

**Socialised Labour under Change: Collaboration, Contracted Labour
and Collective Modes of Production in Art since the 1960s**

Danielle Leanne Child

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of PhD
The University of Leeds
School of Fine Art, History of Art and Cultural Studies
September 2011

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The right of Danielle Leanne Child to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

© 2011 The University of Leeds and Danielle Leanne Child

Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to Dr Gail Day for her support, advice and feedback given throughout my research. In particular, I thank Dr Day for her invitation, in 2006, to hear Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello speak at King's College in London, which ignited my interest in *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. Thank you.

Thank you also to Dr Andrew Warstat for reading and commenting on an early draft of my second chapter and to my good friends (and fellow academics) Rebecca Wade and Amy Charlesworth for their invaluable advice and friendship, particularly in the final stages of my PhD.

I would like to express my gratitude to the University of Leeds for the financial assistance that I received by way of a University Research Scholarship.

I have had the opportunity to present my research at a number of conferences over the past four years. As such, I am grateful for the opportunities given and the feedback received at various stages of my research and writing, which have shaped my thinking. I am also thankful to my students who, no doubt, have inadvertently assisted my development.

Finally, I would like to thank Logan Helps and my parents, Janet and David Child, for their continuous support throughout my research, and especially in my write-up year.

Abstract

Adopting an historical materialist methodology, this thesis examines how artistic labour is affected under specific phases of capitalism from monopoly through neoliberal capitalism. It is not the intention here to argue that artists directly adopt or accept capitalist tropes; rather, it is to argue that the recent socialised artistic practices have a dialectical relationship to the social turn that capitalism has recently taken.

The first chapter considers the establishment of US art fabrication firms in relation to the renewal of the deskilling thesis in the late 1960s by Harry Braverman. I argue that the deskilling that occurred in art making in the late 1960s – often termed the ‘dematerialisation of art’ (Lippard and Chandler) - was a response to the ideological changes that originated from the implementation of Taylorist and Fordist production methods in the US.

The second chapter addresses the establishment of the Mike Smith Studio in London – an artist facilitator – in terms of the ‘new spirit’ of capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello). I argue that the Mike Smith Studio was able to emerge as a business model within the UK because of the changes implemented by the ‘new spirit’ ideology and its accompanying neoliberal tropes (such as flexibility, individuality, the network and an increase in contracted labour).

My final chapter delineates two socialised artistic practices that exemplify opposing reactions to neoliberal ideologies: relational aesthetics and art-activism. I argue that relational aesthetics adapts to these ideologies whilst art-activism attempts to critique capitalism by stepping outside of the art institution and into ‘everyday life’. Art-activism does not, however, divorce itself entirely from neoliberalism by doing so. I conclude my thesis by considering these newer artistic practices in relation to the task of the historical avant-garde (that is, the return of art to life praxis) and propose that the art-activists are the art practitioners who have come closest to achieving this task.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

Introduction	... 1
Labour in Art: Part One	... 2
<i>The Representation of Work</i>	... 3
<i>Working Practice</i>	... 7
<i>Representation Takes on a Social Cause</i>	... 14
<i>A Pseudo-Social Period?</i>	... 18
Labour in Art: Part Two	... 20
<i>The Historical Division of Labour in Art</i>	... 21
<i>The Makers: The Artist's Assistant</i>	... 24
<i>The Makers: The Business of Art Making</i>	... 29
Methodology	... 32
<i>Productive and Unproductive Labour in Art</i>	... 37
<i>A Note on 'Socialised Labour'</i>	... 39
<i>Labour and Pre-Capitalist Production</i>	... 41
Socialised Labour under Change	... 46
Overview of the Thesis	... 47
Chapter One - Dematerialisation, Contracted Labour and Postproduction: The Deskilling of the Artist in the Age of Late Capitalism	... 52
The Labour Process	... 56
Braverman and 'The Degradation of Work'	... 60
<i>The Process of Deskilling</i>	... 64
<i>Braverman's Legacy</i>	... 68
Ford, the Model T and Fordism	... 70
The 'Dematerialisation of Art'?	... 75
<i>Production Methods or Industrial Aesthetic?</i>	... 92
<i>Minimal Manufacture</i>	... 98
Deskilling Beyond Mid-Twentieth Century American Sculpture	... 101

<i>'Master' of all Trades, Jack of None: Hirst's Division of Labour</i>	... 102
<i>Surplus Value and Spots</i>	...106
Conclusion	...108
Chapter Two – The Worker as Artist (and its respondents)	...110
Many Hands Make Light (Art) Work: The Neoliberal Effect	...111
<i>'Flexible Accumulation', Neoliberalism and the 'New Spirit' of Capitalism</i>	...113
<i>Capitalist Co-optation: The Two Models of Critique</i>	...116
<i>The 'New Spirit' of Neoliberalism?</i>	...121
<i>'Toyotism': A Note on the Japanese Model</i>	...126
The Mike Smith Studio	...130
<i>The 'Great Man': Mike Smith Studio & the 'New Spirit'</i>	...133
<i>'Facilitator' as the New Worker, or the Commodified Personality</i>	...137
<i>The 'Flexible Personality'</i>	...141
Conclusion	...145
Chapter Three – Neoliberalism and the New Social Artistic Practices	...148
Capitalism and Incorporeality: Immaterial Labour and the Commodification of Subjectivity	...149
<i>Immateriality and Relationality in Art</i>	...154
<i>Thomas Hirschhorn – Artist as Project Manager?</i>	...160
The Art-Activist	...170
<i>Affective Action</i>	...178
<i>The Activist and the Virtuoso</i>	...185
<i>Biting the Hand that Feeds: Knowledge versus Capitalism</i>	...187
<i>The Revival of the 'Social Critique'</i>	...191
<i>Pseudo-Corporate Dissent: etoy</i>	...194
Conclusion	...198
Conclusion – Art into Life: The Artist-Turned-Cinematographer or the Call of the 'New' Avant-Garde	...204
The Work of Art in the Age of Technological Production	...205
Performance versus Action	...209
<i>Collaboration as Performance</i>	...211

<i>Art into Life: the Call of the Historical Avant-Garde</i>	...214
<i>The Yes Men: Fact or Friction?</i>	...218
Conclusion	...219
Afterword - Nobody is Safe: The Art-makers and the Economic Crisis	...221
Bibliography	...224

- Introduction -

This is a thesis about labour, and more specifically, labour in art production. Moreover, it is a thesis about the relationship between the labour of work and the labour of non-work. It is not the labour of the individual (artist) that has pushed my research forward, but the collective labour of artists, assistants, facilitators and, sometimes, non-artist groupings - what I consider to be the entire process of arriving at an artwork. The hidden nature of labour in art history has only begun to become unravelled in debates over the past ten years in art-historical circles; as such, there is much study yet to be undertaken.¹ In this introduction, I consider the existing assumptions about art and work and look to how labour in art has been presented in art history.² One of the key questions that drive my thesis is: when did the term ‘labour’ become a ‘dirty word’ in discussions of art? Or, to put another way: when did labour disappear from art production, or accounts of art in art history? In order to begin to answer these questions, a brief look at the history of labour in art is necessary.

Firstly, the section titled ‘Labour in Art: Part One’ addresses what are assumed to be the more commonly imagined manifestations of work in art. Through presenting a history of practices in which works of art are not necessarily made by the artist him or herself, in the section titled ‘Labour in Art: Part Two’, I introduce my own approach to

¹ Key discussions include *Artforum*, ‘The Art of Production’ edn (November 2008), which devoted a large amount of the edition to articles about artists’ assistants, larger facilitators and methods of art production, culminating in a roundtable discussion of artists, facilitators and dealers. *Third Text*, ‘Art and Collaboration’ edn, ed. by John Roberts, 18:6 (2004). *Art Monthly* has also engaged these debates more recently with key commentators on the subject being associated with Free art collective. Julia Bryan-Wilson’s book *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California, 2009) was also published during this period of research, which is invaluable for thinking about how artists perceived themselves as workers in 1960s’ America.

² Even within the social history of art, publications have more often approached the subject of art and labour predominantly in terms of its visual representation. For example, Valerie Mainz and Griselda Pollock’s two-volume publication titled *Work and the Image. Work and the Image Volume One - Work Craft and Labour: Visual Representations in Changing Histories* and *Work and the Image*, ed. by Mainz and Pollock (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000); *Work and the Image Volume Two - Work in Modern Times: Visual Mediations and Social Processes*, ed. by Mainz and Pollock (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

the subject of art and labour. The two sections are distinguished from one another by a shift from that which is commonly perceived to be the topic of 'labour and art', in part one, to my own concern with the labour *of* art, in part two. I conclude the introduction by elaborating on the terms and methodologies drawn upon for this thesis.

Labour in Art: Part One

In this section I take a look how labour is presented in art history in order to situate various aspects of my project. I do not attempt to relay an exhaustive history of labour in art under capitalism; rather, I discuss a range of ways through which labour in art has been considered, with a particular emphasis on socialised labour. It becomes clear that, throughout history, labour in art takes on different roles. Rather than present these roles as a fixed chronology, I wish to view certain uses or functions of labour that are associated with specific periods of capitalism. I identify these functions as the representation of work, working practice, representation as 'social work' and an encouraged or pseudo-sociality. There are crossovers between periods in which these uses occur and one function of labour in art may be similar to another function that appears in a different period. Accordingly, these categories are not definitive. As we shall see in the following section, there is a pattern which helps us to think of art in relation to the context in which it was made. 'Labour' here, simply means people working - workers or work - which encompasses the artist (as worker) and non-artist alike. The category is not restricted to manual labour; it incorporates a more contemporary conception of labour such as office/clerical/administrative work and extends to include tools and instruments of work (such as machinery).

The Representation of Work

First a disclaimer: ‘representation’ is a loaded term and one has to bear in mind that it is distinct from replication or reproduction which refer to an attempt to create realistic *copies*. Re-presentation - presented again - involves passing through the ‘eyes of the artist’ (so to speak), and it is these eyes that are historically and socially conditioned. Their ‘view’ is *not* neutral; even the photographer has to choose the scene that she wishes to present. There are myriad choices, social conventions and ideologies that may have conditioned the ‘representative’ images that I discuss. Representation, for this analysis, means the depiction of work or labour, whether it is politically neutral or (more plausibly) not.

Labour appears as representation in the art of the earlier periods of capitalism. It is aligned with social change, where changes in everyday working conditions (part of everyday lives) are recorded in paint.³ For example, labour operates on the level of representation when it appears in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century painting - such as in the paintings of Jean-François Millet and Gustave Courbet. In these examples, the artists depict the working lives of the peasants and these depictions are clearly operating at a representational level; they are images of work and labour. In his analysis of Courbet’s *The Stonebreakers* (1849), T.J. Clark claims that it is a painting that not only portrays the physical presence of labourers but, more importantly, one that delineates

³ An important example of an image of the working class in Britain is William Bell Scott’s *Iron and Coal on Tyneside in the Nineteenth Century* (c.1856). It depicts first and foremost, iron and coal workers in action. However the painting is loaded with industrial imagery: A strong worker wielding a mallet alongside his co-workers draws the viewer’s eye to the centre of the painting. The steam train signals the advent of steam (a sketch on the lower right-hand corner depicts a steam train whilst another locomotive moves over a bridge in the distance at the top right-hand side). In the near distance we view ships and port activity which is no doubt a nod to trade. There is a large chimney - signifying the factory - and also a ‘fat capitalist’ with top hat in the background of the painting.

physical labour.⁴ For Clark, this is a rare image of work – one that prioritises the *physicality* of manual work, not the ‘feelings of the individuals that perform it.’⁵

Later, Vincent van Gogh, taking inspiration from Millet, also took on the task of representing workers. Fred Orton and Griselda Pollock claim that Van Gogh:

‘...was particularly interested in the work of Frank Holl, Hubert Herkomer and Luke Fildes, whose drawings he admired because they aroused sympathy for the poor, the old and the outcast.’⁶

Amongst his paintings are depictions of miners, weavers, postmen and also those who worked the land. His *Potato Eaters* (1885) enters into the home of the workers. There are many paintings in Van Gogh’s catalogue that make visual references to the hard labour of the peasants whom he so often painted. For example, he repeatedly had older peasant women wearing hats to sit for him whose weathered faces were captured in paint (the *Head of Peasant Woman with Dark Cap* series of 1885). He also would sketch workers carrying heavy loads with their bodies doubled over, paint the hands of peasants or their boots, which, whether intended or not, captured the physical effects of manual labour (For example, *Bearers of the Burden*, 1881; *Two Hands*, 1887 and *A Pair of Shoes*, 1886).⁷ This kind of interest in manual workers can later be seen in the example

⁴ T. J. Clark, *The Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1982), pp.80-82. See also *The Absolute Bourgeois*, in which Clark devotes a chapter to discussing Millet’s move from Paris to Barbizon, in 1849, during the revolution. The months preceding this move and those subsequent to it, were to mark a new subject-matter for Millet, albeit one that he had flirted with in the past: labourers. T.J.Clark, ‘Millet’, in *The Absolute Bourgeois* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1982), pp.72-98.

⁵ Clark (1982), p.80.

⁶ Fred Orton and Griselda Pollock, ‘Rooted in the Earth: A Van Gogh Primer’, in *Avant-Gardes and Partisans Reviewed* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1996), pp.1-51 (p.10).

⁷ The representation of the rural poor also became a subject for eighteenth-century British landscape painting. In his book *The Dark Side of the Landscape*, John Barrell examines the representation of the poor in terms of the social and moral constraints that were put upon these kinds of depictions. For example, one of the constraints that Barrell identifies, was the requirement to present labourers in agriculture as ‘honest and labourious’ (p.21), which, Barrell argues, is in contrast to the earlier Arcadian

of Arthur J. Munby, whose obsession with Victorian working women - manual labourers and also servants - led to a vast collection of photographic images (and also diaries) of female workers.⁸ Munby's reasons for photographing these women operated, again, on a more observational level (on the part of Munby) - albeit a sexually or psychologically motivated one – rather than to further a social cause, as is suggested with Lewis Hine's work (to be discussed in the following section).

With the dawn of photography, the representative mode is amplified. Having the appearance of being an exact copy of the scene (with the connotation of 'truthful'), the camera appears to have overcome the difficulties of the artist's representation with the indexical imprint.⁹ However, this idea just masks further the assimilation of the artist's point of view into the image, under the cloak of the apparatus. We see labourers documented in American photography in the early twentieth century. Martha Rosler explores this subject in her important text - 'In, around, and afterthoughts (on documentary photography)' - in which she situates the history of documentary photography within a social context.¹⁰ Rosler views the role of images of the poor and the working class as having another function alongside that of depiction. She proposes that the images of certain photographers in this period also operate on a level akin to social work. For example, Lewis Hine, an early twentieth century American

pastoral scenes in which shepherds' lives were seen as simple and happy. Again, the depiction of work is not simply a neutral portrayal of workers. John Barrell, *The Dark Side of the Landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

⁸ Munby's fascination has been exposed to being one of a sexual nature. He eventually married a lower ranking servant who continued to live as his maid, dressing as a lady only when she travelled with him. Martha Rosler, 'In, Around, and, Afterthoughts (on documentary photography)', in *3 Works* (Nova Scotia: Nova Scotia College of Art and Design: 2006), pp.61-93 (p.76). See also the Channel 4 documentary *Upstairs Downstairs Love* (2008).

⁹ The indexical imprint here refers to the physical act of light initiating a chemical reaction with the film to create the negative from which a photograph is made.

¹⁰ Rosler. This documentation of labourers also occurs within Victorian photography, where the worker is depicted in photographic images. In English photography, labour 'types' were often depicted. Steve Edwards' book - *The Making of English Photography: Allegories* - is filled with images of organ grinders (and their monkeys), numerous industrial machines such as steam hammers and a 'vacuum sugar apparatus' from Victorian exhibitions. Steve Edwards, *The Making of English Photography: Allegories* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006).

photographer, utilised his images for the purpose of sociological study. He was initiated into the photography aspect of social work when he was employed to photograph child workers - with the aim of stopping these exploitative practices - by the National Child Labour Committee. Hine's work as a photographer drew him to social causes; he, more famously, depicted workers in the steel factories in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for a sociological study called *The Pittsburgh Survey* and is well known for his photographs of the workers building the Empire State Building.¹¹ Hine's work had a designated purpose - representing often dangerous or unsafe working conditions for adults and children. Earlier portrayals of the poor, and the dispossessed generally, had a less positive, affective role, and were often displayed in journals for the purpose of reaffirming class status.¹² The journalistic mode of representing the poor, Rosler suggests, is tied up with Christian ethics, charity and morality; the viewer was encouraged to donate to charitable causes on seeing the photograph(s).¹³ There is a sense that displaying images of these class groups was enough, whereas in effect, the imagery often stood to reinforce class boundaries (and barriers).¹⁴ The work of Hine, and others,

¹¹ Sociological surveys did not only take place in America in the early twentieth century. In 1937, the Mass Observation project was set-up in England by the ornithologist-turned-anthropologist Tom Harrisson, documentary film-maker Humphrey Jennings and the communist poet and newspaper reporter Charles Madge, with the intention of being a study of 'everyday life'. The research took many forms including asking participants to keep diaries and respond to questionnaires; participant observation – Harrisson took up a work placement at Unilever Combine in Bolton to record every aspect of working life; and also the taking of documentary photographs. Initially the researchers were based in London and in Bolton (renamed 'Workstown' for the purpose of the project). The project was born out of a Surrealist-inspired idea for 'Popular Poetry' which would 'map the mass-consciousness of the nation through the establishment of factory- and college-based "Coincidence Clubs"'. (Hobble, p.5.) For further information see: Nick Hubble, *Mass-Observation and Everyday Life: Culture, History, Theory* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). See also: John Roberts, 'The Making of Documentary: Documentary after Factography', in *The Art of Interruption* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1998), pp.58-71 and Steve Edwards, 'Disastrous Documents', *Ten*, 8, 15 (1984), pp.12-23.

¹² For an in-depth analysis see: John Tagg, *Burden of Representation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988).

¹³ Rosler, p.74.

¹⁴ In his essay 'Disastrous Documents', Steve Edwards examines 1930s' British documentary photography and the role that it played in maintaining the ideology of a North/South divide in England. He argues that the North was presented as dirty and destitute, with associations of being unhealthy, in order to encourage people to move to the South for a 'better life'. The reality of which, Edwards demonstrates, was questionable. Edwards (1984).

clearly had a different role: aiding the struggles for the improvement of working conditions of children, for example.

The practice of depicting labour in art, historically, was not a socially or politically neutral act. The introduction of photography as a method of representing labour further complicated the reception of the image. This complication occurred when the apparatus was considered to create a physical replication of what is before the camera, which gave the appearance of being a 'truthful' document. Notwithstanding, the choosing of the subject matter and where the image was to be published or displayed (and the caption displayed alongside it) had an effect upon the reception of and also the response to the subject matter. However, the questionable neutrality of the works themselves does not mar the fact that the subject of labour, or work, initially presented itself in art under capitalism at the level of representation.

Working Practice

Whilst artists were depicting labourers at the beginning of the twentieth century, there was a shift that occurred in the way some artists (often non-painters) were working. The focus moved from *representing* workers/labour to how the artists themselves were working. I have found that this kind of shift often (although not always) transpires in a more collective environment. Here, I take the Arts and Crafts movement in Britain and the Constructivists in the Soviet Union as examples of the way in which labour becomes more than merely an image of a worker on a canvas or in a photograph. It is important to acknowledge *how* and *when* these movements came about; the trigger for the change in how artists worked (rather than how they represented work) occurs, in these examples, at a time of political and economic transformation. Both periods bore witness to a significant adjustment in the economic structure of society: In the first instance, the legacy of the industrial revolution and the move from handicraft to machine work. In the

second instance, the Russian Revolution of 1917 entailed a complete overhaul of the political and economic conditions of the country and a project to fulfil a revolution at the social level as well as at the level of a political regime. Art responds to these changes - actively and passively, positively and negatively, accepting or rejecting them.

The Arts & Crafts movement in Britain (c. 1850-1915) called for a return to craftsmanship, in the face of increasing industrialisation and mass-produced goods following the Industrial Revolution. Their project was to defend traditional craft-based knowledge in art making in response to the increased machination of everyday work. In the writings of those associated with the Arts & Crafts movement, the emphasis was placed on craftsmanship and skilled work, and, more importantly, the fact that a person and not a machine made the work. The pertinence of this task is demonstrated in their writings. W. R. Lethaby, in 1913, called for artworks to signify that:

EVERY WORK OF ART SHOWS THAT IT WAS MADE BY A HUMAN
BEING FOR A HUMAN BEING.... Machine work should show quite frankly
that it is the child of the machine...¹⁵

He ends this piece by stating that ‘Art is thoughtful workmanship.’¹⁶ William Morris, one of the key figures of the movement, stresses the importance of the role of the handicraftsman in an address to the Trades’ Guild of Learning in 1877:

You look in your history books to see who built Westminster Abbey, who built St. Sophia at Constantinople, and they tell you Henry III. Justinian the Emperor.

¹⁵ W. R. Lethaby, ‘Art and Workmanship’ first printed in *The Imprint*, 1 (January 1913), <http://www.burrows.com/art.html> [Accessed: 13/05/2009]. Lethaby’s capitals.

¹⁶ Lethaby.

Did they? or, rather, men like you and me, handicraftsmen, who have left no names behind them, nothing but their work?¹⁷

Morris draws attention here, to something which is important for my own thesis: the hidden labour of an artwork. Morris, through his addresses and writings, stresses the ill effects of capitalism, or ‘commerce’ as he often refers to it, on the nature of labour. In his text ‘Art and Socialism’ (1884) he explains how the rise of commerce created unhappy workers who make ridiculous goods for the sake of luxury. Following his idea that labour is a ‘slave to commerce’, he calls for a reformation of working conditions and sets out three conditions:

In a properly ordered state of Society every man willing to work should be ensured - First - Honourable and fitting work; Second - A healthy and beautiful house; Third - Full leisure for rest of mind and body.¹⁸

In his address to the Birmingham Society of the Arts and School of Design, February 19th 1879, he further stated that art should be: ‘ART WHICH IS TO BE MADE BY THE PEOPLE AND FOR THE PEOPLE AS HAPPINESS TO THE MAKER AND THE USER.’¹⁹

Morris’ agenda is clearly political and resistant to the effects of industrial capitalism. Without naming it, he recognises commodity fetishism (which Marx discusses at the end of the first chapter of *Capital*), which is the phenomenon where people begin to mediate relationships through the items that they purchase. According

¹⁷ William Morris, ‘The Decorative Arts, Their Relation to Modern Life and Progress’ (December 1877), <http://www.burrows.com/dec.htm> [Accessed: 13/05/2009].

¹⁸ William Morris, ‘Art and Socialism’ (January 1884), delivered to the Leicester Secular Society, <http://marxists.org/archive/morris/works/1884/as/as.htm> [Accessed: 23/06/2009].

¹⁹ William Morris, ‘Hopes and Fears for Art’ (February 1879), <http://ebooks.edu.au/m/morris/m87hf/chap2.html> (Morris’ capitals) [Accessed: 23/06/2009].

to Marx, under commodity fetishism the relations between people become relations between things.²⁰ Morris perceived the marginalisation of man-made goods as a result of machine manufacture. The movement called for a return to well-made handcrafted objects, which the craftsman took pleasure in making, in the face of machine-made goods and frivolous luxury items. In my first chapter, I discuss how art responds to the prevailing industrialisation in the mid-twentieth century and, more specifically, the deskilling that occurs in mainstream production in differing ways.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, we also witness a politicisation of art in the Soviet Union. Again, around the time of the 1917 revolution, firstly, art becomes a medium through which politics is able to operate, and, secondly, a change takes place in the working practices of artists (and the function of art itself). This change emerged out of a fostered collectivity, which was due, in part, to the creation of Petrograd Free Studios shortly after the Revolution. I have in mind here the Constructivists, and more specifically the Productivist branch (associated with Vladimir Tatlin and Alexander Rodchenko), which became the pioneering art movement.²¹ Art became a part of social organisation under Communism and it was given its own department within state organisation (the Proletkult – the department for proletarian culture).²² In 1918, Mayakovsky declared:

²⁰ Karl Marx, ‘The Fetishism of Commodities and the Secret Thereof’, in *Capital* (1887) (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983), pp.76-87.

²¹ I stress the Productivist branch, as those around Kandinsky, Malevich and the Pevsners were more concerned with a spiritual idea of art which disavowed the artist-engineer.

²² The Proletkult was a division of the Narkompros (the People’s Commissariat for Education), headed by Anatoly Lunacharsky, whose charge was education and culture.

We do not need a dead mausoleum of art where dead works are worshipped, but a living factory of the human spirit - in the streets, in the tramways, in the factories, workshops and workers' homes.²³

With the incarnation of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921, the Proletkult encouraged the fostering of art and industry under Olga Rosanova's leadership of the Art-Production subsection (a position that she held from 1918). Igor Chubarov references Boris Arvatov's writings on the historical reconstruction of art, which called for the specialisation of the artist:

Moreover, Arvatov, Gan and Tarabukin saw the future of art not in a return to cottage craftwork, as Ruskin and Morris (and Proudhon) would have had it. On the contrary, artists would be involved in the organisation of industrialised machine production as engineers and inventors.²⁴

The marrying of art and industry did not solely operate on an aesthetic level, but encouraged artists to make useful objects that would be practical aids for society. Christina Kiaer states that the Productivists' aims, in 1921, were: 'anti-art', 'proindustrial' and 'utilitarian'.²⁵ They abandoned the term 'art' and replaced it with 'intellectual production'.

²³ Vladimir Mayokovsky, 'Meeting ob iskusstve', *Iskusstvo Kommuni*, 1 (7 December 1918). Cited in Camilla Gray, *The Great Experiment: Russian Art, 1863-1922* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1962), p.216.

²⁴ Igor Chubarov, 'Productionism: Art of the Revolution of Design for the Proletariat?', *Chto Delat? #01-25: What is the use of art?* (2009), http://www.chtodelat.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=558%3Aproductionism-art-of-the-revolution-or-design-for-the-proletariat&catid=204%3A01-25-what-is-the-use-of-art&Itemid=455&lang=en [Accessed: 3/08/2011].

²⁵ Christina Kiaer, *Imagine No Possessions* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2005), p.13.

It is useful to draw upon the distinction between Constructivism and Productivism: the former being associated with a revolutionary artistic practice and the latter with the functional aspects of art and, particularly, the role of art in industrial production.²⁶ John Roberts proposes that Constructivism was based on the idea of a ‘laboratory artist’ where the production of work was subject to group research.²⁷ Authorship was in a shared studio space and was the basis for speculative social projects and interventions. Roberts states that those concerned with Constructivism saw Productivism as too close to the instrumental and pragmatic demands of industry and considered them to be idealist about worker participation. Those involved with Productivism, on the other hand, thought Constructivism to be too close to the atelier system. Productivism’s concerns were with the notion of collective practice, the task of which was to liquidate the barrier between artistic technique and general social technique. They prioritised working directly with industry, which Roberts suggests is the basis of a worker/artist and engineer/artist collaborative practice.

These movements are implicit in Peter Bürger’s *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, when he views the task of the historical avant-garde as dissolving art into life praxis.²⁸ I

²⁶ The artists associated with Productivism originally divided from the artists who were to become the known as the Constructivists. The publication of Naum Gabo and Antoine Pevsner’s ‘The Realistic Manifesto’, in 1920, is considered to have played a part in the separating the ideas of the more functional-oriented artists, such as Tatlin, from artists concerned with time, space and kinetics, such as Gabo. ‘The Realistic Manifesto’ can be found reprinted in *The Tradition of Constructivism*, ed. by Stephen Bann (New York: The Viking Press, 1974), pp.3-11. Gabo remained concerned with keeping art ‘pure’ and publicly criticised *Tatlin’s Monument to the Third International*, stating: ‘Either build functional houses and bridges or create pure art, not both. Don’t confuse one with the other.’ Gabo cited in Kenneth Powell, ‘Modernism Divided’, in *The Avant-Garde: Russian Architecture in the Twenties*, ed. by Catherine Cooke and Justin Ageros (London: Academy Editions, 1991), pp.6-7 (p.6).

²⁷ See his discussion of the two in his chapter four. John Roberts, *The Intangibilities of Form: Skill and Deskilling in Art after the Readymade* (Verso: London, 2007), pp.123-131.

²⁸ Peter Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde* (1984) (Minneapolis: Minnesota, 2004). Despite the implied references to the work of the Constructivists and Productivists, Bürger does not make these references explicit, and favours the practices of Dada, Surrealism and Futurism. However, art historians like Hal Foster, assume the role of Constructivism and Productivism to be aligned with that of the historical avant-garde. See: Hal Foster, ‘What’s Neo about the Neo-Avant-Garde?’, *October*, 70 (Autumn 1994), pp.5-32. Andreas Huyssen also includes these movements in his identification of the historical avant-garde. Andreas Huyssen, ‘The Hidden Dialectic: Avantgarde-Technology-Mass Culture’, in *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), pp.3-15.

wish to stress, again, the emphasis on labour within the two groups, and particularly that of the Productivists.²⁹ The relationship between art and labour, as articulated by Soviet artists, is especially poignant for my thesis. Seeing the implicit connection between the two in the work of the Productivists, helps to authorise my later arguments, whereas art history has traditionally overlooked labour in favour of biography or formal analyses. Although Constructivism and Productivism had an explicit political aim, given the circumstances in which these practices evolved - and the fact that they were not concerned with 'art for art's sake', but rather, an implicit engagement with a type of social production seen as appropriate to Communism - aspects of their practice can be found in contemporary models of art making.

It is important to stress the collective nature of the work which emerged from the USSR in this short period. The Petrograd Free Studios (Svomas) and the Higher Technical Artistic Studios (Vkhutemas), which were created shortly after the Revolution, nurtured the collective nature of artistic production. Similarly the Inkhuk (under Wassily Kandinsky) fostered a collective mode of working.³⁰ The institute divided into two branches: firstly, those working with a more spiritual conception of art - such as Kandinsky and Kazimir Malevich - adopted a laboratory model of working, where ideas were tried and tested in the confines of the studio. The second branch comprised of those artists who would become known as the Productivists, and who held to a more utilitarian concept for art, retaining a concern for the marrying of art and industry.³¹ Unfortunately, with the death of Lenin, and under the leadership of Stalin,

²⁹ Obviously the Productivists were not entirely successful in their collapsing of art/labour together - they went into the factories but the symbiosis of artist and factory worker was never accepted and therefore, unsuccessful. Nevertheless, they are an example of collective art production that attempted this synthesis and their model is still important within the history of art and labour.

³⁰ Notably, twenty-five artists collectively voted Kandinsky out of his position as chair of the Inkhuk in 1921. See Chuborov.

³¹ Although this more collective way of group work often was adopted, there are exceptions, Camilla Gray writes: '... Tatlin always chose to work apart with a few chosen disciples, rather than with a general

art's function shifted back to painting and propaganda.³² Labour in Russian art was once again subsumed to the level of representation, and later in the name of Socialist Realism.³³

The two movements that I have selected present cases in which the focus moves from depiction and representation to the *making* of art. Both movements developed within periods of socio-politico-economic change - with Morris' reacting, in particular, to the rise of industry and the employment of machine manufacture - and I would attribute both movements to an 'avant-gardist' agenda.³⁴ The movements attempt to return art to life praxis in the sense that Bürger identifies as the task of the 'historical avant-garde'.³⁵ In this thesis, I attend to numerous moments of collectivity which often follow political change. This collectivity is often fostered by groupings that do not belong to the established art world and thus offer a counter to more commercial art (or arguably an avant-gardist contribution). I close my thesis with a return to thinking about the avant-garde (in Bürger's sense) directly; the project to return 'art into life praxis', however, is apparent throughout.

Representation Takes on a Social Cause

If we return to thinking about representation, 'labour' appears to disappear from the art agenda in the 1940s and 50s, particularly with the dominance of abstract painting in

group.' Camilla Gray, *The Great Experiment: Russian Art, 1863-1922* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1962), p.250.

³² It is questionable how far art and industry actually gelled in this period, but my concern is the motivation rather than the success here.

³³ This is not to say that Constructivist art did not also have a propagandist or political function in terms of Communist ideals, the point that I am making is that Soviet Realism helped to mask problems in Soviet Russia, whilst I believe Constructivism initially truly aimed for a fostering of art and industry.

³⁴ Avant-garde refers to the idea that an artist (or group of artists) is doing something innovative that is different to contemporary art practices. The term originates from the military, where the avant-garde were those who led the troops into battle – the foremost guard. However, it was adopted by art historians to refer to: '...a range of social postures and strategies for artists by which they could differentiate themselves from current social and cultural structures while also intervening in them.' Fred Orton and Griselda Pollock, 'Avant-Gardes and Partisans Reviewed', in *Avant-Gardes and Partisans Reviewed* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), pp.141-164 (p.142).

³⁵ Bürger.

America, and is also omitted from popular Western art-historical accounts of the period.³⁶ The prominence of the artist-genius myth - with its associations of god-given talent, masculinity and the lone artist - brought images, and films, of the lone artist in the studio to prominence and their assistants fade into the background (only to disappear completely out of art history texts).³⁷

The 1960s and 70s bore witness to various political contestations and moments of social change in the Western world alone and a wealth of artistic movements devoted to social causes began to appear. Particularly in America, numerous artists' unions emerged, and groups aligned with causes like feminism and anti-racism feature widely in recent art-historical accounts of this period.³⁸ Trade Unions are historically associated with the defence of working conditions, pay, and so on, and the unions such as the Art Workers' Coalition, formed in 1969, were no exception. In this period, the artist began to think her/himself as a worker with rights.

Artists, and particularly women artists aligned with feminist causes, start to make work about the gendered division of labour and about those roles which are historically naturalised as female, addressing issues such as the inequality of pay. I allude briefly

³⁶ I use the term 'appears' here, as there were collective moments in this period. Events held at Black Mountain College present examples of artists working together. Numerous collaborative events took place and performances, organised by artists such as John Cage, Robert Rauschenberg and Niki de Saint-Phalle, but these are often obscured by accounts of the dominant American artists of the time. Also, artists' assistants are still busying themselves labouring for the artist but they are hidden from accounts and, especially, photographs from this era.

³⁷ For example, Hans Namuth's videos of Jackson Pollock 'dripping' paint, or Willem de Kooning stood in paint-splattered clothing next to his paintings, but, as suggested earlier, the photograph is not always a true depiction. Caroline A. Jones discusses the drastic change in image that occurred in Frank Stella's publicity photographs, taken by Hollis Frampton between the years 1959 and 1960, in *Machine in the Studio*. Caroline A. Jones, *Machine in the Studio: Constructing the Postwar American Artist* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996), pp.114-129. See also her chapter two - 'Filming the Artist, Suturing the Spectator' - for a consideration of artists on film in the same book (pp.60-113). For discussions of images of artists in their studios see: *Close Encounters: The sculptor's studio in the age of the camera*, exhibition catalogue, Henry Moore Institute, 25th September 2001-6th January 2002; Alexander Liberman, *The Artist in his Studio* (1960), revised edition (Random House, 1988).

³⁸ For a more in-depth discussion of the groups around New York in this period see Alan W. Moore, 'Artists' Collectives: Focus on New York, 1975-2000', in *Collectivism After Modernism*, ed. by Gregory Sholette and Blake Stimson (Minneapolis: Minnesota, 2007), pp.193-221; Mikkel Bolt Rasmussen, 'The Politics of Interventionist Art: The Situationist International, Artist Placement Group, and Art Workers' Coalition', *Rethinking Marxism*, 21:1, pp.34-49; and Julia Bryan-Wilson, *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2009).

here to a number of works which focus on the subject of labour. *Women and Work: A Document on the Division of Labour in Industry* (1973-5) was a group project undertaken by Kay Hunt, Margaret Harrison and Mary Kelly, which stemmed from their involvement in the Women's Workshop of the Artist's Union. The project culminated in an installation, comprising of photographs; office furniture; writings; film; audio-tapes and company papers from a metal box factory in Bermondsey. The implementation of the Equal Pay Act in 1970 was the focus of the groups' research. The aim of the installation was to show the inequality still at play between the men and women who worked at the factory. Between 1970 and 1975, Kelly also worked as part of the Berwick Street Film Collective on the film *Nightcleaners*, which, again, tackled the issue of women at work. On this occasion, the subject was the cleaners who worked at night, hidden away from the general public.³⁹ Again, this project operated on a documentary level, recording the labour of the workers and 'documenting the 1972 campaign to unionise predominantly female office cleaners in London.'⁴⁰ And the list of films about work continues: *The Song of the Shirt* (1978), made by Jonathan Curling and Sue Clayton, under the remit of The Film and History Project, also addressed the situation of working class women and the welfare system in the seventies. Cinema Action, Liberation Films and the Newsreel Collective are among the other collectives who made political films about labour in the 1970s. The common thread between these artworks is

³⁹ Interestingly, Kelly did not exhibit these projects after the event until 2000 when she conceived her *Social Process/Collaborative Action* exhibition, which drew attention to her collaborative works. Her re-exhibiting of these works coincides with an increasing awareness of collaboration and social engagement (following the publication of Nicolas Bourriaud's *Relational Aesthetics* in 1999) in contemporary discussions of artistic practice.

⁴⁰ Author unknown, *Reconceiving (Mary) Kelly*, <http://www.articlearchives.com/print/1518548-1-hg2.html> [Accessed: 08/05/09].

Despite the film's political subject-matter and the involvement of the Women's Movement in making the film, the success of *The Nightcleaners* in raising direct awareness for the cause was questionable. This partial failure was primarily because of the time it took to make the film, which extended beyond the campaign to unionise female nightcleaners. The women's liberation groups had expected the film to be a useful campaign film, which it never became. See: Claire Johnston, 'The Nightcleaners (part one): Rethinking political cinema', *Jump Cut*, 12/13 (1975), pp.55-56 and Claire Johnston and Paul Willemen, 'Brecht in Britain: The Independent Political Film (on *The Nightcleaners*)', *Screen*, 16:4 (Winter 1975/6), pp.101-118.

the use of the documentary genre, which brings us full circle back to representation.⁴¹ Like the photographs of Hine, these films take on a representative function, i.e. they are not just depicting workers, but also making the viewer aware of these hidden practices (as is particularly the case of the nightcleaners). Through raising awareness of these types of labour, the documentary filmmakers draw attention to the obscuration and the exploitation of these particular workers, which, in turn, implies social relations. The viewer relates or reacts to the film before her.

There is a similar moment of collective-focus on labour in Japan. Although collective and group activity dominates the history of Japanese art, Hi Red Centre's *Cleaning Event* of 1964 stands out as one with a difference. Reiko Tomii gives a brief outline of Japan's history of collectivism after modernism (in the book of the same name) in which he acknowledges that the artist groups in this period often operated under the leadership of one person and also respond to the collective nature of Japanese society.⁴² Hi Red Centre diverted from the usual dynamic of leader and followers by adopting a more openly collective working model. Their *Cleaning Event* took place during the Tokyo Olympic Games, when the artists took to the streets of the Ginza District in white coats and cleaned the streets. Their flyer (which called for fellow collectives to join in) mocked the bureaucratic organisation of such events, with its division of labour under specific 'committees' such as the 'Metropolitan Environment Hygiene Execution Committee' and the 'Housewives Federation' (listed as a sponsor). This event was not, as a lot of the so-called relational works of the late 1990s through the 2000s are, attached to an art institution; rather, Tomii viewed it as an act of social

⁴¹ *The Nightcleaners* was actually criticised for foregoing the intended 'cinéma vérité' approach, in favour of a more aesthetic and theoretical form. See Johnston and Willemsen, particularly the section titled 'Discussion', pp.113-118.

⁴² Reiko Tomii, 'After the Descent to the Everyday', in *Collectivism after Modernism*, pp.45-75. For an account of Hi Red Center's *Cleaning Event* 1964, see pp.54-7.

activism.⁴³ The artists were mistaken for a cleaning team employed for the big clean up in preparation for the Olympics. In this example, we see artists *performing work* (cleaning) rather than representing it.

There is a similar change in the mode of engaging with feminist issues around the turn of the twenty-first century, with a move to a more performative model of art. Julita Wójcik's 2001 *Obieranie Ziemniakow* (Peeling Potatoes) performance at the Zacheta National Gallery in Warsaw, is a good example of this shift. Wójcik, wearing an apron, simply peeled potatoes - a signifier of domestic work - for this event, whilst chatting to gallery visitors. She has also made work about craft, in which she invited embroiderers into the gallery space. Other female artists concerned with working women, return to the documentary format. Ursula Biemann's work extensively takes on subjects such as sex workers crossing borders in order to find work as part of the global sex trade (*Remote Sensing*, 2001, *World Sex Work Archive*, 2003). Her work usually takes the form of 'video essays', a format which suggests a more educational or informative use rather than a merely documentary function.⁴⁴

A Pseudo-Social Period?

In the contemporary period, the subject of work in art, materialises (or not) in a wealth of media and practices. This diversification is in contrast to the previous periods in which 'work' is often confined to a specific medium (such as photography or video, for example). This expansion, in part, can be ascribed to the post-conceptual nature of art in which the material (and immaterial) possibilities of art become many. In the 1990s, work was firmly placed back on the contemporary art agenda. Nicolas Bourriaud's

⁴³ My reference to art institutions here, and in the rest of this thesis, includes biennials, triennials and art fairs, alongside galleries and museums.

⁴⁴ See Biemann's website for an extensive look at her works, http://www.geobodies.org/01_art_and_videos/. Also see: *Mission Reports: Artistic Practice in the Field - Ursula Biemann Video Works 1998-2008* (Bristol: Arnolfini Gallery, 2008).

Relational Aesthetics became a focus for debates around sociality in art in more public art forums.⁴⁵ The publication of *Relational Aesthetics* in 1998 raised the awareness of certain collective or social art practices in the art world, albeit a certain mode of sociability that generally existed within the socially-safe confines of the gallery space. Bourriaud's key examples are artists such as Rirkrit Tiravanija, who famously cooked for his audience (*Pad Thai*, 1990) or invited gallery visitors to peruse texts in one of his reading rooms while consuming a crepe (*Untitled (One Revolution per Minute)*, 1996). The work of the late Felix Gonzalez-Torres also engaged the audience, inviting them to take a sweet or a poster from a pile that was replenished daily. The common denominator in relational works is primarily interaction and, most commonly, the audience's interaction with the work. It differs from performance in the fact that the artist does not necessarily have to be present for the event. The installation format, often utilised in these works, allows for the interactions to take place in the absence of the artist. These works do not explicitly deal with the subject of work; however, I argue that they can be considered in the context of the theme of labour. I propose that the encouraged interaction acts as a new model of working practice that is wider than Bourriaud's somewhat limited choice of examples in *Relational Aesthetics*. His are examples, which, (arguably) encourage the audience to be involved in the artwork; in turn, the artwork, does not take the form of an object, but of interaction itself. In such practices, the onus is on the individual viewer to work in the collective, the audience member comes to the work as an individual but takes part in a process of which others are a part. Therefore, a type of encouraged collectivity occurs. There is a sense that the

⁴⁵ Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, trans. by Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods (Les presses du réel, 2002). Gail Day further notes the effectiveness that Bourriaud's book has had on more radical debates, claiming that: 'the critical engagement with this project [*Relational Aesthetics*] has propelled discussion and action leftwards.' Gail Day, 'The Fear of Heteronomy', *Third Text*, 23:4 (July 2009), pp.393-406 (p.404).

audience ‘completes’ the work, although I find this argument somewhat troubling.⁴⁶ This model again differs from the earlier modes of collective making (as exemplified by the Productivists, whose choice was to work together). Whilst the Productivists were actually working within the beginnings of a communist society, relational works are said to be ‘microtopias’. A forced social experience, rather than one of true sociability or collectivity, occurs within these situations. In chapter three, I make a distinction between relational artists and those artists who work with the public while subsuming the piece under their own name. I discuss Thomas Hirschhorn’s *Bataille Monument* (2002) in more detail, as an example of this type of practice.

Within the recent period of socialised labour, there is a return to the kind of political groupings of the 1960s. Although activism itself is not new, activists begin to appear in art journal debates at the turn of the twenty-first century. A variety of technologies influenced developments, such as ‘hacktivists’, protestors (organised by text messaging), mobile activists (as in Pubixtheater Caravan) and civil disobedience. An ambiguity emerges as to whether these groupings are to be understood as art or not. They are considered, in certain venues, as artists exhibiting in art exhibitions and, in others, they are considered as political activists outside of the art institution.

The art-activists quite often use the appearance – and also the technologies - of work in their actions. For example, etoy present themselves as an online corporation complete with their own branding, whilst the Yes Men infiltrate business events, playing with subversive attempts to raise awareness of the damage that multinational

⁴⁶ Of course, relational works are not the first to emphasise the role of the spectator/viewer. Robert Morris writes about how minimal works are made in relation to a human-scale in order to differentiate them from the ornament and the monument in his ‘Notes on Sculpture 2’ (1966), reprinted in *Minimal Art: A Critical Anthology*, ed. by Gregory Battock (Berkeley, University of California, 1995), pp.228-235. Morris’ involvement and concern for the performative in art is clear in this essay. Performance art often relied on the viewer’s involvement, exemplified in a work such as Yoko Ono’s *Cut Piece* (1965) performed at the Carnegie Recital Hall New York City, in which viewers were invited to cut Ono’s clothing from her.

corporations can do.⁴⁷ I argue that these practices have a parlous relationship with neoliberalism and I expand upon this idea in the third chapter.

Labour in Art: Part Two

In the following section, I present a number of ways in which labour in art can be thought more literally; that is, the employment of labour for the task of art making. These practices comprise of practical working relationships between artists, craftsmen, engineers and other skilled workers. An enquiry into these types of business exchanges within the art world also forms the foundation of my own research concerns - the labour of art. The employment of assistance to make a work of art is not a new artistic practice in itself; however, it is a practice that has been obscured from the art-going public for a number of reasons. I now turn to address the history and the hidden nature of these practices.

The Historical Division of Labour in Art

Early forms of contracted labour can be traced back to the medieval workshops and renaissance guilds, where a master employed and trained apprentices to paint in a particular style that signified the guild. These workshops and guilds were not solely devoted to what we now consider art, but extended to craft-based trades and disciplines – such as goldsmithery and carpentry. Craft was considered as work and was part of the larger collective labour. The work of art or craft was often the product of many hands, with the guilds and workshops operating a skilled division of labour. The division of labour was hierarchical. Jeffrey Chipps Smith writes of how boys of twelve to fourteen

⁴⁷ For example, one member of The Yes Men posed as a representative of Dow chemical company for an interview with BBC World, where he disclosed that the company was accepting responsibility for the Bhopal disaster (an industrial disaster in which toxic gas was released into the air at the Union Carbide plant - now owned by Dow). The documents from this event were exhibited at the 2008 Taipei Biennial.

years old began their apprenticeships and were often bound to a master for between three to six years. He notes that: ‘Specialisation occurred, especially when an assistant proved adept at rendering draperies or architecture.’⁴⁸ Of course, the role of the master did not remain static. As Anthony Hughes writes of workshops such as Vasari’s:

A shop like this expanded and contracted as the need arose, and it is often difficult to give a satisfactory name to the master’s precise role, which changed from executor to chief designer, and from designer to impresario as the occasion demanded, though one ‘job’ was never entirely exclusive of any other.⁴⁹

John Roberts maps a brief history of the workshop model in his book *The Intangibilities of Form*.⁵⁰ He proposes that the early workshops from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century operated on the model of the ‘collective workshop’, where the trained workers were considered to be craftsmen. He delineates the seventeenth to the mid-nineteenth century model as operating on the lines of a ‘master-run atelier’. In this model, Roberts suggests, the role of the master was changing and was ‘subject to an increasing executive role under the commercial demands of a fledgling commercial art market.’⁵¹ Roberts proposes the apprentice role transforms to that of the assistant at the end of the nineteenth century and, additionally, to one of wage-labour. The role of the artist similarly transforms, but this time from a sole creator to a role akin to the executive

⁴⁸ Jeffrey Chips Smith, *The Northern Renaissance* (Phaidon: London, 2004), pp.23-5.

⁴⁹ Anthony Hughes, ‘An Academy for Doing II: Academies, Status and Power in Early Modern Europe’, *Oxford Art Journal*, 9:2 (1986), pp.50-62 (p.56).

⁵⁰ Roberts (2007).

⁵¹ Roberts (2007), p.141. I question Roberts’ proposition here, as, when returning to his sources (the Hughes text noted above), the changes in the workshop model explicitly correlating to the emerging market are not acknowledged. Further, I would suggest that Roberts’ ‘executive role’, which he attributes to the master in this period, could also be another teaching role. As such, the master subjects the workshop to a division of labour, in order to deploy the apprentice with the best skills for a particular job.

producer.

With the emergence of the Romantic conception of the artist in the eighteenth century, the hand of the artist became an important tool in the creation of a work of art and the assistants faded into the background. The myth of the ‘Romantic artist’ continued through to modernism. This is not to say that artists were the sole creators of their works. We know that the sculptors Auguste Rodin and Henry Moore, amongst others, employed many assistants and also contracted work out to external foundries.⁵² It is common knowledge that Moore utilised the Morris Singer foundry in Basingstoke and later contracted the majority of his work to the Noack foundry in Berlin.⁵³ The emergence of the bronze foundry, particularly in mid-nineteenth century Paris, undoubtedly had an enormous effect on the production of editions. The foundry was paradigmatic for Rodin and for the proliferation of his career. There are countless reasons as to why artists contracted foundries to cast their works. The reduced time-scale of producing market-ready multiples would have undoubtedly been a motivating factor. The labour involved in bronze casting entails skill, specialist knowledge and techniques, of which the artist is not necessarily an expert (although this is not always the case).⁵⁴ Therefore, adopting a process such as bronze-casting is paramount to the problem-free production of casted editions. Accessibility to actual materials and the instruments and tools of labour - which would have been very expensive for artists to buy outright - are

⁵² For the division of labour within and outside of Rodin’s studio see: Albert Elsen, *Rodin’s Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003) and, in particular, the chapter titled ‘The Many Lives of a Rodin Sculpture’ (pp.21-29); Monique Laurent, ‘Observations on Rodin and his Founders’, in *Rodin Rediscovered*, ed. by Albert Elsen (Washington & Boston, 1982), pp.284-93. For Moore’s use of contracted labour, see: Sarah King, *Yellow Brick Studio (Carving Studio)* (2004), http://www.henry-moore-fdn.co.uk/matrix_engine/content.php?name=f [Accessed: 30/07/2007].

⁵³ For Morris Singer see: <http://www.zmaf.co.uk/morrissinger.htm>; for Noack Foundry see: http://www.noack-bronze.com/index_en.html

⁵⁴ There are exceptions, however, the sculptor Edward Allington learned to cast bronze himself. He believes that it is important for sculptors to learn the principles of the methods used, further claiming that one has to understand the craft in order to make the work. Edward Allington, ‘Thinking with our Hands or the Continuity of Labour/Craft and the Continuity of Forgetting about Labour/Craft’, paper presented at the Association of Art Historians 35th Annual Conference 2009, Manchester Metropolitan University, 2nd - 4th April 2009.

also factors in the reasons why artists used foundries as opposed to casting in their own studio. The enlargement of works for casting was also, traditionally, the domain of assistance of a different kind: that of the machine. Rodin's output greatly benefitted from the introduction of the Collas Machine in 1836, which made the enlargement and reduction of existing works possible.⁵⁵ Despite the extensive use of assistants and foundries, the divide between art and craft had been drawn and the modernist artist reaffirmed his status as sole creator. This notion is exemplified in Albert Elsen's remark: 'Rodin believed that foundry work was for artisans and not sculptors like himself.'⁵⁶

The Makers: The Artist's Assistant

The artist's employment of assistants is a more recent form of contracted labour in art. The artist's assistant who is true to the job description, i.e. who 'assists' by mixing paint, tidying up, stretching canvases and so on, belongs to the long history of workshops. An article published in *Art in America* in 1993 included interviews with twenty-three artists working in America about their role as an assistant and/or their employment of assistants. This piece remains the most informative text on contemporary artists' assistants.⁵⁷ Wade Saunders, the author of the article and interviewer, draws his own conclusions from the interviews. He notes that few painters would discuss the collaborative nature of working with an assistant, claiming that they make all the decisions. Saunders suggests that it is easier for sculptors to admit to employing professional assistance because of the large-scale nature of their work. Furthermore, he believes that it is easier for artists to openly acknowledge assistants in the context of museum shows, rather than at selling exhibitions.

⁵⁵ Rodin's assistant Henri Lebossé was responsible for many of the enlargements of Rodin's sculptures. Elsen (2003), pp.25-6.

⁵⁶ Elsen (2003), p.30.

⁵⁷ Wade Saunders, 'Making Art, Making Artists', *Art in America*, 81 (January 1993), pp.70-95.

There are a number of issues, arising from reading these interviews, which are interesting for my own argument. Robert Morris and Jack Beal both claim that artists did not have assistants in their generation, which I deduce is around the 1960s and 70s.⁵⁸ Saunders offers a reason for the non-employment of assistance by artists in this period, claiming that artists did not employ assistants for around thirty years after the Great Depression.⁵⁹ Because of the rejuvenated interest in American ‘modernist painting’ and its accompanying lone artist image, the importance of the artist’s hand in art making during the 1940s and 50s also had an effect on the open employment of artist’s assistants.⁶⁰

The reasons given by the artists for employing an assistant are numerous. Firstly, there is the undertaking of mundane tasks, such as paint mixing, canvas stretching, office duties and organization and making lunch. There is also the employment of skilled assistants, i.e. employing people technically more competent than themselves to make a piece of art. Additionally, there are assistants who adopt a very ‘hands on’ role, for example those who paint entire paintings because they are technically better painters or to compensate for the boom in the market, which speeds up the time it takes to produce works, allowing for market demands to be met. Finally, and more rarely, there are artists who wholly acknowledge their assistants’ involvement in the conception of their works.

The latter is a coveted role as it is the aspect of art making usually reserved for the artist. As Robert Longo states: ‘It was my work, because the ideas were mine.’⁶¹ Contrary to this idea, other artists will allow the assistants to do anything except touch the artwork. As Peter Halley explains: ‘I try to protect the actual act of painting because

⁵⁸ Saunders, p.73 (Morris) and p.87 (Beal).

⁵⁹ Saunders, p.74.

⁶⁰ The interviewees allude to the artist’s hand on more than one occasion.

⁶¹ Saunders, p.86.

I really do like it.’⁶² In the past, Donald Baechler employed assistants to paint vegetables on his work, since then he has had a change of heart and claims: ‘Now I do as much as possible myself. I’ve realised I want everything to be something I touched; everything that goes on the canvas, goes on by me.’⁶³ Dorethea Rockburne asserts: ‘I am the only one to touch the work.’⁶⁴ However, in contrast, Marilyn Minter states: ‘Art is about ideas. I am a painter, and the hand is important. But it doesn’t have to be my hand. I can hire a lot of people who can make that little mark.’⁶⁵

There are a few artists interviewed who do, in fact, encourage the discussion of their work with their assistants. Vito Acconci stresses the fact that the people who are often viewed as his assistants at exhibition openings are actually his collaborators.⁶⁶ When his work changed direction in the 1980s – from solo or joint performance-based works - it orientated towards architecture, and he began to work with Ron Ervolino and Luis Vera, who were both architecture students. Acconci has subsequently worked with a number of people from a variety of backgrounds. He states:

The studio has now coalesced into three people: me, Luis Vera (the architect who has been there since 1986), and Jenny Schridder (who comes from an art-school background and who has worked with me since 1989). We work collaboratively.⁶⁷

Acconci, like other artists in the article, attempts publicly to acknowledge the

⁶² Saunders, p.78.

⁶³ Saunders, p.80.

⁶⁴ Saunders, p.88.

⁶⁵ Saunders, p.80.

⁶⁶ Saunders, pp.89-90.

⁶⁷ Saunders, p.89.

involvement of his collaborators, a role that is distinct from that of the assistant.⁶⁸ He informs Saunders that galleries are not so happy to list assistants on the walls:

Sometimes that causes a problem for galleries; a fabricator is one thing, but a near-collaborator is something else – it breaks down notions of the individual artist, and therefore it interferes with standards of value, especially economic value.⁶⁹

Acconci is not the only artist to refer to the galleries' unease with the listing of assistants alongside their artworks. Ann Hamilton states that she sometimes displays a list of people who have helped her and other times does not, claiming that this is due to time restrictions. She does, however, try to acknowledge them in her catalogues.⁷⁰ According to the interviewees, the market and collectors have a role in keeping artists' assistants below the public radar and, therefore, below that of the buyer. Jack Goldstein states: 'Without question, if assistants are known to be actively involved in the production of your work, it detracts from your financial success, especially if you are a painter.'⁷¹ His assistant, Ashley Bickerton – now a successful artist - recalls the effects of the anonymity of the assistant on his working relationship with Goldstein:

⁶⁸ The artists' collective Freee more recently interviewed Acconci about his studio - Acconci Studio. His attitude towards the collaborative nature of his studio remained positive. He also discussed 'public art', 'multitudes' and working as part of a group - all key concepts in the recent debates within the contemporary art press. However, it did not go unnoticed that Acconci was interviewed on his own by a collective; his name as a solo artist (stemming from his work in the 1970s) still appears to take precedence, whereas his work has now moved on to a collaborative studio practice. Freee, 'Changing Spaces', *Art Monthly*, 332 (Dec/Jan 2009), pp.1-4.

⁶⁹ Saunders, p.89. Note the distinction between assistant and fabricator here.

⁷⁰ Saunders, p.78.

⁷¹ Saunders, p.82.

With Jack it was almost a matter of pride for me not to be publicly credited, since I wanted to be as rigorous as he was to show that I knew my role there... But he sometimes seemed to worry that I might cease to be a faceless technician. He hated my talking to people who came into the studio, and didn't want me going to his openings; he gave me really dirty looks when I showed up anywhere.⁷²

Marilyn Minter takes a dim view of hiding assistants from the public:

There are prejudices in the art world against certain kinds of practices, prejudices I don't share. When I did the television commercial for my show at Simon Watson, I thought it important to show the assistants painting on the metal structures.⁷³

These interviews, although now over fifteen years old, ascertain a certain attitude towards the public recognition of assistants and fabricators that is perhaps only just beginning to disperse. The *Observer*, more recently, published an enquiry into the world of artist's assistants.⁷⁴ Rose Aiden's article discusses contemporary British artists and their assistants. The article reaffirms some of the points made, by artists and their assistants, in Saunders' piece ten years prior. Aiden focuses primarily on those assistants who help to realise the work, but she also mentions the assistant who works as a kind of PA or organiser. Artists who assisted other artists before they established themselves, is a key trajectory explored in the article; it is almost as though assisting is some kind of

⁷² Saunders, p.83.

⁷³ Saunders, p.80.

⁷⁴ Rose Aiden, 'Brush with Fame', *Observer*, October 12th 2003, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4772547-102280,00.html> [Accessed: 12/10/05].

unofficial apprenticeship. This practice is also mentioned in Saunders' article on American artists from the 1990s. The role of the market is also recognised as an important factor in the need for assistants. Richard Wentworth states: 'In the last ten years art has become part of the wheel of commodity. It's to do with the market: artists are expected to be extremely productive and very repetitive.'⁷⁵ Assistants are employed to increase and quicken the productivity, so that artists can sell more work and meet market demands. Although these practices are now more widely acknowledged, the work of the named singular artist still holds the most (financial) value.⁷⁶

These debates do not belong in the past, they still continue today. In a 2007 roundtable on art fabrication, the question of acknowledging artists' assistants was raised. Interestingly, the subsequent response unfolded into a discussion about legal contracts that protect the artist from assistants attempting to have a claim on the artworks on which they assisted.⁷⁷ A principle at the fabrication firm Carlson & Co., Ed Suman, was under the impression that to publicly acknowledge assistants in an exhibition was still a cavalier move for the artist.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Aiden.

⁷⁶ For example, in the Press Release for the closing of the Frieze Art Fair 2009 there is no mention of artists' groups' works in the lists of major sales - all singular artists. Superflex, the artist/activist group is acknowledged as they made the Frieze Film 2009. The reference to installations being sold is more common, which acknowledges a trend towards installation since the around 1990s; perhaps in another 15-20 years, collective works will become the 'new installation' and frequent the buyers market. But this is one example of many sales, I chose Frieze as it is known as a contemporary art event rather than a more traditional art sale. 'Clear Evidence of Renewed Confidence at Frieze Art Fair 2009', *Frieze Art Fair Press Release*, 19th October 2009, http://www.friezeartfair.com/images/press_releases/End_of_Fair2009.pdf [Accessed: 07/01/2009].

⁷⁷ Jeffrey Deitch, founder of Deitch Projects, claimed: 'We now try to cover ourselves by using work-for-hire contracts with fabricators and artists' assistants, but problems slip through the cracks.' Deitch cited in 'The Producers', *Artforum* (October 2007), pp.352-6 & p.402 (pp.357).

⁷⁸ 'The Producers', pp.357-359.

The Makers: The Business of Art Making

In contrast to artists assisting other artists or artists attempting to establish themselves within industry (as with the Productivists' unsuccessful venture into the factory), businesses solely devoted to assisting and fabricating for the artist emerge in America in the 1960s. These fabrication firms were not necessarily businesses founded by artists; rather, they were set-up by astute businessmen, from varying backgrounds, who found a niche in the market. In distinction to the traditional foundry - which casts, enlarges and makes multiples for artists – the art fabricator became an established model in the US. There is an interim model between the foundries and the art fabricators, which can be found in the metalwork companies such as Gratz Industries, which manufactured industrial goods alongside making metal sculptural works for artists. Art fabrication firms such as Lippincott Inc and Carlson & Co. assisted sculptors whose work deviated from the traditional modes of art making, with an emphasis on new materials – in particular, cor-ten steel - and scale. The artist, when working with a fabricator, hands over the manufacturing of their artworks to skilled professionals, who are remunerated for their work. In the first chapter, I return to discuss these fabrication firms at length. While in the second chapter I present a newer model of art fabricator – the facilitator, in the guise of the Mike Smith Studio, London.

Atelier van Lieshout (AVL) is an example of a contemporary art-maker. AVL differs from the above list, not because it is based in The Netherlands, but because of the distinct nature of its work. AVL produces work that is exhibited under the studio's name and it also makes commissioned artworks which range from pieces for schoolyards and airports to a portable floating abortion clinic (*A-Portable for Women on Waves*, 2001) and stage design.⁷⁹ AVL's name is taken from its founder Joep van Lieshout. Its workshop is based in a warehouse at Rotterdam's harbour and its team has been

⁷⁹ See AVL's website for a catalogue of their works, www.ateliervanlieshout.com.

fabricating artworks since 1995. There is a definite sense of practicality or usability (use-value) to the works that AVL produce, which aesthetically ranges from the sublime to the ridiculous (for example, those works that are modelled after body parts and internal organs).

After being under conception for a number of years, AVL began to build AVL-Ville in 2001 - an 'autonomous village' where past, present and future AVL employees could live. Van Lieshout stresses the distinction between AVL as a business and the idea of AVL-Ville operating as a 'free state': He is the boss of the former, but not necessarily of the latter.⁸⁰ AVL functions as a business, nevertheless placing emphasis on the collaborative nature of the studio. It states on the AVL website:

The name Atelier Van Lieshout emphasises the fact that the works of art do not stem solely from the creative brain of Joep van Lieshout, but are produced by a creative team of artists, designers and architects.⁸¹

Van Lieshout dismissed the misperception that AVL-Ville was a utopian project: 'AVL-Ville is not utopian; it's absolutely the farthest place from utopia because the latter can't be realised. I have no interest in things that can't be realised.'⁸² Van Lieshout had planned to add an AVL-Academy as part of AVL-Ville. The curriculum would comprise of: 'Everything you never learned in art school: specific technical skills like

⁸⁰ Joep van Lieshout discussed this idea in his interview with Marcus Verhagen as part of the *Talking Art* series at Tate Modern with *Art Monthly*, 20th October 2007, <http://channel.tate.org.uk/media/24881439001>.

⁸¹ www.ateliervanlieshout.com [Accessed: 18/12/09].

⁸² Van Lieshout cited in: Jennifer Allen, 'Up the Organization - Joep van Lieshout, Atelier van Lieshout - Interview', *Artforum* (April 2001), <http://artforum.com/static/issues/200104/feature/lieshout4.html> [Accessed: 24/04/2008].

working with fibreglass and wood, as well as management and marketing.⁸³ The ‘free-state’ was short-lived. AVL-Ville survived for nine months, before a barrage of inspectors from numerous agencies - farming, alcohol licensing and building inspectors - closed it down for non-compliance with a number of regulations.⁸⁴ If you take away the sometimes-sadistic aesthetic and function of AVL’s work - for example, *Slave City*, and *Robotec* - a shipping container which is designed to be ‘outfitted for a variety of sexual practices, from Bestiality to S&M’⁸⁵ - the ethos of AVL can be reduced to a concern with the manufacturing of artworks using skilled labour within the studio. This production, in turn, encourages collaborative or cooperative labour with an emphasis on making not only an aesthetic object but, rather, producing a practical, functional one.

Methodology

*Raphael as much as any other artist was determined by the technical advances in art made before him, by the organisation of society and the division of labour in his locality, and, finally, by the division of labour in all the countries with which his locality had intercourse. Whether an individual like Raphael succeeds in developing his talent depends wholly on demand, which in turn depends on the division of labour and the conditions of human culture resulting from it.*⁸⁶

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*

The above quotation, from *The German Ideology*, is a key passage for the subject of and the methodology adopted in my thesis. Expanding upon Marx and Engels’ ideas about artistic labour, my aim is to situate moments of collective artistic labour since the 1960s

⁸³ Allen.

⁸⁴ Van Lieshout in conversation with Marcus Verhagen (2007).

⁸⁵ Allen.

⁸⁶ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology* (1845-6), ed. by C. J. Arthur, students’ edition (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1978), p.108.

within the economic, social and political context in which it was born, viewing art and society as connected. This approach refutes the conception that art and the economy exist within isolated spheres apart from one another. As Marx and Engels rightly intimate in the section on ‘Artistic Talent’, the artist is subjected to the division of labour within society whilst also being influenced by the geographic and historical context in which they are making. To view these works of art in isolation would be to make false assumptions about the nature of art, enhancing the myth, encouraged by the rise of the bourgeoisie, that art belongs in isolation from the outside world. I will not be supporting this myth and my thesis is firmly grounded in the notion that one cannot view art outside of the context in which it is made: be it economic, social, historical or geographical events which influence (not necessarily consciously) its production. This influence is not always a one-way street; art, or the way in which artists produce, can also affect how society operates.

A brief discussion of Marx and Engels’ concept of base and superstructure here may clarify some of these notions. Although a much-debated concept, the base/superstructure dyad is central to thinking about art in relation to the economy: namely, that the dominant modes of production affect the way that art is produced. The notion of base/superstructure appears in various guises in a number of writings by Marx and Engels, with Engels elaborating upon it (and adapting it to his own ideas) in his letters of the 1890s.⁸⁷ Marx sketches an outline of this concept in his ‘Preface’ to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure

⁸⁷ Marx and Engels, (1845-6). See ‘Part One: On Feuerbach’, pp.39-91. Frederick Engels, ‘Letter to Joseph Bloch’, London, September 21, 1890; ‘Letter to Conrad Schmidt’, October 27, 1890; ‘Letter to Franz Mehring’, July 14 1893; and ‘Letter to W. Borgius’, January 25th 1894.

and to which corresponds definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political, and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness... With the change of the economic foundations the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.⁸⁸

Marx proposes that the relations of production are what condition the 'superstructure'. A common misconception of the base/superstructure relation is that it is only a one-way determinate relationship. As Jorge Larrain points out, in *Theories of Surplus Value*, Marx acknowledges a 'reciprocal influence' between the base and superstructure, identifying that spiritual production can also have an effect on material production.⁸⁹ Therefore, the relationship between the base and superstructure can be viewed as dialectical (the interpretation that I adopt): the economic base informs the realms of art, religion, politics, ideology, etc. Furthermore, these realms can also inform the base. Obviously, things are not so clear cut, and there are accusations of reductionism aimed at this concept, but for the purpose of thinking the two as inseparable and informing one another this will suffice for understanding how I view art in relation to the wider world.⁹⁰ My consideration of art in relation to economic activity - or more specifically, art in relation to the dominant modes of production and division of labour within the period in which it was made - stems from an engagement with what Marx and Engels

⁸⁸ Karl Marx, 'Preface to A Critique of Political Economy' (1859) extract, in *Karl Marx Selected Writings*, ed. by David McLellan, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p.425.

⁸⁹ Jorge Larrain, 'Base and Superstructure', in *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, ed. by Tom Bottomore, 2nd edn (Oxford, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001), p.46.

⁹⁰ Larrain also points out that 'Marx is aware that material production develops unevenly with respect to artistic production'. This is due to the favouring of styles of earlier periods that are heralded as the norm or great art. We have only to read philosophers such as Georg Hegel or art historians like Heinrich Wölfflin to see how the heralding of one artistic style or period over another occurs.

termed a ‘materialist conception of history’.⁹¹ Arnold Hauser elaborates on this concept with regards to art history. He states:

The essence of the materialistic philosophy of history, with its doctrine of the ideological character of thought, consists in the thesis that spiritual attitudes are from the outset anchored in conditions of production, and move within the range of interests, aims and prospects characteristic of these; not that they are subsequently, externally, and deliberately adjusted to economic and social conditions.⁹²

Hauser firmly situates the production of art in relation to the economic conditions, he claims: ‘...In no phase of art history... do we find the development of art completely independent of the current economic and social conditions.’⁹³ However, Hauser is cautious to point out art’s distinct position in reflecting these conditions. He acknowledges that art and philosophy may at times veil the social causations of their production, nevertheless, these conditions remain decisive for the creation of both.

Following from Hauser’s considerations, it is important to recognise the unique position that art holds in relation to the base/superstructure formulation. Unlike law, art’s relationship to the economy is not always direct. In Leon Trotsky’s discussion of the relative autonomy of art, he suggests that the *form* of art is independent, however, the person making the work is not. The artist is a social being with a psychology and: ‘This psychology is the result of social conditions.’⁹⁴ For Trotsky, the production of art cannot be divorced from society because the artist is a social being who is conditioned

⁹¹ Marx and Engels (1845-6). See: ‘Part One: On Feuerbach’, pp.39-91.

⁹² Arnold Hauser, ‘The Sociological Approach: The Concept of Ideology in the History of Art’, in *The Philosophy of Art History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959), pp.19-40 (p.28).

⁹³ Hauser, p.36.

⁹⁴ Leon Trotsky, ‘From Literature and Revolution’ (1925), in *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, ed. by Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (Malden and Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp.442-447 (p.445).

by the same conditions as other men. In this way, we can understand art's relationship to society as being autonomous in the fact that the form of art is independent but it cannot be wholly detached because it is a (indirect) product of society. Indirect, in the fact that the artwork has been made by a person, but exists on its own, as an autonomous object. Theodor Adorno concedes this point, he states:

The aesthetic force of production is the same as that of productive labour and has the same teleology; and what may be called aesthetic relations of production – all that in which the productive force is embedded in and which is active – are sedimentations or imprintings of social relations of production. Art's double character as autonomous and *fait social* is incessantly reproduced on the level of its autonomy.⁹⁵

The task of viewing art with regards to the relations of production (via the artist) is not always a simple one. I have taken into account Adorno's warnings and have tried, throughout this thesis, to keep in mind the relative autonomy of art when considering its production in relation to the respective modes of production discussed.

I engage with economic texts and theory in order to see how artists working since the 1960s, adopting a mode of socialised labour, have been conditioned by or have conditioned the dominant modes of production within late capitalism. My approach does not entail merely a formal mapping of modes of production onto artworks.⁹⁶ Rather, it details actual models of art making and labour in art, in relation to methods of non-art

⁹⁵ Theodor Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory* (1970) (London: Continuum, 2004), p.6.

⁹⁶ My contention here is with homologous accounts, such as Frederic Jameson's 'The Brick and the Balloon: Architecture, Idealism and Land Speculation'. In the essay, Jameson elaborates on a discussion of recent glass 'balloon-like' architecture as a symptom of the move to immaterial labour. His argument is literal and visual. This falls into the trap of Formalism rather than critical engagement. Frederic Jameson, 'The Brick and the Balloon: Architecture, Idealism and Land Speculation', in *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983-1998* (London and New York: Verso, 1998), pp.162-189.

production (focused primarily on the relation between manager and worker) within their respective periods. Art, and the way it is produced in late capitalist society, has a dialectical relation to the way everyday industries work within the contemporaneous period. Thus, art is not viewed in isolation from industry and economics but alongside them. Art is a product of labour, be it productive or non-productive labour (not directly producing a material object) and my thesis is predicated on this notion. It is for these reasons that I chose not to undertake ‘field work’ in my research. Because this thesis is concerned with models of art labour within particular periods, it references interviews with fabricators and texts from the periods in which they originated. This return to earlier interviews is to identify the attitudes and concerns at the time, rather than ones attributed, for example, to the establishment of fabrication firms after the fact.⁹⁷

Productive and Unproductive Labour in Art

The notion that art is subject to the laws of capital is fundamental to this thesis. Marx’s analysis of the commodity in *Capital* is predicated on productive labour (i.e. labour that produces a commodity) as such, art has to conform to this model for the validation of this thesis.⁹⁸ Further to the notion that art embodies value, is the proposition that artists can be productive and unproductive labourers. In the example of contracted labour, the artist purchases the labour of others in order to produce works of art. This model encompasses the buying of labour, the production of surplus (through making the object) and also the sale of the artwork. According to Marx, productive labour is that which produces, firstly, an object and, secondly, surplus value. If the artist was to make the object him or herself, arguably – if we are to follow Marx’s discussion in ‘Peasants and

⁹⁷ Recent publications include Peter Carlson and Ed Suman’s participation in the earlier cited roundtable on art fabrication in *Artforum* and also the publication of a book by Donald Lippincott’s son, about Lippincott Inc. Jonathan D. Lippincott, *Large Scale: Fabricating Sculpture in the 1960s and 1970s* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010).

⁹⁸ Peter Bürger views the exclusivity of art as being founded in the bourgeois period, in which, he argues, the separation of art from life praxis occurred. Bürger.

Artisans in Capitalist Society’ - they are neither productive nor unproductive labourers, nor both.⁹⁹ Marx sees the role of the artisan as being split, taking on the task of the capitalist and also that of a wage-labourer. However, the roles of patron and dealer, which have become established within the art world since Marx’s analysis, confuse this equation. If the artist’s patron commissions a work then, ultimately, the patron is the capitalist who has purchased the labour-power of the artist. The surplus will be realised once the work is sold on. Within the contracted labour model, the artist takes on the role of the capitalist (as the purchaser of labour-power) whilst the assistant/fabricator/facilitator takes on the role of wage-labourer. Through addressing Marx’s analysis, the feasibility of proposing that the artist can take on a role akin to the capitalist is thus confirmed. Marx stated that the capitalist mode of production was based on an enlargement of the earlier Guild model; as such, craft production forms the basis of the model of capitalist production.¹⁰⁰

The unproductive labour of the newer modes of artistic practice (to be discussed at length in the third chapter) confuses the analysis of the artwork as commodity. Unproductive labour can be viewed in those practices that are not concerned with the production of a material artwork. In these practices the ‘art’ aspect exists in the relations and interactions that are formed, encountered and facilitated by the artist or artist-collective.¹⁰¹ As capitalism moves towards what Marx views as ‘unproductive labour’ (the provision of services and use-values not embodied in commodities), so does art making. Despite this proposition, newer art practices do, however, incorporate elements of ‘productive labour’. The productive labour lies in the production of documentary materials; be it a photograph, video or booklet. These documents subsequently become

⁹⁹ Karl Marx, ‘Peasants and Artisans in Capitalist Society’ (*Theories of Surplus Value* extract), in *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*, pp.432-434.

¹⁰⁰ Karl Marx, *Capital*, trans. by Ben Fowkes, vol. 1 (London: Penguin Classics, 1990), p.439.

¹⁰¹ I will return to discuss these practices in terms of the ‘performative’ in the conclusion to my thesis.

the commodities and begin to circulate the market. However, there are works whose remnants can only be found in witness accounts; these works are truly unproductive in terms of their immateriality. These works are more generally associated with art-activism, which I discuss in the third chapter.

A Note on ‘Socialised Labour’

It is important to elaborate on the title and to consider the terms of my thesis (and the historical development of these) within the wider remit of art history. My research into (some would say fascination with) labour in art production began when I started to ask questions about who was making, and I mean physically making, works of art. Like a lot of undergraduate art history students, the phenomenon of (contemporary) artists utilising assistants to create their work was alien, after being previously schooled in the myth of the ‘artist-genius’ - the lone artist working in his studio.¹⁰² After happening upon an article about Damien Hirst’s assistants, I was more than eager to uncover why the subsumption of their work under one artist’s name was rarely addressed in art history. And this interest is how my inquiries into the division of labour in art began. There are a wealth of artistic practices that explode the myth of the single author; the term ‘socialised labour’ becomes useful in describing this mass of practices.

Socialised labour is the overarching term that I use to describe a kind of production that is social. At the heart of this term is the incorporation of multiple workers. However, these workers or labourers do not always conform to the traditional model of art making, but also extend to encompass the participatory audience of post-conceptual artistic practices. Socialised labour comprises of collective labour; however, the two are not necessarily identical. Collective labour evokes a sense of ‘working

¹⁰² My use of ‘his’ is purposeful in signifying the male artist as ‘genius’.

together' or group work, which is not always the case with socialised labour. The term 'collective', for me, has a more positive - somewhat utopic - emphasis that connotes an egalitarian way of working and which, for most of the art practices discussed in this thesis, is generally not the case. Socialised labour can entail a division of labour (and, subsequently a hierarchy) - as in the case of artists' assistants who may be subjected to a variety of roles for which they are remunerated: from cleaning brushes and stretching canvases to operating technology or painting whole paintings/creating entire sculptures or installation under an artist's instruction. The assistant is commonly not publicly acknowledged in the production of the artwork, but their labour does contribute to the making of the work. Socialised labour also incorporates those who fabricate for artists on their own independent business premises. This can take countless forms: multiple craftsmen or even the further contracting of labour to non-art industries in order to achieve the perfect finish or size; in other words, to achieve the artist's conception. As an extension of the fabrication model, those who 'facilitate' - who base their entire business model on assisting and making for artists and designers - are also counted as socialised models of labour. I identify these models of art making as 'contracted labour'.

Socialised labour also expands to those artworks which are 'immaterial'- processes that do not produce a material artwork - to those which Nicolas Bourriaud terms 'relational aesthetics' (placing emphasis on the creation of relations rather than objects); and to those practices which earlier came under 'performance'.¹⁰³ Artist's groups also fall within this classification, which extends to partnerships, collaboration with the public (audience participation and 'encouraged' engagement) and art-activism. I address these types of artistic production in the third chapter. Throughout this text I will

¹⁰³ I am well aware of the political and theoretical ideas that I am signifying by using the term 'immaterial'. Later in this thesis, a discussion of 'immaterial labour' (from Maurizio Lazzarato and other Autonomia thinkers) will ensue. Bourriaud (1999).

engage with the different practices separately, I do not intend to view all these ways of making as one homogenous practice with a singular intention and result. They all have their own specificities which relate to different aspects of later modes of capitalism. I propose that certain moments within capitalist society have allowed for socialised labour to occur in artistic practice; one of the key questions for this thesis being: why do artists adopt collective or social modes of production in certain periods? Thus, the structure of this thesis is loosely chronological in terms of identifying two periods in the twentieth century in which art making becomes more explicitly social. These moments occur around the late 1960s and the 1990s, although this thesis is not strictly limited to the two periods, looking to models of socialised labour that emerged since the 1960s. I should also note here, that my thesis is mainly focused upon the Western capitalist world and, more specifically, for the main part addresses examples from the United States and Britain.

Labour and Pre-Capitalist Production

The logical starting point for thinking about labour in art would be to consider modernity.¹⁰⁴ Modernity fostered the growth of industry and is the period in which images of mass workers begin to manifest in art.¹⁰⁵ First, however, I wish to attend to notions of socialised labour in the period prior to capitalism, as this type of labour is neither exclusive to the period on which this thesis is focused, nor capitalism in its entirety. Arguably, the concept of individuality is a (bourgeois) capitalist construct, which has its foundation in modern life, as opposed to the concept of the social, which is

¹⁰⁴ By 'modernity', I am referring to what is termed 'classical modernity', also known as 'the age of capital' or the 'long nineteenth-century' (Eric Hobsbawm).

¹⁰⁵ I am not saying here that people only began to work under capitalism, rather, I am signalling the specific nature of work under capitalism which shifts the onus from producing for oneself to producing for the market. The employment of a mass of workers, by the capitalist, for the production of commodities becomes commonplace under capitalism.

more recently associated with neoliberal capitalism.¹⁰⁶ Frederick Engels claimed that labour was present in the lives of early man, arguing that the physical evolution of the human hand was, ultimately, a product of labour.¹⁰⁷ Raymond Williams writes that the earliest reference to 'labour' in writing was around 1300.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the understanding of the term as 'manual work' became widespread only in analyses of capitalism. Marx situates collective labour historically, with the idea of man as a hunter-gatherer 'at the dawn of human development'.¹⁰⁹ However, his key writings on labour are those concerned with the capitalist economy.¹¹⁰

The physical evolution of man, for Engels, was a result of the kind of labour activities pre-historic man embarked upon. Engels elaborates upon this to argue that the development of labour brought society together through joint activity, also leading to the origins of language, which he further argues is a prelude to the evolution of the human brain. The origin of tools is paramount to human development - beginning with the simple and developing into the more refined - and is also the context for the origins of

¹⁰⁶ Although this association may now be the case, I would argue that the 'social' onto which neoliberalism has latched, is a forced, mediated type of sociality, exemplified in technologically facilitated media such as Facebook and Twitter. It is a sociality experienced without any real effort (i.e. a click of a mouse, as opposed to face-to-face interactions). Furthermore, I also believe that this sociality is played out by individuals and does not entail a true sociality or collectivity. For discussions of modernity and individuality see: Georg Simmel, 'The Metropolis and Mental Life' (1902-3), extracted in *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, pp.132-136; Charles Harrison, 'Modernism', in *Critical Terms for Art History*, ed. by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996), pp.142-155; Charles Baudelaire, 'The Painter of Modern Life' (1863), in *The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays*, ed. by Jonathan Mayne (London: Phaidon, 1964), pp.22-40 (see particularly the section titled 'The Artist, Man of the World, Man of the Crowd, and Child' and Baudelaire's discussion of the flâneur); Marshall Berman, 'Baudelaire: Modernism in the Streets', in *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (London & New York: Verso, 1982), pp.131-171; and T.J Clark, 'Introduction' to *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers* (London and New York: Thames and Hudson, 1984), pp.3-22.

¹⁰⁷ Frederick Engels, 'The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man' (1876) (Moscow: Progress, 1934), www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1876/part-played-labour/index.htm [Accessed 09/04/2010].

¹⁰⁸ Raymond Williams, 'Labour', in *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Fontana, 1988), pp.176-179.

¹⁰⁹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, trans. by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, vol. 1 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983), p.316.

¹¹⁰ Marx and Engels detail the evolution of the division of labour between, and within, the town and the country in *The German Ideology*, where they discuss the emergence of manufacture and industry from the guild model which, in turn, came from individual craftsmanship. Marx and Engels (1845-6), pp.68-79. Marx discusses the fundamental role of labour in creating value in the commodity at length in *Capital*.

organised or cooperative labour. The tool is paramount to the development of capitalism in the twentieth century and, paradoxically, is seen by commentators to play oppressive and emancipatory roles at different stages within capitalism's history.¹¹¹ Therefore, for Engels, labour is fundamental to the development of society; it is not only the labour of the individual, but also the social or cooperative nature of labour that encourages communication between early man. Charles Woolfson calls Engels' proposition a 'labour theory of culture'.¹¹²

Marx also wrote about the pre-capitalist labour process. In the first volume of *Capital*, he devotes some space to discussing the relation between man and nature in early forms of labour and the production of use-values: 'The labour-process', he writes:

... is the everlasting Nature-imposed condition of human existence, and therefore is independent of every social phase of that existence, or rather, is common to every such phase.¹¹³

The labour process, for Marx, existed before and beyond the bounds of capitalism. Arguably, the model of labour to which Marx refers, is more concerned with individuals who worked the land for their own means of subsistence. Any surplus produced would then be taken to market. A social mode of production - in terms of employing mass labour - occurs under capitalism, albeit one which fosters worker-alienation and exploitation.

¹¹¹ See the following chapter in which I examine the effect of the introduction of machinery into the factory and the deskilling that occurred alongside it.

¹¹² Charles Woolfson, *The Labour Theory of Culture: A Re-examination of Engel's Theory of Human Origins* (London: Routledge, 1982).

Also noteworthy is Ernst Fischer's *The Necessity of Art* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963). Fischer considers early man's relation to art, working with the premise that man's mastery over nature is magic and that this magic – that he believes is at the 'very root of human existence' (p.33) - is the essence of art. He develops this notion to then argue that art must help change the world through its social nature (p.48).

¹¹³ Marx (1983), p.179.

Cooperation is fundamental to the capitalist labour process - the capitalist's employment of the labour power of a mass of workers who are 'working together, at the same time, in one place' marks the beginning of capitalist production for Marx.¹¹⁴ However, once again, cooperation is not unique to capitalism. Marx distinguishes between earlier forms of cooperative production - such as the building of the pyramids in Egypt - and capitalist modes of production. The former model of labour, he argues, is either communal (i.e. a vested community interest) or slave-labour, whereas the capitalist worker is free to sell his or her labour. Cooperation, or what I term socialised labour, becomes important to capitalist production. Pre-capitalist 'artistic' or craft production takes the form of guilds and workshops, forming the basis upon which capitalist production develops. Marx states at the beginning of his chapter on Co-operation: 'It [early capitalism] is merely an enlargement of the workshop of the master craftsman of the guilds.'¹¹⁵ Art produced within an established, yet early, phase of capitalism attempts to resist this sociality and the artist becomes individualised in the wake of the industrial revolution and when confronted by mass production.¹¹⁶ The artists' resistance to the sociality of the capitalist labour process, takes a collective form when confronted with later phases of capitalism that adopt a more individualised labour model. I address the capitalist labour process in depth in the first chapter.

In terms of pre-capitalist art making, Peter Bürger acknowledges the 'social' in earlier periods of art in his *Theory of the Avant-Garde*.¹¹⁷ Bürger's plotting of the development of art through the delineations of Sacral, Courtly and Bourgeois Art (each

¹¹⁴ Marx (1983), p.305.

¹¹⁵ Marx, (1990), p.439.

¹¹⁶ The mid-eighteenth century gave rise to Romanticism, a movement formed in response to scientific and industrial progress. The arts responded to these innovations by considering the aesthetic effect of their works and the artist was viewed as the sole creator of his work with judgements of taste welcomed. The work of art is defended against the effect of an intensified technical base in society. Aesthetic theories also begin to be written by philosophers such as Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Schiller. The Romantic individual is born out of this movement and is a person who has a singular (divine or god-given) vision.

¹¹⁷ Bürger, pp.47-54.

roughly equating to a distinct time period), draws attention to the waning of collectivity in art production and reception as we move towards the category of Bourgeois Art. Sacral Art, Bürger argues, is collective in its production and reception, whilst Courtly Art remains collective only in its reception. Bourgeois Art denounces the collectivity of Courtly Art and privileges the individual in both its production and reception. In Bourgeois Art, Bürger argues, there is a clearly defined individuality in the model of the Romantic artist and also in the contemplative nature of ‘experiencing’ a painting. Therefore, we can deduce that through the collective nature of its production and reception, originally, the labour in art - associated with craft - was social. However, through the incarnation of Bourgeois Art under capitalism, art, in Bürger’s analysis, has become increasingly individualistic in its production and reception. Bürger identifies an early moment where artists break away from the established notion of individual production in art, which he terms the ‘historical avant-garde’.¹¹⁸ The historical avant-garde questioned the autonomy of art; that is, the idea that bourgeois artists were concerned with aestheticism and were no longer concerned with everyday life praxis. Bürger argues that the historical (and later the neo-) avant-garde attempted to negate this autonomy through its engagement with life praxis in its work. This task is epitomised in Duchamp’s Readymades, which Bürger views as ‘manifestations’ rather than works. Duchamp returned everyday objects to the art context and, for Bürger, this resulted in the negation of the category of individual production.¹¹⁹

Despite the confirmation of a move toward the individual in artistic practice under early capitalism and the dawn of modernity, I draw attention to the re-socialisation of labour in art making in the later stages of capitalism. Further, I point towards those practices that are clandestine in the face of the individualisation of the artist. Moreover,

¹¹⁸ Bürger, pp.47-54.

¹¹⁹ Bürger, pp.51-2.

in recent phases of capitalism, the individual does not disappear or become overshadowed by the collectivity; rather, he becomes ingrained into a certain type of socialised art practice. This type of practice fosters an artist-model, which I shall refer to as the ‘social individual’. At the same time, the ‘social individual’ is disavowed by the more radical artist groupings that engage a fuller collective sociality.

Socialised Labour under Change

I have given a sense of the role that labour has adopted throughout art history to assist in mapping my own project. There are periods in which art takes a more social turn and these turns are fostered by the kind of ideological structures that are socially and economically implemented in society. These concentrated moments of ideological change within capitalism, in turn, effect how art is made. Dominant work practices influence artists’ working models (i.e. artists’ groups adopting a corporate identity). Additionally, certain management and business models adopt artists’ working methods (as is evident in the 1990s).

Labour appears in art around periods of social change - the industrial revolution, changes in attitudes and laws about women’s working hours, full-scale social revolutions and so forth. Further to this proposition, those moments that are truly revolutionary - such as the period following the October Russian Revolution of 1917 - are the periods in which the working practice of artists is affected. In such circumstances, there occurs a shift from simply representing social change to implementing it through working practice. This is where Bürger locates the historical avant-garde, with its collective mode of production and its efforts to incorporate ‘art into life’, in which the function of art extends beyond that of mere representation.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ Bürger.

Art making has undergone a profound change since the 1960s. It began to resemble the dominant modes of production more closely than in previous periods, to the extent that, I will argue, some art practices subconsciously adopt the traits of certain capitalist production processes. The moments in which the economics of everyday - working practices and the division of labour - cross over into art form a substantial part of this thesis.

Overview of the Thesis

Each chapter of this thesis is focussed upon a different guise of socialised labour in art and how it relates to the wider socio-politico-economic period in which the respective types of labour occur. These guises are: the emergence of the art fabricator – the contracting of non-artistic labour, the adaption of the US art fabricator model into the British art facilitator and, finally, collective and social modes of artistic practice that become visible in the 1990s – relational aesthetics – and recent models of art-activism. The question that underpins my thesis is: Why did these specific models of socialised labour in art become prominent when they did? Therefore, I chose the above guises as they are each specific to the period in which they emerge and, more importantly, aspects of the dominant ideologies resulting from period-specific economic models can be identified within each model. For example, the deskilling of work - which resulted in the dominance of Fordist ideology in post-1945 America – is viewed as having an ideological effect on the establishment of the art fabrication businesses.

Chapter one specifically addresses the emergence of the US art fabricators in the late 1960s. I argue that the establishment of businesses primarily founded to manufacture works of art is not to be understood in isolation from the moment of capitalism in which they are founded. I look at the deskilling of work in the twentieth-century, with particular focus given to the labour process as the site of deskilling in

general work. Harry Braverman's renewed analysis of the labour process from 1974 is a key text for this chapter and provides the historical underpinning for the rest of the thesis. In order to understand the subsequent phase of capitalism (examined in the following two chapters) – neoliberalism - we first need to identify the ideological features of its predecessor - monopoly capitalism.

Despite the earlier publication of analyses of the capitalist labour process, I use Braverman's text because it is focussed upon monopoly capitalism and renews the early analyses –including that of Marx. This updating makes Braverman's thesis appropriate for thinking about the American labour process and the effects of the deskilling of work in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It is important to understand the process of deskilling and the resultant changes for the worker because of the ideological effect that methods such as those implemented by Ford had on society more widely. I therefore argue that the American art fabrication firms are indebted to an ideology resulting from the deskilling and dividing of work.

I further propose that the artist is also subjected to a deskilling through contracting the labour of fabricators for the production of their works of art. Lucy Lippard and John Chandler's seminal 1968 essay 'The Dematerialisation of Art' openly acknowledges the renewed interest of artists contracting labour outside of the studio in this period.¹²¹ The division of labour in art is not specific to capitalism; artistic tasks were commonly divided within pre-modernist artistic working models. However, the later moment of deskilling within capitalism is distinct to those of the pre-modernist workshops and guilds. Once the deskilling of work is commonplace within general production, the artist begins to contract labour again, but now it is contracted to those

¹²¹ Lucy Lippard and John Chandler, 'The Dematerialisation of Art' (1968) originally published in *Art International*, 12:2 (February 1968). Reprinted in *Conceptual Art: A Critical Reader*, ed. by Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimson (Cambridge: MIT, 2000), pp.46-50.

skilled in industrial production methods. In this way, the skills utilised in making these artworks are distinct from traditional artistic skills and are not necessarily skills that the artist has himself. In the final section of the chapter, I turn to argue that the effect of deskilling within art has transmuted into a very different practice today, to one that allows artists such as Damien Hirst to contract the labour of assistants to do work which he is skilled to undertake himself.

The second chapter turns to consider post-Fordism and the phase of capitalism known as neoliberalism. I propose that there are two ways in which art is affected by neoliberalism: Firstly, it affects those who are making the artworks whom I address in this chapter and secondly, those artists or artists' groups who work collaboratively, to be addressed in my third chapter. The second chapter examines the emergence of the Mike Smith Studio in London - a newer model of the art fabricator: the facilitator - within the context of neoliberal capitalism. I draw upon David Harvey's theory of 'flexible accumulation' to argue that the economic conditions of neoliberalism allowed for a UK business devoted to facilitating every aspect of making art to emerge in the 1990s.¹²²

I begin the chapter by establishing an understanding of neoliberal working tropes (and their accompanying ideologies) through reading analyses such as Eve Chiapello and Luc Boltanski's *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. Subsequently, I turn to examine the artist-facilitator – the Mike Smith Studio – and its working model in terms of neoliberal business ideology. *The New Spirit of Capitalism* is particularly important for this thesis as it presents a model worker that Boltanski and Chiapello claim is specific to neoliberal capitalism. They identify two periods in which the critique of capitalism has changed and name these 'social critique' (c.1930s) and 'artistic critique' (post-1968). The model

¹²² David Harvey, 'From Fordism to Flexible Accumulation', in *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), pp.141-172.

worker post-1968 is founded within the latter critique and takes his inspiration from the model of the Romantic artist. In this chapter, I argue that the Mike Smith Studio incorporates aspects of new working models identified within 1990s management discourse - such as the project, the network and new technologies - and claim that the Studio, in many ways, epitomises neoliberal business ideologies. Furthermore, I propose that Mike Smith himself embodies the ideal worker within this period.

Building upon the analysis of neoliberal capitalism in the previous chapter, the final chapter moves away from contracted labour in art and art businesses to address different types of socialised artistic practice: relational art, socially-engaged art and art-activism. In this chapter I draw upon the Italian Autonomists' analyses of contemporary capitalism in addition to the work of theorists discussed in the preceding chapter. I do so for the purpose of further examining the second way in which I propose art is affected by neoliberalism: new social practices in art. The Autonomists' writings are particularly important for thinking about how the ideological effects of neoliberalism – such as the employment of the 'artist' model worker – can be adapted and utilised for collective political action counter to capitalism. I draw upon theories such as 'immaterial labour' (Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Maurizio Lazzarato), 'virtuosity' (Paolo Virno) and the implementation of new technologies, in a consideration of the effect that these models have had on the 'social turn' within contemporary artistic practices. I argue that the recent socialised artistic practices respond to neoliberal ideology in distinct ways: relational art adapts to neoliberalism, whilst art-activism utilises capitalist technologies and tropes – such as the network – to critique it. Others, such as the artist Thomas Hirschhorn, navigate the mid-ground of the two.

The chapter begins by critiquing Nicolas Bourriaud's argument from *Relational Aesthetics*, which proposes that the artworks discussed are political through their

sociability.¹²³ I offer a counter-argument by showing that these artworks, in fact, adopt and adapt to neoliberal working practices rather than offer an alternative to capitalism. Subsequently, I examine socialised artistic practices that are more critical of capitalism, but nevertheless utilise capitalist tropes in their actions. Thomas Hirschhorn's *Bataille Monument* (2002) is presented as an example of an artwork which takes the form of a temporary project.

The chapter concludes by turning to examine the more ambiguous practices aligned with art-activism in terms of neoliberalism and the social affect that these practices are able to produce. I question the use of capitalist tools - such as the internet - and also neoliberal working practices – such as the project – by the art-activists who are critical of capitalism and ask if it is possible for these devices to be used for the re-politicisation art. Through this examination, a distinction is made between artists who *perform* politics and those who 'do' politics.

My conclusion elaborates upon the argument that the art-activists 'do' politics rather than perform it in the preceding chapter by considering these practices in terms of the concept of the avant-garde. I draw upon Peter Bürger's notion of the avant-garde, which calls for art to return to life praxis, to argue that art-activism is the new avant-garde artistic practice because of its ambiguity as to whether the work the activist undertakes is art or politics.¹²⁴ The art-activists' practice clearly makes interventions into social life whilst the results of these actions are exhibited in art contexts. This crossing of the boundary between social life and art makes it difficult for the work to be categorised. For this reason, I conclude by claiming that art-activism is the closest artistic model to achieving Bürger's task of the avant-garde.

¹²³ Bourriaud.

¹²⁴ Bürger.

- Chapter One -

**Dematerialisation, Contracted Labour and Postproduction: The
Deskilling of the Artist in the Age of Late Capitalism**

*The technical and economic conditions of
machine production...today determine the
lives of all the individuals who are born into
this mechanism...with irresistible force.*¹²⁵

Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism*

In 1974 Harry Braverman published *Labour and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, a seminal book that examined the changing nature and the deskilling of work in the American labour process under monopoly capitalism. The move towards deskilling was not unique to the US. Similarly, in Britain and Europe workers in manufacturing plants and elsewhere were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the ‘degradation of work’ occurring in the workplace. In the wake of scientific management (Frederick Winslow Taylor) and Fordist production methods, workers were no longer able to apply a wide range of skills but were often subjected to repetitive tasks and stripped of their skills in the name of capital. This was not a phenomenon isolated to the sphere of work but extended far beyond the scope of Braverman’s analysis and countless others’ theses into the world of art.

In this chapter, I propose that there is a trend towards a gradual deskilling in the work of artists in general from the 1960s through to the present day. The handing over of the production of work by artists to skilled assistants, technicians, foundries, fabricators and facilitators, in order to accommodate the market, is symptomatic of the

¹²⁵ Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1976), p181.

deskilling of non-art workers.¹²⁶ Through directing the manufacture of an artwork, the artist takes on a role akin to that of a manager, which involves him adopting new management skills while rejecting the traditional skills associated with art. Through the employment of fabricators, the artist no longer needs to have (technical) skills; the labour is now hidden alongside the skilled ‘artisan’ who fulfils the role of the fabricator.

Is the move towards deskilled artists outsourcing work to skilled workers symptomatic of late capitalist society? Is there a need for the reskilling of art, or is this just the inescapable condition in which artists now work? Some would argue that the newer models of art involve, in fact, the reskilling of the artist. However, I contend that these new skills, contrary to the craft-based skills of earlier periods, are those akin to the administrative or social work (affective labour) of neoliberal capitalism. In art, a shift towards an emphasis on the *idea* rather than the making of an object occurred around the 1960s (what John Chandler and Lucy Lippard termed ‘dematerialisation’).¹²⁷ John Roberts argues that post-Duchampian art entails a reskilling, precisely because of the artist’s rejection of craft-based skills in favour of immaterial skills.¹²⁸ He identifies this phenomenon as the ‘deskilling-reskilling’ dialectic which, he argues, allows the divorce of craft skills from the artist to be viewed as a reskilling. According to Roberts, the potential for a reskilling of art relies upon the non-heteronomous labour of deskilled art which, he argues, allows for autonomous forms of transformation.¹²⁹ Roberts continues:

¹²⁶ Sculpture in its ‘expanded sense’ refers here to those methods of art making that Rosalind Krauss details in her seminal essay ‘Sculpture in the Expanded Field’, for example, performance, land and minimal art. Krauss, ‘Sculpture in the Expanded Field’, in *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Massachusetts: MIT, 1986), pp.276-290.

¹²⁷ Lucy Lippard and John Chandler, ‘The Dematerialisation of Art’ (1968) originally published in *Art International*, 12:2 (February 1968). Reprinted in *Conceptual Art: A Critical Reader*, ed. by Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimson (Cambridge: MIT, 2000), pp.46-50.

¹²⁸ Roberts (2007).

¹²⁹ Roberts is unclear as to the form that the reskilled art takes. He does not believe that art after the decline of craft-based skill became entirely heteronomous, despite the argument that conceptual art replaced these skills. The hand was still useful in making conceptual works, even if it was only directed by the artist (rather than attached to him). Roberts makes the argument that skill re-emerges as the craft of reproducibility of copying without copying (as Roberts suggests the Readymades are). Roberts, pp.97-99.

‘...these forms of transformation will of necessity find their expression in other skills than craft-based skills: namely, immaterial skills.’¹³⁰

In this chapter, I take a closer look at Braverman’s thesis (and criticisms of it) in order to question whether the correlation between deskilling in the everyday workplace and the move to dematerialisation in art is coincidental. Furthermore, I propose that the dematerialisation of art is a consequence of the wider economic and ensuing ideological conditions of monopoly and, subsequently, late capitalism. I look at the dematerialisation of art in relation to the broader deskilling in work at large, with particular relevance given to the increase in the use of contracted labour by artists.

Firstly, a note about the different periodisations of capitalism: There are conflicting terms and ideas about the numerous periods of capitalism within Marxist theory. Marx only lived through and identified early capitalism, however he did anticipate how capitalism might evolve.¹³¹ The first phase of capitalism is often called ‘competitive capitalism’ (Adam Smith), and is the phase to which Marx attends in *Capital*. According to Laurence Harris, within competitive capitalism, the markets guide the division of labour and surplus is predominantly appropriated in the form of profit.¹³² The second phase of capitalism is often called ‘monopoly capitalism’ (of which Braverman writes, originally named thus by Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy) and the third phase has been termed ‘state monopoly capitalism’ or ‘late capitalism’ (Ernest Mandel).¹³³ Harris writes that under monopoly capitalism, the credit system dominates

¹³⁰ Roberts (2007), p.88.

¹³¹ We must not forget that Marx and Engels already saw the beginnings of finance capital and the effect that credit had on the economy in *Capital III*. This stems from the discussion of the replacement of gold with paper money (acting as a kind of credit note). See chapter 27 in *Capital III* for Marx’s discussion of this. Karl Marx, *Capital* (1894), trans. by David Fernbach, vol. 3 (London: Penguin, 1991), pp.566-573.

¹³² Laurence Harris, ‘Periodisation of Capital’, in *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, p.416.

¹³³ Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy, *Monopoly Capitalism An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).

Ernest Mandel chooses the latter - ‘late capitalism’ over ‘state monopoly capitalism’ arguing on the most basic level - that of syntax - that the title ‘state monopoly capitalism’ implies an ‘exaggerated emphasis on the relative autonomy of the state.’(p.515) He continues his argument by proposing that those who write about ‘state monopoly capitalism’ fail to place emphasis on the ‘logic of capitalism itself’ rather

and works with the commodity markets to guide the social division of labour. Surplus is appropriated from interest in this stage. Under state monopoly capitalism, Harris claims that the state coordinates the social division of labour and the extraction of surplus is through taxes. Multinational corporations emerge within this later phase, which marks a contrast from state-run to international businesses.¹³⁴ I will address the contemporary period of capitalism, originating in the late 1970s, as ‘neoliberal capitalism’.¹³⁵ The contemporary period has also been referred to as ‘neo-flexible capitalism’ by Eve Chiapello and is closely associated with the economic model established in the West by Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan.¹³⁶

Harris proposes that each stage of capitalism is ‘marked by increasing socialization of every aspect of the economy.’¹³⁷ Harris’ proposition - that the capitalist economy is becoming increasingly socialised - aids my thesis. I assert the notion that art adapts to the conditions of capitalism through its increasingly apparent utilisation of social methods of production. The socialisation of labour that occurs under monopoly capitalism within the dominant models of production is the main focus of this chapter and sets the precedent for subsequent phases of capitalism (state monopoly or late capitalism). In order to look at the effects of deskilling under monopoly capitalism, we first need to understand a Marxian conception of the ‘labour process’.

than the role of the state. It is the inherent contradiction of capitalism - the hybrid combination of market anarchy and state interventionism - that is at the core of late capitalism for Mandel. He does not deny the role of the state in capitalist economy – taxes, for example - but views capital, and therefore profit, as the leading force. [See Ernest Mandel, *Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1980), pp.500-522.] I adopt ‘late capitalism’ rather than ‘state monopoly capitalism’ for my thesis.

¹³⁴ Harris, pp.416-7.

¹³⁵ Milton Friedman and his predecessor Friedrich Hayek are cited as key economic theorists on what we now call ‘neoliberalism’, which, in the 1970s, became a dominant economic model in the US and the UK. See: David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2005) and David Harvey, *Spaces of Global Capitalism* (London & New York: Verso, 2006).

¹³⁶ Eve Chiapello, ‘Evolution and Co-optation’, *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.585-594.

¹³⁷ Harris, p.415. Harris takes his cue from Marx (and Engels) in *Capital III*, chapter 27, where he discusses social capital in relation to joint stock companies.

The Labour Process

In Chapter Seven of the first book of *Capital*, Marx wrote about the labour process under capitalism. Preceding his analysis of the capitalist labour process, he firstly discusses the pre-capitalist labour process. Marx viewed the labour process as natural, occurring when man ‘confronts the materials of nature as a force of nature’.¹³⁸ Marx’s identification of man working with nature as an early form of labour is reminiscent of Engels’ theory of evolution. Engels argues that labour takes a primary role in the development of the human hand and the transition from ape to (hu)man more generally. I interpret Marx’s section in Chapter Seven as suggesting that man, through his very nature, is predisposed to labour. This predisposition, in turn, allows for man to be made susceptible to the labour process. David Harvey proposes that this relationship is dialectical, rather than it being viewed as one-sided with man’s mastery over nature.¹³⁹ Following his discussion of pre-capitalist labour in Chapter Seven, Marx turns to the capitalist labour process. Marx details the effect that the division of labour has on what he termed the ‘social division of labour’ - how labour is divided within society - and identified three moments in which the changes in the social division of labour affected the worker.¹⁴⁰ For example, Marx delineates the transition from the guild system through to manufacture; under the latter, the ‘social mechanisation of production belongs to the capitalist.’¹⁴¹ The nature of labour changed from that of cooperation within the guild system, to become labour that is increasingly divided within the new system of manufacture. Marx claims that the guilds aimed to prevent Masters becoming capitalists by limiting the number of apprentices and journeymen a capitalist could employ. As such, the merchants could buy the commodities but could not purchase

¹³⁸ Marx, *Capital* (1990), p.283.

¹³⁹ David Harvey, *A Companion to Marx’s Capital* (London: Verso, 2010), p.111.

¹⁴⁰ I am writing specifically here about ‘Chapter 14: The Division of Labour and Manufacture’, in *Capital* (1990), pp.455-491. References here refer to the Penguin Classics edition unless otherwise stated.

¹⁴¹ Marx (1990), p.481.

labour (as the capitalist does under the manufacture phase).¹⁴² The ability to buy labour power (the capacity to work) is a key distinction between the phases of cooperation and manufacture; the privilege of purchasing labour thus belongs to the latter. Consequently, Marx argues that the transformation of the manufacture mode of production takes ‘labour-power as its starting-point’.¹⁴³

Within the phase of manufacture, Marx acknowledged the fragmentation of the worker. The capitalist controlled a growing number of workers and the division of labour intensified. Marx writes:

Not only is the specialised work distributed among the different individuals, but the individual himself is divided up, and transformed into the automatic motor of a detail operation.¹⁴⁴

Thus, the socialisation of labour increased. Within the manufacture stage, the collective worker emerges at the expense of the worker’s ‘individual productive power’.¹⁴⁵ The subsequent stage, according to Marx’s analysis, is that of large-scale industry. The distinction between large-scale industry and the earlier manufacture stage turns on the role of machinery. The increase of machinery, the co-operation of machinery (i.e. using numerous machines to complete a task) and, ultimately, the replacement by machinery of tasks which men undertook using tools belonged to large-scale industry. However, not all the workers were replaced by machines. Something more specific occurred within the phase of large-scale industry; the skilled labour of the worker became even

¹⁴² Marx (1990), p.479.

¹⁴³ Marx (1990), p.492.

¹⁴⁴ Marx (1990), p.481. This machinic metaphor is a familiar motif in early modernism - the advent of the manufacture stage, and the increasing control of the capitalist - particularly in art we only have to look to Fernand Leger’s *Mechanical Ballet* (1924) or the work of the Vorticists and Futurists; in popular culture, Charlie Chaplin’s *Modern Times* provide a key example of the mechanisation of everyday life. In these examples, the penetration of the mode of production into everyday life is evident.

¹⁴⁵ Marx (1990), p.483.

more fragmented into discrete tasks and, as a result, less skilled. Braverman takes up this proposition in his analysis. Work within large-scale industry was increasingly under the control of the machine. Despite the machine controlling work, Marx was clear that labourers were still required within this phase in order to create value, as machines do not produce value themselves.

Thus far I have presented Marx's historical development of early capitalism, from *Capital*, in order to address the moment in which manufacture subsumed craft production. The increased use of the machine in industry displaced the importance of the hand in manufacturing goods.¹⁴⁶ The displacement of the hand from learnt skill is central to Braverman's analysis, which emphasises the deskilling of the worker, or the 'degradation of work', with a particular emphasis on the subject of the craftworker.¹⁴⁷

The importance of viewing art within the economic conditions of its inception is implicit to an historical-materialist methodology. Rather than adopting the belief that art exists in isolation, historical-materialists acknowledge the influence of wider social circumstances on the making of art. To quote Arnold Hauser:

Historical materialism...derives ideologies not from the motives of persons, but from objective conditions that work themselves out often without the

¹⁴⁶ There are also ensuing aspects of production implemented within the subsequent phase of capitalism which Marx could not have wholly anticipated. These ensuing aspects - such as the move to the international outsourcing of manufacture under what is commonly known as 'globalisation' and also the increase in the service industry (which does not produce material goods) - are addressed in the following chapter.

¹⁴⁷ Braverman's thesis has been much criticised for his romanticism of the craftworker (having learned a trade himself, it is no wonder that the craftworker is his focus). Michael Burawoy writes that there are traces of 'romantic utopianism' in Braverman's thesis. Burawoy, *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes under Capitalism and Socialism* (London: Routledge, 1985), p.22. Burawoy also proposes that the importance assigned to Braverman's thesis was because it countered the subjective nature of sociology in the 1970s, but views Braverman's objectivism as equally unbalanced. John Bellamy Foster, 'A Classic of Our Time: "Labour and Monopoly Capital" after a Quarter of a Century', *Monthly Review* (January 1999), <http://monthlyreview.org/1999/01/01/braverman-and-the-class-struggle> [Accessed: 19/03/2009].

consciousness, and not infrequently contrary to the intentions, of the participants.¹⁴⁸

Thus, the influence of material conditions on ideology – and, therefore, on art as a vehicle of ideology - is recognised through adopting an historical-materialist methodology.

Historically, the activities we think of as art belonged to the artisanal mode of production prior to the emancipation of ‘art’ from ‘craft’.¹⁴⁹ The separation of art from craft transpired within a specific moment of history and, as such, cannot be viewed in isolation from these circumstances. The inherent connection between the making of art and the concurrent modes of production can be validated through this example. This validation lies in the historical fact that art and craft both belonged to the pre-capitalist division of labour. Marx claims that capitalism is based upon an ‘enlargement of the workshop of the master craftsman of the guilds’; thus both art and capitalist production are born out of the workshop model of making.¹⁵⁰ Consequently, the individualised nature of artistic production - which Peter Bürger recognised in courtly and bourgeois art - was a reaction to the ideological influence of the respective economic periods.¹⁵¹ Bourgeois art reflected the individualism embraced by the newly emerged middle classes through its production and reception within the period.

¹⁴⁸ Hauser, p.30.

¹⁴⁹ For a detailed history of how ‘Art’ emerges as an independent category, see Victor Burgin’s ‘The End of Art Theory’, in *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity* (London: Macmillan, 1986), pp.140-204.

¹⁵⁰ Marx (1990), p.439.

¹⁵¹ Bürger.

Braverman and the ‘Degradation of Work’

Braverman’s book reopened the debate on the labour process. His project focused upon the transitional phase of monopoly capitalism occurring between ‘competitive’ and ‘late’ capitalism. Braverman renewed Marx’s analysis of the labour process within the early phases of capitalism by attending to the labour process in the United States in the 1960s and 70s.¹⁵² Braverman utilises Marx’s analysis of the early capitalist labour process as an interpretive tool for analysing the period preceding 1974. He proposed that the phenomenon of deskilling was prevalent in the contemporary workplace and looked to recent labour history in order to trace the development of deskilling.¹⁵³ Despite closely following Marx’s delineation of the labour process, Braverman’s thesis has been criticised by orthodox Marxists for its failure to take into account the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. In short, this law acknowledges the idea that crisis is an essential and inevitable aspect of the wider capitalist system, beyond the labour process, something which we have witnessed only too recently.

Braverman’s omission of the law follows Baran and Sweezy’s precedent in their earlier publication *Monopoly Capital* upon which Braverman based his

¹⁵² Paul Thompson writes that Braverman does not defer from Marx’s delineation of the labour process rather his success is his attempt to renew Marx’s theory of the labour process and apply it to subsequent historical development. Thompson, p.73. Thompson later claims that Braverman takes his thesis further than Marx in his linking the labour process to a theoretical model of the class structure. Thompson, p.86.

¹⁵³ It should be noted here that Braverman’s book is specific to the American labour process but should not be discounted because of this.

Burawoy is sceptical about the specificity of Braverman’s analysis, stating that it is a product of a particular time and place claiming that there is no comparison to the dominance of capital in the US. Michael Burawoy, *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes under Capitalism and Socialism* (London: Routledge, 1985), p.26.

I introduce Gramsci’s discussion of Americanism and Fordism later in this chapter in order to present a European perspective. Of course, Gramsci’s account is not without its own drawbacks - the key one being that it is written in isolation from society - a prison cell.

own thesis.¹⁵⁴ Thus, fundamentalists see Braverman's analysis as eradicating the moment within the capitalist system in which the drive for revolution can transpire - the period of crisis - in which the economy is weakened. Regardless of the accusations of reformist politics, Braverman, in contrast to Baran and Sweezy, acknowledges that there is the potential for change within the labour process and that the power to affect this lies with the working classes. Braverman's account is not devoid of class struggle, despite criticisms to this effect from commentators such as Michael Burawoy; he does not solely focus upon this struggle, nevertheless, class relations are implicit throughout. Furthermore, Braverman's thesis attends to the labour process from a materialist standpoint (after Marx), viewing the capitalist labour process as a system, rather than engaging specifically with questions of individual worker subjectivity (questions to which Burawoy attends).¹⁵⁵

Braverman was not the first person to write about the labour process after Marx, there are numerous theorists who take on this subject. However, Braverman's thesis was presented at a moment in which the working class movement was strong post-1968 and thus, became a seminal text.¹⁵⁶ Regardless of other publications on the subject within this period, Hassard, Hogan and Rowlinson argue that, despite his romanticism, Braverman's thesis became an important text because of Braverman's historical vision.¹⁵⁷ His vision identified the potential of the working class to affect change, with an alternative future in mind. Braverman's confidence in the working class' role in changing the system was contrary to Baran and Sweezy's analysis, which placed the revolutionary capabilities with the exploited workers from 'third world' countries rather

¹⁵⁴ Baran and Sweezy.

¹⁵⁵ Burawoy.

¹⁵⁶ Other labour process theorists include Blauner (1964); Goldthorpe, Lockwood et al (1968) and Giddens (1973). For a detailed look at those who have looked at the sociological aspect of work, see: Paul Thompson, *The Nature of Work*, 2nd edn (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 1989), pp.11-37.

¹⁵⁷ John Hassard, John Hogan and Michael Rowlinson, 'From Labour Process Theory to Critical Management Studies', *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 23:3 (2001), pp.339-362 (p.346).

than the working classes of America.¹⁵⁸ Even with its criticisms, which I address later, I utilise Braverman's thesis because of the central role that it has, rightly or wrongly, taken within labour process theory and the correlation between his and Marx's own delineation of the labour process.

Braverman's main concern is the mass deskilling or 'degradation' of work that occurred within industrial production. The distinction for Braverman, and for Marx, between capitalist production and pre-capitalist production is the idea that labour under capitalism is sold - i.e. sold as *labour power*, a commodity whose use is the capacity to work. This differs from pre-capitalist production where, in a basic conception of the Feudal system, the ground would be worked by serfs for the landowner in exchange for the use of a piece of land to grow food. In this example, the serfs are still producing food for their own subsistence rather than having to buy food from the market. Labour becomes a commodity under capitalism. The selling of the worker's labour power forfeits the worker's control of the labour process. The only person who needs to be concerned with the labour process is the capitalist as it is he or she who has a financially vested interest in the company; in contrast, the labourer simply sells his or her capacity to work.¹⁵⁹ The interest in the products that are being manufactured is separated from the worker. Braverman suggests that this separation was a leading factor in the origins of management. The capitalist needs to control his workers (who now have no control over the work they are undertaking) and this is when the role of manager was created to monitor the workers and ensure productivity.

Braverman proposes that the degradation of work primarily occurs within the division of labour. He claims: 'The separation of hand and brain is the most decisive

¹⁵⁸ Baran and Sweezy (1968). Baran and Sweezy's analysis is focused upon the American labour process, so it would make sense to identify the revolutionary capabilities closer to home.

¹⁵⁹ Braverman discusses this in chapter one. Braverman, pp.46-58.

single step in the division of labour taken by the capitalist mode of production.’¹⁶⁰ The division of labour is not new to capitalism; as Braverman acknowledges, Adam Smith’s famous detailing of the manufacture of pins from *The Wealth of Nations* evidences this:

One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving, the head; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business, to whiten the pins is another; it is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper; and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about eighteen distinct operations, which, in some manufactories, are all performed by distinct hands, though in others the same man will sometimes perform two or three of them.¹⁶¹

Braverman claims that the capitalist makes the worker into a detail operative; the latter never chooses this role.¹⁶² He continues by arguing that from this point forth (i.e. with industrial capitalism), the worker is no longer in control of his or her labour. The capitalist (factory owner) bought the worker’s labour power; he then employed the manager to keep control of the worker. Marx claims that through selling his labour-power to the capitalist, the worker enters the production process alienated from his own labour. Throughout the process, his labour ‘constantly objectifies itself so that it becomes an object alien to him.’¹⁶³ The worker is now alienated from the goods they manufacture and also from their labour and control of this.

¹⁶⁰ Braverman, p.126.

¹⁶¹ Adam Smith, ‘On the Division of Labour’, in *An Enquiry into the Nature and the Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), <http://geolib.com/smith.adam/won1-01.html> [Accessed: 11/08/2009].

¹⁶² Braverman, p.78.

¹⁶³ Marx (1990), p.716

The labour is divided into minute tasks in order to extract more surplus value. The capitalist division of labour, Braverman states, ‘... subdivided the work of each productive speciality into limited operations.’ Braverman thus proposes that this method of work became generalised *only* within the capitalist labour process.¹⁶⁴ The division of labour into smaller and smaller tasks is a process that aims to raise profit, not worker satisfaction. Braverman cites numerous ways in which the division of labour into smaller tasks can cut the costs of production. For example, he shows that less skilled work can be undertaken for less pay and explores how women, boys and girls could assume specific tasks for less pay. Braverman references Charles Babbage, the economist, who claimed that dividing the craft cheapened the individual parts, making it easier to know purchase quantities.¹⁶⁵

The increased division of labour into smaller, less skilled tasks paved the way for the present situation under capitalism. The extension of the division of labour can be witnessed within globalisation. Under globalisation the manufacturing of goods is often contracted to developing countries, whose workers undertake low skilled repetitive tasks for a lot less money than those in the so-called ‘developed countries’. The division of labour expands across countries; as such, it is not uncommon for an end-commodity to be made up of parts manufactured in several different areas across the globe. The global division of labour extends to the service industries, such as the moving of call centres to India in order to employ cheap labour.

The Process of Deskilling

In his analysis, Braverman returns to the late nineteenth century to locate the origins of deskilling in the workplace. He attends to scientific management and, more specifically,

¹⁶⁴ Braverman, p.70.

¹⁶⁵ Braverman, pp.80-1

the methods implemented by Frederick Winslow Taylor, who cumulated a variety of scientific methods into one, the effects of which become known as Taylorism. I devote some space here to looking at scientific management and its effects from Braverman's analysis, in order to view the wider economic situation under which the production of art evolves (although my analysis is in no way a simple mapping of scientific management onto art production). Braverman's focus upon the shifting control from the owners of capital to the manager is key to his analysis. The role of the manager is important here and, once we turn to art production, connections are made between the manager and the artist. The correlation between the two becomes more apparent under recent phases of capitalism, which I consider in the next chapter.

Scientific management was a method of controlling production, introduced in the late nineteenth century, in order to achieve optimum production and increase the extraction of surplus in the late nineteenth century. One of the distinctions between competitive capitalism and monopoly capitalism is that, in the latter, the capitalist makes money from surplus value, which becomes profit.¹⁶⁶ The extraction of surplus is attributed to a form of exploitation of the worker. The surplus value is, essentially, the difference between the wages of the worker and the price of the commodity sold. Therefore, the more productive worker (i.e. the one who assembles the fastest) produced more surplus than those who worked more slowly. It is in the best interest for the capitalist to employ more efficient workers in order to extract more surplus value and this is where scientific management assists. Scientific management involved controlling every aspect of production and took the form of the division of labour into piecework or the implementation of an incentive system where workers are given bonuses for achieving high targets. Braverman argues that Taylorism was a response to the problem

¹⁶⁶ See Harris in *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, pp.414-417.

of how to best control alienated labour.¹⁶⁷ Taylorist methods attempted to gain optimum output from the workers by dividing up the work into smaller and smaller tasks. Taylorism was highly concerned with control, Braverman argues that the methods asserted ‘...the dictation to the worker of the precise manner in which work is to be performed.’¹⁶⁸ The worker no longer employed their own methods of labour but was asked to follow strict guides as to how a particular task was to be undertaken. Hence the scientific element: the optimum results were scientifically calculated in order to ascertain how long it would take to do certain tasks and then the ‘correct’ method for undertaking a job is delineated from this data. Taylor dictated that the control must move into the hands of the management, who would determine each step of the process.¹⁶⁹

Braverman’s analysis splits Taylorist methods into three principles: The first principle stated that the managers should gather all the traditional knowledge that was possessed by the workmen in the past. They then classified the knowledge reducing it to rules, laws and formulae. Braverman argues that this stage was concerned with the ‘dissociation of the labour process from the skills of the workers’.¹⁷⁰ The second principle proposed that ‘brainwork’ be moved from the shop floor to the planning department. This is a key point from Braverman’s thesis. He argues that, within this principle, *conception* was separated from *execution*; not *mental* from *manual* labour as it is often interpreted. (Indeed, Braverman claims that mental labour was itself subjected to the separation of conception and execution.) He argues that the dehumanisation of the labour process became crucial for the ‘management of purchased labour’ within the operation of the separation of conception and execution. Braverman adopts Babbage’s

¹⁶⁷ Braverman, p.90.

¹⁶⁸ Braverman, p.90.

¹⁶⁹ Braverman, p.100.

¹⁷⁰ Braverman, p.112.

argument that the purpose of scientific management was to cheapen the cost of the worker by decreasing his training and enlarging his output.¹⁷¹ Finally, the third principle consisted of providing the worker with fully specified instructions for each task in the form of information cards. The instructions were planned ahead by management. Braverman argues that the ‘use of this monopoly over knowledge [was] to control each step of the labour process and its mode of execution.’¹⁷²

Braverman’s thesis acknowledges an increasing deskilling of the craftworker in particular, which led to a separation of execution and conception in work. This deskilling then has a degrading effect upon the workers. Braverman proposes that the entire working class was lowered and deskilled through the implementation of scientific management. Respondents to Braverman have argued that the effects of deskilling are not so black and white. Keith Mann, in his review of Roger Penn’s *Class, Power and Technology* (1990), presents his ‘compensatory theory of skill’ in which he proposes that technological change leads to deskilling and also skilling.¹⁷³ He views this deskilling and skilling as central to capitalism; the directive productive roles are deskilled whilst ancillary skilled tasks, such as maintenance, are created.

The newly deskilled workers did not readily accept the changes and there was union opposition to the increased deskilling of the worker. Terry Smith writes of the unions which emerged in the face of the production methods that were implemented in Ford’s factories in the early 1900s.¹⁷⁴ Whilst Braverman’s thesis has revolutionary leanings (the incitement of the working class to affect change), these intentions became divorced from political action once the neoliberal agenda began. Hassard, Hogan and

¹⁷¹ Braverman, pp.113-118.

¹⁷² Braverman, p.118.

¹⁷³ Keith Mann, ‘Whither the Skilled Worker?’, *Sociological Forum*, 8:1 (1993), pp.143-50.

¹⁷⁴ Terry Smith, ‘Fordism: Mass Production and Control’, in *Making the Modern: Industry, Art and Design in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1993), pp.15-55.

Rowlinson write of how, in the 1980s, British labour process theorists appealed to management to:

...chose control strategies that would avoid provoking unnecessary resistance from workers, so that managers would then refute the deskilling thesis by their own actions.¹⁷⁵

Braverman's Legacy

Despite the prominence of Braverman's thesis within Labour Process Theory (LPT), it also became, and remains, a much-contested text. Unfortunately, Braverman died two years' after writing *Labour and Monopoly Capitalism* and, as such, did not have the opportunity to fully respond to his critics. In defence of my own adoption of Braverman for this interpretation, I put forward that Braverman's analysis is synonymous with LPT which, I believe, is testament to the importance and centrality of his thesis for the analysis of monopoly capitalism. *Labour and Monopoly Capitalism* has been named as the instigator of the Anglo-American labour process debate.¹⁷⁶

Discussions concerning the 'dematerialisation' of art emerged within the same period as Braverman's text and thus it is useful for a comparative analysis. However, the criticisms of Braverman's analysis need to be addressed. There are numerous strands of criticism aimed at Braverman which come from distinct branches of LPT. I present some of the key criticisms here in order to see how labour process theory is thought otherwise.

The separation of ownership from control, present in Braverman's argument, originated from Baran and Sweezy's *Monopoly Capitalism*. This separation is the

¹⁷⁵ Hassard, Hogan and Rowlinson (2001), p.349.

¹⁷⁶ Paul Thompson and Chris Smith, 'Follow the Redbrick Road', *International Studies of Management & Organisation*, 30: 4 (Winter 2000-2001), pp.40-67 (p.40).

leading factor in accusations of ‘managerialism’ aimed at Braverman. In Braverman’s text we see the role of management as ‘observer’ emerge, and the control that accompanies this, through the implementation of Taylor’s methods. Thus, it is thought that the manager takes the intermediary, controlling role, whilst the owner reaps the profits from a distance. Contrary to this proposition, Hassard, Howard and Rowlinson suggest that the ‘constraint upon management in the labour process is the self-imposed requirement to preserve a role for itself’, rather than the prioritization of the extraction of surplus for the owners of capital.¹⁷⁷ So where does the driving factor of the labour process lie: is it with the extraction of surplus, as I believe, or the defence of the manager’s subjectivity?¹⁷⁸

Paul Thompson and Chris Smith also address the question of control within *Labour and Monopoly Capitalism* in their essay ‘Follow the Redbrick Road’.¹⁷⁹ They claim that theorists such as Rowlinson and Hassard, David Spencer, K Turner and Sheila Cohen all make a distinction between exploitation and control.¹⁸⁰ Thompson and Smith write:

What they share is that exploitation, not control, lies at the centre of the labour process - the law of value regulated through competition rather than the subjectivity of labour being the determining influence on work.¹⁸¹

This idea defends the notion that management is concerned not with control but maintaining a role for themselves and argues that the extraction of surplus is the driving force in motivating the workers. According to Smith and Thompson, Turner proposes

¹⁷⁷ Hassard, Hogan and Rowlinson (2001), p.347.

¹⁷⁸ My preference is for the former; Marx argues that the capitalist system is constantly moving toward profit and the extraction of surplus is central to this.

¹⁷⁹ Thompson and Smith (2001).

¹⁸⁰ Thompson and Smith (2001), p.46.

¹⁸¹ Thompson and Smith (2001), p.46.

that the wage form is the ‘real basis of subordination within capitalism.’¹⁸² Turner’s claim opposes the managerialist perspective, which places the manager at the heart of control within the labour process. The fact that labour is sold is a key distinction for capitalism, setting it apart from previous economic models. The ‘indeterminate character of labour’ – that labour is a commodity - is central to LPT. As such, wages play a motivating role in the selling of labour power and are, arguably, the reason why the labourers work – to earn a wage.

Finally, there emerged a branch of LPT concerned with a Foucauldian analysis of control and subjectivity in the labour process. Clearly, this mode of analysis diverges away from Braverman’s thesis, which is embedded in the economic, and is commonly known as the postmodernist or poststructuralist perspective. What ensues from this approach is the ‘missing subject’ debate, which returns to question the lack of attention to worker subjectivity in Braverman’s book.¹⁸³

Ford, the Model T and Fordism

Discussions of Taylorist control often go hand in hand with those of the Fordist assembly line, which is usually considered as a historical extension of the piecework so meticulously delineated by Frederick Taylor.¹⁸⁴ In 1913 Henry Ford, owner of the Ford Motor Company, put to work an assembly line which was capable of mass producing the Model T motor car, at the Highland Park site in Detroit. The following year he implemented the five-dollar (eight hour) working day, which was crucial to his success.

¹⁸² Thompson and Smith (2001), p.46.

¹⁸³ For an in-depth look at this perspective, see: Damien O’Doherty and Hugh Willmott, ‘Debating Labour Process Theory: The issue of Subjectivity and the Relevance of Poststructuralism’, *Sociology*, 35:2 (May 2001), pp.457-476.

¹⁸⁴ Key participants in discussions of Fordism and post-Fordism are David Harvey, Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt and Fredric Jameson. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Cambridge, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1990); Hardt and Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2000); Jameson, ‘Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism’, *New Left Review*, 1:146 (July-August 1984), pp.53-92.

David Harvey writes that 1914 is the ‘symbolic initiation date’ of Fordism.¹⁸⁵ It is important to stress that Ford himself did not invent the assembly line. His engineers developed an assembly line to mass manufacture the Model T, through experimenting with and adapting the existing technology (reportedly found in slaughterhouses).¹⁸⁶ However, Ford was the man who changed the face of history with the particular implementation of this technology in automobile production. The assembly line affected the mode of worker-employment and the nature of labour in the plant. The new machinery became a worker substitute in many ways. As Smith writes:

The multiple-purpose machines embodied the skills that had, for centuries, been the province of the craftsmen...Rather, they concentrated on quite particular partial skills, certain moments in what used to be a sequence of creative labour, the frozen sections susceptible to separation, reduced to a simple motion, untiringly, infinitely repeatable.¹⁸⁷

The machinery did not make the worker completely redundant. The upkeep and monitoring of the machines remained a human job and the labourer became another cog in the machinery, completing repetitive tasks on endless production lines on a much larger scale. Note that the terms ‘separation’ and ‘repetition’, associated with the Taylorist division of labour, appear in the quotation from Smith. Although there are similarities in how the labour was being divided, Smith argues that Fordist production methods were distinct from Taylorist systems because Taylor viewed the parts in terms of the *whole* process (including the work force); whereas Ford placed emphasis on the

¹⁸⁵ Harvey, ‘Fordism’, in *The Condition of Postmodernity*, p.125.

¹⁸⁶ For a detailed history of the origin of the assembly line see Smith, ‘Fordism: Mass Production and Total Control’, pp.15-55.

¹⁸⁷ Smith, p.23.

function of the *machine* with ‘minimal human intervention’.¹⁸⁸ Distinct from the approach of Taylor, Fordist production methods intensified the intervention of the machine within the labour process, leaving the worker with minimum skills.

Antonio Gramsci writes in his *Prison Notebooks* that Americanism and Fordism were:

... the biggest collective effort to date to create, with unprecedented speed, and with a consciousness of purpose unmatched in history, a new type of worker and of man.¹⁸⁹

It is Gramsci’s identification of a certain type of worker and man that contributed to the new social and economic model that became known as Fordism (Smith calls the subject of this society ‘Fordised man’.)¹⁹⁰ As the title of this section suggests, Ford and Fordism are separate from one another. Certainly, Ford applied new production methods and implemented the eight dollar day but it is the *effect* of Ford’s changes on the workers which ultimately transformed the wider socio-economic and ideological conditions within society. Gramsci’s writings on ‘Americanism and Fordism’, in his *Prison Notebooks*, addressed the question of whether the new production methods put to work in America constituted a new historical epoch. Gramsci was seriously concerned with the Fordist model and, in particular, the psychological and moral monitoring of workers - especially the question of sex. Although Gramsci does not present a solid conclusion,

¹⁸⁸ Smith, pp.23-4.

The focus on the machine also extends to the wider socio-political picture, in which the backdrop is soon to be one of war. Particularly with the Second World War, we see the effect of technology (often originating from commodity production methods) on modern warfare.

¹⁸⁹ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), p.302.

¹⁹⁰ Smith, p.50.

the attention that he gives to the methods of coercion utilised by Ford, and the effect of Americanism on Europe, are testament to his anxiety.

Fordist production was not without problems. Firstly, there was worker unrest which resulted in a high turnover of workers. The issue of control arose; as in Taylorism, the manager took on the task of controlling the worker.¹⁹¹ Smith writes of the ‘visible hand’, in which the manager’s coercion of the worker is implicit.¹⁹² Smith’s articulation is opposed to Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand of the market’, which was said to be the driving force of production prior to Taylor and Ford’s methods. A significantly worrying aspect of the Ford Motor Company - and where the work/life boundary began to be blurred - was the company’s involvement in the lives of the Ford workers through the establishment of the Sociological Department.¹⁹³ Smith details the work of the Sociological Department which Ford put in place from 1914. The department was created to monitor the workers’ lives outside of the factory including cleanliness of homes, sanitation, alcohol consumption and the sexual activity of its employees. Essentially, the task of the department was to ensure the workers were in good working condition. We can draw parallels between the workers and the machines here; the workers are being ‘serviced’ through their close monitoring. Therefore, we can deduce that the workers did not have an ‘outside of work’ and this is what Smith refers to when he writes of the ‘Fordised man’.¹⁹⁴ What separated this ‘new man’ from other forms of abstract labour which preceded Fordism, Smith argues, is the acceleration of machine production and ‘a tying of the new worker to a mechanical process...’¹⁹⁵ Man and machine become symbiotic under Fordist production.

¹⁹¹ Note here the increasing responsibility and new role of the manager emerging under Fordism. In the following chapter I discuss the artist as a model for the manager under ‘neo-flexible capitalism’ (Eve Chiapello).

¹⁹² Smith, p.42.

¹⁹³ Of course, Gramsci also devotes a large amount of his analysis expressing his concerns with this.

¹⁹⁴ For a detailed analysis of the role and impact of the Sociological Department, see Smith, pp.48-55.

¹⁹⁵ Smith, p.51.

Whilst Fordism was emerging, the two world wars had an obvious effect on production and also a mass ideological effect on a global scale. Harvey argues that it was not until after 1945 that Fordism matured as a ‘fully-fledged and distinctive regime of accumulation.’¹⁹⁶ Further, Harvey claims that it also became a ‘total way of life’ after the Second World War.¹⁹⁷ During the period in which the ideology of Fordism was emerging in the US, more traditional production methods were still being used in European manufacture. We know from Harvey’s account of Fordism that prior to this model, Henri Fayol’s ‘Administration Industrielle et Générale’ (1916) was more influential in Europe than Taylor’s contribution to scientific management.¹⁹⁸ Similarly, Fordism does not spread to Europe until the 1950s.¹⁹⁹ This late arrival of Fordism in Europe is not to be overlooked, and I propose that this has an effect on art production (particularly in Britain in the 1990s). I will return to this point in my consideration of the Mike Smith Studio and its late establishment in Britain in relation to its American predecessors.

So far, I have focused on Braverman’s thesis on the degradation of work: where the majority of workers in production plants or those industries with a craft knowledge base were subjected to a deskilling in which the execution of work was separated from the conception. I have also looked at the emergence of Fordism, which began in the US as a faster mode of production, expanding upon Taylorist aspects such as piecework and effective production. Fordism subsequently grew into a ‘way of life’ where work and everyday life were taken over by commodity production and consumption. Now I turn to see how art under monopoly and late capitalism was

¹⁹⁶ Harvey, p.129.

¹⁹⁷ Harvey, p.135.

¹⁹⁸ According to Craig Littler, Taylor’s methods did not make it onto British shop floors until 1914. Craig Littler, *Deskilling and the Changing Structure of Control*, Nuffield Paper (1978) cited in *The Nature of Work*, p.71.

¹⁹⁹ Harvey, p.128.

effected by the ideological implications of deskilling and Fordism. Is the production of art also constrained by the degradation of work?

The ‘Dematerialisation of Art’?

I propose that art is also subjected to a form of deskilling in the twentieth century.

Furthermore, I argue that the deskilling which occurs within art making, is a response to the ideological changes within capitalist society stemming from Taylorist and Fordist production methods. This proposition does not lie in a simple mapping of production methods. Clearly, the production of art and of mass produced goods are different processes; however, both have a singular ending point - the market (be it the art market or the mass market, both are sold as commodities with a price tag).²⁰⁰ Art’s relative autonomy to the economic base, allows for it to operate autonomously from the mass market. However, the artist’s connection to economic and social life cannot be divorced from the products of their own specific labour. In this relation, the artist is not isolated from the effects of the mass worker felt within society, which are epitomised, for example, in Smith’s ‘Fordised man’.²⁰¹

It is often the case in discourse on the deskilling of art for Marcel Duchamp to be named as the main protagonist.²⁰² His (in)famous Readymades are often cited as the instigators of the removal of skill from works of art. One can see how the connection between Duchamp and deskilling is made. David Lee exclaims:

²⁰⁰ I am speaking specifically here of those artworks which produce an object, which could include a documentary photograph, a programme of events, or, more traditionally a painting or a sculpture. I will discuss relational works which foster immateriality later in this thesis.

²⁰¹ Some artists are directly affected because they worked in industry before pursuing art. David Smith worked for the Studebaker automobile factory in Indiana as a riveter; also doing soldering, spot-welding and working a lathe. Later, we are told, he learns to forge from a local Blacksmith. David Smith Chronology, www.davidsmithestate.org/bio.html [Accessed: 23/07/2009]

²⁰² In addition to those discussed in the following, Bourriaud also situates Duchamp at the beginning of his own art history in *Postproduction*. Postproduction artists are, he writes, ‘the specialised workers of cultural reappropriation.’ He then continues by claiming that the Readymade is at the beginning of appropriation, which is the first stage of postproduction. Nicolas Bourriaud, *Postproduction* (New York: Lukas & Sternberg, 2002), p.25.

Vive Marcel! He saved artists from the drudgery of actually learning anything.

He made skills redundant, the very hand superfluous to an artist's needs. Having ideas was now enough.²⁰³

John Roberts, in his recent book *Intangibilities of Form: Skill and Deskilling in the Art After the Readymade*, also falls prey to the assumption that Duchamp initiated deskilling within artistic practice.²⁰⁴ The title of Roberts' book alone sets the precedent that Duchamp's Readymades are at the beginning of thinking skill/deskilling in art.²⁰⁵ I am not discrediting the importance of Duchamp's work here, but rather questioning the ease in which he is given the accolade of 'paterfamilias of postmodernism', amongst others.²⁰⁶ Duchamp, in these accounts, is too conveniently situated as the originator of separating the idea from the artwork or, more specifically, the form of the artwork. Historically, the idea or the functionary role of art was of key importance. We have only to look to Western philosophers, such as Plato, to see the significance of the educative role of art, and an emphasis on the (moral) *idea* over *form*. Plato, after all, wished to ban works which represented evil and disharmony from his Republic for fear that the evil and disharmony would be replicated in the real world.²⁰⁷ Historically, icons were

²⁰³ David Lee, 'Hands Off', *Art Review*, 45 (April 1993), pp.28-31 (p.29). Interestingly, Lee loses confidence in his statement later in the article where he proposes that Duchamp took an existing process to its extreme tracing this 'hands-off approach' back to Giotto (p.30).

²⁰⁴ Roberts (2007). The dialectical relationship that Roberts proposes is threefold - skill/deskilling/reskilling as opposed to my twofold reference above.

²⁰⁵ Roberts further adds reskilling to the skill/deskilling coupling.

²⁰⁶ Amelia Jones discusses Duchamp as 'generative patriarch' of American postmodernists in her chapter of the same name in *Postmodernism and the En-gendering of Marcel Duchamp* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1994), pp.29-62.

²⁰⁷ Plato writes:

It is not only to the poets therefore that we must issue orders requiring them to portray good character in their poems or not to write at all; we must issue similar orders to all artists and craftsmen, and prevent them portraying bad character, ill-discipline, meanness, or ugliness in pictures of living things, in sculpture, architecture, or any work of art, and if they are unable to comply they must be forbidden to practice their art among us. We shall thus prevent our

worshipped in churches as if they were a real manifestation of God. In both instances, the function of these artworks, the *concept* of what they are, was prioritised before the objective or formal aspect. Duchamp was not the first to favour the idea of the artwork over its form.

The gravity of Duchamp's Readymades - or what they signified (taking an existing object and proclaiming it art through signing or exhibiting it in a gallery) - did not come into prominence until the 1950s when artists such as John Cage and Robert Rauschenberg became interested in Duchamp and his work. Duchamp then conveniently altered what he had originally claimed about the Readymades. In contrast to earlier musings (which alluded to the aesthetic of the Readymades), Duchamp wrote 'Apropos of Readymades' in 1961.²⁰⁸ This statement reinforced the new thinking about his Readymades. He denounced their aesthetic qualities and encouraged the now somewhat tired mantra 'anything can be art'.²⁰⁹ It is easy, therefore, to assign the deskilling or at least the 'dematerialisation of art' to Duchamp in this period especially as deskilling in art making appears to peak around the 1960s. The origin of a work of art is seen to be in the hands of one artist as opposed to being affected by external factors. I oppose the argument in which one man is named as the instigator of deskilling within art. As such, I argue that social and economic conditions nurtured the move towards the

guardians being brought up among representations of evil...by grazing widely as it were an unhealthy pasture, insensibly doing themselves a cumulative psychological damage that is very serious.

Plato, *The Republic*, (London: Penguin, 2003), pp.97-8.

²⁰⁸ Lecture at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, October 19, 1961. Published in: *Art and Artists*, 1:4 (July 1966).

²⁰⁹ The denouncement of these aesthetic qualities is in stark contrast to the initial response to *Fountain* adopted by Duchamp's close circle of friends. The second issue of the journal *The Blind Man* was devoted to the controversy surrounding the non-exhibition of *Fountain* in 1917. Contributions from Duchamp's peers extended to aesthetic and formal appreciation of *Fountain*. Louise Norton's contribution to this edition, 'Buddha of the Bathroom', refers to the 'chaste simplicity of line and colour!' The reference to the aesthetics of *Fountain* is discussed further in William A. Camfield, 'Marcel Duchamp's Fountain: Its History and Aesthetics in the Context of 1917', in *Marcel Duchamp: Artist of the Century*, ed. by Rudolf E. Kuenzli and Francis M. Naumann (Massachusetts: MIT, 1989), pp.64-94. The original *Fountain* debate, to which I refer here, took place in *The Blind Man*, 2 (May 1917).

separation of idea and hand in art making. I am in no way delineating a starting point for the deskilling of artists, but want to look to the moment in which this separation is manifested in art. Thus, I attend to the wider conditions of capitalist production in the mid to late twentieth century.

In 1968, Lucy Lippard and John Chandler opened their essay ‘The Dematerialization of Art’ with the following statement:

As more and more work is designed in the studio but executed elsewhere by professional craftsmen, as the object becomes merely the end product, a number of artists are losing interest in the physical evolution of the work of art. The studio is again becoming a study.²¹⁰

This statement testifies to an emergent phenomenon in art making in this period, that is, the separation of the idea from the physical form of the artwork. Clearly, the parallel with the separation of execution and conception from Braverman’s analysis is explicit in this statement. If we interpret Lippard and Chandler’s proposition in terms of Braverman’s thesis, within artistic production, the artist takes control of the idea which is perhaps a role akin to the manager rather than the factory worker.²¹¹ The craftsman who executed the work is, by implication, positioned in the role of the worker. The worker, in this relationship, is not necessarily subjected to the same kind of deskilling as the worker in a manufacturing plant; production for art is distinct from mass commodity production. He is, perhaps, more comfortable in the role of technician. The workers within the fabricator and facilitator models still retain their craft knowledge; it is the fabricator’s knowledge and expertise that is often purchased. However, the person who

²¹⁰ Lucy Lippard and John Chandler, ‘The Dematerialisation of Art’ (1968), pp.46-50.

²¹¹ I have proposed before, and still reinforce that Damien Hirst embodies this role suitably within the art world, which I will come to.

is being 'deskilled' is the artist, a role traditionally associated with the acquisition of skill and craft knowledge. Therefore, the artist is dividing into two work that would historically have been conceived and executed as one.²¹² In essence, the artist deskills him/herself.

Gramsci, like Braverman, contrasts the role of the craftsman to the new production methods:

It is certain that they [American industrialists like Ford] are not concerned with the 'humanity' or the 'spirituality' of the worker, which are immediately smashed. This 'humanity and spirituality' cannot be experienced except in the world of production and work and in productive 'creation'. They exist most in the artisan, in the 'demiurge' [Greek meaning 'handicraftsman'], when the worker's personality was reflected whole in the object created and when the link between art and labour was still very strong. But it is precisely against this 'humanism' that the new industrialism is fighting.²¹³

It is questionable whether the capitalist was ever concerned with the humanity of the worker, as extraction of surplus becomes the nature of production. (The concern that Ford's Sociological Department had for its workers was for production's sake rather than that of 'humanity'.) Gramsci was clearly viewing the Fordist production methods with reference to earlier models of production, such as that of the craftsman whose labour involved making a product from start to finish. Gramsci's fondness for the craftsman, stating that they embody 'spirituality' and 'humanity' in the face of the new

²¹² Of course, if we return to Guilds/workshops etc. the division of labour is different again, but the artist - the master - still passes on *his* knowledge. He has learned his craft to begin with before dividing the labour. It could be argued that the artists involved in the 'dematerialisation of art' around the 1960s are not concerned with the craft that they employ others to undertake. The emphasis in the Guilds is very much on the 'skill'.

²¹³ Gramsci, p.303.

dehumanised worker, attested to the stark change in the model of the worker. In the 1960s, the artisan model is revived in artistic practice in the guise of the art fabricator in America.

The works of art discussed in 'The Dematerialization of Art' are those of a conceptual nature. Writing in the early moments of conceptual art, and taking their lead from Joseph Schillinger's schema, Lippard and Chandler envisaged a move to a 'post-aesthetic' art to come in the near future. Although conceptual art is the article's concern, its opening statement is in fact a reference to minimal works. Lippard's previous writings addressed minimal art.²¹⁴ The aesthetic of minimal art is simple and industrial. It was the artists associated with minimal art who began to use the early artists' 'fabricators' in America in the 1960s; Donald Judd, Sol LeWitt and Robert Morris were amongst them. For 1960s conceptual art, the onus was on the idea. A conceptual artist did not necessarily produce an empirical object; if they did, it was often surplus to the idea. With minimal art, objects were produced, but not always by the artist. The artists associated with minimal art pioneered the utilisation of industrial production methods in this period. The subsequent industrial aesthetic provoked commentators such as Michael Fried to detect a shift to 'objecthood' in sculpture, whilst Clement Greenberg discussed minimal works in terms of a 'non-art' aesthetic.²¹⁵ I do not believe that the

²¹⁴ Lippard edited and published 'Questions to Stella and Judd', *Art News*, 65:5 (September 1966), she also wrote the essay 'Eros Presumptive' published in *The Hudson Review* (Spring 1967), an essay on the eroticism in minimalist language.

²¹⁵ Following the publication of Donald Judd's 'Specific Objects' in 1965, the key debate about minimal art and 'objecthood' took place, predominantly, in the pages of *Artforum* magazine in 1966 through 1967. Contributors included Robert Morris and Tony Smith, who defended the new art against Michael Fried's more damning contribution 'Art and Objecthood'. These contributions are reprinted in *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, ed. by Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell, 1999): Donald Judd 'Specific Objects' (1965), *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, pp.824-828; Robert Morris (1966-7), 'Notes on Sculpture 1-3', *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, pp.828-835; Tony Smith (1966), 'from an Interview with Samuel Wagstaff Jr', *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, pp.760-761.

Michael Fried, 'Art and Objecthood' (1967), reprinted in *Minimal Art: A Critical Anthology*, ed. by Gregory Battcock (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California, 1995), pp.116-147. For other key texts on minimal art, see Battcock. Clement Greenberg, 'Recentness of Sculpture', *American Sculpture of the Sixties*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles County Museum of Art (1967).

emergence of the fabrication companies was solely a response to artists' quests for an industrial aesthetic; the establishment of these firms extended beyond appearances to working practice. The dematerialisation of art, through the use of contracted labour, was very much a reaction, conscious or not, to the implementation of a Fordist ideology in mid-twentieth century America. In response to the deskilling taking place in everyday production, certain artists deskill themselves (whether consciously or not) through the contracting of the manufacture of their works using industrial production methods. The difficulties that artists experienced through working with industrial manufacturers then allowed for businesses solely devoted to art fabrication to materialise.

The industrial manufacturer who also manufactures for artists is epitomised in the example of Gratz Industries. Gratz Industries is a New York-based metalwork's founded as Treitel-Gratz in 1929. They have successfully maintained longstanding working relationships with artists whilst manufacturing industrial items. Gratz are specialist metalworkers who have made links with artists, architects and designers through their trade, most notably, Donald Judd, Walter de Maria and Sol LeWitt. The company began by producing metal furniture for the likes of Florence Knoll, fabricating the famous Mies Van Der Rohe *Barcelona Chairs* alongside the *Tugendhat Chairs* and, more recently, the furnishings of the Kiki de Montparnasse erotic boutiques. They pride themselves on their artworld connections but also fabricate metal items for industry, pilates equipment, items for camera companies, and umpire chairs. Gratz, like many factories, also produced pieces for the armed forces during the Second World War.

It is interesting to note that out of the twenty-one artists named as affiliates on the Gratz Industries website, nineteen are mainly minimal artists working with metal during

the 1960s and 70s.²¹⁶ If we look closely at the Gratz Industries website (that is, at their self-promotion) we can see how the language they use places them as akin to the more traditional workshop-based production associated with craft (such as that of a Renaissance Guild). The website, on more than one occasion, refers to handicraft. They acknowledge their workers as an ‘in-house team of skilled artisans...’ They claim: ‘our craftsmen have over 20 years of experience...’ and emphasise ‘...the artisan-quality craftsmanship and attention to detail that *Gratz Industries* still provides today.’²¹⁷ Through their promotion, they impress the idea that they are an ideal choice for an artist who wishes to remove his hand from the work without compromising on the quality of the artwork. By utilising the language of craft, Gratz also appear sympathetic to artistic ideas. Arguably, companies such as Gratz paved the way for other US firms such as Milgo Industrial (now Milgo/Bufkin) to develop working relationships with artists. Whilst retaining its industrial metal production, Milgo proclaimed, in June 1971, to be the ‘largest fabricator of contemporary sculpture in the world’.²¹⁸

1966 through 1971 saw the emergence of at least three fabrication firms *solely* fabricating for artists in the US: Gemini G.E.L., Lippincott Inc. and Carlson & Co. (with La Paloma Fine Arts later branching out from Gemini G.E.L.). The art fabricators appeared alongside those industrial fabricators, like Gratz Industries, who manufactured artworks for artists whilst they continued to produce everyday commodities. Beginning as a print workshop in 1966, with an artist’s studio, Gemini G.E.L stands out from the group as a primarily a print-based manufacturer whose intentions were to publish prints by mature masters. It soon realised that there was a need for its services, and more, from contemporary artists and expanded its premises in 1969 to incorporate sculpture

²¹⁶ *Gratz Industries*, http://www.gratzindustries.com/client_list [Accessed: 05/08/2007].

²¹⁷ <http://www.gratzindustries.com> [Accessed: 05/08/2007].

²¹⁸ John Lobell (architecture writer and Milgo consultant) in *Arts Magazine* (June 1971). Quoted in Michelle Kuo, ‘Industrial Revolution’, pp.306-315 & 396.

and screen-printing. Gemini claimed that Claes Oldenburg's *Profile Airflow*, which the company fabricated in 1968, sparked its interest in three-dimensional works.²¹⁹ Subsequently, it produced Oldenburg's ambitious contribution to the 1970 World Fair in Osaka, Japan, *Ice Bag - Scale A*, with the assistance of Krofft Enterprises who designed the hydraulic system in *Scale B*. This piece was not only of a monumental scale, measuring 18 by 16 foot, but also kinetic. Gemini worked on a number of sculptural editions for artists such as Donald Judd, Ellsworth Kelly and Willem de Kooning before they closed their sculpture facilities in 1972, after Jeff Sanders left the workshop. Despite the closure of its sculpture shop, a number of employees branched off from Gemini and established their own businesses manufacturing for artists, or became freelance contractors (reminiscent of the 'journeymen' model). In 1974, Ron McPherson founded La Paloma Fine Arts in California, which was initially print-focused, incorporating three-dimensional art production in recent years.

In 1971, Peter Carlson branched out from Gemini G.E.L. to set up his own art fabrication unit in Los Angeles. After a brief period as an independent contractor making works in his garage, he founded Peter Carlson Enterprises (later Carlson & Co.).²²⁰ Distinct from Gemini G.E.L., in the fact that Carlson did not wish to employ artists, Carlson focused on the manufacture of three-dimensional works rather than printmaking.²²¹ Carlson himself comes from an art background; he initially studied electrical engineering before changing to study Fine Arts. Carlson's company has fabricated works for artists with whom Gemini had worked - Oldenburg and Kelly, for example. The firm prided itself on its capacity to undertake any engineering possibilities and Carlson himself, speaking in 2003, denied the collaborative aspect of working with

²¹⁹ Charles Ritchie and Ruth E. Fine, *Gemini G.E.L.: A Catalogue Raisonné, 1966-1996*, <http://www.nga.gov/gemini/essay2.htm> [Accessed: 17/03/2010].

²²⁰ See Lori Moody, 'Some Assembly Required', L.A. Life supplement, *Daily News*, July 26th 1995.

²²¹ In the article 'Artistic Engineers' we learn that many of Carlson's employees in the 1990s are former defence workers. John Morrell, 'Artistic Engineers', The Business Enthusiast supplement, *Alaska Airlines Magazine* (January 1994), p.9.

artists in favour of working *for* them.²²² Up until recently, Carlson & Co. continued to manufacture works of art for contemporary artists like Jeff Koons alongside working on architectural projects. Sadly, the fabrication firm was hit by the recession and closed its doors in April 2010.²²³

Founded in 1966, Lippincott Inc. of Connecticut, devoted its business to the production of large-scale sculptural works. Writing about Lippincott for the *New York Times* in 1976, Leslie Maitland stated:

The sculpture factory grew out of his [Lippincott's] realisation that a need existed for a place that dealt solely with artists, to execute their large-scale ideas - freeing them from the sideline status of working at a general metalworks factory.²²⁴

This allusion to scale confirms the minimal artists' influence in the establishment of the art fabricators alongside the industrial materials (Cor-ten steel, for example). We have only to recall Michael Fried's 'Art and Objecthood' or Robert Morris' 'Notes on Sculpture' to see the importance of scale to this group of artists.²²⁵ The monumental scale, of which artists working with Lippincott were encouraged to undertake, was a result of the public nature of the works.

Donald Lippincott, who founded the company alongside Roxanne Everett, throws

²²² David Pagel, 'The Art Factory', *Calendar*, August 31 2003, p.33.

²²³ Lindsay Pollock reported that Carlson fired his entire workforce a week prior to closing its doors. Reportedly, Carlson said he was facing something akin to bankruptcy. Lindsay Pollock, 'Koons "Dog" Fabricator Carlson Shuts as Recession Hits Big Art', *Bloomberg*, April 28th 2010, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/print/2010-04-28/koons-balloon-dog-fabricator-carlson-closes-as-recession-topples-big-art.html> [Accessed: 4/3/2011].

²²⁴ Leslie Maitland, 'Factory Brings Sculptors' Massive Dreams to Fruition', *The New York Times* (November 24th 1976), p.35 & p.55.

²²⁵ Fried. For an overview of his discussion of scale also see Morris.

light on the working practices of the firm in their early days in a 1975 interview.²²⁶

Lippincott reveals that Everette would approach the artist to initiate the fabrication of a work, rather than have the artist approach them.²²⁷ As such, Lippincott Inc. selected the

artists with whom it worked, fostering a certain aesthetic, whether consciously or not.

Everett explains: ‘Some of the artists originally chosen [to work with Lippincott Inc] were dealing with minimal forms in one way or another.’²²⁸ Lippincott Inc. was unusual

in the fact that it financially assisted the projects. Alongside this patronage of artists

working at the facility, the company acquired fourteen acres of land in which it

displayed the finished artworks. The on-site installation of finished artworks acted as a

kind of outdoor showroom for potential buyers. Hugh Davis claims: ‘The original

concept of Lippincott Inc. was to provide both a fully equipped factory and financial

support for the realization of large sculpture.’²²⁹ Over the years, the art fabrication firm

established relationships with artists with whom it would continue to work.

Michelle Kuo’s detailed trip through the history of fabrication, ‘Industrial Revolution’, acknowledges the proliferation of manufacturing for artists at this time.²³⁰

In her article, Kuo makes reference to Carlson and Co., Lippincott Inc., Milgo

Industrial, Bernstein Bros., Gemini Inc., and the UK-based Mike Smith Studios

(established 1989). All of the US fabricators made work for artists in the 1960s and

70s. However it is only the aforementioned three fabricators - Carlson, Lippincott and

Gemini - who specifically devoted themselves to the manufacture of art. Kuo is quick to

disavow the associations with a Taylorist production line which may be drawn from the

utilisation of industrial production methods in making a work of art for an artist such as

²²⁶ Hugh Marlais Davis, ‘Interview with Donald Lippincott’, in *Artist & Fabricator*, exhibition catalogue, Fine Arts Center Gallery, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 23rd September – 9th November 1975, pp.35-44.

²²⁷ Of course, there are exceptions to this, as was the case with Clement Meadmore.

²²⁸ Hugh Marlais Davis, ‘Interview with Roxanne Everett’, in *Artist & Fabricator*, p.45.

²²⁹ Davis, *Artist and Fabricator*, p.10.

²³⁰ Kuo, pp.306-309 & p.396.

Robert Morris or Donald Judd. Despite the connotations of mass production, the industrial methods employed in the manufacturing of art are not on the same scale. Kuo writes:

When the likes of Judd, Barnett Newman, or Sol LeWitt went to work with Treitel-Gratz, they found themselves not on some Taylorist assembly line but engaged in the dialogic dance of high-end industrial design.²³¹

The ‘dialogic dance of high-end industrial design’, experienced at Treitel-Gratz, was uncommon and the marrying of art and industry was not as straightforward as the finished object would have one believe. In a 1975 interview, Robert Murray called how he, as an artist working in industrial plants, had to keep his hands off the machinery in some of the union shops.²³² Instead he had to provide the shops with detailed diagrams for the making of his works. For the most part, art and industry were too far removed to comprehend one another’s language: hence the initiation of the art fabrication plants. Donald Lippincott makes clear that this difficult relationship was one of the main reasons for establishing a company devoted to making works for artists: ‘I think that recognizing the problems artist had working in other industrial situations is what led us to start with the first pieces.’²³³

In her article, Kuo avoids the fact that these businesses encompass labour processes that are also subjected to a division of labour. The artists may be engaging with ‘high-end design’; however, the engineers and labourers in the art ‘factory’ (Lippincott) still have their work divided. Donald Lippincott, in a 1975 interview,

²³¹ Kuo, p.309. Treitel-Gratz is now Gratz Industries.

²³² Davis, ‘Interview with Robert Murray’, in *Artist and Fabricator*, p.54.

²³³ Davis, ‘Interview with Donald Lippincott’, in *Artist and Fabricator*, p.35.

spoke about the typical division of labour within Lippincott Inc.²³⁴ There is the initial consultation between himself, Eddie Giza (the workshop manager) and the artist, followed by the manufacturing of the artwork, which Lippincott separates into three stages. Firstly, there is the ‘layout’ stage, which comprises of two workers whose sole task is the laying out and cutting of the material. The welding group undertakes the second stage. Lippincott explains that there are normally four or five workers in this group, headed by Robert Giza. The third stage is the finishing, which mainly consists of sandblasting and painting. Painting was Bobby Stanford’s role; one that he rarely deviated from.²³⁵ Lippincott claims that sometimes, rather than being divided into the three stages, one man *may* work on an entire piece.²³⁶ Similarly, Gemini G.E.L also divided labour into three areas and assigned a ‘chief collaborator’ to oversee each project.²³⁷ Stage one of Gemini’s production consisted of the artist defining the project; stage two translated the idea into proofs and prototypes; and the final stage was the production of editions.²³⁸

Kuo stresses the collaborative nature of the works manufactured via the numerous fabricators, stating that ‘Co-opting also meant co-operating.’²³⁹ She expands upon this idea further to incorporate ‘research and development’ claiming that:

‘Fabrication was no longer a utopian imagining of the collective or the autogenic but a

²³⁴ Davis, ‘Interview with Donald Lippincott’, p.40.

²³⁵ Davis, ‘Interview with Donald Lippincott’, p.40.

²³⁶ Davis, ‘Interview with Donald Lippincott’, p.40.

²³⁷ Gemini G.E.L. are more comfortable in thinking of themselves as *assisting* collaborative printmaking, they worked with artists such as Johns and Rauschenberg who were, historically, no strangers to collaborative practice given their involvement with Black Mountain College.

²³⁸ Fine (1984), pp.27-8.

²³⁹ Kuo, p.310. The artist Charles Ray, who utilises fabricators to make his works, opposes the idea that utilising a fabricator is collaborative. He states:

Collaboration is often a word that comes up, but the initial vision is usually not a collaboration. One can have a collaboration with a fabricator as much as one can have a collaboration with a hammer – though a hammer only tells you what it can’t do the hard way, and a fabricator usually tells you this by talking about the budget.

Charles Ray cited in ‘The Producers’, *Artforum* (October 2007), pp.352-359 & p.352 (p.353). Ray’s emphasis. In his response to Ray, Mike Smith is quick to disavow the likening of a fabricator to a hand tool.

levelling of both in the name of research and development.’²⁴⁰ This view recollects the laboratory model envisaged by the Productivists in the Soviet Union earlier in the twentieth century and, moreover, the romanticism with which these kinds of practices are thought of with hindsight. By romanticism here, I am referring to the positive light in which Productivism is considered, despite its failure to affect change within industry as envisaged.²⁴¹

My reference to the Soviet Union warrants attention to the implementation of scientific management, and the role of technical specialist, instigated under Lenin. Judith Merkle proposes that, despite his earlier condemnation of Taylorism, Lenin, after the Bolshevik revolution, began to admire and adopt aspects of Taylor’s methods.²⁴² Lenin saw potential in Taylorist production methods used in the USA. However, Lenin claimed that only once Taylorist methods were freed from working for capital, and the associated exploitation of the worker, could they then be employed to realise their full productive potential.²⁴³ This incorporation of Taylorist concepts into Soviet working practice was extended by Trotsky and, Merkle argues, was also the basis for the speeding up and disciplining of labour witnessed in Stakhanovism under the second five-year plan.²⁴⁴ Nicholas Lampert argues that the technical specialists, whose specialist knowledge was drawn upon in the new economic policies in Soviet Russia, became ‘an

²⁴⁰ Kuo, p.314.

²⁴¹ Of course, there were exceptions to this but, to quote Roberts: ‘...direct involvement by artists in the factory system was indeed rare in this period.’ John Roberts, ‘Productivism and Its Contradictions. A Short History of Productivism’, *Chto Delat?* website, http://www.chtodelat.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=561%3Aproductivism-and-its-contradictions-a-short-history-of-productivism&catid=204%3A01-25-what-is-the-use-of-art&Itemid=298&lang=en [Accessed: 23/02/11]. For a discussion of the success and failures of Productivism also see Roberts (above).

²⁴² Judith A. Merkle, ‘The Taylor System in Soviet Socialism’, *Management and Ideology* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California, 1980), pp.103-135.

²⁴³ Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, ‘The Taylor System - Man’s Enslavement by the Machine’, in *Lenin Collected Works* (Moscow: Progress, 1972), pp.152-154.

²⁴⁴ Merkle, pp.115-135.

agent of discipline in the labour process'.²⁴⁵ The technical specialist appears to embody qualities akin to the manager under Taylorism. David Holloway, referring to Kendall E. Baille's analysis, states: 'The Division of mental and manual labour was reinforced, not abolished in the process of "socialist construction".' He continues:

The model of the 'new Soviet man' was now the engineer, not the manual worker; and this new Soviet man was a specialist, not the well-rounded figure envisaged by Marx in *The German Ideology*.²⁴⁶

The reference to the technical specialist or engineer instigates a consideration of the influence of the role of the fabricator, or, indeed, the fabricators' 'foremen' (such as Bobby Stanford).

I agree with Kuo: the methods employed to produce these often-mammoth artworks involved experimental techniques comprising of trial and error. I also believe that the artists were not always detached from their works. Kuo cites Morris' collaboration with Lippincott on his *Untitled* (1967):

The Lippincott crew *laboured side by side with the artist* on the expansive, forty-foot-long trusslike configuration of structural aluminum I beams installed outdoors as part of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery's 'Plus by Minus' show in Buffalo, New York, in March 1968.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁵ Nicholas Lampart, *The Technical Intelligentsia and the Soviet State: A Study of Soviet Managers and technicians 1928-1935* (London: Macmillan, 1979), p.159.

²⁴⁶ David Holloway, 'The Politics of Soviet Science and technology', *Social Studies of Science*, 11:2 (1981), p.261. Holloway refers to Kendall E. Bailes, *Technology and Society under Lenin and Stalin: Origins of the Soviet Technical Intelligentsia, 1917-1941* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

²⁴⁷ Kuo, p.314. My emphasis.

Needless to say, the installation of such a large-scale sculpture required many hands. However, I question the emphasis on the collaborative nature of these works. Kuo references work that is not necessarily so involved as she suggests in her earlier ruminations:

Even LeWitt, who would often mail or telephone instructions to Gratz, left detailed drawings and maquettes at the firm - suggesting that his earlier use of skilled carpenters and that of the ‘factory’ situation were similarly belaboured processes rather than progressively immaculately ideations.²⁴⁸

Certainly, the artist would send instructions as it is *his* conception and he wished it to be made as envisaged. Here, Kuo stresses the idea that the concept of a work cannot be clearly demarcated from the manufacturing of it: artworks are not simply ‘ordered’ and ‘collected’ by the artist. Donald Lippincott concedes with Kuo on this point, stating that he prefers the artist to be working alongside his workers at the studio and views the team as ‘an extension of the artist’.²⁴⁹ However, I am wary of the hindsight with which Kuo’s article has been written and also the moment in which her research comes to be published. The edition of *Artforum* concerning ‘The Art of Production’ (in which Kuo’s article is printed) appeared in 2007, amidst the contemporaneous debates on collaborative practice in the art world more widely. Within the same period, *Making Art Work* (2003) - a book about the Mike Smith Studio - is published.²⁵⁰ The favouring of artist’s collectives in the art press in the ‘noughties’ could have influenced a more positive view of art fabrication practices (now billed as ‘collaborative’) that have clearly

²⁴⁸ Kuo, p310.

²⁴⁹ Davis, ‘Interview with Donald Lippincott’, p.40.

²⁵⁰ Smith is included in the *Artforum* ‘Art of Production’ edition.

been hidden from the mainstream art public for around forty years.²⁵¹ Furthermore, I attribute the renewed interest in artist collaboration, in part, to the debate ensuing from the publication of Bourriaud's *Relational Aesthetics* in 1998, which drew attention to (and 'labelled') those artists attempting a more 'social' form of installation.

The fabricators' accounts of their working practices are contrary to the idea of collaboration between artist and worker that the art historian presents, perhaps with the exception of Gemini G.E.L. Peter Carlson, founder of Carlson & Co. is quick to disavow the collaborative nature of his business:

We do not collaborate with artists. We work for them. We are intimately involved with every stage of a piece's production. But I don't feel any need to oversell or over-pitch our role in it. We're very lucky we get to work with great artists.²⁵²

Interviews with the fabricators themselves in the 1970s confirm that the ownership of the concept is firmly placed with the artist. Maitland writes:

The artist contributed his time and ideas, while Lippincott furnished the materials and the workmen that the artist would need, displayed the work, sold the work, and in many cases, transported and installed the work in its permanent home.²⁵³

²⁵¹ Books which do engage with the subject of making are Caroline A. Jones' *Machine in the Studio: Constructing the Postwar American Artist* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996) and Terry Smith's *Making the Modern: Industry, Art, and Design in America* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

There are also a handful of newspaper and journal articles on these fabricators, mainly on Carlson & Co. in the 1990s.

²⁵² Peter Carlson cited in Pagel, p.E33.

²⁵³ Maitland, p.55.

The division between conception and execution is evident in the above statement. The manual labour was very much in the hands of the fabricator. Robert Giza (a worker at Lippincott) stated in the same article: ‘At an important stage, if we’re bending something, the artist is here to say “more” or “less”...We’re like their hands, or like seeing-eye dogs...’²⁵⁴ Sidney Felson, co-founder of Gemini G.E.L. is also quoted as saying: ‘We’re a support system, not a co-creator. Each artist is the captain of the ship while he or she is here.’²⁵⁵ Moreover, if we look to Lippincott’s division of labour, the collaborative or experimental pseudo-socialist factory model that Kuo evokes is more akin to that of a manufacturing workshop. Although the fabricators and artists work together, the clear divide between execution and conception remains.

Production Methods or Industrial Aesthetic?

Whatever the reason for the exposition of the art fabricators in 2007, the fact remains that, in the mid-1960s, fabricators began to manufacture work for artists, and for the most part, this practice was unquestioned. Those art historians with more formalist leanings will make the argument for the industrial aesthetic as the motivating factor in the shift to artists working alongside industry.²⁵⁶ However, we have to question why artists began to extensively utilise fabrication methods in 1960s/70s America. I have argued that this period was a cumulating moment for the deskilling of the worker in the production plant and that the new models of manufacture did not belong solely to the workplace but filtered into everyday life through Fordist ideology. I do not believe that art remained untouched by this new way of life. The political atmosphere within the art world, typified in the establishment of the artists’ unions and the visibility of the

²⁵⁴ Maitland, p.55.

²⁵⁵ Sidney Felson cited in Ritchie and Fine.

²⁵⁶ In utilising the term ‘formalist’, I refer to those critics and art historians who took their lead from Romantic philosophers such as Immanuel Kant, art historians such as Heinrich Wölfflin and the critic Clement Greenberg who prioritise the *form* of an artwork.

feminist and black rights movements in art, all signify and contribute towards the changing ideology of American capitalism.

Caroline A. Jones' important text on the post-war artist's studio, *The Machine in the Studio*, focuses on the 'industrial aesthetic' of 1960s America, with reference to the studio practice of artists such as Andy Warhol, Frank Stella and Robert Smithson.²⁵⁷ The industrial aesthetic is ideologically tied to Fordism. The increased machination of work - and the effect and control that this begins to have over everyday life - clearly has an impact on how artists work in this period. The US fabricators testify to a move to industrial production methods in art. Clearly, the visible effect of Fordism in society as a whole - for example, the increasing appearance of the Model T and the Chrysler Airflow on the roads in the 1920s and the 1930s, respectively, to the later proliferation of advertising imagery and mass-marketed goods - had an influence on the visual arts. Both General Motors and Ford had buildings at the New York World Fair of 1939, which signalled their conspicuity. This effect manifested in terms of content - the appearance of cars in paintings and photography - and also in the making process. By the 1960s, capitalist mass-production had infiltrated most aspects of society.²⁵⁸ It has been argued that artists in this period take on the different working roles; the accolade of 'executive artist' is attributed to Frank Stella, whilst Andy Warhol is seen to adopt the role of manager.²⁵⁹

In the 1960s and 70s, industry, or at least the 'look' of industry, appeared to penetrate the art world. Warhol is the obvious example here, with his almost assembly-line production methods (albeit on a much smaller scale than those of Ford). His use of screen-printing (a commercial medium); the 'employment' of assistants; the naming of

²⁵⁷ Jones.

²⁵⁸ For an in-depth analysis of the debasing effects of mass production on art and the subsequent culture industry, see: Adorno (1997).

²⁵⁹ Jones devotes a chapter to 'Frank Stella, Executive Artist', in *Machine in the Studio*, pp.114-188.

his studio the ‘Factory’: all implicitly refer to the influence of Fordism in America.²⁶⁰ I wish to ascertain whether Warhol was simply adopting this practice because of its contemporaneity, whether he was aesthetically representing the period; or whether his use of these techniques should be seen as more subtle, working on a more ideological level rather than a conscious choice? To quote Roberts: ‘The Factory may have been producing assembly line art, but it was not a business in any conventional sense.’²⁶¹ I agree. Warhol’s adoption of the factory line production methods and the representation of his ‘business’ was all part of an extremely well documented practice. The photographs are revealing; be it Gerard Malanga (Warhol’s most famous assistant) ‘squeegying’ a screen or Warhol looking contemplatively at a print, the stages of production and the people producing (and watching the production) are, ultimately, documents of performance.²⁶² Warhol’s adoption of Fordist production methods but on a human scale was an astute performance of the effects of 1960s American ideology. In 1963 he proposed: ‘I think everybody should be a machine’, echoing the commentators on Ford from earlier in this chapter.²⁶³ The labour behind a Warhol print is never hidden. The equation of man into machine, which occurred in Warhol’s production process, is a clear performance of the Fordist effect: that is, the analogical role of man and machine in the workplace.

Returning to Jones’ analysis of post-1945 studio production, I draw attention to what she terms (after Marx) the ‘technological sublime.’²⁶⁴ This concept is very important in Jones’ identification of the machine in the studio specifically in 1960s

²⁶⁰ I use the term ‘employment’ loosely here as Roberts claims that most of Warhol’s assistants were voluntary, with only one (Malanga) ever being on the payroll. ‘Warhol’s “Factory”: Painting and the Mass-Cultural Spectator’, in *Varieties of Modernism*, ed. by Paul Wood (New Haven and London: Yale, 2004), pp.339-361 (p.341).

²⁶¹ Roberts (2004), p.341.

²⁶² There are entire books devoted solely to these documentary photographs. For example, Nat Finklestein, *Andy Warhol: The Factory Years* (Edinburgh: Canongate Books, 1999).

²⁶³ Andy Warhol interviewed by Gene Swenson, ‘What is Pop Art?’, part I:26, cited in Jones, p.189. Smith is an obvious commentator on the correlation between man and machine under Fordism.

²⁶⁴ Jones, pp.54-55.

America. For Jones, the technological sublime splits into two tropes: the *iconic* and the *performative*. The *iconic* aspect refers to ‘an image, figure or representation that is indexically linked to technology, industrial order, or, to the machine’.²⁶⁵ For example, Donald Judd’s metal wall pieces were fabricated by Treitel-Gratz. They bore the imprint of the industrial machinery used to manufacture them. The *performative aspect*, on the other hand, is a:

... mode of production that aspires to, or structurally resembles, an industrial process and/or self representation on the part of the artist that implies a collaboratively generated technological solution or mechanistic goal.²⁶⁶

Jones proposes that certain artists working in the 1960s adopt a combination of both the iconic and performative. The minimalist works - which were initially manufactured by metal fabricators and subsequently, art fabricators - encompassed the iconic but also an element of the performative. Again, we can attribute the performative to Warhol’s practice, particularly the making of his screen prints, which also retain the index of technological processes. The artists in whose work Jones sees the iconic and the performative tropes, also encompass what I argue is wider than the aesthetic. That is, evidence of a process and of labour. Not only are these artworks indexically linked to technology but, they are ideologically affected by the adoption of new technologies and the increase of machination within industrial manufacture. The effects that Fordism and machination had on the worker (and on human life in general) in 1960s America also extended to the artist. The artists become ‘Fordised man’ through their performance and adoption of the models of labour associated with Fordism.

²⁶⁵ Jones, p.55.

²⁶⁶ Jones, p.55.

The fabricators are not concerned with the ‘technological sublime’, the performative or the indexical; they are however, concerned with the practical, problem-solving nature of manufacture and engineering whilst running a commercially viable business. In the 1960s/70s model at least, the artist-executive model is retained - the artist would bring the initial ideas and drawings and then the fabricators discussed and manufactured these. The self-representation of the artist as a worker (epitomised in Stella’s publicity photograph of 1961, in which he poses on scaffolding wearing worker’s attire) is nonetheless proven to be a fraud - a performance.²⁶⁷ This revelation leads me to question whether the artist is still performing when he goes outside of the studio for industrial production?

I find the idea that the use of industrial production methods was *merely* performative rather than being *actual* material production problematic. Warhol’s model was certainly performative: he ‘played’ the manager in his Factory. However, how do the American art fabricators and the machines outside of the studio fit into this schema? As suggested, the fabrication facilities set up in the 1960s and 1970s, unlike Warhol’s Factory, were *real* businesses. They did not entail *performing* the ‘maker’; they *were* the makers, often from an artistic; craft or engineering background.²⁶⁸ The fabricators took their business seriously, producing expensive, high-finish works of art. Money exchanged hands.²⁶⁹ These businesses step out of the ‘art world bubble’ into reality.

Jones does not consider those who created businesses in order to assist the artists who desired a ‘mechanistic goal’. Whilst Jones’ argument is plausible, she

²⁶⁷ Stella had selected a publicity photograph of himself dressed in a suit for the ‘Sixteen Americans’ group show at MOMA a year prior to the photograph of him dressed in work attire sat on the scaffolding. Both photographs were taken by Hollis Frampton. For a discussion of the images, see: Jones, pp.114-129.

²⁶⁸ Warhol’s employment of Malanga was a business exchange – employing him for his experience – however, I am making a distinction here between a company for artists to go to and the employment of an assistant who undertakes tasks from picking up paint to screen-printing. Malanga recounts a typical day working for Warhol in an interview for Planet Group Entertainment, <http://planetgroupentertainment.squarespace.com/planetgroupentertainment/> [Accessed: 23/2/11].

²⁶⁹ In the case of Lippincott Inc. it began by patronising artists who made work at their site in order to establish Lippincott Inc.

remains within the realm of art history for her analysis, as is her intention.²⁷⁰ I believe that Jones' analysis is weakened through remaining within art history. She fails to recognise the utilisation of outside fabricators and their roles within what she calls the 'technological sublime', beyond the index of industrial processes or as a collaborative aspect of the performative. Jones briefly discusses Stella's use of assistants from the mid-1960s and his later contracting of fabricators and print-makers such as Kenneth Tyler in the 1980s, however she never considers the role of the fabricators themselves.²⁷¹ Unlike Warhol's menagerie, Stella's assistants and fabricators remain out of sight and Jones views them as being 'attached' to the work solely through the indexical imprint of industry. Therefore, I ask, if the artists are the performers, where do the fabricators feature? Are the fabricators part of the performance whilst for the most part being kept hidden from the mainstream art audience? I suggest that Jones' reluctance to question further the contracting of fabricators is because the fabricators, in fact, cross the boundary of art into industry. In keeping with art history's tradition, although referenced as 'social activity', the assistants and fabricators remain as an appendix to Jones' discussion of Stella's working practice. This appendage is despite of the prominence that fabricators take in his later career, which Jones attributes to collaboration.²⁷²

Contrary to Jones, I propose that the establishment of art fabrication firms is one of the most decisive material effects of Fordism on the art world within the post-war period. The artists utilising fabricators to manufacture their art works went beyond the established parameters of art in order to represent the mechanised world that surrounded them. Furthermore, the utilisation of fabrication firms was more than a performance as the artist became part of the capitalist process through purchasing the

²⁷⁰ Jones states that it is her intention to do so in the introduction to her book. Jones, p.xviii.

²⁷¹ Tyler worked for Gemini G.E.L. and later established Tyler Graphics Ltd after he left Gemini in 1973.

²⁷² Jones, p.181.

labour-power of others. The artists who purchased the services of the fabricator went beyond the realm of appearances, penetrating reality; that is, through their employment of workers often skilled in non-art production methods (as is the case with the workers at Carlson and Co.).

Minimal Manufacture

After the Second World War, New York became the heart of the art world. In the 1940s and 1950s, the artists predominantly exhibiting in the US were the Abstract Expressionists, followed by the Color Field Painters in the 1960s. Painting was *the* established artistic medium and a medium that was particularly good for the art market. Despite my focus upon sculpture, I would like to note that painting also adopted elements of the industrial around the 1950s, signified in Jackson Pollock's use of household paint brushes and later, Frank Stella's adoption of the house-painters tools and technique as his own. However, the artists with whom the three-dimensional fabricators worked (and were approached to work with in the case of Lippincott) were sculptors, for obvious reasons. Moreover, they were sculptors who were not concerned with the 'hand of the artist' (in contrast to their painting contemporaries).²⁷³ In fact, they reject 'craft' altogether. Those who were more inclined to paint, or print, were working on editions of their works with Gemini G.E.L. In her 'Introduction' to the *Gemini G.E.L. Art and Collaboration* catalogue, Ruth E. Fine claims:

²⁷³ Although Pollock pioneered the 'drip' technique, his hand prints can be detected in works such as *No.1, 1948*.

Many artists of prominence had already acknowledged the possibility of extending their ideas by collaborating on editions, which functioned as a direct counter to personal angst associated with abstract expressionism.²⁷⁴

The fabricators were, arguably, at the forefront of the ‘neo avant-garde’; Gemini G.E.L worked with Johns, Rauschenberg and Oldenberg, whilst Lippincott and Carlson manufactured for the minimal artists, amongst others.

These minimal works that were heavy large-scale metal constructions could not be made by one pair of hands or without the help of specialists accustomed to industrial techniques. However, the particular economical climate, under which workers were stripped of their skills, influenced an increase in the division of labour and the separation of execution and conception in art. It is not merely coincidental that Braverman’s analysis - and the ensuing debates on the American labour process - reappeared at a similar time as the American ‘fabricators’ materialise.²⁷⁵ The opportunity to assist an artist - a fellow problem solver - returned the tools to the increasingly deskilled labourer. Furthermore, the resultant workers’ struggles from the deskilling debates filter down to artists. If the New York Artists Worker’s Coalition, formed in 1969 as a response to the current political climate, testifies to this influence – might not, in addition, the actual process of deskilling?²⁷⁶

However, in this instance, the fabricator was not the person being stripped of his/her skills. In some ways, the labour within a fabrication firm is more interesting

²⁷⁴ Fine, ‘Introduction’, p.17.

²⁷⁵ Lippincott bills itself in 1966 as ‘the country’s only industrial fabricator dedicated to sculpture.’ Kuo, p.310.

²⁷⁶ Alan W. Moore writes that the AWC was formed in response to the civil rights struggle, demanding equal opportunities for the display of non-Caucasian and women artists’ work and also to expand legal rights for artists. Carl Andre, Hans Haacke, Sol LeWitt and Lucy Lippard were counted among its members.

Moore, ‘Artists’ Collectives: Focus on New York, 1975-2000’, in *Collectivism After Modernism*, pp.192-221 (pp.196-7).

than in industry at large. The artist was the person who deskilled him/herself through dividing and contracting out their labour. It is the artist who employed the skills of those involved with industrial production. Braverman argues that the work of the self-employed (i.e. handicraftsmen, artisans, tradesmen etc.) does not constitute productive labour as their labour is not exchanged for capital. He puts forward that the self-employed do not sell their labour power and do not directly contribute to the increase in capital arguing that their labour is, therefore, outside of the capitalist mode of production.²⁷⁷ The artist could be considered in this category. However, the artist utilises productive labour in order to manufacture his/her work. Due to the nature of the labour within a work of art manufactured by a fabricator, but conceptualised by an artist, the productive and unproductive labour cannot be distinguished within the object made.²⁷⁸ The labour which the artist undertakes is that of mental labour - the ideas. Rather than learning a trade, the artists in question purchased the labour power of others in order to manufacture their work. Therefore, we can ascertain that, within the manufacturing of large-scale works of an artist such as Judd, the conception and execution stages of both the manual and mental labour were separated. Writing in August 1975, the artist Clement Meadmore stated:

Every work of art includes elements of art and elements of craft and in many cases the two are inseparable (the artist's touch, etc.). There are also artists including myself in whose work the execution (or craft) is completely separate from the art (or conception), and in such cases the execution is a matter of the highest possible excellence and precision. The advantages of working with

²⁷⁷ Braverman, p.411. 'Even more, they [unproductive labourers] *fall outside* of the distinction between productive and unproductive labour, because they are *outside the capitalist mode of production.*' Braverman's emphasis.

²⁷⁸ Of course, we can establish the divide, theoretically, between conception and execution.

craftsmen and technicians such as those at Lippincott are the possibility of a degree of precision beyond the capabilities of the artist, a scale beyond the limitations of the artist's studio and equipment, and the freeing of the artist to work on new projects.²⁷⁹

Deskilling Beyond Mid-Twentieth Century American Sculpture

Previously, I addressed sculptors needing assistance because of the scale or the skilled nature of their work in order to introduce a more recent incarnation of deskilling in art production. Editions and multiple castings in different media were market-driven concepts - a way of extracting value from one 'original' maquette – taken from a medium which is extremely time consuming.²⁸⁰ The making of editions was mainly concerned with rapid production of saleable artworks for the market. In the preceding section, I have argued that the establishment of fabricators in the mid-twentieth century was in contrast to the production of marketable paintings of the mid-twentieth century. Deskilling, within subsequent art making, transmutes into a wider phenomenon in which artists who are clearly skilled enough to do the work and yet employ others to make their works in order to accommodate the market. This purposeful deskilling of the artist, by the artist, extends to painting - a medium traditionally associated with the hand of the artist. In *Art Since 1940: Strategies of Being*, Jonathan Fineberg states that minimal art was a precursor to conceptual art, naming LeWitt in particular as the progenitor.²⁸¹ If this is the case, does the outsourcing of the making of art - the

²⁷⁹ Clement Meadmore in *Artist and Fabricator*, p.19.

²⁸⁰ I will not enter into a discussion of 'originality' of castings at this juncture. For the debate surrounding Rodin and illegal casting of his works posthumously see: Alexandra Parigoris, 'Truth to Material: Bronze, on the Reproducibility of Truth', in *Sculpture and its Reproductions*, ed. by Anthony Hughes and Erich Ranfft (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 1997), pp.131 - 150. Also see: Rosalind Krauss, 'The Originality of the Avant-Garde' and 'Sincerely Yours', in *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge & London: MIT Press, 1986), pp.151-171.

²⁸¹ Jonathan Fineberg, *Art Since 1940: Strategies of Being*, 2nd edn (London: Lawrence King, 2000), p.294.

separation of execution and conception - precede the separation of execution and conception to such an extent that the concept *becomes* the artwork? Is this the legacy of post-conceptual art? Here, I argue, the artist deskills himself because, in the wake of deskilling within art production, there is no reason for him to be associated with skill. As long as there are buyers. The key perpetrator of this self-imposed deskilling is Damien Hirst.

'Master' of all Trades, Jack of None: Hirst's Division of Labour

The 1980s and 1990s saw another internal shift in capitalism. This shift involved the increase in finance capital, with capitalism moving into a higher gear, and an apparent speeding up of time (David Harvey calls this 'time-space compression.'²⁸²) In Britain, the rise of the art celebrity is epitomised by the Young British Artists (YBAs) in whom the artist's persona once again takes centre stage. Particularly with the example of Hirst, there is the establishment of a brand under which he produced series of works with similar aesthetics: the glass vitrines, the spot paintings, the butterfly paintings and the pill cabinets, for example. Specialist knowledge was required for producing the clean aesthetics of the glass vitrines and the cabinets, not to mention the knowledge of taxidermy and the skill required for the 'pickling' of sharks and other animals.²⁸³ Facilitators and fabricators are employed to manufacture works for Hirst. This employment of contracted labour by Hirst is an extension of the practice initiated by the minimal artists in the 1960s. Some of his works take the process to another level: the

²⁸² Harvey discusses time-space compression in *The Conditions of Postmodernity*. He writes:

I use the word "compression" because a strong case can be made that the history of capitalism has been characterised by a speed-up in the pace of life, while so overcoming spatial barriers that the world sometimes seem to collapse inwards upon us. (p.240).

I do not wish to dwell on the symptoms of postmodernity here as I discuss this in the proceeding chapter.

²⁸³ The taxidermist and artist Emily Mayer is responsible for the majority of Hirst's animals in formaldehyde.

spot paintings. The disavowal of craft (traditionally associated with the hand), exemplified in the way in which Hirst's spot paintings are produced, is symptomatic of a type of artist established within neoliberal capitalism.

Hirst's division of labour is probably the most conspicuous of all the British artists working in the past fifteen years. When he returned to painting in 2005, Waldemar Januszczak visited his studio and reported witnessing Hirst's assistants standing at the walls painting the photorealist works which he was to exhibit under his name.²⁸⁴

Initially, Hirst painted his own spot paintings. He then began to employ assistants to paint them for him. Hirst states:

I only ever made five spot paintings myself. Personally. I can paint spots. But when I started painting the spots I knew exactly where it was going, I knew exactly what was going to happen, and I couldn't be fucking arsed doing it. And I employed people.²⁸⁵

Hirst deskills himself: why paint spots when you can pay someone else to do it for you? Despite Hirst's insinuation that painting the spots required no skill, he actually makes qualitative distinctions between the people that painted his spots. He claims that he had a best spot painter (Rachel Howard) and a worst – himself – in his interview with Burn.²⁸⁶ Hirst became the manager employing the spot painters. In 2000 the painters were situated in their own site in Leyton whilst elsewhere, at other sites, assistants were producing Hirst's other works. Nicholas Glass writes:

²⁸⁴ Waldemar Januszczak, 'Imitate Gallery', *The Times*, March 6th 2005, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/printFriendly/0,,1-531-1506281,00.html> [Accessed: 18/04/2005].

²⁸⁵ Hirst in conversation with Gordon Burn in *On the Way to Work*, ed. by Gordon Burn and Damien Hirst (Faber and Faber, 2001), p.90.

²⁸⁶ *On the Way to Work*, p.90

... he (Hirst) has a small factory of artists working for him. Damien has the ideas; others help him execute them. There are 20 employees, according to Hugh Allen. There are three studios, the biggest in Stroud. The spot paintings are made in Leyton (three or four people); the spin paintings and the pillcases in Vauxhall (10-13 people)...²⁸⁷

In an interview with Rose Aiden, Lauren Child - a painter who use to work for Hirst - reveals that she and 'another part-time assistant painted coloured spots onto Hirst's famous canvases alone in a room in Borough, south London, in the late nineties.'²⁸⁸ She admits to only seeing Hirst about three times in relation to her role as studio manager.

Hirst makes explicit the market's involvement in driving the mass production of the spot paintings and other Hirst-branded art objects. In another interview with Burn in 1999, Hirst stated:

But I make one-offs. And then Koons makes, like, three-offs and four-offs and keeps APs [artist's proofs]... If you make something and you're alive and a thousand people want it, why not make a fucking thousand?

He continues:

²⁸⁷ Nicholas Glass, 'Damien Hirst: Artist or Brand?', *Art Review*, 52 (November 2000), pp.44-5 (p.45).

²⁸⁸ Rose Aiden, 'Brush with Fame', *Observer*, October 12th 2003, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4772547-102280,00.html> [Accessed: 12/10/05].

If you lose that side of it, where the artist is like the travelling minstrel who wanders into the village with his skill... if you lose that, then you also gain this thing where you brighten people's lives up. [sic]²⁸⁹

One would assume that Hirst is making reference here to the 'journeymen' (those who did not fulfil the requirements of the apprenticeship) employed by the Guilds in Renaissance Italy. The journeymen took on a role akin to the contemporary contractor, travelling between the Guilds for temporary work. Hirst clearly distinguishes himself from the journeyman model in the above statement, a role that is comparable to the freelance assistants and fabricators of the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries.²⁹⁰ Hirst asserts that he does not wish to be the artisan but the master. And the master he is. Hirst is happy to employ workers to produce his work in response to the demands of the market. He simultaneously denounces the skill traditionally assigned to an artist that, historically at least, contributed to the creation of value. More recently, the market has had an adverse affect on the division of labour in Hirst's production with his decision to cease producing works in his butterfly and pill-cabinet series.²⁹¹ Over production, obviously, reduces the value of the works considerably.

Ironically, in late 2009 to early 2010, an exhibition of Hirst's recent paintings - which he was proud to proclaim were painted by his own hand - was displayed at the Wallace Collection, London.²⁹² The exhibition was not favourably received, with one reviewer writing: 'The results of Hirst's experiment with actual artistry aren't

²⁸⁹ *On the Way to Work*, p.85.

²⁹⁰ It was not uncommon for art-fabricator employees to branch out into their own businesses or become freelance in the earlier 1970s models. In 1971, Peter Carlson left Gemini G.E.L. and later established Carlson and Co. after a period of manufacturing artworks for artists in his garage. Similarly, Ron McPherson left Gemini G.E.L. to found Paloma Fine Arts in 1974. Jeff Sanders, when required, was contracted by Gemini G.E.L. to assist with sculptural editions.

²⁹¹ For a discussion of the effects of the economic decline on Hirst's work, see my 'Afterword'.

²⁹² Damien Hirst, 'No Love Lost, Blue Paintings', Wallace Collection, London, 14th October 2009 - 24th January 2010.

encouraging.²⁹³ This change in Hirst's established model of art making, came as a shock to those familiar with his practice. Hirst avoided contracted labour in favour of his own hand.

Surplus Value and Spots

As an appendix to the discussion of art and the degradation of work in capitalist production, the question of surplus value has to be raised in relation to Hirst's contracted labourers. Scientific management was fundamental to the extraction of surplus value; workers were pushed to achieve often-unrealistic production targets. Every detail of every task undertaken in the factory was calculated in order to maximise production and extract more surplus value from the workers. Hirst is not a Taylorist; however, his utilisation of contracted assistants to produce valuable works of art subsumed under his name accrues significant surplus value which takes the form of profit. In November 2008, an article published in *The Guardian* stated that Hirst's assistants were paid around £19,000 a year according to sources.²⁹⁴ In a 1999 interview with Burn, Hirst was unsure as to whether he paid his workers a 'fiver' or a 'tenner' an hour.²⁹⁵ In both cases, surplus was being extracted from these workers. Susan Himmelweit writes that surplus value is 'the value produced by the worker which is appropriated by the capitalist without equivalent given in exchange.'²⁹⁶ Colin Gleadell reported in the September 2009 edition of *Art Monthly* that one of Hirst's 2006 butterfly paintings had recently sold for £657,250 at Sotheby's.²⁹⁷ *The Art Newspaper* reported that the thirty-four butterfly paintings, made from 2005 to 2008, in Hirst's major

²⁹³ Peter Conrad, 'Damien Hirst: No Love Lost, Blue Paintings', *The Observer*, 18th October 2009.

²⁹⁴ Jones et al. p.8.

²⁹⁵ *On the Way to Work*, p.82.

²⁹⁶ Susan Himmelweit, 'Surplus Value', in Bottomore, pp.528-531 (p.529).

²⁹⁷ Colin Gleadell, 'Less is More', *Art Monthly*, 329 (September 2009), pp.36-7 (p.37).

Sotheby's sale of September 2008 - *Beautiful Inside My Head Forever*, ranged in price from £145,000 to £2 million.²⁹⁸ The profit gained from the employment of assistants to make these paintings is enormous. The monetary equivalent of the typical labour taken to produce a year's worth of spot paintings is £19,000. In my formulation I am assuming that one assistant makes x amount of spot paintings.²⁹⁹ The record price for a spot painting sold at auction is £1.8 million.³⁰⁰ Therefore, the surplus being extracted through the employment of others to undertake work that is within the artist's own skill set is immense.³⁰¹ The assistant is paid for the labour that they undertake but their wages are not commensurate to the value that they produce and this is where surplus value as profit is accrued.

Now, let us consider what I have just proposed above: the work that Hirst employs others to do is work that he *is* skilled to undertake himself. This is in contrast to the 1960s and 70s' working model of the artist who contracts a fabricator. The

²⁹⁸ Cristina Ruiz, 'Revealed: The Art Damien Failed to Sell', *Art Newspaper*, 194 (September 2008).

²⁹⁹ According to hearsay, Hirst rotated the assistants painting his spot paintings (and also his photorealism series) to avoid an assistant laying claim to painting any one complete painting.

³⁰⁰ Information taken from Sarah Thornton, 'In and Out of Love with Damien Hirst', *The Art Newspaper*, 195 (October 2008), www.theartnewspaper.com/articles/In-and-out-of-love-with-Damien-Hirst/16269 [Accessed: 04/09/2009].

³⁰¹ Hirst relays the story of an assistant who asked for one of his spot paintings when they left their assistant job in an interview with Burn. His response exemplifies his acknowledgement of the surplus that he extracts from his assistants:

A year in the studio getting paid a fiver, a tenner an hour, whatever it is. So I said "I'll give you a cheque for seventy thousand quid if you like. Why don't I just do that? Because you know you are going to sell it straight away. You know how to do it, just make one of your own." And she said "No I want one of yours." But the only difference between one painted by her and one of mine is the money. (*On the Way to Work*, p.82)

There are roles within mainstream industry that are redolent of that of a spot painter, such as the potters and hand-painters involved in the making of Wedgwood pottery. A separate 'specialist' is employed to undertake each of the various stages of production. However, despite Hirst's prolific output, Wedgwood's output will be greater.

McKendrick writes that in his Etruria manufactory, Josiah Wedgwood, in the mid-eighteenth century, was one of the 'pioneers of English factory organization including the disciplining of workers, the division of labour and the systematization of production'. Neil McKendrick, 'Josiah Wedgwood and Factory Discipline', *The Historical Journal*, 4:1 (1961), pp.30-55 (p.30). Thus, Wedgwood's early craft-based factory is not dissimilar to industrial production. The division of labour that Wedgwood adopted was taken from Adam Smith, in contrast to earlier working methods where one craftsman made a whole piece, the work was divided so that each stage was undertaken by a 'specialist' in the new order. For more information, see:

http://www.wedgwoodmuseum.org.uk/learning/discovery_packs/2179/pack/2184/chapter/2322

working relationship between the artists and fabricators was primarily initiated because the artist was lacking either the tools, space or, indeed, skill to realise and complete their artworks. Surplus value is extracted through the employment of assistants to paint his spot paintings. This delegation frees up Hirst's own time for his other commercially artistic endeavours. In contrast to Hirst, I concede that the use of fabricators around the 1970s fostered a more cooperative relationship between the artist and fabricator. However, the emphasis placed on the cooperative nature of the art fabricators as a signifier of collaboration needs to be critically considered. Arguably the production methods employed in Hirst's paintings are indebted to the effect that the deskilling of work had on art making in the 1960s and 70s. As I will return to in the following chapter, the two periods addressed are distinct.³⁰²

Conclusion

The making of art underwent a profound change in the mid-twentieth century with the effects of the establishment of monopoly capitalism in America and the advent of late capitalism on the horizon. Roberts claims that deskilling in art is not the same as the deskilling of productive labour, to which I am in agreement – they are distinct forms of production. However, he further argues that because art is not subject to the law of value, there is a freedom attributed to the artist which allows for them to 'penetrate the materials of artistic labour *all the way down*.'³⁰³ Whereas, in contrast, the worker

³⁰² Although my focus has been on Hirst in this final section, he is not alone in his contracting of assistants to paint and make for him. The US artist Jeff Koons (who often has work manufactured by Carlson & Co.) also adopts assistants to make paintings for him. He claims:

I used to make all my own sculpture, my paintings, but if I did that it would severely limit the range of projects that I could be involved with. I follow my interests in some way that feels profound to me, those that seem to have a deeper meaning.

Adrian Dannatt, 'Jeff Koons on his Serpentine show, his inspiration and how his studio system works', *The Art Newspaper*, 204, (July/August 2009), www.theartnewspaper.com/articles/Jeff-Koons-on-his-Serpentine-show-his-inspirations-and-how-his-studio-system-works/18566 [Accessed: 04/09/2009].

³⁰³ Roberts (2007), p.87.

involved in 'normal' production is blocked off from the materials and machinery of production. I disagree. Throughout this chapter, I have considered the role of a specific type of artist, and a specific form of artistic labour; that is, someone who contracts and who divides the labour of others. In this way, the artist does not 'penetrate' the materials in the same way as a painter or a sculptor (understood in a more traditional sense) would. The artist does not have the skills, such as those of an engineer or a metalworker, in order to make their own work. Once artists begin to contract industrial labour, a form of deskilling does occur between execution and conception. Moreover, I maintain that the effect of the deskilling of work – the ideological implications of a Fordist society – has an effect on the deskilling of art production.

I have shown that the deskilling of general work also effects the art world, albeit on different levels and with distinct aims. Furthermore, the relationship between the dominant modes of production and art making art does not cease with the end of monopoly capitalism or Fordist production methods. In the following chapter, I attend to the subsequent phase of capitalism – neoliberal capitalism – in order to view the effects of more recent models of labour on art. These models are concerned less with the rapid production of carbon-copy goods; the new economic model takes its inspiration from the artistic and the creative, which has its own implications for the direction in which art turns in the late twentieth century.

- Chapter Two -

The Worker as Artist (and its respondents)

The previous chapter addressed the emergence of art fabrication facilities in light of the deskilling that occurred under the effects of Fordism in the US and other Western capitalist countries. The period around the 1970s, in which these changes in art making manifested, immediately preceded the initiation of a new phase of capitalism within the Western world. The separation of hand and mind that materialised in the deskilling of work paved the way for the increase in the service industries within this subsequent period of capitalism. This increase, I propose, lies in the fact that the separation of hand and mind extended into distinct industries. Furthermore, the models of production and the ideologies stemming from these phases of capitalism are not entirely distinguishable from one another. For example, the emphasis on the ‘individual’ - which will be addressed in terms of the model of the artist under the ‘new spirit of capitalism’ - is certainly rooted in neoliberal ideology. The embracing of the ‘individual’ under neoliberal capitalism proved a powerful tool against unionisation in Thatcher’s Britain, in which echoes of Fordism were still apparent. However, work was to be redefined, yet again, under neoliberal capitalism.

This chapter attends to post-Fordist economic models, production methods and the ideologies born out of this period. I question how the new economic model, which began to be implemented in the late 1970s, has affected the way that art is produced. The post-Fordist era is, arguably, one of the most prolific periods of socialised art production because of the myriad ways in which sociability manifests within art under neoliberal capitalism. A number of these socialised art practices are presented within the following two chapters. In this chapter, numerous theories are drawn upon in order to address post-Fordist economic trends. Although I acknowledge the work of key writers on the artist

as an employed cultural worker (often viewed as parallel to the ‘precarious worker’), this thesis is not the place to attend to this subject.³⁰⁴ Moreover, the focus of this thesis is on how the division of labour, within distinct phases of capitalism, affects how art is made. The aforementioned debates address, more specifically, how the artist fits into capitalism as a worker in his or her own right and the economic implications of this, such as wages and pensions. The following chapter is a response to the question: how have labour models changed after Fordism and how is the production of art affected by these changes?

Many Hands Make Light (Art) Work: The Neoliberal Effect

There are two key ways in which collaboration or collectivity operates within art making. Firstly, there are those people who are making for artists (the contracted labour that was predominantly addressed in the previous chapter) and, secondly, those who work collaboratively, such as artists’ groups (to be addressed in the third chapter). There are distinct periods in which collective art making appears more prominent - in particular the 1960s and from the late 1990s to the present. However, it is not the contention here to delineate exact dates for the emergence of artists’ collectives; neither is it to suggest that these are the only moments in which collectives are working. On the contrary, these are moments in which social models of art tend to become more visible. The 1960s was attended to in the preceding chapter; here the focus is on the later period, in which neoliberal ideology is so far engrained within society that the way that artists

³⁰⁴ I am referring here to the work that Pierre-Michel Menger has undertaken, exemplified in his article ‘Artists as Workers: Theoretical and Methodological Challenges’, *Poetics*, 28 (2001), pp.241-254. More recently, there have been a number of British studies on the reality of being a cultural worker (as opposed to the romantic ideal of being a cultural worker), including those of David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker, Helen Kennedy, Mark Banks and Stephanie Taylor. David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker, *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries* (London: Routledge, 2011); Helen Kennedy, *Net Work: Ethics and Values in Web Design* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011) forthcoming; and Mark Banks, *The Politics of Cultural Work* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

produce is influenced. I offer an alternative approach to the discourse on 1990s British art.³⁰⁵ Whereas the texts on 1990s British art often concentrate on the consumption and the reception of art, this analysis focuses on art's production; looking at the labour involved in making works of art in this period. The lack of attention given to labour in art is not limited to discourse on art in the 1990s but is, in fact, symptomatic of art history's approach to modernist and contemporary art. I, therefore, re-emphasise the importance of a discussion of labour and making in art discourse.³⁰⁶

There have been notable changes in art production within capitalist countries since the 1990s, which I propose have been affected by the new capitalist economic models such as flexible accumulation that originated in the late 1970s. Of course, this proposition does not entail a simple mapping of the aesthetics of art onto economic models; neither is it a question of the artistic replication of contemporary working tropes, such as the use of the personal computer.³⁰⁷ There are a number of ways in which artists respond to these changes.

Artists are affected by neoliberal capitalism in three ways: Firstly, I propose that the neoliberal agenda in 1980s Britain allowed for the success of the Mike Smith Studio. Secondly, there are artists who adapt to the changes implemented within a neoliberal economy. For example, those artists whose practices are purportedly 'social' and whose works are often labelled 'relational'. And thirdly, there are the art-activists who are

³⁰⁵ For example, Julian Stallabrass, *High Art Lite* (London and New York: Verso, 1999) and *Art Incorporated* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004); Chin-tao Wu, *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention Since the 1980s* (London and New York: Verso, 2001); and Don Thompson, *The \$12 Million Stuffed Shark: The Curious Economics of Contemporary Art and Auction Houses* (London: Aurum Press, 2008).

³⁰⁶ Of course, there are exceptions to the limited attention on making in art history texts as earlier discussed.

³⁰⁷ Olav Velthuis takes a look at how artists have more literally addressed the subject of the economy in their artworks in his book *Imaginary Economics* (Rotterdam: NAI, 2005). There are also those artists who more literally represent business people, such as Carey Young. In *Everything You've Heard is Wrong* (1999) Young performed at Speakers' Corner in London, dressed as a businesswoman, giving a speech on 'successful corporate-style communication'. For a list of works by Young, see: <http://www.careyyoung.com/works.html>.

generally opposed to capitalism but who, arguably, adopt the tools and organisational models of ‘flexible accumulation’ - the internet and the network - in order to criticise it.

I have stipulated the above three categories in order to explain how new capitalist modes of production have shaped art making. The artists discussed loosely adopt one of two perspectives: those who are for and those who are against capitalism. These categories are not definitive - they do not apply to *all* artists since the 1990s; they look to trends within artistic practice, and within discourse, in this period. In order to substantiate the above propositions, the first half of this chapter is concerned with the economic and ideological implications of neoliberal capitalism. An examination of the Mike Smith Studio in London follows, as an example of the first way that art making responds to neoliberal capitalism. The second and third categories are attended to in the third chapter.

‘Flexible Accumulation’, Neoliberalism and The ‘New Spirit’ of Capitalism

In 1999, *The New Spirit of Capitalism (Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme)* was published in France, and subsequently translated into English in 2005.³⁰⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello’s thesis relies upon an analysis of management discourse from the late 1960s to the 1990s for the task of illustrating the inherent changes within capitalism.³⁰⁹ Through their focus on management textbooks, Boltanski and Chiapello’s analysis becomes useful for looking at the ideologies emerging through the implementation of new business models,

³⁰⁸ Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2005).

³⁰⁹ It may be useful to note here Boltanski and Chiapello’s backgrounds: Luc Boltanski is a professor of social sciences at École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris and Eve Chiapello is a professor at the HEC School of Management, Paris. This dual background of sociology and management studies forms the basis of their analysis.

despite their insistence that the ‘new spirit’ is not a superstructural phenomenon.³¹⁰ Their assertion is a response to the restrictive 1970s notion of ideology that they are working against in their book. The 1970s notion, they argue, reduced the concept of ideology to a set of ‘false ideas’.³¹¹ It becomes apparent within Boltanski and Chiapello’s analysis that ‘spirit’ is interchangeable with a more dialectical conception of ‘ideology’ when they state: ‘...The spirit of capitalism not only legitimates the accumulation process; it also constrains it.’³¹² Of course, the title and the subject of the book - the ‘spirit of capitalism’ – are indebted to Max Weber’s much earlier publication *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.³¹³ Boltanski and Chiapello do not focus on the relation that Protestantism has on capitalism, but state that they ‘draw above all from Weber’s approach the idea that people need powerful moral reasons for rallying to capitalism.’³¹⁴

The New Spirit of Capitalism was written in response to the weakening of protest movements and the decline of Marxism in France, evidenced in the field of French sociology in the 1980s.³¹⁵ Boltanski and Chiapello’s work takes the contradictions in the writings of orthodox Marxists in the 1970s as a departure point for their own thesis. These writings promoted a scientific approach to history and a positivist conception of

³¹⁰ Alex Callinicos criticises Boltanski and Chiapello for turning away from the ideological notion in favour of the idea of justification. It is in their discussion of justification, exemplified through their models of cities in capitalist society, that Callinicos argues their argument is flawed. Callinicos, *The Resources of Critique* (Cambridge: Polity, 2006), pp.51-71.

³¹¹ Boltanski and Chiapello (2005), p.xx.

³¹² Boltanski and Chiapello (2005), p.xx.

³¹³ Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Scribner, 1930). A discussion of the connection between the two analyses can be found in Sara Farris, ‘New and Old Spirits of Capitalism’, *International Review of Social History*, 55 (2010), pp.297-306. Farris states that Boltanski and Chiapello revived Weber’s theoretical approach through the attention that they give to the moral reasons that encourage people to rally to capitalism. However, she claims that Boltanski and Chiapello’s analysis is just the tip of the iceberg as to how Weber’s analysis influences contemporary debates. (p.297).

³¹⁴ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.9.

³¹⁵ For a full history of the influences of Boltanski and Chiapello approach, see their ‘Preface to the English Edition’, pp.ix-xxvii.

the social world.³¹⁶ The orthodox schools also wished to keep in close contact with the social movements of the period. Boltanski and Chiapello believe that, at the time of writing, there were inherent contradictions in sociology because of its dual orientation. This sociological methodology had to be, at once, scientific and critical if it was to encompass the two aspects – that is, taking a scientific approach to history and a positivist conception of the social world, whilst also operating as the ‘critical vanguard’ of the social movements.³¹⁷ Boltanski and Chiapello argue that the problem of values, moral and ideals arose from this contradictory approach. Rather than adopt this perspective, they refer to the critical methodology of Pierre Bourdieu - in particular his sociology of domination - which they see as stressing ‘historical structures, laws and forces’, and thus minimising the role of intentional action.³¹⁸ In light of these observations, they formed part of the ‘Political and Moral Sociology Group’ in the 1980s whose aim was to readdress the question of action and moral values within the disciplines of sociology and political science. The group’s aim was to engage these questions without reducing them to ideologies or an ‘a priori’.³¹⁹

Boltanski and Chiapello recognise that the subject of ‘capitalism’ was off the agenda for sociology in the thirty years preceding their analysis – being a concept that was associated with Marxism – and, therefore, they acknowledge that there was no ‘wider picture’ in which to observe the changes within society. This outlook provides one of the main driving forces for their analysis, which resulted in *The New Spirit of*

³¹⁶ Boltanski and Chiapello explain that by this they are referring to the idea that:

...the social world is constituted by ‘structures’, inhabited by ‘laws’, and propelled by ‘forces’ that escape the consciousness of social actors; and history itself follows a course that does not directly depend upon the volition of the human beings subject to it.

Boltanski and Chiapello, p.x.

³¹⁷ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.ix-x.

³¹⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.x.

³¹⁹ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.x.

Capitalism. Their thesis draws heavily on the analytical framework and model of the city in Boltanski's *De la justification*, co-authored with Laurent Thévenot.³²⁰ As we will see, Boltanski and Chiapello's analysis has not remained within the sphere of sociology; its reception within contemporary art circles, particularly those concerned with art and social change, is notable.³²¹

Capitalist Co-optation: The Two Models of Critique

In their book, Boltanski and Chiapello present two models of critique aimed at challenging capitalism. These models of critique are found within the business discourse of the 1960s and the 1990s, appearing around moments of social and artistic change.³²² In addition, they infer that a third spirit has come into being since the 1990s.³²³ The first moment of critique - 'social critique' - is identified with post-1930s and the implementation of Fordism; whilst the second, 'artist critique', occurs in the 1960s and is foregrounded in 1968.³²⁴ The social critique criticises capitalism as a source of poverty among workers and for unprecedented inequalities (especially between the rich and the poor). It also criticises capitalism for being a source of opportunism and egoism,

³²⁰ Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot, *De la justification: les économies de la grandeur* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991).

³²¹ Chiapello contributed a paper to the *Third Text*, 'Art and Collaboration' edition. Eve Chiapello, 'Evolution and Co-optation', *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.585-594. Other authors engaging with their work includes: Brian Holmes, 'The Flexible Personality: For a new cultural critique', www.noemalab.org/sections/ideas/ideas_articles/pdf/holmes_flexible_p.pdf, 14/05/08 and 'Artistic Autonomy and the Communication Society', *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.547-555; and Maria Lind, 'The Collaborative Turn', *Taking the Matter into Common Hands*, ed. by Johanna Billing, Maria Lind and Lars Nilsson (London: Black Dog, 2007), pp.15-31. These texts discuss Boltanski and Chiapello in terms of open collaboration but never address collaboration within contracted labour.

³²² Boltanski and Chiapello looked at two corpora focusing on the subject of 'cadres' (in its various guises), comprising of sixty texts each. The 1960s' corpus consisted of texts from 1959 through 1969, whilst the 1990s' corpus comprised of texts from 1989 to 1994. Boltanski and Chiapello, p.60.

³²³ The 'spirit of capitalism' is identified as 'the ideology that justifies engagement in capitalism'. Boltanski and Chiapello, p.8.

³²⁴ The model of 'social critique' that Boltanski and Chiapello work with comes from César Graña's *Bohemian versus Bourgeois: French Society and the French Man of Letters in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Basic Books, 1964).

1968 is named as a key moment by Chiapello in 'Evolution and Co-optation', p.592. They also devote a chapter of their book to a discussion of the year. Boltanski and Chiapello, pp.167-215.

which destroys collective bonds and solidarity by exclusively encouraging private interests.³²⁵ Boltanski and Chiapello propose that the model of ‘artist critique’ began to be co-opted by capitalism after 1968.³²⁶ Within the artist critique, capitalism is criticised, firstly, for being a source of oppression. Secondly, the freedom and autonomy of humanity is questioned; man is now subjected to the market and capital more widely. Finally, capitalism is criticised for being a source of disenchanted goods leading to disenchanted lifestyles.³²⁷

The model of artist critique is, according to Boltanski and Chiapello, rooted in the invention of a bohemian lifestyle. This notion is founded upon the divide between the bourgeoisie as land-owners, on the one hand and, on the other, the artists and intellectuals who are considered to be free from ‘production’.³²⁸ The artist critique, they claim, presents itself as a ‘radical challenge to the basic values and options of capitalism.’³²⁹ The personification of this type of critique thus manifests in the model of the dandy – a freethinking, creative, flexible individual, based on the ideals of the

³²⁵ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.37. Boltanski and Chiapello see this form of critique as being led by socialists and continued by Marxists.

³²⁶ I refer throughout to ‘artist critique’, rather than the sometimes-cited ‘artistic critique’, following Eve Chiapello’s preference delineated in her article ‘Evolution and Co-optation.’ Chiapello states:

Whereas many artists expressed this [artist] critique forcefully, they were not alone in doing so, which is why I prefer to speak of ‘artist critique’ rather than ‘*artistic* critique’ - especially since the latter is an ambiguous term liable to mean that artists are the subject of either the critique or its target.

Chiapello, p.586. Chiapello’s emphasis.

³²⁷ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.37. The idea of capitalism as a source of disenchanted goods and lifestyles can be identified in Karl Marx’s analysis of the commodity in the first chapter of *Capital*. In the final section of the chapter Marx introduces commodity fetishism, with the much-quoted description of: ‘social relations between things.’ Under capitalism, the worker is forced to sell their labour in order to survive and, as such, is subject to the market. The labour that he sells to the property owner is used to produce goods that do not belong to him and, because of this, he is subsequently alienated from these goods. The alienation of the worker is not just particular to Marx’s time but proliferates the history of capitalism, as we have seen already in the previous chapter. Marx (1983), p.78.

³²⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.38.

³²⁹ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.39.

Romantic artist. Boltanski and Chiapello identify the absorption of the model of ‘artist critique’ into business models after 1968.³³⁰

In this second period of change that Boltanski and Chiapello ascertain, openly collaborative practices in art making have responded to the internal changes within capitalism that are reflected in the dominant modes of production. In this chapter, I look at how the ideological implications of the ‘new spirit’ are evident in the division of labour in art. In the subsequent chapter, I argue that collaborative practice in art has rejected the model of ‘artist critique’, which capitalism has co-opted, and has adopted the terms of ‘social critique’ and collective labour in order to criticise it. The artist as a freethinking individual now belongs to capitalism; therefore, the new avant-garde is found in collaborative art practices. The dominance of the artist mode of critique, and its subsequent absorption into capitalism, is at the heart of the changes that Boltanski and Chiapello describe as being afoot in the 1990s. However, the distinction between the co-optation of the artist critique by capitalism and the move to collective production in art is not clearly defined. This ambiguity will be addressed in the third chapter.

In their thesis, Boltanski and Chiapello propose that a certain conception of the artist - the Romantic artist - becomes the new model of ‘worker’ within the third period. Maurizio Lazzarato disparages this model of artist. He argues that the idea of artist, which Boltanski and Chiapello claim capitalism co-opts, is an out-of-date notion. Because of this proposition, the model is, therefore, not a true representation of the artist

³³⁰ Boltanski and Chiapello.

The co-option of the ‘artist critique’ can be seen plainly through the recognition and utilisation of commodity fetishism in a 2007 report from The Work Foundation on the performance of the creative industries in Britain, commissioned by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. In the report, The Work Foundation acknowledges its awareness that the public buy to satisfy ‘more complex psychological and emotional needs.’ The creative industries provide the platform for these goods. The Work Foundation, *Staying Ahead: the Economic Performance of the UK's Creative Industries* (June 2007), section 1.11.

The Work Foundation is an independent authority on work and its future, owned by the University of Lancaster. The foundation provides policymakers and authorities with information, advice and evidence about work-related issues.

that is contemporary to the period on which Boltanski and Chiapello focus.³³¹ Contrary to Lazzarato's criticism, I maintain that the model of artist - which is akin to that of the Romantic artist (the creative individual, embodying divine talent, who goes against the grain etc.) - is precisely the conception, or should I say stereotype, of an artist that the non-art experts surmise is 'artist' in contemporary culture.³³² As such, the manager or management theorists (who are not concerned with recent artistic practice) choose this mythic artist as a new model of worker because they believe that artists are non-conforming, free-thinking individuals. This is a view that is historically conditioned, originating from the artist-genius myth.³³³ In addition, we have to consider *when* Boltanski and Chiapello identify the 'artist critique' as occurring. They see the critique as being 'rooted in the invention of a bohemian lifestyle' which takes the Romantic artist as its model alongside the bohemian or dandy, which is a modernist idea.³³⁴ Thus the modernist notion of an artist is pertinent to their analysis. In her article 'Evolution and Co-optation: The Artist Critique of Management and Capitalism', Chiapello claims that the model of artist critique is rooted in the philosophical conception of art and artists that

³³¹ Maurizio Lazzarato, 'The Misfortunes of the "Artistic Critique" and of Cultural Employment', trans. by Mary O'Neill, <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0207/lazzarato/en>, [Accessed: 18/01/2010].

³³² There is an established body of work theorising the adoption of 'cool' within business environments in order to coerce those who see themselves as counterculture into working - and believing that they are the ones in control of this. See Thomas Frank, *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture and the Rise of Hip Consumerism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); Richard D. Lloyd, *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City* (New York, Oxon: Routledge, 2006) and Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

The use of the term 'bohemian' does not go unnoticed here, with its associations with modernism and, of course, the modernist artist.

³³³ In her essay 'The Clouded Mirror', Christine Battersby presents a history of the gendered term 'genius' in art. She plots the genesis of the term from its original associations with mimesis - creating a 'masterpiece' - through to the Romantic notion of genius, attributed to artists in the Renaissance. The Romantic notion of genius was considered to be a talented male with good judgement and knowledge; his work also being associated with originality, which was gaining value at the time. Originality however, in this sense, was still closely connected to mimesis. In the modern sense, originality comes to be aligned with the artist rather than his mimetic abilities. The artist-genius myth is further concretised through a concern with not only the life of an artist but also his (or her) psychology, which is then considered in relation to an artist's oeuvre in order to build a 'story' for the artist, or an artistic subject, as is the case with Vincent van Gogh. Christine Battersby, 'The Clouded Mirror' (1989), in *Art and its Histories: A Reader*, ed. by Steve Edwards (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), pp.129-133. Griselda Pollock, 'Artists Mythologies and Media Genius, Madness and Art History', *Screen*, 21:3 (1981), pp.57-96.

³³⁴ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.38.

emerged in the 18th century.³³⁵ She also acknowledges the more contemporary model(s) of artist who adopt an increased social and collective interaction. Perhaps Lazzarato believes that these artists are more appropriate contenders for the artist-model?

Furthermore, Lazzarato reads *The New Spirit of Capitalism* as if Boltanski and Chiapello are addressing artists as workers, rather than the opposite. There is a body of research on French cultural workers, pioneered by Pierre-Michel Menger, which addresses artists as cultural workers and the economic situation in which they exist; however, Boltanski and Chiapello's research is distinct from this. Menger's research is often cited alongside Boltanski and Chiapello's thesis in discussions about social art practices, which is presumably where Lazzarato's confusion originated.³³⁶

A common criticism of *The New Spirit of Capitalism* is its primary focus on France as its case study. In the 'Preface to the English Edition' of the book, the authors write that 'rather similar processes have affected the principle industrialised countries in the Western world.'³³⁷ The reason Boltanski and Chiapello give for this specificity is that they did not wish to write another general text which looked at 'globalisation'.³³⁸ There were already countless books doing just that at the time of their writing. Nevertheless, Boltanski and Chiapello are confident that the case of France is

³³⁵ Chiapello (2004), p.588.

³³⁶ Pierre-Michel Menger, *Portrait de l'artiste en travailleur (Portrait of the Artist as Worker)* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2002).

An example Menger being placed alongside Boltanski and Chiapello is within Stephen Wright, 'The Delicate Essence of Collaboration', *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.533-545. Wright claims: 'In his recent and blistering essay, Portrait of the Artist as a Labourer, Pierre-Michel Menger, following Chiapello's lead, has described art as a "principle of fermentation for neo-capitalism."' (p.542).

³³⁷ Boltanski and Chiapello state that their use of the term 'ideology' refers to shared beliefs inscribed in institutions in their 'General Introduction: On the Spirit of Capitalism and the Role of Critique', p.3.

³³⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.xxi. The inclusion of an explanation of why they use France as a case study, in the 'Preface to the English Edition', may also be in response to the criticisms that the book received on publication in French. These suggested that their approach was too specific to France. For example, Sebastian Budgen writes 'It is also true that *Le Nouvel Esprit* lacks any comparative dimension.' In 'A New Spirit of Capitalism', *New Left Review*, 1, (January/February 2000), pp.149-156 (p.155). Whilst Bryan S. Turner states in a review of the English edition: 'Many critics have claimed that their work is largely an analysis of French society and that it is difficult to generalise from their account to other national forms of capitalism.' Bryan S. Turner, 'Justification, the City and Late Capitalism', *The Sociological Review*, 55:2 (2007), pp.410-415 (p.413).

symptomatic of wider changes and resulting ideologies in Western capitalism. The 2007 report from The Work Foundation, already noted earlier, offers a British perspective and confirms some of Boltanski and Chiapello's propositions.³³⁹ The report consolidates the features of the artist mode of critique delineated in *The New Spirit* with those of the creative industries in Britain. For example, in the report it is acknowledged that the creative individual is favoured within the 'creative industries'. The report states that expression is marketable, calling it 'expressive value'. The report draws upon Professor David Throsby's work on the various forms of expressive value, including 'aesthetic', 'symbolic' and 'social'.³⁴⁰ However, it forewarns that the employer needs to harness the diversity of these creative individuals in the collective environment.³⁴¹ Those workers who embody 'expressive value' still need to work as part of a creative team. It is also claimed in the report, that talent works best when it has something to 'rub against', citing the examples of Berlin in the 1920s and Paris in 1860 as moments of uncomfortable 'flux' in which artists, presumably, flourished.³⁴² This proposition is particularly pertinent to Boltanski and Chiapello's argument which claims that the 'artist critique' was at its peak during the contestations of 'Mai 1968'.

The 'New Spirit' of Neoliberalism?

Arguably, the features within business models, that Boltanski and Chiapello identify as stemming from the artist critique, are indebted to the implementation of a neoliberal economy. Kevin Doogan views the omission of the concept of neoliberalism from

³³⁹ The Work Foundation.

³⁴⁰ The Work Foundation. Section 4.6. p.97. The Foundation takes its categories from the cultural economist David Throsby's book *Economics and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). For a brief overview of Throsby's key ideas, see: Justin O'Connor, *The Cultural and Creative Industries: A Review of the Literature*, Creative Partnerships Literature Reviews (London: Arts Council England, November 2007), pp.46-47.

³⁴¹ The Work Foundation. Section 5.3.19.

³⁴² The Work Foundation. Section 2.45.

Boltanski and Chiapello's account as a critical weakness, despite their analysis being specific to France.³⁴³ Because of this caveat, the shift to flexible working models - evident in the 1990s' management literature and associated with the 'third spirit' - appears out of nowhere, unrelated to the state or the wider economy.³⁴⁴ The gap between the two can be bridged by looking to analyses of neoliberal capitalism alongside the period in which Boltanski and Chiapello claim that the third spirit manifests. In her article for *Third Text*, Chiapello refers to the period following the late 1970s, when the artist critique was subsumed into everyday business practice, as 'neo-flexible capitalism'.³⁴⁵ Elements of Boltanski and Chiapello's 'artist critique' can also be found within the economic model that David Harvey terms 'flexible accumulation'.³⁴⁶ Harvey's concept of 'flexible accumulation', which I will explain below, is analogous to Chiapello's 'neo-flexible capitalism'. Alongside the appearance of the 'new spirit' within the period in which neoliberalism is implemented; the two economic models share features such as worker flexibility, the encouragement of an ethos of individuality and the employment of sub-contracted labour or project-based work.

In *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Harvey delineates the features of the economy initiated by the neoliberal governments in both Britain and the USA, under Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan respectively.³⁴⁷ 'Flexible accumulation' is the economic 'regime' within the post-Fordist period; as such, Fordist production methods are in decline and the move to the service industry is increasing. Harvey states that flexible accumulation directly confronts the problems that a waning Fordism posed. In particular, the rigidity enforced on the markets and the mass production systems that

³⁴³ Kevin Doogan, *New Capitalism? The Transformation of Work* (Cambridge, Malden: Polity, 2009).

³⁴⁴ Doogan, p.33.

³⁴⁵ Chiapello, (2004).

³⁴⁶ David Harvey, 'From Fordism to Flexible Accumulation', in *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), pp.141-172.

³⁴⁷ Harvey (1990), pp.141-172.

lead to an inflexibility in design.³⁴⁸ Subsequently, flexible accumulation replaces the rigidities of Fordism with flexibility; whereas Fordist production methods dictated the market in many ways, the consumer directs production under flexible accumulation. This adoption of flexibility results in the implementation of new production processes. Dell is an example of a company who utilises flexible production. They build PCs and laptops to customer specifications, instead of holding large stock in warehouses. Without a surplus of stock to sell, the product can be adapted more rapidly to conform to market trends.

The idea that a product can be quickly adapted to the market pertains to another feature of flexible accumulation. Harvey argues that flexible accumulation pays attention to changing trends and ‘cultural transformations’, whilst also reducing the half-life of a product (the time it takes the product to ‘wear out’).³⁴⁹ On a visual level, Harvey suggests that flexible accumulation adopts the ‘fleeting qualities of a postmodernist aesthetic.’³⁵⁰ This adoption, he argues, includes the commodification of cultural forms. The idea of the commodification of cultural forms is insightful as to how flexible accumulation fosters an economy in which artists or creative individuals become valuable. Within this model, artists are no longer the critical outsiders but rather, if we accept Boltanski and Chiapello’s thesis, the criticality of the artist is adopted by the new capitalist economy. Harvey writes:

³⁴⁸ Harvey (1990), p.142.

³⁴⁹ Harvey (1990), p.156.

³⁵⁰ Harvey (1990), p.156.

All this has put a premium on ‘smart’ and innovative entrepreneurialism, aided and abetted by all of the accoutrements of swift, decisive and well-informed decision-making.³⁵¹

Arguably, flexible accumulation allows for art to be thought of as a commodity (as opposed to living in an un-commodifiable sphere of its own.) The production and marketing of one-off, customised goods, all point to the commodification of something conceptually very close to art. This closeness can be seen in collaborations between artists and brands – that of Takashi Murakami and Louis Vuitton, for example. The result of this kind of collaboration is the production of a one-off or limited edition item - in the above example, an artist-designed Vuitton handbag - with a large price tag to accompany it. I propose that the imagined gap between art and commodity closes further under flexible accumulation, imagined, because of the divide that was historically drawn between high and low culture: art being the former, commodified goods belonging to the latter.³⁵²

One has to be cautious, when addressing the flexibility thesis, that flexible labour is not assumed to be the only type of labour undertaken within neoliberal capitalism. Despite the increase in technologies that assist in stock control, for example, and the focus on the service sector, the making of goods does not cease. Doogan argues - in his critique of the canonical texts on ‘new capitalism’, including those of Chiapello and Boltanski and Harvey - that the role of technology on the so-called flexible thesis is not

³⁵¹ Harvey (1990), p.157.

³⁵² Walter Benjamin’s argument in ‘The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility’ exemplifies the initial fear of making art more accessible in the age of reproductive technology. Benjamin considers the effect that the mass production of works of art has on the ‘aura’ of a work of art, for example, the introduction of reproduced artworks into the home. Benjamin, ‘The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility’ (second version, 1936), in *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, ed. by Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty and Thomas Y. Levin (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Belknap, 2008), pp.19-57.

to be overestimated.³⁵³ While he acknowledges the role of new technology on ‘lean production’, Doogan is critical of the emphasis that is placed on the flexible and immaterial aspects of the economy in the literature on the new capitalism.³⁵⁴ He argues that the dominant accounts of this period focus upon ‘qualitative changes’ that are predicated upon labour market changes. Doogan calls this the ‘societal transformation thesis’.³⁵⁵ He suggests that the material conditions of production are too easily substituted for discussions of the informational economy when, in fact, the theoretical attention is not reflected in the empirical data on labour markets.³⁵⁶ Doogan further proposes that the ideological narratives of new capitalism, initiated under neoliberalism, override the economic reality of labour. Thus, the theoretical focus on the flexibility in, and the dematerialisation of, work are ideological constructs that are not fully reflected in the material reality of work.

However, the resulting ideologies concerning the new capitalism are important for this analysis. As Doogan’s book demonstrates, the ideological effects of the new business literature are evident in the dominant narratives of new capitalism. Therefore, they must be taken seriously. In addition, art becomes another receptacle for these ideologies. In contrast to the strict models of production addressed in the previous chapter, the following section looks at a newer form of production developed with market-flexibility in mind.

³⁵³ Doogan.

³⁵⁴ Doogan, p.55.

³⁵⁵ Doogan, p.3.

³⁵⁶ Doogan, p.55.

'Toyotism': A note on the Japanese model

The previous chapter took into account the wider effects of a US car manufacturer, Ford. The period post-Ford also adopts as its model a newer type of car manufacture: that of the Japanese car manufacturer, Toyota. When Ford was establishing itself in the US, the Japanese car market was barely conceived. Koichi Shimokawa, states that the Japanese automobile industry did not establish itself internationally until the 1980s.³⁵⁷ However, once it was established, the Japanese model proved distinct to the production processes implemented by Ford. The Japanese case provides a basis for thinking through the ideological aspects of flexible manufacturing within neoliberal capitalism.

Japan is distinct in more ways than one for this analysis; it presents myriad examples of socialised models of labour in art. Japan's more recent art history (from the 1860s through present) is a cumulative history of artistic groups and collectives. The canonical example of an artists' group - Gutai - operated under the influence of 'Mr Gutai', rather than presenting itself openly as collaboration. However, as exemplified in the artistic practice of the group Hi Red Center in the 1960s and 1970s, subsequent groupings adopted more activist 'Anti-Art' and 'Non-Art' practices, rather than taking a leader.³⁵⁸ I acknowledge the collective nature of Japanese art making here in order to affirm that collectivity is a cultural trope within Japanese society. As Shimokawa testifies to in *The Japanese Automobile Industry*, the cooperative model extends to the way in which businesses operate; it is manifest in both labour relations and at the level of production.³⁵⁹

³⁵⁷ Koichi Shimokawa, *The Japanese Automobile Industry* (London and New Jersey: The Athlone Press, 1994).

³⁵⁸ See my introduction for a discussion of Hi Red Center's *Cleaning Event* of 1964.

Reiko Tomii presents a history of collectives in Japanese art in his essay 'After the Descent to the Everyday', in *Collectivism After Modernism*, pp.45-75.

³⁵⁹ Shimokawa, p.50.

While trade unions were being broken under neoliberal policy in 1980s' Britain, Japanese car manufacturers were comfortably coexisting with their unions, which were company-specific rather than nation-wide or trade-specific. Company-specific unions were (and remain) particular to Japan. Japanese workers' unions were (and are still) consulted before the implementation of changes, for example, before the introduction of new machinery. Under Toyotism the workers were given (and retain) the opportunity to respond and work with management to achieve good working conditions. The Japanese companies' model of worker consultation, alongside their manufacturing processes, strongly contrast the more coercive Fordist and Taylorist models. When robotic technologies were introduced into the Japanese industry, Shimokawa reports, the technology took on the dangerous and mundane tasks, rather than stripping the worker of all their skills. In opposition to being deskilled, the Japanese automobile workers were encouraged to gain multiple skills. These skills could be drawn upon as part of the 'lend a hand' system when required. 'Lend a hand' is taken literally: if a station or area had a larger workload, workers from other areas would be asked to assist on the busier station in order to complete the work on time (with one week's notice to be given, as agreed with the union). This way the production system was (and continues to be) flexible enough to adapt to fluctuations in market demand without too much disruption to manufacture.

Japanese car manufacturers also have a vertical division of labour rather than the historically horizontal model of most European and US car manufacturers (these are now adapting or have already adapted to the Japanese model). A horizontal division of labour involves dividing and compartmentalising work into specialised tasks, such as those within the Taylor and Fordist models. Specific workers are assigned to particular tasks in order to increase productivity. A vertical division of labour is less prescriptive, with variations in skill levels and tasks undertaken adopting a more flexible approach. In

this model, authority is assigned for planning and decision-making, which alters with the size of the hierarchy.³⁶⁰ In the Japanese automobile industry, the vertical division of labour extends to the manufacture of parts. The Japanese car manufacturers operate a system in which only around thirty to forty percent of their parts are manufactured in-house, this is considerably less than do their European and US competitors. Three tiers of suppliers are centred around seven main assembly groups or single assemblers. Furthermore, the relationship between the assemblers and suppliers is close and cooperative.³⁶¹ The ‘just-in-time’ or ‘Kanban’ model of production is adopted to manage the work that is to be undertaken. The required amount of parts is provided to each station for the set tasks, needing no excess stock to be held. Again, this model allows for the companies to be flexible in responding to market demands and fluctuations.

The Japanese car industry exemplifies the newer changes within capitalist business ideology, such as the shift away from the rigidities of Ford to flexibility and cooperation between workers and management. The Japanese model of just-in-time production, adopted extensively in the late 1960s, allows companies to adapt to a rapidly changing market. We recall Harvey’s time-space compression – that is, the shortening of the half-life of goods and increasingly innovative products replacing those that came before.³⁶² Shimokawa states, in his 1994 book, that there has not been a strike in the industry since the 1950s. However, as a result of the recent recession, there have been numerous strikes at sites that are owned (or part-owned) by the Japanese car

³⁶⁰ A summary of Gary Johns and Alan M. Saks explanation of the difference between the two can be found here: http://wps.prenhall.com/ca_ph_johns_ob_6/23/5902/1510999.cw/content/index.html.

³⁶¹ Shimokawa, pp.22-3.

³⁶² As an aside, I believe that the ‘just-in-time’ model of production is partially responsible for Toyota’s survival through the recent PR disaster in which a vast number of Toyota cars were recalled due to faulty parts. Toyota would have easily been able to trace the parts to a specific supplier under their system and also be able to adapt to a decrease in demand as a result of the incident. Although sales may drop, Toyota’s system is equipped to accommodate a reduction in demand, without holding surplus stock.

manufacturers.³⁶³ In June 2010, it was reported that Toyota workers in two Chinese-based plants, which supply the car-makers with parts, were illegally striking because of labour disputes over pay.³⁶⁴ Strikes at Honda manufacturing plants were also acknowledged in the article.

In contrast to the value placed upon the creative individual in certain Western businesses, the Japanese manufacturers encourage a community rather than a group of individuals. Unlike Fordist production, the workers' rights are paramount to the smooth functioning of the company through the unique union model. The success of the Japanese automobile companies is adopted, in part, by Europe and the United States. This flexible, cooperative model subsequently has an effect on the desired type of worker: those who are innovative and are able to work independently and alongside others.

However, we should not overemphasise how flexible the figure of the Toyota worker actually is.³⁶⁵ Despite their skill-set expanding so as to lend-a-hand when required, they are still working on the production of a single commodity – the motor car. Presumably, the worker is mainly located at a single station rather than undertaking a variety of tasks on a day-to-day basis. Within the Toyota model, it is production that really benefits from the move to flexibility – i.e. less surplus stock and rapid market adaptability - whilst the worker is able to adapt to a limited range of tasks. Furthermore, the vertical division of labour adopted for part-making has more recently proven troublesome for Toyota, evidenced in the strikes over pay at their Chinese part-manufacturing plants. One has to question whether the halting of production would

³⁶³ Shimokawa, p.31.

³⁶⁴ 'Strikes halt work at Toyota and Honda plants in China', BBC News, 23rd June 2010, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10389762> [Accessed: 29/03/11].

³⁶⁵ For clarification, reference to the 'worker' here is to those employed at the level of production, rather than administration or management.

have occurred if the parts had been made ‘in-house’ (as in the European and US models) with management keeping a ‘closer eye’ on proceedings.

It is argued in this chapter, that the role of the manager is the more flexible worker under neoliberalism. Management discourse becomes the channel for the neoliberal ideology. Despite its shortcomings, this ideology should not be over-looked, as I will demonstrate in the following discussion of the Mike Smith Studio, it has implications for the production of works of art.

The Mike Smith Studio

At the beginning of this chapter I proposed that art responds to the changes within the economy in three distinct ways. Firstly, I argue that the neoliberal agenda had an effect on the establishment of the Mike Smith Studio; secondly, there are artists who adapt to the neoliberal economy and thirdly, there are artists who criticise the changes in capitalism through utilising its tools and traits. The following attends to the first response, that is, the emergence of the Mike Smith Studio in 1990s Britain. The Mike Smith Studio is a product of a neoliberal economy implemented in the UK under Margaret Thatcher. The business model of the Mike Smith Studio is indebted to the fabricators that came out of America in the 1960s and 70s. Coupled with the late arrival of a Fordist ideology in Britain, I believe that the Mike Smith Studio, whilst belonging to this legacy, is also a product of its time.³⁶⁶ This lies in the fact that Mike Smith Studio pitches itself as a ‘facilitator’, which sets the business apart from the earlier fabricator.³⁶⁷

³⁶⁶ Huw Beynon states in his analysis of Ford in Britain that Britain does not experience ‘Fordism proper’ until after the Second World War. Huw Beynon, *Working for Ford* (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 1973), pp.43-4.

³⁶⁷ In a 2008 roundtable on fabrication, Ed Suman (of Carlson & Co.) also distinguishes between the earlier fabricator model and the newer model. He states:

In its role as facilitator, the Mike Smith Studio extends beyond manufacture to provide, in addition, a service. Furthermore, Smith himself becomes paradigmatic of the new worker - the manager - under neoliberal capitalism.

In 1989 Mike Smith graduated from Camberwell College of Art in London with a degree in Fine Art. Whilst studying, he had worked as an assistant to the painters Christopher Le Brun and Ian McKeever. He later assisted the sculptor Edward Allington, which is where Smith claims he developed his knowledge of different materials.³⁶⁸ Around this time, Smith also inhabited an artist's studio on Jacob Street alongside his peers Anya Gallaccio, Damien Hirst and Angus Fairhurst. According to Gallaccio, Smith was known for his practical knowledge, even at Jacob Street, and was often enlisted to help his neighbouring artists with the practical side of realising their works.³⁶⁹ On the completion of his degree, Smith started his own business, identifying a gap in the market for a studio devoted to assisting artists. His first recorded projects were with Hirst, Gary Hume and Gillian Wearing in 1988, amongst others. In 1990, the Mike Smith Studio was established in London, with the Young British Artists (YBAs) forming the majority of the studio's initial clientele. Arguably, Smith's business grew alongside the rising profile of the YBAs.

The studio was created solely to assist artists with everything from the conception to the realisation and exhibition of a work of art including consultation and installation services. Smith himself is at the heart of the process and is the first point of contact for

The role of 'fabricator' is of necessity being broadened to include fairly complex types of contracting, subcontracting, and sourcing, sometimes on an international basis. This inevitability includes significant management of consultants and other vendors. The discipline and methodology of project management are becoming more and more of a factor in most projects.

Suman, cited in 'The Producers', p.357.

³⁶⁸ Mike Smith, 'Construct your ambition: Making grand ideas become realities', in *The Artist's Yearbook 2006*, ed. by Ossian Ward (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005), pp.188-190 (p.188).

³⁶⁹ Anya Gallaccio interviewed by William Furlong in *Making Art Work*, ed. by Patsy Craig (London: Trolley, 2003), pp.474-478.

an artist wishing to discuss the fabrication of a work of art. He employs a team of technicians that increased nine-fold from two in 1995 to eighteen in 2003.³⁷⁰ The technicians come from a range of different backgrounds including fine art, industrial design, graphic design and engineering. Since the Studio's incarnation, they have been involved in the making of a number of key British artworks, although not all artists are happy to publicise the fact that Smith's studio manufactures their work. In an article for the *Guardian*, Patrick Barkham claims:

Smith is very discrete. He admits that, over the years, some of his clients...have been sensitive about publicising the fact that he makes work for them. 'In a way, it's more to do with the demands being made upon them, and the nature of the art world.' He says.³⁷¹

Despite this discretion, the studio has appeared more frequently in the art press since the year 2000, with Smith taking part in interviews, roundtables on art fabrication and also being the subject of a book, put out by the studio in 2003, titled *Making Art Work*.³⁷²

This visibility, I argue, is in response to wider changes within the artworld that have, more recently, focused upon the social and collective models in art. The studio's website claims: 'The Mike Smith Studio (MSS) is a design and fabrication facility that has been *uniquely* instrumental in realizing important contemporary works of art since 1990.'³⁷³

The presence of the studio, in recent art publications, cements Mike Smith Studio's

³⁷⁰ See 'Artist Project Time Line', in *Making Art Work*, pp.4-10.

³⁷¹ Patrick Barkham, 'Can you do me a quick cow's head?', *The Guardian*, March 5th 2008.

³⁷² These publications include: Mike Smith, 'Construct your ambition: Making grand ideas become realities'; Zoe Manzi, 'Vision Unlimited', *Tate*, 8 (November/December 2003), pp.22-26; 'The Producers', *Artforum* (October 2007), pp.352-359 and p.402; and *Making Art Work*.

³⁷³ www.mikesmithstudio.com. My emphasis.

place within the history of British art alongside the Young British Artists.

The ‘Great Man’: Mike Smith Studio and the ‘New Spirit’

Mike Smith Studio’s business model fits comfortably within the framework of Harvey’s description of flexible accumulation. Harvey identifies a change in business models that moves from a solid core of workers through to an increase in part-time or temporary workers and sub-contractors in the 1980s. The Mike Smith Studio is a contractor; they take on work commissions from artists but do not take any credit for it (the studio is not named as the maker). Harvey writes:

Organised sub-contracting, for example, opens up opportunities for small business formation, and, in some instances permits older systems of domestic, artisanal, familial (patriarchal) and paternalistic (‘god-father’, ‘guv’nor’ of even mafia-like) labour systems to revive and flourish as centrepieces rather than as appendages of the production system.³⁷⁴

The Mike Smith Studio is one of the artisanal small businesses that has emerged and flourished from this move to flexible accumulation. Smith deals not only in labour but also in knowledge. He prides himself on his specialist expertise and, based on his knowledge of the artworld, offers project management as one of his services. Harvey writes: ‘Knowledge itself becomes a key commodity...’³⁷⁵ It is Smith’s knowledge and expertise which I believe makes his business unique in its specificity to art. Depending on the size and nature of the object being made, and again conforming to Harvey’s

³⁷⁴ Harvey (1990), p.152.

³⁷⁵ Harvey (1990), p.159.

model of flexible accumulation, Smith also employs temporary workers and sub-contracts to other businesses with which the Studio has links for particular projects.

Smith's studio, and Smith himself, is considered here in light of the changes in capitalist production and management in the 1990s and in relation to the 'projective city', which Boltanski and Chiapello map in their book. Boltanski and Chiapello argue that various models of political cities co-exist within contemporary society. Callinicos simply refers to the cities as 'political communities'.³⁷⁶ The cities named by Boltanski and Chiapello are: the inspirational; the domestic; the reputational; the civic; the commercial; the industrial city. Drawing heavily upon Boltanski's earlier work with Thévenot, Boltanski and Chiapello state that each city corresponds to a distinct 'logic of justification'.³⁷⁷ Boltanski and Chiapello argue that models of critique are always backed up by justifications. In their example, these justifications are found in the models of justice adopted or conventions leading to the 'common good' in each type of city.³⁷⁸ They delineate an archetypical 'high status' or a model of 'great man' for each city, which is rooted in their belief that disputes over justice always refer back to status.³⁷⁹ The example that Boltanski and Chiapello cite to illustrate this notion is to imagine the order in which people are served at the dinner table as a '*principle of equivalence*'.³⁸⁰ Thus we can deduce that the 'great man' is the person to be served first.

In the inspirational city, high status lies with the saint who achieves a state of grace, or the artist who receives inspiration. In the domestic city, high status comes with seniority in a chain of personal dependencies and, for the reputational city, high status depends upon the opinion of others. The great man in the civic city, is representative of a

³⁷⁶ Callinicos, p.64.

³⁷⁷ This is informed from earlier discussions of justification from Boltanski and Thévenot's *De la justification*.

³⁷⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.22.

³⁷⁹ Boltanski and Chiapello, pp.22-24.

³⁸⁰ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.23.

collective whose general will he expresses, whilst, in the commercial city, he enriches himself by supplying desirable commodities in a competitive market. High status in the industrial city is based upon efficiency, and defines a scale of professional abilities.³⁸¹

Callinicos finds problematic Boltanski and Chiapello's discussion of justification and 'cities'.³⁸² Their approach to critique is flawed for Callinicos because their models of critique are based upon an engagement with these cities. He, firstly, questions whether the plurality of cities is possible in contemporary France. The six cities are based on respecting the common humanity of their members. Notwithstanding, Callinicos is quick to show that racism in France does no such thing, asking where is the city that addresses this unfavourable aspect of French society. He further considers Boltanski and Thévenot's concern with egalitarianism in the city models (on which Boltanski and Chiapello's thesis is based). Boltanski and Thévenot claim that hierarchies do not exist within the *cities*; the 'first "axiom" defining a city, is the principle of common humanity of the members of the city.'"³⁸³ However, Callinicos shows that this equality is not plausible for some of the less-modern city models, which nonetheless still exist. For example, he argues that the domestic city would more commonly function as a patriarch (or even a matriarch), with its naturally occurring hierarchical positions.³⁸⁴ With regards to his discussion of racism, Callinicos also claims that slavery and serfdom have no place within the city models. He stresses that the exemption of specific groups of people from the notion of 'common humanity' in each city is problematic. Problematic because, historically, deeming certain groups of people to be 'non-citizens' is how the practice of slavery was legitimised.³⁸⁵ Furthermore, he concludes that

³⁸¹ Boltanski and Chiapello, pp.22-24.

³⁸² Callinicos, pp.51-72. These 'cities', as stated earlier, are based around logics of justification rather than actual physical cities.

³⁸³ Callinicos, p.64.

³⁸⁴ Callinicos, p.66.

³⁸⁵ Callinicos, p.65.

Boltanski and Thévenot's idea of egalitarianism 'appeals to both a normative concept of justice and the sociological concept of functionality'.³⁸⁶ Boltanski and Chiapello adopt these concepts in their analyses of the cities; however, Callinicos further identifies their tendency to reduce critique to functionality. That is, capitalism restrains its destructive tendencies in order to make itself viable, restricting critique itself. From this conclusion, Callinicos argues that Boltanski and Chiapello prefer the corrective, rather than the radical, mode of critique.³⁸⁷ The radical form of critique operates in the name of principles that are relevant to other cities, Boltanski and Chiapello claim that this mode of critique is revolutionary. In contrast, the corrective mode of critique comes from within the city and is viewed by Boltanski and Chiapello as reformist. Thus, in the second form, the criticism aimed at capitalism is thus adopted by capitalism.³⁸⁸ The corrective critique becomes the motivating factor for the changes in the spirits of capitalism. Capitalism utilises the features of the modes of critique (such as the artistic) in order to correct itself and appeal to those critical of it.

Despite the problems that the delineation of cities as 'logics of justification' fosters in Boltanski and Chiapello's book, the seventh city - which they name the 'projective city' - is relevant to my thesis. The argument presented here is not concerned with justification but with the ideology that stems from Boltanski and Chiapello's analysis of the management literature corpus. The projective city emerges specifically from their analysis of this body of work.³⁸⁹ As such, the acknowledgement of the projective city is useful for this discussion because the tropes associated with this city

³⁸⁶ Callinicos, p.67. A 'normative concept of justice' refers to how things should or ought to be. The 'sociological concept of functionality' refers to the 'study or interpretation of phenomena in terms of the functions which they fulfil within an overall system.' Entry for 'functionalism', in *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. by Catherine Soanes and Angus Stevenson, 11th edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p.575.

³⁸⁷ Callinicos, p.67.

³⁸⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.33.

³⁸⁹ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.24.

are ascertained from Boltanski and Chiapello's close analysis of management literature the 1990s. Taking up Doogan's proposition, neoliberal ideas evolve and disseminate through management discourse in this period. Therefore, one should be cautious not to disregard Boltanski and Chiapello's identification of the cities from this type of literature, as it is the site in which neoliberal management ideology is revealed.³⁹⁰

Boltanski and Chiapello state that the projective city is a new 'general representation of the economic world' in the period when the 'new spirit' takes hold.³⁹¹ In this model, the organisation of society is seen to be in a project form. Communication, reflexivity, engagement and working together are all key factors.³⁹² Boltanski and Chiapello identify an increase in the use of the term 'network' in the 1990s literature. However, rather than basing their model of justification on a 'network city', they delineate the projective city as comprising of more than a series of networks. The project is central to this city precisely because it is the moment that brings networked people together, if only for a limited period of time.³⁹³

'Facilitator' as the New Worker, or the Commodified Personality

First and foremost, I propose that Mike Smith fits the mould of the new worker, or more precisely the new manager, in the projective city. Smith can be seen in the model of the autonomous, flexible individual - the innovative, problem solver.³⁹⁴ To quote Smith on his working practice:

³⁹⁰ Doogan, p.5.

³⁹¹ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.103.

³⁹² Boltanski and Chiapello, pp.103-107.

³⁹³ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.104.

³⁹⁴ About this new model of worker, Barry King writes:

I spend most of my day organising things and solving problems which is kind of the most interesting stuff, but there is a great satisfaction in letting people within the studio grow as well...you know...arranging a team of people and allowing them to have input.³⁹⁵

The projective city is the model in which Smith belongs. From the literature on Mike Smith we establish that he is as a problem solver, willing to try and experiment with everything. He took on Rachel Whiteread's *Monument* (2001) with no prior experience of the material that the sculpture was to be made from. Smith recalls: 'It took us 18 months to realise a successful test model for [it] People got close to throwing in the towel. Eventually it worked out.'³⁹⁶ There is also the sense that the British art scene would be a worse place without him. On two occasions artists have alluded to the fact that if something were to happen to Smith and his studio, contemporary British art would be forced to change.³⁹⁷ Smith is at the heart of a wide network of British artists. We have only to visit the Mike Smith Studio website to see all the artists with whom the Studio has worked over the years. This network is not limited to artists but also extends to outside help, for example, those from whom the studio source materials and the galleries that Smith works with. The work, which Smith undertakes, is project-based,

It is less about being a type of worker and more a matter of being a style of person. The new 'ideal' worker becomes a modular self; one who fits into the team and is yet at the same time (hopefully) is unique and irreplaceable.

Barry King, 'Modularity and the Aesthetics of Self-Commodification', in *As Radical as Reality Itself*, ed. by Matthew Beaumont and others (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), pp.319-345 (p.342).

³⁹⁵ Smith in *Making Art Work*, p.28.

³⁹⁶ Manzi, p.25.

³⁹⁷ Noble and Webster make this comment in *Making Art Work*, p.361. Of course, we have to approach this with caution because of the fact that the book was put out by the studio. However, David Batchelor has also claimed, in a different publication: 'If someone dropped a bomb on Mike Smith's studio, it would change the face of London's contemporary art world.' Batchelor cited in Barkham.

and each project is for a different client (artist). He employs a team of workers who are engaged in numerous projects simultaneously. Smith initially discusses the project with the artist before the work is undertaken. Smith claims:

With larger-scale projects, it's very difficult for the artist to become the project manager, as this may not be within the realm of his or her experience. It also doesn't allow the artist to focus on the bigger picture, since he or she will get bogged down in details that other people may be better suited to resolve.³⁹⁸

And so I turn to Boltanski and Chiapello's model of the 'great men' in the projective city:

In the projective city they are not only those who know how to engage, but also those who are *able to engage others*, to offer involvement, to make it desirable to follow them, because they inspire *trust*, they are *charismatic*, their *vision* generates enthusiasm. All these qualities make them leaders of teams they manage not in authoritarian fashion, but by *listening* to others, with *tolerance*, recognizing and respecting *differences*. They are not (hierarchical) bosses, but integrators, facilitators, an *inspiration*, unifiers of energies, *enhancers* of life, meaning and autonomy.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁸ Mike Smith cited in 'The Producers', p.402.

³⁹⁹ Boltanski and Chiapello, pp.114-115. Their italics.

I quote this description in full as Smith himself fits it, particularly with the last sentence where we read of the ‘facilitator’. Of course, my proposition here is not based on terminology alone but what the role entails. Even those who do not entirely condone Smith’s making works for other artists, as we sense from the artists Tim Noble and Sue Webster, they still recognise Smith’s ‘greatness’.⁴⁰⁰ His greatness lies in the fact that Smith can solve a problem faster, or make something look more professional, than others: ‘...this man who can make your dreams come true.’⁴⁰¹

This ‘great man’ does not just emerge with Boltanski and Chiapello’s identification of the projective city; the model of the ‘great man’ in the projective city has its roots in the ‘manager’ model that appears in 1990s discourse as a departure from the ‘cadre’ of the 1960s. The earlier ‘cadre’ is a more rigid model of manager, who focuses upon administrative rationality and relies on hierarchy for legitimacy.⁴⁰² The new manager is indebted to the co-optation of the ‘artist critique’, which allowed for the replacement of ‘cadre’ with a new conception of manager. Boltanski and Chiapello claim that the new manager is a ‘visionary’, a ‘team leader’ and a ‘source of inspiration’; they see the manager as a ‘network man’.⁴⁰³ This manager shares the information gleaned from his networks, rather than retaining it for his own gain.⁴⁰⁴ Again, Smith fits this model. Boltanski and Chiapello state that: ‘These “innovators” have scientists, and

⁴⁰⁰ Noble and Webster speak of eventually going to Smith for help on one element of a piece which they had made themselves, because they got a large commission and could afford to use the studio. They had avoided it for three years as when they had previously visited Smith for advice they had seen a whiteboard with the name of almost every British artist chalked upon it, which Noble claims still haunts him to this day. Webster comments that:

... it felt like joining a club. And it’s like you know you always want to see yourself as an individual and you have to remind yourself of that and when we saw the list of names and we thought that everyone had given into this man who could make your dreams come true...

Making Art Work, p.359.

⁴⁰¹ Noble and Webster in *Making Art Work*, p.359.

⁴⁰² Boltanski and Chiapello, p.78.

⁴⁰³ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.77.

⁴⁰⁴ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.115.

especially *artists*, as their models.⁴⁰⁵ The Mike Smith Studio comprises elements from both, with Smith employing staff from a range of backgrounds from fine art to engineering. As a problem-solver, Smith is someone who incorporates the scientific whilst coming from an artistic background.⁴⁰⁶ He does not even have to look to the ‘model’ of the artist as he already embodies the role. Perhaps the Mike Smith Studio is the ideal business model under this specific phase of capitalism?

The ‘Flexible Personality’

Boltanski and Chiapello are not the only theorists to identify a new model of personality or worker in this period. Drawing on their work, in his essay, ‘The Flexible Personality: For a New Cultural Critique’, Brian Holmes states:

... artistic critique becomes one of the linchpins of the new hegemony invented in the 1980s by Reagan and Thatcher, and perfected in the 1990s by Clinton and the inimitable Tony Blair.⁴⁰⁷

It is within this period that Holmes identifies the ‘flexible personality’, which is comparable to the model of ‘great man’ in the projective city. The flexible personality borrows from a number of historical and contemporary texts which identify a model of

⁴⁰⁵ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.115.

⁴⁰⁶ Notably, Peter Carlson had a similar background, he moved from Electrical Engineering to study Fine Art (see chapter one of this thesis).

⁴⁰⁷ Brian Holmes, ‘The Flexible Personality: For a New Cultural Critique’ (2001), www.16beavergroup.org/pdf/fp/pdf [Accessed: 08/06/2007].

man, or an ‘ideal type’ as Holmes phrases it, within certain capitalist ideologies.⁴⁰⁸ In his essay, Holmes contrasts Max Horkheimer’s account of the ‘authoritarian personality’ (1950) to the flexible personality. According to Holmes, the traits of the ‘authoritarian personality’ were:

... rigid conventionalism, submission to authority, opposition to everything subjective, stereotypy, an emphasis on power and toughness, destructiveness and cynicism, the projection outside the self of unconscious emotional impulses, and an exaggerated concern with sexual scandal.⁴⁰⁹

Some of the above features are reminiscent of Fordism, for example, the reference to rigidity (with which flexible accumulation is juxtaposed) and the opposition to everything subjective. These notions are exemplified in the increased machination of work and workers, which reduced labour to simple routine tasks and the submission to authority that was encouraged in the coercive methods of Taylor and Ford. Furthermore, the apparent anomaly tacked on to the end of this sociological definition - ‘exaggerated concern with sexual scandal’ - is redolent of the invasive monitoring of Ford’s workers under the remit of the Sociological Department which extended to making observations on the workers’ sex lives.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁸ Holmes (2001).

⁴⁰⁹ Holmes (2001).

⁴¹⁰ Clearly the findings of a large-scale sociological survey, resulting in the publication of two volumes on the subject of the authoritarian personality alone, cannot simply be reduced to one paragraph. The research - undertaken by Theodor Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson and R. Nevitt Sanford - was originally intended to identify levels of social discrimination in 1940s American society. The aim of the questionnaires was to identify and measure ideological trends in society focussing upon the ‘potentially fascistic individual’ (p.1). As such, they undertook surveys on ethnocentrism; anti-semitism; antidemocratic trends and attitudes towards family. Generally, those who scored high leant towards fascism, whilst those who scored low, did not. In his Preface, Horkheimer writes:

The ‘flexible personality’, Holmes argues, ‘represents a modern form of governmentality, an internalised and culturalised pattern of “soft” coercion...’⁴¹¹ He sees the capitalist adoption of this personality as a new form of alienation from ‘political society’ in the sense that the flexible personality is a ‘new form of social control, in which culture has an important role to play.’⁴¹² Holmes views the co-optation of ‘artist critique’ negatively. He argues that the new management and working models stemming from the co-optation have produced a new form of control over workers. The workers *appear* to be unalienated, through the dissolution of the divide between production and consumption, but they, in fact, remain under the control of capital. Holmes states:

The strict division between production and consumption tends to disappear, and alienation appears to be overcome, as individuals aspire to mix their labour with their leisure.⁴¹³

In opposition to the rigidity of the industrialised society of the 1960s and 70s, this new worker now has choices. So where is Smith’s place within this model? Holmes writes:

The central theme of the work is a relatively new concept – the rise of an ‘anthropological’ species we call the authoritarian type of man. In contrast to the bigot of the older style he seems to combine the ideas and skills which are typical of a highly industrialised society with irrational or anti-rational beliefs. He is at the same time enlightened and superstitious, proud to be an individualist and in constant fear of not being like all the others, jealous of his independence and inclined to submit blindly to power and authority.

Max Horkheimer, ‘Preface’ (1950) in Adorno and others, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York and London: W.W.Norton & Company, 1982), pp.xi-xiv (p.xi).

⁴¹¹ Holmes (2001).

⁴¹² Holmes (2001).

⁴¹³ Holmes (2001).

Cultural producers are hardly an exception, to the extent that they offer their inner selves for sale: at all but the highest levels of artistic expression, subtle forms of self-censorship become the rule, at least in relation to a primary market.⁴¹⁴

Smith epitomises the flexible personality: he censors his own ‘artistic expression’ for his primary market – other artists. Smith’s expression may be suppressed but the aesthetic that comes with his services is more recognisable.⁴¹⁵ Of course, Holmes is obviously thinking more widely than artist facilitators and imagines artists, theatre and cinema workers; the creative industries established under New Labour in 1990s’ Britain; and also the earlier cultural policies developed in France headed by the Culture Minister Jack Lang.⁴¹⁶ Despite this focus, I quote at length from Holmes in order to confirm the striking similarities between the utilisation of the network within an organisation and that within a company like the Mike Smith Studio:

... the networked organization gives back to the employee - or better, to the ‘prosumer’ - the *property* of him or herself that the traditional firm had sought to purchase as the commodity of labour power. Rather than coercive discipline, it is a new form of internalised vocation, a ‘calling’ to creative self-fulfilment in and

⁴¹⁴ Holmes (2001).

⁴¹⁵ I have argued elsewhere that the clean-cut manufactured aesthetic produced by Smith is synonymous with the YBAs and that Smith’s studio is, in fact, responsible for the signature style of the three-dimensional works of a number of the YBAs. Danielle Child, ‘Could You Make Me One Like That? Examining the YBAs’ Aesthetic and the Mike Smith Studio’, *The New British Sculpture: Reviewing the persistence of an idea, c.1850 - present*, Henry Moore Institute, Leeds, 17th-18th February 2011.

⁴¹⁶ These policies supported not only the arts but, more widely, mass culture such as theatre, popular music and cinema. In relation to the new communication society and the commodification of the arts, Holmes criticises Lang’s policies and also addresses those of Chris Smith (the first Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport in Britain) in his essay ‘Artistic Autonomy and the Communication Society’, Brain Holmes, *Unleashing the Collective Phantoms* (New York: Autonomedia, 2008), pp.99-113.

through each work project, that will now shape and direct the employee's behaviour Even the firm begins to conceive of work qualitatively, as a sphere of creative activity, of self-realization. 'Connectionist man' - or in my term, 'the networker' - is delivered from direct surveillance and paralyzing alienation to become the manager of his or her own self-gratifying activity, as long as that activity translates at some point into valuable economic exchange, the *sine qua non* for remaining within the network.⁴¹⁷

Conclusion

The shift from general production (with Gratz in the 1960s/70s) to specialisation (in the late 1980s/90s) could also be accounted for in the changes in the dominant business model put into place under Boltanski and Chiapello's second spirit of capitalism (c.1975 - 1990). The business model alters again around the 1990s with the emergence of Boltanski and Chiapello's third phase of capitalism.⁴¹⁸ The 1990s business model that operates within the projective city changes its focus from the firm to the customer.⁴¹⁹ This shift of focus is viewed as a fundamental change in the production process, as acknowledged in Harvey's writings. The consumer becomes part of the production process - as the artists do when working with Smith and his studio.

The visibility of art fabricators in the US press increases within the neoliberal period. In the years 1993-5, Peter Carlson has at least one article published about him and his business per year. Interestingly, within these publications, Carlson himself is foregrounded with his fabrication firm being the secondary focus; articles on Mike

⁴¹⁷ Brian Holmes (2001). Holmes' emphasis.

⁴¹⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.xiii.

⁴¹⁹ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.91.

Smith are of a similar nature. In these articles, the emphasis on the importance of the individual or the ‘face’ of the business (another ‘buzz word’ for neoliberalist business models that adds the personalised touch) does not go unnoticed. The continuation of the art fabrication business model can be attributed, in part, to the fondness that neoliberalism has for the individual, the network and sub-contracting. The artisanal nature of the business, which Mike Smith adopts, allows for fabricators already established in the US to continue their work through this later stage of capitalism. Harvey proposes that these are the kinds of businesses which flourish within this later period, so much so that struggling companies turn to manufacturing art to stay afloat. Merrifield Roberts Inc. and Goetz Custom Shipbuilders are examples of this turn. In the late 1980s, the two Bristol, Rhode Island, boat builders turned to manufacturing artworks, such as Oldenberg and Coosje van Bruggen’s *Spoonbridge and Cherry* installed in Minneapolis.⁴²⁰

Rather than obstructing the manufacture of art, the economic conditions of neoliberalism foster the establishment and continued development of art fabricators – now often named facilitators. The emphasis on the creative individual is embraced with figures such as Mike Smith taking the reigns of his new studio. Although the work of the Mike Smith Studio is often viewed as a collaborative endeavour, in reality, the work produced by the studio became recognisable with a signature style made visible, at least, to the artist’s eye. Smith is exemplary of the network or connexionist man, whom Boltanski and Chiapello argue is at home in the projective city. In this analysis, Smith is considered to be the figurehead of the way the artist critique is absorbed into business models, a revised form of the ‘romantic artist’ model. But what about those artists who

⁴²⁰ See: Susan Diesenhouse, ‘As Sales Drop, Builders of Boats Turn to Artworks’, *New York Times*, March 20th 1988, www.nytimes.com/1988/as-sales-drop-builders-of-boats-turn-to-artworks.html?pagewanted=1&pagewanted=print [Accessed: 16/03/2010].

do not call on Smith to manufacture their ideas, yet still attain some semblance of collaborative practice? Do they escape the conditions of neoliberalist capitalism?

- *Chapter Three* -

Neoliberalism and the New Social Artistic Practices

The increase in the visibility of artists' groups in recent years - each with differing agendas - is viewed in this chapter as a critical response to the co-option of the autonomous artist by capitalism. Visibility, here, refers to exhibition at biennials and art fairs, exhibitions devoted to collectivity and collaboration in art and also art publications and journals. Moving on from the idea of the artist as a worker (or the worker as an artist) addressed in previous chapters, it is important to consider the recent models of socialised art making that occur within neoliberal capitalism. More recently, a number of terms have arisen for these socialised approaches to art, including 'relational' works, socially engaged practices, new genre public art, and art-activism. Rather than discuss the relational practices in an 'aesthetic' sense, I ask the question - why is this mode of working so popular within contemporary artistic practice? The following chapter attends to the second way that art has responded to post-Fordism, looking to contemporary business models and their subsequent ideologies for an answer.

Since its publication, Nicolas Bourriaud's *Relational Aesthetics* has drawn attention to a contemporary mode of art, which became visible in the 1990s, and which professes to be less concerned with producing a material object than creating a social situation.⁴²¹ The debate ensuing from the publication of the book (and its subsequent translation into English) caused a stir in the contemporary art press, which is still resonating in art discourse today. The art world has, arguably, not embarked on such a debate since the term 'postmodernism' came into use. This new genre of art emerged

⁴²¹ Bourriaud (2002) - English edition.

Clearly this practice is an extension of the nature of conceptual art that was born out of the 1960s, which has been referenced in relation to the dematerialisation of art and also regarding the situating of Duchamp as progenitor.

within the neoliberal period and, along with Stewart Martin, Radical Culture Research Collective and Claire Bishop, I argue that certain aspects of relational art reflect and adopt the features of this period with particular emphasis on the ‘project’ and the ‘individual’.⁴²² The proposition here is not that Bourriaud instigated the ‘collaborative turn’ (Maria Lind) in contemporary art; rather, it is that the publication of *Relational Aesthetics* was a catalyst for theorising about artists who undertake artworks or projects of a cooperative nature. I utilise the term ‘relational’ to incorporate those practices that facilitate or encourage sociability or collective experience.⁴²³

Capitalism and Incorporeality: Immaterial Labour and the Commodification of Subjectivity

Under Fordism, manufacturing a material commodity was at the heart of production (obviously, at the heart of capitalism is the creation of profit, which it continues to be). What Harvey, Chiapello and Boltanski, Lazzarato and Holmes all reference is the shift to what is commonly delineated as ‘the service industries’ whose objectives are not necessarily object-production but the provision of a service - be it call centre workers or those in the caring professions such as nursing. In terms of material production we also see a shift to flexible labour, evidenced in the Japanese automobile industry.

⁴²² Martin writes:

Relational Aesthetics can be read as the manifesto for a new political art confronting the service economies of informational capitalism – an art of the multitude. But it can also be read as a naïve mimesis of aestheticisation of novel forms of capitalist exploitation.

Stewart Martin, ‘Critique of Relational Aesthetics’, *Third Text*, 21:4 (July 2007), pp.369-386 (p.370).

Radical Culture Research Collective, ‘A Very Short Critique of Relational Aesthetics’, www.transform.eipcp.net/correspondence/1196340894/print [Accessed: 13/12/2010].

Claire Bishop, ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’, *October*, 110 (October 2004), pp.51-79.

⁴²³ Maria Lind undertakes a discussion of the various terms for Relational Aesthetics in her essay. Maria Lind, ‘The Collaborative Turn’, in *Taking the Matter into Common Hands*, ed. by Johanna Billing, Maria Lind and Lars Nilsson (London: Black Dog, 2007), pp.15-31.

In recent years, there has been much discussion around the concept of ‘immaterial labour’, which was instigated, in part, by the publication of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s book *Empire* in 2000.⁴²⁴ In *Empire*, they argue that information and communication now play a central role in production, exemplified in the Toyotist methods of production. However, for Hardt and Negri, it is the service industries that truly present ‘a richer model of productive communication.’⁴²⁵ Because the service industries do not produce a ‘material and durable good’, they define the labour in this type of work as ‘immaterial labour’, that is: ‘... labour that produces an immaterial good, such as a service, a cultural product, knowledge or communication.’⁴²⁶ Furthermore, Hardt and Negri ascertain three types of immaterial labour. The first type is informationalised industrial production: production that incorporates communication technologies which change the production process. The second type is analytical and symbolic tasks: computing tasks that involve creative and intelligent manipulation and also routine tasks. And the third type is affective labour or labour in the bodily mode: the production and manipulation of affect that involves human contact, such as the caring professions.⁴²⁷

In their later book *Multitude*, which revises and furthers arguments from *Empire*, these types are reduced to two: that of primarily intellectual or linguistic labour, such as problem-solving tasks and the second is affective labour, such as carework.⁴²⁸ The aspect of immaterial labour that is connected to material production, and its associated communicative technologies, is omitted from their revision. Immaterial labour is refocused onto intellectual, knowledge and service-based work. The narrowing of this focus incited critics to accuse Hardt and Negri of looking to the ‘...“high” end of the

⁴²⁴ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2000).

⁴²⁵ Hardt and Negri (2000), p.290.

⁴²⁶ Hardt and Negri (2000), p.290.

⁴²⁷ Hardt and Negri (2000), p.293.

⁴²⁸ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude* (London: Penguin, 2005).

capitalist work hierarchy'.⁴²⁹ Nick Dyer-Witheford, referring to the writings of George Caffentzis, directs the reader to the counter of immaterial labour - the 'new enclosures' in the global South - where the poorer people are forced into the sex industry, crime, drugs and low-paid manufacture, for example.⁴³⁰ Caffentzis also reminds us that the models of labour that Hardt and Negri call 'immaterial' have a very material base in the sweatshop.⁴³¹

Hardt and Negri's engagement with immaterial labour comes out of the traditions of the Italian Autonomia and, earlier, Operaismo (Workerism) movements of which Negri was a part. The debates around the concept of immaterial labour were initiated in the *Futur Antérieur* journal that brought together Autonomia and other leftist thinkers. Amongst those thinkers is Maurizio Lazzarato, who gives a more thorough analysis of immaterial labour in his earlier essay on the subject.⁴³² He stresses that immaterial labour is not simply the production of something 'non-material'; in fact, immaterial labour navigates the terrain between mental and manual labour, straddling the division between conception and execution. Through utilizing Fordism's terms, Lazzarato makes clear the transformation of work from the Fordist model to that of a post-industrial type. Further, he proposes that immaterial labour involves the intellectualisation of manual labour. This intellectualization is a result of the implementation of new technologies in areas of production that were traditionally manual. Thus, the worker has to learn a new set of skills in order to be able to adjust to the new technologies and their maintenance. The deskilled worker is re-skilled within immaterial labour processes but, arguably, with intellectual or knowledge-based skills rather than manual ones.

⁴²⁹ Nick Dyer-Witheford, 'Cyber-Negri: General Intellect and Immaterial Labour', in *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*, vol.1, ed. by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha (London: Pluto, 2005), pp.136-162 (p.148).

⁴³⁰ Dyer-Witheford, pp.148-149.

⁴³¹ Caffentzis (1998) cited in Dyer-Witheford, p.149.

⁴³² Maurizio Lazzarato, 'Immaterial Labour' (1996), in *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, ed. by Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: Minnesota, 2006), pp.133-147.

Much of Lazzarato's analysis is concerned with the subjectivity of the worker. This focus is because of the subjective nature of immaterial labour, which requires the worker's personality to be invested in the work that they undertake. Lazzarato states:

What modern management techniques are looking for is for 'the worker's soul to become part of the factory.' The worker's personality and subjectivity have to be made susceptible to organization and command.⁴³³

Again, this focus upon subjectivity contrasts the previous Fordist and Taylorist models that encouraged workers to work 'like machines'. However, this change is not necessarily emancipatory; Lazzarato warns that the incorporation of the 'worker's personality and subjectivity within the production of value' could be more 'totalitarian' than the previous labour models.⁴³⁴ This notion follows Marx's warning in his 'Fragment on Machines' in which he predicts that the productive forces of the social brain will become dominant in production and crystallised in machinery. Thus, the creation of wealth will come to depend on the social brain, as opposed to the expenditure of labour time.⁴³⁵

While accommodating the worker's personality, immaterial labour is also concerned with collective forms that are epitomised in 'ad-hoc projects', 'networks and flows'.⁴³⁶ Lazzarato defines immaterial labour as 'the labour that produces the

⁴³³ Lazzarato (1996), p.134.

⁴³⁴ Lazzarato (1996), p.136.

⁴³⁵ Dyer-Witheford discusses Marx's passage in relation to *Futur Antérieur* in 'Cyber-Negri: General Intellect and Immaterial Labour', pp.141-2.

⁴³⁶ Lazzarato (1996), p.137.

informational and cultural content of the commodity.⁴³⁷ This description conforms to analyses of neoliberalism addressed in the previous chapter, where the network becomes paradigmatic of new forms of labour. The concept of immaterial labour, like that of the ‘new spirit of capitalism’, is not without its critics.

David Camfield’s main contention with Hardt and Negri’s theory of immaterial labour is that they define the type of labour by the products of that labour (i.e. immaterial ones), which he argues is contra to the traditions of *Autonomia* and *Operaismo*.⁴³⁸ He believes that this narrowing of focus occurs within *Multitude*, and criticises the attribution of the specific features of immaterial labour by virtue of its products: ‘rather than because of a characteristic labour process or place in working-class formation’.⁴³⁹ Further, Camfield argues that this classificatory method seems a ‘fetishistic methodological error.’⁴⁴⁰ This ‘error’ allows for the incorporation of a number of worker models that involve immaterial labour. Camfield questions the breadth of labour-types that immaterial labour covers, asking how can the qualities of immaterial labour ‘informationalise’ and ‘make intelligent’ such a diverse spread of workers from food-servers to healthcare professionals and teachers? The qualitative change that Hardt and Negri see in this ‘new’ kind of labour is over-ambitious. They fail to see how the dominance of the computer in workplaces can operate as a stricter form of monitoring, rather than an emancipatory tool. For example, the logging into a network merely replaces the clocking-in card. Dyer-Witheford returns the material to immaterial labour, stating that the immaterial labour theory does not account for the material

⁴³⁷ Lazzarato (1996), p.133.

⁴³⁸ David Camfield, ‘The Multitude and the Kangaroo: A Critique of Hardt and Negri’s Theory of Immaterial Labour’, *Historical Materialism*, 15 (2007), pp.21-52 (p.32). However, Camfield does point out that the positing of a stylised worker within specific periods – i.e. craft worker, mass worker and the socialised worker - is in keeping with Autonomist mode of thinking. p.38.

⁴³⁹ Camfield, p33.

⁴⁴⁰ Camfield, p33.

production of Personal Computers, exemplified in the mining for minerals used in the silicone chips.⁴⁴¹

Lazzarato states that classic forms of immaterial production are found in the creative industries, that is: advertising, audiovisual production, fashion and other cultural activities. The collective, social nature of immaterial labour and the emphasis on knowledge production can be found in contemporary socialised art practices. I want to argue that the effect of immaterial labour is apparent in art making since the 1990s in two ways: firstly, in the practices associated with *Relational Aesthetics* and, secondly, within art-activism. The intention here is not to present a homologous account which literally reduces ‘immateriality’ to a type of art that is not centred around the production of material objects, rather it is to see how the ideas about immaterial labour are played out in the debates on new artistic practices.

Immateriality and Relationality in Art

Bourriaud’s *Relational Aesthetics* provides the first example of how contemporary artistic practices can be thought in relation to immaterial labour. Bourriaud claims that a new kind of artistic practice emerged in the 1990s that encouraged convivial relations. The moments of sociability that are created by these works, Bourriaud argues, are an attempt to escape mass communications and its ideology.⁴⁴² Through this proposition, relational aesthetics takes on a political task: these artworks are no longer solely about a social encounter but the presentation of alternative ‘life possibilities’.⁴⁴³ These alternatives are played out in microtopic spaces created by artists generally within an art

⁴⁴¹ Dyer-Witford, p.15.

⁴⁴² Bourriaud, p.44.

⁴⁴³ Bourriaud, p.45.

gallery. The artists whom Bourriaud selects for his discussion of relational aesthetics have one thing in common: the centring of interaction, often of social interaction. For example, Felix Gonzalez-Torres invites viewers to take a sweet from a pile or an arrangement of sweets on the gallery floor and eat it. The emphasis is not on the arrangement of sweets but the taking and eating of one. In this way, the viewer participates in the work, which would otherwise be a static formal arrangement of sweets in shiny wrappers.

These works differ to the earlier ‘dematerialised’ conceptual artworks. According to Bourriaud, they do not eradicate or escape form. He criticises the earlier conceptual artists for fetishising ‘thinking’.⁴⁴⁴ Through this criticism, one could argue that Bourriaud is inadvertently suggesting that relational aesthetics fetishises interaction. However, Bourriaud does emphasise the role of the material or formal aspect of the work. In order to distinguish this new practice from conceptual art, he draws attention to the material element of those works that are often considered ‘immaterial’ because of the prominence given to the interactive aspect of the works. Bourriaud writes:

What has one bought when one owns a work by Tiravanija or Douglas Gordon, other than a relationship with the world rendered concrete by an object, which, *per se*, defines the relations one has towards this relationship: the relationship to a relationship?⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴⁴ Bourriaud, p.47.

⁴⁴⁵ Bourriaud, p.48. Bourriaud’s emphasis.

For Bourriaud, the material forms mediate the viewer's relationship to the world. This idea could be considered a mid-point between the fetishisation of thinking (in conceptual art) and the fetishisation of form (as with more traditional types of sculpture and painting). Thus relational aesthetics comprises of immaterial and material tropes; the value of which, according to Bourriaud, lies in the relationship that one has with the presented work.

Bourriaud asserts that relational aesthetics represents a theory of form not a theory of art.⁴⁴⁶ But it is a social form rather than a material form. He proposes in his Foreword that the relational artworks are indications of an alternative to the commodification of society, producing 'hands-on utopias'.⁴⁴⁷ He rightly identifies that we are living in a world in which the majority of things are commodified and he argues that: 'The social bond has turned into a standardised artefact.'⁴⁴⁸ Yet, as in the above citation, Bourriaud alludes to the fact that, despite the omission of a traditional art object, artists still make money through selling and exhibiting the relational artworks: in reality, are these artworks not commodified social relations?⁴⁴⁹ With the increasing branding and corporate sponsorship of exhibitions, fairs, galleries and museums - not

⁴⁴⁶ Bourriaud, p.19.

⁴⁴⁷ Bourriaud, p.9.

⁴⁴⁸ Bourriaud, p.9.

⁴⁴⁹ I am referring here to the quotation regarding owning a 'relationship to a relationship' (p.25). The way in which these artists make money (and the amount made) is clearly distinct from artists who produce easily saleable objects. However, artists cited in *Relational Aesthetics* do attract large commissions. In 2006 and 2009, respectively, Carsten Höller and Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster both created commissioned pieces for Tate Modern's Unilever-sponsored Turbine Hall. A number of these artists have exhibited at international biennials and other major art exhibitions (Höller, for example, represented Sweden at the 2005 Venice Biennale and also exhibited at Documenta X; Gillick created the German Pavilion for the 2009 Venice Biennale; and Tiravanija co-curated the Utopia Station for the Venice Biennale in 2003). The distinction between the way in which money is made with traditional and relational works is that the former is often bought and sold privately, through auctions and dealers; whereas the relational works are more commonly commissioned (often with 'public' money) for short-term projects, such as exhibitions and biennials (exemplified in the Turbine Hall commissions). The former is arguably, more profitable than the latter in the long-term.

forgetting the art market - is the artist, in this interpretation, just another (immaterial) labourer?⁴⁵⁰

In his 'Critique of Relational Aesthetics', Stewart Martin points out Bourriaud's fatal error: his belief that art escapes reification through creating social relations rather than objects.⁴⁵¹ Martin explains:

Capitalist exchange value is not constituted at the level of objects, but of social labour, as a measure of abstract labour. It is the commodification of labour that constitutes the value of 'objective' commodities. To think that the source of value is in the object-commodity is precisely the error that Marx calls fetishism.⁴⁵²

Relational works are, therefore, closer to commodification than Bourriaud believes. The artists omit the production of the object and replace it with the very act that creates value: labour.

It is easy to make comparisons between what is delineated as immaterial labour and Bourriaud's ideas about relational aesthetics. These comparisons are not without validation: the emphasis on human relations rather than object-production; the creation of an immaterial cultural product; communication and the 'manipulation of affect that involves human contact' - found in relational works such as Tiravanija's cooking pieces

⁴⁵⁰ This becomes even more poignant when we think of Rirkrit Tiravanija cooking for his audience, thus replicating the labour of an actual service worker.

⁴⁵¹ Stewart Martin, 'Critique of Relational Aesthetics', *Third Text*, 21:4, pp.369-386 (p.378).

⁴⁵² Martin, p.378.

- makes the two comparable, on the surface at least.⁴⁵³ It is not the contention here to argue that the artistic labour in relational works is identical to immaterial labour. The two types of labour (immaterial and relational-artistic) depart on a fundamental aspect of the new economic model: communicative technologies. Bourriaud argues that relational artists encourage social relations as a response to the proliferation of telecommunications and its associated technology, which detract from the qualitative human relations in society. In this respect, the two concepts could not be more distinct in their intentions: relational aesthetics escapes the new technological advancements through a return to sociality, whereas immaterial labour embraces the new technologies at the level of production and also analytical tasks. These technologies adopt a positive role in Hardt and Negri's initial musings on immaterial labour in *Empire*.

Returning to Marx's 'Fragment on Machines', we read that:

The accumulation of knowledge and of skill, of the general productive forces of the social brain, is thus absorbed into capital, as opposed to labour, and hence appears as an attribute of capital, and more specifically of fixed capital, in so far as it enters into the production process as a means of production proper.⁴⁵⁴

If we are to acknowledge the centrality which Dyer-Witheford claims the *Futur Antérieur* thinkers place upon this section from the *Grundrisse*, the inherent connection between technological development and the social brain becomes clear.⁴⁵⁵ Hardt and Negri take up Marx's idea and argue that information and communication now take the

⁴⁵³ Hardt and Negri, p.293.

⁴⁵⁴ Karl Marx (1939), *Grundrisse* (London: Penguin, 1993), p.694.

⁴⁵⁵ Dyer-Witheford, pp.141-2.

foundational role in production processes. Further, they claim that: ‘... we increasingly think like computers, while communication technologies and their model of interaction are becoming more and more central to labouring activities.’⁴⁵⁶

Bourriaud’s claim for relational aesthetics - which escapes the physical constraint of communication technologies and replaces them with human interaction - does not address the idea that the social brain is also subjected to capital. This omission may have originated in the idea that knowledge and skill ‘appear’ as an attribute of capital and are thus, normalised as a part of capitalist labour through this appearance. Relational aesthetics cannot be aligned with immaterial labour because of the emancipatory ambition - the emancipation from capital - that Bourriaud believes his selected artists to hold in their work. This incompatibility is specifically because Bourriaud sees the emancipation as occurring through encouraging human interactions in the face of technological advancement in society. He does not acknowledge the role of these technologies in organizing an exhibition of these works - electronic mailing lists and the dialogue between gallery and artist, for example – which forms part of the division of labour in the artworks. Hence, Bourriaud’s myopic vision exists predominantly within the gallery space; the microtopic atmosphere is penetrated once the visitor steps out onto the street. However, there are artists whose art has commonalities with relational works (although they are not explicitly delineated as such by Bourriaud) and whose work exits the gallery space, in order to negotiate their relationship to capitalism.⁴⁵⁷

⁴⁵⁶ Hardt and Negri (2000), p.291.

⁴⁵⁷ Bourriaud does, however, acknowledge Hirschhorn in his follow-up to *Relational Aesthetics - Postproduction*. Bourriaud (2002). Claire Bishop questions the omission of the artists Thomas Hirschhorn and Santiago Sierra from *Relational Aesthetics* in her article ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’. Bishop argues that Hirschhorn and Sierra make more democratic works because they emphasise the impossibility of achieving a microtopia. After Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau, she believes that antagonism is fundamental to democracy. Bishop claims that Hirschhorn and Sierra’s works, respectively,

Thomas Hirschhorn - Artist as Project Manager?

In 2002, Thomas Hirschhorn created the temporary ‘social’ work - *Bataille Monument* - for Documenta 11 in Kassel. It exemplified the kind of work which comes under the rubric ‘new genre public art’: incorporating a public audience and also participation from the community where the piece is sited. Like those artists whom Bourriaud claims to make relational works, Hirschhorn’s ambitions were not to produce objects but to engage a social dialogue. He states: ‘The Bataille Monument demanded friendship and sociability and was intended to impart knowledge and information, to make links and create connections.’⁴⁵⁸ In his writings on the *Bataille Monument*, Hirschhorn repeatedly stresses the idea of the work being an experience and an opportunity for discussion. In Hirschhorn’s own words:

Bataille Monument is a precarious art project of limited duration in a public space, built and maintained by the young people and other residents of a neighbourhood. Through its location, its materials and the duration of its

engage debates without the role of dialogue and negotiation becoming the subject of the work (which she argues relational works do). In addition, the works create and sustain a tension between viewers, participants and context through the introduction of collaborators from diverse economic backgrounds. Note that Liam Gillick criticises Bishop’s interpretation of Laclau and Mouffe, claiming that because Mouffe is making an argument:

...against the kind of social structuring that would produce a recognisable “art world”... it is a misreading of Mouffe’s ideas to attempt to apply this specific critique of social and political relations to...contemporary art.

He later states that Bishop misapplied Mouffe’s notion of ‘agonistic social binarism’ to make her argument that Hirschhorn and Sierra are ‘too democratic’ and that he and Tiravanija are ‘too neoliberal’. Liam Gillick, ‘Contingent Factors: A Response to Claire Bishop’s “Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics”’, *October*, 115 (Winter 2006), pp.95-107 (pp.101-102).

⁴⁵⁸ Thomas Hirschhorn, ‘Bataille Monument’, in *Contemporary Art: From Studio to Situation*, ed. by Claire Doherty (London: Black Dog, 2004), pp.133-147 (p.135).

exhibition, the *Bataille Monument* seeks to raise questions and to create the space and time for discussion and ideas.⁴⁵⁹

Documenta 11 funded *Bataille Monument*, however, Hirschhorn chose to situate the work away from main site in a suburb where the majority of the population was Turkish.⁴⁶⁰ The Monument consisted of three shacks situated between two housing projects; one housed a library of books and videos around Bataillean themes with an area to view these; the other was a television studio and the final one consisted of an installation based on Bataille's life and work.⁴⁶¹ There was also a snack bar and a taxi service run by locals, and a sculpture. The three latter elements were not just practical offerings; Hirschhorn had considered how to alternatively engage people in conversation through them. For example, Hirschhorn writes: 'The idea of a snack bar was not primarily about offering food and drinks, but about offering visitors the opportunity to meet, converse and spend time together.'⁴⁶² I cite the sculpture at the end of the list as this seems to be, interestingly, how it is prioritised in the other literature on the *Monument*. Notably, Hirschhorn does not directly refer to the sculpture in his statement reproduced above. However, he does state elsewhere that: 'The sculpture was supposed to be only the sculpture of the monument and not the monument itself.'⁴⁶³ Arguably, the term 'monument' itself refers to a structure or object rather than a project per se. The

⁴⁵⁹ Hirschhorn cited in Carlos Basualdo, 'Bataille Monument, Documenta 11, 2002', in *Thomas Hirschhorn* (London: Phaidon, 2004), pp.94-109 (p.98).

⁴⁶⁰ Hirschhorn was not the first artist to site his work away from the main Documenta arena. In 1982, Joseph Beuys exited the main site of Documenta 7 to create his work *7000 Oaks*. Beuys undertook a social work of a different kind, with the planting of 7000 trees - and accompanying basalt columns - as its aim. Beuys anticipated that each tree would be a 'monument'. For more information, see the Dia Art Foundation: <http://www.diaart.org/sites/page/51/1295> [Accessed 2/7/2011].

⁴⁶¹ See Bishop (p.75) for a more in depth description or Basualdo, pp.94-109. I, like Hirschhorn, am not concerned with the aesthetic of the installations here.

⁴⁶² Hirschhorn (2004), p.140.

⁴⁶³ Hirschhorn (2004), p.143.

shacks could fall under this category. However, on the level of syntax, the sculpture would be more traditionally viewed as the actual ‘monument’ - the public object.⁴⁶⁴

Hirschhorn’s *Bataille Monument* contained features that can be considered in terms of Chiapello and Boltanski’s ‘projective city’: more obviously, the project, the developing of networks and Hirschhorn’s ability to motivate people from diverse backgrounds. However, this reading is not an attempt to argue that Hirschhorn is pro-capitalist in his practice; rather, the following analysis shows how the features of neoliberalism have an effect on artistic practices. Here, I propose that Hirschhorn’s *Bataille Monument* epitomises the utilisation of the temporary project within contemporary art. This mode of working, in some ways, is similar to the project-based work of the Mike Smith Studio. Of course, this comparison is not so simplistic i.e. I am not arguing that Hirschhorn calls *Bataille Monument* a project so it must belong to the ‘projective city’. Art is not necessarily affected in the same ways that a business model may be. Nevertheless, I believe that the choice of working model adopted for the *Bataille Monument* was affected by the ideological implications of an economy based around networks and short-term projects.⁴⁶⁵

If we look to the participants within Hirschhorn’s project, it incorporated a vast amount of people, including the local community, in keeping with Hirschhorn’s anti-exclusionary policy. Referring to a world based upon the networked society, with its intricate structure, Chiapello and Boltanski write:

⁴⁶⁴ In an interview for *October* journal with Benjamin Buchloh, Hirschhorn agrees with Buchloh that he conceives of sculpture as an event or meeting place rather than an object just to be looked at; it is something in which someone participates. ‘An Interview With Thomas Hirschhorn’, *October*, 113 (Summer 2005), pp.77-100 (pp.85-6).

⁴⁶⁵ I am not alone in my consideration of Hirschhorn within the economic terms of neoliberalism. In an article this year, Hal Foster questioned the relationship of Hirschhorn’s oeuvre to precariousness (*précarité*). He concluded that, in his work, Hirschhorn navigates between precariousness and emergency. Hal Foster, ‘Towards a Grammar of Emergency’, *New Left Review*, 68 (March/April 2011), pp.105-118.

In a reticular world, social life is composed of a proliferation of encounters and temporary, but reactivatable connections with various groups, operated at potentially considerable social, professional, geographical and cultural distance. The *project* is the occasion and reason for the connection. It temporarily assembles a very disparate group of people, and presents itself as a *highly activated section of network* for a period of time that is relatively short, but allows for the construction of more enduring links that will be put on hold while remaining available.⁴⁶⁶

The *Monument* consisted of bringing together socially diverse groups of people to work on the project.⁴⁶⁷ The shacks were built by Hirschhorn and between twenty and thirty residents from the Friedrich-Wöhler-Siedlung where the *Monument* was situated.⁴⁶⁸ The residents were remunerated eight euros per hour for their work. Uwe Fleckner, an art historian, assisted in choosing the categories and selecting books for the library. The French writer and art critic, Jean-Charles Massera; French poet, Manuel Joseph and the German philosopher, Marcus Steinweg, were each invited to hold workshops at the *Monument*. Massera worked with the young people to perform his texts; Joseph forged ten letters titled ‘Sculpture as a Bullfight’, which were disseminated to almost 100,000 Kassel households, whilst Steinweg’s workshop focused on the production of texts that contributed to an exhibition panel on *The Ontological Cinema*. Of course, there were also the local residents who manned the snack bar (and kept the profits) - the Kaban family - and the five drivers who ran the shuttle service to and from the *Monument*. Hirschhorn also consulted the poet Christophe Fiat in his research on Bataille’s work in

⁴⁶⁶ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.104. Their emphasis.

⁴⁶⁷ The following information is taken from Thomas Hirschhorn, ‘Bataille Monument’, in *Contemporary Art: From Studio to Situation*, ed. by Claire Doherty (London: Black Dog, 2004), pp.133-147.

⁴⁶⁸ Hirschhorn also lived on the estate for the duration of the project.

preparation for Documenta 11. The visitors who made the journey from the main site of Documenta 11 to the *Monument* should not be excluded from this status. In addition, we also have the webcams that were set up for worldwide access to the monument and the people who accessed these. Without extending this count further afield to people such as the ‘Artistic Director’ of Documenta 11, Okwui Enwezor, who was also inextricably linked to the project, we can see the disparate worlds that Hirschhorn attempted to bring together through this work.

The success of the *Bataille Monument* is debatable; there was a lot of criticism of Hirschhorn’s situation of the *Monument* within the Turkish community and also the employment of local people to assist in the build. Basualdo writes that critics referred to the work as abusive to and exhibitionistic of the people of Kassel.⁴⁶⁹ The choice of location was antagonistic - in the sense that Hirschhorn selected a site where ‘friction and engagement might be possible’ - and played with the ambiguity that Hirschhorn evokes through his works.⁴⁷⁰ Hirschhorn’s work is never quite social work (and does not intend to be); neither is it openly political. However there is usually a definite political air around his work. Hirschhorn is not apologetic for this ambiguity. He states:

⁴⁶⁹ Basualdo, pp.96-108. Interestingly, Hirschhorn’s response to these criticisms is that he did not wish to exclude anyone from his audience. See Hirschhorn cited in Buchloh (2005), p.86

⁴⁷⁰ Hirschhorn (2004), p.135. One might question how abusive was the employment of workers to assist on a creative project? We know that Hirschhorn paid his workers eight euros per hour, which I assume would be the equivalent of the minimum wage. Hirschhorn lived on the estate for the duration of the project; he wished to be a part of the community for the time that he worked there, rather than an artist who entered their social space everyday and left again. Moreover, Hirschhorn knew that he had to put the work in with the local participants in order to facilitate an engagement with them. This relationship was not without its problems. Hirschhorn’s flat was broken into and expensive equipment was stolen. However, Hirschhorn did not go to the police but asked that the equipment be returned, which it was. Because of this, Hirschhorn felt, in some ways, that he had been accepted. Hirschhorn recounts this story in Hirschhorn (2004), p.136.

I am the artist, and when I work in an open space I decide where to place my work. It interests me that my work has to defend itself in any surroundings, in any sector, and fight for its autonomy.⁴⁷¹

It is this concept of autonomy that is important for Hirschhorn and he still asserts himself as the artist at the heart of the project:

That is why I said that my presence on the site was not required for communication or discussion with people, but simply in the role of a caretaker, to check that everything was functioning.⁴⁷²

Noticeably, Hirschhorn chooses to step back from the participants in order for ‘real’ experiences and discussions to take place, as opposed to ones directed by the artist.⁴⁷³

Hirschhorn conforms to aspects of Boltanski and Chiapello’s ‘great man’ in the ‘projective city’:

⁴⁷¹ Hirschhorn cited in Buchloh, p.86.

⁴⁷² Hirschhorn cited in Buchloh, p.87.

⁴⁷³ Hirschhorn’s decision to avoid directing the relations between participants can be viewed as contrary to the interaction that is encouraged (or directed) by relational artists. Although Tiravanija cooks for his audience -which then facilitates the sitting and eating with the artist or strangers - these relations occur between art gallery visitors with art in common. The cooking of food is a precursor to the sitting and eating, and can be seen as ‘directing’ in a performative sense. In contrast, Hirschhorn’s snack bar was run by local people – the Kaban family – and was frequented, not only by Documenta 11 visitors, but also people from the surrounding communities. The resulting conversations and interactions would perhaps be more interesting than those solely between a typical art-audience. Hirschhorn did not ‘direct’ the interactions that stemmed from the *Bataille Monument*, but he did, however, facilitate their taking place, through the designation of a place where they could occur.

Far from being attached to an occupation or clinging to a qualification, the great man proves *adaptable* and *flexible*, able to switch from one situation to a very different one, and adjust to it; and *versatile*, capable of changing activity or tools, depending on the nature of the relationship entered into with others or with objects.⁴⁷⁴

They later state: ‘The great man in a connexionist world is active and *autonomous*.’⁴⁷⁵ Hirschhorn sees his monuments as collaborative, but ultimately retains his name as ‘author’ of the work. More pertinent, perhaps, is that he wishes art to remain autonomous:

The other possibility is that by letting this autonomy shine through, by holding fast to this affirmation of art, I want people to reflect, to think, okay? That is what I want: reflection about my work, art in general, the passage of time, the world, reality. It is possible, for example, to talk with Turkish kids about art, because I don’t talk with them as a social worker but as an artist, as someone who believes in art.... I am not here to rehabilitate anyone, or not to rehabilitate them. That is not my job.... At the same time I find a cynical stance impossible, because it creates no autonomy or activity for me.⁴⁷⁶

Hirschhorn’s method of working, with his monuments at least, is a result of the conditions of capitalism under which artists are working today. The autonomy of the

⁴⁷⁴ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.112.

⁴⁷⁵ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.112.

⁴⁷⁶ Hirschhorn cited in Buchloh, pp.87-8.

individual artist is not compromised because the project is subsumed under his name. Further, the mode in which he chooses to work - the collaborative project, which focuses on participation rather than object production - is in keeping with contemporaneous business working models. Thus, the emphasis on the individual under neoliberalist ideology materialises in the 'great man' who is able to work with others but is ultimately autonomous. Hirschhorn defends the autonomy of art, in which he believes anything is possible, whilst engaging in non-exclusionary collaborations.⁴⁷⁷ I agree that Hirschhorn is, as Basualdo proposes, a modernist at heart.⁴⁷⁸ However, his modernist leanings lie in the type of artist that he embodies rather than how he goes about making art.

Despite Hirschhorn's commonalities with the 'great man', his ambition is contrary to someone like Mike Smith whom, I have already argued, truly fits the model. Despite its creativity, Smith's engagement with the artists for whom he works is primarily a business transaction. Yes, Hirschhorn may be able to initiate and implement a project, but the aims and objectives are not set in stone beforehand and the 'result' is not predefined.⁴⁷⁹ What is important for Hirschhorn is the inclusionary aspect of his projects: 'I want people to be inside my work, and I want spectators to be a *part* of this world surrounding them in this moment.'⁴⁸⁰ Unlike the adaptable 'great man', in public works such as *Bataille Monument*, Hirschhorn always sees his role as that of the artist. In contrast, Smith will become the problem-solver, maker, go-between and consultant in his role as a facilitator. Moreover, Smith's role is also that of a manager – he employs a permanent team of staff whom he divides the labour of. There is a loose division of labour in the *Bataille Monument*, as per who 'mans' which station, however, the roles are not fixed outside of caretaking. The people who worked for Hirschhorn on the *Bataille*

⁴⁷⁷ Hirschhorn: 'Nothing is impossible with art. Nothing.' Hirschhorn cited in Buchloh, p.87.

⁴⁷⁸ Basualdo, p.96.

⁴⁷⁹ One only has to think back to the difficulties, cited earlier, that Hirschhorn encountered in his attempts at being accepted into the community to see that his project was not necessarily a smooth undertaking.

⁴⁸⁰ Hirschhorn cited in Buchloh, p.95.

Monument were mainly young people employed as temporary workers for the duration of the project. Hirschhorn will, most likely, not work with this team again. When Smith works for an artist or a gallery, he is adding to his network of contacts whom he can later draw upon for other projects.

Hirschhorn's works are, ultimately, concerned with creating art and the possibilities that art can achieve in certain situations. His interventions into public space are not easy transitions. He has to develop the skills to work alongside people from diverse backgrounds, the success of which he does not judge.⁴⁸¹ Hirschhorn prioritises experience over results. The clean, polished aesthetic of the majority of the artworks produced at the Mike Smith Studio is testament to the fact that Smith prioritises results.⁴⁸² It is, after all, Smith's job to do so. The distinction between Smith and Hirschhorn is exemplary of the way in which the role of the artist is taken to be the new manager model whereas, in reality, the two cannot truly be assimilated. Despite Hirschhorn's practice being indebted to neoliberal working tropes - such as the project - he will never become the manager that Smith is. Hirschhorn's primary concern lies not with the object, but the experience. At the end of the day, Smith has to produce objects. The creative process is important to Smith's personal enjoyment of his work; however,

⁴⁸¹ Hirschhorn writes:

Visitors often asked me how the project was received by the residents of the housing complex. I am certainly the last person who could answer that question! It seems obvious that an answer would involve a value judgment. That would mean that if the project was received well it was a success and if not, then it was a failure. The *Bataille Monument* project was not a matter of acceptance or rejection...

Hirschhorn (2004), p.145.

⁴⁸² For example, Mona Hatoum's *Mesh Chairs* (1995), Gavin Turk's *The Death of Marat* (1998) and Hirst's vitrines.

his job satisfaction is secondary to the intended result.⁴⁸³ More importantly, perhaps, is that it is a result manufactured for other people.

Here I have drawn attention to a newer type of art making (be it titled ‘new genre public art’, ‘participatory’, ‘relational’ or otherwise) which has inevitably become paradigmatic of contemporary art making. This genre is separate from, whilst it simultaneously adapts to, the conditions of a neoliberal or neo-flexible capitalism. Art’s relative autonomy from the economy means that a work such as *Bataille Monument* will never become entirely subsumed into the capitalist system. However, as Hirschhorn is a social being, integrated into capitalist society, how and what he creates cannot be completely divorced from it. Thus, I propose that the popularity of the project as the moment in which a number of contemporary art practices manifest is not divorced or isolated from the increased use of the project in contemporary business models.⁴⁸⁴ The type of artworks discussed in this chapter, are often part of a larger network, be it the gallery or the biennial where, for a temporary period, a number of projects come together. The artworks are not always explicitly political, as Hirschhorn concedes, but are not always excluded from the remit of politics because of their relationship with the public. Moreover, this mode of working is not the only way in which the network and the project have been adopted by certain groups of creative individuals. Chiapello and Boltanski state: ‘Anything can attain the status of a project, including ventures hostile to capitalism.’⁴⁸⁵ We see this at play in the work of Hirschhorn. And this proposition is precisely the question to which I shall now turn: to those models of contemporary art-

⁴⁸³ I do, however, believe that the fact that Smith enjoys his work motivates him to create ‘perfect’ objects and deliver the intended results. His reputation is founded on this very notion. The point I make here is that Smith’s role is ultimately to make/install art objects, fulfilling other people’s briefs, in contrast to Hirschhorn who wants to explore the possibilities of art.

⁴⁸⁴ Lazzarato also recognises the moment of the project within ‘immaterial labour’: ‘Small and sometimes very small “productive units” (often consisting of only one individual) are organised for specific ad hoc projects, and may exist only for the duration of those particular jobs.’ Lazzarato (1996), p.137.

⁴⁸⁵ Boltanski and Chiapello, p.110.

activism that are explicitly political and anti-capitalist in type. The final section of this chapter addresses the third way in which I propose that artists have reacted to the changes in post-Fordist capitalist production: the art-activist.

The Art-Activist

*'Art, it is said, is not a mirror, but a hammer: it does not reflect, it shapes.'*⁴⁸⁶

Leon Trotsky, from *Literature and Revolution* (1924)

Recently, there has been a lot of discussion in contemporary art journals and at conferences about the nature of activism and its relationship to art.⁴⁸⁷ Despite the fact that activists have been participating in art exhibitions and gaining in presence at biennials for a number of years, it is only in very recent debates that their practices have been acknowledged, questioned and, subsequently, categorised within art discourse more widely.⁴⁸⁸ It is appropriate to note here that the majority of contemporary publications on collaboration or collectivism in art come from writers who are also activists or involved with collectives whose practice lends itself to activism or 'social work'.⁴⁸⁹ By 'social work', I am not referring to the work done by social workers in the

⁴⁸⁶ Leon Trotsky, extract from *Literature and Revolution* (1924), reprinted in *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, pp.442-447.

⁴⁸⁷ It seems as though *Art Monthly* are publishing an article every other month which addresses public art; radical art; art and politics or participatory art, which generally acknowledges the art activist. Amongst those who have discussed these issues in the publication are: Dave Beech, 'Encountering Art', *Art Monthly*, 336 (May 2010), pp.9-11; Recovering Radicalism, *Art Monthly*, 323 (February 2009), pp.7-10; Gavin Grindon, 'Art & Activism', *Art Monthly*, 333 (February 2010), pp.5-9; Anna Dezeuze, 'The Art of Participation 1950 to Now', *Art Monthly*, 324 (March 2009), p.24; Mark Prince, 'Art & Politics', *Art Monthly*, 330 (October 2009), pp.5-9.

⁴⁸⁸ I recall Julian Stallabrass' 'The Fracturing of Globalisation' paper given at the *Historical Materialism Annual Conference 2009* (HM 2009), in which he began to make a distinction between the kind of works that are presented at the contemporary art fairs and biennials. He proposed that there is a clear contrast between the artworks that are 'political documentary' and those that are 'decorative spectacular'. We can make a further distinction between those that represent politics and those who 'do' politics.

⁴⁸⁹ The publications to which I refer here are: *Collectivism After Modernism*, which is co-edited by Blake Stimson and Gregory Sholette. The latter is an artist/activist who was a founding member of two

public sector but to a specific mode of art practice that aims to affect social relations or change. This mode of working is viewed as akin to activism but perhaps is not as overtly political in its ambition. It often materialises at the level of giving aid or community work, rather than making a political statement through protest or digital hijacking (which are often tools of the activists).

The response to the co-optation of the artist critique often involves a call for the politicisation of art. For example, both Brian Holmes, in his ‘Artistic Autonomy and the Communication Society’, and Stephen Wright, in ‘The Delicate Essence of Collaboration’, present political art as the answer to an increased awareness of the utilization of the business model in art practice and the artist’s method of production being used in contemporary business models.⁴⁹⁰ Holmes’ essay reads like a rallying cry against the forces of neoliberalism that have created the ‘flexible personality’ or worker. He lists numerous events, including moments of struggle against right-wing government and employers’ associations in France, which have allowed artists to defend a ‘special unemployment regime that helped shield them from the conditions of flexible labour’.⁴⁹¹ One example of the action against the threat, was the storming of a television studio during the filming of a prime time show - Star Academy - by a group of part-time performers brandishing signs that read ‘Shut off your TVs.’ Holmes states that actions

important political art collectives in the 1980s: REPOhistory and Political Art Documentation and Distribution (PADD). Sholette’s recent book - *Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture* (London, New York: Pluto, 2011) - is on the subject of politicised art practices. Brian Holmes is an activist and also the writer of *Unleashing the Collective Phantoms* (New York: Autonomedia, 2008); editor of the journal *Multitudes* and contributor to *Collectivism after Modernism*, the *Third Text* ‘Art and Collaboration’ edition amongst other publications. Dave Beech, a member of Free Art Collective, has also contributed to the debate on activist and radical art within the contemporary British art journal *Art Monthly*.

⁴⁹⁰ Holmes, ‘Artistic Autonomy and the Communication Society’, *Third Text*, 18:6 (November 2004), pp.547-555. Stephen Wright, ‘The Delicate Essence of Artistic Collaboration’, *Third Text*, 18:6, pp.533-545.

⁴⁹¹ Holmes (2004), p.551. What Holmes is referring to here is the proposed changes to the French unemployment insurance for temporary workers in the entertainment industry. Changes to the terms of the insurance were agreed to in June 2003 and implemented in January 2004, which resulted in protest and actions from entertainment workers. Subsequently, a provisional benefit was set up by the state for those excluded from the 2003 revisions. For more detailed information see the Eurofound website: <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2006/12/articles/FR0612039I.htm>.

like these are: ‘a more interesting collaboration than anything I see in the museums.’⁴⁹² Similarly, Wright supports the art-activist as the only real collaborative practice that is not based upon singular authorship.⁴⁹³ In ‘The Delicate Essence of Collaboration’, he criticises the ‘relational works’ of artists such as Rirkrit Tiravanija for being exploitative of the participants, and for remaining under the instigation of the artist. Wright argues that these types of work are exploitative because he believes that the symbolic economy of art mirrors that of the general economy. The general economy, for Wright, is underpinned by a ‘sort of possessive authorship’, which artists such as Tiravanija and Maurizio Cattelan replicate through their artistic work.⁴⁹⁴ Wright believes that modernism gave rise to art making as a performative practice and that relational works are merely an extension of this practice. What is truly collaborative for Wright is when boundaries of art are blurred and when art moves into politics. He considers this blurring of the boundaries to be employing *competence* as opposed to the *performative*.⁴⁹⁵ Wright takes the term ‘competence’ from Noam Chomsky’s linguistic conception – a set of possibilities conferred on a speaker of a natural language (i.e. the mastery of a language and potential uses of it) - and adapts it to the analysis of art making.⁴⁹⁶ In the final sentence of his article he reveals that ‘competence’ equates to ‘use-values’.⁴⁹⁷ Wright’s ‘competences’ are the skills that artists can bring to projects outside of the art institution (I use project here as a general term), which are exemplified in the practices associated with art-activism. These competencies can only be employed, for Wright, outside of the art space. I understand the move from the art space into civic space, and the employment of competence as opposed to performance by artists, to be the prioritization of *action* rather than *acting* in art making.

⁴⁹² Holmes (2004), p552.

⁴⁹³ Wright.

⁴⁹⁴ Wright, p.534.

⁴⁹⁵ Wright, p.536.

⁴⁹⁶ Wright, p.536.

⁴⁹⁷ Wright, p.545.

In a similar vein, Wright's category of competence is comparable to what Anatoly Osmolovsky calls for in art making: an emphasis on communication rather than object production.⁴⁹⁸ The political model, which interests Wright specifically, facilitates the communication of political messages. Examples that he cites are the *Taller Popular de Serigrafía* (People's Silk-screening Workshop) and the *Grupo de Arte Callejero* (GAC), both in Buenos Aires. These two groups worked with the public, firstly to enable protesters to have access to silk-screening facilities in order to make banners and tee shirts and secondly, with *GAC*, to facilitate the 'public production of signs'.⁴⁹⁹ These projects can be contrasted with Hirschhorn's public practice which, ultimately, brings the public together to author his work. Thus the *Taller Popular de Serigrafía* facilitates the learning of a technique to produce work for a political cause. The banners and tee shirts, produced during the silkscreen workshops, were used to promote political ideas; the use-value in this work is obvious and immediate, while that of Hirschhorn's is less so. Hirschhorn makes art for art's sake, whilst the two aforementioned projects assist in producing useful objects with a clear political aim. Although viewed as collaborative in the wider sense (manifested in the 'project'), Hirschhorn's *Bataille Monument* remained in the realm of art through its functioning as part of Documenta 11- the 'art space'. In contrast, the silkscreen workshops blur the boundary between art and political action from their very incarnation.

Contrary to those who argue that the politicisation of art is a way in which art can escape capitalism's co-optation of the artist critique, or even capitalism itself, I propose that aspects of neoliberal capitalism aid rather than hinder anti-capitalist activity. As I have tried to argue throughout this thesis, capitalism is constantly evolving, with profit always as its ultimate goal. Chiapello and Boltanski's analysis

⁴⁹⁸ Anatoly Osmolovsky, 'Rejection of Museums', *Third Text*, 18:6, p.646.

⁴⁹⁹ Wright, p.539.

proves invaluable in establishing moments in which aspects of the critique of capitalism are adopted by capitalism in order to further its existence. They thus identify the ‘social critique’ and, subsequently, the ‘artist critique’. As suggested earlier, the moment of the ‘project’ in neoliberal capitalist business theory is contemporary with art practices adopting an immaterial and loosely collaborative approach.⁵⁰⁰ I propose that activist events (or at the very least, those discussed in contemporary art discourse) also have the project at their organisational heart and, of course, its kin - the network. However, the activist projects generally have a truer collaborative feel without the necessary ‘network’ or ‘connexionist’ man at the head of the table.⁵⁰¹ The activist works have a symbiotic relationship to neoliberal capitalism through their adoption of newer communication technologies (symptomatic of this period of capitalism) and, above all, the Internet.⁵⁰² Anti-capitalist and anti-globalisation activism utilise the tools of capitalism in order to critique it.

The activist groups fall into a number of categories. For example, there are those who are overtly political in their ambition, such as those groups involved with the anti-globalisation movements (Reclaim the Streets); ‘hacktivism’, which is a form of Internet-based activism; more subversive groups (etoy); ‘craftivism’ (Anarchist Knitting Mob); ‘tactical media’ (exemplified in the work of the Yes Men) and also those who fall under the idiom ‘social work’ (Superflex). A contemporary example of a subversive activist group is the infamous etoy (sic), whose work predominantly exists on the Internet. Etoy ask people to invest in shares in their company - etoy.CORPORATION - in the name of art. Quoting from their website, they warn:

⁵⁰⁰ I say loosely collaborative here, as the example - Hirschhorn’s *Bataille Monument* - is fundamentally subsumed under his own name. This notion is in keeping with Wright’s argument. He proposes that contemporary artworks, which eschew traditional object-making for more collaborative endeavours within the art space, nevertheless mirror the possessive authorship that underpins the general economy.

⁵⁰¹ Such as the J-19 event in 1999, which mobilised many anonymous protesters to take to the streets of London.

⁵⁰² We must not forget that the Internet originated from a military tool.

etoy.INVESTMENTS are not focused on financial profits. The etoy.VENTURE is all about social profit, cultural revenue and intellectual capital generated with the invested resources.⁵⁰³

Etoy's previous projects were of a 'hackivist' nature. Jenny Shears describes an early 'hack':

etoy.SOFTWARE-AGENTS planted over 1000 designated keywords (porsche, startrek, bondage, madonna, censorship, fassbinder) into the world wide web's search engines. Net travellers who clicked on a seemingly innocent search result were taken instead to etoy's digital hijack holding tank, its dark screen pulsing with alarmist proclamations and war-zone imagery, backed by a Clash-like soundtrack manufactured by the [etoy.SOUNDBOYS](#).⁵⁰⁴

Other activist groups include ®™ark who changed the voice boxes in Barbies and GI Joe dolls. They also altered Internet-based 'shoot-'em-up' video games to include hacks which unlocked anti-military and homoerotic content.⁵⁰⁵ There are also groups who take on a more physically present, protest-oriented role, such as Reclaim the Streets and Critical Mass. Reclaim the Streets were involved in the organisation of the J-18 (June

⁵⁰³ www.etoy.com/fundamentals.

⁵⁰⁴ Jenny Shears, 'Etoy Agents: Corporate Art', *Surface* (1998), <http://www.blasthaus.com/press/surface/index.html> [Accessed: 24/08/07].

⁵⁰⁵ Information from Alan W. Moore, 'Artist's Collectives: Focus on New York, 1975-2000', in *Collectivism After Modernism*, pp.193-221 (p.215).

18th 1999) protest which invited participants (of which there were estimated to be between five and ten thousand) to take to the streets in London's financial district in a carnival-esque manner. According to Brian Holmes, who attended the event, the participants pasted up posters; held anti-globalisation banners and puppets; and encouraged business-workers to take off their ties and join in the festivities.⁵⁰⁶ The very heart of the new 'projective city' - the network - allows for the organisation of events counter to capitalism such as J-18.⁵⁰⁷

The type of groups which fall under the 'social work' banner are those which socially engage with their audience in an attempt to affect a change - be it a political or social change. This type of work can be seen in contrast to relational work that, despite its collaborative aspirations, engages a more contrived sociability or, to take Wright's term, a 'performative' sociability. Relational works focus upon the encounter rather than the effects of this encounter; whereas, I understand social work to go beyond the gallery space in order to facilitate a social change in a public that is not necessarily concerned about art. If we consider the criticisms of relational art as a predominantly institutional art practice, one can think of social work as entering into society. A more overtly political example of social work in art is that undertaken by the Women on Waves Foundation, who collaborated with Atelier van Lieshout in 2001 to create the mobile clinic *A-Portable*: a boat upon which abortions could be carried out. The clinic is legally moored beyond the twelve-mile limit from countries where abortion is illegal. It flies the Dutch flag, proclaiming the boat Dutch territory.⁵⁰⁸ Women interested in information on or wishing to have an abortion can then visit the mobile clinic and legally

⁵⁰⁶ Brian Holmes, 'Do-it-Yourself Geopolitics: Cartographies of Art in the World', in *Collectivism After Modernism*, pp.273-293. See pp.275-279 for a detailed look at Reclaim the Streets' events.

⁵⁰⁷ Boltanski and Chiapello acknowledge this dual nature of the city with regards to the network. p.111.

⁵⁰⁸ The boat is moored at the 12-mile point which situates it outside that country's legislation.

undergo the procedure.⁵⁰⁹ Although this does not sound like ‘art’, the boat has been exhibited alongside installation work from Women on Waves in numerous galleries, including the Venice Biennale in 2001.⁵¹⁰

I am *not* stating that art-activism is new or specific to neoliberal capitalism. There is a long history of moments in which art and politics coincide, spanning numerous revolutions and political conflicts.⁵¹¹ However, there has definitely been a conspicuity of activists within the art world since the events of September 11th 2001, as Julian Stallabrass has acknowledged.⁵¹² The difficulty comes in identifying those practices that are art, activist or a combination of the two. For example, Mark Wallinger’s *State Britain* - the reproduction and installation of Brian Haw’s protest banners in Tate Britain (originally situated in Parliament Square, London) - has an overtly political message.⁵¹³ However, the exhibition of the piece becomes a matter of form rather than action. That is, the removal of the banners from Parliament Square and their recreation and installation within the gallery space was a gesture in which an artist transformed one man’s personal plight into ‘political art’ for visitors to Tate Britain to

⁵⁰⁹ See ‘Women on Waves Exhibition’, Mediamatic website, <http://www.mediamatic.net/article-5799-en.html> [Accessed: 24/04/08].

⁵¹⁰ Obviously, there is the underlying question here of whether or not the social works are in fact ‘art’, which is often raised with regards to difficult or conceptual work. My task here is not to concern myself with this question, but simply rely on the fact that it is being written about in art contexts and exhibited in art institutions for my discussion of these practices. I do not intend to proclaim some kind of institutional theory of art after Dickie; rather, it is my contention to engage with what is already being discussed in art circles.

⁵¹¹ The crossing of the boundary of art and politics was prominent in the 1960s and 70s. As discussed earlier, this period was fruitful in producing a more political collectivity through the emergence of political artists’ organisations such as: the Artists Workers Coalition (AWC), Guerrilla Art Action Group (GAAG) and Women Artists in Revolution (WAR) in New York. For a more extensive look at these groups see Alan W. Moore, ‘Artists’ Collectives: Focus on New York, 1975-2000’, in *Collectivism after Modernism*, pp.192-221.

I recently read a working paper detailing the rapid poster production and organisation in temporary workshops during the events of Mai 1968, which was producing the tools for activism. Warren Carter, working paper (2010).

⁵¹² Stallabrass has proposed that since the economic decline, artworks are becoming politicised in order to stress the usefulness of art. Stallabrass (2009).

⁵¹³ *State Britain*, 2006, Tate Britain. Interestingly, the reproductions were manufactured at the Mike Smith Studio.

encounter. The disruption of public space that occurs in Haw's original act is neutralised once (the replicas of) Haw's banners are accepted into the gallery space.⁵¹⁴

Often, activists will exhibit as artists at one event and then act as activists at another. Wright's example of the dual nature of these works is the Taller Popular de Serigrafia who was invited to the Venice Biennale in 2003 as an activist group and to the World Social Forum in the following year as a group of artists.⁵¹⁵

The art-activist groups respond to neoliberal capitalism differently to the other models of art making discussed throughout this thesis. Often, they are averse to and critical of capitalism which, in turn, calls for the crossing over from a general art practice into a form of life or social practice. Certain theorists have argued that the potential for social or political change lies within types of labour that accompany neoliberalism. Earlier, I proposed that there are two ways that immaterial labour can be thought in relation to art; the first way being through the social models created in the practice of relational aesthetics. In the following, I discuss the second way in which immaterial labour affects the production of art-as-activism by attending to the second principle form of immaterial labour: affective labour.⁵¹⁶

Affective Action

The common thread between the writers who view the shift to immaterial labour as a positive step towards anti-capitalist activity is the *potential* of affective labour or what it

⁵¹⁴ Further complicating the exhibition of these replicas were the legal issues with reproducing banners that were being held as evidence in the ongoing court case against Haws. As such, Tate had an indemnity clause added to the contract between it and Mike Smith Studio. Mike Smith recalls these issues in 'The Producers', p.358.

⁵¹⁵ Wright, p.538.

⁵¹⁶ Hardt and Negri (2005), p.108.

represents.⁵¹⁷ According to Hardt and Negri, immaterial labour represents one of the dominant models of production under neoliberal capitalism and affective labour is one aspect of this type of labour.⁵¹⁸ However, in *Multitude*, they argue that the hegemony of immaterial labour is qualitative, rather than quantitative.⁵¹⁹ Due to this revision, one can argue that immaterial labour is not as widespread as Hardt and Negri led us to believe in their earlier book *Empire*. Hardt and Negri's definition of affective labour is: '...labour that produces or manipulates affects such as a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction, excitement, or passion.'⁵²⁰ They also claim that: 'A worker with a good attitude and social skills is another way of saying a worker adept at affective labour.'⁵²¹ Affective labour crosses a number of roles from care workers to flight attendants, fast food workers and those in the entertainment and culture industries. With such a vast number of jobs requiring the employment of affective labour, it is questionable as to whether there are many jobs that do not produce some form of affect.

Hardt and Negri, and Lazzarato identify the potential for a kind of action against capitalism which lies in the subjective turn that they believe labour has taken under neoliberalism. In his article 'Affective labour', Hardt states:

Saying that capital has incorporated and exalted affective labour and that affective labour is one of the highest value-producing forms of labour from the point of view of capital does not mean that, thus contaminated, it is no longer of use to anticapitalist projects. On the contrary, given the role of affective labour as

⁵¹⁷ Here I am referring to Hardt and Negri, *Empire* (2000) and *Multitude* (2005). Lazzarato, 'Immaterial Labour' and Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude* (Los Angeles, New York: Semiotext(e), 2004).

⁵¹⁸ In *Multitude*, Hardt and Negri refer to immaterial labour as the new hegemonic form of labour. p.109.

⁵¹⁹ Hardt and Negri (2005), p.109.

⁵²⁰ Hardt and Negri (2005), p.108.

⁵²¹ Hardt and Negri (2005), p.108.

one of the strongest links in the chain of capitalist postmodernisation, its potential for subversion and autonomous constitution is all the greater.⁵²²

Hardt states that the potential for this subversion lies in the subjective nature of affective labour - 'labour in the bodily mode' - which, he argues, is collective because it requires the presence of others. The cooperative, collaborative and communicative features of this newer form of labour are central to Hardt and Negri's concept of the 'multitude'. This concept is presented as an alternative to existing terms such as 'the people' and 'the population' that Hardt and Negri see as homogenising plurality: 'Multitude' designates a collectivity that is not unified but 'plural and multiple.'⁵²³ It is composed of a set of singularities within a social subject that cannot be reduced to sameness. Thus, we deduce that the multitude is based upon the bringing together of differences. The associations with the projective city and networked society are unavoidable.

Hardt claims that affective labour produces: 'social networks, forms of community, biopower.'⁵²⁴ Hardt identifies 'biopower' as: '...the production of collective subjectivities, sociality, and society itself.'⁵²⁵ The potentiality therefore lies in the communicative nature of a kind of labour that produces 'socialities' and 'collective subjectivities.'⁵²⁶ Hardt proposes that there is the capacity for what he terms 'biopolitics' (after Foucault) because of the dominant position of affective labour in capitalist

⁵²² Michael Hardt, 'Affective Labor', *Boundary*, 2, 26:2 (1999), pp.89-100 (p.90).

⁵²³ Hardt and Negri (2004), p.99.

⁵²⁴ Hardt (1999), p.96.

⁵²⁵ Hardt (1999), p.98.

⁵²⁶ Hardt (1999), p.96. The identification of the potential to affect political change is redolent of the Italian Workerist and Autonomia traditions of which Negri was a fundamental part. For the Workerists, the potential for a revolutionisation of work lay with the 'mass worker' (for example, the Fordist de-skilled, homogenised worker) until around 1977, when Negri re-evaluated his ideas about the mass worker. Within the Autonomia movement, the 'socialised worker' became pertinent for change.

production.⁵²⁷ This latent biopolitics is found in the dual nature of biopower: on the one hand it is associated with the production and reproduction of life (taken from feminist analyses), which is the foundation for capitalist accumulation. Hardt states:

On the other hand, the production of affects, subjectivities and forms of life present an enormous potential for autonomous circuits of valorisation, and perhaps for liberation.⁵²⁸

He argues:

In the production and reproduction of affects, in those networks of culture and communication, collective subjectivities are produced and sociality is produced -

⁵²⁷ Michel Foucault defines biopolitics as:

... the attempt, starting from the eighteenth century to rationalise the problems posed to governmental practice by phenomena characteristic of a set of living beings forming a population: health, hygiene, birthrate, life expectancy, race... (p.317).

He further claims that the above problems are inseparable from liberalism which, Foucault argues, presents a critical reflection on governmental practice. American neo-liberalism, however:

... seeks instead to extend the rationality of the market, the schemas of analysis it offers and the decision-making criteria it suggests, to domains which are not exclusively or not primarily economic: the family and the birthrate, for example, or delinquency and penal policy. (p.323).

The marketisation of everyday 'biological' life – the things that affect everyday living – is part of neoliberal governmentality. Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*, ed. by Michel Senellart (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

⁵²⁸ Hardt (1999), p.100. Negri also elaborates on the subject of biopolitics in relation to art in his paper 'Metamorphoses', originally given at the 'Art and Immaterial Labour' symposium, held at Tate Britain, January 19th 2008. In his paper, he argues that as labour is immaterial, cognitive and affective 'it is becoming ever more *bios*: it is *biopolitical labour*, an activity that reproduces forms of life.' He continues by identifying three aspects of this labour: firstly, it presents itself as *event*; secondly, it is a *multitudinous event*; and thirdly, the *multitudinous event* is excess open onto the common. Furthermore, he argues: 'Consequently, this is how the capacity to renew the regimes of knowledge and action that – in the era of cognitive labour – we call artistic is determined.' For Negri, artistic practice in the 'era of cognitive labour' is concerned with the body and the production of knowledge in the collective. Antonio Negri, 'Metamorphoses', trans. by Alberto Toscano, *Radical Philosophy*, 149 (June/July 2008), pp.21-25 (p.24).

even if those subjectivities and that sociality are directly exploitable by capital.

This is where we can realise the enormous potential in affective labour.⁵²⁹

Hardt and Negri build upon this argument in their section ‘The Sociology of Immaterial Labour’ in *Empire*, where they optimistically propose that:

Today productivity, wealth, and the creation of social surpluses take the form of cooperative interactivity through linguistic, communicational, and affective networks. In the expression of its own creative energies, immaterial labour thus seems to provide the potential for a kind of spontaneous and elementary communism.⁵³⁰

Ben Trott is highly critical of the potential ‘spontaneous and elementary communism’ that Hardt and Negri anticipate.⁵³¹ In his analysis of their thesis, Trott argues that the capacity for any kind of communism, through a qualitatively increased immaterial labour force in a Toyotist structure of work, is no more likely than one of a Fordist assembly line. Further, he states:

Whilst effective communication, coordination and collaboration amongst all of those involved in productive and reproductive practices today may well hold the

⁵²⁹ Hardt (1999), p.97.

⁵³⁰ Hardt and Negri, ‘The Sociology of Immaterial Labour’, in *Empire* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2001), p.294.

⁵³¹ Ben Trott, ‘Immaterial Labour and World Order’, *Ephemera*, 7:1 (2007), pp.203-232.

key to establishing the forms of democracy to which Hardt and Negri allude, that these feature have already become immanent to labouring practices today appears as nothing more than a tragically flawed proposition.⁵³²

However, where Trott does see the possibility of something akin to the multitude is within social movements, such as the counter-globalisation movements. Further to Trott's argument we can add the moments of social action that are apparent within the contemporary art world, which I believe are indebted to the socialised turn in art making. I purposely avoid using the term 'communism' here which is accompanied by a history of mis-use and indeterminacy. The model of capitalism that Hardt and Negri analyse is distinct from previous periods. The neoliberal model ultimately treasures the individual who can temporarily work with others but ultimately remains individual; it is this self-worth that motivates the workers. These are the features in which Hardt and Negri see potential, but how 'social' is affective labour?

A key distinction between pre-capitalist and capitalist labour processes is the purchasing of labour power. Thus, we can deduce that the realised labour of the worker is purchased and, therefore, belongs to the capitalist under manufacture. When the labour is affective, incorporating elements of the worker's personality as the purchased labour, the distinction between work and non-work becomes severely blurred.⁵³³ This blurring of work and non-work can be seen in relation to the discussions of the kind of man who flourishes under the neoliberal or neo-flexible model of capitalism. Within this

⁵³² Trott, pp.225-6.

⁵³³ Hardt and Negri also acknowledge the collapsing of work and leisure time that occurs with the employment of immaterial labour. David Hesmondhalgh also notes that workers within the cultural industries are subjected to an intense 'blurring of work and leisure' and offers this as a reason for cultural workers leaving the industry early. David Hesmondhalgh, 'User-generated Content, Free Labour and the Cultural Industries', *Ephemera*, 10:3/4, pp.267-284 (p.281).

economic model, a certain personality type is purchased. The selection of a worker is no longer a matter of physical capability or skills; rather, the employer is concerned with *who* the worker is and what qualities they possess. This concern with the worker's personality complicates things. Although Hardt and Negri identify the potential for change within the immaterial labour process, in some ways change is made more difficult through the indexical relation that the worker now has to their work in the neoliberal period. Within the earlier Fordist period, the deskilling of work made clear the separation between worker and work, which, ultimately led to worker unrest, which was taken up by the unions and thus affected changes within the workplace. Through appealing to the individual whose personality traits lend themselves to the role, it is perhaps more difficult for the exploitation of the worker to manifest on an obvious level under the newer economic model. I will borrow Trott's distinction here, between the feudal and capitalist extraction of surplus, to illustrate my point.⁵³⁴ In the former mode of production, the worker is aware of surplus value being extracted from them because they work on the landowner's land; when they are labouring for themselves they work on their own land. In the latter, the distinction is not clear: the worker is unaware of when the socially necessary labour time has been exceeded and when the extraction of surplus begins. Therefore, under neoliberalism, the worker is exploited and the worker continues to produce a surplus of some kind. However, the extraction of surplus is hidden through the flexible, immaterial nature of work and the worker's vested interest through the employment of their personal qualities.

⁵³⁴ Trott, p.222.

The Activist and the Virtuoso

I believe that Paolo Virno's argument is analogous to and yet distinct from those of Hardt and Negri. Like Hardt, Negri and Lazzarato, Virno also discerns the symbiosis of work with general intellect/social knowledge as the aspect of neoliberal capitalist production in which the potential to affect socio-political change lies.⁵³⁵ However, Virno sees this symbiosis as a hindrance to action because, he argues, 'work has absorbed the distinct traits of political action.' This absorption, he continues, was made possible by: 'the intermeshing between modern forms of production and an intellect that has become public...'⁵³⁶ The intellect that has become public is found in the knowledge aspect of the immaterial labour in Hardt and Negri's writings. Virno's response to the hindrance of action is to call for a 'redefinition of political praxis'.⁵³⁷ Despite Virno's claim, in his conclusion to *A Grammar of the Multitude*, that post-Fordism is the 'communism of capital' I understand this assertion to be more subtle and realistic than Hardt and Negri's notion of potential communism.⁵³⁸ Virno extends his identification a little further, arguing for a coalition between intellect and *action* rather than the dominant model of intellect and *work*, which Hardt and Negri adopt. How we are to utilise the social knowledge that immaterial labour produces is never really addressed by Hardt and Negri. Perhaps Virno's contribution appeals more because of its contradictory nature: on one hand, he proposes the potential for a redefinition of political praxis but, on the other, he agrees that the 'virtuosity' - the realm of politics and ethics - has been co-opted by capitalist production. (This second idea is akin to the one that Chiapello and

⁵³⁵ Paolo Virno, 'Virtuosity and Revolution', in *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, ed. by Michael Hardt and Paolo Virno (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1996), pp.189-210.

⁵³⁶ Virno (1996), p.189.

⁵³⁷ Virno (1996), p.189.

⁵³⁸ Virno (2004), pp.110-111. I would argue the reverse of this - the capitalisation of communist tendencies or traits.

Boltanski set forth in their analysis). So, how does one (or rather, many) utilise social knowledge for the greater good?

In spite of art's relative autonomous position to the economic base, my thesis has courted the idea that art somehow resists the co-option of the artist critique. This concept, I admit, has been challenging at times because of the way in which works of art exist within the sphere of capital.⁵³⁹ But never has the resistance seemed so pertinent as in relation to the potentiality of affective labour. However, I do not claim that art has emancipated us from capitalism or that it even has the capacity to. But in its nature, contemporary art is critical and resistant. The notion of an avant-garde is founded upon art's critical resistance to the past in the pursuit of creating something new and challenging. The proliferation of politicised art (whether these practices remain within the institutional art space or not) in recent years is testament to the critical nature of contemporary art. For example, the curatorship of the 2009 12th Istanbul Biennial - titled 'What Keeps Mankind Alive?' - by the leftist What, How and for Whom (WHW) curatorial collective. The curatorial group selected political art collectives such as Chto Delat? in order to encourage critical thought about contemporary art and the economy at an international level.

It is contended here that the potential of affective labour is (partially) realised through the practice of art-activism. The art-activists are the closest to Virno's call for the symbiosis of intellect and action through their use of capitalist technologies, associated with work, in order to act against capitalism. The social mobility of art-activist groups can be attributed to an increase in knowledge, information, communication and affect within general work. Furthermore, the groups avoid the

⁵³⁹ Even those works that have attempted to avoid the production of a material, saleable object – for example, performance art – often fall into the pitfalls of producing documentation which subsequently becomes valuable.

culmination of their actions into another ‘project-based’ artwork through the omission of the ‘network’ man from their collective structure and also through the avoidance of the art-space. Thus, the activist groups take a truer collaborative or cooperative approach than neoliberal ideology encourages within mainstream work and relational art. They use their intellect - garnered from the use of capitalist technologies and the heterogeneous nature of their practices - for action rather than put it to work *for* capital. Drawing upon Virno’s categories, I argue that art-activism assimilates *intellect* with *action*, free from the necessary ties of work and the economy, because of art’s relative position to autonomy. The politicised practices of art-activism balance on the axes of their relative autonomy; that is, they simultaneously operate as art and also as non-art. In this way, the art-activists use capitalist technologies and techniques for their anti-capitalist actions whilst, at the same time, being socially engaged (as opposed to autonomous).⁵⁴⁰

Biting the Hand that Feeds: Knowledge versus Capitalism

Let us look to examples of activist practice aligned with art in order to see how they utilise neoliberal traits. The artist’s group Superflex is paradigmatic of the collectives that straddle the border between art and activism. Superflex have been involved in a multitude of projects that are politically engaged, even publishing a book - *Self-*

⁵⁴⁰ We are reminded here of Benjamin’s call for the overthrowing of the fetters of production through changing or improving the apparatus for the revolutionary cause. He states:

Here too, therefore, technical progress is for the author as producer the foundation of his political progress. In other words, only by transcending the specialisation in the process of intellectual production ... can one make this production politically useful; and the barriers imposed by specialisation must be breached jointly by the productive forces that they were set up to divide.

The art-activists who utilise tactical media or employ haktivist means change the function of the capitalist apparatus. Walter Benjamin, ‘The Author as Producer’, in *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, pp.79-95 (p.87).

Organisation: Counter-Economic Strategies - which discusses and presents a diverse sample of ‘counter economic’ projects and practices.⁵⁴¹ In the ‘Contents’ section of this book (which reads more like an index covering ideas thematically) there are twenty-three entries for ‘network’ and thirty-six for ‘community’, as opposed to the seven which adhere to ‘autonomy/autonomous’ and two for ‘competition’. One of the groups mentioned is Freeculture.org, who, in their Manifesto state:

The mission of Free Culture movement is to build a bottom-up, participatory structure to society and culture, rather than a top-down, closed, proprietary structure. Through the democratizing power of digital technology and the Internet, we can place the tools of creation and distribution, communication and collaboration, teaching and learning into the hands of the common person - and with a truly active, connected, informed citizenry, injustice and oppression will slowly but surely vanish from the earth.⁵⁴²

For this group, the emancipatory potential lies in technology. In one sense, the potentiality of ‘general intellect’ is referenced here but the emphasis is definitely on technology, which, as we know, has become one of the principle tools of the ‘information economy’. However, it is this utilisation of capitalist technologies that David Harvey ultimately argues is detrimental to the implementation of an ‘other’ to capitalism.⁵⁴³ Harvey claims, taking his cue from Marx’s discussion of machinery in the

⁵⁴¹ *Self-Organisation: Counter-Economic Strategies* (New York and Berlin: Sternberg press, 2006).

⁵⁴² *Self-Organisation: Counter-Economic Strategies*, p.89

⁵⁴³ Harvey sees the failure of communisms as lying in the continued use of capitalist technologies, rather than changing these once a new system is established after the initial revolutionary stages. Harvey (2010), p. 219.

first book of *Capital*, that technology is not neutral, further proposing that there is a ‘problematic class character of capitalist technologies’.⁵⁴⁴ Similarly, Raniero Panzieri - the founder of *Quaderni Rossi* journal – viewed the role of technology within capitalism as oppressive.⁵⁴⁵ He argues that the use of technology increasingly facilitates capital’s control of the worker in each stage of capitalism’s development from cooperation, through manufacture and large-scale industry.⁵⁴⁶ In the late capitalist stage, informational techniques, he argues, ‘... tend to restore that “charm” (satisfaction) of work which the Communist Manifesto already spoke.’⁵⁴⁷ Thus, work appears more satisfactory to the worker than in previous periods. The control that capital exerts over him is mystified because the worker *appears* content. In some ways, one could see the informationalisation of work as a kind of reskilling - not with manual skills, but rather, knowledge-based skills - thus, the worker becomes more satisfied with work because the worker is acquiring knowledge. Panzieri also illustrates the control that capital has over the social nature of work in the cooperative phase. He makes clear that the socially productive power of labour, in the capitalist labour process, is a ‘free gift to capital’ that is obtained when workers are placed under certain conditions. As such, the sociality that labouring with others encourages, is not necessarily for the benefit of the worker.

Consequently, the utilisation of capitalist tools and machinery encourages relations in which technology is viewed as competition with the worker, rather than an aid. Marx proffers that technology was a powerful tool in suppressing strikes - ‘weapons

⁵⁴⁴Harvey (2010), p.219.

⁵⁴⁵ Panzieri is often referred to as a contributor to the founding of Italian Operaismo because of the role that his journal had in bringing together the protagonists of the movement. See: Sergio Bologna’s online review, *Steve Wright's Storming Heaven. Class composition and struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*, <http://www.generation-online.org/t/stormingheaven.htm>; also see: The Editor of libcom.org’s ‘Introduction to Panzieri’ at <http://libcom.org/library/capalist-use-machinery-raniero-panzieri>.

⁵⁴⁶ Raniero Panzieri, ‘Capitalist use of Machinery: Marx versus the Objectivists’ (1961), trans. Quintin Hoare, in *Outlines of a Critique of Technology*, ed. by P. Slater (London: Ink Links, 1980), pp.44-68. Accessed online via: <http://libcom.org/library/capitalist-use-machinery-raniero-panzieri> [Accessed: 24/05/2011].

⁵⁴⁷ Panzieri.

against class revolt', and Harvey builds on this idea to describe the social nature of technology.⁵⁴⁸ Harvey proposes that capitalist technology can be utilised for revolution but, in order for a non-capitalist state to succeed, the technologies have to be replaced with the establishment of a new state. If the existing capitalist technologies were to be implemented in a newly emergent non-capitalist state, the social conditions of capitalism would be replicated, rather than abolished, through the continued use of technologies that are not socially neutral.⁵⁴⁹ Similarly, Panzieri states:

The relationship of revolutionary action to technological “rationality” is to “comprehend” it, but not in order to acknowledge and exalt it, rather in order to subject it to a new use: to the socialist use of machines.⁵⁵⁰

Technology plays a central role in art-activism. Ricardo Dominguez considers the theory of ‘electronic civil disobedience.’⁵⁵¹ He recalls his association with *Critical Art Ensemble* (CAE), which began with actions such as ‘fax jamming’ and ‘phone zapping’. For example, CAE undertook an action against the corporation Publix when they decided to ban the sale of condoms in their stores as a response to the AIDS epidemic.⁵⁵² The action comprised of calling the company twenty-four hours a day to inform them that CAE were not going to shop at their store. Dominguez presents a personal history of how these kinds of actions evolved into utilising the Internet to support the Zapatista

⁵⁴⁸ Marx (1990), p.563.

⁵⁴⁹ In the previous chapter, I referenced Lenin’s statement that only once Taylorist methods were freed from Capital could they be put to use for communism.

⁵⁵⁰ Panzieri.

⁵⁵¹ ‘Mayan Technologies and the Theory of Electronic Civil Disobedience’, Ricardo Dominguez interviewed by Benjamin Shepard and Stephen Duncombe in *Art and Social Change: A Reader*, ed. by Will Bradley and Charles Esche (London: Tate, 2007), pp.319-331.

⁵⁵² ‘Mayan Technologies...’, p.323.

movement in the Mexican state of Chiapas in 1994. Dominguez argues that the Internet radicalised the Zapatistas. The Internet was employed for the intense publicisation of the Chase Manhattan memo. This memo called for the elimination of groups such as the Zapatistas because they purportedly gave Mexico ‘bad press’ and which, subsequently, could lead to the devaluation of the peso. Dominguez argues that within three days of intense publicisation the offensive against the Zapatistas had stopped.⁵⁵³

Dominguez places himself within the creation of the network in which the Zapatista’s plight was ‘globalised’. During this time, the *Zapatista Floodnet System* was created, which further evolved into the *Electronic Disturbance Theater*, the main aim of which was to disseminate information. The awareness that Dominguez claims was achieved through the employment of the network (via communicative technologies and the Internet) is illustrative of the political potential of the shift to immaterial labour. Ultimately, Dominguez’s involvement with political struggle becomes theatre. However, in contrast to Hirschhorn’s *Bataille Monument*, the network created for the Zapatistas was not temporary and was certainly political, contributing to ceasing the action pitched against them. It is believed that the offensive against the Zapatistas was stopped after three days because of the exposure and global awareness of it. However, the exposure of the Chase Manhattan memo was just one offensive against them, and their political struggle continued, despite this one success.

The Revival of the ‘Social Critique’

Ironically, the art-activist practices appear to have more in common with the earlier model of ‘social critique’, as discussed in *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, than the model

⁵⁵³ ‘Mayan Technologies...’, p.327. Note that the Zapatistas did not have electricity or the Internet at this time.

of ‘artist critique’ adopted by neoliberal capitalism. The social critique, according to Boltanski and Chiapello, is directed at capitalism as a source of poverty and inequality and also considers capitalism as a source of opportunism and egoism, which destroys social bonds and collective solidarity by exclusively encouraging private interests.⁵⁵⁴ The social critique responds to these features of capitalism by attempting to re-collectivise interests in order to counter the individualism. The overwhelming collectivity of an event such as the Reclaim the Streets-organised ‘Carnival Against Capitalism’ in the finance district of London (J-18) rejects the individualism of neoliberal capitalism. The dissemination of information about the Zapatistas also involved anonymity rather than an ego (although Dominguez’s account sometimes reads as though he is taking the credit for it; I assume that this is excitement as opposed to egoism).⁵⁵⁵

There are myriad collectives addressing issues of inequality, such as fair trade or local political struggles in non-Western countries.⁵⁵⁶ For example, Guaraná Power is a project focused upon the production and distribution of guaraná-based products. The Guaraná Power project was established in response to the forming of a cartel by the multinational corporations who would compete for Guaraná as an ingredient for their soft drinks. The forming of the cartel resulted in the eradication of competition for the product and, therefore, a dramatic drop in the price that the companies paid for guaraná, leaving the local Brazilian farmers exploited.⁵⁵⁷ *Guaraná Power* is an energy soft drink

⁵⁵⁴ Boltanski & Chiapello, pp.38-39.

⁵⁵⁵ The collectively-produced newspaper - *Art Work: A National Conversation about Art, Labour and Economics* - and its accompanying website, is the result of a US-based national project to gather together artists, activists, writers and other cultural workers to discuss ideas and issues about art and work. This project is also concerned with the dissemination of information and accruing knowledge. See: <http://www.artandwork.us/>

⁵⁵⁶ This focus is apparent in texts from *Collectivism after Modernism, Art and Social Change: A Reader to Self-Organisation: Counter Economic Strategies*.

⁵⁵⁷ For a more detailed account see: *Self Organisation*, p.135 and pp.312-333, <http://superflex.net/tools/supercopy/guarana.shtml> and also www.guaranapower.org.

produced by a farmer's cooperative in response to these struggles. Superflex ran a workshop in Maues, Brazil, for the local community with the purpose of finding a way to create Guaraná-based products without the need for the expensive equipment of the corporations. Although the workshop produced material results - like sculptures and posters - I believe that the real result was the discussion and the proposed solutions to the community's problem. The workshop facilitated the sharing of knowledge - for example, Superflex made participants aware of *Mecca Cola*, a Muslim soft drink - and the opportunity to consider alternatives to the domination of corporations over the local production of guaraná. It could be argued that the 'art aspect' of the project lies in Superflex's exhibition of the documentation of this project within an art context, which is not dissimilar to the work exhibited by Lothar Hempel in the Bourriaud-curated *Traffic* exhibition at the CAPC Musée d'Art Contemporain in 1996. However, Hempel's contribution to *Traffic* is described as follows:

Lothar Hempel expanded the constituency of the show by approaching local social groups. Producing an unassuming and quietly generous work, he knocked together a four-walled space, and on the inside sketched the facades of anonymous housing blocks, illuminating them with shadowy projections of silhouetted leafless trees. On the outside, he displayed information and educational material from several groups, including an open house for people with suicidal tendencies, an esoteric self-discovery dance school, and a support organisation for prostitutes.⁵⁵⁸

⁵⁵⁸ Carl Freedman, 'Traffic', *Frieze* website: <http://www.frieze.com/issue/review/traffic/> [Accessed: 31/05/2011].

Although, on the surface, the exhibiting of information about social groups, seen in both Superflex's and Hempel's works are similar, their intentions are very different. For Superflex, its involvement with the project is not just to raise awareness of the group, but also to help. Hempel's contribution could be considered 'inactive' – yes, he raises awareness of the social groups whom he selects; however, the work is reduced to representation and does not make an active contribution to the groups in the same way that Superflex does. The possibilities are intangible: the information displayed may have provoked discussion or it may have, perhaps, played a more formal than formative role.⁵⁵⁹

Pseudo-Corporate Dissent: etoy

Etoy is distinct from the above projects and groupings in so far as it is an Internet-based (pseudo?) art corporation that has taken the model of collaboration a step further by assuming a corporate identity. The group adopt aspects of the 'information economy' whilst criticising it. This is how they pitch themselves:

etoy, expanding reality since 1994, redefines art history by replacing the obsolete role of the genius by a network of collaborating agents: a group of exceptional artists and engineers who exploit technology to create and explore new territories. Given these circumstances, the artist's signature and the stroke of the brush are no longer adequate indicators of authorship and authenticity.⁵⁶⁰

⁵⁵⁹ It may be useful to note that Hempel's recent work does not take on a social role: Hempel is the subject of his work.

⁵⁶⁰ www.etoy.com/fundamentals/hologram [Accessed: 19/08/07].

This statement is very telling about their anti-authorial leanings. Apart from what they put out on the Internet (which could be interpreted as propaganda of a kind), the information on etoy is scarce. Their corporate identity is prominent – orange and black being their colours, and the members wear orange boiler suits, with shaven heads and dark glasses. An orange shipping container - a common symbol of the global economy - often accompanies their ‘material’ projects. You can buy shares in their company - etoy.CORPORATION - which is one of the ways in which they survive financially, alongside funding from organisations such as the Arts Council in Switzerland.

Etoy have directly responded to the immaterial nature of today’s communication society. I would argue that this replication or adoption of the e-business model is akin to Art & Language’s institutional critique.⁵⁶¹ In the *Index* works, Art & Language exhibit their ‘paperwork’ in filing cabinets, which is akin to administrative practices in office environments. The gallery is not the office and yet, visitors make the administrative associations nevertheless. Similarly, Marcel Broodthaer’s recreates the (fictional) museum within the gallery-space; his work lies in the creation of the museum and the exhibition of it.⁵⁶² He replicates the role of the curator in his practice, whilst not officially occupying the position. Both Art & Language and Broodthaers are replicating roles in their practice, which are recognisable as working modes, and etoy do the same. Holmes argues that project-based activist works that extend beyond the gallery are

⁵⁶¹ For a history of Art & Language, see Charles Green, ‘Conceptual Bureaucracy: Ian Burn, Mel Ramsden, and Art & Language’, in *The Third Hand: Collaboration in Art from Conceptualism to Postmodernism* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), pp.25-56.

⁵⁶² Despite Broodthaers’ prominence as an artist engaged in institutional critique, Benjamin Buchloh concludes his important essay on conceptual art by claiming that Broodthaers turned the radical achievements of conceptual art into ‘absolute farce’. In contrast, Rosalind Krauss argues that the lineage of the ‘post-medium condition’ (found in mixed-media installation art or institutional critique) ‘traces its lineage...not so much to Joseph Kosuth as to Marcel Broodthaers’. Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, ‘Conceptual Art 1962-1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions’, *October*, 55 (Winter, 1990), pp.105-143 (p.143). Rosalind Krauss, *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1999), p.20.

exemplary of what he considers to be the third phase of institutional critique, which he calls ‘extradisciplinary investigations’.⁵⁶³

Etoy state that they ‘exploit technology’ rather than embrace it. Their hacking project has also been described as an attempt to expose the dangers of the Internet rather than an intention to use it for their own gain.⁵⁶⁴ They also claim to be non-profit making: ‘The firm shares cultural value and intends to reinvest all financial earnings in art.’⁵⁶⁵ Holmes argues that the proliferation of artists groups that perform mimetic interpretations of ‘the values projected from the consulting firms and human-resources departments’, emerging in recent years, demonstrate the extent to which the artist critique has been absorbed by capitalism.⁵⁶⁶ He furthers his argument by claiming that the permeation of the artworld by transnational state capitalism is only restated in the collective work of artists groups that subversively adopt the traits of ‘neomanagement’. Despite their subversive nature, Holmes concludes that the emergence of groups like etoy - ‘which endlessly reiterates the forms of corporate organisation’ - are sorry testimony to the capitalist absorption of the artist critique.⁵⁶⁷

⁵⁶³ The first phase is that of Art & Language and Broodthaers. Holmes states that the second generation occurs in 1980s and 1990s America with the work of artists such as Christian Philipp Müller and Andrea Fraser. Brian Holmes, ‘Extradisciplinary Investigations. Towards a New Critique of Institutions’, *Transversal* (January 2006), <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0106/holmes/en> [Accessed: 20/07/2011].

⁵⁶⁴ www.eto.com/fundamentals/hologram [Accessed: 19/08/07].

⁵⁶⁵ <http://www.eto.com/fundamentals/eto-share/> [Accessed: 24/08/07].

⁵⁶⁶ Holmes (2004), p.551.

⁵⁶⁷ Holmes (2004), p.551. Holmes’ argument about neomanagement is reminiscent of Benjamin Buchloh’s earlier ‘aesthetic of administration’. Buchloh argues that conceptual art emerged in order to displace the mass-produced aesthetic of pop art, replacing it with an ‘aesthetic of administration’, which comprised of ‘legal organisation and institutional validation.’ (p.119). He writes:

...the rights and rationale of a newly established postwar middle class, one which came fully into its own in the 1960s, could assume their aesthetic identity in the very model of the tautology and its accompanying aesthetic of administration. For this aesthetic identity is structured much the way this class’s social identity is, namely, as one of merely administering labour and production (rather than producing) and of the distribution of commodities. (p.128).

Buchloh considered conceptual art to be tautological in terms of the self-reflexive nature of the new art, exemplified in the myriad uses of the square by the minimal artists. He further argues that conceptual art ‘adopted the rigorous mimetic subjection of aesthetic experience to what Adorno had called the “totally administered world”...’ (p.143). In contrast to Holmes’ argument that artists groups, such as etoy, are

I think that Holmes misses the point. Although more ‘tongue in cheek’ than perhaps the work of a collective such as Critical Art Ensemble, etoy still pitch themselves as non-profit making, and essentially, anti-capitalist. In return for buying shares in etoy, shareholders receive a certificate bearing the etoy hologram: ‘The artist’s signature is no adequate indicator of authorship in the *etoy.UNIVERSE*.’ This document is also referred to as an artwork.⁵⁶⁸ The selling of shares in the company can also be understood as a reference to the increased shift to finance or fictional capital that has been witnessed in recent decades. The money raised from the shares is used to fund etoy’s projects, be they hacking or their ongoing ambiguous *Mission Eternity* – a project concerned with people facing death, creating a digital post-mortem of themselves to live on beyond their demise.⁵⁶⁹ Etoy purposely avoid the individuality of the ‘flexible personality’ (Holmes) by successfully eradicating the artist’s hand. They also largely avoid the pitfalls of co-optation by not producing a saleable object (with the exception of the share certificate) or even providing a service for the individual (like the Mike Smith Studio does). However, I am critical of the production of the share certificate, which can arguably become fetishised by a collector as an artwork. As with documents of performances, they become increasingly commodifiable. Etoy replicates the numerous aspects of a corporation under neoliberal capitalism – the adoption of the network; the centrality of the project to their practice; the selling of shares; the branding; the employment of individuals with diverse skills - so well, that even Holmes appears to be fooled.

merely engaging in a mimesis of neomanagement models in their practice, Buchloh is more positive about the role that the aesthetic of administration had on negating the references to artistic labour in the studio and mass-production evident in pop art. The tautological function of works, such as Ed Ruscha’s book *Twenty-Six Gasoline Stations* – which comprised of a mundane collection of photographic images of gas stations – returned art to engaging in a consideration of itself whilst also showing the inescapability of an administered world. Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, pp.105-143.

⁵⁶⁸ <http://www.etoy.com/> [Accessed: 24/08/07].

⁵⁶⁹ See <http://missioneternity.org>.

Through the dissemination of information and actions against multinational corporations, whilst also engaging the collective in which the participants are anonymous and indeterminate, I propose that activist-art rejects the artist critique through the revival of a kind of social critique.⁵⁷⁰ I have shown that even the activists utilise the tools associated with neoliberal capitalism. Without the proliferation of the model of the network or the increasing provision of the Internet, the Zapatistas' struggle may have remained only a local, rather than global, knowledge. What I have demonstrated here, is that those artworks that occur under the categories of 'relational art', 'new genre public art' and 'participatory art' are perhaps more suited to a society that has adopted the 'artist critique'. I argue that this similarity is because these practices, which often culminate in a project, retain the individualism of the artist critique. Thus, they acknowledge capitalism as a source of oppression and respond to this oppression with a call for freedom, creativity and autonomy.⁵⁷¹ The works that are 'activist' are the ones that adopt the features of 'social critique' in order to criticise a capitalism based upon individualism.

Conclusion

I have cited numerous theoreticians who have one thing in common: a concern with the economic and social conditions of a post-Fordist phase of capitalism. Some view the changes as detrimental and others see a potential for change through the dispersal of knowledge. Art is affected by the changes in modes of capitalist production and the response is divided between a positive adoption and a critical disavowal of the effects of these newer models of labour. I earlier cited three particular ways in which art responds

⁵⁷⁰ I am working with Boltanski and Chiapello's notion of 'social critique' here.

⁵⁷¹ Boltanski and Chiapello, pp.37-40.

to changes within neoliberal capitalism. These responses, in turn, are viewed as adopting the practices on the one hand, and rejecting the ideologies implemented under neoliberalism. At the same time, the latter also utilise aspects of the newer mode of production, leaving us to ultimately question the inescapability of capitalism. The focus of this chapter was on the second and third way that art responds to neoliberalism. The second way in which art responds is to adopt practices that are ‘social’ in their intentions, such as those artists associated with ‘relational aesthetics’. I argue that these artists adapt to the changes. I chose Hirschhorn’s *Bataille Monument* in order to address neoliberal capitalism’s effect on art production which is purportedly social and yet, ultimately retains the singular artist as its originator. Finally, I turned to the third way that art responds to neoliberalism, viewing activist-art as paradigmatic of the rejection of the effects of a neoliberal mode of capitalism. Despite rejecting the effects, art-activism cannot avoid adopting the methodologies born out of capitalism in order to do this.

Furthermore, I argued that the relational or social artworks retain the individualism associated with Boltanski and Chiapello’s ‘artist critique’. However, the elements of the ‘social critique’ (which has *not* been a dominant feature of capitalism since the 1960s) found in art-activism, is an attempt to criticise the dominant model of capitalism that is inherently indebted to the model of artist critique.⁵⁷² This adoption by the activists suggests that the ‘social’ is being reintegrated into this model of art practice, creating an alternative to neoliberal capitalism which is built upon the elements of artist critique.⁵⁷³

⁵⁷² It has not been unnoticed that a handful of artists’ groups, such as the Dadaists and those in Russia mentioned earlier, were a prelude to this earlier moment of ‘social critique’. The original phase of social critique was not contained within art, as I propose that it is in this later period.

⁵⁷³ In his review of the original French publication, Budgen also suggests that ‘...the social critique of capitalism is to be renewed.’ Budgen, p.155.

Harvey acknowledges the increase in ‘uneven geographical development’ as a result of globalisation:

... Geographical as well as social inequalities within the capitalist world appear to have increased over recent decades. The promised outcome of poverty reduction from freer trade, open markets and ‘neo-liberal’ strategies of globalization has not materialised.⁵⁷⁴

The freedom and autonomy that was demanded through the artist mode of critique, has been integrated into a neoliberal ideology, resulting in working models that appear autonomous and flexible in comparison to the rigidities of Fordism. Therefore, the stipulations of the artist critique have been met on the surface. However, the rising global inequality, which Harvey refers to above as uneven geographical development, calls for a newer critique or a renewal of the social critique that acknowledged the inequalities of capitalism. The art-activists respond to the developments within capitalism that have not been subsumed into the dominant capitalist ideologies by criticising them.

The recent phase of capitalism makes it increasingly difficult for the worker to separate work and non-work. Under Fordist production, the worker could distinguish between the two – as signified through the clocking-in card. The worker is now employed for his/her personal traits as opposed to manual skills thus confusing the distinction. Virno concludes, in his introduction to *A Grammar of the Multitude*, that the

⁵⁷⁴ David Harvey, ‘Notes Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development’, in *Spaces of Global Capitalism*, (London and New York: Verso, 2006), p.71.

borders between citizen and producer have become blurred.⁵⁷⁵ Virno expands upon this distinction by proposing that the contemporary multitude is, in fact, the mid-region between the individual and collective: ‘The many must be thought of as the individualisation of the universal, of the generic, of the shared experience.’⁵⁷⁶ The ‘individualisation of the universal’ is central to the neoliberal project. This centrality is epitomised by idea that the ‘new’ manager or network man works collectively with others but, ultimately, is viewed as (and views himself as) an individual who has been employed for his specific personality traits. Each participant in the temporary ‘project’ brings individual traits to the collective venture. Furthermore, for Virno, this blurred boundary between worker and non-worker leads to the subsumption of the whole person.⁵⁷⁷ This notion is akin to the difficulty in finding an outside to capitalism which can be seen with art-activism. Even those projects which are anti-capitalist in their intention utilise the techniques of capitalism and the valuable model of network in order to undertake their actions. I know this may appear hopeless and I am not calling for art activists to cease work, however my intention is to identify how capitalist work models and ideologies impact upon art making. In fact, artists are susceptible to these models and ideologies as they also form part of the social division of labour. As the distinction between work and non-work becomes harder to ascertain, the subsumption of work into everyday life quickens and the quest for profit also increases.

Each of the theorists discussed bring diverse approaches to contemporary capitalism and production. Nevertheless, correlations can be drawn between them. I have dealt with the subject of business models separately from activist-artists in order to draw out how certain aspects of neoliberalism assist art making. However, I have found

⁵⁷⁵ Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude* (Los Angeles, New York: Semiotext(e), 2004), p.24.

⁵⁷⁶ Virno (2004), p.25.

⁵⁷⁷ Virno (2004), p.41.

that Boltanski and Chiapello's thesis and Virno's are related. Despite approaching contemporary, post-Fordist capitalism from different perspectives, they are far more similar than might initially be imagined.⁵⁷⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello claim that the model of artist critique (based upon the Romantic artist) has been co-opted by capitalism and is embedded within revised business models. Virno comes to his conclusion through an engagement with classical philosophy and Marx. He proposes that the post-Fordist multitude is depoliticised because political action is appropriated by post-Fordist labour. For Virno, this manifests in the model of the virtuoso, the performing artist.

The 'virtuoso' and the model of 'great man' in the projective city (the artist as manager) are two sides of the same coin. Both are tied to non-productive labour in the Marxian sense - they do not necessarily produce a commodity, rather the work is social yet individualistic. That is, the work to be undertaken is often group work, which requires specific social skills, however the separate personalities of those who make up the group are drawn upon for the task in hand. This notion is exemplified in the model of the project leader who can work in groups but also self-directs work. Mike Smith here becomes an example as someone who runs a successful studio managing a group of craftworkers working collectively whilst also adopting the title role thus being viewed by his clients - artists - as *the* man to consult.

Virno sees virtuosity to be a model of labour that culminates in the culture industry becoming dominant in the post-Fordist era. The question of the culture industry is only implicit in Boltanski and Chiapello's *The New Spirit*, which has, in turn, been drawn upon in numerous discussions of the culture and creative industries. Like the subsumption of the artist critique into dominant business models, Virno argues that

⁵⁷⁸ Boltanski and Chiapello come from sociological and business studies perspectives and Virno adopts a philosophical approach.

virtuosity becomes characteristic of the totality of contemporary social production.⁵⁷⁹

The two accounts depart at the point where Virno embarks on an exploration of how the multitude can be repoliticised by allying intellect with political action. Arguably *The New Spirit* is less overtly political than Virno's text.

Art does not live in isolation from the political and economic climate; on the contrary, art adapts to and adopts the dominant modalities of the neoliberal workplace. Not all artists respond in the same way, yet, they do respond if only to transmute their practice - consciously or not - to more contemporary working practices; some respond critically. The 'social turn' in contemporary art is a two-sided response to neoliberal capitalism - those who adopt the practices in full and those who partially adopt if only to abhor them.⁵⁸⁰

⁵⁷⁹ Virno (2004), p.61.

⁵⁸⁰ The phrase the 'social turn' is taken from Claire Bishop, 'The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents', *Artforum* (February 2006), pp.178-183.

- Conclusion -

**Art into Life: The Artist-Turned-Cinematographer or the Call of the
'New' Avant-Garde**

As we have read in this thesis, the earlier phases of capitalism employed a mass of workers who worked together in order to produce saleable goods. The working models of Taylorism and Fordism relied upon a workforce that was cooperative but not necessarily flexible in its working methods. Each worker was a cog in a 'well-oiled machine' and if one faltered, it had an effect on the other workers. At the same time, the collective nature of work was threatened by the introduction of incentive systems that relied on the singular worker reaching his targets in order to gain a financial reward. In this example, the manager was the individual who directed and controlled the workers, workers who had the potential to become a powerful force when unionised. The subsequent dominant model of production that occurred in the neoliberal phase of capitalism is one which embraces an even more socialised worker, but one with a difference. This worker was required to be flexible and to possess the ability to adapt to diverse working environments. As already discussed, in the neoliberal workplace the manager is the epitome of the social individual: someone who is at ease working alone or with others. In the introduction to this thesis, I referred to how each distinct phase of capitalism is marked by an increased socialisation of work.⁵⁸¹ This socialisation, in turn, has affected how art has been (and continues to be) produced.

Building upon my conclusion to the previous chapter, which referenced the narrowing of the distinction between citizen and producer from Virno, I now return to question the recent re-socialisation of art and society, considering what is at stake in this

⁵⁸¹ This notion originates in my reading of Laurence Harris's contribution to Bottomore.

new 'collectivity'. It has already been argued, in the preceding chapter, that the new sociality manifests in art production on two levels: those who adapt to the new neoliberal ideologies that accompany social working tropes and secondly, those who do not, but whose work is, nevertheless, social in its basis. I conclude my thesis by considering these two aspects of art making in terms of the dyad of performance and action in relation to the task of the historical avant-garde.

The Work of Art in the Age of Technological *Production*

In the second version of Walter Benjamin's canonical essay on technology, Benjamin makes a distinction between the painter and the cinematographer, through using the analogies of the magician and the surgeon, respectively.⁵⁸² For Benjamin, the painter-magician is the creator of illusions - someone who 'maintains a natural distance from reality' - whereas, the cinematographer-surgeon 'penetrates deeply into its [reality's] tissue.'⁵⁸³ Despite the fact that cinema is, effectively, the material fact of projected light onto a surface - which initially appears not too dissimilar to the placing of paint onto a two-dimensional surface - Benjamin makes a strong argument for their difference. The distinction between the painter and the cinematographer's relationship to reality lies in their creative processes. Benjamin states that the painter presents a whole picture, whereas the cinematographer's picture is made up of parts.⁵⁸⁴ It is the penetration of reality by the apparatus (which is hidden from the audience through the process of

⁵⁸² Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility' (1936), in *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, pp.19-55.

⁵⁸³ Benjamin (1936), p.35. The validity of this analogy is unquestionable. Historically, the cinematographer has taken his audience into unimaginable places; one has only to think of the origins of the close-up in cinema (in which one can almost feel the breath of a cult movie star such as Marilyn Monroe) to confirm Benjamin's argument. Even the most proficient painter cannot take us this close to reality, for the painter is equipped with their own style which immediately signifies to the viewer the fact that we are looking at an interpretation, an illusion. We are amazed by the photorealist painters precisely because of their adeptness at creating the illusion of reality.

⁵⁸⁴ Benjamin (1936), p.35.

editing) that creates the effect of 'being-there' which the audience experiences at the cinema. Further, he concludes that film is the more significant medium for contemporary life. This significance is because of the way in which film removes the apparatus from the filmic image. Benjamin also considers the removal of the apparatus to be a typical aspect of a work of art. However, unlike a painting that retains its distance from real life, Benjamin argues that the resulting film is based upon the 'most intensive interpenetration of reality with equipment.'⁵⁸⁵ He views the medium of film to be closer to reality than that of the painter because the penetration of life by the apparatus is a reflection of a society that is becoming increasingly reliant on the apparatus.⁵⁸⁶

The caveat between work and life has increasingly narrowed under late capitalist production. We witness this narrowing on an ideological level with Ford - where a type of man evolves from this model of labour - and we see this also in the control that Ford held over the worker (i.e. the work of the sociological department). The gap between work and life appears to be dissolved within specific neoliberal working models, particularly those that appeal to the 'network man', or the co-opted artist as worker 'type'. A distinct personality is favoured: a personality that obscures the work-life boundary. As we read in Chiapello and Boltanski's analysis, the flexibility adopted in these new working practices – that of the artist-as-manager - does not cease once the worker leaves the office. The preferred network man is identified to be the man who rents his house (rather than having a permanent base), who is willing to travel for work in order to engage in temporary projects and who can adjust to any environment. The worker with 'no strings' – the nomad - is preferable for the role of Chiapello and

⁵⁸⁵ Benjamin (1936), p35.

⁵⁸⁶ This reliance on the apparatus occurs not only in the factory but also in social life.

Boltanski's great man in the projective city.⁵⁸⁷ Thus the penetration of life (by work) transpires. The traditional 'clocking in and out', with leisure time on the other side of the card, is abandoned under neoliberal capitalism.

Technology also plays a role in the collapsing of work into life that is found in the 'network man' model.⁵⁸⁸ If we return to Benjamin's proposition that the audience confronts the apparatus in visiting the cinema, we can see how the introduction of communication technologies into society had a similar effect to those that occurred with the advent of film. For Benjamin, rather than the audience relinquishing their humanity to the machine (which they do as workers in the factory), they partake in collective reception at the cinema. Laughing together before a Chaplin movie is seen as progressive and, therefore, the alienation felt before the machine at work is abandoned at the cinema doors.⁵⁸⁹ Factory production takes place en masse and I propose that the homogenisation of labour that occurs when machines are introduced into the workplace is in no way countered by the advent of film. Moreover, the collective mass of workers is reflected in the mass audience of the cinema. However, because of the association with pleasure and leisure time, the relationship between the collectivity of the factory and the collectivity of cinema appears distinct. The penetration of reality by the cinematographer-surgeon is epitomised by the apparent absence of the apparatus and the close-up in film.

⁵⁸⁷ For their discussion of the ideal type of manager as a 'nomad', see: Boltanski and Chiapello, pp.122-125.

⁵⁸⁸ In order for the reader to follow my argument, I will refer to this new type of 'artist as worker' manager/project leader/ neoliberal worker as 'network man' from this point forth.

⁵⁸⁹ Benjamin claims:

The technological reproducibility of the artwork changes the relation of the masses to art. The extremely backward attitude toward a Picasso painting changes into a highly progressive reaction to a Chaplin film.

The effect that film had on the masses in Benjamin's analysis is paralleled in the contemporary period through considering the invention of the Personal Computer (PC) and more importantly, the Internet. The PC originated as a work tool - a more efficient word processing tool (replacing the now obsolete manual typewriter) - only to become the paradigmatic machine in the office (and also the factory, for example, Computer Aided Design) whilst simultaneously functioning as leisure technology. As work becomes more individualised under late capitalism, so the PC becomes more powerful. The Internet - originally a military tool - has transformed work and leisure. Today, the PC coupled with the Internet traverses the bounds of work and non-work, its myriad uses include business, social networking, shopping, research and art. How does Benjamin's thesis translate when the apparatus that the audience confronts is the same as that which replaces their humanity at work? In this equation, the technology is experienced individually at home and also at work but the effect of the apparatus on work appears to be the same. Furthermore, this technology – and I am now thinking specifically about laptops, tablets and mobile phones – is mobile. The network man no longer needs to be in the office (or the home-office for that matter), he can now work on the train, in the car (with hands-free kits), on a plane, in a café...practically anywhere.⁵⁹⁰ Work, with the assistance of technological development, has now completely penetrated leisure time. Benjamin believed that: 'The most important social function of film was to establish equilibrium between human beings and the apparatus.'⁵⁹¹ Something that, I believe, has come to manifest in the contemporary period. As work blurs into leisure time, the distinction between art and work is also obfuscated.

⁵⁹⁰ Melissa Gregg, in a recent paper, spoke about how work obligations move into the home with the implementation of mobile technologies. This paper was based upon research published in her book *Work's Intimacy* (Queensland: Polity, 2011) which explores the impact of online technology on the work and lifestyles of professional employees. Melissa Gregg, 'Labour Politics and the State of Exception', *Moral Economies of Creative Labour* conference, University of Leeds, 7th-8th July 2011.

⁵⁹¹ Benjamin, p.37.

Performance versus Action

The collapsing of work into life warrants a consideration of the task of the historical avant-garde that Peter Bürger delineates: that is, a call for the return of art into life praxis.⁵⁹² Before I address Bürger's thesis, we need to distinguish between those artists who perform 'life' and those who penetrate it (as with film). A recurrent issue within this thesis is the dichotomy of art as performance versus art as action or actuality. The question of what constitutes the performative arises in texts addressing the machination of art and those that address art-activism alike.⁵⁹³ Firstly, the question of the performative appears when addressing contracted labour in art. The adoption of industrial techniques within the studio, epitomised by the photographs of Andy Warhol's assistants screen printing in his pre-1968 *Factory* with Warhol wistfully on-looker, have been delineated as performance by both John Roberts and Caroline Jones in their respective texts.⁵⁹⁴ In 'Warhol's "Factory"', Roberts calls Warhol's working method a 'performative "industrial aesthetic."⁵⁹⁵ Roberts sees this performative as being driven by a concern for the dissolution of the male artist's ego through presenting collective life in the studio as opposed to that of the solitary male. Roberts' essay concentrates on Warhol's image as a collaborative artist, he states that: '...teamwork for Warhol was closer to the preferred notion of the group performance...'⁵⁹⁶ Despite Warhol's adoption of pseudo-industrial production methods (screen-printing on the studio floor rather than in the 'real' factory) his methods were integral to distinguish his own artist-image from the more dominant lone masculine artist in the studio. Similarly,

⁵⁹² Despite the similarities between Benjamin's notion of the penetration of life by the apparatus and Bürger's return of art into life praxis (i.e. the penetration of life by art), Bürger is critical of Benjamin's argument in 'The Work of Art' essay. Bürger views Benjamin's proposition that technological development had an effect on society to be part of social history and not exclusively influential on art. See Bürger, pp.28-34.

⁵⁹³ This question is raised in Roberts (2004), Jones, Kuo and Wright (2004).

⁵⁹⁴ Roberts (2004) and Jones.

⁵⁹⁵ Roberts (2004), p.345.

⁵⁹⁶ Roberts (2004), p.344.

Jones argues that the introduction of the ‘machine in the studio’ was foremost in response to the image of the masculine artist in the studio that was founded in nineteenth-century Romanticism. Her concept of the ‘technological sublime’, discussed in chapter one of this thesis, comprises of the *iconic* and the *performative* aspects. The iconic has a technological or industrial index, whereas the performative lies in the mode of production *aspiring to be, resembling or implying* an industrial process which suggests: ‘a collaboratively generated technological solution or mechanistic goal.’⁵⁹⁷ The practices of the 1960s’ artists that Jones discusses in her book – those of Stella, Smithson and Warhol - all encompass varying degrees of the two aspects. For Jones, these artists perform the worker whilst embracing some of the qualities of actual industrial production methods. The performative, for these artists, lies in collaboration.

I do not believe that the 1960s’ artists involved with the fabrication firms discussed in my thesis were concerned with ‘performing’ when they went to fabricators for assistance. The fact that this practice commonly does not take precedence in the dominant discourse on the artist, either affirms the failure of the performance (with no audience and thus an unsuccessful piece) or the fact that it was never performance in the first place. I side with the latter. In addition, the contracting of a fabrication firm is not collaborative in its true sense; the fabricators certainly do not view it this way, Peter Carlson stresses: ‘We do not collaborate with artists. We work for them.’⁵⁹⁸ The exchange between artist and fabricator is ultimately a business exchange in which the skill and craft knowledge of the fabricators is bought. For those artists, discussed in chapter one, who utilised and continue to use fabricators, the fact that the works of art are manufactured at a fabrication firm is secondary to the sculptures produced. The fabricator is not a performer nor is he part of the ‘set’ - he is a labourer.

⁵⁹⁷ Jones, p.55.

⁵⁹⁸ Peter Carlson cited in Pagel, p.E33.

Collaboration as Performance

In order to elaborate upon Jones' analysis, in which the performative category is aligned with collaboration, I now turn to question whether collaborative art is performance. I have stated that fabrication is exempt from being considered as collaboration in an artistic sense; I now turn my attention to those art practices discussed in chapter three. If we reverse the question (i.e. is performance collaborative?) there are a lot of early performance pieces that are collaborative or group performances - the 1964 performance piece *Site* by Robert Morris (and Carolee Schneeman), for example; Hi Red Center's *Cleaning Event* (1963-4) and Yoko Ono's *Cut Piece* (1964).⁵⁹⁹ Although not true for all performance art, the presence of an audience implies a form of collectivity, with the audience often considered to be completing the works. I believe that the relational works of the late 1990s are indebted to a combination of performance art and installation art. In these pieces the element of performance can be found in the relationship between artist, art and viewer. As in Ono's much earlier *Cut Piece*, the audience is invited to take part. In the absence of the artist Gonzalez-Torres, viewers eat from his piles of sweets, which extends the artwork beyond its formal arrangement to one that the audience physically participates in and digests even.⁶⁰⁰ Do relational works, in fact, *perform* relations? The relations that occur between viewer and artist are often encouraged or facilitated relations. I propose that the artificiality of these relations equates to a kind of performance.

⁵⁹⁹ Morris's 1964 *Site* was a performance featuring Carolee Schneeman, in which Morris performed the 'picture plane' (planes of wood/board). Morris moved the boards to reveal Schneeman laid in a pose referencing that of Manet's *Olympia* (1863). The piece was clearly a critique of modernist painting. A clip from *Site* can be found here: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvaZ4Ehdk_Q. Ono's *Cut Piece* (1964) involved audience members being invited to cut Ono's clothes from her body. Hi-Red Center's *Cleaning Event* is discussed in my introduction.

⁶⁰⁰ Today this is continued posthumously.

I take up Stephen Wright's proposition, from his essay 'The Essence of Artistic Collaboration', that art in the twentieth century takes a 'disoperative turn'.⁶⁰¹ That is, twentieth century art turns to prioritise the process rather than object making. Wright views this move to the foregrounding of the process in art as *performative*.⁶⁰² He argues that the performative aspect hinders 'meaningful collaboration' and points to the artists associated with Bourriaud's 'relational aesthetics' as the protagonists of this hindrance. Those who provide, to quote Wright:

... very contrived services to people who never asked for them, or rope them into some frivolous interaction, then expropriate as the material for their work whatever the minimal labour they have managed to extract from these more or less unwitting participants (whom they sometimes have the gall to describe as "co-authors").⁶⁰³

Wright argues that through undertaking the above, the 'relational' artists replicate the kind of class-based relations that Marx saw in the capitalist economy. I am inclined to agree, particularly when we return to those 'antagonistic' artists omitted from Bourriaud's text but who are nonetheless associated with relational works, Sierra for example.⁶⁰⁴ What, then, is the alternative for Wright?

As discussed in the previous chapter, Wright evokes the Chomskyan linguistics term 'competence' in identifying a counter to the performative which he claims modernism inflicted on art. Competence, or artistic competencies, thus extends to the

⁶⁰¹ Stephen Wright, 'The Essence of Artistic Collaboration', *Third Text*, 'Art and Collaboration' issue (2004), p.534.

⁶⁰² Parallel to this is the notion that types of labour, such as affective labour, have given rise to a performative model of labour. Barry King writes: 'So it is that from the side of Capital and Labour alike, work is re-valourised as a performance, stealthily centred on the micro-management of the individual.' King, p.342.

⁶⁰³ Wright, p.535.

⁶⁰⁴ For a discussion of the antagonistic artists, see Bishop (2004).

pragmatics of a situation, the ability to anticipate effects, relying on context to complete meaning and always seeing content in terms of form.⁶⁰⁵ In short, Wright's competence endorses those artworks which I have referred to as 'art-activism' and that have, in Wright's words, 'impaired visibility as art'. The Yes Men, Bureau d'Etudes and ®TMark are amongst those whom he lists.⁶⁰⁶ He proposes that these groupings are distinct from the relational artists in the fact that they utilise their artistic competencies within a collective project, without forsaking their own autonomy. The skills they bring complement those of others in the project, bringing about collective action. The distinction is yet again drawn between relational projects and those of the art-activist, one that I have delineated as that of performance versus action.

The notion of the performative consistently reappears in discussions about contemporary capitalism and art. In the third chapter, I entered into an analysis of Chiapello and Boltanski's thesis regarding the adoption of the artist model by business models in the 1990s. Building upon this analysis, I turned to Virno's model of the 'virtuoso', which develops Chiapello and Boltanski's 'artist' model to specify the performing artist as the character of new models of worker in contemporary capitalism. Virtuosity comprises the combination of intellect and work, thus we encounter the kind of work delineated as the service industries, which are closely aligned with performance. Virno claims that: 'Work has absorbed the distinctive traits of political action.'⁶⁰⁷ In the face of a society comprising of 'performers', Virno readdresses the possibilities of a politically engaged alternative to the virtuoso. Analogous to Wright's category of competence and my own 'action', Virno calls for a coalition between intellect and action in the face of virtuosity. The multitude is the society made up of virtuosos; only when the individuals that make up the multitude align intellect with

⁶⁰⁵ Wright, p.546.

⁶⁰⁶ Wright, p.546.

⁶⁰⁷ Virno (1996), p.189.

action, rather than work, do they become re-politicised. Let it be clear that Virno is not necessarily writing about artistic practice here, as Wright and I do, he is looking at the wider division of labour under capitalism. However, I believe that a response to Virno's call can be found in recent art-activist practices that marry intellect and action.⁶⁰⁸

Art into Life: the Call of the Historical Avant-Garde

Virno's appeal for an alliance between intellect and political action has commonalities with Bürger's theory of the avant-garde, in particular, the call for the return of art to life praxis, in order to revolutionise life. In the following section, I consider Bürger's theory of the avant-garde. I stress the pertinence of the arguments about performance and action to the 'art into life praxis' element of the historical avant-gardiste artists that Bürger recounts. How far do the works of art or artists *perform* reality and how far do they *permeate* reality, thus affecting it? In Bürger's analysis, there are two distinct periods in which he identifies an avant-garde in art - the historical and the neo - around the 1920s and the 1960s, respectively.⁶⁰⁹ The historical avant-garde was successful in revolutionising the concept of art. The original concept - the *organic* artwork - involved a consideration of the parts of the work in terms of the whole, whilst the new concept - the *inorganic* artwork - comprised of a contradictory relationship between

⁶⁰⁸ Writing about literature, Benjamin discusses the relationship between intellect and revolution in 'The Author as Producer', which offers an interesting diversion in which to view Virno's call for the marrying of intellect and action (which I further identify as a trait of the art-activists). Referring to the 'bourgeois Left' in 1930s' Germany, Benjamin denounces the revolutionary potential of Activists (a specific branch of intellectual literary writers) because of the intellectual nature of their production. He states that their founding principle is reactionary not revolutionary. What this group of activists lack, for Benjamin, is a solidarity with the worker as a *producer*. They do not work alongside the proletariat with whom their cause is aligned. It is in this notion that perhaps one could argue that, in contemporary society, the new art-activists *are* aligned with the worker because of the way in which certain types of labour are now affective, based around projects, utilising communication technologies etc. The art-activist - and particularly those groupings such as the Carrot Workers Collective and the Precarious Workers' Brigade in Britain - finds their basis in the work that they attempt to revolutionise. Benjamin, 'The Author as Producer' (1934), in *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, pp.79-95.

⁶⁰⁹ Notably, both periods of the avant-garde in Bürger's analysis are ones in which artists' collectives are prominent, for example, the Dada artists - whose work was often undertaken as group performance - and also, later, Robert Rauschenberg, Jasper Johns and John Cage, who collaborated together on performance pieces.

‘heterogeneous elements’.⁶¹⁰ Despite the revolutionary affect that historical avant-garde had on art, Bürger argues that they were unsuccessful in returning art to life praxis, the intention of which was to revolutionise life. Furthermore, Bürger claims that, as the avant-garde artwork lost its shock value, the neo-avant-garde – through continuing the avant-gardiste tropes - institutionalised the avant-garde as art.⁶¹¹ Neither grouping was successful in fully radicalising the social effects of artistic practice. Similarly, once Virno’s ‘virtuoso’ – whose potential lay in the alliance of intellect with work – was co-opted by capitalism, the multitude became politically inactive.

I propose that some of the artists discussed in the final chapter of this thesis represent a new phase of avant-gardiste artists.⁶¹² These artists, I argue, have furthered the original task of the avant-garde to return art to life praxis. Bürger states towards the end of his book that: ‘...avant-garde and engagement ultimately coincide.’⁶¹³ The type of engagement that Bürger writes about here is formally defined, never fully crossing into life praxis. However, Bürger argues that the work of art nevertheless entered into a new relationship with reality as a result of this engagement.⁶¹⁴ As an example of the historical avant-garde, Bürger focuses upon the Dadaists (Duchamp also being included in this) whose work was intentionally performative. The selection of a mass-produced object to enter into the gallery space, the reciting of ‘nonsense’ poetry and the writing of

⁶¹⁰ Bürger, p.82. In his analysis of the historical avant-garde, Andreas Huyssen writes:

...the avantgarde liberated technology from its instrumental aspects and thus undermined both bourgeois notions of technology as progress and art as ‘natural,’ ‘autonomous,’ and ‘organic.’

Andreas Huyssen, p.11.

⁶¹¹ Bürger, p.58. These tropes include shock, chance (as in the work of the Surrealists), fragmentation (including montage) and politics.

⁶¹² This claim is contrary to that of Huyssen who, in 1986, stated: ‘Not only is the historical avantgarde a thing of the past, but it is also useless to try to revive it under any guise.’ However, Huyssen appears to ‘back peddle’ as, in the subsequent paragraph, he asserts: ‘Today the best hopes of the historical avantgarde may not be embodied in art works at all, but in decentered movements which work toward the transformation of everyday life.’ Huyssen, p.15. In this conclusion, I argue that it is the ambiguous position of the art-activists between art and non-art that allows for them to be thought of as the new avant-garde.

⁶¹³ Bürger, p.91.

⁶¹⁴ Bürger, p.91.

group manifestos all signify the performative.⁶¹⁵ The Dada performances allowed for subsequent avant-garde artists to build and expand upon the model and to continue in their attempts at dissolving art into life. Performance becomes established within art practice; it is found in the newer relational practices recounted in chapter three. The attempt at bringing art into life is apparent in the contemporary works; like those artists in Bürger's analysis, a new relationship to reality is established if only temporarily. Despite these attempts – for example, Hirschhorn's *Bataille Monument* - the failure to return art into life praxis, and its revolutionary consequences, is evident through the attachment that these works have to the art institution and to the institution of art itself.⁶¹⁶

I do, however, propose that the task of the historical avant-garde - to return art to life praxis - is achieved in specific contemporary practices. This success occurs on two fronts: firstly, within the economy and, secondly, at the level of politics. For the economic, I turn again to the art fabricators. I cautiously suggest that contracted labour is an assimilation of the return of art into life praxis. The fabrication model presents *actual* labour in the face of a mythology built upon the idea of the individual artist. It is not the employment of industrial methods that is important per se, but the establishment of businesses and 'factories' primarily for the production of works of art that truly brings art into life or actuality. The separation between the two becomes indistinct. The symbiotic relationship between the Mike Smith Studio and certain YBAs is indicative of my proposition above. Art thus permeates the economy through the establishment of

⁶¹⁵ Interestingly, both Bürger and Benjamin concede that Dada disrupted life through its shock value. Benjamin argues that Dada preceded film in attempting to produce the effects that people seek in film. Benjamin, p.38-9.

⁶¹⁶ Hirschhorn, if we recall, has no interest in his work being anything more than 'art', despite its political nature. The resemblance to the virtuoso here is clear – the performing artist. Only once he is politicised is he truly effective.

Radical Culture Research Collective's interpretation of relational aesthetics is fitting: 'Precisely formulated, relational aesthetics represents the *liberalisation* of the avant-garde project of radical transformation.' Radical Culture Research Collective. Their emphasis.

these types of business. The fabricators have successfully brought art into economic life. The manufacture of works of art is now an (niche) industry in itself and very much part of the capitalist division of labour with the art produced being inseparable from the methods that produce it. However, and this is rather a large ‘but’, Bürger anticipated that the avant-gardiste work would be political in its nature and also that it would overthrow the institution of art. The fabricators are not political in their intentions; neither do they exist in isolation from the institution of art. Once the fabricators became established, they became part of the institution.

The second way that art is brought into life praxis is with art-activism. This proposition may appear somewhat contradictory, as I have already aired my doubts over whether art-activism comfortably resides in the art world. Notwithstanding, it is, in fact, the ambiguity of these practices that confirms their success in permeating ‘actuality’ or, to use Bürger’s term, life praxis. The art-activists, like the historical avant-garde, attempt to overthrow the institution of art through redefining the concept of art. When we read earlier about the Guaraná Power project, one has to wonder why this project is being discussed in an art context. It is precisely this question – and the accompanying detachment from the institution of art – that allows for a social change, outside of the art institution.⁶¹⁷ As I understand it, this result is akin to what Bürger hoped for in the work of the historical avant-garde.

⁶¹⁷ In his Foreword to *The Interventionists* exhibition catalogue, Joseph Thompson writes: ‘Interventionist art does not always sit well in museums, produced, as much as it was, to create situations in the world at large.’ Thompson, ‘Foreword’, in *The Interventionists: Users’ Manual for the Creative Disruption of Everyday Life*, ed. by Gregory Sholette and Nato Thompson, (Massachusetts: Mass MOCA, 2004), p.10.

The Yes Men: Fact or Friction?

The Yes Men are a good example of a collective who make interventions into real life.⁶¹⁸ By ‘real life’, I refer to the fact that their interventions are directed at potentially world-changing events such as summits where political and ecological issues are to be discussed. Moreover, they undertake acts of ‘civil disobedience’, which Virno claims is one way in which the coupling of intellect with action can occur.⁶¹⁹ Although their work has an element of the performance - for example the practice of ‘identity correction’ (appearing as a representative of a major corporation or the World Trade Organisation at events and even on TV - the BBC being a point in case) - it crosses into reality because the audience is unaware that the Yes Men representative is performing. The Yes Men member is, on one hand, the virtuoso; on the other hand, he aligns his intellect with action, rather than putting it to work for capital. Their *New York Times* spoof of September 2009 presents an example to explore. On the eve of a major UN climate change summit to be held in New York, the Yes Men - alongside other activists - collated and distributed a fake edition of the *New York Times* in the city, which boasted the headline ‘We’re Screwed’. The Yes Men claimed that, despite the newspaper being a fake, the information included was 100% accurate, presenting the factual realities of climate change.⁶²⁰ The facade may be false or misleading but the actual acts are affective through activist means. The effect of which is the dissemination of political information to the general public. This type of action is what I understand Virno to be calling for when he states that we need to assimilate knowledge with action.⁶²¹ The Yes Men’s events do not recreate relations in the institutional setting but present factual

⁶¹⁸ The Yes Men, however, are by no means the canonical example of what I am to argue is the ‘new avant-garde’. I refer to their practice here in order to substantiate my argument. Other radical or art-activist groupings are equally as qualified for the accolade - @TMmark, for example.

⁶¹⁹ Virno (2004), p.69.

⁶²⁰ See Hijinks section on the Yes Men website, <http://theyesmen.org/hijinks/newyorkpost> [Accessed: 31/08/10].

⁶²¹ Virno (2004), p.68.

information through interventions into the real world. These actions have the potential to make a difference through, firstly, drawing attention to themselves in order to make people aware of the issues that they highlight.⁶²²

Conclusion

Returning to consider the task of the avant-garde, the Yes Men primarily make political work that goes beyond the institution of art, and which redefines what art is through their ambiguous relationship to art itself. Bürger states: ‘The engaged work can be successful only if the engagement itself is the unifying principle that articulates itself throughout the work (and this includes its form).’⁶²³ He further argues that: ‘Art as an institution neutralises the political content of an individual work.’⁶²⁴ How can we understand this in those practices that take work onto the streets? Are they ultimately institutionalised once they are considered in art discourse? Bürger claims that art as an institution determines the measure of political effect that the avant-gardiste works have.⁶²⁵ There is still some way to go, but perhaps the art-activists, through acting outside of the institution, will succeed where Bürger’s historical avant-garde artists failed. Virno concedes that civil disobedience is one way of aligning intellect with action. If the contemporary multitude is made up of virtuosos, who are said to be creative social individuals, the potential to put their intellect to use is still possible. The art-activists are paradigmatic of this assimilation.

In conclusion, let us return to Benjamin to consider the substantive change in the role of the artist that has taken place since the age of technological reproducibility. The

⁶²² Some of the hijinks are less serious in their presentation, yet the interventions have purpose beyond art. Exemplary of the Yes Men’s humour is the member who passed himself off as a representative of the World Trade Organisation wearing a suit with a large protruding screen attached (looking suspiciously similar to a golden phallus). The attached screen was named the ‘employee visualisation appendage’. For a full account of the story, see: <http://theyesmen.org/hijinks/tampere>.

⁶²³ Bürger, p.89.

⁶²⁴ Bürger, p.90

⁶²⁵ Bürger, p.92.

contemporary artist no longer adopts the traditional role of the painter; the artist – or, more germane, the artists’ collective – is now liable to take on the role of the cinematographer-surgeon. That is, the contemporary artist penetrates life praxis; the audience no longer experiences the *effect* of ‘being-there’ – they are there.⁶²⁶ This was the task of the historical avant-garde. As Benjamin wrote: ‘Every epoch, in fact, not only dreams the one to follow but, in dreaming, precipitates its awakening.’⁶²⁷

⁶²⁶ I am referring, of course, to the practices discussed in the final chapter of this thesis and, in particular, the work that extends beyond performance into something akin to reality.

⁶²⁷ Benjamin, ‘Paris the Capital of the Nineteenth Century’ (1935), in *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, pp.96-115 (p.109).

- *Afterword* -

Nobody is Safe: The Art-makers and the Economic Crisis

The economic downturn has had a substantial effect on the subject of thesis, in particular, on those who make works of art for artists.⁶²⁸ When the American market took a nosedive in the late 1980s, boat-builders turned to building works of art in order to survive the economy.⁶²⁹ The tables have now turned and this time around the fabricators have been hit by the global recession. On April 28th 2010, Lindsay Pollock reported that Carlson & Co. was shutting its doors.⁶³⁰ She stated that Carlson would be ‘filing something “akin” to bankruptcy’.⁶³¹ The closing down of the company followed Carlson’s firing of its entire workforce the previous week. The suggestion of some kind of financial trouble for Carlson was predicted in Jori Finkel’s 2008 article on Carlson’s work with Jeff Koons.⁶³² In the article, Finkel recounts how work on Koon’s ambitious ‘Celebration’ series was put on hold in 1996 when the costs overran, to be later resumed in 2000. At the time of reporting, Carlson & Co. were finalising plans, after undertaking a two-year feasibility study, for Koons’ latest large-scale sculpture – a reproduction of a Baldwin locomotive for the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, estimated to cost up to \$25 million.⁶³³ The piece was, reportedly, to be Carlson & Co’s most ambitious undertaking. The formidable artwork could not have come at an economically worse time for the firm. At the close of his article, Finkel states the obvious when he follows Mr Suman’s statement about waiting for Koons’ to decide how he is to proceed, with:

⁶²⁸ My research began in 2007 before the worst of the recession hit the UK in 2008.

⁶²⁹ For more information see: Susan Diesenhouse, ‘As Sales Drop, Builders of Boats Turn to Artworks’, *The New York Times*, 20th March 1988.

⁶³⁰ Lindsay Pollock, ‘Koons “Dog” Fabricator Carlson Shuts as Recession Hits Big Art’, Bloomberg, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-04-28/koons-balloon-dog-fabricator-carlson-closes-as-recession-topples-big-art.html> [Accessed: 04/03/2011].

⁶³¹ Pollock.

⁶³² Jori Finkel, ‘At the Ready When Artists Think Big’, *The New York Times*, April 27th 2008, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/27/arts/design/27fink.html> [Accessed: 22/03/2010]

⁶³³ This is Finkel’s estimate, Carlson & Co. refused to divulge this information.

‘And no doubt to drum up the financing in a shaky economy.’⁶³⁴ Diesenhouse reported that Carlson & Co. were in the middle of manufacturing Koons’ locomotive sculpture when they closed.⁶³⁵

Carlson & Co. is not the only art-maker to be affected by the recession. The British foundry Morris Singer - which cast the Trafalgar Square Lions and artworks for Henry Moore and Barbara Hepworth - went into administration in 2010 after struggling to survive for a number of years.⁶³⁶ They sold their name in 2005 and moved to new premises in Essex, but the foundry did not avoid going into administration. In 2008, it was reported that Damien Hirst had decided to not renew the temporary contracts of workers at his ‘art-producing company’ Science Ltd.⁶³⁷ He decided to let twenty staff go, including those who make the pills for his drug cabinets and who work on his butterfly paintings. Jude Tyrell, one of the directors of Science Ltd, stated: ‘We have to be mindful of the current economic climate and how this may affect us in the future.’⁶³⁸ Prior to this revelation, Hirst had stated in July of the same year that he was to stop making the spin and butterfly paintings and also the medicine cabinets for fear of overproduction in the artworld.⁶³⁹

The effect that the recession has had on Western art making only reinforces the argument that art is not isolated from the economy. The closing of fabricators and

⁶³⁴ Finkel.

⁶³⁵ Diesenhouse.

⁶³⁶ Amy Frizell, ‘Historic Morris Singer metal foundry to close its doors’, Independent.co.uk, 21st May 2010, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/historic-morris-singer-metal-foundry-to-close-its-doors-1978696.html?service=Print> [Accessed: 14/08/2011].

⁶³⁷ Aidan Jones, Kevin Dowling and Helen Pidd, ‘Alas, poor Damien: recession reaches Hirst’s studios’, *The Guardian* (Saturday 22nd November 2008), p.1 & p.8.

⁶³⁸ Jones, Dowling and Pidd, p.8.

⁶³⁹ Hirst, in conversation with Tim Marlow, stated: ‘The spots are going to stay, I’m going to carry on doing those, the butterflies are going to stop, I’m going to stop the spins, and with the formaldehydes, there are just a few works I want to make.’ Cited in: Scott Reyburn, ‘Hirst Will Stop Making Spin, Butterfly Paintings, Drug Cabinets’, *Bloomberg*, 14th August 2008, <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aJGLePFMDyNA&refer=home> [Accessed: 11/08/2011].

foundries, in some ways, signals the decline of a tradition.⁶⁴⁰ However, there are fabricators who have survived thus far.⁶⁴¹ As the economy moves on, so does the way in which artists make art. While artists strive to react against the institution of art, the tradition changes again. Presently, contemporary artists are adopting a more performative or active turn, in the face of a waning economy.⁶⁴²

⁶⁴⁰ The tradition of public art is also affected by the closing of the fabricators, signalling a change in the nature and medium of public art.

⁶⁴¹ At the time of writing, Gemini G.E.L.'s doors are still open and those of the Mike Smith Studio (albeit after moving premises in 2009), whilst Donald and Alfred Lippincott work with other shops in order to assist artists after closing their fabrication shop in 1994. Patterson Sims writes that they decided to close Lippincott Inc 'in response to changes in the art world.' Jonathan Lippincott, p.21.

⁶⁴² One could argue that the newer turn is less 'material' and perhaps the foundries and fabricators become redundant for a specific type of artist within the contemporary period, that is, those who act or perform rather than build and manufacture.

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor, *Aesthetic Theory* (1970) (London: Continuum, 2004)
- Adorno, Theodor, and others, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York and London: W.W.Norton & Company, 1982)
- *Artist and Fabricator*, exhibition catalogue, Fine Arts Center Gallery, University of Massachusetts/Amherst (1975)
- Auston, Rob and Lee Devin, *Artful Making: What Managers Need to Know About How Artists Work* (New Jersey: Financial Times Prentice Hall, 2003)
- Banks, Mark, *The Politics of Cultural Work* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)
- Bann, Stephen, ed, *The Tradition of Constructivism* (New York: The Viking Press, 1974)
- Baran, Paul and Paul Sweezy, *Monopoly Capital: An essay on the American economic and social order* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
- Barrell, John, *The Dark Side of the Landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1980)
- Basualdo, Carlos, 'Bataille Monument, Documenta 11, 2002', in *Thomas Hirschhorn* (London: Phaidon, 2004), pp. 94-109
- Benjamin, Walter, 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility' (Second version, 1936), in *The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility and Other Writings on Media*, ed. by Michael W. Jennings and others (Cambridge, Mass. & London: Belknap, 2008), pp.19-57
- Bevin, Rose, 'The Triumph of Hirstworld', *Art Newspaper*, 14 (November 2004), p.47
- Beynon, Huw, *Working for Ford* (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 1973)
- Bishop, Claire, 'Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics', *October*, 110 (2004), pp. 51-79
- Bishop, Claire, 'The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents', *Artforum* (February 2006), pp. 178-183
- Blackledge, Paul, 'The New Spirit of Capitalism' book review, *Capital & Class*, 92 (2007), pp.198-201
- Boltanski, Luc and Chiapello, Eve, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2005)

- Boltanski, Luc, and Thévenot, Laurent, *De la justification: les économies de la grandeur* (Paris: Gallimard, 1991)
- Bolt Rasmussen, Mikkel, 'The Politics of Interventionist Art: The Situationist International, Artist Placement Group, and Art Workers' Coalition', *Rethinking Marxism*, 21:1, pp.34-49.
- Bottomore, Tom, ed., *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, 2nd edn (Oxford, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001)
- Bourriaud, Nicolas, *Postproduction* (New York: Lukas & Sternberg, 2002)
- Bourriaud, Nicolas, *Relational Aesthetics*, trans. by Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods (Les presses du réel, 2002)
- Bradley, Will and Charles Esche, eds, *Art and Social Change: A Reader* (London: Tate, 2007)
- Bryan-Wilson, Julia, *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2009)
- Buchloh, Benjamin H. D., 'An Interview With Thomas Hirschhorn', *October*, 113 (Summer 2005), pp.77-100
- Buchloh, Benjamin H. D., 'Conceptual Art 1962-1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions', *October*, 55 (Winter, 1990), pp.105-143
- Budgen, Sebastian, 'A New Spirit of Capitalism', *New Left Review*, 1 (January/February 2000), pp.149-156
- Burawoy, Michael, *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes under Capitalism and Socialism* (London: Routledge, 1985)
- Bürger, Peter, *Theory of the Avant-Garde* (1984) (Minneapolis: Minnesota, 2004)
- Burgin, Victor, 'The End of Art Theory', in *The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity* (London & Hampshire: Macmillan, 1986), pp.140-204
- Burn, Gordon, and Damien Hirst, eds, *On the Way to Work* (London: Faber and Faber, 2001)
- Callinicos, Alex, *The Resources of Critique* (Cambridge: Polity, 2006)
- Camfield, David, 'The Multitude and the Kangaroo: A Critique of Hardt and Negri's Theory of Immaterial Labour', *Historical Materialism*, 15 (2007), pp.21-52

- Camfield, William A., 'Marcel Duchamp's Fountain: Its History and Aesthetics in the Context of 1917', *Marcel Duchamp: Artist of the Century*, ed. by Rudolf E. Kuenzli and Francis M. Naumann (Massachusetts: MIT, 1989), pp.64-94
- Chiapello, Eve, 'Evolution and Co-optation: The "Artist Critique" of Management and Capitalism', *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.585-594
- Chipps Smith, Jeffrey, *The Northern Renaissance* (Phaidon: London, 2004)
- Clark T. J., *The Absolute Bourgeois: Artists and Politics in France 1848-1851* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1982)
- Clark T. J., *The Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1982)
- *Collective Creativity*, exhibition catalogue, Kunstshalle Fridericianum, Kassel (2005)
- Craig, Patsy, ed., *Making Art Work* (London: Trolley, 2003)
- Davis, Hugh Marlais, 'Artist and Fabricator', in *Artist & Fabricator*, exhibition catalogue, Fine Arts Center Gallery, University of Massachusetts/Amherst (1975)
- Day, Gail, 'The Fear of Heteronomy', *Third Text*, 23:4 (July 2009), pp.393-406
- Deck, François, 'Reciprocal Expertise', *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.617-632
- Doogan, Kevin, *New Capitalism? The Transformation of Work* (Cambridge, Malden: Polity, 2009)
- Dowling, Emma, and others, 'Immaterial and Affective Labour: Explored', *Ephemera*, 7:1 (2007), pp.1-7.
- Duchamp, Marcel, 'Apropos of Readymades' (1961), *Art and Artists*, 1:4 (July 1966)
- Dyer-Witford, Nick, 'Cyber-Negri: General Intellect and Immaterial Labour', in *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice*, vol.1, ed. by Timothy S. Murphy and Abdul-Karim Mustapha (London: Pluto, 2005), pp.136-162
- Edwards, Steve, 'A Duchamp for the Left?', *Radical Philosophy*, 149 (May/June 2008), pp.56-58
- Edwards, Steve, 'Disastrous Documents', *Ten*, 8, 15 (1984), pp.12-23
- Edwards, Steve, *The Making of English Photography: Allegories* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, 2006)
- Elsen, Albert, *Rodin's Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003)

- Farris, Sara, 'New and Old Spirits of Capitalism', *International Review of Social History*, 55 (2010), pp.297-306.
- Fine, Ruth E., *Gemini G.E.L. Art and Collaboration* (New York: Abbeville Press, 1984)
- Fineberg, Jonathan, *Art Since 1940: Strategies of Being*, 2nd edn (London: Lawrence King, 2000).
- Finklestein, Nat, *Andy Warhol: The Factory Years* (Edinburgh: Canongate Books, 1999)
- Fischer, Ernst, *The Necessity of Art* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963)
- Florida, Richard, *The Rise of the Creative Class And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2002)
- Foster, Hal, 'Arty Party', *London Review of Books*, 25:23 (December 2003), pp.21-11
- Foster, Hal, 'Towards a Grammar of Emergency', *New Left Review*, 68 (March/April 2011), pp.105-118
- Foster, Hal, 'What's Neo about the Neo-Avant-Garde?', *October*, 70 (Autumn 1994), pp.5-32
- Foster, John Bellamy, 'A Classic of Our Time: "Labour and Monopoly Capital" after a Quarter of a Century', *Monthly Review* (January 1999)
- Foucault, Michel, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*, ed. by Michel Senellart (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)
- Fried, Michael, 'Art and Objecthood', *Artforum* (Summer 1967)
- Frank, Thomas, *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture and the Rise of Hip Consumerism* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1997)
- Freee, 'Changing Spaces', *Art Monthly*, 332 (Dec/Jan 2009), pp.1-4
- Glass, Nicholas, 'Damien Hirst: Artist or Brand?', *Art Review*, 52 (November 2000), pp.44-5
- Gleadell, Colin, 'Less is More', *Art Monthly*, 329 (September 2009), pp.36-7
- Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971)

- Graña, César, *Bohemian versus Bourgeois. French Society and the French Man of Letters in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Basic Books, 1964)
- Gray, Camilla, *The Great Experiment: Russian Art, 1863-1922* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1962)
- Green, Charles, *The Third Hand: Collaboration in Art from Conceptualism to Postmodernism* (Minneapolis & London: Minnesota, 2001)
- Greenberg, Clement, 'Recentness of Sculpture', *American Sculpture of the Sixties*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles County Museum of Art (1967)
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Harvard: Harvard University, 2001)
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri, *Multitude* (London: Penguin, 2005)
- Hardt, Michael, 'Affective Labour', *Boundary 2*, 26:2 (1999), pp. 89-100
- Harvey, David, *A Companion to Marx's Capital* (London: Verso, 2010)
- Harvey, David, *Spaces of Global Capitalism* (London and New York: Verso, 2006)
- Harvey, David, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990)
- Hassard, John and Michael Rowlinson, 'Marxist Political Economy, Revolutionary Politics, and Labour Process Theory', *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 30:4 (Winter 2000/2001), pp.85 -112
- Hassard, John, and others, 'From Labour Process Theory to Critical Management Studies', *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 23:3 (2001), pp.339-362
- Hauser, Arnold, 'The Sociological Approach: The Concept of Ideology in the History of Art', in *The Philosophy of Art History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959), pp.19-40
- Hesmondhalgh, David and Sarah Baker, *Creative Labour: Media Work in Three Cultural Industries* (London: Routledge, 2011)
- Hesmondhalgh, David, 'User-generated Content, Free Labour and the Cultural Industries', *Ephemera*, 10:3/4, pp.267-284
- Hirschhorn, Thomas, 'Bataille Monument', in *Contemporary Art: From Studio to Situation*, ed. by Claire Doherty (London: Black Dog, 2004), pp.133-147
- Holloway, David, 'The Politics of Soviet Science and technology', *Social Studies of Science*, 11:2 (1981)

- Holmes, Brian, *Unleashing the Collective Phantoms* (New York: Autonomedia, 2008)
- Hubble, Nick, *Mass-Observation and Everyday Life: Culture, History, Theory* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006)
- Hughes, Anthony, 'An Academy for Doing II: Academies, Status and Power in Early Modern Europe', *Oxford Art Journal*, 9:2 (1986), pp.50-62
- Huyssen, Andreas, 'The Hidden Dialectic: Avantgarde-Technology-Mass Culture', in *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), pp.3-15.
- Jameson, Frederic, 'Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', *New Left Review*, 1:146 (July-August 1984), pp.53-92
- Jameson, Frederic, *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983-1998* (London and New York: Verso, 1998)
- Jaros, Stephen J., 'Marxian Critiques of Thompson's (1990) 'Core' Labour Process Theory: An Evaluation and Extension', *Ephemera*, 5:1 (2005), pp.5-25
- Johnston, Claire, '*The Nightcleaners* (part one): Rethinking political cinema', *Jump Cut*, 12/13 (1975), pp.55-56
- Johnston, Claire and Paul Willemen, 'Brecht in Britain: The Independent Political Film (on *The Nightcleaners*)', *Screen*, 16:4 (Winter 1975/6), pp.101-118.
- Jones, Aidan, and others, 'Alas, poor Damien: recession reaches Hirst's studios', *The Guardian* (Saturday 22nd November 2008), p.1 & p.8
- Jones, Amelia, *Postmodernism and the En-gendering of Marcel Duchamp* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Jones, Caroline A., *Machine in the Studio: Constructing the Postwar American Artist* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996)
- Kennedy, Helen, *Net Work: Ethics and Values in Web Design* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), forthcoming
- Kiaer, Christina, *Imagine No Possessions* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2005)
- Barry King, 'Modularity and the Aesthetics of Self-Commodification', in *As Radical as Reality Itself*, ed. by Matthew Beaumont and others (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), pp.319-345
- Kino, Carol, 'Going Softly into a Parallel Universe', *The New York Times* (17th May 2009)

- Krauss, Rosalind, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1986)
- Krauss, Rosalind, *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1999)
- Kuo, Michelle, 'Industrial Revolution', *Artforum* (October 2008), pp. 306-315 & 396
- Laurent, Monique, 'Observations on Rodin and his Founders', in *Rodin Rediscovered*, ed. by Albert Elsen (Washington & Boston, 1982), pp.284-93
- Lazzarato, Maurizio, 'Immaterial Labour' (1996), in *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, ed. by Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: Minnesota, 2006), pp.133-147.
- Lee, David, 'Hands Off', *Art Review*, 45 (April 1993), pp.28-31
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich, 'The Taylor System - Man's Enslavement by the Machine', in *Lenin Collected Works* (Moscow: Progress,1972), pp.152-154
- Lippard, Lucy and John Chandler, 'The Dematerialisation of Art' (1968), in *Conceptual Art: A Critical Reader*, ed. by Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimson (Cambridge: MIT, 2000), pp.46-50
- Lippard, Lucy, 'Eros Presumptive', *The Hudson Review* (Spring 1967)
- Lippard, Lucy, 'Questions to Stella and Judd', *Art News*, 65:5 (September 1966)
- Lippincott, Jonathan D., *Large Scale: Fabricating Sculpture in the 1960s and 1970s* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010)
- Littler, Craig, *Deskilling and the Changing Structure of Control*, Nuffield Paper (1978)
- Lloyd, Richard D., *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City* (New York and Oxon: Routledge, 2006)
- Mainz, Valerie and Pollock, Griselda, *Work and the Image, Volume One, Work Craft and Labour: Visual Representations in Changing Histories* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000)
- Mainz, Valerie and Pollock, Griselda, *Work and the Image, Volume Two, Work in Modern Times: Visual Mediations and Social Processes* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000)
- Maitland, Leslie, 'Factory Brings Sculptors' Massive Dreams to Fruition', *The New York Times* (November 24th 1976), p.35 & p.55
- Mandel, Ernest, *Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1980)

- Mann, Keith, 'Whither the Skilled Worker?', *Sociological Forum*, 8:1 (1993), pp.143-150
- Martin, Stewart, 'Critique of Relational Aesthetics', *Third Text*, 21:4 (July 2007), pp.369-386
- Marx, Karl, *Karl Marx Selected Writings*, ed. by David McLellan, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University, 2007)
- Marx, Karl, *Capital* (1887), trans. by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, vol. 1 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983)
- Marx, Karl, *Capital* (1887), trans. by Ben Fowkes, vol. 1 (London: Penguin, 1990)
- Marx, Karl, *Capital* (1894), trans. by David Fernbach, vol. 3 (London: Penguin, 1991)
- Marx, Karl, *Grundrisse*, trans. by Martin Nicolaus (London: Penguin, 1993)
- McBride, Shasta, 'The Wizard Behind the Curtain: Carlson and His Company Make Artists' Vision A Reality', *THE Magazine* (November 2008), pp.8-9
- McKendrick, Neil, 'Josiah Wedgwood and Factory Discipline', *The Historical Journal*, 4:1 (1961), pp.30-55
- Mayokovsky, Vladimir, 'Meeting ob iskusstve', *Iskusstvo Kommuni*, 1 (7 December 1918)
- Menger, Pierre-Michel, 'Artists as Workers: Theoretical and Methodological Challenges', *Poetics*, 28 (2001), pp.241-254
- Menger, Pierre-Michel, *Portrait de l'artiste en travailleur (Portrait of the Artist as Worker)* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2002)
- Merkle, Judith A., 'The Taylor System in Soviet Socialism', in *Management and Ideology* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California, 1980), pp.103-135
- Moody, Lori, 'Some Assembly Required', L.A. Life supplement, *Daily News*, July 26 1995
- Morrell, John, 'Artistic Engineers', The Business Enthusiast supplement, *Alaska Airlines Magazine*, January 1994, p.9
- Morris, Robert, 'Notes on Sculpture 1-3' (1966-67), in *Art in Theory 1900 – 2000*, ed. by Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (Malden and Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 828-835
- Negri, Antonio, 'Metamorphoses', trans. by Alberto Toscano, *Radical Philosophy*, 149 (June/July 2008), pp.21-25

- O'Connor, Justin, *The Cultural and Creative Industries: A Review of the Literature*, Creative Partnerships Literature Reviews (London: Arts Council England, November 2007)
- O'Doherty, Damien and Hugh Willmott, 'Debating Labour Process Theory: The issue of Subjectivity and the Relevance of Poststructuralism', *Sociology*, 35:2 (May 2001), pp.457-476
- O'Neill, Paul, 'Group Practice', *Art Monthly*, 304 (March 2007), pp.7-10
- Orton, Fred and Griselda Pollock, *Avant-Gardes and Partisans Reviewed* (Manchester: Manchester University, 1996)
- Osmolovsky, Anatoly, 'Rejection of Museums! Contemporary Art Here and Now', *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.645-648
- Pagel, David, 'The Art Factory', *Calendar*, August 31st 2003, p.E33
- Panzieri, Raniero, 'Capitalist use of Machinery: Marx versus the Objectivists' (1980), trans. by Quintin Hoare, in *Outlines of a Critique of Technology*, ed. by P. Slater (London: Ink Links, 1980)
- Parigoris, Alexandra, 'Truth to Material: Bronze, on the Reproducibility of Truth', in *Sculpture and its Reproductions*, ed. by Anthony Hughes and Erich Ranfft (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 1997), pp.131-150
- Patrick Barkham, 'Can you do me a quick cow's head?', *The Guardian* (March 5th 2008)
- Plato, *The Republic* (London: Penguin, 2003)
- Raunig, Gerald, *Art and Revolution* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007)
- Roberts, John, 'Collaboration as a Problem of Art's Cultural Form', *Third Text*, Art and Collaboration Special Issue, 18:6 (2004)
- Roberts, John, *The Art of Interruption* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1998)
- Roberts, John, *The Intangibilities of Form: Skill and Deskilling in the Art After the Readymade* (London and New York: Verso, 2007)
- Roberts, John, 'The Labour of Subjectivity, the Subjectivity of Labour: Reflections on Contemporary Political Theory and Culture', *Third Text*, 16:4 (2002), pp.367-385
- Roberts, John, 'Warhol's "Factory": Painting and the mass-cultural spectator', in *Varieties of Modernism*, ed. by Paul Wood (New Haven; Connecticut; London: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 339-361

- Rosler, Martha, 'In, Around, and, Afterthoughts (on documentary photography)', *3 Works* (Nova Scotia: Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 2006), pp.61-93
- Saltz, Jerry, 'A Short History of Rirkrit Tiravanija: Thai artist who cooks meals as installation art', *Art in America* (February 1996), pp.82-85
- Saunders, Wade, 'Making Art, Making Artists', *Art in America*, 81 (January 1993), pp.70-95
- *Self-Organisation: Counter-Economic Strategies* (New York and Berlin: Sternberg press, 2006)
- Shimokawa, Koichi, *The Japanese Automobile Industry: A Business History* (London and New Jersey: The Athlone Press, 1994).
- Sholette, Gregory, *Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture* (London and New York: Pluto, 2011)
- Sholette, Gregory and Nato Thompson, eds, *The Interventionists: Users' Manual for the Creative Disruption of Everyday Life* (Massachusetts: Mass MOCA, 2004)
- Smith, Terry, *Making the Modern: Industry, Art and Design in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1993)
- Smith, Mike, 'Construct your ambition: Making grand ideas become realities', in *The Artist's Yearbook 2006*, ed. by Ossian Ward (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005), pp.188-190
- Spencer, David A., 'Braverman and the Contribution of Labour Process Analysis to the Critique of Capitalist Production - Twenty-Five Years On', *Work, Employment & Society*, 14:2 (2000), pp.223-243
- Stallabrass, Julian, *Art Incorporated* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004)
- Stallabrass, Julian, *High Art Lite* (London and New York: Verso, 1999)
- Stallabrass, Julian, *Internet Art* (London: Tate, 2003)
- Stallabrass, Julian, 'Types and Prospects of Radical Art', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Art*, 4:2, 5:1 (2003-4), pp. 189-201
- Stimson, Blake and Gregory Sholette, eds, *Collectivism after Modernism* (Minneapolis: Minnesota, 2007)
- Stimson, Blake and Gregory Sholette, 'Periodising Collectivism', *Third Text*, 18:6 (2004), pp.573-583
- Superflex, *Self-Organisation: Counter-Economic Strategies* (New York and Berlin: Sternberg press, 2006)

- Billing, Johanna, and others, eds, *Taking the Matter into Common Hands* (London: Black Dog, 2007)
- Tagg, John, *Burdon of Representation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988)
- Temporary Services, ed, *Group Work* (New York: Printed Matter, 2007)
- *The Blind Man*, 2 (May 1917)
- 'The Producers', *Artforum* (October 2007), pp.352-6 & p.402
- The Work Foundation, *Staying Ahead: the Economic Performance of the UK's Creative Industries* (June 2007)
- *Third Text*, Art and Collaboration edn, 18:6 (November 2004)
- Thompson, Don, *The \$12 Million Stuffed Shark: The Curious Economics of Contemporary Art and Auction Houses* (London: Aurum Press, 2008)
- Thompson, Paul and Chris Smith, 'Follow the Redbrick Road: Reflections on Pathways in and out of the Labour Process Debate', *International Studies of Management & Organisation*, 30:4 (Winter 2000/2001), pp.40-67
- Thompson, Paul, 'The Capitalist Labour Process: Concepts and Connections', *Capital & Class*, 37:7 (2010), pp.7-14
- Thompson, Paul, *The Nature of Work*, 2nd edn (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 1989)
- Trotsky, Leon, 'From Literature and Revolution' (1925), in *Art in Theory 1900-2000*, ed. by Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (Malden and Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp.442-447
- Trott, Ben, 'Immaterial Labour and World Order: An Evaluation of a Thesis', *Ephemera*, 7:1 (2007), pp.203-232
- Turner, Bryan S., 'Justification, the City and Late Capitalism', *The Sociological Review*, 55:2 (2007), pp.410-415
- Velthuis, Olav, *Imaginary Economics* (Rotterdam: NAI, 2005)
- Virno, Paolo, *A Grammar of the Multitude* (Los Angeles, New York: Semiotext(e), 2004)
- Virno, Paolo, 'Virtuosity and Revolution: The Political Theory of Exodus', in *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, ed. by Michael Hardt and Paolo Virno (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1996), pp.189-210
- Weber, Max, *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976)

- Williams, Raymond, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Fontana, 1988)
- Woolfson, Charles, *The Labour Theory of Culture: A Re-examination of Engel's Theory of Human Origins* (London: Routledge, 1982)
- Wright, Stephen, 'The Delicate Essence of Artistic Collaboration', *Third Text*, 18:6 (November 2004) pp.533-545.
- Wu, Chin-tao, *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention Since the 1980s* (London and New York: Verso, 2001)

Online Publications

- Adams, Stephen, 'Damien Hirst sale breaks art auction record, raking in £70.5 million in its first day', *Telegraph* (15th September 2008), www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2966049/Damien-Hirst-sale-breaks-art-auction-record-raking-in-70.5-million-in-its-first-day.html [Accessed: 30/09/2009]
- Aiden, Rose, 'Brush with Fame', *Observer*, October 12th 2003, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3858,4772547-102280,00.html> [Accessed: 12/10/05]
- Allen, Jennifer, 'Up the Organization - Joep van Lieshout, Atelier van Lieshout - Interview', *Artforum*, April 2001, <http://artforum.com/static/issues/200104/feature/lieshout4.html> [Accessed: 24/04/2008]
- *Art Work: A National Conversation about Art, Labour and Economics*, http://www.artandwork.us/i/art_work_web.pdf [Accessed: 19/04/2010]
- Arun Gupta, 'The Yes Men Speak', *The Independent*, September 18th 2009, <http://www.independent.org/2009/09/17/the-yes-men-speak> [Accessed: 01/09/2010]
- Author unknown, *Reconceiving (Mary) Kelly*, <http://www.articlearchives.com/print/1518548-1-hg2.html>. [Accessed: 08/05/09]
- Author unknown, 'Gratz Industries, a star in the world of metal fabricators', *New York Times*, April 13th 2003, Long Island City Business Development Corporation website, http://www.licbdc.org/area_business_news.html?Year+2003&AID=238 [Accessed: 06/02/11]
- Barkham, Patrick, 'Can you do me a quick cow's head?', *The Guardian*, Wednesday March 5th 2008, <http://arts.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,332812957-123424,00.html> [Accessed: 05/03/2008]
- Chubarov, Igor, 'Productionism: Art of the Revolution of Design for the Proletariat?', *Chto Delat? #01- 25: What is the use of art?* (2009),

- http://www.chtodelat.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=558%3Aproductionism-art-of-the-revolution-or-design-for-the-proletariat&catid=204%3A01-25-what-is-the-use-of-art&Itemid=455&lang=en [Accessed: 3/08/2011]
- 'Clear Evidence of Renewed Confidence at Frieze Art Fair 2009', *Frieze Art Fair Press Release*, 19th October 2009, http://www.friezeartfair.com/images/press_releases/End_of_Fair2009.pdf [Accessed: 07/01/2009]
 - Conrad, Peter, 'Damien Hirst: No Love Lost, Blue Paintings', *The Observer*, 18th October 2009, www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2009/oct/18/damien-hirst-no-love-lost/print [Accessed: 02/11/2009]
 - Dannatt, Adrian, 'Jeff Koons on his Serpentine show, his inspirations and how his studio system works', *The Art Newspaper*, 204 (July/August 2009), www.theartnewspaper.com/articles/Jeff-Koons-on-his-Serpentine-show-his-inspirations-and-how-his-studio-system-works/18566 [Accessed: 04/09/2009]
 - *David Smith Chronology*, www.davidsmithestate.org/bio.html [Accessed: 23/07/2009]
 - Diesenhouse, Susan, 'As Sales Drop, Builders of Boats Turn to Artworks', *New York Times*, March 20th 1988, www.nytimes.com/1988/as-sales-drop-builders-of-boats-turn-to-artworks.html?pagewanted=1&pagewanted=print [Accessed: 16/03/2010]
 - Engels, Frederick, 'The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man' (1876) (Moscow: Progress, 1934), www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1876/part-played-labour/index.htm [Accessed 09/04/2010]
 - Finkel, Jori, 'At the Ready When Artists Think Big', *The New York Times*, April 27th 2008, <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/27/arts/design/27fink.html> [Accessed: 22/03/2010]
 - Freedman, Carl, 'Traffic', *Frieze* website: <http://www.frieze.com/issue/review/traffic/> [Accessed: 31/05/2011]
 - Holmes, Brian, 'Extradisciplinary Investigations. Towards a New Critique of Institutions', *Transversal* (January 2006), <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0106/holmes/en> [Accessed: 20/07/2011]
 - Holmes, Brian, 'The Flexible Personality: For a new cultural critique' (2001), www.16beavergroup.org/pdf/fp/pdf [Accessed: 08/06/2007]
 - Januszczak, Waldemar, 'Imitate Gallery', *The Times*, March 6th 2005, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/printFriendly/0,,1-531-1506281,00.html> [Accessed: 18/04/2005]

- Joep van Lieshout interview with Marcus Verhagen, *Talking Art* series at Tate Modern with *Art Monthly*, 20th October 2007, <http://channel.tate.org.uk/media/24881439001> [Accessed: 21/12/2009]
- King, Sarah, *Yellow Brick Studio (Carving Studio)* (2004), http://www.henry-moore-fdn.co.uk/matrix_engine/content.php?name=f [Accessed: 30/07/2007]
- Kino, Carol, 'Going Softly into a Parallel Universe', *The New York Times*, May 17th 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/17/arts/design/17knio.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print [Accessed: 17/08/2009]
- Lazzarato, Maurizio, 'The Misfortunes of the "Artistic Critique" and of Cultural Employment', trans. by Mary O'Neill, <http://eicpc.net/transversal/0207/lazzarato/en> [Accessed: 18/01/2010]
- Lethaby, W. R., 'Art and Workmanship' first printed in *The Imprint*, vol. 1 (January 1913), <http://www.burrows.com/art.html> [Accessed: 13/05/2009].
- Morris, William, 'Art and Socialism' (January 1884), Delivered to the Leicester Secular Society, <http://marxists.org/archive/morris/works/1884/as/as.htm> [Accessed: 23/06/2009].
- Morris, William, 'Hopes and Fears for Art' (February 1879) <http://ebooks.edu.au/m/morris/m87hf/chap2.html> [Accessed: 23/06/2009].
- Morris, William, 'The Decorative Arts, Their Relation to Modern Life and Progress' (December 1877), <http://www.burrows.com/dec.html> [Accessed: 13/05/2009].
- Pollock, Lindsay, 'Koons "Dog" Fabricator Carlson Shuts as Recession Hits Big Art', Bloomberg, April 28th 2010, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/print/2010-04-28/koons-balloon-dog-fabricator-carlson-closes-as-recession-topple-big-art.html> [Accessed: 4/3/2011]
- Ritchie, Charles and Ruth E. Fine, *Gemini G.E.L.: A Catalogue Raisonné, 1966-1996*, <http://www.nga.gov/gemini/essay2.htm> [Accessed: 17/03/2010]
- Roberts, John, 'Productivism and Its Contradictions. A Short History of Productivism', *Chto Delat?* Website, http://www.chtodelat.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=561%3Aproductivism-and-its-contradictions-a-short-history-of-productivism&catid=204%3A01-25-what-is-the-use-of-art&Itemid=298&lang=en [Accessed: 23/02/11]
- Ruiz, Cristina, 'Revealed: The Art Damien Failed to Sell', *Art Newspaper*, 194 (September 2008), <http://www.theartnewspaper.com/article.asp?id=16005> [Accessed: 04/09/2009]
- Shears, Jenny, 'Etoy Agents: Corporate Art', *Surface* (1998), <http://www.blasthaus.com/press/surface/index.html> [Accessed: 24/08/07]

- Smith, Adam, 'Of the Division of Labour' in *An Enquiry into the Nature and the Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), <http://geolib.com/smith.adam/won1-01.html> [Accessed: 11/08/2009]
- Steyerl, Hito, 'Politics of Art: Contemporary Art and the Transition to Postdemocracy', *e-flux journal*, 21 (December 2010), <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/view/181> [Accessed: 09/12/2010]
- 'Strikes halt work at Toyota and Honda plants in China', BBC News, 23rd June 2010, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10389762> [Accessed: 29/03/11]
- Thornton, Sarah, 'In and Out of Love with Damien Hirst', *The Art Newspaper*, 195 (October 2008), www.theartnewspaper.com/articles/In-and-out-of-love-with-Damien-Hirst/16269 [Accessed: 04/09/2009]
- 'Waterjets Help Artist Tackle Mountain-Size Public Art', Flow International Corporation website, www.flowcorp.com/waterjet-resources.cfm?id+433 [Accessed: 07/06/2010]
- 'Women on Waves Exhibition', Mediamatic website, <http://www.mediamatic.net/article-5799-en.html> [Accessed: 24/04/08]
- Yates, Michael, 'Braverman and Class Struggle' *Monthly Review*, 50:8 (January 1999), www.monthlyreview.org/199yates.htm [Accessed: 19/03/2009]
- Young, Paul, 'Those Fabulous Fabricators and Their Finish Fetish: At Carlson & Co, they do it with art', *LA Weekly*, January 9th 2008, www.laweekly.com/art+books/art/those-fabulous-fabricators-and-their-finish-fetish/18038/?page= [Accessed: 30/04/08]

Websites

- *Gemini G.E.L. Online Catalogue Raisonné*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC: <http://www.nga.gov/gemini/home.htm> [Accessed: 17/03/10]
- Etoy 'Mission Eternity' website: <http://missioneternity.org> [Accessed: 24/08/07]
- Atelier van Lieshout website: www.ateliervanlieshout.com [Accessed: 29/04/08]
- Carey Young, list of works: www.careyyoung.com/works.html [Accessed: 03/07/2007]
- Etoy website: www.eto.com/fundamentals [Accessed: 24/08/07]
- Guaraná Power website: www.guaranapower.org [Accessed: 15/08/11]
- Mike Smith Studio website: www.mikesmithstudio.com [Accessed: 09/08/07]

- Morris Singer Foundry website: <http://www.zmaf.co.uk/morrissinger.htm>
[Accessed: 15/08/11]
- Noack Foundry website: http://www.noack-bronze.com/index_en.html
[Accessed: 15/08/11]
- Gratz Industries website: *Gratz Industries*, www.gratzindustries.com/
[Accessed: 05/08/07]