Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Rethinking Marxism
A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society

ISSN: 0893-5696 (Print) 1475-8059 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rrmx20

Learning Not to Labor

Stevphen Shukaitis

To cite this article: Stevphen Shukaitis (2014) Learning Not to Labor, Rethinking Marxism, 26:2, 193-205, DOI: 10.1080/08935696.2014.888835

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2014.888835

Rethinking Marxism, 2014
Vol. 26, No. 2, 193–205, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2014.888835

Learning Not to Labor

Stevphen Shukaitis

In autonomist history and theory, the refusal of work is frequently invoked but seldom expanded upon in a significant manner. From the celebration of laziness to mass industrial strikes, work refusal takes many forms. This essay develops an expanded autonomist conception of work refusal, understanding work refusal as a compositional practice and arguing for analyzing it through the forms of collectivity and social relations that it creates. Based on this analysis, a form of "zerowork training," or a pedagogy of learning not to labor, is proposed as a process through which antagonism and refusal can be further socialized. Learning not to labor sits at the junction of the refusal of work and the re-fusing of the social energies of such refusal back into supporting the continued affective existence and capacities of other forms of life and ways of being together, as practice and as a form of embodied critique.

Key Words: Affect, Art Strike, Cultural Labor, Refusal, Work

The "right to work"
is for the birds
one of the turds
I can do without
GIVE IT TO THE WORKING CLASS
wherever it's foolish enough to be.

—Alexander Trocchi, "Man at Leisure"

What is, or what can be, the meaning of refusing work today? The refusal of work is a concept and practice—an approach to and understanding of the political, not an incantation. It is one of the most popular and widely circulated concepts associated with post-Autonomia, and also one of the most misunderstood. In the English-speaking context it is far too easily understood as primarily individualistic, along the lines of a clichéd hippy dropout culture. But historically, work refusal has taken many forms, from mass exodus from the factory and wildcat strikes to attempted individual escape plans. The point is not to exclude any one form from consideration but to see the relationships between them: how different modes of refusal work together to animate new forms of social composition. In that sense refusal oftentimes serves

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

more as a provocation or a utopian demand, in Kathi Weeks's (2011) sense, than something elaborated in an expanded way.

If we are to approach the question of the meaning of post-Autonomia today, it is from this understanding: to engage with concepts not so as to precisely understand them but rather to productively misunderstand them—to bastardize and rework them in present conditions, which have shifted greatly since the period of the 1960s and 1970s. And these shifts are not just temporal but also political, economic, cultural, and so forth. If the current state of political discussion is marked by the hegemony of Italian theory, as Matteo Pasquinelli (2011) has suggested, then a mutating and reworking of the key concepts of post-Autonomia is even more important so that they do not become ossified by their preservation.[1] One could go so far as to propose that today it is necessary to develop a kind of "zerowork training," to learn how to not labor, rather than to fall back on previous assumptions about refusing work.

Fig 1. Mladen Stilinović, *Artist at Work*, 1977. Permission from the artist gratefully acknowledged.

Indeed, what form could such zerowork training take? That is a question for consideration here, as well as to ask its method—to rework the notion of the refusal of work in an expanded framework that is adequate to the changing conditions of the present. Paul Willis (1982) in his classic book *Learning to Labor* analyzes how British lads' attempted refusals of school discipline and educational advancement end up fitting them for another form of control: namely, the reproduction of the class relationship as they are then sent off to work in the factory. In other words, the

1. I will be approaching this task through a framework of what semiseriously could be called "Brooklyn Autonomia," or the conjunction of influences and traditions that comes together through Autonomedia and the Midnight Notes Collective.

refusal of a certain type of social structure is part of interpellating them into the industrial class structure. Today it seems that many of those factories are gone, at least from much of the UK and Europe, and with them much of the social antagonism of industrial labor. Where then to find the kinds of practices fitted to learning not to labor? How can we develop this kind of zerowork training?

A Plurality of Refusals

> I don't bother work. Work don't bother me.
>
> I'm just as happy as a bumblebee.
>
> —Gid Tanner and the Skillet Lickers, "Work Don't Bother Me"

An important realization to start from is that the refusal of work is not a single thing but rather a concept that brings together a plurality of different kinds of refusals. These range from the nonconformist preacher William Benbow's ([1832] n.d.) call for a "grand national holiday" (a month-long general strike) during the 1830s to anarchist provocateur Bob Black's (1986) call for the "abolition of work" in the 1980s. The refusal of work as a concept brings Guy Debord—who embraced as a political slogan Rimbaud's call to "Never Work!"—together with collective refusals to work, wildcat strikes, and acts of sabotage prominent in factories in Europe and the United States in the late 1960s and 1970s. Such conditions led management consultants and union bureaucrats to wonder out loud, *Where Have All the Robots Gone?*—which is also the title of a book from that time analyzing the origins of wildcat strikes and sabotage and linking them less to specific demands around wage increases than to the rise of the "anti-authoritarian worker" (Sheppard and Herrick 1972). We can see the refusal of work as a key and important focus in the writing and discussions to emerge from Italy in the 1970s, but more broadly than that, it can also be connected to how Jim Koehline and Ron Sakolsky (1994) have explored (with others) the idea of "going to Croatan," or forms of escape from modern civilization. And we can also look at the hobo dream of the "Big Rock Candy Mountain," where they hanged the jerk that invented work (see Gorgut 2011).

In these examples are many different forms of practice with different ideas and different interactions involved. Much as Walt Whitman put it, work refusal is a multitude unto itself, filled with possibilities, potentials, and contradictions. It is not one thing or one approach. In that sense it might be impossible to trace an exact genealogy at all, or an account of the lineage and influences between different times and spaces.[2] It is rather a shared sensibility transmitted through an undercommons of submerged social practices and spaces. It is part of what Marcus Greil (1989) described, in his elaboration of the connection between the insurgent aesthetics of punk and the

2. Simon During (2010) suggests that literary production and culture, once divorced from the spiritual realm, provides tactics for escape from the domination of work. This is backed up by Henri Lefebvre's (1997) declaration that he became interested in thinking about work refusal not because of a political tradition but rather after reading a science fiction novel, *City* by Clifford Simiak.

medieval heresy, as "the secret drift of history"—a drift that remains secret to those who make it. In these infrapolitical histories, the development of a politics often unseen and not encoded as political, there exists a constant process of translation between infrapolitical insurgency and the development of collective imagination.

In that sense, when we discuss the refusal of work, it is only part of the story that is usually considered: namely, the aspects that are most socially visible. Something always remains hidden away, tucked below the gaze of power. Although that is more often than not a benefit rather than a downfall to many forms of social resistance, for the purposes of this essay we are considering the moments when these subterranean social currents burst through the surface and openly declare themselves. These are the moments when Marx's old mole emerges from the burrows into the sunshine of social antagonism, and most important are the effects this has upon emerging social compositions. The Midnight Notes Collective (1992, xii–xiii) has defined working-class struggles precisely as those that "attempt to reduce the unpaid labor capital appropriates throughout the social circuit." The refusal of work plays a key role in fermenting class struggle as it provides a framework for moving from discontent to action, underpinned by a concrete utopian desire to reduce and if possible eliminate the influence of work over social life.

This is the center of an autonomist refusal of work: a perspective that focuses specifically on the compositional elements of that refusal. The twin concepts of political and technical composition, which are of great importance for understanding what makes operaismo different from other forms of Marxism (see Wright 2003), are likewise important in understanding work refusal as a compositional practice rather than as an individualistically oriented gesture. Jason Read (2011), in his analysis of the affective composition of labor, has argued that the autonomist hypothesis—or refocusing on working-class revolts rather than on capital as the motor of transformation—is only possible through an understanding of class composition. Otherwise, such a reversal of perspective—calls for the radical possibility of the present divorced from an understanding of material and political conditions—risks falling into a form of idealist invocation, a millenarian call or prophetic gesture. The same could be argued for the refusal of work, that it is only possible when approached through a compositional framework: to work from material conditions and practices and the kinds of political and social formations they enable and support.

A compositional analysis of refusal thus is not concerned with just the actions and practices of refusal itself but how these actions and practices are socially embedded and what effects they produce. Such an analysis asks questions like: How is the refusal of work deployed as a practice? How is it understood? What social energies do varying forms of refusing work enact? And this analysis considers, perhaps most importantly, the affective dimensions of those refusals, focusing specifically on the forms of care, social reproduction, and organization that exist to sustain and support the continued self-reproduction of refusal. This consideration of the affective and relational dynamics of refusal moves beyond notions of individualized "dropping out" precisely because any attempt to escape from capitalist logic is only possible through the animation of affective relations capable of reproducing the sociality produced by that refusal. This moment—the negativity of refusal, the drive to escape—carries within it another moment of being together and with others, a moment that enacts a

different mode of social becoming. This is the movement of refusal that leads to the re-fusing of common life and energy back through the social.

Refusals and Typologies

> But what if feminist political analyses and projects were not limited to claims about who we are as women or as men, or even the identities produced by what we do, but rather put the accent on collectively imagined visions of what we want to be or to do?
>
> —Kathi Weeks, "Life Within and Against Work: Affective Labor, Feminist Critique, and Post-Fordist Politics"

The autonomist feminist tradition—oftentimes ignored in the histories of Autonomia and post-Autonomia (and even more so in recent debates that draw from them)—offers much to the reconsidering of work refusal. Although these contributions might seem negative at first glance or to be based on concerns over the limitations of certain forms of social and political practice, I would suggest that only through understanding such limitations and blockages is it possible to work around them. In her article "Where is Jocasta?," Alisa Del Re (1996) argues that forms of refusing work that do not take into account the dynamics of social reproduction have a tendency to reinforce and reinscribe labor demands upon women who are most involved in the tasks of social reproduction. We can imagine this dynamic in terms of women being left to keep the house together and provide support during a strike. In other words, this ends up creating a negative affective recomposition of labor in the way that the tasks of social reproduction fall upon some people and not others.[3] A different approach is necessary to understand class itself: one that is much more compositional in the sense of being formed through ongoing antagonism and conflict rather than as a fixed identity or status. This more fluid and flexible version of understanding class has been developed within the autonomist tradition more generally, although for some reason it has not seemed to filter through into more recent debates on immaterial labor.

One of the best perspectives for this rethinking can be found in the work of the Madrid-based collective Precarias a la Deriva (PAD), originally formed in 2002 in response to a call for a general strike in which many found it quite difficult to participate because of their positions in precarious and gendered forms of labor. This made it difficult, if not impossible, to go on strike without causing harm to themselves or others. PAD's approach thus starts from a rejection of understanding changes in work by analyzing its technical composition—for instance, by distinguishing brain workers from chain workers. Rather, their typology starts from forms of political composition corresponding to the forms of labor—in particular, with different kinds of refusal associated with the varying forms of work. This is a key

3. This dynamic can be seen at work in the film *Made in Dagenham*, in which male workers deride and dismiss the validity and importance of striking female Ford workers based on the assumption that ultimately their incomes are not necessary for social reproduction but are merely additional to the necessary wages of the male workers.

insight: namely, that refusal is not one thing but that the form of refusal varies according to one's position in a broader labor process and by social positioning. Precarias a la Deriva (2004) breaks work into three main categories:

1. *Jobs with repetitive content*: telemarketing, cleaning, textile workshops; little to no subjective engagement with the task; conflict takes the form of generalized absenteeism, dropping out, sabotage
2. *Jobs with varied content, vocational/professional work*: nursing to informatics, social work to research; subjective implication with the task performed is high; conflict is expressed as critique of the organization of labor, its logic of articulation, and the ends toward which it is structured
3. *Jobs with content that is directly made invisible and/or stigmatized*: the most paradigmatic examples are domestic work, home care, and sex work; conflict manifests itself as a demand for dignity and the recognition of social value

This is a useful framework for approaching work refusal, not as one thing but as a practice closely connected to broader changes in the labor process. Thus, rather then lamenting that the heroic years of mass wildcat strikes by industrial workers have seemingly ended (although there is some debate on that depending on where you're looking), the question is to look at the multiple forms that refusal takes in the current composition of the workforce and then, based upon that understanding, to find ways to work between these different patterns of subjectivation, encouraging from that the emergence of new forms of political composition.

EuroMayDay and the organizing around precarity can thus be understood as one attempt to rethink political organizing in such a fashion. And while it was often critiqued for lumping together forms of work that seemed to have little to do with each other from a technical perspective, this was precisely the point. One could make a similar argument for the functioning of the more recent occupy movements: it is not that they share an assumption about the subjective position of all involved and seek to work from that position but rather that they seek to find common grounds for politics despite the variety of positions and experiences of the participants.

Refusal and Cultural Labor

> Art products are the objects of intense financial speculation; cultural productions are top hit-makers in the jackpot end of the New Economy; "cultural districts" are posited as the key to urban prosperity; and creative industries policy is embraced as the anchor of regional development by governments around the world on the lookout for a catch-up industrial plan.
>
> —Andrew Ross, "The New Geography of Work: Power to the Precarious?"

If we take seriously Precarias a la Deriva's notion that different forms of refusal relate to varying positions in the labor process more generally, this would be a good reason to digress into a discussion of cultural labor. By cultural labor I refer mainly to the

kinds of jobs that have been discussed as relating to the creative class, the media and cultural work, artistically oriented professions, and related ideas. These are forms of work that have been generally understood in relation to debates around immaterial labor. Much interesting work has been written about them from multiple perspectives. But for the moment I'm most interested in thinking about how the perspective that PAD proposes could change the way we think about these kinds of jobs, both sociologically and politically. From a compositional perspective, the importance of the forms of cultural labor is in the way they shift the politics of work from a direct refusal of work to embracing it.

In PAD's categories this is a shift from the first type of work to the second, a move from work that is repetitive and leads to pure refusal to vocational work that is more critiqued than refused. Richard Neville (1971) makes a number of insightful observations about this in his book *Play Power*, which explores the dynamics of 1960s counterculture. In countercultural projects "work is done only for fun, obsession, hobby or art form," which transforms every "Monday morning into a Friday night." Neville describes such ventures as mostly undercapitalized, leading to a precariousness that makes it necessary for those involved to "work hard at not working." And while the subjective composition of such projects is motivated by searching for enjoyment and freedom, he notes that "the laxity of the (non) working conditions is beyond a shop-steward's dream (or nightmare?). Gone are contracts, time clocks, fixed holidays, strikes, division of labor and doing things in triplicate" (213). Or one can look at the role that a greater emphasis on cultural labor played within the squatting milieu of Amsterdam in the mid-1980s. According to the history of that time written by Lynn Owens (2009), it involved a shift from a politics of pure refusal to one that tried to negotiate spaces for autonomy in production and community by arguing that there was something valuable in having these sorts of spaces, both from an economic and cultural angle.

In an overall shift and transformation of class composition, the most important aspect is how the shift enacts a broader change in the relationship to work, in particular the higher degree of subjective investment in work itself. In some ways this is a new version of Joseph Beuys's famous statement that everyone is an artist, except that it has now been realized as everyone is a worker, all the time, everywhere. And the higher degree of subjective involvement with and relationship to the work itself has tended to lead away from a refusal that takes the form of pure refusal—or even that of union organizing—and more toward forms of individual critique and the discussion of conditions. At some level this has been seen as the absence of labor politics from many forms of cultural labor. Cultural politics has become a form of political entrepreneurship more than anything else. But this seems a bit unfair in the sense that one can also approach these changes as shifts in the form of refusal rather than its absence altogether. And from an autonomist perspective, that seems much more encouraging.

Recent debates on shifts in cultural labor and politics and on work within the arts economy have tended to focus specifically on the changing nature of work within the world of arts and cultural production (Lovink and Rossiter 2007). There is much to be gained in this kind of exploration. But I would suggest, from a compositional framework, that most interesting is how the changes in relationship to work that

have developed within arts and cultural work have then expanded beyond that particular sphere into much broader patterns. This is the argument made by Pascal Gielen (2009): that the arts world becomes a laboratory where the post-Fordist work ethic is developed and then generalized beyond it. One could make similar arguments concerning the role of what Greg Sholette (2010) calls the dark matter of the arts world, or the necessary but undervalued mass of labor that sustains the functioning of the arts economy without being celebrated, or the increased importance of internships first in the cultural sector and then more generally. Here we have the same dynamic: a different relationship to work is developed (for interns often very little or no pay) based upon a high level of subjective involvement, a process of subjectivation through the work. And this relationship and its intensified forms of exploitation are then generalized beyond the arts and culture world—for instance, by making the recipients of social benefits engage in free labor in order to maintain their benefits. In these cases we see a change in the form of labor, in the refusal involved, and in the overall social composition created.

Renewing the Art Strike

> Resistance has never been more internal, and more inadequate, to the material conditions that support its realization (as value)—this is notable in the currency of critique in contemporary art, for instance, even and especially when it addresses itself to the evils of exploitation or the aporias of emancipation. Selling labor-power to live has never been more conflated with life itself—this indeed conjures away any disparity between capital and labor, when they become indiscernible as variables in the compulsions of life as it is.
>
> —Marina Vishmidt, "Value at Risk: From Politics of Reproduction to Human Capital"

Finally, I would like to turn to a brief reconsideration of the art strike as a possible way to think through the refusal of work where conditions include a high level of subjective involvement in work itself. While the idea and practices associated with art strikes are generally little known, I would suggest they provide an interesting way of rethinking questions around labor politics today.

Historically, the art strike has come about in four main iterations, with variations among them. The Art Workers Coalition issued the first call for an art strike in the 1960s in New York City (Bryan-Wilson 2009). It brought to light the connections between the art economy and the war economy, through the role of people such as the Rockefellers in supporting both. It commented on the Vietnam War as well as on issues of racism and exclusion in the art world. Its main focus was thus the politics of the institution, and in many ways it could be understood as a form of institutional critique (Alberro and Stimson 2009; Raunig and Ray 2009). This is in some ways quite similar to Gustav Metzger's call for 1977–1980 to be "years without art." For these three years, Metzger produced no work, apparently going on strike by himself, likewise with the idea that such a strike could create the potential to change the

institutional structures of the art world. The call for an art strike was taken up again by Stewart Home and the Neoists from 1990 to 1993, with the specific goal of disrupting the role of the artist itself. Thus it was less focused on the institution and more on the position of artists generally. And finally, during the past few years, calls for an art strike have been coming from Lithuania, organized by Redas Dirzys and the Temporary Art Strike Committee. The focus of this iteration is the role of Vilnius as a creative city, as Vilnius was recently named one of the European capitals of culture for a year. The goal of this strike is thus to disrupt the functioning of the arts in a cultural economy.

In each of these iterations there has been an expansion of the scope of the action or strike call, from the role of the gallery and arts institution to the role and position of the artist to the place of creativity in the economy more generally. In this way the art strike directly takes up the theme that seems to underpin practices of work refusal more generally, as it works between the utopian promise of possibility found in human labor, the wealth that can be produced and is already in motion, and the compromised and exploitative forms that work takes. The art strike doesn't seek to do away with this tension but works with it. Stewart Home (1991) once argued that the importance of the art strike is not in its feasibility but in the ways that it expands the terrain of struggle. That would be even more the case today. This argument was echoed recently by Paolo Virno (2009) in an interview discussing the relationship between art production and social movements. Virno suggests these connections are less significant within the content of artistic production than through creating new forms of interaction and new public spheres, especially those that are separate from the state. Given the ever greater enmeshing of creative activity in people's everyday lives (and not just in terms of paid employment), it would seem difficult if not impossible to throw down the tools of creative labor without also throwing down one's own life in the process.

This is a theme to which Croatian artist Mladen Stilinović has returned throughout his decades of work. First, Stilinović proposed to reclaim one's being and energy through laziness rather than through labor. This can be seen most clearly in his 1977 piece "Artist at Work," which comprises a series of eight images of Stilinović in bed in his pajamas, apparently in a condition of doing nothing at all. In a Yugoslav context where productive labor was constantly celebrated as a virtue, the key foundation of building and maintaining a socialist society, this can clearly be seen as a provocation and challenge. The theme carries through Stilinović's work as he celebrates laziness as being necessary and integral to artistic activity. Conversely, Stilinović derides artists who are not sufficiently attentive to developing their own capacity for laziness, referring to them as mere "producers" rather then artists. But a subtler point underpins Stilinović's celebration of nonwork: precisely, that laziness is a form of artistic labor rather than an escape from labor.

This comes out most clearly in his 1993 work "Chinese Business," in which a series of collages explores the question of whether artists can ever truly go on holiday. The work provocatively asserts that it is impossible for the artist to ever truly stop working, that the apparent refusal of productive labor that Stilinović explores through his work at the same time represents the development of new forms of

artistic labor and production.[4] The outside of labor sought through artistic laziness has become another form of production rather than an escape from it.

Another way to approach this is from the observation that real subsumption as a condition, if it should actually come to be true, is such that pointing out that condition would no longer produce any political effect. In other words, if all of life has become part of an overwhelming labor process—the social factory—then the condition of naturalizing the expanded exploitative work relationship is taken as a given rather than experienced as something which is disturbing or could nurture an antagonistic relationship to that condition. This is along the lines of what Franco "Bifo" Berardi (2009b) calls the necessary alienation that precedes a compositional moment and new forms of struggle. But it seems clear, given the changing composition of labor and the shifting ground of politics, that new forms of necessary alienation leading to new antagonistic movements would not likely be similar to those that Bifo describes as having occurred in the 1960s and 1970s. We might look instead to what he describes as the pathological and overwhelming nature of immaterial labor (Berardi 2009a)—the condition of those who find themselves "dreaming in code" (Lucas 2010)—rather than to industrial alienation.

In short, looking to the dark side of the multitude may help with understanding the potential for new forms of subjectivation: to look not just at the conscious activities of labor and politics but also at the ways that sociality is put to work more generally, such as through the use of geolocative data and mobility (Scholz and Liu 2010). And most importantly, this means to look for new routes of political recomposition, not just in the obvious moments of labor and politics but also through understanding blockages to emerging social composition. Working from the blockages of composition is not to mourn them or to fall into a melancholic trap but is rather to realize that new moments of social recomposition emerge from the decomposition of that which has become before. It is to embrace what Frederic Jameson (2010, 13) calls the cynicism of the intellect with the utopianism of the will.

The Shape of Refusal to Come

> For at the sight of work—that is to say, severe toil from morning till night—we have the feeling that it is the best police, that it holds every one in check and effectively hinders the development of reason, of greed, and of desire for independence. For work uses up an extraordinary proportion of nervous force, withdrawing it from reflection, meditation, dreams, cares, love, and hatred … And now, horror of horrors! it is the "workman" himself who has become dangerous; the whole world is swarming with "dangerous individuals."
>
> —Friedrich Nietzsche, *Daybreak: Thoughts on the Prejudices of Morality*

To conclude, let us return to the beginning. It does seem today that work is, as Nietzsche argued, the best policeman. It holds a function of governing social life even

4. For more on Stilinović's work, see Engqvist et al. (2012) and, more generally, Vidokle (2011).

when its role in adding productive value seems to slip away and we find ourselves in the position of what Peter Fleming and Carl Cederstrom (2012) refer to as "dead men working." It might seem that in times of biopolitical production, where the policing function of work is thus the policing function across all of life, the refusal of work is the refusal of life itself. Not surprisingly, this leads to some rather dismal-sounding conclusions about the possibility of autonomy and social recomposition. While I can appreciate a certain degree of questioning of assumptions surrounding the potentials of immaterial labor and of networking (as has been circulated in debates emerging from post-Autonomia over the past decade), I'd nevertheless argue that there's no reason to follow such arguments to rather dire conclusions. Stefano Harney suggests that an alternative can be found most readily within the black radical tradition, which takes up this problem of refusing work when one's life is the work. For Harney (2013), this "is the dimension of original exodus; this is the practice of fugitivity found within the black radical tradition, the escape that does not need to go anywhere but remains escape."

The project to be undertaken, which I've tried to hint at here, is instead to take a more compositional approach to understanding and working with different forms of refusal. That is, to ask certain questions: What form of social surplus is produced by a particular refusal? What form of collectivity? And following from that, what circuits of value production and valorization is the refusal enmeshed in? What is the notion of value and of social collectivity embodied in the refusal, and how does it respond to circuits of capture and accumulation?

Bernard Marszalek, in the new introduction to Paul Lafargue's classic text *The Right to be Lazy*, hints at another important direction: namely, that the opposite of work, and what is produced by its refusal, is neither leisure nor idleness.[5] Rather, for Marszalek (2011, 19) the opposite of work is "autonomous and collective activity—ludic activity—that develops our unique humanity and grounds our perspective of reversing perspective." A compositional approach to work refusal is thus not a question of doing nothing but of developing the skills, capacities, organization, and collective becoming that make possible and sustain these ludic activities and social wealth. In short, this is the very form of zerowork training that we need today: a pedagogy of learning not to labor, not as a form of individual refusal but as a socialization of refusal. This is the argument that Stanley Aronowitz and Jonathan Cutler (1997, 21) make concerning the history of labor struggles for shorter hours: such struggles enable increasing freedom from work and act as a strategic locus for organizing. This locus is capable of embracing the entire working class and creating collective resources to respond to capitalist offensives. Learning not to labor sits at the junction of the refusal of work and the re-fusing of the social energies of such refusal back into supporting the continued affective existence and capacities of other forms of life and ways of being together, as practice and as a form of embodied critique.

5. According to Allen Ruff (1997, 194), in 1917 the U.S. Postal Service banned the sending of Lafargue's text, along with many others, including Marx's *Wage Labor and Capital*.

References

Alberro, A., and B. Stimson, eds. 2009. *Institutional critique: An anthology of artists' writings*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Aronowitz, S., and J. Cutler. 1997. *Post-work: The wages of cybernation*. New York: Routledge.

Benbow, W. [1832] n.d. *Grand national holiday, and the congress of productive classes*. London: Pelagian.

Berardi, F. 2009a. *Precarious rhapsody: Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of the post-alpha generation*. London: Minor Compositions.

———. 2009b. *The soul at work*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Black, B. 1986. *The abolition of work and other essays*. Port Townsend: Loompanics.

Bryan-Wilson, J. 2009. *Art workers: Radical practice in the Vietnam War era*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Del Re, A. 1996. Women and welfare: Where is Jocasta? In *Radical thought in Italy: A potential politics*, ed. M. Hardt and P. Virno, 99–113. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

During, S. 2010. *Exit capitalism: Literary culture, theory, and post-secular modernity*. London: Routledge.

Engqvist, J. H., A. Enqvist, M. Masucci, L. Rosendahl, and C. Widenheim, eds. 2012. *Work, work, work: A reader on art and labour*. Berlin: Sternberg.

Fleming, P., and C. Cederstrom. 2012. *Dead man working*. Winchester: Zero Books.

Gielen, P. 2009. *The murmuring of the artistic multitude: Global art, memory and post-Fordism*. Amsterdam: Valiz.

Gorgut, O. 2011. *Poor man's heaven: The land of Cokaygne and other utopian visions*. London: Past Tense.

Greil, M. 1989. *Lipstick traces: A secret history of the twentieth century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Harney, S. 2013. Abolition and the general intellect. *Generation Online*. Accessed 27 December. http://www.generation-online.org/c/fc_rent13.htm.

Home, S. 1991. *The Neoist manifestos/The art strike papers*. Stirling: AK Press.

Jameson, F. 2010. A new reading of *Capital*. *Mediations* 25 (1): 5–14.

Koehline, J., and R. Sakolsky, eds. 1994. *Gone to Croatan: The origins of North American dropout culture*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

Lefebvre, H. 1997. Lefebvre on the Situationists: An interview. *October* 79 (Winter): 69–83.

Lovink, G., and N. Rossiter, eds. 2007. *MyCreativity reader: A critique of creative industries*. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures.

Lucas, R. 2010. A sleep worker's enquiry. *EndNotes* 2 (April): 154–166.

Marszalek, B. 2011. Introduction to *The right to be lazy*, by P. Lafargue, 1–20. Oakland: AK Press.

Midnight Notes Collective. 1992. *Midnight oil: Work, energy, war, 1973–1992*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

Neville, R. 1971. *Play power*. London: Paladin.

Owens, L. 2009. *Cracking under pressure: Narrating the decline of the Amsterdam squatters' movement*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Pasquinelli, M. 2011. The so-called Italian Theory and the revolt of living knowledge. *UniNomade*, 4 April. http://uninomade.org/italian-theory-en.

Precarias a la Deriva. 2004. Adrift through the circuits of feminized precarious work. *Transversal*, July. http://eipcp.net/transversal/0704/precarias1/en.

Raunig, G., and G. Ray, eds. 2009. *Art and contemporary critical practice: Reinventing institutional critique*. London: MayFly.

Read, J. 2011. The affective composition of labor. *Unemployed Negativity*, 17 May. http://www.unemployednegativity.com/2011/05/affective-composition-of-labor.html.

Ruff, A. 1997. *We called each other comrade: Charles H. Kerr and Company, radical publisher*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Scholz, T., and L. Y. Liu. 2010. *From mobile playgrounds to sweatshop city*. New York: Architectural League of New York.

Sheppard, H., and N. Q. Herrick. 1972. *Where have all the robots gone? Worker dissatisfaction in the 70s*. New York: Free Press.

Sholette, G. 2010. *Dark matter: Art and politics in the age of enterprise culture*. London: Pluto.

Vidokle, A. 2011. Art without work? *e-flux*, no. 29 (November). http://www.e-flux.com/journal/art-without-work/.

Virno, P. 2009. The dismeasure of art: An interview with Paolo Virno. By S. Lavaert and P. Gielen. In *Arts in society: Being an artist in post-Fordist times*, ed. P. de Bruyxne and P. Gielen, 17–44. Rotterdam: NAi.

Weeks, K. 2011. *The problem with work: Feminism, Marxism, antiwork politics, and postwork imaginaries*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Willis, P. 1982. *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wright, S. 2003. *Storming heaven: Class composition and struggle in Italian autonomist Marxism*. London: Pluto Press.