

## **Human rights, leisure and leisure studies**

Published at: A. J. Veal (2015) Human rights, leisure and leisure studies, *World Leisure Journal*, 57(4), 249-272, DOI: 10.1080/16078055.2015.1081271

### **Abstract**

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, endorsed by the United Nations in 1948, includes the right to leisure time, to cultural participation and to travel. While the idea of human rights permeates many aspects of national and international life, it appears not to have permeated the field of leisure studies to any great extent, unlike some cognate areas, such as sport and tourism studies. The purpose of this paper is not to remedy this situation but to argue that this neglect is unjustified and to suggest that leisure researchers might incorporate the idea of human rights and leisure rights into their work. The paper is divided into six main parts. First it considers the parallels between the neglect of human rights in sociology up until the 1990s and the continuing neglect in the field of leisure studies. Second, it considers the basis of human rights in general. Third, it examines the nature of the leisure rights declared in the Universal Declaration. Fourth, the place of leisure in general critiques of economic, social and cultural rights is assessed. Fifth, the relationship between human rights and a number of themes in leisure studies is briefly explored, including: the work/leisure divide; the individual versus society; freedom; gender; globalization; and policy. Finally some suggestions are made for a research agenda on human rights and leisure.

**Key words:** human rights; leisure studies; leisure rights; citizenship rights

### **Introduction**

A *right* is a morally and/or legally justified claim to have or to do something. *Human rights* are those rights to which all human beings are deemed to be entitled on the basis of their humanity alone (Donnelly, 2003, p.7). Rights may be claimed by individuals or groups – the rights bearers – on their own behalf or by others on their behalf. Rights cannot be realised, however, unless they are recognised by relevant others – the duty bearers or addressees – including individuals, communities and institutions such as governments. These actors may, of course, ignore, reject or resist rights claims and, even if they recognise them, may do little to secure their practical realisation. The securing of rights therefore often becomes a focus of campaigns, protest, struggle and negotiation. Rights claims and their recognition or rejection can therefore

be seen as philosophical, political and/or legal phenomena. Reflecting emancipatory philosophies, political struggles and legal solutions, some nations, such as France and the United States, have historically enshrined statements of human rights in their constitutions. However, in 1948, following the Great Depression, the horrors of two world wars and their aftermaths, the newly-formed United Nations recognised a need to ‘restate the basics of life, freedom and community’ on an international basis (Witte & Green, 2012, p.5). The result was the promulgation of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR).

The 30 articles of the UDHR, summarised in Table 1, can be divided into civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural (ESC) rights. Two of the ESC rights deal with leisure: Article 24, the right to leisure time, and Article 27, the right to cultural participation and protection of copyright. One civil right, Article 13, covers the right to travel. Leisure also interacts with the other listed rights, since the upholding or denial of human rights can take place in leisure contexts and denial of some rights, for example to subsistence or education, can compromise the exercise of leisure rights.

#### **INSERT: Table 1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights summary**

While the notion of human rights permeates many aspects of national and international life, it appears not to have permeated the field of leisure studies to any great extent. The purpose of this paper is not to single-handedly remedy the situation but to argue that this neglect is unjustified and to begin a dialogue by suggesting that leisure researchers might become more ‘rights-aware’ and might consider the ‘meaningful integration of rights-based ideas’ and ‘rights-based thinking’ (Connolly & Ward, 2008, p.9) into their work.

Over the 60 years since the promulgation of the UDHR, a substantial additional body of declarations, treaties and practice, from the United Nations and other organisations, has been developed. Examples of documents relevant to leisure are listed in Table 2, although it has not been possible to discuss all of them in detail in this paper. Since the key document, the UDHR, is not an enforceable treaty but a statement of principle endorsed by the UN General Assembly, enforcement is pursued by means of two supporting covenants, the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (ICCPR) and the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (ICESCR), which were promulgated in 1966. The UDHR, ICCPR and ICESCR are sometimes collectively referred to as the International Bill of Rights. The free time rights in Article 24, insofar as they relate to labour conditions, are in part monitored by the International Labour Organization, which was founded under the Treaty of Versailles,

following World War I, and became the first agency of the United Nations in 1945. When UN member states ratify these treaties, they are required to make periodic reports on measures taken to implement them within their countries, and subject themselves to evaluative review. The sanctions for poor performance under this far from perfect system (Chapman, 1996) are, however, of the ‘naming and shaming’ and advising kind only.

**INSERT:** Table 2. Other human rights declarations/treaties relevant to leisure

At a time when gross violations of human rights, including torture, illegal incarceration, slavery, human trafficking, racial discrimination and all forms of violence against the person, take place on a daily basis throughout the world (Human Rights Watch, nd), the appropriateness of giving consideration to leisure may be questioned. But leisure is intimately bound up with many human rights violations. In parts of the world censorship of the creative arts curtails freedom of expression. Throughout the world children are abused for the perverted leisure time pleasure of adults, often those with responsibility for their care. Others are denied leisure due to being forced to work excessively long hours in unacceptable conditions as indentured labour – in some cases to provide leisure clothing and equipment for affluent consumers. Players at sporting events are subject to racial abuse by spectators and others are discriminated against because of their gender or sexual orientation. In some parts of the world cultural expression is denied by the prohibition of cinema, secular music and dance. This paper is predicated on the principle that, if the assembled United Nations saw fit to recognise leisure among the list of human rights in 1948, then a certain obligation falls on those responsible for leisure education, research and service provision to at least examine the extent to which these rights are relevant to the field and the extent to which other rights are upheld or violated through leisure practices. This might make a modest contribution to the defence of the principle of ‘universal, indivisible and interdependent and interrelated’ human rights (World Conference on Human Rights, 1993, p.I.5).

The paper is divided into six main parts: 1. consideration of the parallels between the neglect of human rights in sociology up until the 1990s and the continuing neglect in the field of leisure studies; 2. examination of the basis of human rights in general; 3. examination of the nature of declared leisure rights; 4. discussion of the place of leisure in the general critique of ESC rights; 5. exploration of the relationship between human rights and a number of themes in leisure studies; and 6. a suggested research agenda for leisure and human rights.

### **Sociology, leisure studies and the neglect of human rights**

Some 22 years ago, Bryan Turner (1993: 489) observed that human rights had been ‘largely ignored by contemporary sociology’, due particularly to the influence of the writings of Durkheim, Weber and Marx which had resulted in resistance to any ‘universalistic human ontology’ (see also Hynes, Lamb, Short & Waites, 2010; Sjoberg, Gill & Williams, 2001; Somers & Roberts, 2008). He noted that, even though human rights debates and legislation were ‘major features of the socio-political processes and institutions of modern societies’, sociology possessed ‘no contemporary theory of rights’ (p.490). Given the strong influence of sociology on leisure studies, it is perhaps not surprising to find that these remarks can also be applied to leisure studies today. Turner (1993, p.496) further observed that a sociology of *citizenship* had ‘functioned as a substitute for a sociology of rights’. Based on the work of Marshall (1950/1992), citizenship rights are viewed as being associated with the provisions of the welfare state and are limited to a particular jurisdiction, originally the classical city state, but now more commonly the single nation state. They are therefore geographically and historically contingent rather than universal. Turner (1993, pp.498-9) observed: ‘The point about *human* rights is that they are extra-governmental and have been traditionally used to counteract the repressive capacity of states. By contrast, citizenship has been more frequently associated with state-building and state-legitimacy’. Human rights therefore provided a particularly appropriate framework for considering social issues in the context of globalization. John Urry (2000) has used the term: a ‘sociology beyond societies’. Turner (1993, p.508) proceeded to develop theoretical propositions based on the concepts of ‘human frailty, social precariousness and collective sympathy’. Other sociologists have concurred with him regarding the need for a sociology of human rights and offered their own proposals (e.g. Sjoberg, Gill & Williams, 2001; Somers & Roberts, 2008).

The parallels between Turner’s account of sociology and developments in leisure studies are marked. Regarding the neglect of rights in the field of study, the paucity of references in the leisure studies literature is clear. Some significant analyses of leisure rights exist, but generally outside the confines of mainstream leisure studies (e.g. Richards & Carbonetti, 2013; Risse, 2009).

In Britain, the only leisure scholar to devote more than a passing reference to rights has been Rojek (2005a, pp.197-9) in his brief critique of the World Leisure Organization’s *Charter for Leisure* (WLO, 1979/2000) and his exploration of the illicit accessing of copyright material via the internet (Rojek, 2005b). The topic has, however, arisen in leisure research relating to particular social groups, including those mentioned in United Nations rights documents. In the

case of women, for example, specific mentions have been made, albeit only in passing, by Deem (1982, p.44), who observed that ‘women do not always see leisure as something to which they legitimately have a right’, and by Green, Hebron & Woodward (1990, p.ix), who concluded that: ‘A woman’s right to freedom in leisure is circumscribed by her employment status and income level, her family situation and ...her lack of status as a woman in a patriarchal society’. In general, however, recent discussion of differential access to leisure resources has used the terminology of *inclusion/exclusion* (e.g. Collins, 2003), which reflects a focus on national or local citizenship rather than universal human rights. The idea of there being general rights to leisure for all and the possibility that such rights might be honoured or denied to varying extents has not arisen.

Leisure scholars in the United States have been similarly neglectful, despite living in a nation founded on the basis of one of the most famous of all declarations of human rights, the *American Declaration of Independence*. In this case, the neglect may be less a reflection of sociological orthodoxy than with the fact that North American leisure studies was influenced more by psychology than by sociology and may have been affected by the tone set by the United States government’s ‘dogged rejection of human rights in the domestic context’ (Somers & Roberts, 2008, p.400)<sup>1</sup>. An American leisure scholar who has given some attention to human rights is Karla Henderson. One contribution examines women’s sense of *entitlement* to leisure (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1991) but without using the term human rights. In an exposition of the idea of *just leisure* (Henderson, 2014) she refers to the WLO *Charter for Leisure* but expresses ambivalent views on human rights, as discussed below under gender. Others mentions include: Schor’s (1991, p.141) call for recognition of ‘a right to free time’; a more substantial discussion by Sylvester (1992) focussed on therapeutic recreation; and Mason’s (1999) brief examination of human rights as one of a number of ‘contemporary moral theories’ considered inadequate for addressing feminist issues. Only Sylvester (1992) refers to the UN declarations. Paralleling the British focus on inclusion/exclusion, in recent years a number of North American researchers have promoted the idea of allying leisure research to the pursuit of social justice, but have not used the terminology of human rights (Parry, Johnson & Stewart, 2013; Stewart, 2014).

Outside the Anglosphere, but in English translation, Dumazedier (1971, p.203) made a single observation on the historical emergence of the right to leisure in the twentieth century<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> This United States ‘exceptionalism’ is reflected in its being one of the handful of countries which have not ratified either the ICESCR or the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

<sup>2</sup> The leisure policy/professional sector is even more neglectful of human rights, an exception being the position statement of the (US) National Therapeutic Recreation Society (see Edginton *et al.*, 2006, p.127). Rare examples

As in sociology, the concept of citizenship rights also arose in leisure studies in Britain in the 1990s, and became enmeshed in debates about the welfare state versus the market, or the citizen versus the consumer. For example, Murdock (1994, p.247) noted the centrality of leisure in the ‘gathering debate on the future of citizenship’, but observed that, while ‘the rhetoric of rights’ foregrounded the idea of guaranteeing citizens equal access to a range of entitlements, this had been incorporated into the ‘rhetoric of consumerism which presents consumer rights as ... synonymous with the rights of citizenship’. This observation, while reflecting a long-standing suspicion of the market by many leisure sociologists (e.g. Parker, 1995; Rojek, 2010, p.189), was made against the background of policy developments in the UK. The Labour government of 1975 had asserted that recreation should be viewed as ‘part of the general fabric of the social services’ (Department of the Environment, 1975, p.1), and Henry (1995, p.52) later observed that public leisure services had become ‘recognised as rights of citizenship, the apex of the pyramid of welfare rights’. However, the Conservative government’s 1991 *Citizen’s Charter*, while seemingly a statement of citizens’ rights, sought to ‘drive reforms further into the core of the public services, extending the benefits of choice, competition and commitment to service more widely’ (Prime Minister, 1991, p.4). To the dismay of many leisure scholars, this was followed by policies requiring local councils to open up their leisure services to private sector management via competitive tendering. Coalter (1998), however, was critical of the common stance among leisure researchers which, in the absence of empirical evidence, held that the exclusive source of ‘the sense of freedom and self-fulfilment associated with social citizenship is to be found only in public provision’ (p.24). He called for research on ‘the extent to which the public and commercial sectors play a complementary role in the construction of social citizenship’ (p.34). It is not apparent that this call has been responded to in mainstream leisure studies, so the debate around citizenship rights and leisure remains stalled, although Howell and McNamee (2003) have explored the related concept of *local justice* .

In the United States, earlier neglect of human rights by sociologists was replaced by concern for citizenship rights, which was also influenced by the political environment, notably the threats to such rights posed by the ‘triumph of neo-liberalism’ in the 1990s (Somers & Roberts, 2008, p.400). The limited examples of leisure-related literature in this area have not raised the sorts of debates seen in the UK. Thus Hemingway’s (1999a) examination of ‘Leisure, social capital and democratic citizenship’ was concerned with local decision-making

---

of mentions in textbooks include Edginton *et al.* (2006, pp.127, 379), Veal (2010, pp.80-99) and Veal, Darcy & Lynch (2013, pp.102, 381-2).

based on representative compared with participatory democracy and did not mention rights at all. Rights and related political values figured strongly in Glover's (2002) empirical study of citizenship and public recreation services but as part of the mix of different citizen attitudes towards the politics of local public service provision.

Two areas in which consideration of citizenship rights has found a firm footing in leisure studies should be mentioned. The first is the study of therapeutic recreation and disability, where it has been adopted in preference to medicalised or welfare-based approaches, as Sylvester (1992) and Australian authors Darcy and Taylor (2009) show. This work also has strong links to universal human rights via the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* and parallel national legislation. The second area is concerned with traditional public rights of recreational access to land in the form of footpaths, national parks and beaches in Britain (e.g. Curry, 2000; Ravenscroft & Gilchrist, 2011) and Scandinavia (e.g. Campion & Stephenson, 2014). However, this research tends not to make links with the global context, such as the UNESCO (nd) system of designation of World Heritage Sites which seeks to secure global cultural heritage rights.

In general, then, it can be said that whatever the relationship might be between human rights and leisure it has not been subject to significant attention by leisure scholars. This contrasts with the reviews in cognate fields of study, including tourism (e.g. Lovelock & Lovelock (2013), sport studies (e.g. David, 2005; Donnelly, 2008; Giulianotti & McArdle, 2006; Taylor, 1999) and the arts (Ivey, 2008). While these areas of study are distinct, they deal with specific leisure forms, so their perspectives are potentially relevant to leisure studies and they are discussed later in the paper.

### **Human rights in principle**

The concept of human rights is not an undisputed one. Philosophical debate on the associated concept of citizen rights has a long history stretching back to the city states and empires of classical times. The Enlightenment prompted consideration of rights as bestowed by 'the Creator', as the *American Declaration of Independence* (Preamble) expressed it, or by nature, as indicated in the French *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen* (Article 4)<sup>3</sup>. It is not possible to review this history and associated debates here. Instead, the point of departure is the UDHR. The drafting committee did not expand on the philosophical basis for the document, but this is often considered to be one of its strengths, enabling different individuals to approach the document from different theoretical or philosophical standpoints. Examples include:

---

<sup>3</sup> Copies of these documents and many of the key UN documents can be found in Ishay (1997).

- Gutman's (2001, p.xi) minimalist pragmatic position, that: 'Human rights are important instruments for protecting human beings against cruelty, oppression and degradation. That's all we need to believe to defend human rights'.
- Ignatieff's (2001, p.55) proposition that rights are required because human safety is dependent on the articulation and defence of human 'free agency'.
- Turner's (1993) proposition, noted above, that a system of human rights is required because of the 'frailty' of human beings, precariousness of social systems and the existence of collective sympathy.
- Sjoberg *et al.*'s (2001, p.25) proposition that human rights are a means of 'constraining and channelling organized power'.
- The 'procedural' basis, as explained by Risse (2009, p.29): 'The list of rights within the UDHR has received its standing through a process that involved the drafting by a sophisticated and diverse committee, an adoption by the General Assembly, as well as endorsements through the subsequent ascendancy of other countries to the UN, and the role which the declaration has played as a reference point in international politics'. He might also have added that this is often reinforced by national legislative processes.

It is not proposed to endorse a single viewpoint in this paper; the UDHR statement in Article 1, that 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights', is considered an adequate basis for the discussion presented here, while recognising that there is scope for debate as regards the nature of the concepts involved (Bagaric & Allan, 2006).

One feature of the UDHR should be mentioned, namely that its 30 articles are statements of principle; they do not describe actual existing social conditions but make claims on, or prescriptions for, individuals, governments and societies. Member nations of the UN have therefore endorsed the principle that 'every individual and every organ of society' should 'strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance' (UDHR Preamble).

Before turning to the applications to leisure, we should note one of the major objections to the modern conception of human rights, namely that, being an expression of Western, Christian and Enlightenment values, it is incompatible with certain other religious and cultural traditions and can even be seen as a form of western moral imperialism. It has been claimed, most notably by former prime minister of Singapore, the late Lee Kuan Yew (Zakaria, 1994), that the priority given to individual personal, civil and political rights in the UDHR, contrasts with



Asian Confucian-related culture which respects order, authority and the role of the family (Bauer & Bell, 1999). However, this has been countered by the view that Eastern and Western traditions are not nearly as different as suggested (e.g. Kim, 1994; Sen, 1999, pp.231-2), and that the 'Asian values' narrative is simply an attempt to legitimate authoritarian forms of government (Kim, 1994; Tharoor, 1999; Chan, 2012). Many living under such regimes may therefore support, and seek to make political use of, universal human rights. Furthermore, of the east Asian countries for which Lee Kuan Yew claimed to speak, only Singapore and Malaysia have failed to ratify the ICESCR, while all the members of ASEAN (Association of South-East Asian Nations, 2012) have endorsed the 2012 *ASEAN Human Rights Declaration*, which follows the UDHR and ICESCR quite closely. Thus, there is a degree of procedural endorsement of human rights in east Asia despite the critical arguments. A similar debate has been conducted in regard to the relationship between Islam and human rights (Kayaoglu, 2014). However, Muslim states were extensively involved in the processes leading to the promulgation of the International Bill of Rights documents (Waltz, 2004). The 1990 *Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam* endorses a list of rights, albeit more limited than the UDHR, with reference to leisure limited to a statement on holidays (Article 13), and reference made to the ultimate authority of Allah and Shariah law (Organization of the Islamic Conference, 1990). As Donnelly (2013, p.57) points out, despite differences in philosophies and moral codes, and major variations in actual implementation, an 'overlapping consensus' has emerged internationally around the human rights set out in the UDHR. However, if this seems complacent, Hoover (2013, p.218) sees the field as characterised by 'plurality and contestation' and observes: 'In contrast to the legislative account of human rights, we can see an emerging agonistic understanding that focuses on the use of rights as contentious political claims that demand social transformation'.

### **The nature of leisure rights**

As highlighted in Table 1, the UDHR recognises three groups of leisure-related rights: the right to travel, the right to free time and the right to cultural participation. Here we concentrate on the latter two. What, precisely do these rights comprise?

Article 24 of the UDHR states that 'everyone has the right to rest, leisure including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay'. The use of the term *rest* and the reference to working hours and holidays suggests that, even though the subject is 'everyone', the drafters may have been thinking primarily of time away from work for

employed people. Indeed, in the ICESCR version of the statement it is one of four items under the heading, 'just and favourable conditions of work'.

The view that these rights are primarily an aspect of labour rights is apparent in Risse's (2009) analysis and in David's (2006, p.3) observation that they are referred to in UN documents 'overwhelmingly ... in the particular and restricted context of working conditions'. Donnelly (2003, p.57) points out that the rights arose from reactions to a 'common assault on the dignity of workers, from nineteenth-century factories in Manchester, to twentieth-century sweatshops in New York, to textile and electronics factories across Southeast Asia today'. As noted above, international cooperation to limit working hours pre-dated the UDHR in the establishment of the International Labour Organization in 1919. Cross (1989) points out that during the Great Depression, there was widespread international support for limitation of working hours to share the available work around and reduce unemployment, thus seeking to secure the right to employment for millions. Furthermore, if countries pursuing such a policy were not to be placed at a competitive disadvantage, it was seen as desirable to secure international agreement to act together (Risse, 2009: p.6). In the contemporary environment, international labour standards continue to have a part to play in supporting the rights of workers in all countries, but particularly in seeking to prevent, although not always successfully, a competitive 'race to the bottom' among employers in developing countries offering cheap labour to industrial contractors and consumers in developed countries.

While the term 'rest and leisure' could be simply a 'turn of phrase' it may have been intended to refer to two types of free time activity. Thus *rest* could refer to the time required to recover mentally and physically from work, including relaxation and sleep, while *leisure* could refer to more purposive activity unrelated to recuperation from work. Arguably, a minimum amount of *rest time* is necessary to ensure the worker's well-being, but time for *leisure* can be open-ended. This issue is discussed further below in relation to work/leisure research in leisure studies.

'Periodic holidays with pay' is a bone of contention in the critical human rights literature as discussed below. Again there is a lack of explanation in the UDHR, but it is reasonable to interpret it as implying that the well-being of workers requires relief from work not just on a daily and weekly basis but also on an annual basis.

Tempting though it is, therefore, for leisure scholars to interpret the UDHR statement, 'everyone has the right to rest and leisure', in isolation, its context and subsequent developments in human rights discourse suggest that the term 'everyone' was probably intended to refer to employed workers, who were overwhelmingly male at the time of the

publication of the UDHR in 1948. Efforts could be made to promote a ‘leisure time for all’ interpretation. This interpretation is, for example, assumed in the WLO’s (1979/2000) *Charter for Leisure*, but it does not explicitly address the ambiguities of the UDHR and ICESCR terminology.

Given the work and time-related focus of the right to free time, the issue of leisure rights as *activity* rights might be more profitably explored through UDHR Article 27 (and ICESCR Article 15). This declares, unequivocally for *everyone*, a right to ‘participation in cultural life’<sup>4</sup>. The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights sees culture as encompassing:

ways of life, language, oral and written literature, music and song, non-verbal communication, religion or belief systems, rites and ceremonies, sport and games, methods of production or technology, natural and man-made environments, food, clothing and shelter and the arts, customs and traditions through which individuals, groups of individuals and communities express their humanity and the meaning they give to their existence.(UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 2009, p.4)

Furthermore, the committee asserts that securing the right to cultural participation involves ensuring access to:

libraries, museums, theatres, cinemas and sports stadiums; literature, including folklore, and the arts in all forms; the shared open spaces essential to cultural interaction, such as parks, squares, avenues and streets; nature’s gifts, such as seas, lakes, rivers, mountains, forests and nature reserves, including the flora and fauna found there. (UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 2009, pp.4-5)

The committee therefore affirms the broad scope of culture, but also highlights the fact that the term is used in two senses. The *minority culture* sense refers to the rights of minority groups to practice their unique cultures in the context of the existence of mainstream national or regional majority cultures and/or of globalisation. Securing *minority cultural rights* involves ensuring measures are taken, and a range of leisure and non-leisure resources are available, for minority cultures to flourish in the context of cultural diversity. The *general culture* sense refers to the right of the totality of members of a society to engage with culture generally. Securing *general cultural rights* involves overcoming class, educational, ethnic, economic and supply constraints to engagement in cultural activity whether related to majority or minority

---

<sup>4</sup> The UDHR (Art. 27) refers to *freely* participating in the cultural life *of the community*, but these qualifications are not included in the ICESCR.

cultural traditions. This in turn involves consideration of just what constitutes the ‘cultural life’ and the range of ‘cultural goods, institutions and activities’ in which the general right to participate is to be ensured. The *minority culture* conception links so closely with wider UN preoccupations with self-determination and development that, in UN and related discussions of culture (e.g. Shaheed, 2013; Hansen, 2002), it is often given emphasis at the expense of the *general culture* conception.

In general, therefore, the leisure-related rights, as expressed in the UDHR and related covenants, declare a right to free time on a daily and annual basis for workers, with the application to non-paid-workers somewhat ambivalent. In addition, the documents declare a right to cultural participation for all in its *general culture* sense and in regard to the leisure components of its *minority culture* sense.

### **Challenges to ESC rights and leisure rights in particular**

Despite the UN’s affirmation that human rights are ‘universal, indivisible and interdependent and interrelated’ (World Conference on Human Rights, 1993, p.I.5), a number of critics have questioned the legitimacy of ESC rights, with leisure-related rights, notably holidays with pay, being particularly vulnerable. Thus, Richards and Carbonetti (2013, p.329) point out that Article 24 is one of the ‘most routinely attacked sections of the UDHR’, while Macmillan (1986, p.295) notes that, for the critics, holidays with pay ‘is clearly the least defensible of the social rights’. Nickel (1982, p.263), while defending an inclusive and flexible conception of human rights, argues that a distinction must be made between benefits such as ‘holidays with pay which are merely good things’ and other benefits and freedoms ‘whose availability is of such paramount importance that it is appropriate to view them as rights’. Risse (2009, p.34) and Walzer (1983, p. 196), while accepting limitation of working hours as a right, see holidays with pay as too prescriptive. Tharoor (1999, p.2) observes that the right to holidays with pay is ‘always good for a laugh in the sweatshops of the Third World’. Bargarac and Allan (2006, p.258) see rest and leisure as being among a list of ‘so-called rights that are probably best placed in a wish list’.

Cranston (1983) adopts a similar stance to these commentators, but argues his case against ESC rights on three grounds: impracticality; lack of universality; and lack of paramount importance. However, he invariably refers to leisure rights, particularly holidays with pay, as examples to illustrate his argument, as indicated in the following.

In regard to *impracticality* Cranston (1983, p.13) asks: ‘How can the governments of those parts of Asia, Africa and South America, where industrialization has hardly begun, be

reasonably called upon to provide social security and holidays with pay for the millions of people who inhabit those places?’ Even Peffer (1978, p.85), who supports the idea of ESC rights in general, nevertheless declares: ‘though it may seem plausible to attribute the right to regular holidays with pay to members of advanced industrial societies, given their wealth, it seems absurd to attribute such a right to the members of the poorest third-world nations’. However, Richards and Carbonetti (2-13, p. 343) relate how a number of South American countries were influential in the inclusion of limitation of working hours and holidays with pay in the UDHR and ILO (nd) data indicates that, of the 36 countries which have ratified the most recent convention on holidays with pay, 13 are developing countries. Other commentators (e.g. Macmillan, 1986, pp.287-92; Nickel, 1982, p.259) draw attention to the cost of implementing some civil and political rights, such as maintenance of police forces to ensure security of the person and of legal systems to ensure fair treatment at law, and yet poor countries are expected to implement them. Furthermore, it can be argued in general terms that the cost of ensuring a right is hardly of itself a valid argument for not recognising the right as legitimate (Donnelly, 2013, p.42).

If rights cannot be immediately implemented due to resource constraints, the preamble of the UDHR this raises the possibility that some may be *aspirational*, when it refers to ‘progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance’. The ‘progressive realization’ (Fukuda-Parr, Lawson-Remer & Randolph, 2015, Box 2.1) stance has been defended by Richards and Carbonetti (2013), drawing on Harvey (2004), who argues that virtually all legal enactments begin as aspirational and often have a chequered history before being fully legislated and enforced. The universal nature of rights also implies that wealthy nations should assist less wealthy nations in their implementation, and this can be seen as the basis of much international aid and of the UN Millennium Goals programme (UN General Assembly, 2000).

Regarding *universality*, Cranston (1983, p.13) observes: ‘The right to a holiday for pay, for example, can only be enjoyed by people who are paid’. However, the implication that rights are only valid if they apply to all individuals at all times, is not justified. For example, only adult citizens may exercise the right to vote in elections, and the right is denied to imprisoned criminals in many jurisdictions, while the right to due process in law is called upon only when a person is involved in a legal action. While leisure rights attached to employment may refer only to a proportion of the population at any one time, they apply to virtually everyone at some stage in their lives: everyone can be said to have these rights, to be exercised as and when

required. This idea is similar to the valuation of 'option demand' in welfare economics (Gratton & Taylor, 1991, p.71).

In regard to *paramount importance*, Cranston (1983, p.14) observes: 'Common sense knows that fire engines and ambulances are essential services, whereas amusement parks and holiday camps are not'. The use of these particular examples would seem to be an attempt on Cranston's part to trivialise the argument. However, his assertion is intended to apply to all ESC rights, and these include employment with reasonable working conditions (including time off), some form of social security and minimal education. For a society to ensure a full suite of political and civil rights but not to uphold these rights would surely be seen as, to use Cranston's (1983, p.12) own criterion, 'a grave affront to justice'. If a given society is not able to afford to implement certain of these rights the 'grave affront to justice' becomes international in scope. This is the essence of the UN Millennium Goals Programme which, while focussing on rights associated with eradication of poverty, still reaffirms the UDHR in its entirety (United Nations General Assembly, 2000).

Also of relevance here is the concept of *human needs*, which is accepted by some as a basis for consideration of human rights (e.g. Macmillan, 1986, p.291; Sylvester, 1992, p.14), although rejected by others (e.g. Donnelly, 2003, p.13). One perspective on human needs, the well-known Maslow (1954/1987) hierarchy, though not without its critics (e.g. Doyal & Gough, 1991, p.36), postulates that needs are arranged in a hierarchy, with increasing urgency, saliency or importance attaching to higher order needs as the lower order needs are met. However, needs which are lower in the hierarchy are not any the less needs and the fact that certain needs are not being met and/or are not salient at various times or places does not mean that they stop being needs. The idea of a hierarchy of rights comparable to a hierarchy of needs has been explored by Montgomery (2002).

In regard to paramount importance of leisure-related rights in general, Richards and Carbonetti (2013, pp.334-5) offer a defence by summarizing a number of arguments familiar to leisure studies scholars concerning the potential value of leisure in enhancing mental and physical well-being, self-actualization, life satisfaction and children's development and the long-term negative consequences of the denial of leisure activity.

It can be argued, therefore, that ESC rights, including leisure rights, can be defended, in terms of Cranston's criteria of practicality, universality and paramount importance, if: account is taken of the idea of progressive realization for some rights; it is accepted that all rights may not be exercised by everyone at all times; and consideration is given to the full range of ESC rights.

## **Human rights and leisure studies**

In a field such as leisure studies the phenomenon of human rights can be studied as both an institution which acts in interaction with individuals and other institutions and a normative standpoint which interacts with, or competes with, other normative systems to influence human behaviour. Both paradigms occur in leisure studies. To give an indication of the possible linkages which might be developed between leisure studies and human rights, six topics are briefly examined here, namely: the work/leisure divide; the individual versus society; freedom; gender; globalization; and policy.

### ***Work and leisure***

As discussed above, the UDHR's right to 'rest and leisure' might be interpreted as referring to two types of free time: time necessary to rest and recuperate from the exertions of work; and time over and above this to pursue more purposive leisure activities. Marx (1867/1957, pp. 268-9) spoke of the struggle between labour and capital over the acceptable length of the working day, to ensure time for 'the growth, the development, and healthy maintenance of the body ... for consumption of fresh air and sunshine ... meal time .. and healthy sleep for the collection, renewal, and refreshment of the vital powers', but also for 'education, for intellectual development, for the fulfilment of social functions, for friendly intercourse, for the free play of physical and mental forces'. By the 1920s and 1930s most workers in the West had secured a reduction in working hours which provided them with free time which was widely seen as being over and above that required for rest and recuperation. However, commentators raised questions as to whether they were equipped to use such additional time fruitfully (e.g. Cutten, 1926, p.95; Nash, 1932, pp.9-10). In the post-World War II era, one of the earliest themes of leisure studies was its relationship with work (e.g. Smigel, 1963; Parker, 1971). Curiously, however, this research did not continue the distinction between rest/recuperation time and other components of leisure. Furthermore, despite the fact that the research took place after the publication of the UDHR, the link with the declared human right of limitation of working hours was not made.

Later, this focus on the work/leisure relationship was much criticised and the field of leisure studies moved on to other issues. More recently, however, a number of work/leisure issues have arisen which suggest that this abandonment may have been premature. These issues include: the working conditions and welfare of workers in developing countries, particularly when involved in providing (leisure) goods for consumers in economically developed

countries; evidence of lengthening working time in the industrialised world (ILO, 2007); and intensifying problems of ‘work-life balance’, including the effect of mobile devices in enabling work activity to usurp the worker’s leisure time and the ‘double shift’ imposed on women (Hochschild, 1990). These developments can be seen as a failure to gain the right to ‘reasonable limitation of working hours’ in developing countries and its attrition in developed countries. A fruitful vein of rights-related research therefore lies largely under-exploited by leisure scholars.

### ***Individual vs society***

It could be said that human rights encapsulates one of the great divides in the field of leisure studies, namely that between North America, with its psychologically-influenced concerns with individuals and their motivations, and Europe, notably Britain, with its focus on the societal context within which leisure activity takes place (Coalter, 1999). Human rights might be seen as paralleling this divide in being claimed on behalf of individuals, but being collectively recognised and facilitated, or denied, by society and its institutions. However, while there have been efforts by some North American authors to move ‘beyond individualism’, they have tended to invoke human rights as part of the individualism syndrome. For example, Arai and Pedlar (2006, p.189), in noting with disapproval an increasing tendency towards individualism in leisure in the context of the consumer society, see claims of ‘leisure as a right’ as part of this tendency. Henderson (2014), while introducing the construct of *just leisure*, which takes account of such matters as environmental sustainability of leisure activity, social justice and impacts upon others, and affirming the right to leisure by reference to the World Leisure Organization’s *Charter for Leisure*, also seems to see this as a feature of the individualist approach. She declares: ‘If leisure in the twenty-first century could be viewed less as an individual right and more as a universal responsibility, leisure could move beyond a consumption model’ (Henderson, 2014, p.73). However, these comments downplay the fact that rights involve addressees as well as bearers. Therefore, as Donnelly (2013, p.31) puts it: ‘Individual rights are a *social* practice that creates systems of obligations between individuals and groups of various sorts’.

### ***Freedom***

Critical leisure theorists see freedom, or emancipation, as central, and it is, as Article 1 indicates, at the heart of the UDHR. In Hemingway’s (1996, pp.36-7) terms: ‘the task of a critical theory of leisure is therefore emancipating leisure’. It might therefore be expected that



the concept of human rights, which has ‘become the most common language of emancipation’ (Risse, 2009, p.14), would be relevant to critical leisure scholars. However, the focus of critical theorists’ discussion of freedom has been on challenging definitions of leisure involving the concept on the grounds that, for individuals living under capitalism, it tends to be conceived in terms of freedom of choice in consumption, which is not in fact free but shaped and manipulated by market forces (e.g. Clarke & Critcher, 1985, p.233; Rojek, 2000, p.207; 2005a, pp.197-201; 2010, pp.1-3), or at least threatened by them (Spracklen, 2013, p.238). Consequently, it is argued, the achievement of true freedom requires a fundamental change in the social order. Other sociologists, however, hold that developed market-based systems do offer people a wide degree of, but not unlimited, freedom of choice in terms of consumption, activities and lifestyles (e.g. Roberts, 2006, pp.202-10; Giddens, 1991, pp.80-81), while Sen (1999, pp.26-7) argues that the limited freedoms offered by the market can be preferable to the lack of freedom imposed by poverty or non-market regulation. Interestingly, both groups of theorists *imply* that they view freedom as a human right which should figure in any consideration of the place of leisure in individuals’ lives and in society.

The above debate involves primarily British authors, suggesting that the North American-European divide is also apparent in this domain. While a number of North American scholars, adopt the critical stance (e.g. Andrew, 1981: pp.182-3; Kelly, 1987, p.203; Hemingway, 1996, 1999b), for the most part, in the North American literature, freedom, or ‘perceived freedom’, in leisure is viewed primarily as a personal/psychological phenomenon. As Neulinger (1974, p.15) put it: ‘The primary dimension of leisure ... is freedom or, to be more specific, *perceived freedom*. ... Whether such a perception is true freedom or only the illusion of it, is irrelevant ... Even illusions have real consequences and the crucial consequence of the illusion of freedom is leisure’. There is little room for human rights in such a paradigm: there is no consideration of the nature of the forces, **just or unjust**, which might be responsible for creating the illusion. There are North American critics of the free choice conception of leisure, but their analyses do not involve either the critical stance or a human rights approach. Thus, for example, Harper (1986) critiques the use of the concept of freedom of choice in leisure, not on the grounds that it is potentially illusory, but that considering only the process of *choosing a leisure activity* does not address the sense of freedom which should be involved in the actual *experience of engaging* in the activity. Stebbins (2005, p.351), while accepting that choice of leisure activity is illusory because it is constrained by structural factors, claims to have solved the problem simply by renaming it when he includes in his definition of leisure the expression: ‘uncoerced activity undertaken during free time’. The

leisure ‘constraints’ literature recognizes that leisure choice is not fully free because it is constrained by, among other factors, structural constraints (Jackson, 2005). However, it assumes that these are to be addressed not by considering their source but by individual negotiation and/or substitution of alternative activities (Mannell & Kleiber, 1997, pp.341-5).

As Sen (1999, p.231) puts it, since the concept of a right involves addressees as well as bearers, it ‘goes beyond the value of the corresponding freedom’, so that ‘the language of rights can supplement that of freedom’.

### ***Gender***

Gender, particularly the situation of women and girls, has been a major focus of leisure studies since the 1970s. Early signs of recognition of the issue of rights in this body of research is evidenced by an Australian survey of women with dependent children which discovered a widely held belief that, unlike men, they did not ‘need nor have the right to follow their interests or develop any kind of social life outside their family’ (Anderson, 1975, p.43). Above, we noted similar comments by Deem (1982) and Green *et al.* (1990), but they were not linked to the broader debates on human rights. Later references are limited. Horna (1994, p.25) referred to a report of Canadian women's use of human rights legislation in the area of sport, and Mason (1999) considered the limitations of a human rights perspective for discussing feminist ethics. Henderson, Bialeschki, Shaw and Freysinger (1996, pp.284-5) assert the right to leisure for all but, in briefly examining a possible ‘equal rights scenario’ for the future, manage to avoid the use of rights language (pp.281-2). While rights declarations have been made in relation to women in sport (IWGWS, 2014) these feature only in passing in feminist leisure studies literature (e.g. Aitchison, 2003: pp.94-5). So, despite women’s general campaigns for equal rights, which are reflected in the standpoint of much feminist leisure studies research, the language of human rights has not featured significantly in the literature on women and leisure. A similar observation could be made on LGBT-related leisure research in which such terms as social justice and emancipation are used but not human rights (e.g. Robinett, 2014).

Particular mention should be made of the 1979 *Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women*, which includes the right to participation in sport, recreation and cultural activity. However, no critique seems to have been made of the fact that, while the document lists ten work-related equality rights, it does not mention the right to limitation of working hours and holidays, despite the fact that, as far back as the nineteenth century, labour regulations, particularly limitations on working hours, first applied to women and children. A

more recent International Labour Organisation (2007) report recognised these rights for women but only on the grounds of the burden of women's domestic responsibilities, not their right to leisure time.

### ***Globalization***

There can be no doubt about the significance of the impact on leisure of such global phenomena as the internet, satellite-facilitated broadcasting, the reach of multi-national enterprises and mass international travel. While these developments are discussed in the leisure studies literature (e.g. Best, 2010, p. 260-320; Jarvie & Maguire, 1994, pp.230-63; Rojek, 2005a, pp.10-12), the existence of globally promulgated leisure-related human rights does not form part of such discussions. Arguably, a human rights perspective could facilitate the engagement of leisure studies with key issues at the global, as well as national, but cross-national comparative research on leisure participation (e.g. Cushman, Veal & Zuzanek, 2005) and policy (e.g. Bramham, Mommaas & Van der Poel, 1993) tend to ignore universal human rights.

### ***Policy at national and local level***

A human rights dimension could be a relevant additional factor to examine in local and national policy-related research and practice. It has been noted above that citizenship rights have featured in leisure policy-related debates in the context of national welfare state regimes. In such discussions, however, leisure tends to be studied in regard to deprivation defined primarily in terms of such matters as income, employment, education, health and housing. This research has not therefore been concerned with leisure rights as such but with the leisure activity patterns of groups who are disadvantaged in terms of non-leisure rights.

Human rights, and leisure rights in particular, have not generally featured in formal national leisure-related policy or planning documents. Thus, rights did not feature in a recent review of over 80 sets of government, professional and academic planning guidelines, covering leisure/recreation, sport, tourism and the arts (Veal, 2011). And yet it might be thought that the authority of a policy or planning document might be enhanced by the inclusion of a statement to the effect that its subject matter is a human right. Crompton and West (2008) note isolated, and eventually unsuccessful, attempts to address inequitable distribution of leisure facilities as a rights issue related to anti-discrimination provisions of the U.S. Constitution.

At national level, the fact that a country's government and/or legislature has, or has not, ratified a human rights treaty can be a useful reference point in policy analysis since it offers an

indication of the government/legislature's formal position on a topic and can be a means of holding it to account. This is done in leisure-related disability research, in which legal cases of discrimination in regard to access to leisure services are the focus of analysis (see Darcy & Taylor, 2009). This approach has not, however, been pursued in other leisure research areas where human rights issues might be thought to be relevant. The example of gender is noted above. Research on leisure and race, while influenced by the civil rights movement in America in its early phase, is now less focussed on rights (Floyd, 2007).

Cross-nationally, the World Leisure Organization has a potential role to play through further elaboration and promotion of its *Charter for Leisure* (WLO, 1979/2000), which is a rather less substantial document than comparable charters in cognate areas, such as the UNESCO *International Charter of Physical Education, Physical Activity and Sport* (UNESCO, 2014) and the World Tourism Organization's *Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code* (UNWTO, 1985).

### ***Cognate areas***

As noted earlier in the paper, researchers in a number of cognate areas of study have been more active in exploring rights issues. Thus Lovelock and Lovelock (2013) have reviewed the relationship between international tourism and human rights, noting that over-zealous pursuit of the right to travel may have a negative impact on the rights of residents of destination communities, while Richards (1998) has examined the relationship between tourism and employee holiday rights/entitlements. The considerable rights-related literature in the area of sport studies includes an overall review by Donnelly (2008), a set of conference proceedings edited by Taylor (1999) and a collection of papers edited by Giulianotti & McArdle (2006). Sport-related writing is also typically concerned with negative impacts of sport practices on other rights, for example: exploitation of young athletes (e.g. David, 2005; Brackenridge *et al.*, 2014) and the impacts of major sporting events on the housing of disadvantaged groups and freedom of speech and assembly in host communities (e.g. Adams & Piekarz, 2015; Lenskyj, 2008; Timms, 2012). The direct right to participate, enshrined in the 'Sport for All' slogan, is implicit in the campaigns against the South African apartheid system through sport boycotts in the 1980s (Booth, 2003), while Roche (2000, p.176) explores the related concept of rights which might be exercised through the communications media, expressed in the term 'TV sport for All'. We have also noted that researchers in the area of leisure and disability have embraced a rights-based framework (e.g. Darcy & Taylor, 2009). Because of its link with ethnic cultural identity, cultural activity has benefited from analysis by a United Nations rapporteur (Shaheed,

2013), while Ivey (2008) has explored the commercial control of cultural heritage copyright material such as photographic images and recorded music. It could be argued that all of this can be seen as part of the multi-disciplinary field of leisure studies, but there seems to be remarkably little permeation of these rights concerns into the leisure studies mainstream.

### **Towards a human rights and leisure research agenda**

In regard to traditional areas of leisure research, such as those discussed above, the call here is for an increased *rights awareness*. The question could be posed: to what extent might the securing or denial of access to leisure be viewed as the securing or denial of a human right to which organisations at local, provincial, national and global levels are formally committed?

The potential for research on specific leisure/human rights topics is considerable. Some possibilities include:

- infringements of the right to reasonable limitation of working hours, paid and unpaid, and its corollary, the right to leisure time, related to economic exploitation in developing countries and work/life balance and sustainability issues in economically developed countries;
- the interaction between the precepts of religions and leisure freedoms/rights;
- copyright issues, particularly related to the internet, as already explored by Rojek (2005b); and
- discrimination in leisure contexts in relation to race, gender, sexuality and disability, \in the context of group-specific global rights movements; and
- child exploitation and abuse in leisure contexts.

There is scope for policy-related research, which might raise awareness among policy-makers of their moral and legal obligations under rights treaties which states have endorsed.

Possibilities include:

- examination of the leisure-related content of member states' periodic reports to the UN on progress with ICESCR implementation;
- cross-national research on the extent to which leisure rights are mentioned in national constitutions (Van Maarsveen & Ven der Tang, 1978) and rights legislation;
- investigation of adjudicated leisure-related cases of discrimination under national or regional (EU) anti-discrimination legislation in relation to gender and race, comparable to research already conducted in relation to disability; and

- ways in which leisure might be incorporated into human rights measurement and indexing frameworks, given its general neglect in current systems (Fukuda-Parr *et al.*, 2015; Landman, 2004; United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2012).

### Conclusion

This paper has drawn attention to the existence of the international framework of universal human rights and the possibility of its application to the leisure studies domain. It has documented some of the debates surrounding human rights in general and economic, social and cultural rights and examined the nature of the leisure rights included in international treaties. Attention is drawn to the neglect of the concept of human rights in leisure studies, both in Britain and the United States, and its relevance to a number of key themes in the field, including the work/leisure divide, the individual and society, the concept of freedom, gender, globalization and public policy. Ideas for a research agenda in the area are also offered. In conclusion, it can be suggested that awareness of the universality of leisure-related human rights might assist leisure studies to become a more globally connected field of study.

### References

- Adams, A., & Piekarz, M. (2015). Sport events and human rights: positive promotion or negative erosion? *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*. Online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2014.997864>.
- Aitchison, C.C. (2003). *Gender and leisure*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, R. (1975). *Leisure: an inappropriate concept for women?* Canberra: AGPS.
- Andrew, E. (1981). *Closing the iron cage*. Montréal: Black Rose Books.
- Arai, S., & Pedlar, A. (2006). Moving beyond individualism in leisure theory. *Leisure Studies*, 22(3), 185-202.
- Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) (2012). *ASEAN Human Rights Declaration*, available at: [www.asean.org/news/asean-statement-communicues/item/asean-human-rights-declaration](http://www.asean.org/news/asean-statement-communicues/item/asean-human-rights-declaration).
- Bargarac, M., & Allan, J. (2006). The vacuous concept of dignity. *Journal of Human Rights*, 5(2), 257-70.
- Bauer, J.R., & Bell, D.A. (1999). Introduction. In J.R. Bauer & D.A. Bell (Eds), *The East Asian challenge for human rights* (pp.3-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Best, S. (2010). *Leisure studies*. London: Sage.
- Booth, D. (2003). Hitting apartheid for six? The politics of the South African sports boycott.

- Journal of Contemporary History*, 38(3), 477-93.
- Brackenridge, C.H., Rhind, D., & Palmer, S. (2014). Locating and mitigating risks to children associated with major sporting events. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, online: DOI: 10.1080/19407963.2014.911516.
- Bramham, P., Henry, I., Mommaas, H., & Van der Poel, H. (Eds) (1993). *Leisure policies in Europe*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Campion, R., & Stephenson, J. (2014). Recreation on private property: landowner attitudes towards *allemansträtt*. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 6(1), 52-65.
- Chan, J.C.W. (2012). Confucianism and human rights. In J. Witte & M.C. Green (Eds), *Religion and human rights* (pp.87-102). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chapman, A.C. (1996). A 'violations approach' for monitoring the international covenant on economic, social and cultural rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 18(1), 23-66.
- Clarke, J., & Critcher, C. (1985). *The devil makes work: leisure in capitalist Britain*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Coalter, F. (1998). Leisure studies, leisure policy and social citizenship: the failure of welfare or the limits of welfare? *Leisure Studies*, 17(1), 21-36.
- Coalter, F. (1999). Leisure sciences and leisure studies: the challenge of meaning. In E.L. Jackson & T.L. Burton (Eds), *Leisure studies: prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp.507-19). State College, PA: Venture.
- Collins, M.F. (2003). *Sport and social exclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Connolly, M., & Ward, T. (2008). *Morals, rights and practice in the human services*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Cranston, M. (1983). Are there any human rights? *Daedalus*, 112(4), 1-17.
- Cross, G. (1989). *A quest for time*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Crompton, J.L., & West, S.T. (2008). The role of moral philosophies and operational criteria in determining equitable allocation of resources for leisure services in the United States. *Leisure Studies*, 27(1), 35-58.
- Curry, N. (2002). Access rights for outdoor recreation in New Zealand: some lessons for open country in England and Wales. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 64(4), 423-35.
- Cushman, G., Veal, A.J., & Zuzanek, J. (Eds) (2005). *Free time and leisure: international perspectives*. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing.
- Cutten, G.B. (1926). *The threat of leisure*. New Haven, CN: Yale university Press.

- Darcy, S., & Taylor, T. (2009). Disability citizenship: an Australian human rights analysis of the cultural industries. *Leisure Studies*, 28(4), 419-41.
- David, P. (2005). *Human rights in youth sport*. London: Routledge.
- Deem, R. (1982). Women, leisure and inequality. *Leisure Studies*, 1(1), 29-46.
- Department of the Environment (1975). *Sport and recreation, Cmnd 6200*. London: HMSO.
- Donnelly, J. (2003). *Universal human rights in theory and practice, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal human rights in theory and practice, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Donnelly, P. (2008). Sport and human rights, *Sport in Society*, 11(4), 381-94.
- Doyal, L., & Gough, I. (1991). *A theory of human needs*. London: Macmillan.
- Dumazedier, J. (1971). Leisure and post-industrial societies. In M. Kaplan & P. Bosserman (Eds), *Technology, human values, and leisure* (pp.191-220). Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Edginton, C.R., DeGraaf, D.G., Dieser, R.B., & Edginton, S.R. (2006). *Leisure and life satisfaction, 4<sup>th</sup> Edn*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Floyd, M. (2007). Research on race and ethnicity in leisure: anticipating the fourth wave. *Leisure/Loisir*, 31(1), 245-54.
- Fukuda-Parr, S., Lawson-Remer, T., & Randolph, S. (2015). *Fulfilling social and economic rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Glover, T.D. (2002). Citizenship and the production of public recreation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(2), 204-31.
- Gratton, C., & Taylor, P. (1991). *Government and the economics of sport*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Green, E., Hebron, S., & Woodward, D. (1990). *Women's leisure, what leisure?* Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Giulianotti, R., & McArdle, D. (Eds) (2006). *Sport, civil liberties and human rights*. London: Routledge.
- Gutman, A. (2001). Introduction. In A. Gutman (Ed.) *Human rights as politics and idolatry* (pp. vii-xxviii). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hansen, S.A. (2002). The right to take part in cultural life. In A. Chapman & S. Russell (Eds), *Core obligations: building a framework for economic, social and cultural rights* (pp. 279-303). Antwerp: Intersentia.
- Harper, W. (1986). Freedom in the experience of leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 8(2), 115-30.



- Harvey, P. (2004). Aspirational law. *Buffalo Law Review*, 52(4), 701-26.
- Hemingway, J.L. (1996). Emancipating leisure: the recovery of freedom in leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(1), 27-43.
- Hemingway, J.L. (1999a). Leisure, social capital and democratic citizenship. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31(2), 150-65.
- Hemingway, J.L. (1999b). Critique and emancipation toward a critical theory of leisure. In E.L. Jackson & T.L. Burton (Eds), *Leisure studies: prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp.487-506). State College, PA: Venture.
- Henderson, K. (2014). The unsustainability of leisure: the sustainability of just leisure. In S. Elkington & S.J. Gammon (Eds), *Contemporary perspectives in leisure* (pp.67-78). London: Routledge.
- Henderson, K.A., & Bialeschki, M.D. (1991). A sense of entitlement to leisure as constraint and empowerment for women. *Leisure Sciences*, 13(1), 51-65.
- Henderson, K.A., Bialeschki, M.D., Shaw, S.M., & Freysinger, V.J. (1996). *Both gains and gaps: feminist perspectives on women's leisure*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Henry, I. (1995). Leisure and social stratification: the response of the state to social restructuring Britain. In K. Roberts (Ed.), *Leisure and social stratification* (pp. 49-58). Eastbourne, UK: Leisure Studies Association.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1990). *The second shift*. New York: Avon Books.
- Hoover, J. (2013). Rereading the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: plurality and contestation, not consensus. *Journal of Human Rights*, 12(2), 217-41.
- Horna, J. (1994). *The study of leisure: an introduction*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Howell, S., & McNamee, M. (2003) Local justice and public leisure policy. *Leisure Studies*, 22(1), 17-35.
- Human Rights Watch (nd). *Web-site: www.hrw.org*. New York: Human Rights Watch, accessed May 2015.
- Hynes, P., Lamb, M., Short, D., & Waites, M. (2010). Sociology and human rights: confrontations, evasions and new engagements. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 14(6), 811-32.
- Ignatieff, M. (2001). *Human rights as politics and idolatry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- International Labour Organization (nd). *Ratification of C132 – Holidays with Pay Convention (Revised), 1970*. Geneva: ILO, available at [www.ilo.org](http://www.ilo.org), accessed June 2015.

- International Labour Organization (ILO) (2007). *Working time around the world*. Geneva: ILO, Available at: [www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/media-centre/press-releases/WCMS\\_082827/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/media-centre/press-releases/WCMS_082827/lang--en/index.htm), accessed Jan. 2015.
- International Working Group on Women & Sport (IWGWS) (2014). *Brighton plus Helsinki Declaration, 2014*. Gaborone, Botswana: IWGWS, at: <http://iwg-gti.org/past-iwg-world-conferences-and-their-legacies/>.
- Ishay, M.R. (Ed.) (1997). *The human rights reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Ivey, B. (2008). *Arts Inc.: how greed and neglect have destroyed our cultural rights*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jackson, E.L. (Ed.) (2005). *Constraints to leisure*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Kayaoglu, T. (2014). Giving an inch only to lose a mile: Muslim states, liberalism and human rights in the United Nations. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 36(1), 61-89.
- Kelly, J.R. (1987). *Freedom to be: a new sociology of leisure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Kim, D.J. (1994). Is culture destiny? The myth of Asia's anti-democratic values: a response to Lee Kuan Yew. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(6), 189-94.
- Landman, T. (2004). Measuring human rights: principle, practice, and policy. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 26(4), 906-31.
- Lenskyj, H.J. (2008). *Olympic industry resistance*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lovelock, B., & Lovelock, K.M. (2013). Human rights. Ch. 4 of, *The ethics of tourism* (pp. 63-94). London: Routledge.
- Macmillan, C.M. (1986). Social versus political rights. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 19(2), 283-304.
- Mannell, R.C., & Kleiber, D.A. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Marshall, T.H. (1951/1992). *Citizenship and social class*. London: Pluto Press.
- Marx, K. (1867/1957). *Capital, Vol. I*. London: Dent.
- Maslow, A. (1954/1987). *Motivation and personality, 3rd Edn*. New York: Longman.
- Mason, S. (1999). Beyond flow: the need for a feminist ethics of leisure. *Leisure Studies*, 18(3), 233-48.
- Montgomery, J.D. (2002). Is there a hierarchy of rights? *Journal of Human Rights*, 1(3), 373-85.
- Murdock, G. (1994). New times/hard times: leisure, participation and the common good. *Leisure Studies*, 13(4), 239-48.

- Nash, J.B. (1932). *Spectatoritis: re-creation not wreck-creation*. New York: Sears Publishing.
- Neulinger, J. (1974). *The psychology of leisure*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Nickel, J.W. (1982). Are human rights utopian? *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 11(2), 246-64.
- Nickel, J.W. (2007). *Making sense of human rights*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Organization of the Islamic Conference (1990). *Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam*. Document A/CONF.157/PC/62/Add.18. New York: UN, available at: [www.un.org/en/ga/documents/symbol.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/ga/documents/symbol.shtml), accessed Feb. 2015.
- Parker, S.R. (1971). *The future of work and leisure*. London: McGibbon & Kee.
- Parker, S. (1995). Market and non-market leisure. In G. McFee, W. Murphy & G. Whannel (Eds), *Leisure cultures* (pp.139-44). Eastbourne, UK: Leisure Studies Association.
- Parry, D.C, Johnson, C.W., & Stewart, W. (2013). Leisure research for social justice: a response to Henderson, *Leisure Sciences*, 35(1), 81-7.
- Peffer, R. (1978). A defense of rights to well-being. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 8(1), 65-87.
- Prime Minister (1991). *The Citizen's Charter*. Cmnd 1599, London: HMSO.
- Ravenscroft, N., & Gilchrist, P. (2011). Outdoor recreation and the environment. In P. Bramham & S. Wragg (Eds), *The new politics of leisure and pleasure* (pp. 45-62). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richards, D.L., & Carbonetti, B.C. (2013). Worth what we decide: a defense of the right to leisure. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 17(3), 329-49.
- Richards, G. (1998). Time for a holiday? Social rights and international tourism consumption. *Time and Society*, 7(1), 145-60.
- Risse, M. (2009). A right to work? A right to leisure? Labor rights as human rights. *Law & Ethics of Human Rights*, 3(1), 1-39.
- Robinett, J. (2014). Heteronormativity in leisure research: emancipation as social justice. *Leisure Sciences*, 36(4), 365-78.
- Roche, M. (2000). *Mega-events and modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Roberts, K. (2006). *Leisure in contemporary society*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn. Wallingford, UK: CABI
- Rojek, C. (2000). *Leisure and culture*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Rojek, C. (2005a). *Leisure theory*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rojek, C. (2005b). P2P leisure exchange: net banditry and the policing of intellectual property. *Leisure Studies*, 24(4), 357-69.
- Rojek, C. (2010). *The labour of leisure*. London: Sage.
- Schor, J. (1991). *The overworked America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Shaheed, F. (2013). *The right to freedom of artistic expression and creativity: report of the special rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Doc. A/HRC/23/24*. New York: UN General Assembly.
- Sjoberg, G., Gill, E.A., & Williams, N. (2001). A sociology of human rights. *Social Problems*, 48(1), 11-47.
- Smigel, E.O. (Ed.) (1963). *Work and leisure*. New Haven, CN: College & University Press.
- Somers, M.R., & Roberts, C.N.J. (2008). Toward a new sociology of rights: a genealogy of 'buried bodies' of citizenship and human rights. *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences*, 4, 385-425.
- Spracklen, K. (1913). *Leisure, sports and society*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stebbins, R.A. (2005). Choice and experiential definitions of leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 27(4), 349-52.
- Stewart, W. (2014). Leisure research to enhance social justice. *Leisure Sciences*, 36(4), 325-39.
- Stewart, W.P., Parry, D.C., & Glover, T.D. (2008). Writing leisure: values and ideologies of research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 40(3), 360-84.
- Sylvester, C. (1992). Therapeutic recreation and the right to leisure. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 26(2), 9-20.
- Taylor, T. (Ed.) (1999). *How you play the game. Papers from the first international conference on sports and human rights*. Sydney: University of Technology, Sydney.
- Tharoor, S. (1999). Are human rights universal? *World Policy Journal*, 16(4), 1-7.
- Timms, J. (2012). The Olympics as a platform for protest: a case study of the London 2012 'ethical' Games and the Play Fair campaign for workers' rights. *Leisure Studies*, 31(3), 355-72.
- Turner, B.S. (1993). Outline of a theory of human rights. *Sociology*, 27(3), 489-512.
- UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) (1985) *Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- United Nations (2000). *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. New York: UN, available at: [www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf](http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf), accessed, Jan. 2015.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (2014). *International charter of physical education, physical activity and sport*. Paris: UNESCO, available at: [www.un.org/rights](http://www.un.org/rights), accessed Jan. 2015.
- United Nations Committee on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights (2009). *Guidelines on treaty-specific documents to be submitted by states parties under articles 16 and 17 of the ICESCR*. Document E/C.12/2008/2. New York: UN.

- United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (nd). *World heritage*. Website: <http://en.unesco.org/themes/world-heritage>, accessed June 2015.
- United Nations General Assembly (2000). *United Nations Millennium Declaration*, (document A/Res/55/2). New York: UN, available at: [www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm](http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm), accessed March 2015.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2012). *Human right indicators: a guide to measurement and implementation*. New York: UN.
- Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies*. London: Routledge.
- Van Maarseveen, H., & Van der Tang, G. (1978). *Written constitutions: a computerized comparative survey*. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana.
- Veal, A.J. (2010). *Leisure, sport and tourism, politics policy and planning, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edn*. Wallingford, UK: CABI.
- Veal, A.J. (2011). Planning for leisure, sport, tourism and the arts: goals and rationales. *World Leisure Journal*, 53(2), 119-48.
- Veal, A.J., Darcy, S., & Lynch, R. (2013). *Australian leisure, 4<sup>th</sup> Edn*. Sydney: Pearson.
- Waltz, S. (2004). Universal human rights: the contribution of Muslim states. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 26(4), 799-844.
- Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice: a defense of pluralism and equality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Witte, J., & Green, M.C (2012). Introduction. In J. Witte & M.C. Green (Eds), *Religion and human rights* (pp.3-24). New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Conference on Human Rights (1993). *Vienna declaration*. New York: United Nations, available at [www.un.org/en/rights](http://www.un.org/en/rights), accessed May 2015.
- World Leisure Organization (WLO) (1979/2000). *Charter for Leisure*. Available at: [www.worldleisure.org/userfiles/file/charter.pdf](http://www.worldleisure.org/userfiles/file/charter.pdf), accessed June 2015.
- Zakaria, F. (994). Culture is destiny: a conversation with Lee Kuan Yew. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(2), 108-26.

**Table 1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights: summary**

---

*Article Everyone has the right to:*

---

*e*

---

**General**

1 Personal freedom and dignity. Obligation to behave ‘in the spirit of brotherhood’.

2 Enjoyment of all declared rights regardless of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

---

**Civil and political rights**

3 Life, liberty and security of person.

4 Freedom from slavery.

5 Freedom from torture or cruel, inhuman, degrading treatment or punishment.

6 Equal recognition before the law.

7 Equal protection before the law.

8 Effective remedy against unjust treatment by authorities.

9 Freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

10 Fair and public hearing regarding any criminal charge.

11 Presumption of innocence. No retrospective legislation.

12 Privacy of family, home, correspondence. Freedom from attacks upon honour or reputation.

**13 Freedom of movement/travel, domestically and internationally.**

14 Right to seek and enjoy asylum from persecution.

15 Right to nationality.

16 Right to marry and establish a family, with free and full consent.

17 Right to ownership and security of property.

18 Freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

19 Freedom of opinion and expression.

20 Freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

21 Right to participation in democratic government processes. Equal access to public services.

---

**Economic, social and cultural rights**

22 Social security and economic, social and cultural rights considered indispensable for a person’s dignity.

23 Employment, free choice of employment, just and favourable conditions of work and protection against unemployment. Equal pay for equal work. Just and favourable remuneration. Membership of a trade union.

**24 Rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.**

25 An adequate standard of living.

26 Free (elementary) education.

**27 The right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts. Author’s protection of moral and material interests in scientific, literary or artistic production.**

28 Social and international order to protect UDHR rights and freedoms.

---

**Other**

29 Individual’s duties to the community.

30 Exercising of one right should not threaten others.

---

Source: [www.un.org/rights/](http://www.un.org/rights/) also see Ishay (1997) for copies of the UDHR and a number of the documents listed in Table2. Leisure-related rights in **bold**.

**Table 2. Other Human rights declarations relevant to leisure**

<i>General</i>	1966	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)
	1966	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
<i>Social groups</i>	1979	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
	1989	Convention on the Rights of the Child
	1989	Convention Concerning Indigenous & Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries
	1999	Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious or Linguistic Minorities
	2002	Political Declaration and Madrid International Plan of Action on Ageing
	2006	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
<i>Regional etc.</i>	1961	European Social Charter (European Union)
	1981	African (Banjul) Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights
	1990	Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam (Organization of the Islamic Conference)
	2012	Social Charter of the Americas
	2012	ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) Human Rights Declaration
<i>Activity-specific</i>		
<i>Free time</i>	1919-	Labour Standards (working hours, holidays) (International Labour Organization)
<i>Leisure</i>	1979/2000	Charter for Leisure (World Leisure Organization)
<i>Sport</i>	1996§	The Olympic Charter (International Olympic Committee)
	1992	European Sports Charter (Council of Europe)
	1979/2014	International Charter of Physical Education, Physical Activity & Sport (UNESCO)
	1979	Bill of Rights for Young Athletes (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance)
	2014	Brighton plus Helsinki 2014: Declaration on Women & Sport (International Working Group on Women & Sport)
<i>Culture</i>	2001	European Declaration of Urban Rights (European Commission)
	2001	Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO)
<i>Tourism</i>	1980	Manila Declaration on World Tourism (UN World Tourism Organization)
	1985	Tourism Bill of Rights and Tourist Code (UN World Tourism Organization)
	1998	Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (UN World Tourism Organization)
	2006	Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on Social Tourism in Europe (European Union)