

Work, Free Time and Leisure

The compliment to Education and Culture

Trabalho, Tempo Livre e Lazer

O elogio à Educação e a Cultura

Autores:

Aguinaldo César Surdi

Doutorando em Educação Física pela Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina – Brasil

Professor da Universidade do Oeste de Santa Catarina/Campus de Videira SC – Brasil

Aguinaldosurdi@yahoo.com.br

Dr. Antônio Camilo Cunha

Doutor em Educação pela UMINHO – Braga – Portugal

Professor Auxiliar com Agregação da UMINHO – Braga – Portugal

camilo@ie.uminho.pt

Zenaide Galvão

Doutoranda em Estudos da Criança - Instituto de Educação - UMINHO – Braga - Portugal

Membro do CIEC - Centro de Investigação em Estudos da Criança - IE - UMINHO - Braga - Portugal.

zgalvao@uol.com.br

Dr. José Tarcísio Grunennvaldt

Doutor em Educação pela UNICAMP – São Paulo – Brasil

Professor da Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso – Brasil

jotagrun@hotmail.com

Abstract

In this essay we propose a discussion about the directions that define, nowadays, work, free time and leisure. However incoherent it may be and in the opposite direction of what we would like it to be, it is the work that dictates, more and more, the rules that lead us to use our time out of itself. Therefore, free time is not significant, it doesn't get enough importance and it is placed in lower levels in the process of our existence. So, we want to emphasize its importance, as a fundamental stage in the process of human development. Emphasizing the compliment to education as a possibility to become aware about the individual, and the compliment to culture as a way to provide people the condition to add and to improve

themselves and, consequently, the world, through their free actions and criticism (creative and pleasurable).

Key words: Culture, Education, Leisure, Work, Free time.

Introduction

With the globalization of the work market process, we have noticed a change of the work conception – the old paradigm of the homogeneous universe of work and for a life time, is giving place to another paradigm, the one of a work market with different, diversified and ephemeral characteristics. Associated with this reality, conditions on work and worker's quality of life have become worse, due to the extreme competition, which is sometimes inhuman. This fact has forced the workers' rights (already achieved with great efforts) to become, more and more, fragile. So, with this new reality, the work force begins to have new configurations, overexploited by the extreme conditions, very low salaries, long hours of work, which are "legitimated" by the extra-hours, two or three different jobs, forcing the worker to go far beyond of what is permitted (dignity in life) to earn enough and to survive. These sceneries seem to compromise one of the fundamental components of the "human being" or "being a person", the free time and the leisure, or, if you will, the legitimate and human "good life" – in the Aristotelian conception.

It is a consensus that leisure is a normal necessity and it is essential to all human beings. It is an anthropologic, ontological fact, but also sociological, psychological and even legal. For example, in the Brazilian Federal Republic Constitution (1988, p. 7) chapter II – about the Rights, on article 6º, it says the following: "Education, health, work, residence, "leisure", security, social security, protection in motherhood and in childhood and assistance to someone in need, are social rights, according to this Constitution".

We can also notice that, in the scope of thoughts/academic research, leisure and free time have been a matter of particular analysis with significant changes about the view and the practice of these human constituents.

The most paradigmatic about this fact is the evolution, for instance, of Leisure Sociology. From a position where reductionist and dualist thoughts predominated, that tended to consider leisure as a normal thing, guided to pleasure and without connection with economy, towards a society, with a much more humanized position between work and free time/leisure, showing now the approval for individual/collective well-being, in symbiosis with a more social, civic, political and productive logic.

However, another trend starts to emerge (and we can identify ourselves with this one). It's the trend that considers free time and leisure as a "time and space" of individual and social development, having as a reference the existence of an individual and ontological freedom, which is, somehow, a return (the everlasting return) to a Socratic metaphor, free time to construct myself, that finds in culture and in axiology secure anchors.

It's in this involvement that Elias & Dunning (1992) refer to leisure as something that configures itself with free time activities, as long as it isn't characterized as a specialized occupation, in which we can achieve a better life. We are talking about activities that are directly associated to the break of a routine, which is the characteristic of the mimetic excitement, that involves leisure activities, such as going to the theatre or to a concert, going to races, to the cinema, to go hunting, fishing, play bridge, climbing mountains, to make bets, to dance or to watch tv. Thus, it's all about, and first of all, initiatives that concern about dynamics, which lead to a total, happy and fulfilled person – and only then a dialectics (not a dualism or a dichotomy) with other sector of the human realization – the work.

This essay intends to develop a reflection that tends to give life to both human life realities: the work and the free time/leisure and to contribute to spread the horizons and meanings in people's life. To achieve that, this essay is divided in two parts. In the first one, we will talk about some themes (synthesis) such as: work, free time/leisure, history, the individual being, the collective/social being and life; in the second part, we will make our compliment to education and to culture, as the means to the realization of these noble matters of human life – free time and leisure.

Part I

Free time/leisure: an ontological right and a political sense

There are many conceptions about the concept of free time and leisure. In a simple explanation we can say that leisure activities provide the eruption of strong and pleasant feelings that are, often, absent in our routines. "Its function is not just, as we use to think, the liberation of tension, but the renewal of that tension measure, which is a key ingredient for physical and mental health" (Elias & Dunning, 1992, p. 137-8). More than that, we think that leisure activities are intrinsic issues to human being. They are ways to make people feel and understand themselves and the world. This way, it is an element of the human/existential constitution. Leisure, as an intrinsically human activity, it is a phenomenological, vital and an ontological right.

About the attitudes towards leisure, Marcelino (2004), refers that people are ashamed in what concerns to claim leisure for themselves, for the same reason that it is still treated as a "dispensable" and "useless" thing. The idea that we have about time, and, above all, about the importance of leisure, has originated several mistakes. It seems like we don't have the right anymore to play, to take a walk, to go to the cinema or the theatre, to enjoy, to laugh, to smile, and that we must deal with all the everyday matters as something very serious and productive, which has on work its greatest expression.

Ironically, that sense of work (excessive work) has invaded leisure, transforming it in "productive" work, or as a consumer of its own products. The world of entertainment is now commercialized. All our leisure time seems to be something like a space and time of consumerism or the proposals produced by work. This way, free time becomes a time to consume, not reaching the natural circumstances, to be characterized and experienced as the true leisure time – being and the issues about it.

Besides these dynamics about leisure-work, the real leisure, before (during) and after work, constitutes itself as a political dynamic. Leisure, as a right, should be extended to all the population. It's a primordial function/responsibility of the State, which through public and efficient politics should treat everyone equally. To talk about public politics means that we have to see leisure beyond simple and recreative activities, as a social and cultural process that affects everyone. So, it is a political instrument, with the function to educate and stimulate the most purist ideals in that political sense, such as citizenship, participation, civic sense and criticism.

In this political and ontological context, we think the "secret" is in the beginning, in the childhood and when we start to be educated (by family and school). Since then we can start to have conscience about the construction of thoughts and the ways to build our personality that finds in leisure an existential meaning. Education, for example, has, or should have, transforming ideas about leisure, free time, health, ... So everyone could use those principles and goals about leisure in their life and make changes in the way they live, either in relationships between individuals or socially.

2. Work, free time and leisure – individual phenomena that allow socialization

When we think about work, free time and leisure, we realize that they are intrinsically individual in time and space, but they are also organized and structured by the political and community sense. This fact, will confuse, very often, the necessity about the search for free time/leisure (to play, arts, culture, ...) and health (food, physical and emotional well-being), which is, first of all, individual, with concepts of free time/leisure, health, physical and emotional well-being, and then collective and generalist. On the basis of the principle that people possess different characteristics, which come from genetic and sociocultural aspects, we cannot demand that people follow the same thoughts and act in the same way. Therefore, concepts of leisure, health and education are (or should be) in some way, individual, without forget, however, the collective/community well-being. What is rest or fun to some people is not the same to others and vice-versa; everyone needs to rest and to have fun, but not all look for it in the same way – there is a bio-physo-social individuality that we have to respect. “When it comes to choose your own leisure activities, the concern with your own pleasure, your own satisfaction, can be sovereign within certain limits, socially established” (Elias & Dunning, 1992, p. 140).

Someone who works all day, lives far from the work place and, even, studies at night, for example, probably will have less free time to dedicate it to leisure. It also reflects some issues about appropriate leisure places, such as streets, tennis-courts, countryside, rivers, clubs, associations and parties, usually, it all depends on the individual's location and availability – each one has fun and does something with what he has got. However, should or shouldn't rights be equal? Activities should be chosen by the individual and not be imposed by external reasons.

Leisure causes a different view about the world and makes us understand important aspects in our life, which weren't before, but now they become clear. Victories about freedom, about free speech and the right to leisure are achievements that, we now realize for its real value, should be and have to be defended individually and collectively.

3. Time to work and time to leisure – the sense of recent history

The working world has passed, and is passing, through lots of transformations in the last years. These transformations, according to Antunes (1995), happen, particularly, in capitalist countries, where there has been the disappearance of industrial proletariat, that is, the reduction of the working class. Consequently, there has been a significant “underproletarianization” of work, consequence of the several forms of partial, precarious, tertiary and linked to informal economy, jobs. Noticing, this way, the heterogeneity, the complexity and the fragmentation of work, which has devastated the third world countries, whose industrialization is at a medium level.

To this fact is not strange the process of the working world globalization, that has forced the conditions and conquests achieved by the working class, to lose its strength. The working force is overexploited by the extreme conditions, such as very low salaries and long hours of work, which are “legitimated” by the extra hours, that force the worker to go beyond of what is permitted, by the law, to earn enough to survive, compromising his time for leisure and rest, with implications to his health.

In the working world the reduction of hours of work has always been an issue insistently demanded by workers, with the certainty that such demand would give them more free time, with the possibility of enjoying it (with leisure).

Throughout History, that struggle has been effective and the working hours have been reduced, gradually. Working class' struggles, along with trade unions (which had its appearance in England, in the XIX century, in the industrial revolution context), are some of the means that provided, and still does, such achievements and help to resist to the capitalist logic. Making a

quick historical summary, we can notice that in the pre-capitalist period, everyday life, the time to work, to leisure and to rest were controlled by the worker. To him, those times were, often, mixed up, as he controlled them at his own rhythm (Silva, 2003). There wasn't any kind of clock to control time. Nature was observed as a preliminary form of that control. The rain, the sun, the health and the family were important factors that the worker observed to define his own time and his business.

In modern times and with the industrial revolution, the "creation (attention) to the clock" has risen to respect the rigidity and the pressures of work to, then, try to build a life in society. Deep changes were felt in people's life, in the countryside and in the city – it is now that we attend to the constitution of new and enormous urban towns (industrialized, with services, ...). The natural time, controlled by the rhythm of life, by the clocks and by the pressures of industry (productivity) has turned that into artificial time, controlled by the production ideals. In this context, everyday life and familiar relationships have been adjusted to work, with over 16 hours of work - per day – slave/excessive work. About this fact there was a working mobilization that tell us a story of conquests, among them one of the most established - the working day of eight hours, and still eight hours to rest and another eight hours to leisure. However, this achievement has brought also new issues: will this journey of work, rest and leisure be an objective reality among the workers? We wonder if to supply the basic needs many people use a considerable part of their leisure/rest time to continue working? The precariousness of work, nowadays, with low salaries, job shortage and awful working conditions, would force the worker to do a much larger working day, greater than what he can bear, and with this, compromise a much worthy life with implications on individual/social relationships?

Nowadays, we notice that two thirds of humanity, who works, is living in third world countries, located in several parts of the world, such as Asia, Middle East, Africa and South America (Antunes, 1995). We know that the majority of those people are exploited by the capital, through their work force. Those workers, according to this author, belong to the working class and they submit themselves to the dominant way of capitalist production, accept inhuman work conditions, live in poverty and receive an insufficient payment for their survival.

The historic reduction of the working day had the goal of giving more time to people to take care of themselves. Padilha (2006) points out that this would be a proposal to "soften" the alienation and the exploitation of man, on work, through the development and the rational use of machines. According to this, Lafargue (1999) claims that he could make work go back to what it was, a source of pleasure to the worker. This reduction was seen by Lafargue and Marx as a way to increase worker's free time.

The relation between the working day reduction with the increase of free time/leisure, in reality, it never happened. "Free time" became an extension of the working day, according to Marx (1988, p. 202-203), as a result of the capitalist exploitation:

From the beginning we can realize that the worker, during all his lifetime, is nothing more than work force and because of that, all his available time is, by nature and right, working time, so it belongs to the capital self valuation. Time for human education, intellectual development, the fulfilment of social functions, to social association, to play games free from physical and spiritual vital forces, even the free time on Sundays - even in the nation of the Sabbath day – pure frivolity! But in its blind and excessive impulse, in its voracity for more work, the capital runs over not only moral limits but also those, purely physics, of the working day. It steals time to grow, to develop and to keep the body healthy. It steals time that we need to get fresh air and the sunlight. [...] It reduces the time we need to concentrate, to renew and to restore our vital force, to so many hours of torpor as possible in the rehabilitation of an absolutely exhausted organism.

[...] It (the capitalist production) prolongs the production time in a certain term, through the shortage of his lifetime. (author's line).

We can observe that capitalist logic becomes manipulator of people, with the desire to enlarge its most valuable ideas and, consequently, its profits; it forces the worker to depend on the job and the salary he gets from it to live. We are not here to make a criticism to capitalism. It is, as we all know (in a purist sense), something achieved by humanity, and yet, what it seems to be happening is a distortion of its responsibilities. One of those is to help mankind.

3.1 Culture of work/culture of leisure

We understand that the development of leisure depends (as in the historical account) on the social, economic, political and ideological conditions of each individual or social class.

We do notice that elites try to continue the ideology of work, and in this context, the development of leisure, so workers can get a secondary connotation on the occupation of working extra time. Bacal (1988, p. 41) considers that

[...] between the lines, are the place and the conception of leisure itself in the modern, industrial society. Those who call it superfluous or elitist think they are completely taken by the idea that leisure is synonym of idleness, and it's that characteristic that brings them, as a mark of distinction, the uninterested relation with arts, sports and other activities out of the working world.

On the contrary, the author complements that, “[...] the working classes, whose value is the production, would take the opposite position, and leisure to them would be, in consequence, a secondary activity, executed only in that time not taken by work” (Bacal, 1988, p. 41). Also, according to this author, the opportunities to the development of leisure are much greater to bourgeoisie, because the possibility to occupy it and to develop it with work is more accentuated, by two reasons: a) bourgeoisie can have more free time; b) its social economic conditions allow them to practice different types of activities. For workers, on the other hand, there are limitations that prevent them from the development of leisure activities: a) usually, they don't have much free time, resulting on the long working day (and when the working day is reduced the payment is reduced too); b) they don't have favourable conditions to access leisure practices, or the possibility to opt for other available varieties.

So, both social economic conditions and free time have influence in the development of leisure. We realize, then, that lower social classes have their opportunities reduced, relatively to leisure unlike the elites that can occupy it, thanks to the fact of being owners of the capital. The concept of leisure should be understood and defined by the quality of free time experience, that is, by the resulting values of the objective leisure's nature, by the resting time that leisure provides, by the satisfaction of a free and pleasurable action and by the creation of something as the free expression of itself, and not resulting of the social economic status.

3.2 The importance of resting

In this involvement of leisure as a quality experience, Lafargue (1999) proposes “the right to laziness”, considering work as the object of analysis. He makes a compliment to laziness as a condition to physical, psychological and political development of workers. He points out that workers are ideologically in love by their work and they don't realize that is due to their work force that they get poorer and poorer, in the way that, as much they produce less they receive by the work time spent in the production. That logic is in favour of the capital's

owners, who, with the excess of production, can sell more, mostly when the production has a low quality and little durability. The author proposes that through the rational use of machines and the huge quantity of raw materials and products we own, the reduction of the working day could reach three hours per day, during six months in a year. With that in mind, the worker would have access to the “virtues of laziness”, and, consequently, we all would have work.

In this context, Padilha (2006) proposes four points to discussion about the working day (having implications on free time and leisure), which started in the XIX century and remains until today:

- a) First of all, that the reduction of the working day doesn't mean to eliminate the abstract work;
- b) Second, that the reduction of the working day without the reduction of salaries has been a struggle, in which we still haven't been successful, considering that this matter could help in the solution to structural unemployment;
- c) Third, that the reduction of the working day doesn't mean the increase of “free time”, mostly in poor countries;
- d) Fourth, so that free time would be truly free, it would take a lot more than just the reduction of the working day, something like “the overcome of an economic rationality of capital” (p. 166).

We can understand that the achievement of “free time” goes beyond the reduction of the working day. That reduction, simply, doesn't give (to the worker), according to Antunes (1999, p. 86), a “life full of meaning”, because the capitalist logic continues to dictate the rules. It is necessary a human emancipation, so we can face these problems, and we need to have the will to change. Pronovost quoted by Padilha (2006), says that if we want to conquer a civilization, truly human (leisure as a foundational variable), we will have to fight for the capitalist logic overcome. It is through leisure that people can be fulfilled.

How to do such thing? One possible answer: through education and through culture, that raises life's value and meaning.

Part II

4. The compliment to education and to culture as an expression and conscience about the need for leisure

4.1. The compliment to education – to leisure

Before we talk about education to leisure, perhaps it may be important to explain what Education is. So, we bring here the reflection of Camilo Cunha (2008), who says that there is education only when there is a normative dimension of political, historical, social and cultural influence and the axiological dimension that feeds and is fed by values and culture. We would say, actually, that more than the normative dimension, what really substantiate the real education is the idea of culture and axiology, that, after all, constitutes itself as structural variables of the human knowledge. Education presumes the idea of “light”, the future's preparation, the construction of a critic mind, as we talk about being in the world...a new man, a new citizen (Camilo Cunha, 2008).

In what it concerns to “Education to leisure”, Aristotle and Plato, had already said that leisure is much more than just free time. The greek conception of leisure was based on a time to itself, which was a state or a condition, without worries. Eventually, with the Industrial Revolution, the reduction of the working day and the increase of free time, leisure became the meaning of a period that can be seen as “time off work”.

The most important jobs and concepts about leisure and education (for example, in Brazil), are based on the french sociologist Dumazedier theories (2001). That author defines leisure as a set of occupations, to which the individual can give himself to rest or to have fun, to recreate and entertain himself, or even to develop his own knowledge or uninterested formation, his social volunteer participation or his creative and free abilities, after get rid of his professional, familiar and social obligations. In his publications, the author doesn't consider the influence that the State (education) has in the definition of public politics (of formal, informal and non formal education) and in the constitution of public places, to the practice of leisure. As well as the perspective of the increase of free time to those who work represents a victory to the working class, being the broken result of the contradiction between capital and work. So, leisure gets a reduced understanding face to its potential. In Brazil, no matter how often the "dumazedian" concept is used, it has a lot of interpretations and one of them belongs to the author Marcelino (2004, p. 27), who defines it as:

A set of free, pleasurable, volunteer and liberating activities, focused in cultural, physical, manual, intellectual, artistic and associative interests, fulfilled on a stolen free time or historically achieved upon the domestic and professional working journey, and that interferes in the personal and social development of the individuals.

Although this concept involves a great possibility, we can understand that leisure is an achievement linked to the working day/free time. Marcelino (2004, p.53) believes that an accurate glance upon leisure could be something like "the right time to make some changes at cultural and educational levels. [...] The educator's attitude could assume a double function: to transform leisure into a changing or accommodating element, stimulating its function as a humanizer factor and at the same time mitigating the alienating dimension from a simple consume resource". This perspective about leisure's educational action and social diffusion goes through the democratization of the access to the necessary equipments and places to its practice. Therefore, it means to accelerate the changing process that will allow the installation of a new order at a cultural level, and with it new practices of leisure.

To better specify this concept of "education to leisure" we can assert that it has several connotations. To some, it means to transmit information related to leisure, through the educational system. Traditionally, education to leisure has been seen as a mean of knowledge and abilities (about leisure) transmission, giving opportunities, stimulating and helping to have conscience about the importance of participation in recreative programs, as well as post-scholar programs, that show the value about human development. The education to leisure or the education to free time, according to Marcelino, (2004, p. 56):

It has the goal to educate the individual, so he can live his available time in a more positive way, being a process of total development, and through it the individual extends his knowledge about himself, about leisure and its relations with life and the social "web".

The World Leisure and Recreation Association published, in 2002, The International Letter of Education to Leisure, and it has the goal to inform governments, organizations and teaching institutions about the meaning and benefits of leisure and education to/for leisure and also guide all the educational intervenients – schools, communities and institutions involved in the formation of human resources and also inform about the principles, through those we can develop politics and strategies on education and leisure.

The first reflections (recommendations) of that Letter refer to leisure as a specific area of human experience, with its own benefits, including the freedom to choose, to create, to seek satisfaction, fun and to increase pleasure and happiness. He argues that leisure could have a double function: it is a privileged mean to achieve personal and social development and at the same time an economic resource, a cultural and industrial product which generates jobs and

services; however, he points out that political, economical, social, cultural and environmental factors could also extend it (leisure) or make it difficult.

In the same legislative and organizational way, leisure, according to that same Letter, promotes health and well-being, and it says that people only reach to their full leisure's potential when they are involved in the decisions that define its conditions. This is another relevant aspect, the participation of population (individually or collectively) in the stipulation of dynamics and leisure's necessities. Besides being a basic right to which no one should be apart from, it is facilitated by the provision of basic conditions, such as security, residence, food, rent, education and social justice; it must be seen as a resource to improve the quality of life.

Having in consideration that the ideal conditions to leisure cannot be guaranteed only by the individual, because it requires a coordinated action by the governments, non – governmental and volunteer organizations, industries, teaching institutions and the media, education to leisure has an important role in the reduction of the differences about the conditions and in the guarantee of equality of opportunities and resources.

In this context, we would like to emphasize the importance of physical education teachers, because they have the proper and privileged knowledge to help about these matters. They work at school and in the community and they can strengthen the playful importance of games, of physical, sporting and recreative activities that people can practice in their free time. Nowadays, there isn't a professional of leisure, but a professional who understands about leisure, and we believe that physical education teachers can be a good reference in these matters. The performance of these professionals, today, covers a very broad and diverse area of expertise about free time, which is growing considerably, opening a great array of possibilities in physical education area. It is now that most people look up for leisure with the intention to improve their health, through physical, recreative and sporting activities. This way, a physical education teacher has a structural role in this process. From this observation, we recommend that the initial, continuous and specialized formation of these professionals should give a particular attention to this old and emergent matter.

4.2. The compliment to culture – to leisure

Before anything else, what is culture? Several areas of expertise characterize this phenomenon. Here, we will invoke a simple definition with what we can relate to. "Culture is what mankind adds to nature" (Hall, 2006; Patricio, 2009). It is what man adds to nature and to his nature (nature with an ecological dimension). Culture turns man into something wider, deeper, innovator, lighter and supposedly (desirably) better. We believe that an individual in a society, involved in culture, has more possibilities to change the way he thinks and acts, in these post-modern times and in this case, particularly, in what concerns to leisure and free time.

Leisure time is, for sure, a structural variable of a life time with quality (good life) as, for example, health – we want to emphasize health, because it seems to be the most concerning issue in the beginning of this century. A culture of leisure that has health as a reference. Adding (considering the concept of culture) some forms, strategies and activities to the individual that call upon health.

So, activities that configure themselves as leisure, organized with the understanding that education, culture, health and leisure should, side by side, develop inter-relationships, trying to achieve human well-being. In this context, Elias refers:

Whatever may be the relation that this need might have with other necessities, more elementary, like famine, thirst and sex – all the evidences emphasize the fact that it represents a much more complex phenomenon, a much less purely biological phenomenon – we could

even consider that the despise about the attention dedicated to this necessity is one of the biggest gaps in the approach of health problems (psychological, emotional, ...) (Elias, 1992, p. 136-7).

The culture issue – a culture of leisure in health (a human necessity) has now all the attention and, of course, we shouldn't look to health as a healing treatment field, but, above all, as a preventive – diagnosis field. So, education, health and leisure are institutions which established a “dialogue-trio” and so they permit preventive actions in the scope of collective health, and, specially, in psychological, emotional and spiritual health, such that emotions and feelings, in leisure, are substantial in contemporary society. About the necessity for the search of excitement in leisure (excitement understood as an ontological element of going forward, to achieve happiness) the following statement seems pretty clear.

In a simple or complex way, at a high level, leisure's activities provide, for a short time, the “eruption” of pleasant and strong feelings that are, often, absent in our life routines. Its function is not just, as we usually think, the liberation of tensions, but the renewal of that tension measure, which is a key ingredient in mental, emotional and spiritual health (Elias & Dunning, 1992, p. 137-8).

5. Final considerations

Free time and leisure justify themselves, by the ontological and anthropological value. It is an intrinsic, creative, subjective and opened process, directed to freedom, enjoyment and contemplation. It absorbs us in such a way that we feel lost before the wonder that is possible through its accomplishment. This event depends mostly on the subject, but not only. Education and culture (the compliment we want to make with this essay) seem to be the props and the springs (of impulse) to such dynamics. We know that modern and post-modern context has in rationalization the guidance to human life – in a pragmatic and useful way, with effectiveness and profits. Man, education, work, culture and free time/leisure seem to be hostages of those impulses. Work, education, culture and leisure shouldn't be considered profit machines. About this, Dumazedier points out that leisure, for example, in its ideal form would be an instrument of individual and social promotion, promoting, this way, free human integration in its social context.

So, we defend a way (consciously) that only an axiological education and a culture that adds something, that always brings something more, will permit (in this particular case) the realization of leisure to a better life, that is, a good life. This is our utopia, which we want to become much more (something real). While the rigid and humanly unwanted rules command life and free time (about work, education and culture), leisure, with a liberating and an accomplished form, won't exist. To do that, public politics, clubs, private sectors and institutions in general, should favour and broaden the possibilities of leisure to all the population, without exceptions. Possibilities of leisure that have in consideration people's concerns, their choices and their desires.

Referências Bibliográficas

Antunes, R. (1995). *Adeus ao trabalho?* Campinas: Unicamp.

_____. (1999) *Os sentidos do trabalho: ensaio sobre a afirmação e a negação do trabalho*. São Paulo: Boitempo.

Associação Mundial de Recreação e Lazer. (2012) Seminário Internacional de Educação para o Lazer. 2-4 ago. 1993, Jerusalém. *Carta internacional de educação para o lazer*. 6 fev. 2002.

Disponível em: <<http://www.saudeemmovimento.com.br/profissionais/legislation/index.htm>>. Acesso em: 4 de outubro de 2012.

Bacal, S. (1988) *Lazer: teoria e pesquisa*. São Paulo: Loyola.

Camilo Cunha, A. (2008) *Ser professor - bases de uma sistematização teórica*. Braga: Edições Casa do Professor.

Dumazedier, J. (2001) *Lazer e cultura popular*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.

Elias, N.; Dunning, E. (1992) *A busca da Excitação*. Lisboa: Difel.

Hall, S. (2006) *Da diáspora. Identidades e mediações culturais*. Belo Horizonte: Editora da UFMG.

Lafargue, P. (1999) *O Direito à Preguiça*. São Paulo: Hucitec/UNESP.

Marcelino, N. (2004) *Lazer e Educação*. São Paulo: Papyrus.

Marx, K. (1998) *O capital: Crítica da Economia Política*. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Cultural.

Padilha, V. (2006) *Shopping Center: A catedral das mercadorias*. São Paulo: Boitempo editorial.

Parker, S. (1978) *A Sociologia do Lazer*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.

Patrício, M. F. (2009). *Filosofia do currículo e formação de professores. Uma reflexão*: In: Medeiros, E. (Coord). Educação, cultura(s) e cidadania. Lisboa: Edições Afrontamento, p.73-81.

Silva, M. R. (2003) *Trama Doce-Amarga: exploração do trabalho infantil e cultura lúdica*. São Paulo: Hucitec/Unijui.