

# **Art Needs Time: Temporality of Laziness in the Performing Arts**

Olga Blázquez Sánchez

Student number: 4228065

---

## **CONTENTS**

### **INTRODUCTION (2)**

#### **1. FAST CAPITALISM, FAST ART (5)**

**1.1. Immaterial labour and the temporality of acceleration (5)**

**1.2. Art as immaterial labour (8)**

**1.3. Art residencies as ‘accelerated institutions’ for the development of artistic practice (10)**

**1.4. The necessity of slowing down and being lazy (12)**

#### **2. TOWARDS A NEW TEMPORALITY OF LAZINESS AND SLOWNESS (13)**

**2.1. On laziness and slowness (13)**

**2.2. Laziness does not only endanger Capitalism (16)**

**2.3. Chronopolitics (17)**

**2.4. From the politicization of time to the political implications in the change of the perception of time (18)**

**2.5. Laziness in practice: artists that have supported alternative temporalities (20)**

**2.6. Producing the change from inside the system or from outside? (23)**

#### **3. CONCLUSION: MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR A TEMPORALITY OF LAZINESS (24)**

#### **4. LAZINESS BEYOND ART (25)**

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY (28)**

***“Iba tan deprisa que no caí en la cuenta  
que corría y corría y que no tenía prisa”***

(I was going so fast that I did not realize  
that I was running and running, and that I was not in a hurry<sup>1</sup>)

—Jarabe de Palo, *Como Peces en el Agua*

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis analyses the relationship between time, labour<sup>2</sup> and the arts (and more specifically, the performing arts). Temporality crucially determines the type of working conditions a given profession is related to. Nowadays, the temporality of speed and acceleration, which is typical of the post-fordist age, has made labour, and even life, become more precarious since there is the general feeling of not having time for anything at all. Carl Honoré critically refers to this obsession for speed in western societies in his book *In Praise of Slowness* (2004) when he asks: “When did you last see someone just gazing out the window on a train?” (11). Then he argues that this simple action of looking through the window has become really bizarre because “everyone is too busy reading the paper, playing video games, listening to iPods, working on the laptop, yammering into mobile phones” (Ibid). The human being lives in a perpetual state of anxiety due to the necessity of making time and filling hours with an incessant repertoire of activities. This temporality of speed and acceleration has come into existence in large part thanks to the development of certain ways of production related to the spread of the internet and new technologies all over the world, which has made it possible for information to travel very fast. The development of these new ways of production caused the ‘dematerialization’ of labour. It is not necessary for the commodity to be intrinsically linked to materiality anymore. Maurizio Lazzarato refers to this relationship between labour, new ways of production and immateriality in “Immaterial Labour” (2006) as follows: “Manual labor is increasingly coming to involve procedures that could be defined as ‘intellectual’, and the new communication technologies increasingly require subjectivities that are rich in knowledge” (133). Nowadays, what capitalist societies mainly produce is *thinking*, namely immaterial cognitive substance that can be worldwide shared in a few seconds. The production of knowledge, the development of intellectual tasks, the use of new technologies and the acceleration of time have become intrinsic to the so-called immaterial labour. Art, as a cultural practice that does not necessarily relate to the production of a material object is also conceived as being part of this change in the way of production. Contemporary art is not necessarily linked to the physicality of the artwork anymore, but to the intangibility of the artistic process. The Artist

---

<sup>1</sup> Translations from Spanish and French into English are my own.

<sup>2</sup> In this thesis I prefer to use the British version of the word *labour*, instead of the American version, *labor*. However, I have not modified the way authors that are here quoted use the word. Therefore, the reader can find both *labour* and *labor* in quotes.

Placement Group, for example, which was an art collective active during the sixties that will be later on examined in detail in this thesis, based its artistic practice in placing artists in factories, out of the art galleries. The objective of this artistic practice was not to achieve the production of any artwork, but simply to analyse what the presence of artists in the workplace generated. Art was conceived as an immaterial process that was happening during a given period of time (in this case, during the period in which artists were present in the workplace). Consequently, art did not relate to the material outcome anymore, but to the immaterial process.

The first section of this thesis discusses what the development of immaterial labour implies in terms of working conditions and the experience of time. The production of cognitive substance, typical of the so-called immaterial labour, is not required to be performed at the factory anymore. Workers are not necessarily asked to attend a specific workplace to perform their tasks. Cognitive substance, namely ideas and thoughts, can be produced at home, at the bar or even at the beach. The production of *thinking* does not require a specific context. A car mechanic, for example, needs a garage in order to develop his/her activity, which consists of repairing cars. This means, a mechanic can only work in a specific place and during a certain period of time (when the garage is open). For their part, immaterial commodities can be produced *wherever* and *whenever*. Immaterial labour, then, relates to the existence of “the ‘diffuse factory’ and [the] decentralization of production” (Lazzarato 2006, 135). Society itself becomes the factory, which implies that work becomes almost indistinguishable from life. This fact has affected the working conditions characteristic of industrial Capitalism. Now, there is no need for eight-hour working days since workers are expected to work anytime from anywhere. The direct consequence of the immateriality of labour is a growing precariousness in the working conditions. Workers’ (including artists’) rights dissolve in the undefined limits of immaterial labour and post-Fordism. On the other hand, the cognitive substance produced by capitalist societies travels from one place to another within seconds and it becomes rapidly obsolete. Information, for example, is continuously being replaced by new information, so that we are perpetually updated. It becomes really easy to get lost in this swirling vortex of speed and renovation. Indeed, the type of precariousness intellectual proletarians have to face has to do with this acceleration of time. Workers have to adapt their lives to the accelerated rhythms of production in order to survive. Artistic practice is also related to speed since artists are always requested to produce something new and original and to continuously evolve towards new aesthetical paradigms. Bojana Kunst relates the temporality of acceleration in the field of the arts and the performing arts to the concept of *project*. Working on projects implies living in a never-ending projection to the future with the aim of reaching a goal that is actually unachievable: the end of the working process. I will discuss this *projective temporality* that seems to reign in the field of the arts and I will also analyse the role of artistic residencies as institutions that allow this *projective temporality* to be assumed by artists without offering any kind of resistance.

However, the main aim of this thesis is not only to describe the main features of contemporary ways of (artistic) production, but also to question the temporality of acceleration typical of post-Fordism by looking at the concept of *laziness* as Paul Lafargue theorized it in his pamphlet *The Right to be Lazy* (1883). The second part of this thesis, then, will focus on the possibility of creating a new temporality that radically differs from that of acceleration. *Laziness* implies destroying the veneration myths surrounding the virtues of labour, the necessity of never-ending production days

and the prevalence of speed. Instead, it is a claim for an alternative way of living and producing goods where slowness, pleasure and the option of doing nothing are actually relevant. Slowing down also implies recognising that immateriality is not the actual quality of contemporary ways of production. Slowing down is indeed necessary because of the material character of production. The material world all of us inhabit imposes a series of limits that cannot be exceeded in terms of acceleration. Cognitive substance, then, cannot be produced any faster because it depends on the limits of the brain, which is a material part of the material human body. No matter how plastic, malleable, modifiable and adaptable to new situations the brain is, there will always be certain limits imposed by its material character. This could be interpreted as a deterministic statement, and, indeed, it is. However this is exactly the main point of this thesis. This world, and the creatures that inhabit it, have limits. We are determined by our material limits. Therefore, thinking, as any other activity that takes place in/inside a material body, requires time to be produced. Thinking cannot 'happen' beyond time. This is the reason why it cannot be indefinitely accelerated. Thus, claiming for an alternative temporality implies questioning the concept of immateriality itself as it has been developed by Italian operaists, such as Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt. The refusal of the concept of immateriality, nevertheless, does not imply a complete refusal of these author's ideas. Indeed, I still agree with their analysis of the contemporary labour scene and the descriptions of the precarious working conditions typical of post-Fordism they provide. However, I will claim that the analysis of contemporary ways of production should not be based on the concept of immateriality.

Besides this, in order to discuss the possibility of an alternative temporality, I will look back at the ideas developed by Lafargue as well as the comments made by contemporary authors on his pamphlet. I will also consider the possibility of applying this alternative temporality of *laziness* to artistic practice by analysing and comparing four case-studies: Maintenance Art developed by Mierle Laderman Ukeless, the artistic practice developed by the Artist Placement Group, the *Tucumán Arde* project and L'Association des Temps Libérés. These four case-studies will be analysed from the perspective of working conditions and the temporalities commonly associated to immaterial labour rather than from a purely aesthetic point of view. Therefore, I will not discuss the artistic quality of these case-studies. Instead, I will refer to them in order to focus on the relationship between labour and time in the field of the performing arts. This does not mean I underestimate the aesthetic value of the four case-studies. However, aesthetics are not the main focus in this thesis. The focus is on analysing the way these performances are produced and the impact they have in the definition of time. This approach is relevant since it provides an opportunity to focus on the ability of artists to actually question the temporality of acceleration typical of Capitalism and post-Fordism. Finally, I will also discuss the potentiality and responsibility of artists to produce a shift from speed to *laziness* and slowness in other fields, such as education, scientific research or ecology. The main stance in this thesis is that the arts, and more specifically the performing arts, can function as a political avant-garde in the revolutionary process of redefining the temporality we inhabit. In the last section of this thesis, then, I will discuss the concept of *laziness* not only as an alternative temporality, but also as an alternative reality, which would be more respectful with the human being and the Earth.

## 1. FAST CAPITALISM, FAST ART

The aim in this first section is to research, define and analyse the main features of the so-called immaterial labour. The focus will be on arguing that the temporality of acceleration has become one of the inherent characteristic of capitalist production nowadays and that it strongly determines working conditions. I will specifically examine the impact of this temporality of acceleration in the field of the arts with the aim of revealing the precarious situation characteristic of artistic practice and standing up for the necessity of creating an alternative temporality that makes artists' working conditions improve. Previous to this analysis on the impact of speed and acceleration on the arts, it will also be worth discussing to what extent artistic practice can be defined as labour, and more specifically, as immaterial labour.

### 1.1. Immaterial labour and the temporality of acceleration

Capitalism is not only an economic system, but also a social way of organizing the way people live. Due to the measureless character of the concept of Capitalism, it is worth focusing on two main elements that are relevant for this analysis: production and labour. Nowadays, capitalist societies do not only produce material commodities, namely physical objects, but also immaterial *goods* such as information, culture, knowledge and subjectivity. As established by Scott Lash in "Being after Time: Towards a Politics of Melancholy" (1998), nowadays, workers are "producing life: they make thinking substance, they manufacture reflecting and reflective objects" (317). From this point of view, the type of labour needed in order to produce goods nowadays has necessarily to differ from that of industrial Capitalism, Fordism and Taylorism, which was based on the materiality of the commodity. Immaterial labour implies a change in the characteristics of the commodities and also in the way workers are expected to work and the skills they are expected to develop. Maurizio Lazzarato defines these two main changes carried out by immaterial labour as follows:

"The concept of immaterial labor refers to *two different aspects* of labor. On the one hand, as regards the 'informational content' of the commodity, it refers directly to the changes taking place in workers' labor processes in big companies in the industrial and tertiary sectors, where the skills involved in direct labor are increasingly skills involving cybernetics and computer control (and horizontal and vertical communication). On the other hand, as regards the activity that produces the "cultural content" of the commodity, immaterial labor involves a series of activities that are not normally recognized as "work" — in other words, the kinds of activities involved in defining and fixing cultural and artistic standards, fashions, tastes, consumer norms, and, more strategically, public opinion" (Lazzarato 2006, 132)

Immaterial labour refers to both the production of the commodity and the concepts, subjectivities and ideology surrounding this commodity, which, in words of Dusan Grlja in "Theoretical Practice: On the Material Effects on an 'Immaterial' Labour" (2010), causes that "the surplus-value is no longer exclusively an outcome of the corporeal exploitation of labour-power, but increasingly of the addition of a symbolic value to the products generated by the exploitation of the 'creative' or 'cultural' workers" (47). Manual skills are not necessarily required from workers anymore since adding a symbolic value to the commodity is an immaterial, meaning intangible and imponderable, task that depends on creative skills. Coca-cola, for example, is not only a material and concrete product defined as a carbonated soft drink made of cola syrup. It is also the series of myths related to the beverage: happiness, freshness, brightness, etc. Understanding what immaterial labour is

all about implies realizing that Coca-cola is both the material cola drink we all know, as well as the immaterial mythology surrounding it, and that both things have been produced by workers. One of the main differences between material labour and immaterial labour lies in the vagueness intrinsic to the last one, because:

- The immaterial product has no physical concretion (the happiness related to Coca-cola does not take the shape of a physical object) and
- Immaterial labour has neither a specific place nor a specific moment to be performed (happiness can be 'designed' and 'produced' wherever and whenever. It does not require a specific context).

Workers of the immaterial labour age have no specific space for working because the factory, as a concrete place, has disappeared. Instead, capitalist societies have founded what Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt define in *Empire* (2000) as the dispersal of the working spaces. Society itself has become the factory and it reaches every single corner of the city. The word *city* is here intentionally used with the aim of emphasizing the metropolitan and occidental character of the concept of immaterial labour. Immaterial labour has mostly expanded in the largest cities of the so-called 'developed countries'. However, the reduction of material labour and the increase of immaterial labour in these countries have not only something to do with economic development, but also with offshoring. Big companies relocate their factories to industrial areas in impoverished or 'peripheral' countries, where working regulations are less strict, in order to make bigger profits. Therefore, the importance given to immaterial labour in the 'developed countries' does not deny the existence of other spaces where precarious material labour is still the prevailing type of work. Grlja explains this idea when maintaining that "a huge share of globally circulating goods for everyday consumption are being made in China, India, and other peripheral countries, which means that there still is a properly classical industrial proletariat" (2010, 48). Robert Hassan also addresses this idea in *The Age of Distraction* (2012) where he argues that the existence of new types of intellectual labour in the 'developed countries' has made it possible to create the illusion that "today we are purportedly far more progressive and far more civilized. Certainly, people are still brutally exploited in the factories that make our shoes and shirts and electronic gadgetry in Latin America, in wide stretches of Asia and elsewhere across the world" (x).

Coming back to the core of the matter, which is analysing the main features of immaterial labour in relation to the existence of a *diffuse factory*, it becomes clear that, nowadays, not only labour itself, but also the factory, has become an immaterial entity that is simultaneously nowhere and everywhere. However, this diffuse or dispersed factory has not only spread out over space, but also over time. The existence of a dispersed factory, then, implies that workers should be able to work everywhere and they should be available to work at any moment. There is no eight-hour working day anymore since intellectual workers have no working regulations (which include defining working spaces and shifts), and therefore, they have less well-defined working rights.

Immaterial labour has come into existence thanks to the development of new technologies, mass media and the global spread of the internet. One of the main consequences of the expansion of immaterial labour and the generalization of the information age is the acceleration of life: "In this age of brute information the time of events and the society of the network are part and parcel of the new post-time temporal experience of *speed*" (Lash 1998, 311). Information travels from one part of the world to another in a blink of an eye, news become obsolete within a few minutes and they must be replaced by fresh ones, people are told to stay up to date with fashion trends, etc.

Speed has become an intrinsic characteristic of citizens-consumers-workers' subjectivity. We do not experience *time* anymore, but *speed* (Ibid). Of course this acceleration of time is not always a real fact. Acceleration functions as a lens through which we are told to look at the world we inhabit. We embody acceleration as an attitude towards ourselves and toward the world, as a mode of being and relating to the environment. It has been collectively, and unconsciously, agreed that there is no time for laziness. Work and speed must always prevail. These two categories (work and speed) function as elements of our collective and individual subjectivity, as embodied technologies that produce the space and the time we experience and allow no moment for slowness, which is a requirement for reflection, critical thinking and creativity. Thinking is not possible in the age of speed because, as established by Franco Berardi in "Time, Acceleration and Violence", published by the *E-flux Journal* (2011), the "brain functions in time, and needs time in order to give attention and understanding. But attention cannot be infinitely accelerated"<sup>3</sup>. Thus, acceleration rejects attention, understanding and reasoning. The citizen-consumer-worker cannot stop to look at himself/herself neither at the world. S/he has no time to question the order of things. This is why Lash also relates this fast way of production, typical of immaterial labour and post-Fordism and the new subjectivity linked to acceleration, to indifference and inertia. Citizens-consumers-workers are not allowed to move against the flow of speed. As a consequence, speed becomes a type of violence, a very specific mechanism for alienation. Speed makes the dialectical relationship between the worker and labour disappear for the sake of efficiency. Thanks to acceleration, "our relationship to the world will become purely functional, operational - probably faster, but precarious" (Berardi 2011).

The inexistence of a working frame or context, which includes specifying and regulating a space and a moment for performing labour, in combination with the creation of a subjectivity of acceleration has made it possible for post-fordist Capitalism to destroy the traditional definition of labour, which was a category closely related to materiality/corporeality and linked to a large series of working rights achieved after historical vindications made by workers during the XIX and the XX centuries. These vindications ended up with the introduction of the eight-hour working day and the right to strike, among other achievements. By redefining the concept of labour, the capitalist system creates the illusion of a new Capitalism without preceding history, without memory, without roots in the past. Achievements in the field of labour law are not valid anymore because what we used to know about labour has been erased from history. Consequently, a re-precarization of labour has taken place. Working now implies "precariousness, hyperexploitation, mobility and hierarchy" (Lazzarato 2006, 136). In order to clarify what precariousness means, I will look at the definition made by Rosalind Gill and Andy Pratt in "Precarity and Cultural Work. In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work" (2008). They define precariousness as "all forms of insecure, contingent, flexible work – from illegalized, casualized and temporary employment, to homeworking, piecework and freelancing" (3). These precarious working conditions are also linked to the existence of a new type of proletarian worker, which Lazzarato calls the "intellectual proletarian" (Lazzarato 2006, 136).

In this context of labour insecurity, flexibility and precariousness, the artist has become the quintessential paradigm of the intellectual proletarian. Claire Bishop in *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (2012), basing her analysis in Andrew Ross' observations, explains this when arguing that "artists provide a useful model for precarious labour

---

<sup>3</sup> Online at: <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/time-acceleration-and-violence/>

since they have to work mentally based on flexibility (working project by project, rather than nine to five) and honed by the idea of sacrificial labour (i.e. being predisposed to accept less money in return for relatively freedom)” (16). However, despite becoming a benchmark for other professional sectors, the identification of artists to workers and art to labour has been widely discussed throughout history. Even now, in a period of crisis and public budget cuts in the field of culture and the arts, this discussion about artistic labour is still addressed with the aim of justifying or claiming against austerity measures and cultural budget cuts. For example, in Spain, the Minister of Education, Culture and Sports, José Ignacio Wert, said in 2013 that the arts were a “distraction” in comparison with other subjects such as maths or language<sup>4</sup>. He used this ‘argument’ in order to justify a reduction of the amount of hours, and subsequently money, spent in the arts at school. This demonstrates that creative work has been traditionally considered as non-work, or, at least, as a less essential type of work. Think, for example, about the word *painter*. People would rapidly make the difference between *painter* as a worker, and *painter* as an artist. Indeed, the website [Oxforddictionaries.com](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com), which is a widely spread and popular tool for searching words, also distinguishes these two ‘different’ meanings of the word *painter*<sup>5</sup>, which are presented in two different entries. The first entry defines *painter* as “an artist who paints pictures”, whereas the second entry refers to *painter* as “a person whose job is painting buildings”. It is especially interesting to notice how the word *job* is included only in the second entry of the dictionary. Therefore, the first thing that needs to be clarified is the question: *can art actually be defined as labour?*

## 1.2. Art as immaterial labour

Defining the arts as labour<sup>6</sup> is not only concerned with semantics and meaning, but also with politics. It implies giving artists the status of workers and, therefore, applying labour regulations to artistic practice. However, as argued before, labour is being redefined with the aim of creating a kind of *tabula rasa* from which to establish new exploitation rules. The importance of examining the relationship between labour and the arts includes analysing how artistic practice is being used as a paradigm from which to design those new labour rules.

The identification of artistic practice to labour has historically been problematic, particularly in the field of the performing arts, due to the difficulty of answering certain questions, such as: what does it mean to work for an actor? To perform? To rehearse? Both? None? Nowadays, the arts in general, and the performing arts in particular, are both identified as immaterial labour because they relate to an intellectual activity and to the production of immaterial substance (subjectivity, reflection, thinking, etc.) However, there is a clear difference between the plastic arts, for

---

<sup>4</sup> This case will be later on examined in this thesis.

<sup>5</sup> Online at: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/painter>

<sup>6</sup> This discussion about the relationship between labour and the arts could be further elaborated by looking at Hannah Arendt’s definitions of *action*, *labour* and *work*. Margaret Canovan refers to these definitions in the “Introduction” she wrote to Arendt’s book entitled *The Human Condition* in 1998. Canovan explains that there is a clear difference in Arendt’s theories between “labor, which corresponds to the biological life of man as an animal; work, which corresponds to the artificial work of objects that human beings build upon the earth; and action, which corresponds to our plurality as distinct individuals” (ix). However, this distinction does not solve the problem because it does not provide an answer to the question: can the arts be clearly and indisputably placed in (only) one of these categories (labour, work or action)?



example, which are related to the production of a physical object, and the performing arts, linked to an intangible object: the performance. Paolo Virno in *The Grammar of the Multitude* (2004) recognizes this problem and tries to understand it by consulting Marx's theory about this topic. This way, Virno discovers that Marx distinguished between two principal types of immaterial labour: labour that produces commodities that can be separated from the producer (books, cd's, dvd's, pictures, installations, etc.), and labour that produces commodities that cannot be separated from the producer and the act of producing itself (performances). Virno also goes back to Aristotle's "distinction between activity-with-end-product and activity-without-end-product" (Virno 2004, 53- 54). This second type of immaterial labour, in which the product, the producer and the act of producing cannot be isolated, is characteristic of the performing arts. In the field of the performing arts, the end-product (the performance) can only exist while being performed by performers. In other words, the performance is a 'product' the existence of which has to be actualized through the bodies and the activity (production) of the performers (producers). In summary, the performing arts do not "produce an end product which is distinguishable from performance" (Ibid, 56).

However, this distinction between the two types of immaterial labour does not give an account of the creative process and rehearsals. Performing arts do not only consist of performing a piece, but also of creating and rehearsing it. The relationship between the product, the production and the producer is not the same in all the phases of the process. While staging a piece in front of an audience, it is impossible to distinguish between the final product (performance) and the act of producing (performing the performance), whereas during the creative process, which includes thinking about the piece, for example, the product does not need to be embodied (and actualized) through performers-producers' bodies. In this case, the product, which is still only an abstract idea or a project drafted on a piece of paper, can indeed be distinguishable from production. Therefore, it seems that the type of immaterial labour specific of the performing arts is characterized by including different periods in which the piece (product) relates to the act of production and to producers in different ways. Materiality, and not only immateriality, is particularly important during certain stages of the creative process, such as the period of documentation: performances have to be recorded, filmed, photographed and described in dossiers with the aim of materializing (and selling) them. This way, the presence of materiality becomes obvious, even when referring to immaterial labour. Grlja explains this idea when maintaining that, even though immaterial labour has to do with immateriality, it is always surrounded by a material context. We are part of a material world, which means that we "cannot deny the material [...] conditions, in which we have to operate" (Grlja 2010, 49).

All of this aside, the most relevant question is whether the arts, and more specifically, the performing arts, play a role in the definition of what immaterial labour actually *is*, or not. As explained before, immaterial labour relates to the temporality of speed and the subjectivity of acceleration, which is also an intrinsic characteristic of the (performing) arts nowadays. Kunst published an article in the *Manifesta Journal* entitled "The Project Horizon: On the Temporality of Making" (2012) where she calls this very specific temporality characteristic of the performing arts, linked to acceleration and speed, "projective time" or "projective temporality". This projective temporality relates to the concept of *project*. *Project* is a term that has recently been generalized to talk about the way artists work. Artists are always working on a project, which implies a never-ending projection to the future. The project is what has still been unaccomplished and still needs to be accomplished in the future. It is a forecast, a promise that is supposed to be accomplished,

but not today. This way, artists are always trapped in a promise of a new project, between the present and the unachievable future. “Over the course of this ‘projective time’, artists are expected to successfully negotiate both realized and unrealized projects in addition to projecting new imaginaries upon the future. However, such acts of imagination always depend on a successful calculation between the present and the future” (Kunst 2012, 112). The project, then, becomes the horizon, the actual end-product of artistic labour.

The never-ending projection to the future implies a lack of “the actual time of the present” (Ibid, 115). Artists always work for a future moment. They do not experience the ‘now’ and, therefore, they are always ‘running’ with the aim of grasping the slippery horizon. They live in the present with the urgent necessity of living in the projected future. Speed does not only relate to the rhythms of production but also to the necessity of change and innovation. Artists are expected to always create new and original things. What is more, artists are told to be different from other artists. Originality includes creating artists’ own existence and image. Artists also have to be original, which means being mutable and always-changing. “Projective temporality also influences the acceleration of imaginative and creative work, and, in the race to reach the horizon, demands continuous transformation toward a new, even more radical individualisation of the subject” (ibid, 113). The word *project* has been generalized and applied to other fields beyond art: we talk about scientific projects, engineering design projects, etc. This way, the projective temporality typical of the arts serves as a model to follow for other professions.

However, there is still one question concerning projects that needs an answer: If the project is a never-ending process, then, when is it finished? Kunst argues that a project is never completely finished. This is why the concept of *deadline* has been created. The deadline is the illusion of an achievable horizon, the artificial ending of the project. The deadline is normally established by the one who receives the project (festivals organizers looking for proposals, theatre programmers looking for new performances, etc.) not by the one who develops the project (the artist). Therefore, artists are expected to always be working. The exhausting and always-ongoing artistic labour is like the water of a river that always remains flowing in the same direction until it reaches the sea. But the deadline is only a fiction, because the project does not die the day the document containing the main ideas of the project is submitted. The project, in the same way the water of the river does when it blends with the water of the sea, evaporates, creates clouds and rains back down again, also survives and takes part in a perpetual cycle.

### **1.3. Art residencies as ‘accelerated institutions’ for the development of artistic practice**

Art residencies are the most appropriate example to illustrate the working conditions characteristic of artistic labour. Art residencies consist of a space and an amount of time that artists are provided with in order to produce an artwork or develop a project. Art residencies, as defined by Laura Windhager and Lisa Mazza in “Neither Working nor Unworking. On Residencies as Sites of Production”<sup>7</sup> (2013) are “sites or spaces of production, they are process oriented, open ended, they require no final product –at least in most programmes.” However, this illusion of freedom created by art residencies’ organizations ends up being totally false since artists are most of the times required to show the way they work or their work-in-progress. Therefore, “this openness and freedom for creativity and production is also limited and deceptive: whilst no actual artwork or finished text might be expected, it is common practice that the residents give public

---

<sup>7</sup> Online at: <http://www.openspace-zkp.org/2013/en/journal.php?j=4&t=26>

talks, have an open studio day or even finish with a solo or group exhibition” (Windhager and Mazza 2013). This urgency in justifying the way an artist-in-residence is spending his/her time by publicly showing at least his/her working process emphasizes the necessity of institutions to offer the illusion of a final product. There is no artistic practice without product. Indeed, artistic practice itself becomes the product. The final work of art is never finished. This is why artists should move from a residency to the next one. The artistic project has to keep on being developed and the artist has to keep on showing the only product s/he can show: his/her own artistic practice, his/her own life. The projective temporality consists of living in a perpetual state of looking for a new residency.

Residencies are also defined by their ontological vagueness. It is not clear what the limits of an art residency are: where does labour start? Is there any difference between working and living during an art residency? From the point of view of Windhager and Mazza, “residencies and their studio programmes offer studios where life and work collide”, which implies that residencies are linked to “the practices of immaterial labour and the post-fordist working conditions with their flexible working hours, immaterial labour, the dissolution of routinisation, and the drill to excessive individualisation” (Ibid). Artists cannot distinguish between labour and life, which implies the existence of a perpetual working process.

It should be neither forgotten that the way art residencies function is closely linked to the way Capitalism is organized. Art residencies, as argued by J.K. Bergstrand-Doley in “EMERGENCY ECTOPLASMIC EXODUS Rejected Materials – Take II”<sup>8</sup> (2013), reproduce the selection procedure that takes place as part of any other company’s recruitment process. Artists have to apply and compete for a position as an artist-in-residence. After the process of selection has come to an end, artists that have not been selected to take part in the art residency programme become “component parts of the value of those who succeed, revenants haunting success through their failure” (Bergstrand-Doley 2013). Artists-in-residence that have succeeded, then, become a kind of elite that get access to the production facilities provided by the art residency organization. Sometimes, these production facilities include “a form of payment that is below the poverty line” (Ibid), but that has to be considered by artists as an extremely valuable *extra* facility. Artistic elite includes all those artists that have access to (ridiculous amounts of) economic income, which becomes a luxury production tool in a world where art is hardly ever remunerated.

Analysing art residencies can make one aware of the type of labour expected from artists. It is a type of labour related to a projective temporality that includes acceleration, speed and perpetual working cycles. Artists never inhabit the current moment but the future. There is always a necessity of applying for a new art residency. Residencies become an essential part of an artist’s *curriculum vitae*. They are indispensable for the sake of a successful artistic career. Art residencies are also related to vagueness since artists’ working conditions are not defined, labour and life overlap and artists have to deal with never-ending working days. What is more, the artistic final product, what used to be called the *work of art*, is not the goal anymore. What artists offer to the public is an image of themselves while working. Artistic practice is the product. Thus, artists’ lives become marketable.

---

<sup>8</sup> Online at: <http://www.openspace-zkp.org/2013/en/journal.php?j=4&t=27>

#### **1.4. The necessity of slowing down and being lazy**

Whether artistic practice is defined as labour or not, the most relevant thing for this thesis is to observe how the arts have incorporated, reproduced and projected the temporality of acceleration typical of Post-Fordism and immaterial labour as an inherent characteristic, which makes artists' lives become precarious in the same way workers' lives do. There is a lack of time in the present to serenely develop an artistic practice distinguishable from life itself. Life and artistic practice overlap because of this lack of a calm present-moment. Artists are expected to be always working on art projects the limits of which are totally uncertain, undefined and diffuse. Projects are simply forthcoming and potential realities that deprive artists of their current existence here and now. This turns into an anxious and precarious situation.

What would it be necessary in order to produce a change in the precarious situation typical of artistic practice and immaterial labour? The main stance in this thesis is that it is necessary to defend alternative temporalities that focus on the importance of having time for doing nothing but existing, slowing down and prioritizing 'unproductive' activities, such as maintenance tasks or affective and social relationships, over production and labour. The arts can play an important role in this process of change from a temporality of acceleration to a temporality of laziness and slowness since artistic practice has always included the potentiality of producing new realities.

## 2. TOWARDS A NEW TEMPORALITY OF LAZINESS AND SLOWNESS

This section examines the concept of *laziness*, and its ability to function as an alternative temporality, from the point of view of several authors that have defended the necessity of rethinking the way we experience time and production rhythms in order to create more fair and sustainable relationships between human beings and their habitat, which includes the physical, geographical, social, political and temporal context they inhabit. After having introduced this concept, I will also examine the relationship between the arts and laziness with the aim of revealing its revolutionary potential to challenge the temporality of acceleration typical of post-fordist Capitalism. Finally, I will focus on the four case-studies that have already been mentioned in the introduction in order to provide different examples that demonstrate that this relationship between laziness and artistic practice can actually take place.

### 2.1. On laziness and slowness

In capitalist societies, *working* appears as the only possible *doing*. Working is the most appreciated type of activity. It is, as maintained by Pablo Rieznik in “La Perea y la Celebración de lo Humano” (2004), “*la virtud de la nueva sociedad*”<sup>9</sup>, the virtue of the new society. The identification of labour as a virtue has penetrated so deeply the heart of every single individual that it has translated into an irrational love of work. Lafargue reports this passion and obsession for working at the very beginning of his pamphlet entitled *The Right to be Lazy*, written in 1883 and published in English by International Publishing Co. in 1898<sup>10</sup>, as follows:

A strange mania governs the working class of all countries in which capitalist civilization rules, a mania that results in the individual and collective misery that prevails in modern society. This is the love of work, the furious mania for work, extending to the exhaustion of the individual and his descendants. The parsons, the political economists, and the moralists, instead of contending against this mental aberration, have canonized work (4).

Other authors of the XIX century, such as Robert Louis Stevenson, also noticed this deification of labour supported by capitalist societies. Indeed, Robert Louis Stevenson, in a sarcastically critical way, denounced the reduction of human life to a mere production instrument in his essay “An Apology for Idlers”, contained in *Essays of Robert Louis Stevenson* (2008), where he stated: “As if a man's soul were not too small to begin with, they have dwarfed and narrowed theirs by a life of all work and no play” (38). Due to the canonization of labour and the value and the importance given to it as the measure of all things, laziness appears as a vice or as an immoral behaviour that should be avoided. Laziness is perceived as a synonym of *doing nothing at all* since it supposedly relates to passiveness. Aaron Schuster expresses this idea in “It is Very Difficult to Do Nothing. Notes on Laziness” (2012), as follows: “We tend to think of laziness as pure vegetable nihilism, but that is itself a symptom of our idealization of work”<sup>11</sup>. Lazy people are perceived as not being productive anymore, and therefore, they are not useful for the economy. “Laziness or idleness falls out of this economy, and for that reason it is strictly worthless” (Schuster 2012). Concurrently to the process

---

<sup>9</sup> Online at: [http://www.dgz.org.br/jun04/Art\\_01.htm](http://www.dgz.org.br/jun04/Art_01.htm)

<sup>10</sup> This version has also been published online by the Socialist Labor Party of America: [http://www.slp.org/pdf/others/lazy\\_pl.pdf](http://www.slp.org/pdf/others/lazy_pl.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Online at: <http://metropolism.com/magazine/2012-no2/liever-niets/>

of identification of working to the only possible mode of being in capitalist societies, the identification of the worker to “the predominant figure of subjectivity” (Ibid) has also taken place. Consequently, the citizen is still a citizen as long as s/he is working. Labour makes it possible for people to become citizens by having access to the basic social services such as public health, education services and salaries. Therefore, these two categories (*worker* and *citizen*) overlap and it becomes impossible to distinguish one from the other. Citizens-workers organize their time around labour. This way, “the temporality of life becomes governed by work” (Gill and Pratt 2008, 17), what people actually experience is not time at its purest, but the time of working rhythms. Labour, then, “becomes [an] *embodied experience*” (Ibid, 19).

Understanding laziness as *doing nothing at all* is closely linked to the concept of heterochrony, coined by Michel Foucault in “Des Espaces Autres”, a conference that was pronounced for the first time in 1967 and published in *Empan* in 2004. In this conference, Foucault established a new category with the aim of giving a name to certain spaces that are unreal but actually exist in our world. He distinguished the concept of utopia (the unreal space that does not exist) from the concept of heterotopia (the unreal space that does exist). The perfect heterotopia for Foucault was the boat because “*le bateau, c’est un morceau flottant d’espace, un lieu sans lieu, qui vit par lui-même, qui est fermé sur soi et qui est livré en même temps à l’infini de la mer*” (19), which is to say that the boat is a piece of space floating in the water, a space without space, which lives by itself, which shuts itself off from the outside and which is simultaneously free in the infinitude of the sea. The boat does not exist in a specific place, but in an always-mutable-somewhere. Heterotopias always relate to alternative temporalities, which Foucault called heterochronies. A heterochrony, then, is the unreal temporality, which, nevertheless, exists. In other words, heterochrony is, as defined by Alvin Cheng-Hin Lim in “Hybridity as Heterochrony” (2014), a “temporal otherness” (486). Heterotopias, as well as heterochronies, function in a specific way within the capitalist system. For example, Foucault talked about prisons, cemeteries or holiday resorts as heterotopias since they are places with a very specific function within society, but, at the same time, they are places that are not conceived by society as being totally real, even though they are. Laziness can be conceived as a heterochrony because of the same reason. It is a type of temporality the existence of which is not totally accepted by Capitalism, because it implies a ‘waste’ of time that could have been spent on producing something. However, it still has a very specific function within the system. Laziness is expected to provide an opportunity to reproduce the labour force, which is necessary for the development of the productive economy. Laziness is doing nothing but providing time and allowing workers’ to recuperate from the hard work. It is the “*reposo imprescindible para el mantenimiento de la fuerza de trabajo*” (Reiznik 2004), the indispensable moment for resting in order to maintain the workforce.

This type of laziness allowed by Capitalism is not emancipatory at all; it does not make it possible to have a moment for freedom since it has been designed to maintain, or even increase, the productive capacity of the economy. Lazy moments are neither free because they have to be filled with activities offered by the same corporations that exploit workers. Therefore, workers consume what they produce. One cannot simply get out of this cycle because there seems to be no time for doing it. Workers are always running out of time, whether they are working or not. There is not space for emptiness. As Robert Hassan pointed out, this age of speed is also the age of distraction. Many things happen simultaneously and quickly. There is a kind of *horror vacui*, a fear of empty space, motionlessness and silence. There is a fear of nothing happening, a fear of boredom. Consequently, there is a clear difference between laziness as it is understood by Capitalism, which is a moment for reproducing the workforce that is filled in with a large series of distractions, and

laziness as it was theorized by Lafargue, which is an emancipatory concept that endangers capitalist leisure and capitalist temporality of acceleration. In 1995, L'Association des Temps Libérés (The Association of Freed Time) was created by Pierre Huyghe with the aim of providing a platform for making art and creating an alternative way of experiencing free time far away from the concept of leisure supported by Capitalism. The term *freed time*, as established by Lauren Rotenberg in "The Prospects of 'Freed' Time: Pierre Huyghe and L'Association des Temps Libérés" (2013), was indeed coined to emphasize the importance of "imaginative play and social experiments as distinct from the packaged and controlled leisure time of the work economy" (186). This way, Huyghe looked back on the importance given to games and creative leisure by the Situationist International<sup>12</sup> during the sixties. Situationists, as well as Huyghe, conceived playing as a free and creative activity that reveals the absurdity of spending one's life working so hard and consuming leisure for the sake of the economy. Sadie Plant describes situationists' defense of play in *The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age* (1992) as follows: "The situationists wanted to develop this provocative love of play into a way of life" (72). Huyghe's objective in developing L'Association des Temps Libérés was essentially the same. He did not only want to reject work, but to completely get out of the capitalist dynamics of production and consumption by supporting alternative ways of *being in the world* and spending time, such as playing.

Lafargue's concept of laziness also incorporates this critique to the capitalist leisure. As indicated by Pablo Reiznik, laziness is closely linked to the meaning given to *leisure* by the ancient Romans, who took it from the ancient Greeks. Romans conceived *otium* (leisure) as the natural and active mode of being, as the actual *doing*, whereas *negotium* (literally, non-leisure) was the denial of this *doing*. Lafargue's concept of laziness includes this meaning given to *leisure* by ancient Romans. As a consequence, laziness is "connected with freedom in a more positive and humanist sense, as the cultivation of life for its own sake outside the iron cage of economic calculation" (Schuster 2012). Laziness implies experiencing and embodying an alternative temporality which differs from that one of productivity, efficiency and acceleration. What Lafargue indeed claimed in *The Right to be Lazy*, then, was to go back again to this type of temporality that once existed.

Conceiving laziness as an active mode of being imposes the necessity of questioning the concept of laziness itself. If laziness is not *doing nothing*, then, how can we call the mode of being consisting in a passive way of actually doing nothing? Lash argues that melancholy, instead of laziness, is what we actually mean by *passively doing nothing*. Melancholy implies being apathetic. It is the opposite of laziness. Laziness means non-working, whereas melancholy means non-doing at all. Melancholic subjects, unlike lazy subjects, "are inactive. They do not use time, they – like prisoners – 'kill time'" (Lash 1998, 316). Melancholy cannot work as an alternative temporality because it simply relates to indifference and it does not challenge the temporality of acceleration, whereas laziness implies an active role of the subject, which endangers the prominence given to labour as the activity around which accelerated time is organised.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Situationist International (1957 – 1972) was a group of theorists and artists based in Paris whose main leader was Guy Debord. This group was highly influenced by Surrealism and Dadaism and also by Marxism and Sartre's ideas. Situationists claimed against both the culture of capitalist mass consumption and the aesthetics of contemporary art and spectacle. They developed a series of ludic and playful strategies in order to produce a change in the order of things and they also highlighted the importance of games and playing as an alternative way of living in a society that venerates labour above all things.

Laziness, as an alternative temporality opposed to the temporality of acceleration, implies new concepts from which to look at the world, such as slowness, pleasure and degrowth<sup>13</sup>. Laziness does not only imply working less, and therefore producing less, but also working slower and allowing time for not working at all, which translates into a subsequent enjoyment of time and the duration of the present-moment. There is enough time for people to actually inhabit their current lives instead of inhabiting the projective and uncertain future. Working less and working slower also implies a degrowth of the economy. For the capitalist economy, which has traditionally been related to the myth of the endless growth, this alternative order of things is simply inconceivable.

## 2.2. Laziness does not only endanger Capitalism

Being lazy, slowing down and degrowing do not only endanger the myth of the endless growth but also other realities and institutions deeply rooted in Capitalism and perpetuated over time, such as the patriarchy. Acceleration and speed have caused a “masculinization of the perception of time, of the perception of politics, of perception itself” (Berardi 2011). This means that claiming for laziness and slowness is also recognising the important role of slow temporalities traditionally conceived as being ‘feminine’. These slow temporalities are concerned with activities of reproduction and maintenance of life, the economy of care and the affective labour. Mierle Laderman Ukeles, an artists who developed her career mainly during the sixties, directly points to this masculinization of the perception of time and denounces this relationship between Capitalism, the temporality of acceleration and the patriarchy with her art of maintenance.

Ukeles wrote a Manifesto in 1969 in which she promoted the art of maintenance. This implied considering daily and repetitive maintenance tasks such as sweeping, washing or cooking, which have traditionally been performed by women, as art. “Everything I say is Art is Art”, she maintained on page 2 of her “Maintenance Art Manifesto 1969!” Identifying art to maintenance tasks implied recognizing the possibility of defining art not as the always new, innovative, original and changing anymore. Therefore, maintenance art, which implies taking to the front the importance of traditional ‘feminine’ tasks, challenges both the temporality of acceleration and the patriarchy. Maintenance relates to slow and repetitive rhythms because it has nothing to do with the productive and ‘masculine’ economy but to the reproductive and ‘feminine’ economy. Maintenance is, in words of Helen Molesworth in “House Work and Art Work (2000), a series of “activities that make things possible” (78). Maintenance is the support of life and existence, the basis for everything else. In summary, maintenance consists of protecting what already exists. This way, by developing a type of art that differs from the idea of art as being always-new, always-innovative and always-original, Ukeles rejects the necessity of a never-ending projection to the future. The *projective temporality*, as Kunst has theorized it, is not applicable to maintenance art because maintenance tasks always occur in this precise moment, maintenance is always happening. It is not a promise nor a project, but an actual practice that takes place in the present and needs time to be developed. Ukeles’ art rejects fast Capitalism and supports slowness, repetition and the actual rhythms of the real economy and life by emphasizing the activities traditionally relegated to the domestic and ‘feminine’ field. She uses these words in her manifesto in order to express this idea:

Maintenance: keep the dust of the pure individual creation; preserve the new; sustain the change; protect progress; defend and prolong the advance; renew the excitement; repeat the flight; show your work—show it again; keep the contemporary art museum groovy; keep the home fires burning (1).

---

<sup>13</sup> This concept of *degrowth* will be later on developed in this thesis.



Therefore, maintenance art is not about always trying to create something new by developing a new project. It is about maintaining, keeping, protecting and repeating what has already been made. This idea of *protecting the existing newness* instead of just *creating new newness* radically challenges capitalist and patriarchal faith on fast processes of production and consumption. There is no need to produce/to buy new things anymore. Things can be renewed each day. Renovation is a repetitive and slow process that has historically been performed by women.

But setting aside Ukeles' work, it can be perceived that, besides patriarchy, the temporality of laziness also implies questioning the existence of other concepts, such as *success*. Laziness actually provides an opportunity for failure. Mistakes are part of human activity. However, in a world where results have to be achieved immediately, failure is not an option. There is no time to explore different possibilities, there is no time to develop a process, and there is no time to be wrong. Success is the only possible goal. Thus, mistakes are automatically perceived as being negative. Laziness is an expanded time that allows choices to be made. Failure as well as success can happen.

Finally, laziness also provides a space for 'disabled' and 'unhealthy' bodies to do things. Beatriz Preciado in her conference "¿La muerte de la clínica?", pronounced on March, 9<sup>th</sup> 2013 in the Museo de Arte Reina Sofía (Madrid, Spain)<sup>14</sup>, explained that, from the expansion of the industrial Capitalism and the increasing importance given to production and work, *healthy bodies* have been only identified as those that used to attend the workplace. The healthy body has always been the masculine working body. Other bodies, related to other activities and temporalities, such as feminine bodies or 'disabled' (meaning disabled for working) bodies were catalogued and defined as handicapped or pathological. Thus, the refusal of acceleration and speed, and the redefinition of work may also produce a redefinition of the *healthy body*.

### 2.3. Chronopolitics

The potentiality of laziness to function as an alternative temporality opposed to capitalist temporality of acceleration, and therefore to Capitalism itself, also produces a politicization of time. Political power now resides in those who manage time and define life rhythms and temporalities. As Paul Virilio has noticed in his book *Speed and Politics* (2006), power is not a question of geopolitics anymore, but a question of chronopolitics:

The maneuver that once consisted in *giving up ground to gain Time* loses its meaning: at present, gaining Time is exclusively a matter of vectors. Territory has lost its significance in favour of the projectile. *In fact, the strategic value on the non-place of speed has definitively supplanted that of place*, and the question of possession of Time has revived that of territorial appropriation. (149)

Considering time as a *space without space*, or as a *non-space* that, nevertheless, can be conquered, is what has made it possible for Negri and Hardt's disperse factory to succeed. The social factory has been installed *in time*. The traditional factory, considered as a physical and well defined space, did not only provide a place to perform labour, but also a moment to do it. The existence of a concrete space, then, was intimately related to the existence of a specific amount of hours that were spent at the workplace. However, the evanescence of the factory as a concrete and tangible place has also had an impact on the amount of hours workers spend on their jobs. Labour has not spatial or temporal limits anymore. It spreads all over the space-time. The difficulty

---

<sup>14</sup> Online at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4aRrZZbFmBs>

of grasping time and defining the limits of the diffuse factory is, in fact, what has caused the precarization of the working conditions. Speed, which is the main strategy used in times of war with the aim of conquering new territories to the enemy, is now used as the main strategy to conquer citizens-workers time. Workers' lives are totally colonised by activities that they did not actually choose: working, producing and consuming. Speed, then, as established by Paul Virilio, is a type of violence since it is intentionally used with the aim of governing time without allowing a moment for reaction or disagreement.

#### **2.4. From the politicization of time to the political implications in the change of the perception of time.**

How can a shift from acceleration and speed to laziness be produced and what are the role and the responsibility of artists in this process? One of the first steps in order to produce a change in the way time is experienced is to reject the concept of labour. When artists claim for their right to be recognised as workers, they incur the same mistake exploited workers fell into in the XIX century when claiming for their right to work. Indeed, this is the most important critique Lafargue, who was Marx's son-in-law, makes of communists. Sven Lütticken in "Liberation through Laziness. Some Chronopolitical Remarks" (2014), reports this critique by maintaining that Lafargue "accuses the communist movement of buying into the myth of labor"<sup>15</sup>, which implies falling into the nets of the capitalist ideology based on the exploitation of the working force. The right to work is "the right to become slaves to regular wages and to the rhythm of the machine" (Hassan 2012, ix). Refusing work and standing up for a lazy society, for its part, explicitly imply a refusal of the political and economic Capitalism and its imposed rules. Refusing work does not mean refusing workers' (including artists') power and ability to change the order of things. Andrea Smith points out in her article entitled "Humanity Through Work" (2014), that when Lafargue critiques the communist 'myth of labour', nevertheless, he "does not de-center the proletariat from being the central agent of the revolution but does argue that the 'the right to be lazy' is central to the revolutionary project"<sup>16</sup>. Therefore, if artists really want to get out of their precarious situation, and serve as an example for other workers, they should not demand their right to work and their right to be fully recognised as workers, but their right to remain lazy.

Furthermore, in order to make the mechanism of the capitalist society visible and claim for a space in the shift from speed to laziness, artists, especially those who 'work' in the field of the performing arts (which is the field more directly concerned with immateriality), should also question the concept of immateriality itself. Indeed, there are some authors, such as Beatriz Preciado, who have argued against the concept of immaterial labour because it does not give an accurate account of the actual character of the production processes. Preciado maintains in her book *Testo Yonki* (2008), that the only thing Italian operaists have done is to discuss among themselves to discover "*en qué medida el trabajo cognitivo o 'inmaterial' es realmente inmaterial*" (196), to what extent cognitive or 'immaterial' labour is actually immaterial. However they have not paid enough attention to the materiality that still reigns in the field of labour. In the age of the production of cognitive substance, it is the material body of the worker what indeed allows products to be actualized, or, in words of Shannon Jackson in "Just-in-Time. Performance and the Aesthetics of Precarity" (2012), immaterial objects cannot exist without a material support, which is necessary "to bring them continually into being" (19). The activity performed by a given material

---

<sup>15</sup> Online at: <http://moussemagazine.it/articolo.mm?id=1071>

<sup>16</sup> Online at: [http://www.borderlands.net.au/Vol13No1\\_2014/smith\\_humanity.pdf](http://www.borderlands.net.au/Vol13No1_2014/smith_humanity.pdf)

body guarantees the achievement of a given immaterial product: there is no information without the physical activity of the journalist, which includes researching, interviewing, writing, etc., nor is there any performance without the material activity of the performer<sup>17</sup>, which includes speaking, moving, singing, etc. In other words, the material body, in the case of the performing arts, is always the support that guarantees the achievement of the immaterial effect: the performance (Jackson 2012). Both Jackson and Preciado question the concept of immaterial labour and they suggest two new adjectives to define labour: “über-material” (Preciado 2008, 197) and hypermaterial (Jackson 2012, 19). Über-material or hypermaterial labour is labour beyond materiality. It is more than material. It is material and *something else*. From Preciado’s point of view, labour is now more than ever related to the materiality of the body. Indeed, the body itself and the different things it embodies can become the final product. In the field of performing arts, for example, there is no difference between the final product and the ones who embody this product. The performance occurs in/on/surrounding the material bodies of the performers. However, the performance itself is perceived by the audience as an immaterial object. Talking about the arts in terms of über-material or hypermaterial labour, then, makes it possible to emphasize the material character of the artistic process of production without forgetting the immaterial character of the artistic effect (the performance itself as it is perceived by spectators). This distinction between the material production of performances and the immaterial effect of performances was made by Jackson in order to characterise the main features typical of the artistic practice in the field of the performing arts. The most important thing in relation to this distinction is that it underlines the prevalence of materiality during the artistic process, which, as it will later on be argued, is necessary in order to claim for an alternative temporality of laziness.

Besides Preciado and Jackson, other authors have also reflected on the material essence of the arts from different perspectives. For example, Josefine Wikström, in “Practice comes before labour: An attempt to read performance through Marx’s notion of practice” (2012), reflects on the concept of *practice*, which was already included by Marx in his “Theses on Feuerbach” (1845). She prefers to use the term practice instead of labour due to the broad sense and ambiguity of the last one in relation to the performing arts. This selection of terms is, nevertheless, very relevant. When the author chooses to talk about practice instead of labour, she remarks the material essence of the performing arts since practising implies using the material body to do something. Therefore, thinking about the performing arts in terms of practice, implies that one of the main characteristics of the performing arts is the “use of the body as material” (Wikström 2012, 25). Even in early stages of the creative process, when there are still no rehearsals and the main task consists of thinking about the piece, materiality is also present because intellectual tasks cannot be performed without using a material part of the body: the brain. Thinking is not an immaterial task, it requires physical processes and it consumes energy. Thinking is a body function, a somatic activity. Therefore, the production of subjectivity, the production of knowledge, the production of the cognitive substance, the production of art or the production of culture are not immaterial at all. As maintained by Ortega y Gasset in *El Tema de Nuestro Tiempo* (1923): “*El pensamiento es una función vital, como la digestión o la circulación de la sangre. Que éstas últimas consistan en procesos espaciales, corpóreos y aquella no, es una diferencia nada importante para nuestro tema*” (57-58). With these words, Ortega y Gasset meant that thinking is a vital function, such as digestion or the circulation of blood. The fact that the last-mentioned, unlike the first one, consists of spatial and body processes is a difference without importance for our concern here. Revealing that there is always a material support that allows the development of any kind of human activity,

---

<sup>17</sup> With *performer* I refer here to a human being, an object, the lights, or even the space.

including making art, is necessary in order to produce a change from acceleration to laziness because it implies that speed cannot be accelerated *ad infinitum*. Our bodies cannot deal with an always increasing acceleration in the process of production. In other words, our bodies have certain physical and somatic limits in relation to speed and acceleration that have to be respected.

Questioning immaterial labour also implies recognising that the mechanisms, strategies and objectives of Capitalism are not so different from those of the early industrial age. These mechanisms, strategies and objectives have been simply ameliorated, updated, improved, refined, diffused, computerised and accelerated. Changes have been made, of course, but not essential changes. In other words, questioning the concept of immaterial labour is revealing that there is not a new, and more civilized, Capitalism that is not based on arduous material labour anymore. Therefore, artists do not have to claim for being recognised as workers because they already are. Their work does not deeply and essentially differ from industrial labour. However, the kind of limbo where artists have traditionally been placed due to the difficulty of defining art either as labour or as non-labour, makes it possible for them to play an important role at the vanguard of the revolution consisting in redefining the things humans do and the time humans inhabit while doing them. Of course, until this shift from speed to laziness is accomplished, artists have still to survive within the capitalist system. So, what could be the strategy during the process? What could artists do to make their working conditions improve in the meanwhile? Probably, the best option is not only to question, but also to totally discard the concept of immaterial labour to refer to what artistic practice is. The concept of immaterial labour, as revealed by Negri and Hardt, only relates to the characteristics of the final *product*. If the product is a physical object, then they talk about material labour; if the product is intangible, ephemeral and imponderable, then they talk about immaterial labour. However, laziness, as a shift in the focus from the result to the process, also implies taking into account the act of working itself, which is always performed by any part of a material body. From this point of view, any type of labour is intrinsically material. Considering artistic practice as material labour will provide artists with an historic opportunity to join other workers' claims instead of being apart from the labour movement.

### **2.5. Laziness in practice: artists that have supported alternative temporalities**

Some artists during the sixties, a moment when authors started theorizing about immaterial labour, proved with their artistic practice that questioning immaterial labour and producing a shift from acceleration to slowness was actually possible. Mierle Laderman Ukeles, who has already been introduced, questioned the temporality of speed from a gender perspective. Between 1973 and 1974, Ukeles performed a series of pieces in the Wadsworth Athenaeum (Connecticut). These pieces consisted of certain maintenance tasks that were performed in different spaces of the art gallery. In this case, as she had already established on page 3 of her "Maintenance Art Manifesto 1969!", her "working" was "the work". The artwork was the act of performing the maintenance task. Two of these pieces were *Hartford Wash: Washing Tracks, Maintenance Inside* and *Hartford Wash: Washing, Tracks, Maintenance Outside*. They consisted of Ukeles mopping the floor of the museum and cleaning the exterior space surrounding the museum respectively. This type of tasks, that have traditionally been executed by women, implied spending time taking care of the museum, preventing and repairing any damage on it and allowing the space to be used again in the future. Therefore, Ukeles did not only produce a change in the perception and use of time by emphasizing the relationship between art and maintenance tasks, but also by addressing a question of gender. Affective labour and reproductive economy have historically been linked to women, which means, it is necessary to recognize the role of women in the change from speed to

laziness. As argued by Judy Wajcman in *Pressed for Time: The Acceleration of Time in Digital Capitalism* (2015), “a gender perspective highlights how different kinds of tasks require different qualities of time and that speed, and the technologies that enable speed, may not enhance the relationship between the time spent and the activity. For instance, giving and receiving care involves slowness” (129). Ukeles, then, stands up for a new affective temporality. This type of temporality focuses on the creation of the appropriate atmosphere that allows relationships among human beings to be established. This atmosphere also allows these relationships to develop slowly, without necessarily succeeding.

Ukeles did not only criticize the relationship between acceleration, patriarchy and Capitalism through her art of maintenance, but also questioned the temporality and essence of labour by integrating herself as an unpaid worker /artist-in-residence in the museum. Indeed, Ukeles created a specific working position for herself at the Department of Sanitation in New York City. This way, Ukeles reproduced a practice that other art collectives, such as the Artist Placement Group, also developed consisting of placing artists in the workplace with the aim of modifying the way of looking at labour and temporalities related to work. The main goal was to discover what the simple presence of the artist produced in terms of temporality.

The Artist Placement Group was an art organization created in 1965. Its objective was to replace art and artist out of galleries. Bolt Rasmussen defines this objective more in detail in “The Politics of Interventionist Art: The Situationist International, Artist Placement Group, and Art Workers’ Coalition” (2009):

From 1965, the British group, Artist Placement Group, examined the social potential of art by placing artists in public institutions and companies. The placements were intended to introduce a different time perspective from that companies and institutions normally followed, making the creativity of art available outside the confines of the art institution and thereby pointing toward another way of life (36).

There is an obvious difference between Ukeles’ maintenance art and the Artist Placement Group consisting of the characteristics of the space they occupied. Ukeles preferred to use the artistic space in order to produce a change in the way we perceive art and the temporality related to it, whereas the Artist Placement Group went out of the art galleries. Despite this difference, the artistic practice developed by both Ukeles and the Artist Placement Group had an impact on the definition of the workplace. Ukeles redefined the relationship between art and labour by creating a specific working position for her in the art gallery, and the Artist Placement Group intervened into the workplace and questioned the rhythms of labour routine by placing artists in factories. Moreover, the main consequences of the intervention of these artists in social spaces was the same: they produced a change in the experience of time. The objective of the Art Placement Group was not to produce a specific work of art but to produce a change in the way time is perceived and experienced by placing artists outside art institutions. Placing artists out of art spaces provided an alternative way of life (including an alternative way of working and experiencing time). Artist Placement Group members actually played an important role in redefining temporalities at the workplace since they were not only experiencing new ways of relating to time themselves, but also producing a change in the way *others* experience it. The simple presence of artists, who were not asked to achieve any result or create any artwork, produced this change. This was possible because of the specific relationship existing between art and time.

[Artists] operate on a longer time base than other groups in society and partake in a value system that is in sharp contrast to that of commerce - expression, not economic profitability, is the value of

art - they were capable of registering the unfurling dynamic of the workplace and potentially to highlight alternative ways of working and being involved in the activities going on in the factory or institution (Bolt Rasmussen 2009, 41).

The objectives and practices developed by this organization evidenced that some artists do not look at their work as a marketable product or as a result, nor choose they a specific fragment of their work-in-progress in order to show it in front of an audience (as it is sometimes expected from artists-in-residence). Therefore, they do not focus on the artistic *project* (future) but on the artistic process (present). The result of the activity of the Artist Placement Group could not be measurable. The result was the process of experiencing a new way of relating to time. Art, as expressed in the last extract, is incompatible with capitalist rhythms of production because creative activity needs time to be produced. When Ukeles and members of the Artist Placement Group placed themselves at the workplace they were suggesting the possibility of relating to work from a new perspective. From their point of view, labour was not an exhaustive activity anymore, but a space of potentiality. Art, as developed by Ulekes and the Artist Placement Group, creates new conditions for production to be developed, based on a new way of understanding time. However, production itself is not required. The product is only a potential possibility.

In Argentina, also during the sixties, a collective of artists, who were very close to the Confederación General del Trabajo de los Argentinos (the General Confederation of Labour of the Argentine Republic), understood the importance of artistic intervention in order to explicitly point at reality and modify it. This collective developed a project called *Tucumán Arde* which consisted of a process of researching and documenting the social reality of a problematic region of the country, called Tucumán, which was directly affected by unemployment and poverty. In this case again, the artistic practice was not related to the production of an object anymore but to the production of the necessary social conditions for change. In other words, artists were using their presence and their time differently. They were spending their time *unproductively* because they were not focusing on the artwork but on reflecting on a given situation and trying to materialize the conflict and the social crisis so that the situation could become visible and modifiable. One can even say that they were not making art. They were being lazy since they were not developing the type of activities that are expected from artists. All the documents gathered by artists of the *Tucumán Arde* project were also exhibited in 1968 as part of an event that also contained other performative actions. The exhibition was rapidly censored by the Government, which was led by the dictator Juan Carlos Onganía. The artistic practice developed by Ukeles, the Artist Placement Group and the *Tucumán Arde* artists evidences the potentiality of artists to use their presence and their practice in order to modify the way we relate to the world, to time and to artistic practice (or labour) itself.

More recently, L'Association des Temps Libérés, created by Pierre Huyghe during the nineties, as already mentioned, also produced a redefinition of time. One of the pieces developed by this association was called *The House or Home?* It consisted of an unfinished house where social relationships were expected to generate. The relationships established among the people present in the house would produce the space. Instead of using bricks with the aim of building the walls of the unfinished house, Pierre Huyghe wanted the unfinished architectural structure to be completed and become a warm home thanks to the social activity performed within the space. This way, Huyghe reflected on the ability of non-work activities, such as socialization, to function as productive practices. Huyghe understood that this type of activities that involve affective tasks implies a "constant state of production" (Rotenberg 2013, 191) that, nevertheless, does not relate to Capitalism. The act of socialization is productive by definition because it always brings

something new into existence (new relationships, social spaces...), but this production cannot be previously planned and it is not measurable in terms of economic benefits. L'Association des Temps Libérés, then, was able to “contest linear production processes that follow planned protocols and allow social space to remain open to accident and chance constructions, thereby deviating from capitalism’s rational and efficient productive logic” (Ibid, 193). Artistic practice, from Huyghe’s point of view, must be randomly developed, which, again, implies a refusal of the concept of project and the projective temporality typical of artistic labour. The focus of Huyghe’s artistic practice is on a series of specific concepts, such as *accident*, *openness* or *chance*. He resists the projective temporality and the definition of *future* as the upcoming moment when things will be executed as previously projected. Huyghe claims for an artistic practice without a defined future. From his point of view, art inhabits the accidental and random present. Claiming for the current *now* as the moment that should be inhabited by artists implies defending the right of artists not to lack time. As Kunst maintained, artists lack time only because they inhabit the future. The shift from a temporality related to the future to a temporality linked to the present, then, includes a shift from lacking time to actually having time for doing things. What is more, in the present, things can happen slowly because there is no need to be in a hurry to grasp the future.

## **2.6. Producing the change from inside the system or from outside?**

Art developed by Pierre Huyghe differs from art developed by Mierle Laderman Ukeles, the Artist Placement Group and *Tucumán Arde* in the way he relates to institutions. Ukeles, the Artist Placement Group and artists developing the *Tucumán Arde* project explicitly established a dialogue with the capitalist structures (the museum, the factories and the Argentine Government respectively). This dialogue allowed them to materialize the conflict existing between time and labour. In these three cases, artists produced a change in the use, perception and experience of time because they developed their practice from inside Capitalism. However, Pierre Huyghe, clearly rejected the category of labour. He placed his artistic practice far away from the capitalist institutions. This allowed him to produce an alternative temporality related to the social activity performed by human beings, but he failed to produce a change in the temporality of speed. In other words, Huyghe’s artistic practice was so distant from Capitalism and the social conflicts related to its development, that he lost his ability to produce a change in the temporality of acceleration characteristic of contemporary (im)material labour. Artistic practice can only produce a shift from speed to laziness if it explicitly makes the relationship between acceleration and Capitalism visible. Becoming aware of this relationship is the first step to deconstruct the subjectivity of acceleration, which has consolidated after decades of fast labour. Deconstructing the subjectivity of acceleration will allow a new temporality of laziness and slowness to expand.

### 3. CONCLUSION: MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR A TEMPORALITY OF LAZINESS

Speed and acceleration are two inherent features of the temporality related to Post-Fordism. They determine how people work and the way they live. One of the consequences produced by the acceleration of time in the age of the so-called immaterial labour is the precarization of working conditions. There is no time for any other thing but producing. The temporality of acceleration typical of post-fordist Capitalism, nevertheless, can be challenged. Indeed, there are alternative temporalities that are being supported by different social collectives, scholars and artists in order to question our perception of time and speed and also the way societies relate to the world they inhabit. However, it is necessary to discard the concept of *immaterial labour* to achieve this goal. Admitting that human existence is essentially material and the world we inhabit is also material implies recognizing that our bodies and our habitats have certain physical limits that it is impossible to exceed without social and ecological catastrophic consequences. One of the physical limits of our material existence consists of recognizing that nothing can infinitely be accelerated. Artists, and all kind of 'immaterial' workers, then, have to claim for their practice/work to be defined as material as the first required step to start producing a change from speed to laziness. The refusal of immateriality is a required condition to produce this change, but it is not enough, though. The concept of labour itself must also be questioned for the sake of a slower society. Rejecting labour is recognizing that human life cannot be reduced to capitalist terms (productivity, efficiency, etc.) and, therefore, it implies recognizing the importance of other things we do besides working.

Artists supporting, enacting and experiencing laziness, then, are facing a process that requires two main stages. The first one consists of claiming for art to be defined as a material practice or even as material labour with the aim of both establishing the material basis for defending a temporality of laziness, and also joining the labour movement and have access to certain rights as workers. The second stage, nevertheless, consists of rejecting labour in order to emphasize the importance of other activities beyond production, that relate to slowness, laziness and pleasure, such as maintenance tasks, socialization, playing or making art. Rejecting labour is to claim for an alternative society and an alternative temporality that is not defined in terms of productivity and speed anymore. Therefore, rejecting labour does not necessarily mean to avoid the large series of activities we call "work", but to put an end to the hegemony of working as the only possible activity that supports the development of societies.



#### 4. LAZINESS BEYOND ART

Besides the field of the performing arts and the arts in general, the concept of laziness has also been developed by other disciplines with the aim of rethinking the temporalities people inhabit and improving living conditions. For example, laziness and slowness are two central ideas supported by the movement of degrowth. The movement of degrowth appeared in France and has developed during the last decades of the XX century and the beginning of the XXI century. It is an ecological movement that does not only focus on Nature and the impact of human activity on it, but also on the creation of an alternative social organization based on the idea of the Good Living. This Good Living implies slowing down. That is the reason why the movement of degrowth opposes the dynamics of fast production and the myth of infinite growth. It also opposes the so-called green policies of sustainable growth. From a degrowth point of view, sustainable growth is not possible. It does not exist. Sustainability necessarily implies degrowth, laziness and slowness. The problem is that slowness and laziness are not possible within Capitalism. Consequently, the movement of degrowth claims for getting out of the economy. Economic terms and analysis are no longer useful for describing social and environmental problems. Valérie Fournier explains this idea in "Escaping from the economy: the politics of degrowth" (2008), as follows: "Thus one of the starting point of the degrowth movement is to politicise the economy, to reveal it as an abstract idea, a self-referential system of representations rather than an objective reality, a set of 'given' facts" (533). Questioning economic realities implies considering people as being citizens rather than consumers or workers. In other words, it implies a change in the dominant and normative subjectivity characteristic of Capitalism. People are not workers, nor consumers anymore because labour and consumption are not expected to be the central activities around which human lives and societies are organized. Laziness and slowness include consuming less and working less hours and also questioning the type of labour that needs to be considered as such. However, this does not mean citizens must make sacrifices in order to slowing down: "degrowth is not envisaged in terms of sacrifice, or austerity and scarcity (as it is often accused of), but as an opportunity to reconsider what constitutes the good life" (Fournier 2008, 536). Finally, the degrowth movement also opposes the overrated end-oriented thinking, which implies a never-ending projection to the future. For the degrowth movement, *now* is the moment to do things.

Other fields, such as science or education, have recently included a reflection on the topic of laziness and slowness, too. Indeed, a "Slow Science Manifesto" has been written by the Slow Science Academy, founded in Germany in 2010, with the aim of questioning the rhythms imposed to science and scientific research nowadays. Scientific production should not be analysed in terms of financial benefits. In this manifesto, scientists argue that "science needs time to think. Science needs time to read, and time to fail"<sup>18</sup>. Having time also implies being independent from private companies' objectives. This manifesto reveals how the subjectivity of acceleration characteristic of Capitalism is not only a matter of working rhythms but also a matter of knowledge production rhythms. Scientists are asked to produce more and always new knowledge which indeed is not always possible. Acceleration in the production of knowledge is something that cannot be planned or projected. As stated by Jeremy Hunsinger In "Against Speed Cosmopolitanism towards the slow university" (2013):

[...] knowledge is not fast, knowledge grows fast but its growth is primarily due to population and population's multiplications, and not due to speed cosmopolitanism and technocultural acceleration of its technicities. Coming to know is not fast, nor is it becoming faster, and while new technologies

---

<sup>18</sup> Online at: <http://www.slow-science.org/slow-science-manifesto.pdf>

aid us in creating knowledge and the larger communities engaged with questions might create a simulation of acceleration of knowledges.<sup>19</sup>

Science, as well as art, needs time in order to develop. New scientific and artistic ideas are always supported by previous successes or failures. Thus, scientists have to learn how to become more patient in terms of expectancy. Again, it is a question of inhabiting the current moment instead of anticipating the future.

Finally, in the field of education, and more specifically, University education, there are some voices that also rise up against acceleration and speed. Learning is not a process that can be accelerated or decelerated depending on capitalist thirst for innovative knowledge. Learning rhythms have to be designed for students' sake. Each of us needs time to assimilate new concepts and theories and also to produce critical thinking. What is more, students also need time for producing social relationships. Acceleration and speed have made Universities become mere knowledge factories where cognitive substance is produced without any kind of analysis or debate. This is why "since knowledge and learning are slow and require time, perhaps we need to promote the idea of a slow university" (Hunsinger 2013). The slow university is a space where goals are not as important as processes. Indeed, one of the main problems of 'fast universities' is that these institutions feel the necessity of reaching as many goals as possible in the less time as possible in order to compete in the knowledge marketplace and climbing positions in the ranking of the world best and most efficient educational institutions.

University administrations are attempting to maximize profits from faculty labors as part of the need to be fact, the need to compete, the need to participate in the marketplace of higher education and research. The university and its faculty do not have to compete, we do not need to maximize profits, and we do not need to perpetually compare ourselves to others in order to justify our existence. What we need to do in order to justify our existence is to produce communities that generate knowledge (Ibid).

University education, as well as scientific research, is not a question of speed, but a question of quality, and quality can only be improved *in* time. Art can play a role in this shift from acceleration to laziness and slowness because of its potential to function as a disruptive force. Art and the performing arts can intervene in the public sphere and the different spaces of social organization, such as educational and science institutions, factories, or urban spaces with the aim of suggesting and actively producing an 'arrhythmia', a redefinition of the normative temporalities related to Capitalism. In other words, the performing arts, which are closely linked to the performative sense of 'nowness' and the development of *in situ* practices, can function as an engine that produces the movement towards a temporality of laziness. This implies recovering the potential of the arts not only to function as an aesthetic avant-garde but also as a political avant-garde.

This potential of the arts to question the already existing reality is well known by politicians and businesspeople. Indeed, when in 2013 Spanish Minister of Education, Culture and Sports, José Ignacio Wert, defined the arts as being distracting in order to justify an education reform that gave less space for the development of artistic disciplines at school, he was directly pointing at the ability of the arts to challenge normative temporalities. Why are the arts defined as a distraction by Wert? Because allowing an artistic development of people at early stages of their lives implies minimizing the importance of other subjects, such as maths, language or science (which are

---

<sup>19</sup> Online at: [http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/10\\_1/hunsinger10\\_1.html](http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/10_1/hunsinger10_1.html)

intentionally supported by the Government with the aim of creating competitive workers for the capitalist marketplace) in favour of the arts, which are less productive in capitalist economic terms. The arts are distracting because they allow people to spend their time differently and to focus their attention on other possible realities. Therefore, in order to produce the shift from speed to laziness, artists have to claim for their right to have access to time and to employ this time in an alternative way. It is not about emphasizing the benefits of supporting the arts from a capitalist point of view, namely recognising the potentiality of artistic practice to produce creative entrepreneurs and creative market strategies. It is not about, as argued by Kunst in "Art and Labour: On consumption, laziness and less work making" (2012), producing an attempt to make spending on art "meaningful" for the sake of the capitalist economy (118). It is about recognising that artistic practice is essentially out of Capitalism. Therefore, "If art really needs to be affirmed through the language of economics, it needs to be pointed out that art is not connected to the economy of the production of value but is much closer to senseless spending" (Kunst 2012, 118). Artists are lazy, which means their practice cannot be translated into an economic profit or efficiency statistics, but into multiple and diverse social manifestations. It implies that artistic practice and production cannot be accelerated because art, as a social practice, is placed beyond time.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amin, Ash (Ed). 1994. *Post- Fordism: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1987. "Labor, work, action". In *Amor Mundi. Explorations in the Faith and Thought of Hannah Arendt*, edited by James W. Bernauer, S.J., 29-42. Dordrecht (The Netherlands): Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Arnolfini. 2013. "Exhibition guide. Mierle Laderman Ukeles Maintenance Art Works 1969 – 1980". Last modified January 26, 2015. <http://www.arnolfini.org.uk/whatson/mierle-laderman-ukeles-maintenance-art-works-196920131980/MierleGuidedefinalweb.pdf>
- Aunión, J. A. 2013. "Artes y filosofía pasan a segundo plano". *El País*, November 28. Accessed March 9, 2015. [http://sociedad.elpais.com/sociedad/2013/11/26/actualidad/1385491452\\_200770.html](http://sociedad.elpais.com/sociedad/2013/11/26/actualidad/1385491452_200770.html)
- Berardi, Franco. 2011. "Time, Acceleration and Violence". *E-flux Journal*, 27. Online at: [http://worker01.e-flux.com/pdf/article\\_245.pdf](http://worker01.e-flux.com/pdf/article_245.pdf)
- Bergstrand-Doley, J.K. 2013. "EMERGENCY ECTOPLASMIC EXODUS Rejected Materials – Take II". *Open Systems Online Journal*, 4. Online at: <http://www.openspace-zkp.org/2013/en/journal.php?j=4&t=27>
- Bishop, Claire. 2012. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso.
- Bolt Rasmussen, Mikkel. 2009. "The Politics of Interventionist Art: The Situationist International, Artist Placement Group, and Art Workers' Coalition". *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, 21(1): 34-49, doi: 10.1080/08935690802542374
- Bradley, Will and Charles Esche (Eds.). 2007. *Art and Social Change. A Critical Reader*. London: Tate Publishing.
- Canovan, Margaret. 1998. "Introduction". In *The Human Condition* by Hannah Arendt. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Forkasiewicz, Kris. 2014. "Animal Fragments". *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 25(2): 1-13. doi: 10.1080/10455752.2014.904562.
- Foucault Michel. 2004. "Des espaces autres". *Empan* 2 (54), 12-19. doi: 10.3917/empa.054.0012
- Fournier, Valérie. 2008. "Escaping from the economy: the politics of degrowth", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 28(11-12): 528-545. doi: 10.1108/01443330810915233
- Gill, Rosalind and Andy Pratt. 2008. "In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work". *Theory, Culture and Society*, 25(7-8): 1-30. doi: 10.1177/0263276408097794

Grija, Dusan. 2010. "Theoretical Practice: On the Material Effects on an 'Immaterial' Labour". *Le Journal des Laboratoires* and *TkH Journal for Performing Arts Theory*, 17: 46-50.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Hassan, Robert. 2012. *The Age of Distraction: Reading, Writing, and Politics in a High-Speed Networked Economy*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Honoré, Carl. 2004. *In Praise of Slowness: Challenging the Cult of Speed*. London: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd.

Online at: [http://khosachonline.ucoz.com/\\_ld/1/152\\_In\\_Praise\\_of\\_Sl.pdf](http://khosachonline.ucoz.com/_ld/1/152_In_Praise_of_Sl.pdf)

Hunsinger, Jeremy. 2013. "Against Speed Cosmopolitanism towards the slow university". *Fast Capitalism*, 10.1. <http://www.uta.ed> Just-in-Time

Jackson, Shannon. 2012. "Just-in-Time. Performance and the Aesthetics of Precarity". *TDR/The Drama Review*, 56(4): 10-3.

Klein, Gabriele. 2013. "Labour, Life, Art: On the social Anthropology of Labour". *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts*, 17(6): 4-13. doi: 10.1080/13528165.2013.775751

Kunst, Bojana. 2012. "Art and Labour: On consumption, laziness and less work". *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts*, 17(6): 116-125. doi: 10.1080/13528165.2013.775774

—. 2012. "The Project Horizon: On the Temporality of Making". *Maska, Performing Arts Journal*, 149-150 (27):

Laderman Ukeles, Mierle. 1969. "MANIFESTO FOR MAINTENANCE ART 1969! Proposal for an exhibition CARE".

Online at: [http://www.feldmangallery.com/media/pdfs/Ukeles\\_MANIFESTO.pdf](http://www.feldmangallery.com/media/pdfs/Ukeles_MANIFESTO.pdf)

Lafargue, Paul. 1883. *Le Droit à la paresse. Réfutation du droit au travail de 1848*. Paris: Henry Oriol.

Lash, Scott. 1998. "Being after Time: Towards a Politics of Melancholy". *Cultural Values* 2(2-3): 305-319. doi: 10.1080/14797589809359301

Lazzarato, Maurizio. 1996. "Immaterial Labor". In *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, edited by Michael Hardy and Paolo Virno, 133-147. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Lütticken, Sven. 2014. "Liberation through Laziness. Some Chronopolitical Remarks". *Mousse Magazine*, 42.

Online at: <http://moussemagazine.it/articolo.mm?id=1071>

Marx, Karl. 1845. "Theses on Feuerbach". In *Marx/Engels Selected Works, Volume One (1845-59)*, translated by W. Lough from German, 13-15. Marx/Engels Internet Archive. Online at: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm>.

Molesworth, Helen. 2000. "House Work and Art Work". *The MIT Press*, 92, 71-97. Online at: [http://myweb.rollins.edu/rsimmons/artdiversityplace/Course\\_Info\\_files/house%20work%20art%20work.pdf](http://myweb.rollins.edu/rsimmons/artdiversityplace/Course_Info_files/house%20work%20art%20work.pdf)

Ortega y Gasset, José. 1923. *El Tema de Nuestra Tiempo*. Madrid: Calpe.

Oxford Dictionaries. 2015. "Painter". Last modified April 22. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/painter>

Preciado, Beatriz. 2008. *Testo Yonqui*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe

—, 2013. "¿La muerte de la clínica?", pronounced on march, 9<sup>th</sup> 2013 in the Museo de Arte Reina Sofía. Online at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4aRrZZbFmBs>

Rasmussen, Bolt. 2009. "The Politics of Interventionist Art: The Situationist International, Artist Placement Group, and Art Workers' Coalition". *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, 21(1), 34-49. doi: 10.1080/08935690802542374

Rieznik, Pablo. 2004. "La Pereza y la Celebración de lo Humano". *Data.Grama.Zero. Revista de Ciência da Informação*, 5(3). Online at: [http://www.datagramazero.org.br/jun04/F\\_I\\_aut.htm](http://www.datagramazero.org.br/jun04/F_I_aut.htm)

Schuster, Aaron. 2012. "It is Very Difficult to Do Nothing. Notes on Laziness". *Metropolis M*, 2.

Stevenson, Robert-Louis. 2008. "An Apology for Idlers", In *Essays of Robert Louis Stevenson*, edited by William Lyon Phelps, 31-42. Maryland: Arc Manor

Taylor, Sunny. 2004. "The right not to work". *Monthly Review*, 55(10). Online at: <http://monthlyreview.org/2004/03/01/the-right-not-to-work-power-and-disability/>

Virilio, Paul. 2006. *Speed and Politics*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Virno, Paolo. 2004. *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Los Angeles: Semiotex(e).

Wikström, Josefine. 2013. Practice comes before Labour: An attempt to read performance through Marx's notion of practice". *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts*, 17(6): 22-27. doi: 10.1080/13528165.2013.775753

Windhager, Laura and Lisa Mazza. 2013. "Neither Working nor Unworking. On Residencies as Sites of Production". *Open Systems Online Journal*, 4.  
Online at: <http://www.openspace-zkp.org/2013/en/journal.php?j=4&t=26>