Madison Avenue, and

the satellite of industrial corporations and business concerns that they represented in the 1960s and 70s. It is a culture of married, heterosexual couples, in which the husband is the bread-winner and the wife is the home-maker. This culture is unemployment-proof. Crime is a constant threat, but it is confined to a murky, marginal cast of under-socialized, anti-social individuals. The judiciary is incorruptible. Policing is even-handed and fair. The culture is presented as a world in which there is substantial agreement about central values and social responsibilities. This is the social system depicted by Cheek and Burge (1976) in their account of the functions of leisure forms and practice.

From the vantage point of multi-cultural and multi-ethnic groups, today this view from Madison Avenue seems bizarre; in the day, it seemed fanciful and out-of-touch. The concept of consumers with which we now operate is of people living with, and through, difference. By this is meant a perspective that embraces multi-ethnicity and multi-culturalism. Difference is not understood only in terms of categorical distinctions but also the entire system of ordering in which these distinctions are positioned and relate to each other. For example, in societies dominated by white history it is a matter of how non-whites are located historically and contemporaneously in relation to scarcity, status and other distinctions.

In addition, it is necessary to use the concept of disembedding in relation to consumers in contemporary society. The mass media, the internet and other branches of modern communications provide opportunities for consumers to contrast local and national conditions with international and global circumstances. This may contribute to the restraint of global capitalism. For example, in 2008 the Apple iTunes store was forced to reduce the price of track downloading in the UK market from 79 pence to 74 pence. This was partly achieved by the pressure of consumer groups to standardize the UK price of legal downloading with that charged by Apple to other members of the European Union.

More generally, mass communications enables consumer disembedding that contributes to the dissemination of issues relevant to enhancing Care for the Self and widening Care for the Other. It provides consumers with a resource for the understanding of international market conditions and labour relations systems in the leisure sector. Of course, this does not mean that consumers possess perfect market knowledge. Nonetheless, even in the state of imperfect knowledge they have access to more cross cultural data than previous generations.

• Academics

The leisure society thesis brought the question of leisure to the lips of academics, many of whom were hitherto indifferent or patronizing about the academic study of leisure.

In the 1970s and 80s it was the main catalyst for the growth of academic departments of Leisure Studies. These departments responded to growing medical evidence of the relationship between the work–leisure balance and health, and increasing public awareness of the value to communities of well-resourced leisure, recreation and heritage provision. After the 1990s, with deregulation, privatization and globalization, Leisure Studies began to be overtaken by the sub-disciplines of Sport Science and Tourist Studies.

Leisure Studies was disadvantaged by a traditional preoccupation with wider quality of life issues relating to the work-life balance and the restructuring of industrial society. These issues suggested an abstract quality to the field, that was not compensated for by the practical agenda of leisure, recreation and health management. In comparison, the links between sport and good health and tourism and widening personal and collective horizons seemed much easier for most people to grasp and apply. Leisure Studies was forced into a defensive role as newer, more ‘relevant’ fields of study began to increase student rolls.

In addition, Leisure Studies was closely tied to public sector employment and its critical wing was attached to a public agenda of social progress. The activist side of the discipline identified with developing leisure policy in relation to welfare issues and social engineering.

Students with degrees in Sports Science and Tourist Studies were more attractive to private sector entrepreneurs intent on managing the expansion of gym culture, health clubs, package tours and post-tourist travel *à la* the *Lonely Planet* and *Rough Guide* franchises.

Academics in Leisure Studies cannot convincingly point to the leisure society as the future. The notion of a social transition to a qualitatively different type of society in which leisure values dominate has been replaced by an interest in the structural constraints on freedom, having to do with class, race, gender and status; and also, the question of the ideological connotations of leisure. The strong emphasis upon the value of emotional intelligence in lifestyle and work relations queries the relevance of traditional notions of choice, self-determination and time off. At its most interesting, academic Leisure Studies grapples with the issue of how social interests exploit and develop the ideology of leisure in societies founded upon organized inequality and the necessity to engage in paid employment.

• Social Movements

A variety of social, cultural and technological factors have combined to devalue the power of the state to act as a political agent. The social democratic parties that emerged in the nineteenth and twentieth century had clear ideological differences between a market and a state solution to social, economic and political questions. It is now widely argued that there is an ideological crisis among both Left and Right (Beck 1992; Giddens 1998, 2000; Linklater 1998). Left- and Right-wing solutions are no longer seen as viable. A mixture of ideological policy and strategy is now advocated, with partnerships with voluntary organizations, corporations and special single issue interest groups (such as Greenpeace, Oxfam, Make Poverty History).

The literature refers to the emergence and interaction of specialist single issue interest groups as *sub-politics*. The term was coined by Ulrich Beck (1992). Within the field of Leisure Studies over the last twenty years the impact of these groups is demonstrated most forcefully in the emergence of the events industry. Special events like Live Aid (1985), Live 8 (2007) and Live Earth (2007) raised public awareness of specific issues and generated income for third world relief and sustainable ecology. They belong to the category of neat capitalism which offers stateless solutions to specific social, economic and environmental issues. These solutions may be designed to expose the shortfalls of state policy or to provide immediate funding for urgent global issues. They are external to party politics although economic sponsorship and cultural partnerships with governments may be sought in pursuit of their objectives.

• Illegal Leisure

Leisure Studies has never really come to terms with the fact that millions of people devote huge parts of their leisure to illegal activities. A United Nations report from the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC 2007) estimates that 200 million people worldwide engage regularly in the consumption of illegal narcotics. Demand in the world's biggest single market, North America, is thought to have stabilized. In contrast, the market in South East Asia and Australasia has grown rapidly, fuelled by a flood of amphetamine-based stimulants supplied from sources in China. Mares (2006: 58) submits that nearly 50% of the adult population in the US have participated in illegal drug use. The most popular drugs are marijuana, cocaine, heroin, and psychoactive drugs such as

amphetamine (meth), LSD, GHB (Gamma Hydroxybutyrate – the so-called ‘date-rape’ drug) and Ecstasy. Contrary to popular opinion, official statistics in North America, Europe, Australia and Japan indicate the illicit drug use is found across every category of class, ethnicity, national origin, gender, profession and occupational status.

None of these features are compatible with efficient policing. Global entertainment piracy has damaged the profitability of many multi-nationals in the leisure sector. The fourth annual Digital Music Survey by Entertainment Media Research (2007) found that 43% of their poll of 1,700 people illegally downloaded music between 2006–7, rising from 36% in 2005–6. Only 33% cited the risk of being prosecuted as a deterrent against unauthorized downloading, compared with 42% in 2006 ([http:// www.entertainmentmediaresearch.com](http://www.entertainmentmediaresearch.com)).

The International Federation of Phonographic Industries estimates that one in three CDs exchanged in the world is an illegal copy (IFPI 2006). What does copyright piracy mean? It refers to the unauthorized reproduction and exchange of copyrighted intellectual property in the form of sound recordings, motion pictures, software, photographs, video games, books and articles. Illegal exchange occurs over two main highways. Duplication and sale of copyright material is part of black-market metropolitan culture. Siwek (2007) calculates that each year piracy costs the US economy \$580 billion in total output, costs American workers 373,575 jobs and \$16.3 billion in lost tax revenue.

Digital piracy raises many serious issues for students of leisure. Two should be mentioned here. The first is the simple question of the theft of digital entertainment property via illegal downloading and the reproduction of software. As we have already seen, estimates differ about the size of this problem. For obvious reasons, the offence is private and has a high chance of avoiding detection. Criminologists argue that crime is influenced by the agent’s judgement of morality. For example, it may be that a colonized citizen believes that the property laws are immoral since they are founded upon the appropriation of domestic property by the colonizing force. This is a defence often used by terrorists and political prisoners to justify their acts. With respect to illegal downloading the question of morality is opaque since the offence against the copyright holder is invisible and indirect. The separation of the offence from the copyright holder means that the offender often downloads in the belief that he or she is engaging in victimless crime (Wolfe et al. 2007).

Moral problems with respect to this issue are compounded if one examines the question of digital piracy from the perspective of an offender in the emerging and developing world. Not only is it the

case that much digital entertainment software is beyond the average *per capita* income, but also multi-national corporations and the leading industrial nations are widely seen as imposing a cap on development by keeping wages low and extracting wealth. The *Sao Paulo Declaration* (1998), issued by the World Leisure and Recreation Association and the *Charter for Leisure* (2000) approved by the World Leisure Board, are both committed to the global proselytizing of leisure and recreation values and the expansion of participation.

Article 3 of the *Sao Paulo Declaration* states:

All governments and institutions should preserve and create barrier free environments e.g. cultural, technological, natural and built, where people have time, space, facilities and opportunity to express, share and celebrate leisure.

The internet represents one of the most cost-effective, ubiquitous technologies to achieve these ends that has ever been invented. Illegal downloading may be interpreted as an act that exploits the full potential of the system. This leisure professionals who focus on conditions in the emerging and developing world with some interesting moral questions.

Another aspect of digital crime that has not been sufficiently widely examined by students of leisure is the proliferation of computer viruses. Harmer *et al* (2002) estimate that over 55,000 separate computer viruses have been identified. A virus is a piece of malicious software that is created and exchanged with the intention of system disablement. They are aimed at disrupting business operations, banking transactions, military organization and airline schedules. In August 2003, the *SoBig* virus was estimated to have caused \$30 billion in damage across the world (Balthorp et al. 2004). System disablement may be aim of a hacker who holds a grudge against business, the military or society. But it is also a leisure pursuit for those who regard hacking as a challenge to their faculties and a means of outwitting the system.

Katz (1988) wrote convincingly of the pleasure and honour gained from beating the system and traced many acts of crime back to this source. Hacking belongs to the same category and is worthy of much greater consideration by students of leisure.

The aim of the revised framework of Leisure Studies is to alert students and researchers to the full range of breadth and dynamics of the field of force in which leisure practice is positioned and develops. The purpose is not to deny the proposition that individuals have choice. The prominence given to intentionality in leisure acts in Chapter 1 of the book is designed to situate subjective decisions in the dialectics of leisure forms

and practice. The parallel emphasis assigned to emotional intelligence, emotional labour, social and economic positioning, and the categorization of leisure forms and practice as types of engagement with the problem of scarcity, are ways of relating individual practice to questions of inequality and power. *Atomized* views of leisure present the subjective intentions of the actor as the focal point of leisure practice. *Deterministic* views erase subjective intentionality by making practice the reflection of allocative mechanisms of class, gender, race, status and other structural agents. The revised SCCASMIL framework sketched out here seeks to focus thinking and research on the dialectics of the interface between subjective intentionality and structural influence.