Looking back at five years education of Fine Art soon to be starting my post-graduate life, I question how I as an artist work and how art belongs in society. I wonder if artists and art can be a workforce in society or if artists are a separate group? Before I attended the Art Academy, I had no real preconditions of how the art world functioned and it still seems confusing. Working as a painter, the subject of gallery representation after art school comes up, and it seems as if (without really having any experience) the power relation between a young artist and the commercial gallery is somewhat uneven. The gallerist works to sell the work of the artist, and their job is to serve the visitors with information and details about the work and the artist who made the work. The only real experience I have had with sales was when I worked in my parents’ boutique while I was growing up.

ART AS STYLE

The boutique started back in 1991 as a domestic shop, where you could buy handicrafts and decorations for your home. I started working there when I was 13 years old, but long before that I was often brought along when my mother and father went to work. The objects you could purchase in the store had the function of decorating and personalising the buyer’s home, and they were exhibited on the shelves in the store to show how they could be placed in the homes. From 1991 and onwards my childhood home slowly became more and more filled with these decorative objects, and soon I realised how much our home resembled the store. Each object was placed carefully next to another, matching in colour, shape and style almost looking like a still painting. Whether I saw the decorative objects mantled carefully on the dresser at home or on the store shelves, each different object spoke to the one next to it, making a beautiful decorative collage. My relation to the workplace and the private became very much entwined, while I spend a lot of time in both environments and both places showed the style of my parents and the style they believed to be the customers.

It is hard for me to claim this, while I was only five years old when the transformation of our home started, but for me the 90’s seemed to be a decade when the Scandinavian middle-class and upwards had enough money to spend on styling their homes. And because money wasn’t an issue it was easy for people to follow the commercial trends. It didn’t really matter if the objects or commodities were cheap or expensive, most people could afford spending money in specialised shops, like the one my parents started in 1991.
Today people often mix old “storytelling” antiques or second hand objects with new mass-produced goods. Some tend to buy used objects to save money and avoid supporting overproduction, and others do so because mixing different styles is very trendy.

Since industrialisation there has been changes in businesses, where big companies sell ever cheaper and bigger varieties of products, in order to attract more customers – probably also the customers who prefer to shop second hand. The 90s almost seemed to me like the last decade with small, specialised shops, where it was possible for the store owner to survive and not necessarily being forced to compete with big supermarket chains. Today supermarkets sell everything from food, to bicycles, kitchenware, books, electronics, home decorations, clothes etc. and often they can afford to charge less than the local storeowner. The large stores often replace the outdated goods with goods that come new with every season and with a low price thanks to the fact that costs are cut in every stage of the production. Thus even people with low income can buy the mass-produced commodities and follow the comings and goings of the seasons of fashion.

In an essay, Design and Crime, Hal Foster writes: “[…] with the ‘flexible specialization’ of post-Fordist production, commodities can be continually tweaked and markets constantly niched, so that a product can be mass in quantity yet appear up-to-date, personal, and precise in address.”1. The individual consumer’s demand on the object’s style and function is increasing, but still it is possible to manufacture and sell large scale productions with the message that the product is “made for you”. For an object to be specific and more desirable it must appeal to people’s taste in design. A given object’s design can have artistic character. Not necessarily the kind of artistic character as the style of the Art Nouveau, which sometimes reminds me of the style that was the flavour of the upper middle-class north of Copenhagen in the 90ies, but in a more contemporary way mixing several genres. All of these genres are again followed by many more options of styles and colours to choose from. The industrial factories are integrating art in the creative production of objects to appeal to the taste of the masses. As the market of design is influenced by art, often art is also influenced by design and commercials, and one may ask where the dividing line is when the art object is a commodity?

When a piece of art is purchased from the gallery or from the studio directly, and e.g. ends up in a private home, it becomes something else. In this new location the artist has no longer access or capability to control where the painting is destined, the specific wall and room where it is installed, and consequently the function of the painting is also out of reach for the artist. If the buyer purchases a painting to match his or her home interior, the painting can become camouflaged in the abundance of the everyday objects that dominates the home. Does the painting in this situation then turn into an object of design, with the mere purpose of describing the personality of the buyer? If so,
how is the artistic labour put into the artwork described and valued in relation to the other objects
that make the home decor?

If the artwork becomes a commodity, not only the process will be undervalued but the intellectual
value of the art work, the artist’s conceptual intention behind the work, seems to be ignored and/or
disappears disregarded. In my opinion, the idea of the artwork is equally as important as the process
and the result itself, because in the end the object is the result of the process, and before process
comes the idea – at least when I work. If the artwork is equaled to the mass-produced commodity it
would mean that it is highly undervalued, insomuch as the labour and intellectual intentions of the
artist can-not be replaced by machines.

ART’S CIRCUMSTANCES

Objects that today are industrially manufactured and mass-produced are in my opinion often low on
quality and made from poor material. This is of course in order for us as consumers to buy yet
another new object in a new design when the old one breaks or are outdated. Foster talks about the
inflation of design in which he considers what he calls the “political economy of design”. He writes:
“[...] The product is no longer thought of as an object to be produced so much as a datum to be
manipulated – that is, to be designed and redesigned, consumed and reconsumed.”

Forster is here explaining how the product in itself is not the only valuable part. What are valuable are also the idea
and the capacity to generate it again and again. The idea has become a raw material in which we
can’t touch or feel – and it is being produced again and again because of the demands of the people.
What happens when there is a higher demand for mass-produced objects rather than of single
production, and why do people buy these mass-produced objects instead of single productions?
Maybe people who can’t afford fine art buy these reproductions in order to get closer to the feeling
of luxury and give a little extra to life? Or maybe they desire to be a part of something bigger, a
larger community – one home connecting the next through the same Ikea painting or furniture –
while the single produced art works are often for the ones with money, collectors and a few selected
artists in the market. The single produced artwork tells a story about the artist and the fabrication
and process of it, whereas a mass-produced object tells a different kind of story about its output.
I, also, can fall in the claws of the commercialized market, buying for instance an Ikea table,
because I am in need of a table, it is cheap and has a design that I can live with. But otherwise
looking at the table, it doesn't give me anything; it doesn't relate to anything else than the lack of
money on my bank account, and the satisfaction of a quick and cheap solution. In a contrast, when I
see exhibitions or look at pictures of art, occasionally I can relate to artists’ works and understand
what they are or at least they can present something for me that I may not have thought of before.
But in cheap mass-produced objects, I see nothing but repetition, and even though the object exists to fill a need, it is in reality still an unnecessary filling in the home. Does people look differently upon consumer objects than I do, and how are peoples general experience of art? Art is the way of life I have chosen, or to put it in a way that refers to society, the line of business I have chosen, and I wonder what the function of art in society is and thereby my art, in relation to a culture of evermore superfluous objects.

To work with art, to have art as your profession or “job” can mean many things, and the same goes for the reasons for purchasing art. I would suggest that people buy art and crafts in order to have something visually nice to look upon or engage with, because art, design, music, film, poetry etc. increases the living standard as a whole – it helps to sweeten the everyday life. But how important is art compared to other things? In an ordinary home crisis situation, for example when your toilet is overflowing, it would be a natural reaction to call for help if you don’t have the ability to fix it yourself. A lot of other people gladly pay other people to get out of dirty, practical or time-consuming but necessary tasks. These everyday problems have to be fixed in order to get the daily life to function, which is why these kinds of labour is of relatively high value. The value of these jobs, like any job, is transferred into income salary. The salaries differ depending on experience, location, hours spent, intensity of work etc., and when talking about valorization of labor, one could argue that if there were no difference in salary nobody would want to be e.g. a waste collector or a plumber, in the blue-collar sector some of the best paid professions.

So I wonder, how great is the need of people to have art at home, and how is that related to income? Would for instance people from the well-off middle class also have the money and will to buy art or would they be satisfied with a mass-produced poster, and spend their savings on e.g. buying a new kitchen, which ultimately would affect the entire house to exceed in value? I think the main reason for people not buying contemporary art is because of the high level in prices – simply that it is too expensive.

The idea of capitalism is to produce surplus value through exchange. Surplus value happens when labour power is performed by workers producing/delivering the product, and when the products are distributed to a price that is higher than the total of workers’ wages and other costs related to the production and distribution of the product. Diedrich Diederichsen discusses a similar subject in the essay “On (surplus) Value in Art”. He calls surplus value “Artistic Mehrwert” and comments that “Artistic Mehrwert” happens in the production of artworks when: “[...]there is a desire to justify a special effort made or expense incurred by an artist, or in the course of the production of an artwork.
Or when it is a matter of weighing whether or not a certain subject or approach lends itself to artistic treatment: is there an added value involved in treating it artistically?3

Looking at the terms “Artistic Mehrwert” in the art world, and surplus value in our capitalist society, I would argue these two concepts have the same character or is the same. Diederichsen calls “Artistic Mehrwert” that which I consider to be intellectual value of the artist, covering the idea and process of the artwork. But as Diederichsen point out is it fair to look at a social context to remunerate artists with a bonus because the work is treated in an artistically manner? Would it instead be fairer to remunerate artists in a fashion as other workers with a steady wage?

When you get paid for what you do as an artist, is most often when you sell an artwork. Generally when you set a price on a piece, a painting for example, the value is mainly based on the size of the canvas and the material, and the reputation of the artist.

But what would happen to the value and the quality of the artwork if we were to decide the salary in relation to the hours actually put into the work? Workers or craftsmen usually work by getting paid by the hour. Craftsmen, who are often trained in apprenticeship, either get paid when the job is done – a sum based on their education or skill and how many hours it took –, or they discuss a fixed price with the customer before they start to work.

In my practice I mainly paint. I often work on one painting at a time before continuing on the next. At times I investigate and make a more extensive series of paintings, but also here I focus on one piece at a time until it is done. My way of working is indeed a very anti-Fordist way of working, while I don’t work like a factory with an assembly line “installed” in my studio. Concentrating on one painting at a time has made me very much aware of how long time I’m spending on each painting.

As this text shows I am interested in the labour value of artist productions, which is why I have employed the model of working by the hour in my own painting practice. I am interested in seeing how much time it really takes to create a painting and what I can estimate the value of it to be. So far I have used two different methods of working. In one project, I have made paintings where I worked within a time limit and in another project I did the opposite, with time not being a stopping factor. In the latter example, I have only in the end checked to see how long it took to create the painting. In the first example, I have intentionally pressured myself to work within a certain time limit to get the job done faster. By doing so I wanted to see how the result of frustrating and stressful work situation would look like. Often working in the studio is thought of as relaxing and reflective, but in this case I wanted to see what would happen to the painting in a situation where time was of the essence. By setting up this kind of system, I automatically ended up with a different result than if I had painted without a time limit; in this situation there was less time to reflect and
gaze upon the painting in order to make thought out choices and adjustments. In one way this was a liberating way of working because before I started I decided on which colours to paint with, (resembling colour field painting or paint by numbers) that created a freedom with rules situation. Also in another way it was an impediment to work with a time limit, because there was no time to e.g. mix the exact right colour or apply it in a fashion that I was entirely satisfied with – choices, or obstacles, that you normally meet as a painter and have time to adjust to.

The reactions toward the paintings, where I beforehand set a limit for how much time I should spend on each painting, have been very different. Where most may be positive, some have been judgmental towards not so much the concept, but to the painting and its style. I have heard statements from my colleagues that the paintings are “bad painting” or “poor craftsmanship” as well as being compared to Ikea replicas.

So why do some believe that my paintings are “bad paintings”? Is the lack of skill or lack of “beauty” that results from the concept, the time limitation controls the process, which make them “bad”?

In an essay by Georg Woodstock “The Tyranny of the Clock” he describes that: “Men actually became like clocks, acting with a repetitive regularity which had no resemblance to the rhythmic life of natural being […] man has become servant of the concept of time.” The working man is bound to time, and a normal workday in Sweden is estimated to be 8 hours per day. The clock time makes it possible for people to communicate with and understand each other, and follow the same rhythm every day. In my latest work the clock makes it visible what is working hours and leisure time, but it also brings in the stressing factor of just producing for the sake of producing. Does the
concept of counting the time when I paint turn the otherwise free process of painting into an act of objectification and commodification? Is it maybe why the painting becomes a bad painting?

In an essay “Whatever Happened to Beauty?” Arthur C. Danto writes about the fact that beauty in art has been replaced by politics. He remembers the words of Brice Marden interviewed by Pat Steir: “The idea of beauty can be offensive […]. It doesn’t deal with issues; political issues or social issues. But an issue that it does deal with is harmony.” Danto continues in his own strain of thoughts: “[…] For I would then have realized the degree to which social and political issues are today framed in terms of disharmony […] when in truth the great political visions have been precisely of the harmonious society, and it would be difficult to think of a more exact criteria of political health than harmony […]. I might then have proposed that every beautiful work can be viewed as an allegory of political well-being, and disharmonic work as allegorical of social pathology.” By looking at beauty as a political statement of well-being, could one take Danto’s remark as a pretext to claim that since some feel disharmony towards my paintings, they would suggest my “politics” of mapping down the working time to be failing?

I find Danto’s remark on politics within art relevant in my practice. Politics and economy are what determines the value and meaning of work and also the living standards of every man. Workers and craftsmen have different educational backgrounds and can be considered as different kinds of professionals, and what I question is if artists get paid as a traditional craftsman or a traditional worker when they sell an artwork.

In his book “The Craftsman” Richard Sennett writes about his former teacher Hannah Arendt, who had a theory of how to divide the working people into two different categories. She called them Animal laborens and Homo faber. Sennet describes Arendt’s explanation of the two: “Animal laborens is, as the name implies, the human being akin to a beast of burden, a drudge condemned to routine […] Animal laborens takes the work as an end in itself. By contrast Homo faber is […] men and women doing another kind of work, making a life in common […] Man as maker.” One could perhaps describe a typical artist as Homo faber, because artists create ideas whereas a typical traditional worker could be described as Animal laborens, because workers are condemned to work hard subjected to routines. In “The Craftsman”, Sennett points out how these political identities can be understood according to Arendt: “[…] And in a special way Homo faber is the judge of material labor and practice, not Animal laborens’s colleague but his superior.” This quote explains what I mentioned earlier; that if the idea was not present in my practice the artwork would not come to life. Sennett describes the skill and the knowledge of the hand of the craftsman, but as an artist I find it difficult to distinguish the work between hand and head, or to put in other words – the idea determines if there is an art piece to produce or not. Craftsmen learn to use the selected tools and
materials to accomplish their tasks. As an artist in spe I choose to learn about different varieties of materials in order to achieve and present my ideas the best.

Once art (painting and sculpture) was considered to be something that could be taught: “In classical antiquity, the word ‘art’ (Greek, tekhnē; Latin; ars) was the name given to any activity governed by rules; art was that which could be taught, and as such did not include activity governed by instinct or intuition.” But today art is something different: “Art is art when it exists for discourses and practices that recognize it as art, value and evaluate it as art, and consume it as art, whether as object, gesture, representation, or only idea.”

A craftsman or a ‘skilled’ worker are mainly taught by a Journeyman/Master or they have attended College or University where they have applied a special skill or knowledge. I also attend Art School but seeing that art isn’t a specific matter I prefer to look at the artist education as a training of inspiration, discovering and testing of ideas.

**ART’S WORK**

To value the idea of an artwork can seem difficult, especially in relation to the work model of counting the working hours. Often it is difficult to turn off the stream of thoughts and idea-making that occur 24/7, which makes it impossible to say when an idea occurred or developed. It is impossible to map down the time I have spent on the thoughts that have impact on my practice, in particular if they are to be derived outside my studio work. I guess most people experience this in relation to what they do. The cognitive actions and the development of ideas are impossible to date, therefore also to price. If all preparation time spent on formulating the concept is not being paid for but only the time spent on working with the material, the artist will receive a very small payment for the artwork. Dedicating many hours to the work is very common among artists, but it is also quite a common thing in general to bring work home. Both in material and immaterial workplaces a lot of assignments demand that you prepare before you can start working. The artistic research, the process of developing ideas, investigating or researching, gathering information while developing the idea, is similar to other types of work; for instance advertisement, architecture, journalism, science or carpenter’s work. I imagine a lot of this preparatory work happens at home, because the consequence of not bringing the work with you home and finishing it in time, can easier lead to resignation.

In “Immaterial labor” Maurizio Lazzarato claims that because of the financial insecurity of today people are devoting more and more time to their work; we consume ourselves with work and identify ourselves with it. The workplace becomes a social sphere were discussions, ideas and thoughts are invested, the work life and private life more and more blend while the manual,
repetitive skills that the earlier historical forms of capitalism demanded now become interwoven with cognitive skills. I, also feel that kind of devotion to my work, and I have a hard time separating my private life from my working. Even though I don’t work collaboratively, I discuss my ideas while conversing with colleagues and other people I am lucky to meet as well as with myself, and I develop these ideas at any time of the day.

To look closer at what it can mean to work in the studio or the opposite, what you can do by bringing the art practice outside the studio, I would like to refer to a specific art practice described by Julia Bryan-Wilson in the essay “Occupational realism”. In the essay she writes that “occupational realism” is: “[...] performances in which artists enact the normal, obligatory tasks of work under the highly elastic rubric of ‘art’. Here, the job becomes the art and the art becomes the job.” She continues: “If we can admit there is no such thing as one kind of ‘worker’, then we must account for the fact that ‘artists’ are likewise not a coherent category [...] I might go so far as to say that ‘artists’ are not ‘workers’, which is precisely what makes occupational realism legible as a form of practice”. How far can this elastic term be stretched? Can you claim that the hours spent working on an artwork, or working in the studio, to have a comparable value to the hours spent on wage labour or working on commission?

If you as an artist in beforehand accept a paid job that normally wouldn’t have anything to do with your practice, would you still be able to call it art – your artwork? Another situation in which the relation between work and art is questioned is when the artist is selling works at commercial galleries. Does that affect the artwork and transform it into a commodity? But by rejecting the galleries, or whatever offer comes along, precludes you from “the game”, and why then be an artist and use all your time to make art, if you by doing so can’t support yourself? Could the solution perhaps be, that the artist take the position of an ‘artist-journeyman’ and make that the art practice? Would all the artworks that they do then be equally valued in money and perhaps also artistic value, weather it would be commissioned or based on own personal intentions? When does the art making become work and work become art making?

Here I would like to address John Dewey’s comprehension of the difference between work and labour as it is explained by the Danish philosopher Michael Husen in his book Work and Identity: “‘Labor’ is a form of work where the result of the work only has value, because it can be traded with something else. ‘Labor’ is an economic term, opposed to ‘work’ which is a anthropologic term, i.e. a term which tells something about the nature of man.” Most artists never make it big by selling art, but nevertheless they continue working with art. Can we by this define art making for this group of artists as work, because it in terms of Dewey’s opinion lies internally in the nature of
man? And does art making become ‘labor’, in the terms of Dewey, for the few artists who do succeed by living of their art, because the art piece becomes an object that can be traded? I can’t remember the thoughts that went through my head some 10 years ago when I truly started to be interested in working with art or what my goals were. It can be hard to explain the past in rational terms, but today art making is something I can't help but do, regardless if it is worth buying or not.

A lot of post-workerists, among others Maurizio Lazzarato, have talked about the changes of work from the industrial society to the informational society. Today a lot of workplaces are based on immaterial labor, production and dissemination of information and communication, for instance in the cultural sector, and this is something the post-workerist thinkers are discussing: “When artists and non-artists share similar tools, and procedures as labor, then, to what extent are artists – in the collective sense – in possession of skills that are autonomous and non-transferable (the abiding assumption within traditional accounts of artists creativity)”\(^{15}\).

Of course I don’t believe that artists who do work resembling office work is not artists, or that it can’t be viewed as art. It was something else that made me wonder about Roberts’ quote: If people expect artists to produce new art – with the traditional underlining, i.e. make art in “traditional” materials as painting, sculpture etc. – so as to let people relate and categorize it as art, then it would automatically limit the freedom of the artist. The artist would then have a hard time to him/herself in the medium he/she prefer, and would automatically be put in a box that says “non-artist”. If you as an artist pursue this as a problem, and wish to be recognized for what you do and what you do to be art, the risk is that you make art that may only be perceived as a tangible objects that can be sold. Some artists distance themselves from this issue and prefer to take part-time work to pay the rent rather than be involved in the economy of the commercial side of art.

So is there a way for art to be valued and recognized more evenly and can it be valued according to the hours spent or would that undermine the preparatory work? Cognitive labor, which Roberts also calls “cognitive capitalism”, is in focus because of the changes in the industrial sector. Technology has meant less work places but more production, and that manual labor has become devalued. Once most people were involved in industrial processes of construction that had a clear tangible dimension, manual labor like constructing chairs from blocks of wood, whereas today most people work with designing and distributing them. If society today is mainly based on cognitive capital and less people wants to pay for “man-hours” and you pursue the artist as a craftsman instead of an intellectual, does the artist then have less value to society? By condemning the artist to follow routines and rules, by painting within a time limit with rules and constrictions of procedures, does that erase or remove the quality in the art piece? Is there a potential in looking at art labor as a traditional worker’s labor or is it erasing the professionalization of the artist, saying anyone can make art?
Johannes Andersen, a lector and researcher of Society on Aalborg University, claims that a group of people from the creative community has in fact named themselves “the creative class”. According to Andersen there is some degree of arrogance in this proclamation because, implicitly: “then there is others who aren’t that creative.” This subject is also discussed by the post-workers in terms of the workplaces: “[…] the breakdown of the social division between the non-creativity of producers and the creativity of non-producers […]” inflicts a confusion towards who is the creative or artist and who is not, because many people now a days share the same tools, and gain the same knowledge through the computer work station, i.e. the internet, Photoshop and so on.

Maybe the reason for claiming to be a part of “the creative class” is due to the need of recognition of the individuality? It is natural for people to divide themselves and other people into groups, and if you automatically are not judged by others to be an artist, because of “wrong” methods it would perhaps mean that you don’t make art!

In *The Life of the Mind* Hannah Arendt explains the multiple choices we have in an affluent society like ours: “[…] Difference and otherness, which are such outstanding characteristics of the world of appearances as it is given to man for his habitat among a plurality of things, are the very conditions for the existence of man’s mental ego as well, for this ego actually exists only in duality.” She continues: “This original duality, incidentally, explains the futility of the fashionable search for identity.” Like we have multiple choices of things available in society to define and form our appearance and home, we also have multiple choices when talking about education and career. We live in a society that tells us it is important to acquire an education in order to find a job and be part of the community. Only then will life have meaning, and thus the working man becomes a product of that society. But maybe artists can’t be put in a box defined by society?

If appearance and career defines identity, maybe it is impossible to define the art practice as an identity, seeing there are multiple choices of how to work as an artist. But maybe it is not about how the work schedule looks like for an artist, or about making art that may sell at galleries? Maybe art is not about limits but presenting statements in relation to the world you live in.

I wish to enlighten the artist’s way of working in this society of mass-production and mass-consumption, bound to the scarcity of time as well as under- and unemployment. Can the artist who makes single works actually inhabit a position that can withdraw from the standard prosumerist position of the production/consumption of today?

I am trying to question art's place in society, and understand art in relation to established models of employment. I am struggling with the question of how artworks are valued, and if I see my artworks, and art practice, as commodities, as a way for me to make a living, or if I see them as art that doesn’t gain their meaning through the market. Creating and working with art is of course of high
value to me while it is here I feel freedom, while freedom for someone else might be located in the freedom of economic stability – which also can be a reason for working.

My parents have succeeded in maintaining their shop after nearly 25 years, more or less by changing the range of products from what was once utility goods and a few clothes, till today, selling mainly shoes and clothes and a little bit of decoration, carefully following the demands of the consumer. By working within the service business I have found that it is only an area that exists through the consumer’s demands. Projecting this type of business onto my own practice I have found that I don’t feel the urge of producing in order just to survive, because my ideas cannot be neither forced into being nor forcefully applied.

We live in a culture that is all about derivatives for money in terms of time or goods. Society dictates that we at some point grow up and answer the question that has been given to us from birth: “What is your function in society?”

It seems natural for people to think that everyone should gain a certain expertise, also in the field of art. But it is not necessary for art to be in a certain way, because nothing is the way it was. I work with art for the sake of art. But at the same time I am engaging with society indirectly through my art, by questioning my role as an artist in society.
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