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Free time is the time spent on tasks that are not official.

However, this is not always the case as most people do not have the boundary between personal tasks and officials tasks. When presenting his views, the author navigates his arguments around the sociological view, political view and philosophical view. The paper, therefore, critiques Adornos position on free time including his choice of examples. Throughout this article, the author provides his views concerning free time and its applicability. He begins by addressing the question concerning time, what people do with it, the opportunities that evolve from it, and indicates that it must not be taken as an abstract generalisation. In tracing the origin of the term “ free time” the author juggles around recent terminologies like leisure time.

Adorno indicates that free time depends on the totality of social aspects, which continues to hold individuals under it. In other words, people spend free time doing activities that have no basis just as a way of escaping boredom. The author also talks about the personal utilisation of free time. According to him, he does not have the boundary between real-time work and leisure; he considers all of them serious.

He indicates that organised freedom is compulsory in ones life. He further curses that anyone who does not have free time or hobbies, is old fashioned and is likely to fall to ridicule in society concerning free time. The author also indicates that the act of dozing in the sun marks the culmination of a crucial element of free time. In addition, he indicates that it would be foolish and erroneous to expect a lot of things out of ones free time.

The author sums up, at the end of the article, with the evidence that, in as much as people highly consent to the offering from the society, they have reservations with the social processes. In his words, “ the real interests of people are still strong to resist. ” He concludes that if they carry on with this stand, then free time will no doubt turn out into proper freedom. ‘ Free time’ has varied meanings derived from ‘ leisure’– privileges of a comfortable and unconventional lifestyle. The term refers to something qualitatively different: generally a time taken by work, still bound to it.

It is something given by social totality. As deduced from the article, there is no real freedom in free time or work, no independence; it is all an issue of social functions, which is deep that nearly every social life aspect is functionally determined. Besides, free time has no authentically free will, it is still being coined. As identified from the article, increased output should increase people’s free time, nevertheless, this still will be in the un-freedom realm.

The idea of hobbies for instance, Adorno does not have any. Therefore, this does not mean that he is a workaholic. Hobbies, according to the author, are mere trivialities employed to kill time. The author, for instance, listens to music, makes music and reads. He further admits that his job provides no serious resistance to this preference.

Time after time, concerns with hobbies indicate the way reification has taken place. In fact, hobbies are a measly continuance of a profit based social life. To be precise, this is observed clearly in terms like the leisure industry or show business. Camping and tourism are clearly organised for income.

The perceptible separation of free time and work is only maintained based on the fact that free time is needed for recreation and to recreate labour power. This generally explains its significance in bourgeois society. It as well explains the ‘ inanity’ of leisure. In fact, this is a component of a general effort to stamp out the unruliness, and to administer and organise everything.

This give details concerning the influence of the ‘ hobby ideology. ’ In fact, the force to take up hobbies indicate that organised freedom is required, whilst not to take part is to risk being branded as an ‘ eccentric’ or ‘ swot. ’ In seeking to attain any understanding of any philosophers work, one should start by asking oneself what encouraged her or his philosophical labours. Therefore, what was Adorno trying to attain via his philosophical writings? His philosophy is inherently apprehensive of the human suffering. His philosophical aspects are founded upon a fundamental moral conviction: that the human civilisation development has been attained via the combination of insidiously oppressive political and social systems, to which people are all exposed.

In the author’s diagnosis of what he identified as life that is damaged, comprises in the critical character of his assessment of the impacts of contemporary societies upon their residents, together with a tentative, but a dedication to a belief in the likelihood of the eradication of pointless suffering. Adorno’s bleak diagnosis of the modern world is grounded within an uncertain anticipation for a better world. In the article, there is a clear connection with the culture industry. The work tended to presume a domination of the unconscious and conscious of clients.

Nonetheless, it is clear that end user consciousness has not been fully dominated. The culture industry concerned the coverage of the Princess Beatrix wedding by the media. How did the public in German react to the publicity of the wedding? Could this episode qualify the personalisation ideology? Where the personality value is overstated to offset the social determination of ordinary life? It was obvious that this was simplistic; just as an example to show the way critical theory requires experiential, social research. Therefore, the political import of the occasion was straightforward. Generally, the mass culture products cannot be popular if people are not enjoying them, and that culture must be self-determining in its management.

This aspect denies Adorno modern political mileage, when he argues that politics in a successful society is entirely centred on action rather than with thought. Adorno’s work stems from his inability to make practical inferences from his theories. Besides, there is also a lack of reliability in his assertions to be implementing Marxism. Marx’s theory was based on the compliance of the working people to overthrow those in power, but Adorno seems to suggest that the industry culture has destabilised the revolutionary movement.