THE COLONIZATION OF TIME:

PRODUCTION, CONSUMPTION, AND LEISURE

by

NICHOLE MARIE SHIPPEN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Political Science

Written under the direction of

Dr. Stephen Eric Bronner

And approved by

_____

_____

_____

_____

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May 2011

Abstract of Dissertation

The Colonization of Time:

Production, Consumption, and Leisure

By NICHOLE M. SHIPPEN

Dissertation Director:

Dr. Stephen Eric Bronner

This dissertation reconsiders discretionary time as an objective measure of freedom through the concept of temporal autonomy, or the ability to control one's time. The ability to control one's time relates to the organization of the economy, state, and household with regards to the allocation of necessity. Capitalism dominates necessity through the manipulation of "necessary" labor-time that must be sold in order to survive in a market society, which I argue facilitates capitalism's colonization of time for the purpose of generating profit and ensuring economic growth, rather than addressing human need or scarcity. If time is the ultimate scarce resource, then the distribution of time is a matter of justice. For this reason, I argue the fight for time as a political response to capitalism's colonization of time remains an indispensible project that needs to be rethought in light of new historical conditions. Whereby the original fight for time fought to control and limit the time spent in production, I argue today's fight for time must also address capitalism's colonization beyond production through the commodification of time in general.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the support of so many caring individuals who went beyond what might reasonably be expected from friendship. No matter how much I despaired over the process of completing my dissertation, three individuals graciously answered my phone calls and e-mails at all times of the day and night and believed in me when I was unable to muster up belief in myself. Carolyn Craig, Amy Linch, and Michael J. Thompson offered me endless amounts of encouragement, compassion, and love, which gave me the strength to finish what I had started. They did so without complaint and offered not only common sense, but humor to balance out my overly dramatic sense of doom and gloom. Michael Forman deserves special thanks for being my longtime mentor, outside reader, close friend, and biggest fan. My best friend, Crystal Lawson, took my phone calls despite her hands being very full with five young children. She listened with patience and understanding, and offered her support. She has been there from the beginning and I am certain she will be there until the end.

Writing is an isolating pursuit plagued by self doubt, but many people helped me to feel less alone in the process, including Sara Angevine, Jim Archer, Josh Beall, Kate Bedford, Darren Botello-Samson, Melissa Brown, Alyson Campbell, Sanger Chambers, Giselle Datz, Helen Delfeld, Joseph Dwyer, Mark Engler, Michael Fisher, Natalie Gearhart, Brian Graf, Andrew Greenberg, Shira Kalman-Hicks, Denise Horn, Aaron Keck, Beth Kelly, Kristy King, Geoffrey Kurtz, Nicole Hablenko (Boy Nicole), Amanda Harding, Alexandra Hoerl, Stacey Hunt, Karey Leung, Chance Lykins, Laurie Marhoefer, James Mastrangelo, Jennifer Miller, Anna Mitchell, Krista Nethercott, Shanna Nix, Ken

Panfilio, Ben Pauli, Benjie Peters, Eric Radezky, Aparna Rishi, George Rogge, Meredith Staples, Brian (Stick) Stipleman, Joseph Schwartz, Tony Steen, Maria Svart, Shatema Threadcraft, and Wendy Wright.

During the final years of completing my dissertation, I was a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Women's and Gender Studies Program at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio. The Women's and Gender Studies Program at Ohio University gave me the opportunity to present and develop my work through their colloquium, and build a new scholarly community. Many local friends and colleagues helped me survive not only the final stages of the dissertation, but the adjustment to life in rural Appalachia. Judith Grant graciously offered her time and professional advice on numerous occasions, but also shared many road trips back to the east coast. I cannot not leave Athens without thanking Susan Burgess, Susanne Dietzel, Julia Friday, Evelyn McDade Geiger—my lovely and erudite neighbor and fierce feminist in her 80s, Kristin Grey, Alex Hibbitt, Laura Larson, Danielle Leshaw, Kim Little (Women's BB!), Lisa Marie, Katherine Milton, Lynette Peck, Dan Skinner, Kathleen Sullivan, Rebecca Mercado Thornton, Joan Weston, Julie White, and of course my students at OU, especially the YDS (Young Democratic Socialists) students.

My dissertation committee, Stephen Bronner, Cynthia Daniels, Dennis Bathory, and Michael Forman, deserves special recognition and gratitude for their patience and wisdom. As my advisor, Stephen Bronner challenged me in ways that ultimately helped strengthen my arguments. Cynthia Daniels urged me on and always offered kind words of encouragement. Dennis Bathory offered insightful comments on the final manuscript. Other Rutgers' faculty and staff helped along the way, including Audrey Boyd, Drucilla

Cornell, Sheila Friedlander, Jan Kubik, Beth Leech, Jan Murphy, the late Wilson Carey McWilliams, and Gordon Schochet.

My family did not really understand what it was exactly that I was up to for all these years, but they cheered me on nonetheless. For this, I thank my parents, Elizabeth and Roscoe Martin Shippen; my younger siblings, Roscoe and Rachael Shippen; my nephew, Colton Shippen; my niece, Kaia Leseberg, and her mother, Shay Leseberg; and my Aunt Victoria Trujillo. Sadly, my brother, Roscoe Anthony Shippen, died unexpectedly on the same day I set my defense date. The respective departments at Ohio University and Rutgers University donated generously to help defray the costs of my late brother's funeral. The kindness extended toward my family will not be forgotten. My faith in humanity is constantly restored by such acts of benevolence.

Nichole Shippen

April 18, 2011

Table of Contents

Reconsidering the Value of Time: An Introduction

> *I am always surprised to see some people demanding the time of others and meeting a most obliging response. Both sides have in view the reason for which the time is asked and neither regards the time itself—as if nothing there is being asked for and nothing given. They are trifling with life's most precious commodity being deceived because it is an intangible thing, not open to inspection and therefore reckoned very cheap—in fact, almost without any value. People are delighted to accept pensions and gratuities, for which they hire out their labour or their support or their services. But nobody works out the value of time: men use it lavishly as if it costs nothing.*[1] Seneca

In *On the Shortness of Life*, Seneca challenges his reader to reconsider the value of time. Given the certainty of death, time is inherently limited. What Seneca offers is a valuation of time based on a normative claim similar to what Aristotle referred to as the "good life." The "good life" refers to the following of habits that produce arête, or virtue. Along similar lines, contemporary scholars refer to the "quality of life" as a measure of well-being, which takes into account qualitative considerations beyond the quantitative measures that define the "standard of living" through monetary terms.[2] Questions concerning the "good life" have previously been overshadowed by a conflation of wealth and well-being.[3] I argue this conflation is a result of the general valuation of time dominated by economic rationality, which is embodied in the commodity form. This valuation of time is historically specific to capitalism.[4] Although the commodity form is not yet operative, Seneca's ruminations nevertheless lack a consideration of the political and economic factors, which determine how people value their time. He admonishes

---

[1] Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *On the Shortness of Life* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 12.
[2] Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999); Martha C. Nussbaum, *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000).
[3] Sen, *Development and Freedom*, 13-14.
[4] For a general discussion of "value" as constituted by economists, see Raj Patel's *The Value of Nothing: How to Reshape Market Society and Redefine Democracy* (New York: Picador, 2009). For a historical analysis of "the problem of value," including Marx's labor theory of value see Robert L. Heilbroner's *Behind the Veil of Economics* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1988).

those who sell their time, but does not consider the conditions that make it necessary to do so. He complains about the abstract nature of time, but fails to consider the conditions that might make the relationship between time and freedom concrete.[5] Developing a political consciousness about time is more complicated than simply convincing individuals to value their time differently. Alternative valuations of time already exist, but their actualization depends upon transforming the political and economic conditions that presently constrain them. I argue the politics of time under capitalism must be rendered visible by those who seek to transform the way we value time. Time is the very substance of freedom; it is in and through time that we develop our capacities for exercising critical thought and meaningful action. For this reason, I argue "discretionary time" and "temporal autonomy" should be considered central aspects of freedom.[6]

Although the human experience is under considerable time constraint given the inevitability of death, this dissertation considers the factors which I argue most contribute to the shared experience of time as loss (or the feeling that there is simply not enough time in the day to accomplish all we *need* or *want* to do).[7] I argue the scarcity of time is exacerbated by the historical economic and social processes of capital accumulation, which dispossess people of control over the use and meaning of their time to the political and economic advantage of capital.[8] In particular, I demonstrate how capitalism's domination of necessity, or the time and labor that must be sold in order to survive in a market society, facilitates capitalism's colonization of time for the purpose of generating

---

[5] Robert E. Goodin, James Mahmud Rice, Antti Parpo, and Lina Eriksson, *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 3.
[6] I borrow both concepts from Goodin et al., *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom*, but develop them through the Marxist tradition.
[7] Raija Julkunen, "A Contribution to the Categories of Social Time and the Economy of Time," *Acta Sociologica* Vol. 20, No. 1 (1977): 6.

profit and ensuring economic growth, rather than addressing human need or scarcity.[9] Regardless of other contributing factors, I argue the poverty of time corresponds to the organizational needs that most benefit capitalism. Moreover, capitalism benefits from the very time constraints it imposes since individuals tend to purchase services and technology to help them manage their overall lack of time, rather than organizing for alternative time arrangements at the societal level.

If time is the ultimate scarce resource, then the distribution of time is a matter of justice.[10] The fight for time as a political response to capitalism's colonization of time remains an indispensible project that needs to be rethought in light of new historical conditions. At stake in the fight for time is autonomy and creating the conditions that contribute to its reflexivity. The ability of individuals to make meaningful decisions with regards to their time is greatly hampered by capitalism's colonization of time. How people "spend" their time at present is usually considered off limits from criticism since it is assumed to be freely chosen activity and thus self-determined. Yet, this assumption precludes any consideration of the political-economic context which determines choice in the first place.[11] A meaningful decision, is after all, contingent upon an awareness of the ideological and material forces that constrain or undermine the ability to make autonomous decisions with regard to time or what I refer to "time consciousness." The fight for time is a struggle that involves both time consciousness and the political-economic conditions that would expand the realm of autonomous choice.

---

[8] David Harvey uses "accumulation by dispossession" to refer to the historical continuation of what Marx referred to as "primitive accumulation" in *Capital*.
[9] Necessity is a historical concept, which only derives meaning from a specific historical context.
[10] Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Plurality and Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 185.
[11] Claire Snyder-Hall, "Feminism in Action: History, Ideology, Tradition," in *Rational*

Whereby the original fight for time fought to control and limit the time spent in production, I argue today's fight for time must address capitalism's colonization of free time and leisure. Commonly or uncritically assumed to be time free from production with the exception of feminists' analyses of the sexual division of labor in the household and critical theorists' criticisms of the culture industry, free time and leisure have increasingly become integral parts of the production process through the combined structural and ideological imperatives not only to work, but to spend and relax under conditions over-determined by the profit driven market. In this manner, capitalism has come to dominate the social meaning, value, and organization of time well beyond the realm of production. As a consequence, it is difficult for people to recognize alternative understandings of time as legitimate or probable which in turn makes alternative organizations of time seem utopian rather than as a political goal to be achieved. In general, people want more control over their time, but they cannot fathom how that might be possible given the need to work long hours to make ends meet.

The fight for the reduced work day remains central to the struggle for autonomy, but transforming the political-economic conditions so as to decrease the overall reliance on the market for all goods and services is just as necessary for developing a politics of time today. If capitalism's ability to colonize time rests in its domination of necessity, as I argue, then creating alternatives should decrease its power to control others' time through the need to work and spend as circumscribed by a market society. Alternatives might include a combination of welfare provisions, a basic or guaranteed wage, or

---

Radicalism and Political Theory: Essays in Honor of Stephen Eric Bronner, ed. Michael J. Thompson (New York: Lexington Books, 2010), 130.

increased self-provision at the local level.[12] In this regard, it is useful to reconsider the relationship between necessity and freedom as situated in the Aristotelian-Marxist tradition. The necessity/freedom framework helps us not only to consider how the value of time has been shaped by the historical development of global capitalism, but how the parallel development of the fight for time sought to resist capitalism's colonization of time on humanistic grounds. Perhaps more importantly, the fight for time was never simply a fight for time away from production, but a fight for self-determined time inside and outside of production in order to increase autonomy.[13]

The control of one's time is relative to the degree to which forces beyond the individual's control constrain time. Outside of death, the primary constraint on time is necessity. Necessity is a historical and thus a relative category. Necessity is markedly different for Aristotle than it is for Karl Marx who uses the same category under different historical conditions. Nonetheless, Marx applies Aristotle's theoretical framework to his critical analysis of capitalism. In brief, the necessity/freedom framework assumes a reduction in time spent satisfying basic needs as a pre-condition of freedom. Unlike Aristotle, Marx is concerned with eliminating the constraints of necessity for all and not simply the privileged few. Marx criticized the parasitic nature of the kind of freedom that existed in Aristotle's society, one enabled by the labor and time of slaves, servants, and women. Remnants of this unburdening of one's self from necessity remain possible given the inequality built into the system of capitalism, which tends to institutionalize the

---

[12] See Juliet B. Schor, *Plentitude: The Economics of True Wealth* (New York: Penguin Press, 2010) for examples of self-provision at the local level.

[13] It should be noted that the fight for time is gendered, but not always in the same manner. Women once fought for time on the basis of their domestic and care giving responsibilities outside of the workplace. See Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004). Second wave feminists fought to transform the

sexual, racial, and global divisions of labor. In contrast, Marx sought to establish the material conditions that would reduce necessity for all, a theme that resonates with later theorists who focus on issues of domination and exploitation in human social relations.

What Marx offers is a detailed analysis of how the historical development of industrial capitalism came to dominate necessity through the manipulation of "socially necessary" labor-time in order to extract "surplus" labor-time.[14] The manipulation of "socially necessary" labor-time appears to the workers not as exploitation, but as a determined relationship between work and need, which I argue continues to deny "time-consciousness," or an understanding of how the system of capitalism colonizes time and restricts temporal autonomy. The rise of timed wage labor under capitalism transformed the collective understanding of the relationship between time, work, and necessity so that "time becomes necessity," i.e., necessity overburdens time to such an extent that its connection to freedom is severely limited.[15] The system of capitalism succeeds in colonizing necessity because "one [is] compelled to produce and exchange commodities in order to survive" under the "abstract time" of capitalism.[16] "Abstract time" refers to the fact that production and need are abstracted from each other so that time becomes an independent rather than a dependent variable of human activities.[17] The transformation from "concrete" to "abstract time" allows the dominating logic of capitalism to control the meaning and use of time. As a consequence, time is mistakenly understood as objective or neutral when it is informed structurally and ideologically by capitalism to the

---

sexual division of labor and the resulting "second shift"—a term coined by Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Second Shift* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003).

[14] Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. I., trans. Ben Fowkes (New York: Penguin Books, 1981-1990).

[15] Moishe Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 191.

[16] Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, 191.

extent that time as money becomes common sense. The transformation from concrete to abstract time dissolves the consciousness of time as historically constructed to the advantage of the accumulation of capital. This lack of time-consciousness, however, has not always been the case, i.e., work time was once part of the political agenda as formulated through the fight for time.

The extent to which capitalism has been able to colonize time is related to the overall strength or weakness of the left's ability to regulate the economic mandates of capitalism through democratic reform, which historically has included the length of the work day. What the fight for time demonstrates is that capitalism's colonization of time is neither automatic nor unavoidable, but contestable and political. Developed by Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx in response to the unregulated working conditions of early industrial capitalism, the fight for time originally sought to institutionalize constraints on capitalism's domination by setting limits on work time. This would allow for (if not guarantee) the possibility of self-determined time. The fight for time was a political struggle framed in terms of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of time that paralleled negative and positive understandings of freedom. Forever critical of the abstract nature of political rights, Marx nevertheless recognized the usefulness of democratic reform for protecting workers from overwork. Negative freedom was marked by the institutionalization of the 10-Hour Bill, which distinguished "when the time which the worker sells is ended, and when his own begins."[18] Positive freedom, as articulated by Marx, followed the Aristotelian vision of time as teleologically related to the development of human potential. The labor slogan, "Bread and roses!" captures the

---

[17] Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, 190-191.
[18] Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, 190-191.

necessity/freedom framework well since it demonstrates workers made demands not only for the basic necessities, but for the finer things in life as well including leisure.

The colonization of time today takes place in ways both similar to and different from the original colonization of time as shaped by the needs and conditions of early industrial capitalism. The relationship between capitalism and time is fluid, and should not be assumed beforehand. Different phases of capitalism ranging from Fordism to Post-Fordism have contributed to the gradual transformations of time as determined by the changing needs of the economy.[19] Equally important are the various forms of resistance against capitalism's colonization of time including the fight for time. The fight for time is arguably gendered, but for the sake of coherence, I have limited this work primarily to thinking about capitalism's colonization of time through the Marxist and Critical theory traditions. However, one cannot discuss temporal autonomy without acknowledging the work of feminists who have criticized the sexual division of labor as decreasing women's temporal autonomy. The history of socialist feminist thought remains fertile ground toward rethinking the sexual division of labor through the lens of time, but it often focuses on gender at the expense of race. Patriarchy and white supremacy certainly intersect with capitalism's organization of time and contribute to the unequal distribution of discretionary time.

Breakdown of the Chapters

Chapter I reconsiders the value of time through the ancient conception of leisure as articulated by Aristotle. For Aristotle, leisure is the ideal form of temporal autonomy. In his development of leisure, Aristotle anticipates many of the defining elements of the

modern fight for time including the interdependent relationship between necessity and freedom. Identifying the connections between Aristotle and Marx as they relate to a specific understanding of time in relationship to freedom is useful for recovering ideas which have been lost, as well as ideas which remain useful for developing a politics of time against capitalism's colonization of time.[20] In particular, I argue the loss of a teleological understanding of time as related to the development of human potential has not been without a loss of a progressive vision of history once defined by an overall decline in work and a corresponding increase in leisure. Understanding the forces in the context of the United States that transformed the fight for time into "the right to work" is significant to understanding capitalism's colonization of time.[21] In addition, Aristotle's conception of the classical understanding of leisure is useful insofar as it privileges leisure as a good in itself, which makes the contemplative life possible. I argue the understanding of leisure as a good in itself has been replaced by an instrumental understanding of leisure in relationship to work. Additionally, I argue the classical understanding of leisure be used as a "regulative ideal" against capitalism's colonization of time.[22] If leisure is not possible given the current economic-political conditions then

---

[19] See David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1989).

[20] Stephen Eric Bronner, *Socialism Unbound* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), 152 and 154. Bronner argues, "Renewing the radical spirit of the socialist undertaking is possible only by appropriating and transvaluing the unrealized values animating the original undertaking." Bronner includes the fight for time as "a prime ethical undertaking for a critical theory of socialism."

[21] Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt, *Work Without End: Abandoning Shorter Hours for the Right to Work* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988).

[22] The idea of the "regulative ideal" originates in Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 591, but is used by Stephen Bronner, *Socialism Unbound*, 146: "But communism is discredited and socialism can now exist only as a regulative ideal." Kant states, "Accordingly, I assert: the transcendental ideas are never constitutive use, so that the concepts of certain objects would thereby be given, and in case one so understands them, they are merely sophistical (dialectical) concepts. On the contrary, however, they have an excellent and indispensably necessary regulative use, namely that of directing the understanding to a certain goal respecting which the lines of direction of all its rules converge at one point, which, although it is only an

the conditions must be transformed. Leisure remains a radically anti-capitalist concept connected to non-pecuniary activities.

Chapter II focuses on Marx and his understanding of the political nature of time under early industrial capitalism to lay out the various ways capitalism dispossesses people of their time beginning with "primitive accumulation." Reconciling the relationship between necessity and freedom through the concept of labor, Marx helps us to recognize the full implications of capitalism's colonization of time as a loss of time for the development of human potential. Given this loss, Marx recognizes the significance in transforming leisure from a regulative ideal to a political fight for time. He does so through a teleological understanding of history as related to the expansion of freedom. Taking Hegel's "insight into necessity" as a pre-condition of freedom, Marx is able to demonstrate the link between capitalism's manipulation of "necessary" labor-time and overwork.

Chapter III uses Georg Lukács to develop a theory of time-consciousness in response to the reification of time or the acceptance of time as socially constructed under capitalism as permanent, rather than as historical and political. Lukács' *History and Class Consciousness* is particularly helpful in re-establishing a dialectical link between the philosophical and political aspects of time in relationship to history, as established by Karl Marx, as a way to contest the reification of time-consciousness. The fight for time reconsidered must address all elements of capitalism's colonization of time, including and perhaps most of all the reification of time-consciousness, which denies individuals

---

idea (focus imaginarius)—i.e., a point from which the concepts of the understanding do not really proceed, since it lies entirely outside the bounds of possible experience—nonetheless still serves to obtain for these concepts the greatest unity alongside the greatest extension."

the ability to understand reality in terms of fluid historical processes. In contrast, time-consciousness enables individuals to make connections between their immediate reality and the totality of social relations.[23] In this way, individuals come to understand not only how capitalism colonizes time, but recognize the objective possibilities of contesting capital's colonization of time without retreating into subjectivity or romantic anti-capitalism.

Chapter IV offers critical thoughts on free time and leisure primarily through Adorno and Horkheimer's criticisms of the "culture industry." Although, they held a rather dismal take on the emancipatory potential of free time and leisure, their criticism of the culture and leisure industries help us to think critically about how capitalism colonized time by linking free time to consumption. Capitalism's colonization of time through consumption entailed a systematic reorganization and re-conceptualization of time as mediated by consumption in the early 20th century in the United States. Making the connections between Aristotle's classical ideal of leisure and the conditions which deny the possibility of that understanding of leisure politicizes time by demonstrating how capitalism limits the social experience of time.

Chapter V ends with some reflections on the work of André Gorz and the development of a politics of time for today. Following Gorz's lead, I re-examine the potential of the fight for time given the economy as it exists today. As the need to work intensifies given the economic recession, the overall lack of full-time work renders the contradictions of the neo-liberal economic mandate to work and spend visible. It is the cracks in the current modes of production and consumption that make it necessary to

[23] Martin Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1984), 104: "Lukács linked action and knowledge, contending that the inert immediacy of

reconsider the primary categories of capitalism, including labor, time, and value.[24] Because Gorz discusses the "wages for housework" campaign of feminists in the 1970s, I respond to some of his criticisms. Feminist criticisms of the sexual division of labor remain useful for rethinking the necessity/freedom framework.

facts had to be overcome by mediating them through a dynamic understanding of the whole."
[24] André Gorz, *Ecologica*, trans. Chris Turner (London: Seagull Books, 2010), 21.

Chapter I: Leisure, Necessity, and the Aristotelian Roots of the Fight for Time

Although it is primarily recognized as a political struggle to limit the workday through legislative reform, I argue the modern fight for time is based on a much earlier, broader, and more radical conception of autonomy grounded in the Aristotelian-Marxist tradition.[25] If it is to break out of the confines of economic determinism, the fight for time must seek to renew the radical impulse informing its original undertaking by privileging time. What is at stake in the fight for time is autonomy and creating the conditions, which most contribute to its reflexivity. Aristotle anticipates the defining element of the modern fight for time, namely autonomy through the lens of time as related to a teleological understanding of human development, and initiates a structure of thought along these lines that is later picked up by Karl Marx. The connection between time and autonomy is captured in Aristotle's development of the ancient conception of leisure. Aristotle understood leisure as the ideal form of autonomy, and justified the political conditions which made it possible in the context of the Greek city-state, namely the subordination of women, servants, and slaves to lives of necessity in service to the male citizenry. Marx attempts to overcome this limitation by theorizing the political conditions that would extend leisure to all, and not simply the privileged few. Despite this limitation, I argue Aristotle's development of leisure as a political concept reveals the interdependent relationship between necessity and freedom, which anticipates the problematic issue of necessity for modern questions of equality.

Although the commodity form was not yet operative, Aristotle also anticipates the modern tendency to value money over time. For Aristotle and the ancient world in

general, wealth was a means to obtaining a degree of temporal autonomy, including leisure, and not an end in itself.[26] Temporal autonomy was valued over wealth getting for the sake of wealth or *pleonexia*.[27] Aristotle offers an inverted understanding of value, which I argue could conceivably serve as an alternative to the modern conception of economic value by forcing a reconsideration of the "good life" through the lens of time in relationship to the development of human freedom. As it stands today, questions of the "good life" are often overshadowed by the needs of capitalism informed by the "ideology of work" which proclaims that more, not less work is the answer to all societal ills despite the overall decline in available and gainful employment.[28] Temporal autonomy is greatly restricted by the need to work as determined by the conditions of capitalism.

The modern understanding of labor as something intrinsically valuable did not exist in the Greek world. Labor was related to necessity, or the need to labor in order to procure that which was necessary for sustaining life and the possibility of attaining the "good life," but it was considered akin to slavery since it did not allow for autonomous thought or activity. Leisure, not labor was considered a defining condition of human flourishing. The reduction of labor constrained by necessity determined by nature or the subordination to another person due to conditions of poverty was considered to be a pre-condition of leisure, and the measure of freedom was based on the degree one was not subjected to either: "The free man, if he had to work, wanted therefore to work for

---

[25] For an excellent literature review on the various connections between Aristotle and Marx, please see George E. McCarthy, *Marx and the Ancients: Classical Ethics, Social Justice, and Nineteenth Century Political Economy* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1990), 58-59.
[26] James William Booth, *Households: On the Moral Architecture of the Economy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 86: "In [the ancient] world, the squandering of time on additional economic activity was deemed perverse as, in a mirror image, would time away from production and wealth creating be judged slothful, or even sinful, in a later society."
[27] Booth, *Households: On the Moral Architecture of the Economy*, 9.

himself, not someone else."[29] In contrast to the modern understanding of labor as alienable and therefore saleable without necessarily inferring subjugation on the part of the laborer, the political aspects of economic relations in the ancient world were rendered visible by the social relations of domination and subordination in the context of the household economy.

Aristotle operates under the assumption that a reduction in time spent satisfying basic needs is an essential pre-condition of freedom, while slavery to necessity defines the condition of unfreedom. From the Greek standpoint, "the freedom of some could not be imagined without the servitude of others and the two extremes were not thought of as contradictory, but as complementary and interdependent."[30] Slavery was justified on the grounds that it was the only conceivable way to reduce necessity in order to allow for the time necessary for the extensive set of political commitments for the male citizenry in the Greek city-state.[31] For Aristotle, the reduction of necessity is a necessary, if not sufficient, condition of human self-development as related to telos-realization. Aristotle regards necessity and freedom as irreconcilable due to an ontological conception of humans as contemplative, rather than laboring beings. The condition that lends itself most to contemplation is leisure, not labor.

The Politics of Necessity

In order to re-establish a meaningful relationship between time and freedom, it is necessary to analyze the historical conditions that most determine necessity. For

---

[28] André Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, trans. Gillian Handyside and Chris Turner (New York: Verson, 1989), 219.
[29] M.M. Austin and Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1977), 15.
[30] Austin and Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece*, 19.
[31] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), 81.

Aristotle, necessity is determined by nature or the subordination to another person due to conditions of poverty.[32] Thus defined necessity refers primarily to a combination of biological and economic constraints. Biological necessity is the time one must devote to basic survival. Although biological necessity might be universalized as the very basic animal need to eat, drink, and sleep, the fulfillment of biological necessity is historical. The time an individual must devote to basic survival is shaped by the political and economic conditions he or she encounters, including the general distribution of "social time" across necessity and leisure through the division of labor in a given society.[33] Having no theory of history, Aristotle's understanding of necessity is limited by the fact that he accepts the given conditions as inevitable. Nevertheless, Aristotle demonstrates that the delegation of necessity is a political question related to the organization of the state, and the household economy.[34]

Importantly, Aristotle's analysis of the political nature of necessity reveals time to be a collective resource shaped by specific political-economic constraints, and not an individual's property abstracted from his or her social position as liberalism is wont to describe it.[35] Liberals tend to approach time as something that belongs to individuals whom decide for themselves how best to distribute their time, which denies the reality of the economic constraints, which I argue is the overarching factor determining the level of temporal autonomy, or the ability to control one's time under capitalism. The need to

---

[32] Booth, *Households: On the Moral Architecture of the Economy*, 44.
[33] Raija Julkunen, "A Contribution to the Categories of Social Time and the Economy of Time," *Acta Sociologica* Vol. 20, No. 1 (1977).
[34] Robert E. Goodin, James Mahmud Rice, Antti Parpo, and Lina Eriksson, *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
[35] Chris Rojek's nuanced approach to leisure seeks to "reconcile the analytic gains made by positioning leisure choice and forms in relation to history and scarcity with a defence (sic) that leisure behavior is intentional, albeit within the constraints of social positioning." See Chris Rojek, *The Labour of Leisure: The Culture of Free Time* (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2010), 126.

commodify one's labor in order to be able to purchase commodities necessary for basic survival links the political and economic aspects of time under the category of economic necessity.[36] However, time freed from economic necessity or the need to work is not necessarily free given the additional constraints on time including "household necessity," which feminists argue continues to be disproportionately assigned to women through the sexual division of labor despite increasing numbers of women participating in the market. For this reason, "discretionary time," rather than free time potentially offers a more realistic measure of temporal autonomy since it refers to the time available after a consideration of the minimum amount of time that must be spent on biological (personal care), household (sexual division of labor), and economic necessity (waged labor) combined.[37]

Necessity might never be eliminated, but the reduction of necessity can be accomplished in several ways. The primary method is to create a political community that delegates necessity through a social division of labor-time. Securing time to cultivate one's individuality is made possible through the cooperation of individuals in a given society since each individual does not have to procure for himself all the necessary provisions:

> Without political society no individual could develop his or her unique talents. In the family or the village, it is impossible to specialize very much. In fact, it is impossible to get very far beyond a concern for survival. Hawthorne discovered that in a small, utopian community like Brooke Farm, one does not write much poetry. Planting potatoes takes up too much of one's time and energy. And it is because someone plants the potatoes that others can cultivate the fine arts.

[36] The slow food movement is an economic and political response to this financial constraint since it offers self-provision and thus less reliance on the market and challenges the logic of fast food.
[37] Goodin et al., *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom*.

> Individuality is a product, not an antecedent, of political society and is always dependent on the order of political life.[38]

Unfortunately, the division of labor has a tendency to reinforce existing patterns of inequality, which determine who will "plant the potatoes" and who will "cultivate the fine arts."

Aristotle regards necessity and freedom as irreconcilable due to an ontological conception of man as a contemplative being.[39] Consequently, he accepts the assignment of necessity to slaves, servants, and women in the household insofar as it affords male citizens time to participate in politics and experience leisure as contemplation: "Hence those who are in a position which places them above toil have stewards who attend to their households while they occupy themselves with philosophy or with politics."[40] Beyond simply accepting the existing division of labor, Aristotle reinforces it by arguing that individuals cannot be slaves to necessity and be free since they do not make autonomous decisions with regards to their own lives, i.e., they do not have access to temporal autonomy since their time is over determined by necessity, and moreover necessity not defined by their needs, but the needs of their masters.[41] Temporal autonomy makes political participation and the experience of leisure as contemplation possible, but temporal autonomy is made possible in Greek society through the disproportionate designation of necessity to women, servants, and slaves in the private household.

---

[38] Carey Wilson McWilliams, "Values and Politics" (1979), http://www.iscv.org/Civic_Idealism/McWilliams/ValuesPolitics/valuespolitics.html.
[39] Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. J.A.K. Thomson (New York: Penguin Books USA Inc., 1976), chapter 8.
[40] Aristotle, *The Politics*, trans. Carnes Lord (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984), 19.
[41] Goodin et al., *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Free*dom, 27.

Aristotle does note that the difference between those who participate in the realm of necessity and those who do not is determined by convention and not by nature.[42] Thus the assignment of roles is contestable and seems quite arbitrary other than the criteria of citizenship, which he defines as "belonging…only to those who have been relieved of necessary sorts of work. Those who perform necessary services for one person are slaves; those who do so for the partnership are vulgar persons and laborers."[43] Expressing a general disdain for those regimes that makes vulgar persons, laborers, and foreigners, citizens, Aristotle argues, "…it is impossible to pursue the things of virtue when one lives the life of a vulgar person or a laborer."[44] Aristotle's conception of citizenship is based on exclusions justified and reinforced by the existing division of labor. Instead of challenging the existing division of labor, Aristotle accepts it. He does, however, allow for the possibility of self-operating technology to free the need for slaves as the primary means of reducing time constrained by necessity—an idea that Marx eventually develops in light of the technological innovations of industrial capitalism.

Although Marx by contrast seeks to extend democratic participation and leisure to all and not simply the privileged few, he accepts Aristotle's general argument that freedom is dependent upon the reduction of time constrained by necessity. He argues against the unjust working conditions of early industrial capitalism which reduces the working class to necessity as determined by the profit motive rather than the common good. Under unregulated capitalism, the bourgeoisie compel the working class through the force of necessity to sell their labor-time:

---

[42] "The rule of a master over slaves exists by convention only and not by nature." Aristotle, *The Politics*, 15.
[43] Aristotle, *The Politics*, 24.
[44] Aristotle, *The Politics*, 93.

> Up until the start of welfare provision late in the second half of the nineteenth century workers received no guaranteed public means of subsistence. They therefore had to work in order to feed, clothe and house themselves. When they became ill, unemployed or too old to work they were forced to appeal to private charity or else to reconcile themselves to destitution and homelessness.[45]

Given the lack of government regulation and welfare provisions, the working conditions of early industrial capitalism reduced nearly all time to necessity. It was not uncommon to find 14-18 even 19-20 hour work days.[46] It was the blatantly miserable working conditions of this time period that largely defined the working class experience: "Not only [did] they have less leisure time at their disposal, but the effects of their work and conditions of life upon their bodies and minds impose[d] strict limits upon the development of their faculties and interests."[47] This was not life as it should be, but life constrained and overcome by necessity "(survival and work)"[48] as determined by capitalism. The struggle for 10-hour day legislation was meant as a preventive measure to keep workers from selling themselves into slavery since as Marx notes the logic of capitalism reduces all "disposable time" to "labour-time, to be devoted to the self-expansion of capital."[49] Time thus becomes a force and a relation of production under capitalism through the manipulation of "necessary" labor-time. The fight for time framed

---

[45] Chris Rojek, *Decentering Leisure: Rethinking Leisure Theory* (London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1995), 12.
[46] Alexander Trachtenberg, "The History of May Day," http://www.marxists.org/subject/mayday/articles/tracht.html.
[47] Chris Rojek, "Did Marx have a theory of Leisure?" *Leisure Studies* 3 (1984), 166.
[48] "Marx's distinction between the realm of necessity (survival and work) and the realm of freedom is a repetition of an originally Greek view of political life…" George E. McCarthy, *Marx and the Ancients: Classical Ethics, Social Justice, and Nineteenth Century Political Economy* (Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1990), 114.
[49] Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. I*., trans. Ben Fowkes (New York: Penguin Books, 1981-1990), Chapter 10, Section 5. Also available online at http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm.

in terms of negative freedom sought *freedom from* capital's colonization of time through the reduction of "necessary" labor-time without a reduction in pay.[50]

Marx sought to reconcile necessity and freedom through the concept of labor. Breaking with Aristotle and following Hegel's lead, Marx develops an ontological conception of being based on labor, or self-conscious interaction with nature, rather than contemplation. Labor allows Marx to reconcile necessity and freedom because consciousness and practical activity are dialectically related to freedom. Marx's critique of capitalism is based on the limitations it places on this dialectical relationship by alienating people from their labor and exploiting them through their labor denying them a meaningful connection between self-consciousness and labor. The socialist vision of the "good life" thus sought not simply a reduction of work time through democratic reform, but a complete reorganization of the economy so that under socialism everyone contributes to necessity so that no one is forced to live a life reduced to necessity.

Both Aristotle and Marx conceptualize freedom as something extending beyond material need. For Aristotle, satisfaction and security of biological needs are a precondition of experiencing freedom through contemplation. Security of the ability to meet bodily needs might further prevent people from experiencing freedom as Aristotle construes it because contemplation requires leisure, which is not available to those who must work to ensure that they have enough food and shelter. Marx similarly recognized the satisfaction of material need as precondition of freedom and illustrates the dimensions of human experience that are obviated by need. However, Marx radically extends the relationship between freedom and necessity in Aristotle's thought by assessing the impact

[50] Temporal autonomy was also sought within the work place by extending democratic control over the production process with regards to the speed ups in production.

of material satisfaction and security at the collective level. Marx understands the material dimension of human life – need satisfaction – as a relational process that constrains freedom in a far more encompassing fashion than imagined by Aristotle. While Aristotle's citizens can experience freedom through contemplation at the expense of women, servants, and slaves, Marx recognizes that those citizens are bound by a set of social relations that ensures their material well-being. The relations themselves are need based, thus they remain bound to necessity even when they are in a state of leisure or pursuing freedom through contemplation. Marx understands freedom as a collective phenomenon, something that cannot be achieved at the expense of another because domination constrains the autonomy of both parties, indicts the system of social relations that make apparent freedom in any part of it possible.

Despite the more problematic aspects of Aristotle's necessity/freedom framework, his ideas remains useful for the purpose of developing a politics of time since it forces us to rethink the allocation of necessity through the lens of temporal autonomy. Doing so, offers a way a way to think about time in terms of justice as related to the human development of potentialities and the unequal distribution of this opportunity. How time is distributed across necessary activities is a political question. For Aristotle, the public sphere, "where free and equal citizens engage together in striving for some common good," depended upon the converse "relationships of *in*equality and dependence" in the private sphere.[51] Remnants of this unburdening of one's self from necessity remain possible given the inequality built into the system of capitalism whereby those with the means are able to purchase labor-time from those without at a cheaper cost than it would

cost to do the work themselves. However, Aristotle's argument that humans reduced to necessity are not capable of exercising freedom and thus not eligible for citizenship remains useful for making ethical and political arguments in support of a reduced work day and week so as to allow all individuals to participate in politics and experience leisure.

Reflections on an Ancient Ideal: The Content of Leisure

The common sense or uncritical understanding of leisure as license is not particularly helpful in disrupting capital's colonization of time and may in fact reinforce it. The logic of capitalism informs the commodification of time in general including leisure. For this reason, it is important to provide a careful consideration of the classical ideal of leisure as developed by Aristotle. The classical ideal of leisure is informed by a teleological understanding of time in relationship to the development of freedom between human potential and actualization. For Aristotle, time alone does not guarantee leisure, content matters: "If some shame must always attach to any failure to use aright the goods of life, a special measure of shame must attach to a failure to use them aright in times of leisure…"[52] What one does with their leisure matters insofar as it contributes to (or inhibits) the development of human potential as guided by the "good life." The failure to use leisure rightly is shameful because it is so closely aligned with freedom itself.

Assumed to be the ultimate experience of freedom, leisure is often considered off limits from any sort of criticism. I argue this is a mistake given capitalism's colonization of time. My own criticisms focus less on the choices people make with regard to their

---

[51] Martha A. Ackelsberg, *Resisting Citizenship: Feminist Essays on Politics, Community, and Democracy* (New York, Routledge, 2010), 147. Also see Susan Moller Okin, *Women in Western Political Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 73-96.

leisure time, and more on the overall lack of choices given capitalism's colonization of time, which includes the experience of leisure itself. For Aristotle, freedom is not assumed, but is carefully qualified. For example, Aristotle is careful to distinguish freedom from pleasure and amusement. Instead, leisure is active contemplation of the lived experience. Aristotle qualifies activities that contribute the development of human freedom from those that do not.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle presents the relationship between time and freedom as related to human potential and actualization.[53] This potential is not predefined, but something that might be developed given favorable political-economic conditions, which free time from necessity. Aristotle does not explicitly define human potential but he links it generally to the achievement of the "good life" or that life most likely to bring about happiness. Not all people will realize their potential by the end of their lifetimes, but this does not negate the reality that every single person has the potential to develop his or her capacities to the fullest extent. Whether this potential is partially or completely realized depends upon the limitations placed by the political-economic conditions, but it also depends in part upon whether a person is able to discern the sources of genuine happiness; a capacity that arguably entails a certain degree of critical consciousness of the external influences shaping desire.[54]

Aristotle's conception of time as the substance of human development allows him to identify obstacles to self-actualization. He recognizes, for example, that people often

---

[52] Aristotle quoted by John L. Hemingway, "Leisure and Civility: Reflections on a Greek Ideal," *Leisure Sciences*, Vol. 10 (1988), 189. The quote is from Aristotle's *Politics* (1334a).
[53] "Again, of all those faculties with which nature endows us we first acquire the potentialities, and only later effect their actualization." Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 91.
[54] This point is relevant to chapter 4 and my discussion of the appeal of the culture industry as related to the time constraints under advanced capitalism in the U.S.

mistake pleasure or enjoyment for happiness.[55] Aristotle carefully qualifies happiness as activity and not simply a state of being.[56] The teleological understanding of being in ancient Greek philosophy endows human life with purpose and an end. Time, as the means through which a person achieves his or her telos is thus intimately linked to an understanding of being in terms of the good that Aristotle describes as happiness.[57] The connection between happiness and leisure for Aristotle is contemplation.[58] Demarcating leisure from contemplation in Aristotle is no easy task: "Contemplation, like leisure, or being itself leisure, brings felicity."[59] Similar to happiness, leisure can neither be license nor mere idleness precisely because it ends at some good.[60] In the case of leisure, however, the good is a good in itself. Carefully qualifying leisure as an activity that is done for its own sake, Aristotle argues that contemplation fits this description: "Again, contemplation would seem to be the only activity that is appreciated for its own sake; because nothing is gained from it except the act of contemplation, whereby from practical activities we expect to gain something more or less over and above the action."[61]

At the same time, Aristotle admits that contemplation is never simply for the sake of contemplation. As he states, "…the end consists not in gaining theoretical knowledge of the several points at issue, but rather in putting our knowledge into practice. In that

---

[55] "To judge by their lives, the masses and the most vulgar seem—not unreasonably—to believe the Good or happiness is pleasure. Accordingly they ask for nothing better than a life of enjoyment." Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 68.

[56] "We said, then, that happiness is not a state, since if it were it might belong even to a man who slept all through his life, passing a vegetable existence." Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 328.

[57] As Aristotle states, "Our task is to become good men, or to achieve the highest human good. That good is happiness; and happiness is an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue." Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 75.

[58] "The view that happiness is contemplation is confirmed by other arguments." Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics, 333.*

[59] Sebastian De Grazia, *Of Time, Work, and Leisure* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1962), 18.

[60] "Every art and every investigation, and similarly every action and pursuit, is considered to aim at some good." Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 63.

case it is not enough to know about goodness; we must endeavour (sic) to possess and use it, or adopt any other means to become good ourselves."[62] Aristotle recognizes a relationship between the contemplative and the practical life since happiness is contemplation of virtuous conduct: "We conclude, then, that the happy man will have the required quality, and in fact will be happy throughout his life; because he will spend all of his time, or the most time of any man, in virtuous conduct and contemplation."[63] This, however, can only come about as Aristotle argues, "in a complete lifetime. One swallow does not make a summer; neither does one day. Similarly neither can one day, or a brief space of time, make a man blessed and happy."[64] Thus it seems that leisure is required to be able to contemplate and strive toward the "good life." The measurement of the "good life" is based on the quality of a human life as differentiated from other animals.[65] Today the *Nicomachean Ethics* might be read as an ethical guidebook for time use insofar as it guides people to attain general knowledge of the "good life" and then apply it to their own lives in order to achieve happiness. The *Nicomachean Ethics* guides individuals to virtuous activities that shape self-development toward the "good life," rather than dictating what individuals must do with their leisure, which would remove the self-directive aspect of purposive activity.[66]

---

[61] Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 329.
[62] Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 335.
[63] Ibid, 83.
[64] Ibid, 76.
[65] "This is indicated, too, by the fact that the other animals have no share in happiness, being completely activity. For while the whole life of the gods is blessed, and that of men too in so far as some likeness to them, none of the other animals is happy, since they in no way share in contemplation." Aristotle, *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*, 77-79.
[66] Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 186.

In *The Politics*, Aristotle describes the role of the state to provide not only the bare necessities, but the "good life."[67] Thus Aristotle makes a distinction between necessity and freedom or "living" and "living well."[68] Leisure is not possible without the state.[69] Aristotle considers the happiness of the individual and of the city: "Whether happiness must be asserted to be the same both for a single individual human being and for a city or not the same, however, remains to be spoken of. But this too is evident: all would agree it is the same."[70] Thus we see a complimentary and balanced relationship between self-regarding and other-regarding behavior in Aristotle's recognition that citizens must rule and be ruled in turn. This aspect of Aristotle's argument is important in making a case against a system in which some people never have the opportunity to rule, but are only ruled. However, it is important to note that political activity in Athens was considerably more time consuming than it is under representative democracy:

> The virtue of a citizen, consisting in the excellence with which he performs these activities, can be fully achieved only under such regimes as equip him with sufficient leisure to attend to public affairs which, in a non-representative system of rule, means literally to attend the public deliberative body.[71]

It makes sense for Aristotle to argue against leisure being compatible with political activity since political activity is a part of necessity under non-representative systems of rule. Leisure should not be sacrificed to politics. Leisure sacrificed to politics is no different than leisure sacrificed to capitalism—both in their respective ways limit temporal autonomy. Temporal autonomy can only be realized when no one aspect of society determines and overrides the other aspects.

---

[67] "…the state comes into existence, originating in the bare needs of life, and continuing for the sake of the good life." Aristotle, *The Politics*, 13.
[68] Aristotle, *The Politics*, 24.
[69] Rojek, *The Labour of Leisure*, 133.
[70] Aristotle, *The Politics*, 199.

Leisure as a Regulative Ideal

The *Nicomachean Ethics* and *The Politics* together are useful for developing a critique of capitalism's colonization of time. The conditions of capitalism replace the classical ideal of leisure as a good in itself to an instrumental understanding of leisure with regards to work. Leisure is desired for rest and relaxation in order to recuperate one's strengths in order to be able to return to work: "'Time off' for the workers is simply to rest them up to reenter the workforce. No other activity can be of open-ended duration, all is confined by work-time."[72] In fact, it makes little sense to think about leisure existing under capitalism as conceived by Aristotle since leisure was a state of being defined by quality and not simply a certain amount of time designated to be "free": "We can note to start that free time accentuates time; it sets aside a unit of time free from the job. In Aristotle's short definition time has no role. Leisure is a condition or a state—the state of being free from the necessity to labor."[73] Today free time and leisure are used interchangeably to the detriment of the radical potential of leisure as a regulative ideal against capitalism's colonization of time. Free time as informed by the "liberal principal that individuals may do what they like in their free time providing it does not interfere with the freedom of others" all too easily lends itself toward capitalism's commodification of free time. By contrast, Aristotle's qualified understanding of leisure returns us to the early 20th century idea of "progress" defined by a reduction of work and an increase in leisure as related to the "good life."

---

[71] William James Booth, *Households: On the Moral Architecture of the Economy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 46.
[72] Booth, *Households: On the Moral Architecture of the Economy*, 173.
[73] De Grazia, *Of Time, Work, and Leisure*, 11.

We begin to see the great distance between the classical ideal of leisure and free time under capitalism. The primary difference being that leisure is valued by the realization of human potential that culminates in happiness and not by the needs of capitalism, which reduces time to labor-time and free time to consumerism and participation in the culture industry. By contrast, leisure as articulated by Aristotle radically challenges capital's commodification of time.[74] The capitalist ideology that proclaims, "Time is money," severely limits the realization that there is a choice to be made between time and money, which is denied by the daily reality that time is severely constrained by necessity as enforced by dependency on the market combined with the almost non-existence social safety net in the context of the U.S. When we sell our labor, we are not only selling our labor, but also our time for human development.

Leisure is no longer possible in the way Aristotle articulated it precisely because capitalism demarcates time not between potential and actualization, but between work and not work or work and free time. Even our supposed leisure never leaves us free from the constraints of work time even when we are not working because the alienation from our time unavoidably infiltrates our consciousnesses to the extent that even within those moments designated "free" we remain painfully aware of the unavoidable return to work:
Free time does not exist…neither in the classical aristocratic sense of leisure for the sake of timeless open-ended contemplation, nor in the Marxist sense of a praxis which creates its own social relations in its own time. Free time for the worker is always for limited periods of time, within or away from work; there is no way to forget the limits of

[74] "Commodification refers to both the process by which labour is purchased as a resource by the capitalist and turned into a 'factor of production', and the process by which goods, services and experiences are packaged and sold as objects to the consumer."Chris Rojek, *Decentering Leisure: Rethinking Leisure Theory* (London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 1995), 4.

measured time, no possibility of unlimited entry into any activity but work. Most of non-work time is spent in recuperative and diversionary activity whose purpose is to prepare for the return to work.[75] Leisure is fundamentally radical since to ask for leisure which is timeless is to reject the major time constraints that capital imposes through production and consumption, and fight for the political-economic conditions that would allow us to privilege time over money.

The current economic crisis presents us with an opportunity to rethink the relationship between time and work, but as Marx warns, "'Liberation' is a historical and not a mental act."[76] In terms of this particular project, this is difficult to accept since the actual existing conditions seem to make the future of leisure unlikely. However, to use leisure in such a way that people can re-imagine another way of thinking about time in connection to a political struggle over the meaning and use of time then it is extremely useful since it may serve as a way to transform consciousness of time in order to politicize it. Today leisure has either been forgotten or worse people have learned to accept leisure as defined by the leisure industry. If it is simply forgotten, then its history might be reclaimed. If it is no longer desired, it is because people no longer have the ability to imagine time outside the context of commodified time due to the reification of time-consciousness. This also might be contested.

The political nature of leisure is rarely examined or explained, but leisure is the very antithesis of the logic of capitalism because it rejects the very ideas and values that sustain capitalism, i.e., constant productivity and efficiency in the name of profit. Leisure

---

[75] Nancy L. Schwartz, "Labor, Politics, and Time in the Thought of Karl Marx" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976), 182.
[76] Karl Marx, *The German Ideology* in *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*, ed. and trans. Loyd D. Easton and Kurt H. Guddat, (Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company , 1976), 437.

is fundamentally anti-capital to the extent to which it cannot exist under the current conditions. To make leisure possible would mean to not only restrain, restrict, and censor the incursions of capitalism, but cultivate an understanding that leisure makes many things possible that capital makes impossible by granting time for living the examined life and for self-development.[77]

For the ancients time is valued not in terms of productivity or efficiency but with respect to the quality of a human life. As a consequence, time cannot be separated from being and becoming as the meaning and value of time comes from its intimate relationship to life. Indeed, time seems largely abstract outside of the meaning and value assigned to it by humans in any given historical context. Put still another way, humans have a unique relationship to time insofar as it weighs heavier for those who carry the burden of consciousness, especially given knowledge of their own mortality.[78] Mortality is the great equalizer of life time insofar as no one knows the exact length of his or her life and yet, the actual quality of lived time has been a source of inequality created through the reduction of life time to labor time. Time is a resource that is both individual and social. So called free time is largely made possible because we live in a society whereby we do not have to do every single thing for ourselves due to the division of labor.

---

[77] Nancy Schwartz argues, "Marx's critique of the operation of the labor theory of value under capitalism involves a criticism of the elements of that system—labor-power and labor-time. He argues that a system which reduces the varieties of power to just one form of power—labor power—and the varieties of labor time to just one form of time—labor time—robs life of certain other crucial dimensions of experience. By implication, then, there are alternative experiences and organizations of experience which are possible, and some which are desirable." Nancy L. Schwartz, "Labor, Politics, and Time in the Thought of Karl Marx," 190.

[78] As Camus states, "There is but one truly serious philosophical problem, and that is suicide. Judging whether life is or is not worth living amounts to answering the fundamental question of philosophy." Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus, and Other Essays*, trans. Justin O'Brien (New York: Vintage Books, 1955).

What Aristotle provides is the basic framework for thinking about time in relationship to freedom as defined by a qualified understanding of leisure. To recap leisure is not idleness. Leisure is not amusement. Leisure is related to freedom as time unbound by necessity. Time unbound by necessity is made possible through the social division of labor. Leisure allows for autonomy and self-rule. Leisure is moderation. Leisure is about cultivating what is unique to our individuality with the recognition that our individuality is not possible outside of a political society. The paradox of leisure might be described by what Kant referred to as our "unsocial sociability." Obligations are not simply defined by economic necessity, but familial and community responsibilities. Leisure is defined by its non-instrumentality or what Kant would later call "purposeful purposelessness." Rather than offering a precise answer as to the content of leisure, Aristotle instead presents some general guidelines, which I argue remain useful for reconceptualizing the classical ideal of leisure as a regulative ideal,[79] or a standpoint for critique of the processes of capital accumulation that dispossess people of time, and an alternative means for thinking about time independent of capital's cycles of production and consumption, which I argue ultimately structure the collective experience and understanding of time today.

To the common sense understanding of freedom as license the classical ideal of leisure might not seem terribly appealing. However, an unqualified understanding of leisure is not useful to developing critical consciousness of the lived experience as shaped by capitalism. It might be better to think of Aristotle as offering advice to those who want to attain the greatest human good which is happiness and criticism to that which distracts people from genuine happiness. Aristotle provides a qualified understanding of leisure

[79] See footnote 22.

that is quite radical in comparison to our contemporary understanding of free time. We have little time that is unstructured. We have little direction for our free time that is not informed by the cycles of production and consumption. Leisure is the foundation of political communities that are the foundation of individualism and culture. Contemplative leisure might be understood for our purposes as time for reflection or it might be time that is not mentally preoccupied with worry. His emphasis on quality over quantity of leisure time rejects the idea that leisure is defined by a period of time designated as "free" since leisure is only possible through economic security. If one does not have economic security, she is consistently occupied by worries of how to make ends meet. Preoccupation leads to anxiety and depression. Leisure is pleasure of life.

Marx takes Aristotle's understanding of leisure and uses it to demonstrate the obstacles that capitalism poses to any meaningful relationship between time and freedom. Capitalism does so through the manipulation of "necessary" labor-time. Capital creates the very time constraints that cause time to be experienced as loss. The tension that exists between young and mature Marx, is perhaps a result of Marx's deepening understanding of capital's colonization of time. The classical ideal of leisure as time for self-development is rendered impossible for most given the realities of capitalism. Young Marx offers communism as the alternative political-economic system. Given Marx's materialists ways he recognizes that "work" and "leisure" have specific historical meanings under capitalism. Thus we cannot immediately know what possibilities might be opened under alternative political-economic arrangements. Unfortunately, this leaves leisure conceptually hazy at best. It seems the power of Marx's analysis at the end of the

day remains in his ability to elucidate how capitalism colonizes time and why this is harmful to human development.

Concluding Remarks

Several ideas have been gleaned from Aristotle's analysis of leisure which bear repeating. As mentioned above, Aristotle's treatment of leisure is unique insofar as it offers not only the normative justifications for leisure as related to a teleological realization of human potential, but also a careful consideration of what makes leisure possible in the first place. Leisure is defined objectively as time not determined by necessity, which is increasingly being considered as a "new" measure of freedom.[80] Necessity is a historical concept informed by capitalism's colonization of necessity through the manipulation of "necessary" labor-time. How much we work is determined by how much we *need* to work in order to make ends meet and, of course, the availability of gainful employment. How much we *need* to work is determined by the level of wages against the cost of living standards. A structural political-economic analysis reveals that the relationship between business and government largely determines how much we must work. Work is largely compulsory lacking a social safety net.

If, for the sake of argument, we were able to reduce necessity through a number of political reforms that might include a reduction in the work week without a reduction in pay, a guaranteed or basic wage, and universal healthcare, i.e., all the benefits currently tied up with full time employment, the question of what to do with our leisure follows. However, as I suggest, leisure has historically been used as a regulative ideal related to an alternative vision of what constitutes "progress," namely the enlargement of human freedom, but should be related to a concrete political program that works toward creating

the political-economic conditions that make leisure possible. The fight for time not only set limits on capital's colonization of time, but has also historically been informed by an understanding of "progress" as related to a reduction of work and an increase in leisure. Finally, the content of leisure is useful in combating capitalism's colonization of time through the leisure industry. As I have argued, an unqualified understanding of leisure under the conditions of advanced capitalism is susceptible to the leisure industry or pre-packaged experiences driven by the profit motive, which are arguably well received precisely because people do not have enough discretionary time to be able to make alternative choices.

Leisure is central to freedom because the very basis of freedom addressing the realm of necessity in a more equally distributive manner. Necessity is a complicated, ambiguous, and historical concept. Along the same lines, I argue that in order for meaningful time to exist there must be a balance between the time spent in the realm of necessity and the realm of freedom. With regard to the division of labor, there must be a balance between self-regarding and other-regarding time.[81] For questions of freedom, it matters how people spend their time because it influences both how they experience and understand time meaning and use as a reflection of their self-worth.

The differentiation between the private household and the public political realm, between the household inmate who was a slave and the household head who was a citizen, between the activities which should be hidden in privacy and those which were worth being seen, heard, and remembered, overshadowed and predetermined all other

---

[80] Goodin, Robert et al., *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom*.
[81] This will be more concrete once I address the sexual division of labor and the gendered nature of time use or lived time in the final chapter.

distinctions until only one criterion was left: is the greater amount of time and effort spent in the private or in public?[82]

The actual possibility of leisure is thought to be the realization of that balance. Leisure is that time that makes self-development possible. Self-development arises from Aristotle's understanding of time as that existing between human potential and actualization. Individuals matter is a real way within this understanding of time as opposed to liberalism that abstracts individuals from their concrete lived experience. This understanding of time is derived from the combination of the Aristotlean-Marxist tradition and an existential element that emphasizes the quality of each life. As Arendt states, "Plurality is the condition of human action because we are all the same, that is, human, in such a way that nobody is ever the same as anyone else who ever lived, lives or will live."[83] The quality of a life is political insofar as it represents what is lacking in a given political and economic system. The most downtrodden of any given population is a reflection of how our society has ultimately failed humanity. Arendt describes "the burden of laboring and the bondage to necessity" mankind's "oldest and most natural burden."[84] The inequalities I describe are not new. What is new is examining this inequality through the lens of temporal autonomy. Returning to Aristotle's concept of leisure we can begin to think about the ways in which particular contributions to necessity are devalued and how human potential is stymied and foreclosed. What might human beings be and do remains an open question. What is possible is understanding the ways that capitalism shapes the lived experience to the detriment of human potential by limiting autonomy so severely through the commodity form.

---

[82] Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 85
[83] Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 8.

Chapter II: Time in the Production Process: Marx and Self-Development

In contrast to Aristotle and the political conditions that defined antiquity, Marx is confronted with the conditions of early industrial capitalism. Decidedly materialist, Marx spends far less time articulating the ideal of leisure as a form of freedom in the abstract, and more time identifying the obstacles capitalism poses to the realization of that aspect of freedom. As a consequence, a theory of leisure must be extracted out of his various descriptions of self-development in his early works and through his analysis of capital's colonization of the meaning and use of time under capitalism in his later works, as the two are intimately related. The first section of this chapter focuses on young Marx's criticisms of capitalism, specifically the division of labor as related to the unequal distribution of time across necessity and freedom whereby the burden of necessity falls disproportionately to the working class, which he argues denies them their humanity.

Early Marx

The positive articulation of self-determined time in early Marx is perhaps the most memorable because certain passages evoke a rather romantic vision of emancipation under communism in direct contrast to the severe reality of the working class existence under capitalism. One cannot read Friedrich Engels's descriptions of the horrendous working conditions described in *The Condition of the Working Class in England* without wanting some sort of reprieve for the workers. Marx decries the fate handed to the working class, which reduces the working class to an existence that ultimately denies them their humanity. As he states, "…Political economy knows the worker only as a

---

[84] Ibid, 4.

working animal—as a beast reduced to the strictest bodily needs."[85] Similar to Aristotle, Marx considers a life reduced to necessity as somehow not fully human:

> To develop in greater spiritual freedom, a people must break their bondage to their bodily needs—they must cease to be the slaves of the body. They must, therefore, above all, have *time at their disposal for spiritual creative activity and spiritual enjoyment*. … If the satisfaction of a given amount of material needs formerly required a certain expenditure of time and human effort which has later been reduced by half, then without any loss of material comfort *the scope for spiritual activity and enjoyment has been simultaneously extended by as much*. …But again the way in which the booty, that we win from old Kronos himself in his most private domain, is shared out is still decided by the dice-throw of blind, unjust Chance. In France it has been calculated that at the present stage in the development of production an average working period of five hours a day be every person capable of work would suffice for the satisfaction of all the material interests of society…"[86]

What it means to be human then is somehow related to the self determination of one's time, but the possibilities for self-determined time depend on the overall distribution of social time with regard to necessity. Marx rightly identifies the contradiction under capitalism whereby labor-time can never be reduced to "the material interests of society" precisely because capitalism is about profit and profit can only be had by adding surplus time to necessary labor time. This means that even if technology has "reduced by half" the "time and human effort" necessary for the same overall level of "material comfort," the logic of capitalism with regard to time will not allow it. Time consciousness is necessary in order for humans to recognize themselves as historical producers so that rather than capitalism distributing time, the rational organization of society might distribute time more evenly across necessity and freedom.

---

[85] Karl Marx, *The Economic and Philosphic Manuscripts of 1844*, ed. Dirk J. Struik (New York: International Publishers, 1964), 73.

[86] Marx quoting Wilhelm Schulz, emphasis mine. Marx, *The Economic and Philosphic Manuscripts of 1844*, 73. According to the explanation in footnote 12, Schulz (1797-1860), was a radical democrat and author of Die Bewegung der Produktion, eine geschichtlich-statistische. Marx, *The Economic and Philosphic Manuscripts of 1844, 239.*

Marx's analysis of alienation in *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* is simultaneously an examination of the ways in which humans are denied their humanity or self-development due to the alienation of individuals from their labor under capitalism. To overcome this alienation means to reclaim and redefine the relationship between labor and time. For example, readers get a sense of the importance of self-determined time in direct opposition to the unequal distribution of time based on the unequal division of labor:

> The contradiction between the personality of each separate proletarian and labor, the condition of life forced upon him, is very evident to him, for he is sacrificed from his youth on and within his class has no chance of arriving at conditions which would place him in another class.[87]

It seems there is a connection between self-development and self-determined time, especially if "…the division of labor implies the possibility, indeed the necessity, that intellectual and material activity—enjoyment and labor, production and consumption—are given to different individuals."[88] The consequences are clear:

> Individuals have always started with themselves though within their given historical conditions and relationships, not with the "pure" individual in the sense of the ideologists. But in the course of historical development and precisely through the inevitable fact that in the division of labor social relationships assume an independent existence, there occurs a division in the life of each individual, insofar as it is personal and determined by some branch of labor and by the conditions pertaining to it. (This does not mean that, for example, the rentier, the capitalist, ect., cease to be persons; but their personality is conditioned and determined by very definite class relationships…) … In reality they are less free, because they are more subjected to the domination of things.[89]

Marx argues that the division of labor is at the very root of alienation: "Finally, the division of labor offers us the first example for the fact that man's own act becomes an

---

[87] Karl Marx, *The German Ideology*, in *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and So*ciety, ed. and trans. Loyd D. Easton and Kurt H. Guddat (Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1967), 459.
[88] Marx, *The German Ideology*, in *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and So*ciety, 422.
[89] Marx, *The German Ideology*, in *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and So*ciety, 458.

alien power opposed to him and enslaving him instead of being controlled by him…"[90]

Most readers of Marx are familiar with the oft used quotation from *The German Ideology*:

> …In communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic. This fixation of social activity, this consolidation of what we ourselves produce into an objective power above us, growing out of our control, thwarting our expectations, bringing to naught our calculations, is one of the chief factors in historical development up till now.[91]

A tension exists in Marx concerning the division of labor. Ali Rattansi argues that there exists a division between the *young* and *mature* Marx's view on the division of labor. Rattansi argues young Marx wants to abolish the division of labor, whereby the mature Marx sees the division of labor as necessary. The division of labor is necessary because no one individual is self-sufficient. Young Marx states, "Communism…is the genuine resolution of the conflict between man and nature and between man and man—the true resolution of the strife between existence and essence, between objectification and self-confirmation, *between freedom and necessity*, between the individual and the species."[92] In contrast to Aristotle, Marx desires reconciliation between the two for the benefit of humanity through communism. The need for leisure from the point of view of capitalism is frivolous, "To him [the capitalist], therefore, every *luxury* of the worker seems to be reprehensible, and everything that goes beyond the most abstract need—be it in the realm

---

[90] Marx, *The German Ideology*, in *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and So*ciety, 424.
[91] Karl Marx, *The German Ideology*, ed. C.J. Arthur (New York: International Publishers, 1996), 53.
[92] Marx, *The Economic and Philosphic Manuscripts of 1844*, 135, emphasis mine, but Ali Rattansi, *Marx and the Division of Labor* (London: Macmillan, 1982) explores the division of labor as a concept emanating from the Greeks.

of passive enjoyment, or a manifestation of activity—seems to him a luxury."[93] Within it, Marx provides a glimpse of the positive articulation of self-determined time. Implicit in this statement is a refutation of the division of labor that reduces individuals and the development of their faculties to their occupation, but it also ends with an understanding that things are about to change and that change is predicated upon the collective recognition of humans as self-conscious historical producers. In other words, time consciousness is necessary in order to reveal the historical nature of all things.

Mature Marx

Marx recovers and transforms Aristotle's conception of leisure as a way of establishing a philosophical-anthropological relationship between time and freedom so that the right to meaningful time might be extended to all. The realization of this relationship was contingent on the reduction of time spent in the realm of necessity by means of technology and the development of a more equal division of labor, i.e., a transformation of the existing political-economic and social conditions. This section examines the evolution of capital's accumulation by means of the general dispossession of time. The pre-existing inequality in the distribution of social time became much more defined and at the same time, elusive, under the system of capitalism. The bourgeoisie gained control over the proletarians' time through the exploitation of their labor power in the realm of production. The mature Marx spends significantly more time criticizing the prevailing logic of political economy that justifies and sustains the system of capitalism. In his treatment of time, for example, Marx demonstrates the ways in which capital manipulates necessity. He demonstrates how, as a consequence of the malleability of

[93] Marx, *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, 149-150.

necessity, the value of time comes to be entirely defined by the terms of political economy.

The question of necessity is a historical concept since it means different things in different places. Capitalism's power is its ability to completely define necessity on terms that are profitable. Marx's criticism of liberalism is that political rights are not sufficient to guaranteeing people rights since people spend the most of their time working. The overall lack of a welfare state contributes to the power of capital to define necessity since an individual is hard pressed to survive without the help of the state. Many benefits that are available through the state are connected to employment. Welfare to work is but one example where women must work in order to receive welfare benefits even if realistically the job will not pay the bills.

Historically, capital's colonization of time began with time discipline in factories during early industrial capitalism made possible by the combination of mechanical clocks and capitalism's need for organized and disciplined labor-time, which individuals were forced to contend more and more out of necessity as the transition to early industrial capital takes place. Thus the potential connections between time and freedom that improvements in technology and the overcoming of scarcity promise becomes less plausible given the combined processes of the objectification, commodification, alienation, and reification of time that begin to be solidified in the realm of production.

Primitive Accumulation

The social and technological requisites of capital's colonization of time formed alongside the development of industrial capitalism. According to Marx, the accumulation

of capital by the dispossession of workers' time took various historical forms.[94] Capitalism did not invent surplus labor; it merely unfettered it from the limitations inherent to previous economic systems:

> Wherever a part of society possesses the monopoly of the means of production, the labourer, free or not free, must add to the working-time necessary for his own maintenance an extra working-time in order to produce the means of subsistence for the owners of the means of production, whether this proprietor be the Athenian caloς cagaqoς [well-to-do man], Etruscan theocrat, *civis Romanus* [Roman citizen], Norman baron, American slave-owner, Wallachian Boyard, modern landlord or capitalist. It is, however, clear that in any given economic formation of society, where not the exchange-value but the use-value of the product predominates, surplus-labour will be limited by a given set of wants which may be greater or less, and that here no boundless thirst for surplus-labour arises from the nature of the production itself.[95]

Marx's analysis of the transformation of time focuses on the historical transition from feudalism to capitalism.[96] With the near completion of the enclosure movement at the close of the 19th century and the dominance of the private over the collective form of property, the peasant population was forced off the land and into the cities where they become wage-laborers under the conditions defined by the capitalist class. Thus the conditions were set for capital's original accumulation by the dispossession of time. This transformation included increasing demands on the former peasants' "extra working-time," which Marx designates as "surplus working-time."

Capital's original accumulation by dispossession established time as divided unequally between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, to the distinct economic advantage

---

[94] "…Primitive accumulation (previous accumulation of Adam Smith) preceding capitalistic accumulation; an accumulation not the result of the capitalistic mode of production, but its starting point." Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VIII, Chapter 26, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch26.htm

[95] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 2 (emphasis mine), http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S2.

[96] "The starting-point of the development that gave rise to the wage-labourer as well as to the capitalist, was the servitude of the labourer. The advance consisted in a change of form of this servitude, in the transformation of feudal exploitation into capitalist exploitation." Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VIII, Chapter 26, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch26.htm.

of the bourgeoisie.[97] Time was gained by the bourgeoisie, not primarily for purposes of leisure or participation in politics, as with the Greeks, but profit seeking. For this inequality of time to be institutionalized, the proletariat had to first be put into a situation where they had little choice, but to sell their labor-time in order to survive. Thus a complete separation between the worker and the means of production first had to be established:

> The process, therefore, that clears the way for the capitalist system, can be none other than the process which takes away from the labourer the possession of his means of production; a process that transforms, on the one hand, the social means of subsistence and of production into capital, on the other, the immediate producers into wage-labourers. The so-called primitive accumulation, therefore, is nothing else than the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production. It appears as primitive, because it forms the pre-historic stage of capital and of the mode of production corresponding with it.[98]

Wage-labor became an act of necessity under capitalism, but the number of hours devoted to this necessity is never fixed because, as Marx reveals, the working day is never solely determined by necessity. The work day is split into "necessary working-time" and "surplus working-time,"[99] but capital attempts to extract as much surplus working-time as possible. This means that not all working days are equal since capital

---

[97] "However, this did not come about without some sort of moral tale that justified this condition as a natural consequence of the deserving versus the undeserving: "This primitive accumulation plays in Political Economy about the same part as original sin in theology. Adam bit the apple, and thereupon sin fell on the human race. Its origin is supposed to be explained when it is told as an anecdote of the past. In times long gone-by there were two sorts of people; one, the diligent, intelligent, and, above all, frugal elite; the other, lazy rascals, spending their substance, and more, in riotous living. The legend of theological original sin tells us certainly how man came to be condemned to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow; but the history of economic original sin reveals to us that there are people to whom this is by no means essential. Never mind! Thus it came to pass that the former sort accumulated wealth, and the latter sort had at last nothing to sell except their own skins. And from this original sin dates the poverty of the great majority that, despite all its labour, has up to now nothing to sell but itself, and the wealth of the few that increases constantly although they have long ceased to work. Such insipid childishness is every day preached to us in the defence of property." Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VIII, Chapter 26, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch26.htm.One only has to consider for a moment the rhetoric around welfare reform to understand that Marx was correct insofar as time is political.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid.

may extract varying amounts of surplus working-time. If the worker needed only to work the amount of hours necessary to sustain his self, then he would be paid the full value of his labor, but the extraction of surplus working-time results in exploitation since the capitalist pays the worker for one work day, but profits from three days of work through the extension of the work day. Importantly, this process is by no means apparent to the worker since under capitalism "surplus-labour and necessary labour glide one into the other."[100] Whereby under the conditions of feudalism, time devoted to self-maintenance versus time devoted to the lord of the estate, were distinct from each other and thus apparent to the peasants. To counter the imbalance between necessary and surplus time under capitalism would mean to shorten the work day and increase the hourly wage so that the worker benefits more from the surplus that his labor time alone creates.

Taking his cue from Hegel, Marx recognizes that the "insight into necessity" means the recognition or consciousness of the slave with regard to his actual position vis–à–vis the master or, in this case, the capitalist. Thus Marx gives the worker insight into the logic of capitalism, specifically exchange value, necessary to demand the value of his labor power: "You pay me for one day's labour-power, whilst you use that of 3 days."[101] Time becomes a contested struggle between the capitalists and the workers because given the law of exchange each party has an equal right to their demands:

> We see then, that, apart from extremely elastic bounds, the nature of the exchange of commodities itself imposes no limit to the working-day, no limit to surplus-labour. The capitalist maintains his rights as a purchaser when he tries to make the working-day as long as possible, and to make, whenever possible, two working-days out of one. On the other hand, the peculiar nature of the commodity sold implies a limit to its consumption by the purchaser, and the labourer maintains his

[100] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 2, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S2
[101] Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 1, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S1.

> right as seller when he wishes to reduce the working-day to one of definite normal duration. There is here, therefore, an antinomy, right against right, both equally bearing the seal of the law of exchanges. Between equal rights force decides. Hence is it that in the history of capitalist production, the determination of what is a working-day, presents itself as the result of a struggle, a struggle between collective capital, *i.e.,* the class of capitalists, and collective labour, *i.e.,* the working-class.[102]

The inequality of time thus becomes a domain of political contestation that takes a largely defensive form in response to capital's dominance of time. It is telling that Marx states, "Between equal rights force decides." It is the force of capital's colonization of time in the realm of production that makes it difficult to "fight for time" outside the parameters set by the system of capital. This is why, out of necessity, Marx must use the language of political economy, specifically, exchange value, to argue that the worker is not paid what he is worth. However, a valid question seems to be whether Marx's own analysis falls into the reification of the category of time.

Additionally, the "peculiar nature of the commodity" of human labor which Marx reflects seems to indicate a desire to emphasize the humanity of the worker as additional grounds on which to contest the extension of the work day and define a "normal work day":

> On the basis of capitalist production, however, this necessary labour can form a part only of the working-day; the working-day itself can never be reduced to this minimum. On the other hand, the working-day has a maximum limit. It cannot be prolonged beyond a certain point. This maximum limit is conditioned by two things. First, by the physical bounds of labour-power. Within the 24 hours of the natural day a man can expend only a definite quantity of his vital force. A horse, in like manner, can only work from day to day, 8 hours. During part of the day this force must rest, sleep; during another part the man has to satisfy other physical needs, to feed, wash, and clothe himself. Besides these purely physical limitations, the extension of the working-day encounters moral ones. The labourer needs time for satisfying his intellectual and social wants, the extent and number of which are conditioned by the general state of social advancement. The

[102] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 1, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S1.

> variation of the working-day fluctuates, therefore, within physical and social bounds. But both these limiting conditions are of a very elastic nature, and allow the greatest latitude. So we find working-days of 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 hours, i.e., of the most different lengths.[103]

Marx points out that "the working-day itself can never be reduced to…necessary labour" since the capitalist would make no profit without the extraction of surplus labor time beyond necessary labor. However, he maintains that there should be limitations to the working-day, and these are based on basic biological needs such as sleeping and eating and normative appeals to the more qualitative aspects of time such as "satisfying…intellectual and social wants." The fight for time is thus based on three criteria within the Marxist tradition. First, the worker is not receiving the full value of his labor power thus he is exploited. Second, the worker is a living being and thus should not work beyond the general "physical limitations" of any particular animal used for purposes of work. Third, the worker is human beyond his very basic animal subsistence, which means that the length of the working day should not deny him time for self-development.

In terms of the distribution of time between necessity and freedom, the transition from feudalism to capitalism establishes the original accumulation by dispossession of time whereby wage-labor becomes the primary means to sustain oneself as a member of the newly established working class. However, the length of the work day can never be reduced to necessary work time since capital in its search for profit extracts as much surplus working-time as possible through the extension of the work day. Since necessary and surplus working-time both happen within the context of the work day, the worker may not realize the extent of his exploitation. Finally, the wage earned is simply a way to

[103] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 1, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-

be able to purchase the necessities in life. As Marx states, "No sooner is the exploitation of the labourer by the manufacturer, so far, at an end, that he receives his wages in cash, than he is set upon by the other portions of the bourgeoisie, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.,"[104] and these necessities must be attended to after the finish of the work day, which, again, has no limits from the perspective of capital and thus is limited only to the extent that the working class is organized.

The Working Day

> *Capital is dead labour, that, vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks. The time during which the labourer works, is the time during which the capitalist consumes the labour-power he has purchased of him. … If the labourer consumes his disposable time for himself, he robs the capitalist.*[105]

From the original accumulation by dispossession, capital has maintained the upper hand on the control over time. In fact, *Capital* might be read as a detailed examination of the transformation of the social use, meaning, and value of time and the ways in which capitalism came to colonize even the parameters of the fight for time starting with the original accumulation by dispossession. From the standpoint of capital, there exists no limits to the length of the work day except for the death of the worker, but even this is of little concern to the capitalist since workers are easily replaceable:

> Capital cares nothing for the length of life of labour-power. All that concerns it is simply and solely the maximum of labour-power, that can be rendered fluent in a working-day. It attains this end by shortening the extent of the labourer's life, as a greedy farmer snatches increased produce from the soil by robbing it of its fertility.[106]

---

c1/ch10.htm#S1.

[104] Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*, in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, Second Edition, ed. Robert C. Tucker (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978), 479.

[105] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 1, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S1.

[106] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 5, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S5.

This is not to say that the individual capitalist is not capable of exercising morality, but morality holds little weight when it comes to the logic of the system of capitalism. Marx reminds us more than once that appeals to morality simply will not do.[107] Further, due to capital's relentless and limitless "greed for surplus labour," which turns the workers into nothing more than "personified labour-time," Marx argues that there must in the very least be limits to the length of the work-day set by legislation and enforced by the state.[108] The fight for the 10 hour day is fundamental to keep workers from selling themselves into slavery. Otherwise, the logic of capital transforms all available life time into working time: "Hence it is self-evident that the worker is nothing other than labour-power for the duration of his whole life, and that therefore all his disposable time is by nature and by right labour time, to be devoted to the self-valorization of capital."[109] For capital, time exists solely for the creation of surplus value. The only limits to production are sleeping and eating, but even these natural limits are not honored without legislation limiting the hours a person can work. This is more than evident in Marx's descriptions of the conditions of labor without limits in section 3 and 4 of the "Working Day," and in Friedrich Engel's *The Condition of the Working Class*. Before the 10-hour bill, time was controlled by the productive sphere in ways that had never previously before been possible. As Marx reveals, without institutional limits, capital colonizes all available life time because, "Moments are the elements of profit."[110]

---

[107] "I demand, therefore, a working-day of normal length, and I demand it without any appeal to your heart, for in money matters sentiment is out of place." Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section I, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S1.
[108] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section II, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S2.
[109] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 375.
[110] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 353.

Marx ends "The Working Day" by disputing the liberal notion that a fair bargain was ever possible between the worker and the capitalist:

> It must be acknowledged that our labourer comes out of the process of production other than he entered. In the market he stood as owner of the commodity "labour-power" face to face with other owners of commodities, dealer against dealer. The contract by which he sold to the capitalist his labour-power proved, so to say, in black and white that he disposed of himself freely. The bargain concluded, it is discovered that he was no "free agent," that the time for which he is free to sell his labour-power is the time for which he is forced to sell it, that in fact the vampire will not lose its hold on him "so long as there is a muscle, a nerve, a drop of blood to be exploited."[111]

The bargain between the worker and the capitalist is not one based on the free will of the worker, but one based on necessity. Only the abstract individualism of liberalism can abstract the individual from the specific constraints that capitalism imposes on him. In other words, the individual does not make choices in a vacuum, but in a specific historical context in which capitalism is the dominant structuring force. The workers have no choice, but to find power in their strength in numbers as the working class that upholds the system of capitalism to fight for time away from the clutches of production. Finally, Marx introduces what will come to be referred to as the division between work time and free time that later comes to be disputed by feminists and critical theorists alike:

> For "protection" against "the serpent of their agonies," the labourers must put their heads together, and, as a class, compel the passing of a law, an all-powerful social barrier that shall prevent the very workers from selling by voluntary contract with capital, themselves and their families into slavery and death. In place of the pompous catalogue of the "inalienable rights of man" comes the modest Magna Charta of a legally limited working-day, which shall make clear "when the time which the worker sells is ended, and when his own begins."[112]

It is not that Marx designates this time as "free" since that time, even with the limits to the length of the work day, is barely enough time to fulfill the very basic physical

---

[111] Ibid., 415-16.
[112] Ibid.

demands of any living being. Freedom for Marx, as discussed in the previous section, is the development of the self that builds upon, but is not a slave to necessity. Indeed, it is a wretched existence to exist only as "personified labour time" as every writer critical of the impact of unfettered capitalism has demonstrated from Charles Dickens to Upton Sinclair. At the end of the day, Marx argues that it makes a significant difference to the individual workers' lives whether there is a law that limits the length of the work-day or not.[113] Subsequently, capitalism found ways to go around the law including the incentives of overtime pay.[114]

Time Discipline

The colonization of time would not be possible without the workers' participation and acceptance, however reluctant, of the parameters set by capitalism. It does not follow, however, that those same participants are necessarily conscious of the extent to which capital colonizes time or the processes by which it does so. Time discipline in the realm of production, or that which most impacts the workers most directly, then, is central to understanding the ways that capital's accumulation by dispossession is reproduced and maintained, and becomes a form of social control and domination that is caught up in the production and circulation of commodities.[115]

Arguably one of the most influential historical pieces on the early processes of time discipline, E.P. Thompson's "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism" captures the developing relationships among the external forces of time discipline, namely industrial capitalism and the mechanical clock, and the impact of these combined forces on the collective consciousness of time. Thompson's central question revolves

[113] Capital has found ways to overcome the limits set by the state by paying overtime.
[114] http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/workhours/overtime.htm

around the extent to which work discipline was internalized by the workers and seems to suggest that a sort of slow forgetting of time as not disciplined by capitalism took place as the habituation to capital's control of time takes place over several generations:

> The onslaught, from so many directions, upon the people's old working habits was not, of course, uncontested. In the first stage, we find simple resistance. But, in the next stage, as the new time-discipline is imposed, so the workers begin to fight, not against time, but about it.[116]

It seems that the terms of the debate about time were already largely determined by capitalism as the transition from time to time as defined by capitalism takes place:

> The first generation of factory workers were taught by their masters the importance of time; the second generation formed their short time committees in the ten-hour movement; the third generation struck for overtime or time-and-a-half. They had accepted the categories of their employers and learned to fight back with them. They had learned their lessons, that time is money, only too well.[117]

If Thompson is correct that the workers accepted commodified clock time as time itself, then the workers conceded too much to capitalism from the get go, but then again it seems they had little choice in the matter. Unlike Marx, Thompson stops short of fully analyzing the political implications of workers fighting for time within the "accepted…categories of their employers." Again, the colonization of time is not possible unless the workers concede to time as determined by capitalism, and while critics of Thompson have pointed to the multiplicity of time experiences which may occur within or alongside capital's domination of time, these experiences are certainly not given institutional grounding and thus are often powerless in the face of capital.

---

[115] Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*.
[116] E. P. Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism" in *Past and Present* Vol. 38 (1967), 85.
[117] Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism," 86.

In contrast to Thompson, Moishe Postone takes a decidedly historically materialist approach to the commodification of time whereby he considers the transformation of time leading up to industrial capitalism. In doing so, he contextualizes commodified clock time within the pre-history of capitalism proper, but maintains that "the emergence of such a new form of time was related to the development of the commodity form of social relations…rooted not only in the sphere of commodity production but in that of commodity circulation as well."[118] In doing so, he places the need for disciplined and coordinated labor in the medieval cloth-making industry in the 14th century whereby the length of the work day became a contested issue between the merchants and the workers since the length of the work day determined the amount of pay the worker received.[119] At this point in time, work bells were used rather than mechanical clocks to "coordinate the working time of large numbers of workers" in pre-factory like settings.[120] As he understands it, "Marx's analysis of the commodity form…as an analysis of structured forms of everyday practice that involve an ongoing process of abstraction from the concrete specificity of objects, activities, and persons, and their reduction to a general 'essential' common denominator," namely money.[121] With regard to time, he states,

> Temporality as a measure of activity is different from temporality measured by events. It implicitly is a uniform sort of time. The system of work bells, as we have seen, developed within the context of large-scale production for exchange, based on wage labor. It expressed the historical emergence of a de facto social relationship between the level of wages and labor output as a measured temporally—which, in turn, implied the notion of productivity, of labor output per

[118] Postone states, "I am suggesting, then, that the emergence of such a new form of time was related to the development of the commodity form of social relations. It was rooted not only in the sphere of commodity production but in that of commodity circulation as well." Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, 211.
[119] Ibid., 210.
[120] Ibid., 210.
[121] Ibid., 189.

> unit time. In other words, with the rise of early capitalist forms of social relations in the cloth-producing urban communes of Western Europe, a form of time emerged that was a measure of, and eventually a compelling norm for, activity. Such a time is divisible into constant units; and within a social framework constituted by the emerging commodity form, such units also are socially meaningful.[122]

Postone is primarily interested in the transformation of time from a dependent to an independent variable meaning that time becomes independent of human events:

The conception of abstract time, which became increasingly dominant in Western Europe between the 14th and 17th centuries, was expressed most emphatically in Newton's formulation of "absolute, true and mathematical time [which] flows equably w/out relation to anything external." Abstract time is an independent variable; it constitutes an independent framework within which motion, events, and action occur. Such time is divisible into equal, constant, nonqualitative units.[123]

The political relevance of such a transformation from concrete to abstract time allows the dominating logic of capitalism to inform the abstract nature of time. As a consequence, time is treated as neutral because it is abstract when in reality it is informed ideologically by capitalism to the extent that "time is money" simply becomes common sense. The transformation from concrete to abstract time dissolves the consciousness of time as socially constructed.

The clock is the concrete objectification of abstract time, but Postone repeatedly stresses that the invention of clocks alone do not account for the rise of abstract time. Instead he argues that "the origin of abstract time…seems to be related to the organization of social time. Abstract time, apparently, cannot be understood solely in terms of invariable time units anymore than its origins can be attributed to technical

---

[122] Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, 211.

devices."[124] However, it is important to think about clock time as a force of resistance as much as a force of domination since abstract time means the abstraction might be filled with varying degrees of logic, and is not exclusive to the logic of political economy as the fight for time in its various forms has shown. An hour is only an hour because we have socially and collectively agreed on that measurement as 60 minutes.[125] It is a quantified measurement of time, but not a qualitative understanding of time. Time is money is a qualified measurement of time as defined by capital, but quality time is made meaningful in many other ways.

Objectification

To fully understand the political implications of capital's colonization of time on human consciousness within the context of the Marxist tradition it is important to understand the process as related by German Idealism, specifically Hegel, and the process of objectification as the externalization of an abstract idea into a concrete object, given this is where the roots of the Marxist tradition lie. Objectification is important for political theory, in general, to the extent that it becomes necessary for an abstract concept such as freedom to be realized or guaranteed in a concrete manner, e.g. freedom as guaranteed by the state. It was Hegel that recognized the necessary dialectic between the subjective and objective realms that ultimately overcame the subject-object divide as posited by Kant. The move from Kant to Hegel was central to transforming time and space from categories of apperception to categories of consciousness. As against Kant,

---

[123] Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory* 202.
[124] Ibid., 206.
[125] For a historical account of the creation of standard time at the end of the 19th century, see Stephen Kern, *The Culture of Time and Space: 1880-1918* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).

Hegel argues that we can know the objective world to the extent that we shape it through our labor, i.e., our conscious interaction with nature.

The dialectic as conceived by Hegel between subject and object is important in the development of consciousness, but only if individuals are ever conscious of the human element that creates objects, especially those not created by themselves or created by previous generations. Time as objectified by the clock has a longer history than the history of capitalism. It is not objectification alone that brings about the lack of consciousness with regard to time. Yet, it cannot be denied that time as objectified in the clock comes to be understood as a force of nature, rather than a historically specific construction of time. The subjective must play a much larger role since it is precisely from the subjective point of view that may arise at the point of frustration of a contradiction between the dictates of the clock and the realities of life that the possibilities of resisting clock time become visible.

Commodifying Time

The commodification of time means simply that time becomes objectified through the commodity form, i.e., something that can be bought and sold. The commodification of time differs from the objectification of time. While the objectification of time is the form time takes, i.e., clock time, the commodification of time is the content of time, i.e., the money value form:

> The common expression ‘time is money’ is a colloquial example of the rule of this money value system. As it relates to human lifetime, the money value system computes as valuable only those forms of human activity that produce commodities or services for sale, or that aid in the realization of profit through the purchase of those same commodities or services. It thus forms a general social value matrix linking work life and leisure within which people come to

> experience their life activity as valuable or worthless to the extent that it serves this money value system as its instrument.[126]

As Marx states, "A commodity is, in the first place, an object outside us, a thing that by its properties satisfies human wants of some sort or another. The nature of such wants, whether, for instance, they spring from the stomach or from fancy, makes no difference." In "The Fetishism of Commodities and the Secret Thereof," Marx introduces the commodity form in terms of its use value and exchange value. Use value is simply that which transforms nature into something useful to humans: and as Marx states, "The mystical character of commodities does not originate, therefore, in their use value."[127] Marx compares the fetishism of commodities with religion:

> In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relation both with one another and the human race. So it is in the world of commodities with the products of men's hands. This I call the Fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labour, so soon as they are produced as commodities, and which is therefore inseparable from the production of commodities.

Commodity fetishism is the transformative mechanism that turns that which is qualitative into a calculable quantity, or in the words of Marx, it is that which replaces use-value with exchange value. Exchange value equalizes distinct (and thus unequal) objects by creating a uniform money standard that is not related to the object's natural properties. As Marx argues, value is social, not natural.[128] This point is important considering that certain uses of time, namely those that benefit the market, are privileged, while others are not. Commodity fetishism is transferable to time because capital reduces time to

---

[126] Jeff Noonan, "Free time as a Necessary Condition of Free Life," *Contemporary Political Theory*, Vol. 8, 4 (2009), 378.
[127] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, Chapter 1, Section 4, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch01.htm#S4.
[128] Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, Chapter 1, Section 4, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch01.htm#S4.

exchange value, thus commodifying time. The fetishism aspect of the commodification of time is such that it mystifies the reality that clock time is the conscious creation of humans and not a natural force acting upon them and over which they have no control. In Lukács' words:

> The essence of commodity structure has often been pointed out. Its basis is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a 'phantom objectivity,' an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people.[129]

As capitalism "create[d] a world after its own image,"[130] across the last two centuries, the creation of clock time to measure labor was slowly transformed from an experience of social constraint to an experience of inevitability through an ever increasing internalized sense of time as commodified. This feeling of inevitability arose from the lived experience of time in ever more service to capital and the economic rational that informed this experience as necessary to maintain progress, defined as continual economic growth. In later chapters, we shall see that "progress," itself a form of understanding the passage of time, is political.

Capitalism reduces everything to a commodity. In other words, everything has a price tag, which means that everything is reduced to a quantified value through its determined exchange value (quantified), not its use-value (qualitative). As a consequence, the human experience of time is largely commodified, most obviously in the productive sphere were individuals are coerced to sell their time in the market for a wage. Marx aptly describes this coercion:

---

[129] Georg Lukács , History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1971), 83.
[130] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Communist Manifesto*, (International Publishers: New York, 1948), 13.

> …it must be acknowledged that our worker emerges from the process of production looking different from when he entered it. In the market—contract seemed equal, but when the transaction was concluded, it was discovered that he was no 'free agent,' that the period of time for which he is *free* to sell his labour power is the period of time for which he is *forced* to sell it, that in fact the vampire will not let go 'while there remains a single muscle, sinew or drop of blood to be exploited'.[131]

Hence Benjamin Franklin's familiar saying, "Time is money," takes on an entirely new meaning. The idea behind commodity fetishism appears to be a very basic one, but this does not mean that once individuals are made aware of the process of commodity fetishism that they are then able to see their way out of its structure. Conscious resistance through critical thought and action remains a constant struggle because the commodity form's reach is so extensive and so intrusive that it reifies our self-understanding of time, a category that informs much of our lived experience.[132]

Concluding Thoughts

The fight for time sought to limit the reach of capital though production (work time), but the processes of production are only the most obvious manifestation of capital's more general dispossession of time by means of commodification. Capital colonizes time through the linked processes of production and consumption. The historical developments of global capitalism have only increased its ability to colonize more and more aspects of the lived experience through the commodification of time. Thus the fight for time must move beyond production. Leisure is politically significant in a way that the fight for time alone is not. Leisure provides not only an alternative understanding of time that delinks and contests the "time is money" formulation, but a major structural critique of a system which denies leisure altogether by colonizes the

[131] Marx, *Capital*, Volume I, 415-416, emphasis mine.

meaning and *distribution* of our time. The way it does so is the dispossession of time through the ever increasing commodification of time not only in production as the original fight for time against, but consumption and leisure. This makes sense given Marx's analysis of the commodity cycle. Unfortunately, production is often delinked from consumption in thinking about time. Thus it makes little sense to enter into an argument over whether people are working more or less because the ever-increasing commodification of all time means people are essentially always working if work is defined by necessity and necessity is defined by capitalism. The original fight for time does not contest the "time is money formulation."

Work time constrains free time, and severs the link between freedom and time every time people are forced to choose money over free time. Consequently, increasing the realm of free time is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for enlarging qualitative freedom. Still, unstructured time has the potential to force people to confront their individual freedom in ways that they are able to currently avoid due to the burden of overwork, but there is a problem. Due to overwork, free time is frequently spent recovering from work so as to be able to return again. This means that free time is often viewed as the occasion to either catch up on the basic household chores, spend time with the family, run errands, or if one is very lucky, to do absolutely nothing at all beyond participating in some form of passive leisure provided by yet another technological device, leisure machines, which are not time-saving, but all time consuming.

Finally, alternative understandings of time cannot be abstract, but must be rooted in institutions. Without the strength of a vibrant labor movement in the U.S., the channels

---

[132] This is why it does not make sense to speak of "false consciousness," but instead contradictions within all consciousnesses.

through which free time might realistically be expanded (albeit in a limited way) today include legislation around family leave, vacation time, and living wage campaigns. The first two are obvious, but a living wage would allow workers to work less part-time jobs. A genuine refusal of our current harried lifestyles will not come about simply by raising individual consciousness one by one. It will only come about my creating the institutional conditions necessary to enable a different approach to time than currently exists.

Chapter III: The Reification of Time-Consciousness and the Fight for Time Reconsidered

Time is everything, man is nothing; he is at the most the incarnation of time.[133]

Although under-theorized, Marxist and critical social theory have laid the groundwork for theorizing the relationship between time and consciousness as situated under the historical developments of global capitalism. Georg Lukács' *History and Class Consciousness* is particularly helpful in re-establishing a dialectical link between the philosophical and political aspects of time in relationship to history, as established by Karl Marx, as a way to contest the reification of time-consciousness. The fight for time reconsidered must address all elements of capitalism's colonization of time, including and perhaps most of all the reification of time-consciousness, which denies individuals the ability to understand reality in terms of fluid historical processes. In contrast, time-consciousness enables individuals to make connections between their immediate reality and the totality of social relations.[134] In this way, individuals come to understand not only how capitalism colonizes time, but recognize the objective possibilities of contesting capital's colonization of time without retreating into subjectivity or romantic anti-capitalism.

Lukács uses the category of reification to describe the extension of the Marxian concept of commodity fetishism and the Weberian concept of rationalization to all aspects of life under modern capitalism.[135] He is particularly interested in the reification of consciousness which he links to the historical transformation of labor-time as shaped

---

[133] Karl Marx quoted in Georg Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, trans.Rodney Livingstone (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2000), 89.

[134] "Lukács linked action and knowledge, contending that the inert immediacy of facts had to be overcome by mediating them through a dynamic understanding of the whole." Martin Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 104.

by scientific management or Taylorism.[136] Frederick Taylor sought to extend the scientific method to the management of the production process primarily by means of the division of labor, and especially time and motion studies in order to increase efficiency and productivity through the rationalization and standardization of the production process. This transition from capital's generation of absolute surplus value by lengthening the working day to the generation of relative surplus value by the application of scientific management and technology to reduce necessary labor-time in direct proportion to the surplus labor-time extracted identified by Lukács[137] is presumably somewhat reflective of the success of the labor movement in establishing limits to the working day. The concept of reification thus reflects the transformation of the experience not only of labor, but of time-consciousness.

Although, Lukács' central category is labor,[138] his analysis of the transformation of labor-time lends itself to rethinking time in a critical fashion since the reification of time-consciousness or consciousness of time is simultaneously a consequence of capital's colonization of time since there is a connection between capital's colonization of time and what people come to believe is objectively possible:

> Man's liberty is limited, but not only by external conditions…men are limited just as much by their mental structures which result from those conditions and are to be found in them. Nevertheless, these conditions and mental structures do not

---

[135] Andrew Feenberg, *Lukács, Marx and the Sources of Critical Theory* (Totowa, NJ: Roman & Littlefield, 1981), 61.
[136] See Frederick Winslow Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1919).
[137] Abendroth states that Lukács identifies the "essential difference between modern late-capitalist industrial society and the previous period consisted in the central issue of class conflict shifting from absolute to relative surplus value." Hans Heinz Holz, Leo Kofler, and Wolfgang Abendroth, *Conversations with Lukács*, ed. Theo Pinkus (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1975), 81.
[138] Georg Lukács, *The Ontology of Social Being*, Vol. 3 *Labour*, trans.David Fernbach (London: Merlin Press, 1980).

> merely place limits on men; they also create for them a field of possibilities within which they act and modify reality while modifying themselves.[139]

This means that the fight for time must include a careful analysis of how capital colonizes time including the reification of time-consciousness which ultimately limits the realm of what is considered possible. At the same time, the fight for time must avoid the "false duality" of "the field of the possible created from without and the field of the possible created from within" since for Lukács, "possible consciousness and objective possibility are inextricably linked."[140] The fight for time must begin with the historical reality of capital's colonization of time and the corresponding reified time-consciousness, but it must not be entirely limited by it:

> On the one hand, the external situation of the group and of individuals determines them and makes certain things impossible; but, on the other hand, the mental structure of the group determines its actions and acts in such a manner that certain things, certain projects, are not thinkable.[141]

The strength of reification as a critical category of analysis lies in Lukács' dialectical approach to time or what I refer to as "time-consciousness." Time-consciousness is a theoretical category of analysis which aims to render the dialectical relationship between the objective and subjective aspects of time as shaped by capital's colonization of time visible in order to contest the reification of time-consciousness or the experience of commodified labor-time as a "fixed and established reality," which confronts individuals as immutable.[142] Capitalism dominates social time by masquerading as absolute time: "The social is therefore colonized by positivist logics that empty the social of social

---

[139] Lucien Goldman, *Lukács and Heidegger: Towards a New Philosophy*, trans. William Q. Boelhower. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977), 53.
[140] Ibid., 54-55.
[141] Ibid., 54.
[142] Georg Lukács, *The Ontology of Social Being*, Volume 3: *Labour*, 88.

characteristics."[143] Thus time is rarely regarded as legitimate grounds for political contestation since it is experienced as "obeying law-like regularities that cannot be overturned without violating that which is natural and just."[144] Lukács' dialectical analysis of reification thus continues to offer a unique opportunity to rethink time in a manner that is potentially disruptive of this sleight of hand maneuver. The answer to the "riddle of commodity-structure"[145] or economic fetishism lies in solving the reification of time-consciousness by re-establishing a philosophical and political relationship between time and freedom in order to contest advanced capital's colonization of time and time-consciousness.

Considered Lukács' seminal contribution to Western Marxism, *History and Class Consciousness* sought to re-establish a meaningful relationship between time and freedom by reconsidering the dialectical relationship between history and consciousness as juxtaposed between the philosophies of Hegel and Marx. In doing so, Lukács recovers the transformation of the concept of time from an idealist to a materialist understanding of history. Marx's development of history from an unconscious to a potentially self-conscious status opens up the possibilities of individuals to see beyond the immediacy of clock time as necessity so as to think of time in relation to freedom as creating the conditions most conducive to the development of human capabilities. To think of time in this manner rejects the conditions under capitalism that deny a meaningful relationship between time and freedom. The human embodiment of time remains central to establishing a meaningful relationship between time and freedom precisely because it serves as a constant reminder that that which makes time meaningful is not money even if

[143] Tony Fitzpatrick, "Social Policy and Time." *Time & Society* Vol. 13 (2004), 201.
[144] Ibid., 201.

we are often forced to reduce time to this singular understanding, but the quality of life itself and the quality of life is dependent on the organization of a given society. An already scarce good due to mortality, time becomes the ultimate scarce good due to the logic of capitalism which understands all disposable to time as rightfully belonging to capitalism.[146] The difficulty Lukács confronts with the reification of consciousness is the collective understanding of historical conditions as a permanent and necessary reality.

In his "Preface to the New Edition (1967)," Lukács describes the book as an attempt to re-connect Marxism and philosophy by way of Hegel: "*History and Class Consciousness* represents what was perhaps the most radical attempt to restore the revolutionary nature of Marx's theories by renovating and extending Hegel's dialectics and methods."[147] The dialectical method is ultimately Lukács' solution to the problem of the reification of consciousness. As he states, "…we need the dialectical method to puncture the social illusion so produced and help us glimpse the reality underlying it."[148] Taking his cue from Hegel, Lukács recognizes that freedom is the insight into necessity, or, in the case of capitalism, it is the insight into the economic determination of necessity (and thus of freedom) itself. He thus begins his analysis of reification by rendering the manner by which capital comes to dominate labor-time visible in "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat," the central essay of *History and Class Consciousness*.

Time and Capitalism

Capitalism's colonization of time was neither automatic nor inevitable, but the end result of a political struggle between labor's fight for self-determined time and

---

[145] Georg Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 81.
[146] "If the labourer consumes his disposable time for himself, he robs the capitalist." Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section I, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S1.
[147] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, xxi.

capitalism's domination and manipulation of necessary labor-time. In contrast to feudal conditions where peasants were conscious of a distinction between necessary and surplus-labor time, capitalism blurs the distinction so that workers come to understand all labor-time as necessary.[149] This is why Marx argued that workers demand the actual value of their labor power. Capitalism's historical advantage rests in the workers' acceptance, however reluctant or unconscious, of this commodified understanding of time informed and reinforced by the categories of political economy.[150] Additionally, workers' dependence on the market for wages increased as households ceased to be spaces of production for family needs. As Lukács' states, "Reification requires that a society should learn to satisfy all of its needs in terms of commodity exchange."[151] For this reason, it is central to understand Lukács' analysis of commodity fetishism with respect to capital's commodification of time. In the opening lines of "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat," Lukács makes a rather bold statement that at "…this stage in the history of mankind there is no problem that does not ultimately lead back to that question and there is no solution that could not be found in the solution to the riddle of the commodity-*structure*."[152] Lukács argues that the commodity reflects the structure of capitalism in its totality when it becomes "the universal structuring principle"[153] of modern capitalism:

The commodity can only be understood in its undistorted essence when it becomes the universal category of society as a whole. Only in this context does the reification

---

[148]Ibid., 5-6.
[149] "The social totality constituted by labor as an objective general mediation has a temporal character, wherein time becomes necessity." Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, 191.
[150] See E.P. Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism," in *Past and Present*. Vol. 38, (1967), 56-97 for a history of the transformation of the collective experience and understanding of time through time discipline under early industrial capitalism.
[151] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 91.
[152] Ibid., 83.

produced by commodity relations assume decisive importance both for the objective evolution of society and for the stance adopted by men towards it.[154]

To understand the essence of the commodity means to understand the commodity through the human relations that produced it: "Its basis is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a 'phantom objectivity,' an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people."[155] The centrality of understanding the commodity form as the embodiment of human relationships is the recognition or consciousness of the human element concealed in all commodities including time as a way to combat the reification of consciousness. In this way, time comes to be understood not as an autonomous force of economic determination, but as a historical product of social relations and therefore contestable.

Lukács quotes at length Marx's account of commodity fetishism to describe "the basic phenomenon of reification:"

> A commodity is therefore a mysterious thing, simply because in it the social character of men's labour appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour; because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour. This is the reason why the products of labour become commodities, social things whose qualities are at the same time *perceptible* and *imperceptible* by the senses…It is only a definite social relation between men that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things.[156]

By way of Marx, Lukács presents a rather complex understanding of consciousness whereby the commodity form's appearance under capitalism is simultaneously the

---

[153] Ibid., 85.
[154] Ibid., 86.
[155] Ibid., 83.
[156] Ibid., 86 (emphasis mine).

concealment of the human element. Lukács relates this concealment to reification,[157] which he describes as a "situation [where]…man's own activity, his own labour becomes something objective and independent of him, something that controls him by virtue of an autonomy alien to man."[158] Reification for Lukács refers to an unconsciousness of the essence of what he refers to as "second nature" [159] or the "self-created material circumstances."[160] Philosophically speaking, Lukács concept of "second nature" resolves the Kantian duality between subject and object by referring only to that "nature" which is a direct product of human interaction with unadulterated nature. Consciousness for Lukács means a self-awareness of the world as a historical as opposed to an ahistorical product of what Marx referred to as dead labor: "[Reification] meant the petrification of living processes into dead things, which appeared as an alien 'second nature.'"[161] Thus consciousness goes beyond the recognition of commodities as the embodiment of human relations to a self-awareness of human beings as historical producers of material goods, social relations, and ideas: "The historical knowledge of the proletariat begins with knowledge of the present, with the self-knowledge of its own social situation and with the elucidation of its necessity (i.e., its genesis)."[162] Following Marx, Lukács reconceptualizes history in philosophical anthropological, rather than purely empirical terms to return time to its rightful place, i.e., being and becoming. As Andrew Feenberg argues, Marx and Lukács establish a "philosophy of praxis" whereby "…history is ontology, the becoming of the human species is the privileged domain within which the

---

[157] Lukács admitted conflation of objectification and alienation in his concept of reification (a term Marx did not use) makes it difficult to determine what descriptions are specific to alienation and what conditions are specific to reification. Thus "reification" will have to suffice for now.
[158] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 86-87.
[159] Ibid., 86.
[160] George Lichtheim, *Georg Lukács* (New York: The Viking Press, 1970), 71.
[161] Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*, 109.

problems of the theory of being can finally be resolved."[163] History as ontology is not however Lukács' starting point, but his final destination. His starting point is labor-time as it appears to the working class under modern capitalism in the processes of production. Lukács demonstrates that the colonization of time is not simply an ideological constraint determined by the needs of capital accumulation, but a structural reality:

> On the one hand, the process of labour is progressively broken down into abstract, rational, specialized operations so that the worker loses contact with the finished product and his work is reduced to the mechanical repetition of a specialized set of actions. On the other hand, the period of time necessary for work to be accomplished (which forms the basis of rational calculation) is converted, as mechanization and rationalization are intensified, from a merely empirical average figure to an objectively calculable work-stint that confronts the worker as a fixed and established reality.[164]

In applying Weber's concept of rationalization to Marx's analysis of commodity fetishism,[165] Lukács argues that the increasing rationalization of the processes of production through scientific management intensifies the experience of reification by replacing every aspect of self-determined time with an abstract understanding of labor-time directly informed by the instrumental rationality of the production process:

> [The] …fragmentation of the object of production necessarily entails the fragmentation of its subject. In consequence of the rationalization of the work-process the human qualities and idiosyncrasies of the worker appear increasingly *as mere sources of error* when contrasted with these abstract special laws functioning according to rational predictions. Neither objectively nor in his relation to his work does man appear as the authentic master of the process; on the contrary, he is a mechanical part incorporated into a mechanical system. He finds it already pre-existing and self-sufficient, it functions independently of him and he has to conform to its laws whether he likes it or not. As labour is progressively rationalized and mechanized his lack of will is reinforced by the way in which his activity becomes less and less active and more and more contemplative. The contemplative stance adopted towards a process mechanically conforming to fixed laws and enacted independently of man's consciousness and impervious to

---

[162] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 159.
[163] Andrew Feenberg, *Lukács, Marx and the Sources of Critical Theory*, 7-8.
[164] Georg Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 88.
[165] Feenberg, *Lukács, Marx and the Sources of Critical Theory*.

> human intervention, i.e., a perfectly closed system, must likewise transform the basic categories of man's immediate attitude to the world: it reduces space and time to a common denominator and degrades time to the dimension of space.[166]

The "transforma[tion] of the basic categories of man's immediate attitude to the world" means that neither politics nor philosophy is immune from the reification of time-consciousness as Lukács demonstrates in his discussion of "the antinomies of bourgeois thought."[167] However, his initial understanding of reification as totalizing and "perfectly closed system," comes about because he failed to distinguish between categories. The sections that follow break down time in terms of objectification, commodification, alienation, and reification in light of Lukács later reflections on *History and Class Consciousness* in order to examine the political consequences of conflating these categories for the fight for time.

Objectification

Given Lukács' admitted conflation of objectification (*vergegenstäendlichung*) and alienation (*entfremdung*),[168] it is important to clarify the differences between these concepts in relationship to time in order to demonstrate why it matters politically to the fight for time. Herbert Marcuse interprets Hegel's understanding of objectification (*vergegenstäendlichung*) as the externalization of humanity via labor: "In labor something happens with the man and with the objectification in such a manner that the 'result' is an essential unity of man and the objectification: man 'objectifies' himself and the object becomes 'his,' it becomes a human object."[169] *Vergegenstäendlichung* is "the

---

[166] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 89.
[167] Ibid.,110.
[168] "History and Class Consciousness follows Hegel in that it too equates alienation with objectification [Vergegenstandlichung] (to use the term employed by Marx in the Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts)." Ibid., xxiv.
[169] Herbert Marcuse, "On the Philosophical Foundation of the Concept of Labor in Economics," in *Telos,* Vol. 16, (Summer 1973), 13.

process of becoming an object," [170] and labor is that which is the doing of the process: "And it is precisely in this doing of human beings as the mode of one's being in the world: it is that through which one first becomes 'for itself' what one is, comes to one's self, acquires the form of one's being-there [*Da-seins*], winning one's 'permanence' and at the same time making the world 'one's own.'"[171] In contrast to Hegel's understanding of objectification, Lukács argues that Marx "distinguishes sharply between objectification in work in general and the alienation of subject and object in the *capitalist form* of work."[172] In the same manner, a distinction should be made between the objectification of time as clock time in general and the commodification of time under capitalism. Not only is the history of the clock longer than the history of capitalism, but making this distinction also provides a clearer picture of how commodification distorts the objectification of time and thus the relationship between labor and consciousness.

Reflecting on objectification in general Lukács states that it is,

> …indeed a phenomenon that cannot be eliminated from human life in society. If we bear in mind that every externalization of an object in practice (and hence, too, in work) is an objectification, that every human expression including speech objectifies human thoughts and feelings, then it is clear that we are dealing with a universal mode of commerce between men. And in so far as this is the case, objectification is a neutral phenomenon; *the true is as much an objectification as the false, liberation as much as enslavement*.[173]

In conflating objectification and alienation under the category of reification, Lukács confused that which is a universal human condition, objectification with that which is a historical condition, alienation. The political significance for the purposes at hand being

---

[170] Dirk J. Struik, "Explanatory and Reference Notes" in *The Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, ed. Dirk J. Struik, trans. Martin Milligan (New York: International Publishers, 1964), 240.
[171] Herbert Marcuse, "On the Philosophical Foundation of the Concept of Labor in Economics," 13.
[172] Georg Lukács, *The Young Hegel: Studies in the Relations between Dialectics and Economics*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1976), 551-552.
[173] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, xxiv, (emphasis mine).

that the clock may be used in service to capitalism as well as in contestation of the time constraints produced by capitalism.[174] At the same time, it is evident that capitalism let alone capital's colonization of time would not have been possible without the precision of the mechanical clock.[175] This seems to suggest that the objectification of time in the form of the mechanical clock is significant insofar as there is a relationship between form and content.[176] The historical transformation of the meaning of time, following the Newtonian influence, from a concrete (time as a dependent variable) to an abstract (time as an independent variable) understanding of time[177] arguably renders time more susceptible to capital's colonization of time by making it possible for capital to replace social or relational time with absolute or reified time.[178]

Commodification

Lukács argues that objectivity is "distorted…by its commodity character," which is why he reasons reflection does not reflect essence, but appearance:

> The commodity character of the commodity, the abstract, quantitative mode of calculability shows itself here in its purest form: the reified mind necessarily sees it as the form in which its own authentic immediacy becomes manifest and—as reified consciousness—does not even attempt to transcend it."[179]

As with objectification in general, the objectification of time is increasingly mediated by the commodity form: "As the quantification and measurement of time has become more

---

[174] "Time, after all, was the master's, as it had to be in a slave society. Clock- and watch-owning slaves would too easily become time-negotiating workers…" Mark M. Smith, *Mastered by the Clock: Time, Slavery, and Freedom in the American South* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 7.

[175] "The clock, not the steam-engine, is the key machine of the industrial age." Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilization*. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1934), 15.

[176] For a discussion of the relationship between capitalism and the Newtonian conception of time, see Moishe Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) and Tony Fitzpatrick, "Social Policy and Time," *Time & Society* 13 (2004), 197-219.

[177] Postone, *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*, 201-202.

[178] Tony Fitzpatrick, "Social Policy and Time," *Time & Society* 13 (2004): 197-219, 201-202.

[179] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 93.

precise, so we have become less the agents who embody time and more the subjects that commodified time embodies."[180] The value of time comes to be defined predominately by exchange rather than use value or in the words of Benjamin Franklin, "Time is money."[181] Commodified labor-time employed by capital takes on a new meaning that stands in direct opposition to the expansion of free time. Lukács quoting Marx:

> …machinery considered alone shortens the hours of labour, but, when in service of capital, lengthens them; since it in itself lightens labour, but when employed by capital heightens the intensity of labour; since it in itself is a victory of man over the forces of Nature, but in the hands of capital, makes them paupers…[182]

A paradox thus arises. Reflecting on technology and the potential of technology to decrease the time spent in the realm of necessity in order to expand the time for self-development as originally formulated by Marx, Lukács states,

> Now there is today such a thing as scientific management and a way of dealing psychologically with the workers, but this is simply directed towards creating a technology which could make labour a valued occupation for the workers. A firmly fixed prejudice of ours that I have already mentioned holds that, since capitalism is as it is, since every technological innovation is directed towards increasing profit, and everything else is a side-effect, it is therefore part of the ontological nature of technological developments to stand unconditionally in the service of capitalism.[183]

Again Lukács recognizes that technology is potentially as much liberation as it is enslavement. Henry Pachter reflects on this paradox with regard to the liberatory potential of technology:

> Now here is the paradox: as a human being, the worker should be glad that machinery is being invented to relieve him of (at least some of) the drudgery; as an employee he has to fight hard not to be relieved entirely by the machine…

---

[180] Fitzpatrick, "Social Policy and Time," 202.
[181] Benjamin Franklin, "Advice to a Young Tradesman, Written by an Old One" in *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, Vol. 2. (Boston: Tappan, 1840), 87.
[182] Georg Lukács quoting Karl Marx in *History and Class Consciousness*, 152.
[183] Holz et al., *Conversations with Lukács*, 56.

> Under capitalist conditions he has to fight on two fronts—on the one hand for his "right to work," on the other hand for his "right to leisure."[184]

Workers want to be relieved of the unnecessary burden of labor, but not entirely due to the condition that they must work to be able to fulfill their very basic human needs though the market. The fight for time must address this paradox by making visible the manipulation of necessary and surplus labor-time through absolute and relative surplus value.

Alienation

Walter Kaufmann describes alienation as an inevitable condition of human existence necessary for self-consciousness, "To speak of alienation without making clear who is held to be alienated from whom or from what is hardly fruitful, and talk of the 'total' alienation of modern man is as nonsensical as talk of the total absence of alienation."[185] What does it mean to speak of people being alienated from time? The question only makes sense if time is understood as the linking the processes of labor, objectification, and self-consciousness. Marx describes the relationship between objectification and labor under the conditions of industrial capitalism:

> Labor's realization is its objectification. In the sphere of political economy this realization of labor appears as *loss of realization* for the workers; objectification as *loss of the object* and *bondage to it*: appropriation as *estrangement*, as *alienation*…The *alienation* of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an *external* existence, but that it exists *outside him*, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien.[186]

---

[184] Henry Pachter, "The Right to Be Lazy" *Socialism in History: Political Essays of Henry Pachter*, ed. Stephen Eric Bronner (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 6-7.
[185] Walter Kaufmann, introduction to *Alienation* by Richard Schacht (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970), xxiv.
[186] Karl Marx, *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, ed. Dirk J. Struik and trans. Martin Milligan. (New York: International Publishers, 1964),108.

In Marx's understanding labor is the activity that defines life and it is labor that is being alienated under the conditions of capitalism, but it is the time discipline and constraints through absolute surplus value which distort the ontological relationship between labor and consciousness by denying a meaningful relationship between time and freedom whereby necessity might be reduced to enlarge the time for human development. Marx's understanding of time is not reducible to labor-time as it appears under capitalism, but is teleologically related to human potential and actualization. Time is necessary for human development and human development is being denied by the needs of capitalism taking precedence over the development and enlargement of conditions that might contribute rather than hinder individual and collective freedom.

Lukács' brilliance is often attributed to his discovery of Marx's concept of alienation (*entfremdung*) prior to the release of *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* which confirmed the idealist, i.e., Hegelian roots of Marx's critique of political economy despite the fact that Marx relied heavily on the language of political economy to make his case.[187] As a point of clarification, Lukács' concept of reification should not be confused with Marx's concept of alienation. In the "Preface to the New Edition (1967)," Lukács explains that although he used alienation and reification synonymously, they are not identical concepts.[188] For this reason, I focus primarily on Lukács' later reflections on *History and Class Consciousness* where Lukács attempts to address his mistake in conflating objectification and alienation as reification. The political significance of distinguishing between objectification, alienation, and reification

[187] George Lichtheim, *Georg Lukács*. (New York: The Viking Press, 1970), 64-65.
[188] Georg Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, xxiv-xxv.

is central to maintaining an analysis of time that is critical of capitalism and is not itself susceptible to reification.

In his "Preface to the New Edition (1967)" of *History and Class Consciousness*, Lukács is careful to distinguish between objectification and alienation in order to reveal how individuals become alienated from human objectifications or what Lukács refers to as "second nature":

> Only when the objectified forms in society acquire functions that bring the essence of man into conflict with his existence, only when man's nature is subjugated, deformed and crippled can we speak of an objective societal condition of alienation and, as an inexorable consequence, of all the subjective marks of an internal alienation.[189]

Lukács admits that his original conflation of objectification and alienation "convert[ed] an essentially social alienation into an eternal 'condition humain',[190] which only served to reify time in his very analysis of reification. It is clear that alienation is a historical product and being a historical product it is not universal or immutable as a law of nature. Lukács is careful to identify the historical differences between Marx and himself in regard to the fight for time as a political strategy against alienation, which he identifies as "class conflict shifting from absolute to relative surplus value"[191]:

At the time that Marx wrote *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, the alienation of the working class directly involved a labour that drove the workers down to an almost animal level; alienation was in a certain sense dialectical with de-humanization, and consequently the class struggle was oriented for decades towards securing a human life for the workers by means of appropriate demands regarding wages and working hours. The celebrated 'three eights' of the Second International were

[189] Ibid., xxiv.
[190] Ibid.

symptomatic of this class struggle. Today this problem has in a certain sense been displaced, only in a certain sense, of course.[192]

Whereby Marx's analysis of alienation reflects capital's inhumane use of labor-time, Lukács' analysis of alienation confronts the increasing encroachment of capital on consciousness through capitalism's creation of a consumer ethos to be fulfilled during free time:

> It follows that a new problem is visible on the working-class horizon, that is the problem of a meaningful life. The class struggle in the era of surplus value was directed towards creating the objective conditions for a meaningful life. Today, with the five-day a week and a wage corresponding to this, the first conditions for a meaningful life can already emerge, and as a result the problem has arisen that the manipulation which extends from the purchase of cigarettes through to presidential elections divides human beings from meaningful life by a mental barrier. For manipulation is not, as the official doctrine has it, the desire to inform the consumer what the best refrigerator or the best razor blade is, but a question of the control of consciousness.[193]

The barrier to a meaningful life is for Lukács a "mental barrier" caused by manipulation by means of advertisements and distraction:

> As a result of this manipulation, the worker, the working person, is forcibly distracted from considering how he could transform his free time into genuine leisure, and it is insinuated that consumption is his own life-fulfilling purpose, exactly as, in the era of the twelve hour working day, labour itself dominated life in a dictatorially intrusive way.[194]

The fight for time thus must take into consideration the manipulation of free time:

> Earlier struggles over free time only went as far as to campaign for working hours that permitted the workers some kind of human existence. Today there is much more involved. In fact through the shortening of working hours a space arises in which free time can be turned into real leisure. But present-day capitalism does everything to prevent this.[195]

---

[191] Holz et al., *Conversations with Lukács*, 81.
[192] Holz et al., *Conversations with Lukács*, 54-55.
[193] Ibid., 55.
[194] Ibid., 55.
[195] Ibid., 82-83.

The transition from absolute to relative surplus value makes a significant difference to class consciousness since it is no longer as easy to identify "working-class interest" with "the struggle against capitalism and for its transformation into a new society" because "the manipulation of free time, the consumer goods industry, constantly reduces the mental abilities of the great majority of the population" because the profit motive necessarily reduces literature, for example, to the "lowest possible level."[196] The argument still relates back to the major time constraints since the attractiveness of the culture industry may reside in the overall lack of self-determined time. Lukács lays the groundwork for critical theory's later criticisms of the culture and leisure industry as destroying the possibilities of freedom in so-called free time. His analysis of alienation as related to consciousness thus makes it possible to argue that the fight for time under advanced capitalism must take into consideration not only the realm of production, but consumption and leisure: "No trade-union struggle is possible which is not also a cultural struggle and occasionally also a political struggle for the maintenance of cultural freedom."[197] Importantly, Lukács' analysis of time is not the leap into freedom found in romantic anti-capitalism, but a dialectical analysis of how time-consciousness comes to be alienated not only objectively, but subjectively. This means that alienation can only be overcome by transforming the actual existing conditions that contribute to it. The difference between the "experience" of "everyday life as a teleology directed independently" of humans under capitalism must under socialism "subordinate the whole of economy to the teleological projects of human consciousness."[198] At the end of the day, the fight for genuine free time is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for class

[196] Holz et al., *Conversations with Lukács*, 84.
[197] Ibid., 85.

consciousness because capital's colonization of time is largely derived from its manipulation of necessary labor-time.

Reification

As mentioned previously, Lukács (unlike Marx) collapses objectification and alienation into the single concept of reification, a term that Marx himself did not use.[199] In contrast to Marx's concept of alienation, Lukács' concept of reification enlists the Weberian notion of rationalization. As Lukács states, "We are concerned above all with the *principle* at work here: the principle of rationalization based on what is and *can be calculated*."[200] His criticism is that capitalism operates under the assumption that everything can be calculated: "There arises a rational systematization of all statutes regulating life, which represents, or at least tends toward a closed system applicable to all possible imaginable cases"[201] without regard for the "violation of man's humanity."[202] The principle of rationalization does not stay within the confines of production, but inundates the entire society thus strengthening reification.

The process of rationalization of the work place and thus of the worker is not possible without the precision of the clock. Yet, rationalization simultaneously transforms the meaning and experience of time itself by denying any meaning beyond quantification, control, prediction, and efficiency meant to ensure profit:

> Thus time sheds its qualitative, variable, flowing nature; it freezes into an exactly delimited, quantifiable continuum filled with quantifiable 'things' (the reified,

---

[198] Ibid., 64 and 83.
[199] See Ernst Bloch, "Entfremdung, Verfremdung: Alienation, Estrangement" in *Brecht*, ed. Erika Munk (New York: Bantam Books, 1972), and Stephen Eric Bronner, "Philosophical Anticipations: A Commentary on the 'Reification' Essay of Georg Lukács" in *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*, second ed. (New York: Routledge, 2002).
[200] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 88.
[201] Ibid., 96,
[202] Ibid., 99.

> mechanically objectified 'performance' of the worker, wholly separated from his total human personality): in short, it becomes space.[203]

The rationalization of time contributes to the reification of time-consciousness because it forces workers to deny almost every aspect of their humanity while at work:

> The quantification of objects, their subordination to abstract mental categories makes it appearance in the life of the worker immediately as a process of abstraction of which he is a victim, and which cuts him off from his labour-power, forcing him to sell it on the market as a commodity, belonging to him. And by selling this, his only commodity, he integrates it (and himself: for his commodity is inseparable from his physical existence) into a specialized process that has been rationalized and mechanized, a process that he discovers already existing, complete and able to function without him and in which he is no more than a cipher reduced to an abstract quantity, a mechanized and rationalized tool.[204]

However, it is precisely this condition that Lukács argues is the reason that the standpoint of the proletariat is in a position to fight reification because unlike the bourgeoisie, the proletariat does not seek to preserve itself as a class, but seeks to abolish itself.[205] Unfortunately, history has proven Lukács wrong and Lenin's idea of the necessity of a vanguard party to infuse the proletariat with a revolutionary consciousness right:

> No proletarian revolution has occurred anywhere, no section of the proletariat has spontaneously oriented itself toward the conflict with all the other social groups which it should have wanted to eliminate from power in order to create a classless society in which it itself would disappear, and no section of the proletariat's evolution has been spontaneously revolutionary.[206]

However, Lukács' basic reasoning seems to stand that the working class should not be as invested in the status quo as the middle class due to its "essential different…structuration of class and consciousness."[207] The starting point of any analysis of time should be who benefits and who is disadvantaged by capital's colonization of time.

---

[203] Ibid., 90.
[204] Ibid., 166.
[205] Goldman, *Lukács and Heidegger: Towards a New Philosophy*, 60.
[206] Ibid., 64.
[207] Ibid., 61.

Time-Consciousness

Although, Lukács never develops a theory of "time-consciousness," he does develop a theory of history in relation to class consciousness:

> The real subject of all historical action for Lukács (inspired by Marx), the subject of all human action, is a plural subject; the subject which at the same time is an object, since it is itself that it understands, and since it acts upon society of which it forms a part. At the essential level of decisive historical action, of philosophy and of culture, this plural subject is a privileged group, a class, which is oriented toward the global organization of re-organization of society, hence the terms history and class consciousness.[208]

Historical action includes the self-consciousness of the proletariat as able to penetrate the "inert immediacy of facts" by "mediating them through a dynamic understanding of the whole."[209] Arguing that the proletariat is in a better position for penetrating the veil of reification than the bourgeoisie "enmeshed in its immediacy by virtue of its class role,"[210] Lukács points in the general direction of the importance of time-consciousness. The peculiarity of the commodification of labor-time is that the qualitative elements of humanity continue to co-exist alongside commodification despite capitalism attempt to deny the qualitative aspects of humanity by trying to make the worker as efficient as the machine. The proletariat has the quality of being the only commodity that has the possibility of becoming self-aware. Lukács argues that the standpoint of the proletariat is capable of seeing beyond its immediacy due to the concreteness of their experience and the denial of their humanity beyond necessity. Further, the duality or antinomies of thought (necessity and freedom, theory and practice) found in classical philosophy and replicated in bourgeois economic thought is overcome through the proletarians' collective

---

[208] Goldman, *Lukács and Heidegger: Towards a New Philosophy*, 32-33.
[209] Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*, 104.
[210] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectic*s, 171.

self-conscious practical activity. Lukács provides the foundation for time-consciousness by revealing the connections between labor-time and consciousness:

> Of course, all of this is only contained implicitly in the dialectical antithesis of quantity and quality as we meet it in the question of labour-time. That is to say, this antithesis with all its implications is only the beginning of the complex process of mediation whose goal is the knowledge of society as a historical totality. The dialectical method is distinguished from bourgeois thought not only by the fact that it alone can lead to a knowledge of totality; it is also significant that such knowledge is only attainable because the relationship between the parts and the whole has become fundamentally different from what it is in thought based on the categories of reflection. In brief, from this point of view, the essence of the dialectical method lies in the fact that in every aspect correctly grasped by the dialectic the whole totality is comprehended and that the whole method can be unraveled from every single aspect.[211]

Given his analysis, Lukács suggests that labor-time is the opening toward understanding time as history and history as universal history. Universal history is to be understood as the "totality of history," a "real historical power—even though one that has not hitherto become conscious and has therefore gone unrecognized—a power which is not to be separated from the reality (and hence the knowledge) of the individual facts without at the same time annulling their reality and their factual existence. It is the real, ultimate ground of their reality and their factual existence and hence also of this knowability even as individual facts."[212] Time-consciousness is only the beginning of a larger process meant to grasp the totality. The proletariat is able to grasp that which the bourgeoisie cannot precisely because they are connected to labor, the real basis of history:

> Whereby for the proletariat the way is opened to a complete penetration of the forms of reification. It achieves this by starting with what is dialectically the clearest form (the immediate relation of capital and labour). It then relates this to those forms that are more remote from the production processes and so includes and comprehends them, too, in the dialectical totality.[213]

---

[211] Ibid., 169-170.
[212] Lukács quoted in Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas,* 105.
[213] Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*,185.

To reconnect time as self-conscious history means to understand history not as something to which "men and things are subjected," but as a series of processes rather than absolutes. Embodied time thus becomes self-conscious and in becoming self-conscious begins the de-reification of all reality so that connections are able to be made between the past, the present, and the future in a dialectical understanding of history.

The Fight for Time

Lukács early analysis of reification and later analysis of the manipulation of free time brings to light many of the elements necessary for rethinking the fight for time as a fight that must confront the realities of capital's colonization of time. In particular, he considers reification of consciousness as directly related to the commodification and rationalization of time. As damning as his critique may be, Lukács allows for the possibility of fighting reification in general:

> Reification is, then, the necessary, immediate reality of every person living in capitalist society. It can be overcome only by constant and constantly renewed efforts to disrupt the reified structure of existence by concretely relating to the concretely manifested contradictions of the total developments, by becoming conscious of the immanent meanings of these contradictions for the total development.[214]

Given Lukács' insight that alienation and reification are reflective of historical specificity and are themselves historical concepts, it makes sense to argue that the fight for time must fundamentally re-conceptualize alienation and reification to account for the historical specificity of time under advanced capitalism. As Lukács states, "What we need…is a major, fundamental portrayal of alienation at its present-day level."[215] An

[214] Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*, 197.
[215] Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*, 58.

analysis of alienation and reification today would reflect all the ways in which people are dispossessed of their time and time-consciousness.

Lukács speaks directly to the fight for time by arguing alongside Marx that production must be made more meaningful so as to be less alienating, but he also emphasizes the "transformation of free time into leisure, which [he argues] can only be achieved by ideological work, by an ideological enlightenment which explains every more fully how contemporary manipulation runs contrary to the true interests of humanity."[216] Lukács' analysis of reification has immediate relevance for the fight for time even if the fight could conceivably lead to the proletariat "adapt[ing] itself ideologically to conform to…the emptiest and most decadent forms of bourgeois culture."[217] Lukács demonstrates that the fight for time is crucial to political consciousness because the fight for time is a practical activity that seeks to establish a meaningful relationship between time and freedom by reconnecting the qualitative or subjective dimensions of time with the quantitative or objective dimensions of time. In the concept of labor-time, Lukács demonstrates that the duality between subject and objective aspects of time is an illusion since the worker can never be separated from his humanity or qualitative attributes. They may be suppressed or denied, but they continue to exist.

Given his analysis of reification as all encompassing, Lukács demonstrates the ways that reification permeates even the organized resistance to capital's colonization of time. The fight for time as understood through the categories of political economy can never be sufficient since it leads directly back to reification. In other words, the fight for

[216] Holz et al., *Conversations with Lukács*, 57.
[217] Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, 208.

time must be conscious of the various ways that capitalism fills time with positivistic logic by reducing time to economic laws. Social or relational time must "substitute its own positive contents for the emptied and bursting husks" Lukács uses to describe the "decline of bourgeois society."[218] The fight for time must thus take into consideration not only the form (quantitative), but the content (qualitative) of time. Marx's own strategic analysis of suggesting workers demand the actual value of their labor-time must also include a discussion of the content of time for the purposes of human development.

It is clear from Lukács that the objective existing conditions under which labor-time operates must be the starting point. Thus a careful analysis of the various ways that capital colonized time historically and currently is of the upmost importance. The problem with bourgeois philosophy and economics is that it takes economic categories as givens or fails to comprehend the economic base of the concepts and categories they use to make sense of reality. In other words, is it possible to make demands for time using the logic of capitalism without accepting the logic as autonomous and thus uncontestable? Importantly, Lukács dialectical understanding of time is resistant to the temptation of retreating into subjectivity by demanding the transformation of the material conditions that lead to alienation and reification. Under bourgeois economics, time is understood as individually possessed and not something that is only possible due to the collective efforts of everyone involved. In other words, the solution to the time constraints posed by capitalism cannot be addressed at the individual level, but must be addressed collectively. It is not so useful when it comes to thinking about time not as individually possessed but something collectively possible through the division of labor. Lukács was always and

[218] Ibid., 208.

everywhere concerned with the dialectic between objective reality and subjective consciousness.

Lukács complicated analysis of reification, reveals that what is at stake in the fight for time is much more than free time. Time-consciousness shakes the foundations of capitalism by contesting the reified acceptance of commodified clock time as time itself. Time as a category of thought informs whether individuals see the world as a product of humanity. Lukács considers the extent to which reification disrupts our ability to grasp the whole.

Concluding Remarks

Lukács reading of Marx through Hegelian categories is useful in re-establishing a meaningful relationship between time and freedom through a dialectical understanding of history in relation to self-consciousness. The analytical power of the dialectical method lies in distinguishing between that which is universal (objectification) and that which results from specific historical conditions (alienation and reification). Alienation is related but not reducible to the objectification of time as clock time. Alienation occurs when time is no longer recognized as a human creation and clocks are not longer understood as a human tool to measure the passage of time. Lukács analysis logically extends to considering the conditions under advanced capitalism which include the colonization of time not only through the processes of production, but consumption and the leisure industry which provides entertainment that the masses have no way of rejecting given the severe time constraints placed upon their time. However, Lukács is unique insofar as he never privileges subjectivity or consciousness to the exclusion of objective reality and the possibilities of transforming that reality through political praxis.

In other words, he never forecloses the possibility of transforming the conditions that contribute most to reification. His later reflections reflect the fundamental historicity of the concepts of alienation and reification.

Chapter IV: Critical Thoughts on Free Time and Leisure

> *The melancholy science from which I make this offering to my friends relates to a region that from time immemorial was regarded as the true field of philosophy, but which, since the latter's conversion into method, has lapsed into intellectual neglect, sententious whimsy and finally oblivion: the teaching of the good life. What the philosophers once knew as life has become the sphere of private existence and now of mere consumption, dragged along as an appendage of the process of material production, without autonomy or substance of its own.*[219]

Given that capital's colonization of time shapes all aspects of the lived experience, including time designated as "free" or "leisure," I argue the fight for time must extend beyond the realm of production. Taken uncritically, free time is commonly assumed to be the area where individuals make autonomous choices with regard to the allocation of the time left over after "work," narrowly defined as that activity taking place in production. This understanding of free time fails to recognize the dialectical relationship between production and consumption whereby "work" time shapes time off of "work" in form and content. When a relationship between production and consumption is recognized, it is usually identified as the "work-and-spend cycle,"[220] but the fight for time must move beyond this understanding to be able to grasp the complexity of capital's colonization of time through consumption—a project that entailed a systematic reorganization and reconceptualization of time as mediated by consumption in the early 20th century in the United States.

According to Marx, production shapes the object in relationship to the subject and consumption shapes the subject in relationship to the object: "Production thus not only

---

[219] Theodor W. Adorno, *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life* (New York: Verso, 2005), 15.
[220] Juliet B. Schor, *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure* (New York: Basic Books, 1991), 126.

creates an object for the subject, but also a subject for the object."[221] I argue this dialectical relationship is dominated by capitalism to the extent that human need based on scarcity is no longer the primary driving force of production, but has been replaced by the manipulation of "needs" for purposes of profit. The manipulation of needs includes the historical promotion of free time as time for consumption in the context of the United States, which ultimately transformed the ideal of "leisure" from a good in itself to a commodified good. My contention is that the fight for time must address the relationship between production and consumption for the very reason that capitalists exploit human need through the development of mass consumption and advertising, which are used to maneuver and manipulate consumption for the purposes of continued profit and justified in the name of continued economic growth.

Capitalism's manipulation of "needs" has grown increasingly more sophisticated under advanced capitalism as Herbert Marcuse among other critical theorists demonstrates, but my analysis begins from an earlier historical period, which renders visible the initial development of the relationship between free time and mass consumption, and the organized resistance to this linkage. A historical approach forces us to acknowledge the political battles over the content of free time including what values, market or non-market ultimately came to define free time and why. A historical approach is antithetical to reification since it reveals the historical nature of the social meaning of time and thus the impermanence of that specific meaning thus revealing the potential of time outside of the meaning conferred by capitalism.

---

[221] "The product only obtains its 'last finish' in consumption." Karl Marx, *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Introduction, Section 2, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1857/grundrisse/ch01.htm.

The commodification of free time was part of the conscious project of businessmen to deal with the threat of "overproduction" due to "improved productivity and economic abundance" in the 1930s.[222] Their worry was fueled by the notion that consumption based on necessity alone could be fulfilled easily enough that people might start to work less as a result:

> Responding to the threats of chronic overproduction and the decline of the need to work, businessmen began to concentrate on consumption and conclude that demand could be stimulated. If traditional markets were being 'saturated,' then the reasonable response would be to find new markets and increase consumption, not to reduce working hours. Businessmen became increasingly convinced that Americans could be persuaded to need things produced by industry which they had never needed before and consume goods and services, not in response to some out-of-date set of economic motives, but according to a standard of living that constantly improved. With this concern with consumption, the business community broke its long concentration on production, introduced the age of mass consumption, founded a new view of progress in an abundant society, and gave life to the advertising industry.[223]

Promotion of consumption took several forms, including the linkage of free time and consumption or the conflation of "leisure" with consumption: "Even though 'luxuries or leisure' was a theoretical 'free consumer choice,' optimistic businessmen were confident that they could successfully compete with leisure by linking it to consumption and promoting their new products."[224] Stuart Ewen argues capitalism sought to make a direct connection between free time and consumerism: "As modern industry…[was] geared to mass production, *time out* for mass consumption bec[ame] as much a necessity as *time in* for production."[225] It is clear that time outside of production was of as much interest to capitalists as time spent directly in production.

---

[222] Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt, "The End of Shorter Hours," in Labor History XXV (Summer 1984), 378.
[223] Ibid., 382.
[224] Ibid 386-7.
[225] Stuart Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), 29 (emphasis mine).

Even so businessmen worried that a reduction in working hours would lead to a drop in production which they continued to view as the life blood of economic growth. Thus "they…characterized labor's position on this issue as 'unAmerican' since they felt that labor's bid for the 40 hour week was basically an attempt to limit production."[226] Consumption became part of the new vision of "progress" as much as it became a new way to be a good citizen and to exercise individual freedom: "Progress ha[d] been redefined by businessmen and economists as chasing after the 'phantom of insatiable desires.'"[227] This new view of "progress" propagated by businessmen began to change from "dreams of both…the growth of wages which would improve material welfare *and* of the steady increase of leisure which would free individuals from material concerns for other, finer things"[228] to the loss of leisure and the destruction of time devoted to the development of "nonpecuniary values, motives, and activities."[229] The new consumption was defined as an "alternative to increased leisure such as an improved standard of living, consumerism, and steady work."[230] New consumption was purposely designed to meet the needs of capital.

This is not to say that citizens were oblivious or fully accepting of the processes underway. "Labor spokesmen, religious leaders, reformers, intellectuals, educators, and social critics" all offered up competing discourses as to what exactly constituted "genuine progress"[231] in their challenge to capital's linkage of consumption and leisure:

> By producing new goods and new demands for these goods, industry was keeping the common man at work longer than necessary. He was working more to serve

[226] Hunnicutt, "The End of Shorter Hours," 381.
[227] Ibid., 391.
[228] Ibid., 376.
[229] Ibid., 373.
[230] Ibid., 379.
[231] Ibid., 387.

> the interests of the capitalist profit system and less to take care of his real material necessities or meet his own individually felt needs. They questioned perpetual industrial growth, believing that it would continue to exploit workers by convincing them to produce unnecessary "luxuries." The worker had lost control of production. Now he was losing control of consumption and the ability to shape his future and culture.[232]

The collective resistance offered shorter work hours as an alternative to the gospel of consumption: "Shorter hours could decrease work, raise wages, spread employment, reduce unnecessary production and surpluses, and insure a minimum standard of life for everyone. Therefore, leisure was as practical in 'New Economic Era' as new markets and was preferable."[233] The resistance to the colonization of time by market values also fought for leisure in the form of a democratic distribution of "the growing social surplus of time," rather than a democratic ability to participate in consumption which would eventually come to define the New Deal.[234] The democratic distribution of time would also serve to offset the inherent alienation experienced at work:[235]

> …Leisure could be used to revive the benefits and values that work had lost to the machine. Things such as craftsmanship, creativity, worker control, and initiatives could take place during sports, hobbies, volunteer projects and other constructive recreation. Leisure was preferable also because it would help keep other institutions and traditions alive which were threatened by mass society, standardization, and mass consumption. Individualism, the community of workers, the family and the church would be strengthened and would grow as people had more time to devote to these things. In addition, increased leisure would keep open the possibility of what Edwin Sapir called "genuine progress." The dreams of utopian writers, socialists, and reformers which had been around for over a century—dreams of a democratic culture, worker education, the universal pursuit of happiness, and "humane and moral freedom"—were reasonable possibilities given increased leisure. Lastly, shorter hours would counter the new "economic gospel of consumption" which had begun to define

---

[232] Hunnicutt, "The End of Shorter Hours," 387.
[233] Ibid, 388.
[234] Stipelman, Brian Eric, "Necessitous Men are not Free Men:" The Political Theory of the New Deal" (PhD diss., Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, 2008).
[235] Hunnicutt, "The End of Shorter Hours," 390.

> progress solely in terms of economic growth and abandoned the other, more humane kinds of progress.[236]

Thus a fully developed sense of leisure in the service of self and community sought to balance the time devoted to production with the development of a democratic culture based on alternative values to the market. Unfortunately, with the loss of the Black Bill's 30 hour bill "and the advent of governmentally managed capitalism, the shorter hour movement lost its short-lived political momentum,"[237] the linkage between leisure and "optional consumption" was cemented, and the fight for time, at least in regards to shorter hours as an economic and political solution to overproduction and unemployment, was lost. This did not mean, however, that capital's colonization of time through consumption was by any means complete, but the transformation of free and leisure time to consumption marks the beginning of the conditions that make it possible for free time and leisure to be largely mediated by the "culture industry."

Gendering Time: The Commodification of Time in the Household & the Creation of the Time-"Conscious" Consumer

The move from an economy based on production to an economy based on consumption in the early 20th century is the historical juncture key to examining the rise of the "new consumption" based not on the needs of human beings, but on the needs of capital. Central to this transformation was the parallel transformation of the household from a primary site of production to a primary site of consumption,[238] which included the formation of the nuclear household and with it a redefined sexual division of labor inside the household that would ultimately gender time use to the distinct disadvantage of

236 Hunnicutt, "The End of Shorter Hours," 388-89.
237 Ibid, 403.

women in relation to free time. The transformation of the household involved moving production schemes and economic rationale from the factory floor into the household. Thus we see the beginnings of the material conditions that would come to inform household efficiency based on time-motion studies--a process propagated by Christine Frederick by means of Taylorism and facilitated by the consumption of time-saving/labor-saving technology in the household. These facts are important due to the often mistaken notion that the household was somehow immune to the rationale of the market.[239]

Women's roles were influenced in several ways with the industrialization of the household. Household work that once involved all family members now became the sole responsibility of women, as men and children were largely relieved from their former duties. For example,

> The switch from home-grown to 'store-bought' grains relieved men and boys of one of the most time-consuming of the household chores for which they had been responsible. At the very same time, the switch may well have increased the time and energy that women had to spend in their tasks, particularly cooking and baking.[240]

The introduction of time/labor saving devices only seemed to increase the amount of housework designated as "women's work." As Ruth Schwartz Cowan states, "Labor-saving devices were invented and diffused throughout the country during those hundred years that witnessed the first stages of industrialization, but they reorganized the work

---

[238] For additional descriptions of the move from a household based on production to a household based on consumption, please see Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).
[239] A notion debunked by Christopher Lasch, *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), and Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were*: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap (New York: Basic Books, 2000).
[240] Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*, 49.

processes of housework in ways that did not save the labor of the average housewife."[241] In part, this was a result of the newly defined sexual division of labor with the ideal of a stay-at-home mother based on "the notion that a woman's place is in the home."[242] The "drudgery of housework" did not escape women who continued to spend a considerable amount of time on housework and childcare. As Cowan states, "As industrialization took some forms of productive work out of homes, it left other forms of work behind. That work, which we now call 'housework', has been transformed with which it is done; this is the process that I have chosen to call the 'industrialization of the home.'"[243] Cowan demonstrates the fact that technology is not neutral and does not by itself alleviate inequality. In the case of the household, technology may even help to maintain inequality.

Turning individuals away from their original collective enterprise in a household based on production meant that individuals were now artificially divided by a wage system that pitted them against one another and sought to create the illusion that individuals were not interconnected, but independent at least in the realm of production. In the realm of consumption, the household, women and children were largely dependent on men. However, the illusion of independence in the case of middle class white woman in the nuclear household was maintained through the introduction of time/labor saving devices in replacement of domestic help which was not always economically feasible. The illusion of complete independence was central to the marketing of time/labor-saving devices. As Marx states, "If it is clear that production offers consumption its external object, it is therefore equally clear that consumption ideally posits the object of

241 Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*, 45.
242 Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*, 118.

production as an internal image, as a need, as drive, as a purpose."[244] Not only does capital create the material conditions under which people experience time as loss because of the forced time spent in production, it also profits by creating consumers wary of time loss. The experience of time loss creates a conscious anxiety about saving time, but the question of saving time from consumption is never realized because it is kept at a constant with so-called innovations in household and other time-saving technology.

The change of the household from a site of production to a site of consumption opened the flood gates for increased consumption as households slowly became dependent on the market for previously home produced goods as well as on wages needed to purchase those goods. Ewen offers a telling description of this immense transformation of the household:

> Where the farmer of the nineteenth century could account for a ten-dollar expenditure per annum to supplement what was overwhelming a subsistence living, two-thirds of the national income was now spent on the following: staple foods, canned and prepared foods, fresh fruit and vegetables (the marketing of these was made possible through improvements in refrigeration techniques), confections, family clothing, furniture, as well as many goods which transcended the needs and realms of traditional home production (synthetic cloth, electric household equipment, radio, and so on). The wage had emerged, in its exchange capacity, as the dominant conduit to survival.[245]

Time previously spent in productive, non-market time was now spent increasingly in consumption as defined by the market. As Ewen states:

> What occurred in those early days of industry, and what has marked its history since, has been the steady displacement of home production by social production, with the lore and custom of production formalized and separated out of the home

---

[243] Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*, 5.
[244] Marx, *Grundrisse*: *Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy* (New York: Penguin Books, 1973), 92.
[245] Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*, 115-16.

> as planning and engineering. Thus the authority of industry encroached on the authority of the home whose productive capacity was becoming outmoded.[246]

The move from active production in the household to passive consumption included the introduction of time/labor-saving technology and household efficiency experts as the new form of authority in the household. Passive consumption is defined by its apolitical manner and choices defined a priori by the market. This does not mean that consumption cannot be political. Passivity may not be the best word to use here as passivity connotes something being done to people and it is true that people actively participated in the new consumption described above, but actions overly informed by historical factors and the market, both forces seemingly out of the control of individual, are to a certain extent coerced actions especially when alternatives are rendered invisible.

Common sense would seem to indicate that as the household became less focused on production that housework would take less time, but Cowan offers additional reasons for why this was not the case. Though she describes in great detail the processes through which the production of "food, clothing, and health-care" were moved from the household to centralized institutions outside the household,[247] she argues that the "conventional wisdom" of the move from production to consumption in the household did not hold true for transportation:

> The household transportation system has developed in a pattern that is precisely the opposite of the food, clothing, and health-care systems: households have moved from the net consumption to the net production of transportation

---

[246] Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*, 115.

[247] "In food production, for example, flour became something that was bought rather than made in the home. Milling, butchering, and canning along with the refrigerator increased the amount of food that was bought rather than made. "Indeed by the end of the century, processed foods of all kinds—packaged dry cereals, pancake mixes, crackers and cookies machine wrapped in paper containers, canned hams, and bottled corned beef—were part of the staple output of some of the largest, and most monopolistically organized, business enterprises in the nation." Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*, 73.

> services—and housewives have moved from being the receivers of purchased goods to being the transporters of them.[248]

Whereby capital once took responsibility for the time and costs of distribution, with the mass production of the automobile by the 1930s, there was a significant move away from mail-order catalogues and door to door salesmen.[249] These changes made all the difference in terms of women's time use. As Cowan states:

> By midcentury the time that housewives had once spent in preserving strawberries and stitching petticoats was being spent in driving to stores, shopping, and waiting in lines; and the energy that had once gone into bedside care of the sick was now diverted into driving a feverish child to the doctor, or racing to the railroad station to pick up a relative, or taking the baseball team to the next town for a game. The automobile had become, to the American housewife of the middle classes, what the cast iron stove in the kitchen would have been to her counterpart of 1850—the vehicle through which she did much of her most significant work, and the work locale where she could most often be found.

Today transportation seems to be changing once again with the advent of online shopping. Time use in household is not only gendered, but classed insofar as those who can afford to pay for services such as home grocery delivery are able to save time at least from the physical realm of consumption in comparison to those who must spend significant amounts of time shopping offline whereby they must drive to the physical locations of the stores.

Further innovations in mass consumption and advertising combined forces with the social sciences to increase the amount of time spent on consumption primarily through time management which eventually moved beyond the realm of production and into the household:

> The move in industrial thought was in the direction of 'human management'—a more affirmative approach to discipline. …The implementation of the time-

[248] Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*, 79.
[249] Ibid., 71.

> motion studies of Frederick W. Taylor and others attested to the new interaction of business and the social sciences in confronting the problem of making an often antagonistic work force behave stably and predictably.[250]

As Ewen argues, "The studies of early twentieth-century social scientists and "progressive" social critics began to create a general understanding that the social control of workers must stretch beyond the realm of the factor and into the very communities and structures within which they lived."[251] Thus the creation of a "cultural apparatus aimed at defusing and neutralizing potential unrest" was established.[252] A large part of this cultural apparatus involved the family, the household, and the regimentation of time according to production schemes within the household.

Under the direction of Christine Frederick, the tenets of Taylorism were translated for the purposes of household efficiency. Taylorism, created by Frederick Winslow Taylor, the "Father of Scientific Management," sought to manage the future and rid the workforce of "wasted effort" through time-motion studies.[253] As Janice Williams Rutherford states, "Scientific management was a response to the desire for increased production."[254] One of the main principles of Taylorism included the "…development of the 'science of the task' through careful timing and analysis of required motion…"[255] It was a system bent on transforming the worker into the epitome of the machine akin to Charlie Chaplin in "Modern Times" in 1936. Chaplin's character works on the assembly line and since "moments are the element of profit," the capitalist boss wants to introduce

---

[250] Ewen, *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*, 12-13.
[251] Ibid., 15, 18-19
[252] Ibid., 12.
[253] Martha Banta, *Taylored Lived: Narrative Productions in the Age of Taylor, Veblen and Ford* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993) 3.
[254] Janice Williams Rutherford, *Selling Mrs. Consumer: Christine Frederick and the Rise of Household Efficiency* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2003), 43.
[255] Rutherford, *Selling Mrs. Consumer: Christine Frederick and the Rise of Household Efficiency* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2003), 44.

time-saving technology that will feed workers over the assembly line so as to eliminate the need for lunch breaks or work stoppages for any reason. Time saving in the realm of consumption is illustrated by an earlier film, "One Week" (1920) starring Buster Keaton. Martha Banta offers a good description of the film:

> As a wedding present, Buster and his bride receive a house lot and a set of crates containing ready-made parts manufactured by the Portable House Company. …The ready-made house was one of the prizes scientifically managed production systems offered to the general public in the first decades of the twentieth century. Families were meant to be masters of their own do-it-yourself fate. Mail-in order catalogues promised dream houses that could be assembled in record time and for a fraction of the cost of a custom-built home.[256]

Through the latter film, we get some insight into how workers are not only sold a product, but importantly they are sold a product that manages to retain the original idea of self-creativity through a do-it-yourself project. Since modern work had replaced the creative self-development of labor as described by young Marx, the do-it-yourself projects were meant to capture some of the lost creative art of laboring. Thus Henry Pachter's insight about the fight for work was only partially correct. Workers did not want to be entirely relieved of work, not only because they were now entirely dependent on the wage system, but also because labor itself as a category remained meaningful even if industrialization standardized work made work less meaningful. Businessmen found new ways to capture this lost art in ways that proved profitable. Do-it-yourself projects turned the consumer into the worker. Now the consumer put forth the labor to build the house and not only does he did he do it for free, but he has paid for the pleasure of it! Today this phenomenon continues to thrive under the presumption that it saves the customer money by reducing the cost goods, but this answer fails to address the ways in which labor costs are cut and workers lose their jobs.

At this point, we should entertain the question, time saving for whom and for what? The answer from the point of view of capital is clearly for capital and for profit. Thus anytime the words "time saving" are used we are right to be suspect even when outside the context of production. Still, time-saving is not completely an illusion. Obviously, a washing machine run by electric energy saves enormous amounts of time over the scrub board, but then again the amount of clothing has largely increased as have the standards of cleanliness in general. As Cowan states, "Increased standards of cleanliness,' when translated into the language of production and consumption, essentially means 'increased productivity.'"[257] The question that should continue to haunt our analysis is what were people saving time for once the idea of increased leisure was discarded from the notion of progress? The obvious answer today is that people are working more than ever so the idea of saving time outside the realm of production is very appealing since everything else in life that has to be accomplished has to be accomplished during off hours. However, this analysis seeks to challenge the notion that time-saving technology actually saves time as compared to serving the needs of consumption in the both the physical and psychological creation of the time wary consumer. Women are especially targeted in this regard since they continue to deal with the burden of the "the second shift."[258]

The movement of Taylorism into the household presents the most obvious moment of time-management moving from production to consumption. Indeed, the very name "home economics" seems to bring economic rationality into the household. Home

---

[256] Banta, *Taylored Lives: Narrative Productions in the Age of Taylor, Veblen and Ford*, 9.
[257] Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open hearth to the Microwave*, 89.
[258] Arlie Russell Hochschild and Anne Machung, *The Second Shift* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003).

efficiency was a logical offshoot of scientific management. Frederick was one of the leader figures in the movement who was pro-business and sought to promote time-saving machines. However, at this time we also find a competing discourse. Charlotte Gilman Perkins offered an alternative in *The Home* (1903), "a scathing critique of the single-family dwelling as archaic and wasteful."[259] Importantly, Perkins retained the idea of self-development: "To Gilman, the domestic ideology of the nineteenth century had damaged woman's evolutionary progress and inhibited her ability to achieve full personhood. … The home, she wrote, was neither private nor sanctified. Furthermore, it did not promote economy. It was wasteful of time, energy, and woman's talent."[260] Like, Frederick, she also "proposed that advances in science and management be utilized," but she had in mind relieving women of the burden of solitary housework and childcare by collectivism: "Advanced expertise, efficient production, and wider distribution of goods might mean that innovations like commercial laundries, bakeries, and food processors would take over the tasks that had traditionally fallen to the housewife. Women, then, would be free to pursue other interests and talents."[261]

Through Perkins we see the continuation and permanence of the idea originally developed by Aristotle that technology will free us all from the burden of work in the realm of necessity. Perkins sought a collective solution to a collective problem that was otherwise framed as an individual problem. In contrast, Frederick wanted to utilize technology in order to displace the need for servants:

> When the American homemaker, because of economy and scarcity, is forced to dispense with service, and do the work herself, she turns to the mechanical servant which every manufacturer is urging her to buy, and which Yankee

[259] Rutherford, *Selling Mrs. Consumer: Christine Frederick and the Rise of Household Efficiency*, 40.
[260] Ibid., 40-41.
[261] Rutherford, *Selling Mrs. Consumer: Christine Frederick and the Rise of Household Efficiency*, 43.

> ingenuity has perfected in a high degree. The question before the homemaker is not whether she shall use tools, but what tools are most efficient for her particular household needs.[262]

It would take second wave feminism to politicize housework and challenge the unequal sexual division of labor embedded within it. However, it is central to note that technology has historically been viewed as a way to change social relations without fully addressing the ways in which technology serves to reconstitute social hierarchies as noted by André Gorz.

Citizen Consumer to Purchaser Consumer

As the household changed from a site of a production to a site of consumption, the consumer identity was born. The historical conditions that made this identity possible are listed above, but the consumer identity was further reinforced in the name of patriotism and citizenship. Lizabeth Cohen describes the transition from citizen consumer to purchaser consumer in the 1930s.[263] The citizen consumer played an active political role in consumerism, while the purchaser consumer played a passive non-political role that maintained legitimacy through the promotion of the economy especially during times of war:

> …citizen consumers were regarded as responsible for safeguarding the general good of the nation, in particular for prodding government to protect the rights, safety, and fair treatment of individual consumers in the private marketplace...purchaser consumers were viewed as contributing to the larger society more by exercising purchasing power than through asserting themselves politically.[264]

Cohen goes on to describe the conscious creation of the "consumer's republic": "Faith in a mass consumption postwar economy hence came to mean much more than the ready

---

[262] Frederick, *The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management*, 61.
[263] Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000).

availability of goods to buy. Rather, it stood for an elaborate, integrated ideal of economic abundance and democratic political freedom, both equitably distributed, that became almost a national civil religion from the late 1940s into the 1970s."[265] Cohen describes the politics of mass consumption in postwar America: "In the postwar Consumers' Republic, a new ideal emerged—the purchaser as citizen—as an alluring compromise. Now the consumer satisfying personal material wants actually served the national interest, since economic recovery after a decade and a half of depression and war depended on a dynamic mass consumption economy."[266]

The colonization of time by way of consumption depended on several factors including capital's successful linkage of free time with consumption, which worked to eliminate the notion of increased leisure from the idea progress. Progress hence forth was framed as economic growth for the sake of economic growth. The loss of increased leisure and the acceptance of "steady work" ensured that people worried about unemployment would accept the terms of labor and the manipulation of needs so as to facilitate optional consumption further guaranteed by trends, planned obsolescence, and perhaps most importantly, the conflation of consumption with patriotism and citizenship. In other words, capital sought to replace any non-market time with activities specifically tied to the market. Any project seeking to fight for time from the realm of consumption then must first work to disconnect free time from consumption.

…

---

[264] Cohen, *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America*, 18-19.
[265] Ibid., 127.
[266] Ibid., 9.

The Culture Industry

Critical theorists take issue with the assumption of freedom in free time through a critical assessment of popular culture, which it designates the "culture industry."[267] The culture industry is a form of mass manipulation through the guise of "'entertainment' [meant] to sugar-coat the ideological content of oppression while eroding cultural standards in order to quell any forms of expression which might contest the given order" to the detriment of critical consciousness.[268] The culture industry integrates culture seamlessly into the commodity cycle by connecting free time and leisure with consumption through pre-packaged experiences, which I argue are found to be all too appropriate given the overall lack of discretionary time under capitalism.[269] Capitalism creates the very time constraints, which work to its advantage since individuals simply do not have enough discretionary time at their disposal to be able to consider time outside of these constraints. In other words, capitalism's determination of necessity through production and consumption renders other experiences of time impossible. What critical theory makes clear is that the extension of free time alone does not guarantee freedom because the emancipatory potential of culture had been undermined by the culture

---

[267] "The term culture industry was perhaps used for the first time in the book *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, which Horkheimer and I published in Amsterdam in 1947. In our drafts we spoke of 'mass culture.' We replaced that expression with 'culture industry' in order to exclude from the outset the interpretation agreeable to its advocates; that it is a matter of something like a culture that arises spontaneously from the masses themselves, the contemporary form of popular art. From the latter the culture industry must be distinguished in the extreme. …Thus, although the culture industry undeniably speculates on the conscious and unconscious state of the millions towards which it is directed, the masses are not primary, but secondary; they are an object of calculation, an appendage of the machinery. The customer is not king, as the culture industry would like to have us believe, not its subject but its object." Theodor W. Adorno, "The Culture Industry Reconsidered," in *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*, eds., Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner (New York: Routledge, 1989), 128-29.

[268] Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner, introduction to *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 10.

[269] That leisure is not leisure in any sense of the word is apparent when individuals proclaim that they need a vacation from their vacation. Since vacation time is so severely limited in the context of the U.S., and

industry. The culture industry transforms leisure from a qualitative good in and of itself to a commodified good "established and organized for the sake of profit."[270]

Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno offer a critique of the culture industry so damning and all encompassing as to render political consciousness or redemption seemingly implausible even and especially in leisure since leisure itself, in their estimation, becomes the extension of work.[271] To say that leisure is simply an extension of work means that exchange value has taken over use value in the realm of leisure as much as in work. The conditions under which "leisure" exists force leisure to be vacuous due to capital's colonization of time. Leisure as contemplation or time for politics simply does not fit into the equation because people spend most of their time working out of necessity.

Free time is rarely free due to additional obligations that must be attended to outside the context of the "work" day, but for those who do manage to secure some amount of self-determined time, they most likely experience it as largely mediated through the culture industry in the form of mass produced entertainment. As Adorno and Horkheimer state, "The man with leisure has to accept what the culture manufacturers offer him."[272] In their mutual condemnation of the culture industry, they argue capitalism's monopolization of culture reduces the range of choices open to people:

---

often not taken even if it is available, people may attempt to cram in as much as possible over the span of 1-2 weeks.

[270] Theodor W. Adorno gives tourism and camping as examples in his essay, "Free Time," in *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*, trans. Henry W. Pickford (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 169.

[271] "The entertainments manufacturers know that their products will be consumed with alertness even when the customer is distraught, for each of them is a model of the huge economic machinery which has always sustained the masses, whether at work or at leisure—which is akin to work." Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Standford: CA: Standford University Press, 2002), 127.

[272] Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, 124.

> Under monopoly all mass culture is identical, and the lines of its artificial framework begin to show through. The people at the top are no longer so interested in concealing monopoly: as its violence becomes more open, so its power grows. Movies and radio need no longer pretend to be art. The truth that they are just business is made into an ideology in order to justify the rubbish they deliberately produce.[273]

Though the choices seem to be endless to consumers, they argue that mass culture is simply variations of the same. This uniformness is made possible by means of standardization. Adorno argues that mass culture no longer asks for much from the individual. In fact, he suggests that individuality or personality may no longer be possible since there is no real way to differentiate oneself:

> Culture as a common denominator already contains in embryo that schematization and process of cataloging and classification which brings culture within the sphere of administration. And it is precisely the industrialized, the consequent, subsumption which entirely accords with this notion of culture. by subordinating in the same way and to the same end all areas of intellectual creation, by occupying men's senses from the time they leave the factory in the evening to the time they clock in again the next morning with matter that bears the impress of the labor process they themselves have to sustain throughout the day, this subsumption mockingly satisfies the concept of a unified culture which the philosophers of personality contrasted with mass culture.[274]

Instead of responding to the demands of the people, something Adorno denies, the culture industry shapes the demands of the people. A reversal occurs whereby the culture industry turns individuals into consumers:

> The ruthless unity in the culture industry is evidence of what will happen in politics. Marked differentiations such as those of A and B films, or of stories in magazines in different price ranges, depend not so much on subject matter as on classifying, organizing, and labeling customers. Something is provided for all so that none may escape; the distinctions are emphasized and extended. The public is catered for with a hierarchical range of mass-produced products of varying quality, thus advancing the rule of complete quantification.[275]

---

[273] Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, 121.
[274] Ibid., 131.
[275] Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, 123.

Mass culture as ideology is all the more effective given the insights of psychology into the advertisement industry so it is little wonder that not only are the masses deceived, but they internalize the messages as their own truth:

> The way in which a girl accepts and keeps the obligatory date, the inflection on the telephone or in the most intimate situation, the choice of words in conversation, and the whole inner life as classified by the now somewhat devalued depth of psychology, bear witness to man's attempt to make himself a proficient apparatus, similar (even in emotions) to the model served up by the culture industry. The most intimate reactions of human beings have been so thoroughly reified that the idea of anything specific to themselves now persists only as an utterly abstract notion: personality scarcely signifies anything more than shining white teeth and freedom from body odor and emotions. The triumph of advertising in the culture industry is that consumers feel compelled to buy and use its products even though they see through it.[276]

Consumers may even recognize that they are being manipulated to a certain extent, but this is all part of the enjoyment of reification. The idea of the fad demonstrates the phenomenon whereby I buy something because everyone else owns it, not because I need it. Though Adorno does not make this point explicit, it goes without saying that a person's self worth as well as their judgment of others peoples' worth comes to be shaped by these messages. If we only consider the very basic standards any given person has to meet in order to be treated with respect and dignity, it becomes obvious what role the market plays in reproducing class inequalities.

J.M. Bernstein succinctly summarizes Adorno's central argument:

> The culture industry, which involves the production of works for reproduction and consumption, thereby organizing free time, the remnant domain of freedom under capitalism in accordance with the same principles of exchange and equivalence that reign in the sphere of production outside leisure, present culture as the realization of the rights of all to the gratification of desire while in reality continuing the negative integration of society.[277]

---

[276] Ibid., 164.
[277] Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, 4.

Thus even that which people find most pleasurable in their free time is in fact a form of unfreedom, not only because free time is severely limited by the need to work, but because the experiences possible within the limited time within that which is designated "free" is no longer (if it ever was is debatable) "…a sanctuary of immediate life within a completely mediated total system,"[278] but commodified time that contributes to a reified understanding of time. It is the subjective element of time that critical theory seeks to reclaim. This does not negate the need for objective protections such as maximum hours, parental leave, mandatory vacation, etc., but it is the foundation for these very institutional protections.

Critical theory vacillates on the question of whether individuals are able to be conscious of the extent to which their consciousness are reified by the culture industry, and never resolves it perhaps because the tension between negative and positive freedom is important to maintain for fear of "forcing people to be free" in some totalitarian fashion. In other words, the relationship between negative freedom and time might be achieved by the limits on the work day and week, but it leaves the question of what opportunities, choices, and experiences are open given capitalism's restrictions of free time and its monopoly of culture. The tension between positive and negative freedom can take many forms, but within the Marxist tradition the tension revolves around the question of consciousness whereby people become aware of the concrete conditions which constrain their individual freedom. This tension is all the more complicated by the realization of critical theory that people willingly participate in their own oppression. Suddenly, non-freedom is experienced as freedom, but it is a freedom defined by capital. This insight is not so different from Marx's own insight that liberal or bourgeoisie

[278] Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, 169.

freedom is a limited understanding of freedom. Mass culture is often defended as democratic insofar as it made art accessible to the masses, but Adorno and Horkheimer argue the form and content of art through the culture industry grants a much more passive role to the audience. The laugh track, for example, alerts the audience that something is funny. Adorno's point is that the culture industry gives all the answers and thus asks for little that might conceivably develop critical faculties or meaningful experiences.

Take for example Adorno and Horkheimer's indictment of films:

> The whole word is made to pass through the filter of the culture industry. The old experience of the movie-goer, who sees the world outside as an extension of the film he has just left (because the latter is intent upon reproducing the world of everyday perceptions), is now the producer's guideline. The more intensely and flawlessly his techniques duplicate empirical objects, the easier it is today for the illusion to prevail that the outside world is the straightforward continuation of that presented on the screen. …real life is becoming indistinguishable from the movies. The sound film, far surpassing the theater of illusion, leaves no room for imagination or reflection on the part of the audience, who is unable to respond from within the structure of the film, yet deviate from its precise detail w/out losing the thread of the story; hence the film forces its victims to equate it directly with reality.[279]

Films manipulate our sense of time insofar as a whole life time might transpire before our very eyes, but in "real" time only two hours has passed. Perhaps film helps individuals the illusion of escape from the time constraints of capitalism by providing the illusion of a different experience of time.

One of the primary questions considered within critical theory was the relationship between culture and consciousness in relation to subjectivity. In *The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception*, Adorno and Horkheimer view mass culture or more specifically the culture industry as a political force which acts upon peoples' consciousness rather than allowing for any substantive interaction with culture on the part

[279] Ibid., 126.

of the subject. As a consequence, subjectivity is left underdeveloped and is thus highly susceptible to manipulation by the culture industry. Adorno and Horkheimer sought to recover subjectivity as a form of resistance to the monopoly and unification of culture under capitalism. They saw similarities between the culture industry and propaganda as equally violent forces on the peoples' consciousness. This is problematic because mass culture purports to be democratic. Popular culture is for the masses. This Adorno and Horkheimer argue changes the emancipator potential that art once played. The culture industry is precisely that, an industry that does not claim to be art, but business:

> Under monopoly all mass culture is identical, and the lines of its artificial framework begin to show through. The people at the top are no longer so interested in concealing monopoly: as its violence becomes more open, so its power grows. Movies and radio need no longer pretend to be art. The truth that they are just business is made into an ideology in order to justify the rubbish they deliberately produce.[280]

Subjective Idealism to Dialectical Thought

The idea of the subject can be traced back to Kant's "subjective idealism" through Hegel and Marx.[281] The idea of subjectivity is based on the conscious or knowing subject, but "freedom alone, for Kant, differentiates a subject from an object"[282] and freedom is the ability to give and follow a law one has set for oneself. The problem with Kant is the false subject/object dichotomy, which is later fundamentally transformed by Hegel's master/slave dialectic and by Marx's historical materialism in which it is recognized that man is "matter that thinks" or in other words man is part of nature, not distinct. Nevertheless, the question of consciousness remains situated in the subject to a lesser or greater extent depending on the particular thinker at hand. For the purposes of critical

---

[280] Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, 121.
[281] Stephen Eric Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 11.
[282] Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*, 13.

theory, one of the most significant insights of Kant was his recognition that "instrumental calculation cannot solve normative conflicts."[283] With critical theory's criticism of the dominance of instrumental or technological rationality, normative claims become undermined in terms of their given weight of significance. Thus Kant "introduce[es] a critical method intent upon confronting reality with the ideals it sets for itself, contesting attempts to identify freedom with the status quo, understanding the multi-dimensional character of reality, exploring the manner in which the arbitrary restriction of freedom takes place, and articulating new possibility for its expression."[284] The progress of consciousness is therefore actually nothing more than humanity's awareness of what should have been evident from the beginning: freedom is the purpose of reason."[285] How one's time is experienced is intimately related to consciousness. The brilliance and no doubt the attraction to critical theory is its politicization of culture or that which most people participate in, but do not necessarily find explicitly political.

In "Free Time," Adorno confronts the reality of free time in the 1960s. He begins by making a distinction between free time and leisure:

> The expression "free time," incidentally of recent origin—formerly one said "leisure", and it was a privilege of an unconstrained life and hence surely also something qualitatively different, more auspicious—refers to a specific difference, that of unfree time, time occupied by labor and, one should add, time that is determined heteronomously."[286]

Heteronomous time means time subject to external constraints not of one's making. He argues, "Free time is shackled to its contrary."[287] His aim in the piece is to consider the

---

[283] Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists,* 14.
[284] Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists,* 16.
[285] Bronner, *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*, 23.
[286] Theodor W. Adorno, *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*, trans. Henry W. Pickford (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 167.
[287] Ibid.

liberatory potential of free time in light of the criticisms of the culture industry that define critical theory. His primary question is whether individuals can indeed experience free time as a form of freedom or whether individuals are "functionally [over]determined."[288] The question of agency is an interesting one from the perspective of critical theory since it maintains such a damning critique of an all encompassing manufactured culture. Similar to Lukács, there seems little possibility for the conscious penetrating of reification.[289]

The key question for Adorno, "What will become of free time in the context of the increasing productivity of labor, yet under persisting conditions of unfreedom, that is, under relations of production that people are born into and that prescribe for them the rules of their existence nowadays just as much as they ever did?"[290] Adorno argues, "Unfreedom is expanding within free time, and most of the unfree people are as unconscious of the process as they are of their own unfreedom."[291] "A parody of itself" is an apt description of free time that is not free, but unfree. How is it unfree? Adorno is disgusted with hobbies, which he defines as "activities I'm mindlessly infatuated with only in order to kill time…"[292] He denies the rigid binary between work and free time precisely because he finds his work meaningful. He recognizes that he is privileged

---

[288] "Even those conciliatory sociologies that apply the concept of 'role' like a master key acknowledge this fact to the extent that the concept, borrowed from the theater, hints that the existence imposed on people by society is not identical with what they are in themselves or what they could be. Certainly no simple division should be attempted between human beings as they are in themselves and their so-called social roles. The roles extend deep into the characteristics of people themselves, into their innermost composition. In the age of truly unprecedented social integration it is difficult to discern anything at all in people that might be other than functionally determined" Adorno, *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords,* 167-68.
[289] "Moreover, and far more importantly, free time depends on the totality of societal conditions. That totality now as much as ever holds people under a spell. In reality, neither in their work nor in their consciousness are people freely in charge of themselves." Adorno, *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords,* 167.
[290] Adorno, *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords,* 168.
[291] Adorno, *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*, 168.
[292] Ibid., 168.

insofar as he may order his day as he wishes. Autonomous time begins with self-determination.

In contrast, culture once played a crucial role in stimulating critical consciousness whereby it was political and forced individuals with dilemmas to consider without giving them explicit answers to those dilemmas. In contrast, popular culture comes equipped with a laugh track that indicates when it is appropriate to laugh. It is highly formulaic and thus predictable. To be a critical thinker in today's society means to be filled with anxiety and live an isolated and lonely intellectual life. People mistake critical thinking for extreme pessimism in a culture that sees happiness and positive thinking as the highest ideal. This is apparent by the mass appeal of the self-help genre and anti-depressants. There are very real, i.e., political reasons for unhappiness, dissatisfaction, anger, and feelings of helplessness, but they are not unique to the individual suffering them. The culture industry is the new opiate of the masses. Adorno and Horkheimer are often received as the worst case example of academic snobbery or elitism or condemnation of popular culture as the epitome of idiocy.[293]

In contrast to Adorno and Horkheimer, Marcuse maintained hope that "dialectical philosophy could promote critical thinking" beyond one-dimensional thought informed by technological rationality.[294] Douglas Kellner chalks up this difference of thought to two distinct trends within critical theory in the 1940s. The first being "the philosophical-cultural analysis of the trends of western civilization being developed by Horkheimer and

---

[293] It would be interesting to consider what Adorno and Horkheimer might think about the influx of popular culture into college courses. At least, or hopefully since I do not know with complete certainty, teaching popular culture teaches students to think critically about popular culture rather than being passive recipients.

[294] Douglas Kellner, introduction to *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, by Herbert Marcuse (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991). xiv.

Adorno" and "the more practical-political development of critical theory as a theory of social change proposed by Marcuse..."[295] According to Kellner, Marcuse's concept of one-dimensionality is not as "totalizing concept" as Horkheimer and Adorno's "culture industry."[296]The main point of contention between the two camps revolves around whether reification might be penetrated and to what extent critical consciousness makes this possible.

Marcuse argues society becomes administered to the point that people no longer recognize true needs from false or generated needs. The very trick, according to Marcuse, is that capitalism mimics the real human needs to such an extent that it is able to capitalize on them through commodification. To what extent has capitalism successfully manipulated the "needs" of individuals so that they experience the false needs as of their own volition? Marcuse states,

> In exchange for the commodities that enrich their life, the individuals sell not only their labor but also their free time. …They have innumerable choices, innumerable gadgets which are all of the same sort and keep them occupied and divert their attention from the real issue—which is the awareness that they could both work less and determine their own needs and satisfaction.[297]

If the overall goal of the Aristotelian-Marxist tradition was to reduce the amount of time spent in the realm of "necessity," Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man* addresses the realm of necessity through a consideration of capitalism's manipulation of "needs:"

We may distinguish both true and false needs. "False" are those which are superimposed upon the individual by particular social interests in his repression: the

---

[295] Kellner, introduction, xxii.
[296] "In light of Marcuse's criticism of "one-dimensional" states of affairs by posing alternatives that are to be fought for and realized, it is wrong to read him solely as a theorist of the totally administered society who completely rejects contradiction, conflict, revolt, and alternative thought and action." Kellner, introduction, xxvi.
[297] Marcuse, Herbert, *Eros and Civilization*: *A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1974),100.

needs which perpetuate toil, aggressiveness, misery, and injustice. Their satisfaction might be most gratifying to the individual, but this happiness is not a condition which has to be maintained and protected if it serves to arrest the development of the ability (his own and others) to recognize the disease of the whole and grasp the chances of curing the disease. The result then is euphoria in unhappiness. Most of the prevailing needs to relax, to have fun, to behave and consume in accordance with the advertisements, to love and hate what others love and hate, belong to this category of false needs.[298]

Concluding Remarks

Critical theory was on the mark to examine popular culture as a dominant way that people spend their time. As Aristotle argued, it matters how people spend their time. Do they have experiences ruling or only in being ruled? Are they passive or active participants in their world? Do they spend it in critical reflection in connection to meaningful action? Or do they passively accept what the culture industry provides? Given the relationships between life, time, and consciousness it makes sense to argue that it matters how individuals spend their time. As much as what people eat matters to their health, what people do with their time matters to their intellect or their ability to reflect on the lived experience beyond the confines provided by the culture industry, which if punctured ultimately is dissatisfying. If exercise is now considered a necessity for general health, why not consider intellectual effort a necessity for mental health?

Claims of elitism are problematic to the extent that the label too easily dismisses Adorno and Horkheimer's very valid criticisms of the culture industry, but perhaps more importantly it cheats working class people the ability to understand their personal

---

[298] Herbert Marcuse, *On-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991), 4.

experiences in a political way that might help them move away from the self-blame that results from the internalization of class shame. Class consciousness gives individuals empowerment to the extent that it illuminates the larger economic, political, and social forces at work that are simply beyond the individual's control. Adorno's analysis of culture might benefit from a re-evaluation of the working class and the continued need for class consciousness. The working class might prove to be ultimately more receptive to criticisms of the culture industry since they can never fully participate in all that it has to offer. The cultivation of working class culture remains a powerful force of resistance to capital since it reclaims the history of working class struggles. Politicizing one's consciousness is a painful process, especially if only a few individuals are able to think beyond the dominant ideology. This is, of course, best illustrated by Plato's "Allegory of the Cave," whereby the individual with political consciousness who re-enters the cave is found so threatening to the people in the cave's way of understanding themselves that they kill him. As Adorno states, "It suffices to remember how many sorrows he is spared who no longer thinks too many thoughts…"[299] The thinking individual may be filled with anxiety, rage, depression or all of the above.

Literary sources that address the externalization of internalized oppression are particularly useful in terms of examining the colonization of time. Frederick Douglass, for example, once wrote, "I would at times feel that learning to read had been a curse rather than a blessing. It had given me a view of my wretched condition, without the remedy. It opened my eyes to the horrible pit, but to no ladder upon which to get out."[300]

---

[299] Theodor W. Adorno, *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. J. Bernstein (London: Routledge, 1991), 46.
[300] Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave*, ed. John W. Blassingame, John R. McKivigan, and Peter P. Hinks (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).

Douglass' words are as beautiful as they are tragic in terms of illuminating the relationship between the consciousness of our "wretched condition" and the possibilities (or lack of possibilities) of transforming those very conditions. The experience Douglass describes is precisely what Hegel termed, "the unhappy consciousness." The unhappy consciousness today must confront a culture of "positive thinking" and "happy pills" that overemphasizes the individual as if the individual were not part of a collective in the first place.

Adorno makes three primary claims with regard to the culture industry. First and foremost, it is detrimental to the exercise of subjectivity. Second, it is detrimental to subjectivity because the culture industry holds a monopoly on culture to such an extent that any deviation from the known profit making strategies is rejected. This means that all of culture becomes uniform regardless of the form it takes. A good example is the reproduction of books as film and film into books. Thus even though consumers experience choice, their choices are greatly limited by the culture industry which classifies and organizes products to appeal to certain target audiences. The uniformity of culture makes it impossible for individuality to exist: "The sacrifice of individuality, which accommodates itself to the regularity of the successful, the doing what everybody does, follows from the basic fact that in broad areas the same thing is offered to everybody by the standardized production of consumption goods."[301] Adorno spends a good deal of time examining the transformation of culture under capitalism. Aesthetics no longer calls for active reflection on the part of the subject; instead, the culture industry provides all the answers since the mass produced films and books are formulaic and thus

[301] Theodor W. Adorno, "On the Fetish Character" in *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. J. Bernstein (London: Routledge, 1991), 40

are largely predictable. Thus there is little need for reflection on the part of the individual. The political manipulation of totalitarianism is clearly not far from Adorno's mind. The insidious nature of the culture industry's mass manipulation is that it is experienced as pleasurable. Perhaps our senses are dulled to the extent that art does not play such a fundamental role as it does under a repressive regime. For example, art is necessarily subversive when it is constrained by political forces whereby it must present communism in a favorable light. Art under capitalism functions not under… Even Adorno states, "Nonetheless, no half-way sensitive person can overcome the discomfort conditioned by his consciousness of a culture which is indeed administrated."[302]

[302] Theodor W. Adorno, "Culture and Adminstration," in *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. J. Bernstein (London: Routledge, 1991), 107.

Chapter V: Developing a Politics of Time: André Gorz and the Revaluation of Time

Given his critical role in developing a politics of time through the insights of Marxism, Critical Theory, Ecology, and Feminism it only makes sense to end by reflecting on the contributions of André Gorz (1924—2007). Throughout the entirety of his work, Gorz never lost sight of the centrality of the fight for time or its radical potential for democratic socialist reform. He was particularly taken with the idea of the Left developing a politics of time out of the general decline of full-time paid employment in Western Europe. Chastising the social democratic political parties and trade unions for continuing to define their political agenda along the lines of protecting full employment,[303] Gorz argued labor might instead develop a politics around time in order to bring about a more equitable distribution not only of the remaining economically viable work, but the time freed by technological innovations.[304] Although he focused primarily on Western Europe, Gorz's economic and political analysis is useful for thinking practically about the material conditions necessary for developing a politics of time in general, i.e., a mandatory reduction in work time combined with a basic or guaranteed income, as well as the primary obstacles to implementing this vision.[305]

Gorz's plan is not as utopian as it might at first appear given that France's implementation of the mandatory 35-hour work week in 2000 was an attempt to deal with the high levels of unemployment[306] now reflected in the economic recession of the

---

[303] Adrian Little, *The Political Thought of André Gorz* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 102.
[304] André Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, trans. Gillian Handyside and Chris Turner (New York: Verso, 1989), 6.
[305] Gorz's plan is not as utopian as it might at first appear given that France's implementation of the 35-hour work week in 2000 was an attempt to deal with the high levels of unemployment now reflected in the economic recession of the United States. However, the actors which might be the political force for implementing Gorz's political vision in the United States are clearly not identical as those located in Western Europe.
[306] Philippe Askenazy, "France's 35-Hour Workweek," in *Dissent* (Fall 2007), 30.

United States.[307] The fight for time also has a history in the United States leading up to the passage of Senator Hugo Black's 30-hours bill by the Senate in 1933.[308] The reduction of work hours was proposed in response to the Great Depression as a way to "increase productivity, reduce unemployment, drive up wages, strengthen the family, make time for domestic duties, [and] increase leisure time."[309] However, the "right to work" eventually won out over the fight for shorter hours, and the Roosevelt administration went with "work creation" over "work reduction," echoes of which remain at the center of U.S. economic ideology today.[310] As Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt argues,

With the failure of the Black-Connery bills and the advent of governmentally managed capitalism, the shorter-hour movement lost its short-lived political momentum. More important, the New Deal committed the federal government to assuring workers to a 40-hour week, and in so doing institutionalized a bias against free time in any form, leisure or unemployment. The two were virtually defined in terms of each other. Since the depression, few Americans have thought of work reduction as a natural, continuous, and positive result of economic growth and increased productivity. Instead, additional leisure has been seen as a drain on the economy, a liability on wages, and the abandonment of economic progress.[311]

---

[307] However, what is not entirely clear is who might be the political actors in the fight for time in the U.S.? Unlike France, the U.S. does not have democratic socialist political parties or a strong labor movement.
[308] For a detailed historical account of the fight for shorter hours in the United States see Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt, *Work Without End: Abandoning Shorter Hours for the Right to Work* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988).
[309] Kathi Weeks, "'Hours for What We Will': Work, Family, and the Movement for Shorter Hours," in *Feminist Studies* 35, No. 1 (Spring 2009), 104.
[310] Weeks, "'Hours for What We Will': Work, Family, and the Movement for Shorter Hours," 104.
[311] Benjamin Kline Hunnicutt, *Work Without End: Abandoning Shorter Hours for the Right to Work* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988), 309.

Although historians argue that the fight for time died in 1939, I argue that the fight for time in the context of the United States has continued in different, but related forms that need to inform one another in order to develop a more inclusive politics of time. In this chapter, I focus on bringing together the insights of Marxism and Feminism with regards to their respective analysis of the politics of time. In this respect, Gorz is useful since he revisits the domestic labor debates, but frames them in the larger economic framework.[312] Leaning more towards Marxism, Gorz fails to take feminist critiques of the sexual division of labor seriously, but his analysis might be strengthened by a more thorough integration of feminism.

The Fight for Time: Then and Now

Developed by Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx in response to the unregulated working conditions of early industrial capitalism, the fight for time originally sought to institutionalize limits to capitalism's colonization of time by setting limits on "work" time thus allowing for (if not guaranteeing) the possibility of self-determined or free time. Under modern capitalism, the possibilities of self-determined time were further constrained by the commodification of free time through the manipulation of "needs" and the passive amusements provided by the culture industry which critical theorists argued replaced more autonomous and self-determined forms of activity. In describing the shift from an economy based primarily on production to an economy based on consumption, Gorz identifies a corresponding shift from "prescriptive regulators [to] force individuals, on pain of certain penalties, to adopt functional forms of conduct" to "incentive regulators [to] ensure functional integration by inducing individuals to lend themselves of

[312] See Christine Delphy and Diana Leonard's *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies* (Cambridge: Polity Press: 1992) for a thorough overview of the Domestic

their free will, to the instrumentalization of their predetermined activity."[313] With regards to time, the primary prescriptive regulator has been the discipline of the workforce through clock time and the rhythm of machines, while the incentive regulators under and beyond Fordism have included the culture and leisure industries as a form of recompense that only works given the time constraints of capitalism.

A primary condition of self-determined time depends upon self-consciousness of the forces that constrain time. Thus the fight for time must address the relationship between production and consumption or "work" and "need" as situated under advanced capitalism. As Gorz states,

> That exit [from capitalism] implies that we free ourselves from the grip capitalism has exerted on consumption and from its monopoly of the means of production. It means re-establishing the unity between the subject of production and the subject of consumption, and hence recovering autonomy in the definition of our needs and their mode of satisfaction.[314]

Capitalism's greatest strength has been the colonization of necessity largely made possible through the manipulation of "necessary" labor time and the commodification of free time:

> As productivity and real wages rose during a period of growth, an increasing proportion of the population would have chosen to work less. But workers were never allowed to adjust the hours they put in to the amount of money they felt would take care of their needs. Economic rationality has no room for authentically free time which neither produces nor consumes commercial wealth. It demands the *full-time employment of those who are employed* by virtue not of an objective necessity but of its originating logic: wages must be fixed in such a way as to induce the worker to maximum effort.[315]

Labor Debates.

[313] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 35.

[314] André Gorz, *Ecologica*, trans. Chris Turner (London: Seagull Books, 2010) 38-39.

[315] Gorz quoted in Conrad Lodziak and Jeremy Tatman, *André Gorz: A Critical Introduction* (London: Pluto Press, 1997), 71.

The manipulation of necessity through the production and consumption cycles creates what appears to be a determined relationship between work and need despite the fact that "production has become increasingly distanced from need."[316] In contrast to the economic rationality of capitalism under which time is largely determined by the "needs" of capitalism, the fight for time has consistently prioritized the "needs" of human beings, especially those "needs" most neglected by capitalism. The persistent conflict between "work" time and time needed to attend to human needs presents itself as an opportunity to develop a political consciousness of time. Historically, this conflict has been of particular salience to women whose time is further constrained by the sexual division of labor. Given the crisis in the neo-liberal regime of accumulation based on finance capital and credit, the opportunities for developing a comprehensive alternative set of values through the fight for time present themselves, but connections need to be made between the larger economic trends and the opportunities to develop alternative ways to produce and consume. The fight for time provides "insight into necessity" since it is able to illuminate the unjust nature of the time constraints which people readily accept as unchangeable givens. Additionally, it provides an alternative understanding of time in relationship to freedom from the instability of the market.

Economic Rationality and the Ideology of Work

The fight for time is one way to articulate a set of limits based on an alternative understanding of value informed by a qualitative relationship between time and freedom, which might serve as a form of resistance to the ideological and structural imperatives of capitalism to produce and to consume in ways overly determined by capitalism. Given that the accumulation of capital has no inherent limits, including no limits to the amount

[316] Lodziak and Tatman, *André Gorz: A Critical Introduction*, 71.

of labor time extracted from workers as demonstrated by Marx, limits must be formulated outside the logic of what Gorz refers to as "economic rationality" or an understanding of time and work that aims at maximum efficiency for purposes of increased productivity and profit in order to ensure continued economic growth. Recognizing that time, much like work, is not inherently emancipatory due to capital's organization of time around the needs of production and consumption and in service to the profit motive, Gorz seeks to establish a new set of limits to economic rationality.[317] Making time a central category of analysis helps to illuminate alternatives to economic rationality since it focuses on the more qualitative aspects of life that cannot be so easily quantified and rationalized. Economic rationality is characterized by "the desire to *economize*, that is, to use the factors of production as efficiently as possible."[318] Economic rationality is related to instrumental rationality defined by the characteristics of "efficiency, productivity, [and] performance."[319] For Gorz, extending economic rationality to domestic labor is fundamentally irrational and politically problematic for women's equality because it reinforces the sexual division of labor. Gorz begins by confronting the prevalent "ideology of work,"[320] which he argues contributes to the extension of economic rationality by reinforcing the idea that work is the answer to all societal ills. The ideology of work is "a feature of 'work-based societies' that they consider work as at one and the

[317] "The history of capitalist society can thus be read as being first the history of the gradual abolition of the limits impeding the deployment of economic rationality, and then the history of the reimposition of new limits: from the abolition of slavery, of the sale of women, of the sale of children and of child labour, the setting of standards for housing density, hygiene, pollution control, and the like. To put it another way, the central problem of capitalist society, and the central issue in its political conflicts, has been, since the beginning, that of the limits inside which economic rationality is to operate." Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 127.
[318] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 2.
[319] Ibid., 5.
[320] Ibid., 219.

same time a moral duty, a social obligation and *the* route to personal success."[321] "Welfare to Work" is an example of a U.S. public policy informed by the ideology of work, but liberal feminists are as guilty of "valorizing work" as "an essential source of individual growth, self-worth, and social status" without any recognition of the social inequality between women.[322] Economic rationality focuses on calculability or quantity of available jobs rather than the quality of jobs and blatantly ignores the reality that the largest growing sector of the economy is the service sector much of which is contingent.[323] The ideology of work reinforces an antiquated political agenda which equates economic growth with full employment despite the reality of the decline of full employment and the corresponding rise in part-time and temporary service work in developed countries.

The rise of service work, Gorz argues, is an attempt "not to provide work but to save it" by applying economic rationality to previously unpaid domestic labor.[324] Gorz argues that these economic trends are "only possible in a context of growing social inequality, in which one part of the population monopolizes the well-paid activities and forces the other part into the role of servants."[325] Further, these economic trends contribute to the creation of a "dual economy":

> The division of society into classes involved in intense economic activity on the one hand, and a mass of people who are marginalized or excluded from the economic sphere on the other, will allow a sub-system to develop, in which the economic elite will buy leisure time by getting their own personal tasks done for them, at low cost, by other people. The work done by personal servants and enterprises providing personal services makes more time available for this elite and improves their quality of life; the leisure time of this economic elite provides

[321] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 219.
[322] Weeks, "'Hours for What We Will': Work, Family, and the Movement for Shorter Hours, 102.
[323] Little, *The Political Thought of André Gorz*, 102.
[324] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 4.
[325] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 156.

> jobs, which are in most cases insecure and underpaid, for a section of the masses excluded from the economic sphere.[326]

The dual economy results in an "unequal distribution of work in the economic sphere, coupled with the unequal distribution of the free time created by technical innovations."[327] The service sector ultimately serves those with access to full employment and saves them time since they are "able to purchase time more cheaply than they can sell it personally."[328] Yet, the service sector rarely provides economic security for the service sector workers themselves unless they manage to unionize.[329]

Autonomy/Heteronomy

In privileging time, Gorz is forced to reconsider labor as a foundational category of Marxist theory in general; more precisely he revisits the traditional leftist emphasis on workerism. He begins by making a distinction between "work" as informed by the conditions of employment under capitalism and labor defined by self-conscious interaction with nature.[330] He argues that "work" is not compatible with labor due to the fact that "work" is increasingly defined by heteronomy or "the totality of specialized activities which individuals have to accomplish as functions co-ordinated from outside by a pre-established organization."[331] In other words, the "sphere of heteronomy" is not self-directed, but other directed by the "hetero-regulation" of the market, "which imposes its laws from without on individuals who are then ruled by them and are forced to adapt and to modify their conduct and projects according to an external, statistical and totally

---

[326] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 5.
[327] Ibid., 6.
[328] Ibid., 5.
[329] For a good discussion of the turn toward service work unionism, see Dorothy Sue Cobble and Michael Merrill, "The Promise of Service Work Unionism" in *Service Work: Critical Perspectives*, eds. Marek Korczynski and Cameron Lynne Macdonald (New York: Routledge, 2009), 153-174.
[330] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 13.
[331] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 32.

involuntary balance of forces."[332] Recognizing the increasing complexity of bureaucracy analyzed by Max Weber, Gorz argues that self-determined work under such conditions is not possible since "the overall working of these apparatuses is beyond the comprehension of the individuals within them and even of the individuals (ministers, managing directors, departmental heads and so on) who (formally) bear institutional responsibility for them."[333]

Rather than transforming the conditions within the sphere of heteronomy such as those related to worker control and self-management as he did in earlier proposals[334], Gorz seeks to limit the impact of this experience of "work" by decreasing work time and thus increasing the time available for autonomous activity outside the economic sphere. Although reminiscent of the Aristotelian-Marxist formulation of the relationship between necessity and freedom whereby reducing the time spent on necessity increases the time for the exercise of freedom, Gorz argues the necessity/freedom distinction no longer makes sense given that work under capitalism is not defined by human need, but economic rationality or rationality defined by the imperatives of the market:

> This is why, in our daily experience, it is no longer so much the freedom/necessity distinction which is decisive, but the autonomy/heteronomy opposition. Freedom consists less (or rather consists less and less) in freeing ourselves from the work we need to do to live and more to do in freeing ourselves from heteronomy, that is, in reconquering spaces of autonomy in which we can *will what we are doing and take responsibility for it*.[335]

Gorz refers to autonomous activity as "those activities…which are themselves their own end. In those activities, subjects experience their own sovereignty and fulfill themselves

---

[332] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 34.
[333] Ibid., 32.
[334] Little, *The Political Thought of André Gorz*, 28.
[335] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 166.

as persons."[336] Gorz includes unpaid reproductive labor or "tasks, repeated day after day, which are indispensable for the maintenance and reproduction of our individual lives"[337] as autonomous because they are guided by values outside of economic rationality. For this reason, he argues against the commodification of domestic and care labor.

The extension of economic rationality beyond the production process and into previously uncommodified domestic labor (and leisure activities) in order to "make work"[338] is one of the primary obstacles Gorz identifies in reducing work time. Consequently, Gorz offers provocative arguments against the feminist "wages for housework" and "wages for motherhood" which are useful for reconsidering the domestic labor debates[339] through a politics of time. With Gorz, I argue that a reduction in work time is a radical proposal that fundamentally challenges the ideology of work and corresponding work ethic. Against Gorz, I argue that women's continued disproportionate responsibility for domestic and care labor *paid or not*, limits their access to self-determined time in ways not accounted for in gender-neutral analysis of time under capitalism. For this reason, a politics of time must incorporate feminist criticisms of the sexual division of labor as related to women's oppression. Additionally, a politics of time must address recent feminist criticisms of the original domestic labor debates for failing to provide a historical and intersectional analysis of the sexual, racial, and global divisions of domestic and care labor between women.[340] Inequality between women

---

[336] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 167.
[337] Ibid., 13.
[338] Weeks, "'Hours for What We Will: Work, Family, and the Movement for Shorter Hours," 104.
[339] See Christine Delphy and Diana Leonard's *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies* (Cambridge: Polity Press: 1992) for a thorough overview of the Domestic Labor Debates.
[340] "Marxist feminists place the gendered construction of reproductive labor at the center of women's oppression. They point out that this labor is performed disproportionately by women and is essential to the industrial economy. Yet because it takes place outside of the market, it is invisible, not recognized as real

allows some women the option of shifting the sexual division of labor onto the backs of "other" women rather than fighting for a more equitable distribution of domestic and care labor and thus self-determined time for all. Although lacking an intersectional analysis of the sexual, racial, and global divisions of labor, Gorz's criticisms of the commodification of domestic and care labor remains useful in demonstrating how feminism is itself susceptible to reinforcing economic rationality and the corresponding ideology of work to the detriment of expanding equality for all women and not simply the privileged few.

The Commodification of Domestic Labor

The rise of the service sector lead Gorz to engage feminist critiques of the sexual division of labor in the household since women are disproportionately represented in service work and the commodification of domestic labor bears at least some resemblance to the "wages for housework" campaigns first waged by feminists in the 1970s as a proposed solution to gender inequality. Initially referred to as the "politics of housework," feminists fought for the "recognition and redistribution"[341] of both domestic and care labor or what is now referred to as social reproduction.[342]With regards to time,

---

work. Men benefit directly and indirectly from this arrangement—directly in that they contribute less labor in the home while enjoying the services women provide as wives and mothers and indirectly in that, freedom of domestic labor, they can concentrate their efforts on paid employment and attain primacy in that area. Thus the sexual division of reproductive labor interacts with and reinforces sexual division in the labor market. These analyses drew attention to the dialectics of production and reproduction and male privilege in both realms. When they represent gender as the sole basis for assigning reproductive labor, however, they imply that all women have the same relationship to it and it is therefore a universal female experience." Evelyn Nakano Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Vol. 18, Issue 1 (October 1992): 2.

[341] I borrowed this term from Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth, *Redistribution or Recognition?: A Political-philosophical Exchange*, trans. Joel Gold, James Ingram, and Christiane Wilke (New York: Verson, 2003).

[342] "The term social reproduction is used by feminist scholars to refer to the array of activities and relationships involved in maintaining people both on a daily basis and intergenerationally. Reproductive labor includes activities such as purchasing household goods, preparing and serving food, laundering and repairing clothing, maintaining furnishings and appliances, socializing children, providing care and emotional support for adults, and maintaining kin and community ties." Evelyn Nakano Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," 1.

feminists point out that despite the political and economic gains made by the women, women continue to spend a disproportionate amount of time on social reproduction than their male counterparts:[343]

> Feminist scholars have argued that women's continued responsibility for unpaid work in the home disadvantages them in the labor market, both through periodic or long-term absences and through the burden of the second shift that wage earning women still bear at home. These labor market disadvantages restrict women to lower-paying, lower-status jobs, reinforcing men's greater access to both resources and power. In turn, this inequality at the macro level maintains material constraints and ideological norms that uphold the gendered division of labor in the home.[344]

A politics of time must address the specific set of time constraints caused by the sexual division of labor, but not solely for the purposes of freeing up women to participate in the labor market since this simply reinforces the idea that work is inherently emancipatory and ignores the inequality between women based on factors other than gender, i.e., the racial and global divisions of labor.[345] The realm of necessity or social reproduction is never overcome as much as it is historically assigned and re-assigned on the basis of

---

[343] Sayer, Liana C., "Gender, Time and Inequality: Trends in Women's and Men's Paid Work, Unpaid Work and Free Time" in *Social Forces*, Vol. 84, Number 1 (September 2005); "Married Parents' Use of Time 2003-2006" available at the Bureau of Labor Statistics: http://www.bls.gov/news.release/atus2.nr0.htm; Belkin, Lisa, "When Mom and Dad Share It All," NY Times, June 15, 2008 available at http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/15/magazine/15parentting-t.html. Unfortunately, and perhaps of interest to the topic at hand is that race is rarely factored into the empirical research that measures women's versus men's contributions to the household.

[344] Mignon Duffy, "Doing the Dirty Work: Gender, Race, and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective" in *Gender & Society* Vol. 21, 3 (June 2007): 315.

[345] "Reproductive labor has divided along racial as well as gender lines and the specific characteristics of the division have varied regionally and changed over time as capitalism has reorganized labor, shifting parts of it from the household to the market. In the first half of the century racial-ethnic women were employed as servants to perform reproductive labor in white households, relieving white middle-class women of onerous aspects of that work; in the second half of the century, with the expansion of commodified services (services turned into commercial products or activities), racial-ethnic women are disproportionately employed as service workers in institutional settings to carry out lower-level "public" reproductive labor, while cleaner white collar supervisory and lower professional positions are filled by white women." Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," 3.

hierarchies formed around the intersections of class, gender, race, and nationality.[346] The realm of necessity is thus minimized for some at the expense of others who serve them.

Although he fails to address the racial and global divisions of reproductive labor between women, Gorz includes the constraints on women's time due to the sexual division of labor in developing of a politics of time:

> In particular, the labour movement's campaign for a reduction in working hours cannot ignore the fact that the unpaid work done by women in the private sphere can be as hard as the labour which men and women have to put up with to earn their living. The campaign for shortening of working hours must, then, go hand in hand with a new and equitable distribution of paid work amongst all those who wish to work, and for an equitable redistribution of the unpaid tasks of the domestic sphere.[347]

Still, at other times, he expresses skepticism: "Do people really 'work' five hours in their homes after having worked seven or eight hours outside the home?"[348] What Gorz means is whether domestic work is (or should) be directed by economic rationality in the private sphere in the same manner as it is in the public sphere? He seeks to demonstrate the absurdity of applying economic rationality to domestic labor:

> In other words, equity and economic logic appear to demand that everything people do be evaluated according to its exchange value on the market: the night the mother spends at the bedside of her sick child should then be paid for at the price it would cost in a confectioner's; the birthday cake Grandma baked charged at the price it would cost in a confectioner's; sexual relations paid for at the rate each of the partners might get at an Eros Centre, maternity at the price charged by the surrogate mother.[349]

For Gorz, domestic and care-giving activities are of *incommensurable* value and should be kept that way in order to protect the "last vestiges of self-determined and self-

---

[346] Intersectional analysis cuts across various categories of oppression. Each analysis of oppression and strategy for resistance is unique insofar as it addresses different type of political demands as well as different analytical constructs and research agendas.
[347] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 224.
[348] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 136.
[349] Ibid., 136.

regulated life."[350] For these reasons, he argues against the feminists' "wages for housework" proposals since they seem to endorse the extension of economic rationality into the private household which in turn institutionalizes domestic labor as "women's work," rather than redistributing domestic and care work on a more equitable basis.

Although he describes the material conditions that might make gender equality possible, i.e., a reduction in work combined with a basic income, Gorz never fully articulates how the sexual division of labor itself might be institutionally mediated. Instead, he reasons that a reduction in work time might lead individuals regardless of sex to do for themselves what they can only pay for now:

> In other words, when free time ceases to be scarce, certain educative, caring and assistance activities and the like may be partially repatriated into the sphere of autonomous activities and reduce the demand for these things to be provided by external services, whether public or commercial.[351]

While this may be true for the more enjoyable aspects of care giving or what is commonly referred to as "quality time," Gorz's reasoning is not as applicable to the more tedious aspects of domestic labor. Historically, the more onerous aspects of housework have been delegated to women of lesser economic and social status not due to lack of time, but because of privilege and status[352] usually in relation to the social construction of white femininity. While his general concerns about the consequences of applying economic rationality toward social reproductive work are valid because they invoke ethical questions about the applicability of economic rationality to care giving, it is

---

[350] André Gorz, *Farewell to the Working Class: An Essay on Post-industrial Socialism*, trans. Michael Sonenscher (London: Pluto Press, 1997), 84.
[351] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*.
[352] Bridget Anderson's "Just Another Job? The Commodification of Domestic Labor" in *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*, ed. Barbarah Ehrenreich and Arlie Hochschild (New York: Metropolitan, 2002), 106.

simply not realistic to argue that a viable solution at this point in time is to exclude this type of work from commodification altogether.

Despite his failure to acknowledge the racial and global divisions of social reproductive labor, Gorz's approach to the sexual division of labor remain instructive insofar as they move feminists beyond the ideology of work as exemplified in "Welfare to Work," and the idea that domestic and care labor is women's responsibility paid or not. Gorz's approach also releases the fight for time from an approach based on the rational that women need more time for their domestic and care responsibilities, which tend to "invoke and reinforce the conservative or neoliberal family values and agendas."[353] A politics of time must focus not only on the conditions that make it possible to determine one's time by "gaining a measure of separation or detachment only from capitalist command," as noted by Gorz, but also from the "imposed norms of gender and sexuality, and traditional standards of proper family roles."[354] Additionally, any analysis of social reproduction must take into account the racial and global divisions of labor that are rendered necessary by the lack of a substantive welfare state in the U.S.

Feminist Approaches to the Commodification of Domestic Labor

The politics of housework is probably most familiar in the United States as the radical feminist demand for men to participate equally in the nuclear household. And although this particular political strategy may emphasize ideology over the mutually reinforcing political and economic structural underpinnings of the sexual division of labor, it does underscore the continued need for feminist consciousness around the

---

[353] Weeks criticizes Arlie Russell Hochschild's "family-centered approach in her 1997 *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home becomes Work*" for falling into conservative family values agendas Weeks, "'Hours for What We Will': Work, Family, and the Movement for Shorter Hours," 106-07.
[354] Weeks, "Hours for What We Will": Work, Family, and the Movement for Shorter Hours," 118.

politics of housework as an issue of unequal time distribution related to women's potential for self-development beyond the "gender-neutral and… autonomous market individual as an ideal"[355] which only colludes with the processes of capital accumulation at the same time it denies the reality that workers of both sexes have family responsibilities. Radical feminist work on the politics of housework remains powerful to the extent that it illuminates the political aspect of the everyday in an accessible fashion[356] by revealing exactly how the personal is political[357] and why women have a right to demand change. Women's demand for equality in the heterosexual household remains an important step to the empowerment of women,[358] but it should be noted that it is an individual solution to a collective problem, which begs the political question as to how time should be distributed across productive and reproductive labor in a given society if not by sex as the automatic default? Women's freedom depends upon the answer to this question.

In her classic essay, "The Politics of Housework," Pat Mainardi argued that men benefit from the sexual division of labor since women are assigned the domestic tasks that are simultaneously the most necessary and repetitive, and as a consequence the most time consuming:

---

[355] Dorothy Sue Cobble, The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 8.

[356] By accessible I mean both easy to read and understand and more readily available due to the grassroots nature of second wave feminism. Bell Hooks discusses the advantages and disadvantages as second wave feminism became institutionalized in the university setting and became less grassroots. Along with Bell Hooks, the question of accessibility to feminist thought is of continued interest since feminism has the potential to transform women's lives in significant ways. See Hooks' *Feminism is for Everybody*: *Passionate Politics* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000) and *Feminist Theory: Margin to Center* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000).

[357] The private sphere has historically been framed as apolitical. Second wave feminism challenged this idea by demonstrating the connections between the private and public spheres. In other words, the sexual division of labor in the household is perpetuated outside of the household as well.

> Here is my list of dirty chores: buying groceries, carting them home and putting them away; cooking meals and washing dishes and pots; doing the laundry; digging out the place when things get out of control; washing floors. The list could go on but the sheer necessities are bad enough. All of us have to do these jobs, *or get someone else to do them for us*.[359]

Necessity compels eating, drinking, and sleeping, but it is patriarchy and the resulting sexual division of labor that genders time distribution across the realms of reproduction and production. Mainardi's primary objection to the sexual division of labor is that it is not a fair division of labor because it privileges men's time over women's time in a very specific way that benefits men and disadvantages women with regard to free time in private realm.[360] As she states, "Participatory democracy begins at home. If you are planning to implement your politics there are certain things to remember. He is feeling it more than you. He's losing some leisure and you're gaining it. The measure of your oppression is his resistance."[361] In contrast to Aristotle's justification for women's confinement to the private sphere so that male citizens might have enough time to exercise freedom through political engagement in the public sphere, Mainardi argues that democracy must take place in all spheres of life including the private sphere, especially if women are to participate. In a similar fashion, the fight for free time as originally conceived of as that time free from the realm of production must take into account the

---

[358] It should be noted that non-heterosexual households have been found to be more egalitarian than heterosexual with regards to housework. See "When Mom and Dad Share It All," NY Times, June 15, 2008 available at http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/15/magazine/15parentting-t.html, 10.

[359] Pat Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework" in *The Politics of Housework*, ed. Ellen Malos (Cheltenhan: New Clarion Press, 1995), 83 (emphasis mine).

[360] Mainardi notes that both she and her partner have careers: "We both have careers, both had to work a couple of days a week to earn enough to live on. So why shouldn't we share the housework?" Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework," 83.

[361] Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework," 83-85.

gendered aspect of time since many women do not experience the realm of reproduction as free time, but as a "second shift."[362]

Mainardi translates her husband's responses to her request that they share the burden of housework. While he states, "I don't mind sharing the housework but I don't do it very well. We should each do the things we're best at."[363] According to Nancy Folbre this very argument is made by conservative scholars:

> Conservative social thinkers, including many economists, insist that women are naturally suited to child care, and this, in turn, gives them a comparative advantage in providing care to others, including the sick and the elderly. Specialization, after all, increases efficiency, but specialization also affects the development of human capabilities and the exercise of bargaining power.[364]

Mainardi politicizes her partner's statement: "Meaning: Historically the lower classes (Blacks and women) have had hundreds of years doing menial jobs. It would be a waste of manpower to train someone else to do them now."[365] It is precisely this mentality toward necessity or "menial"[366] jobs that creates distance (consciously or not) between people who do these jobs and people who do not.[367] This is especially true if the people

---

[362] Dorothy Sue Cobble argues that working class women fought for time so that they might fulfill their household and childcare roles: "The politics of time were as gendered as the politics of pay in the postwar era. Labor women supported efforts to reduce work time for different reasons then did men, and at times, they devised their own distinct counterproposals to those of the male-led labor movement. Working class women desired leisure as did men, but finding ways of meeting their dual responsibilities as breadwinner and caretaker was of even greater concern." Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America*, 140.

[363] Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework," 84.

[364] Nany Folbre, *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values* (New York: New Press, 2001), 5.

[365] Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework," 84.

[366] The Oxford English Dictionary defines "menial" as follows: " Of service, employment, etc.: proper to or performed by a menial or domestic servant. In later use only with disparaging implication: of the nature of drudgery; servile, degrading; (spec. of work) lacking in reward or prestige, glamour, or status, undignified; requiring little skill" available online at http://dictionary.oed.com. However, this understanding of menial confers a value to this type of work in a specific cultural context. In contrast, Buddhism may value this work, not in terms of capitalism, but as intrinsically meaningful as a physical way to discipline the mind and body.

[367] People working in the service sector are, I suspect, routinely verbally abused, which seems to be the customer's right given that the "customer is always right."

who do the so-called menial jobs are kept invisible so that there is never a chance to see the person's humanity.[368]

Since women spend a large portion of their time in service to husbands and children, Mainardi argues that men have more time to develop their potential beyond attending to their or their children's basic biological needs:

> If human endeavors are like a pyramid with man's highest achievements at the top, then keeping oneself alive is at the bottom. Men have always had servants (you) to take care of this bottom stratum of life while he has confined his efforts to the rarefied upper regions. It is thus ironic when they ask of women: 'Where are your great painters, statesmen, etc.?' Mrs. Matisse ran a millinery shop so he could paint. Mrs. Martin Luther King kept his house and raised his babies.[369]

Mainardi argues both for the recognition of women's historical contributions to the development of culture and politics and an acknowledgement of the unequal distribution of time as situated across necessity and freedom at the expense of women's self-development.[370] If, as Mainardi's argument goes, men were able to develop to their potential as artists or orators because they had wives devoted to the realm of necessity in service to them, it would appear that the only way women can experience this sort of freedom is if they are also able to assign, in whole or part, their share of necessity to someone else. And, this is precisely what has taken place as previously unpaid domestic and care labor has moved into the marketplace. Instead of men carrying half of the burden, though there are always exceptions within individual relationships, the work has shifted to hired help for those families with the means, in the form of personal nannies, certified nursing assistants, and housecleaners, all of which are disproportionately filled by women and not men of lesser socio-economic status. Those families without the

---

[368] I am thinking here of janitors that clean buildings at night.
[369] Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework."
[370] Fraser, *Redistribution or Recognition?: A Political-Philosophical Exchange*.

means to hire private help negotiate time constraints by other commodified means.[371] As Nancy Folbre argues, "We ignore the fact that working for pay actually costs money—the money required to purchase substitutes for family care."[372] Since reproductive labor extends beyond the private sphere, the "equation of women with unpaid domestic work in the private sphere and men with paid work in the public sphere" is no longer an adequate model to thinking about the sexual division of labor.[373] The formulation of freedom as minimizing the amount of time spent in necessity needs to be rethought in light of the gendered aspect of time since the realm of necessity or social reproductive labor continues to be filled disproportionately with women whether it takes place in the private sphere or not. A better approach might reflect on how a democracy might address the realm of necessity so that it is more equitably distributed and this cannot be addressed simply by offering state subsidized child and elder care since the gendered nature of reproductive labor stays in place.

Mainardi goes on to frame the issue explicitly in terms of time as distributed across necessity and freedom: "One hour a day is a low estimate of the amount of time one has to spend 'keeping' oneself. By foisting this off on others, man has seven hours a week—one working day—more to play with his mind and not his human needs."[374] Thus she defines necessity broadly as "human needs" and freedom as time for thought. Men benefit from the sexual division of labor in terms of potential (if not realized) time for self-development since it is women, and not men who are gendered to be consumed with

---

[371] The negotiations of time constraints created by capital are thus resolved by capital as the previously unpaid reproductive labor of women has become increasingly commodified. Yet, these positions are still marked by the sexual division of labor.

[372] Nancy Folbre, "Valuing Unpaid Work Matters, Especially for the Poor," *New York Times*, September 21, 2009, http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/21/valuing-unpaid-work-matters-especially-for-the-poor/.

[373] Duffy, "Doing the Dirty Work: Gender, Race, and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective," 315.

necessity in service to others. This does not mean, however, that all people will use free time for the self-development. The preoccupation with necessity is no accident, but is the result of the gendering of time.

The gendered preoccupation with necessity is politically significant for there is an argument to be made that there is a correlation between how people spend their time and their self-consciousness, especially if their time is spent disproportionately in service to another in a relatively more powerful position. Mainardi suggests this very correlation:

The psychology of oppressed peoples is not silly. Blacks, women, and immigrants have all employed the same psychological mechanisms to survive. Admiring the oppressor, glorifying the oppressor, wanting to be like the oppressor, wanting the oppressor to like them.[375]

The colonization of time through accumulations by dispossession creates a situation of inequality whereby one person spends their time in the realm of necessity in service to another. This is particularly problematic when it comes to women as a group under patriarchal capitalism since their sense of self is largely formed around time devoted to others, especially through emotional and care giving work. The old adage that the "way to a man's heart is his stomach" comes to mind. If patriarchal capitalism leaves men as a collective disproportionally in positions of power (economic, political, etc.), women must learn to negotiate within the context of an unequal distribution of power. This negotiation takes time and thought. This negotiation is not necessarily conscious or informed by feminist thought, which means that negotiations take multiple forms that may be in direct political opposition to one another. To account for these differences

---

[374] Mainardi, "The Politics of Housework," 86.

between women, second wave feminists spoke of "false consciousness" as opposed to "raised consciousness" meaning that some women did not have a political awareness about their specific historical position. In other words, they understood their position as unique and personal, rather than as political. A feminist consciousness is one that understands women's position not fixed or natural, but as capable of being transformed so that women's potential might be realized beyond the specific gender roles of any given time period.

An important development since the 1970s (and the second wave of feminism) has been the commodification of women's formerly unpaid reproductive activities. As Evelyn Nakano Glenn points out, "In the second half of the twentieth century, with goods production almost completely incorporated into the market, reproduction has become the next major target for commodification."[376] The commodified approach to reproductive labor has been rightly criticized as leaving unequal gender relations in place, but it should also be noted that the growing visibility of this work has also been a benefit as unions have increasingly started to organize the service sector including domestic labor. What is at stake for feminists seems to differ with regard to critics of commodification. As Glenn states,

> Aside from the tendency of capital to expand into new areas for profit making, the very conditions of life brought about by large-scale commodity production have increased the need for commercial services. As household members spend more of their waking hours employed outside the home, they have less time and inclination to provide for one another's social and emotional needs.[377]

---

[375] This description is only complicated by thinking about relationships based on "love" when love is based on the self-sacrifice of one person in service to the other.
[376] Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," 5.
[377] Ibid., 5.

Thus we see the ways in which the time constraints caused by the colonization of time only help to secure and privilege the market as the only source of fulfilling our needs. Glenn quotes Harry Braverman:

> The population no longer relies upon social organization in the form of family, friends, neighbors, community, elders, children, but with few exceptions must got to the market and only to the market, not only for food, clothing, and shelter, but also for recreation, amusement, security, for the care of the young, the old, the sick, the handicapped.[378]

The growing recognition of paid domestic labor and the rise of the service sector in general pose benefits and disadvantages for women who occupy these positions. First, the commodification of domestic labor has arguably increased the visibility of "women's work," especially given the transition from an economic system based on production or "the making of things" to an economic system based on consumption or "the provision of services."[379] Second, the commodification of domestic labor only increases the power of the market as "reproduction has become the next major target for commodification."[380] Service work has come to be recognized as a legitimate source of work. Prohibiting the applicability of economic rationality toward domestic and care labor will not suffice. Applying economic rationality to service work may be the only available means to rendering service work both visible and valuable. An alternative approach might focus on unionizing service workers, private and public so as to give domestic and care workers the same rights afforded to other workers. However, unionizing only makes sense if the cheapest sources of labor, i.e., undocumented immigrants are included in unionization

---

[378] Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," 5

[379] Cobble, "The Promise of Service Work Unionism."

[380] Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," 5.

efforts. These jobs cannot be eliminated because they represent a human need that cannot be outsourced or resolved through technological solutions.

In contrast to Gorz, Margaret Jane Radin offers a more nuanced approach to setting limits to economic rationality or what she refers to as commodification. Similar to Gorz, she wants to contextualize commodification as a world view shaped by capitalism which informs our understanding of value, but she rejects the compartmentalization of market and non-market realms. Instead she argues that in reality what exists today is "incomplete commodification." She is particularly interested in what she refers to as "contested commodities" or those "instances in which we experience personal and social conflict about the process and the result [of commodification]."[381] In cases of contested commodities, Radin argues what exists is "incomplete commodification" to refer to the limits of commodification when it comes to personal attributes. Gorz fears that extending economic rationality to domestic and care labor will undermine social obligation and reciprocity. What feminist have argued is that paying for care work does not necessarily remove the human element. Radin argues that commodification or economic rationality should not be analyzed apart from the economic conditions that lead people into "desperate exchanges" in the first place, and she wants to situate commodification in relation to other kinds of social oppression.[382]

The politics of housework takes a decidedly different angle when approached by feminists interested in the intersections between the racial and sexual divisions of labor. An intersectional approach challenges analyses of social reproduction based solely on the sexual division of labor in the private sphere by emphasizing the inequalities between

[381] Margaret Jane Radin, *Contested Commodities* (Cambridge: MA: Harvard Press, 1996), xi-xii.
[382] Radin, *Contested Commodities*, 155.

women whereby women of color and working class women have historically been denied access to the same "intimate equality"[383] or "the ability to devote oneself, wholly or in part, to intimate tasks for the benefit of one's own family,"[384] afforded to privileged white women. In some ways, it seems Black women's fight for access to "intimate equality" was at odds with white women's established access to "intimate equality" because it was largely made possible by the hiring of Black women as servants. As Glenn states, "In the domestic sphere, instead of questioning the inequitable gender division of labor, [white feminists] sought to slough of the more burdensome tasks onto more oppressed groups of women."[385]

Glenn argues, "Historically race and gender have developed as separate topics of inquiry, each with its own literature and concepts."[386] As a consequence, reproductive labor has been largely ignored in studies of race. This is interesting insofar as it might be related to a possible racial division of labor within the scholarship of social reproduction itself. When social reproduction is thought of only with reference to gender, the inequalities between women remains somewhat hidden. Again, women of relative privilege have been able to manage the double burden or the second shift by hiring

---

[383] "Black women, from the moment they began conscious political organizing, always articulated a concurrent critique of their place in American society that centered on their desire for access to legitimate intimate life. In claiming intimate equality, black women after Emancipation asserted their right to be women, wives, and mothers, rights enjoyed by most white women at the time, as much as the franchise was a privilege of all white men." Shatema Annice Threadcraft, "'Labor,' Free and Equal: The Black Female Body and the Body Politics" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2010), 15

[384] Threadcraft, "'Labor,' Free and Equal: The Black Female Body and the Body Politics" 12.

[385] Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," 7.

[386] Ibid., 1.

women of color and working class women to assist them. As Glenn argues that not all women have had the same relationship to reproductive labor:[387]

> Reproductive labor has divided along racial as well as gender lines and that the specific characteristics of the division have varied regionally and changed over time as capitalism has reorganized labor, shifting parts of it from the household to the market. In the first half of the century racial-ethnic women were employed as servants to perform reproductive labor in white households, relieving white middle-class women of onerous aspects of that work; in the second half of the century, with the expansion of commodified services (services turned into commercial products or activities), racial-ethnic women are disproportionately employed as service workers in institutional settings to carry out lower-level "public" reproductive labor, while cleaner white collar supervisory and lower professional positions are filled by white women.[388]

In other words, the historical racial division of labor in the household between women of different status is reproduced as occupational segregation within paid reproductive labor.

This difference in time distribution structures relations between women of unequal status by lending itself to a general association or stereotyping of one group of people with a certain type of work. Cameron Lynne Macdonald and David Merrill offer two explanations for occupational segregation: "Dominate groups control access to employment and provide access to coveted jobs based on membership to "ingroups" and "outgroups", while simultaneously making those inequalities appear "natural" and "a natural human tendency to order a complex world through the use of categories. Individuals use stereotypes as an unconscious 'cognitive shortcut' to sort through the

---

[387] "Marxist feminists place the gendered construction of reproductive labor at the center of women's oppression. They point out that this labor is performed disproportionately by women and is essential to the industrial economy. Yet because it takes place outside of the market, it is invisible, not recognized as real work. Men benefit directly and indirectly from this arrangement—directly in that they contribute less labor in the home while enjoying the services women provide as wives and mothers and indirectly in that, freed of domestic labor, they can concentrate their efforts on paid employment and attain primacy in that area. Thus the sexual division of reproductive labor interacts with and reinforces sexual division in the labor market. These analyses drew attention to the dialectics of production and reproduction and male privilege in both realms. When they represent gender as the sole basis for assigning reproductive labor, however, they imply that all women have the same relationship to it and it is therefore a universal female

barrage of info…[which] occur whether or not a person carries animosity towards a given group."[389]

Global Division of Labor

Nancy Hartsock's recent work on the relationship between women, primitive accumulation and social reproduction is a good starting point for thinking about the global division of labor. Through her gender analysis of primitive accumulation, Hartsock is able to make connections between the exploitation of the global South's women's labor, in part, to fulfill the social reproductive needs of the global North. As she argues:

> [There is a] creation of a new class of landless free laborers. Many forces are at work at present which are creating new classes of especially, women workers. The number of women wage workers worldwide has vastly expanded since the 1980s. moreover, the skills required by the new networked, informational economies tend to draw on women's relational skills. One can point as well to many specific s that push/pull women into the labour force: the fact that in many places women cannot own land, the pressures that lead women to migrate in search of jobs to support their children, the worldwide traffic in persons, especially women and girls, the impact of welfare reform in the USA, with its work requirements for recipients, etc.[390]

In a similar fashion, Rhacel Salazar Parrenas makes a powerful argument that connects "regressive welfare state regimes" and the politics of neoliberalism which "keeps childcare a private and not a public responsibility."[391] She argues that "the inadequacy of state welfare support is one of the greatest burdens on women in the labor force.

---

experience." Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor," 2.

[388] Ibid., 3.

[389] Cameron Lynne Macdonald and David Merrill, "Intersectionality in the Emotional Proletariat: A New Lens on Employment Discrimination in Service Work" in *Service Work: Critical Perspectives*, eds. Marek Korczynski and Cameron Lynne Macdonald (New York: Routledge, 2009), 114-15.

[390] Nancy Hartsock, "Globalization and Primitive Accumulation: The Contributions of David Harvey's Dialectical Materialism" in *David Harvey: A Critical Reader*, ed. Noel Castree and Derek Gregory, (Malden: MA: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd., 2006), 181.

Moreover, it instigates care inequalities between women and nations. Privatization engenders the commodification of care and the search for affordable care workers" and points to the example of the U.S. as one of the richest nations with the "least welfare provisions" citing the overall lack of "universal health care, paid maternity, and parental leave, government provided childcare or family care giving allowances."[392] Thus Parrenas is able to persuasively demonstrate a connection between the "social patterns of welfare provisions" in the U.S. and "the direction of the migratory flows of foreign domestic workers" to fill the commodified versions of this labor.[393] The use of guest workers as sources of cheap labor has been a continual strategy by the U.S. that works by pulling in workers when they are needed and pushing them back out when they are not.[394]

Concluding Thoughts

Though few links have been made between the labor movement's fight for time and feminism, the fight for time was taken up by second wave feminists in their fight against the sexual division of labor in the household that at core was a fight over the unequal distribution of time between necessity and freedom between women and men. What was at stake was women's potential time for self-development, but reframed the domestic labor debates forces the political question of necessity. The division of labor based along sex, race, class, and nationality lines creates a division that creates divides between who does and does not do certain jobs. This division between manual and mental labor creates real divisions between human beings since it constructs and sustains a hierarchy. Meaningful time would mean having time that is balanced across necessity

---

[391] Rhacel Salazar Parenas, "The Globalization of Carework" in *Service Work: Critical Perspectives*, eds. Cameron Macdonald and Marek and Korczynski (New York: Routledge, 2008), 143.
[392] Ibid, 143-45.
[393] Ibid, 145.

and freedom. When it comes to women, the necessity/freedom divide is not possible because women have historically been not only confined to the private realm of necessity, but also the embodiment of necessity or rather women's subordination has been justified historically by justifications based on women's biology, specifically their reproductive capacities.

[394] Ibid, 145.

Chapter VI: Conclusion

The fight for time remains an indispensible political project that needs to be recovered for the purpose of uniting disparate political concerns related in their mutual criticisms of capitalism and its detrimental impact on the quality of life. As a category of experience underlying justice, time has the potential to bring together a range of political organizations under the fight for time as it relates to their specific goals. In particular, I have brought together the political concerns of Marxism, Feminism, and Critical Theory in order to extricate their respective contributions to different aspects of the fight for time, i.e., the fight for time, the domestic labor debates, and criticisms of the culture industry. The fight for time as developed within the Marxist tradition is particularly useful because it offers a history of asserting the radical notion that the quality of life is fundamentally related to the ability to control one's time. Furthermore, the fight for time transforms freedom from an abstract concept into a concrete measurement of "discretionary time" at one's disposal.[395] My research provides a complimentary political-theoretical approach to the existing empirical research on "discretionary time" by analyzing the various forces that contribute to the experience of time as loss under advanced capitalism, which I have argued is a result of capital's colonization of time. Ultimately, I argue for the political-economic conditions that might enable individuals to make more meaningful decisions with regards to their time. Finally, I argue that capitalism's strength rests in its ability to control the meaning, use, and allocation of time, which behooves the Left to prioritize the fight for time among their political concerns.

---

[395] Robert E. Goodin, James Mahmud Rice, Antti Parpo, and Lina Eriksson, *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Leisure as a Regulative Ideal

In Chapter I, I argued that the history of the fight for time as informed by the Aristotelian-Marxist tradition provides ethical and political arguments for the importance of recovering a meaningful relationship between time and freedom. In particular, I suggest that ethical considerations be derived from Aristotle's understanding of leisure as related to the good life. The good life is primarily defined by "self-rule" rather than "living as one likes."[396] The good life is informed less by subjective or individual accounts of happiness, and more by the overall happiness of the community. Happiness is not a state of being, but self-development in relationship to the larger community. Since individuality is only possible within a given community, the ancients sought for self-regarding (private interest) and other-regarding (public good) behaviors to coincide at least among those individuals considered part of the free citizenship. Aristotle's qualified understanding of leisure is useful insofar as it rejects the idea of freedom as reduced to license, idleness or passive amusement. Free time has little relation to the classical understanding of leisure. free time is more closely related to individual license, which I argue is a very limited understanding of freedom that ultimately lends itself to capital's commodification of free time and leisure. By contrast, the classical ideal of leisure is related to critical thought understood by Aristotle to be contemplation of the lived experience guided by the good life. Leisure is what makes reflection possible by helping individuals recognize distractions from the good life.

The classical understanding of leisure might be used as a "regulative ideal" for today. As a regulative ideal, leisure is useful for returning us to the basic principle that a

life reduced to necessity is no life at all. A life reduced to necessity, severely restricts if not eliminates the exercise of autonomy. As a regulative ideal, leisure offers a practical use of an ideal. It is not wishful thinking, but a way to guide our efforts by being able to discern if we are moving toward or away from the good life. Additionally, the classical ideal of leisure rejects the instrumentalization of leisure under capitalism, whereby leisure derives its meaning primarily from its relationship to work. The regulative ideal of leisure links freedom with a particular understanding of non-instrumental time, which lends itself Kant's idea of "purposeful purposelessness." Leisure becomes a good in itself, which resists time as related to the internalized disciplinary values of efficiency and productivity even outside of "work." Efficiency is no doubt useful, but it should not be the primary measure of time. Leisure is the antithesis of efficiency since the point of leisure is to have a different experience of time. Time that is open-ended is a sort of freedom that is only possible with a good portion of time off from work. Leisure as a good in itself may also open up experiences of time that are currently denied under the fragmentary nature of time under capitalism. As I argue, overly-determined or structured time leaves individuals with very little access to discretionary time and thus few experiences of temporal autonomy. To make leisure possible today would mean not only restrain, restrict, and censor the incursions of capitalism, but to cultivate a cultural understanding that leisure makes many things possible that capital makes impossible by granting sustained amounts of time for self-reflection and self-development.[397] Key to self-

---

[396] Wilson Carey McWilliams, "Democracy and the Citizen: Community, Dignity, and the Crisis of Contemporary Politics in America," in *How Democratic is the Constitution?* Eds. Robert A. Goldwin and William A. Schambra (Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1980), 83.

[397] Nancy Schwartz argues, "Marx's critique of the operation of the labor theory of value under capitalism involves a criticism of the elements of that system—labor-power and labor-time. He argues that a system which reduces the varieties of power to just one form of power—labor power—and the varieties of labor time to just one form of time—labor time—robs life of certain other crucial dimensions of experience. By

reflection and self-development is greater participation in the public sphere. For individuals to be empowered to want to control their time, they would need to recognize the contradiction between the interdependent nature of time and the disproportionate allocation of "discretionary time," i.e., the political nature of time as a scarce resource under capitalism.

The Politics of Leisure

Aristotle's political writings offer an analysis of the political-economic conditions that make leisure possible while at the same time introducing the political nature of time as a collective resource that must be distributed based on the aggregate needs of the community. Introducing the necessity/freedom framework, Aristotle argues the reduction of time spent satisfying basic needs is an essential pre-condition of freedom, which relies on a corresponding division of labor between the private sphere (necessity) and the public sphere (freedom). Leisure and political participation are made possible for male citizens through the exclusion and confinement of women, servants, and slaves to the household. I argue Aristotle's ethical and political considerations of leisure are at odds since he cannot reconcile necessity and freedom either at the individual or societal level. The only reconciliation Aristotle offers is the future possibility of using technology to eliminate the need for the unequal division of labor across necessity and freedom. He never reconsiders the current division of labor even though he recognizes that it is justified by convention and not based on natural differences.

In contrast to Aristotle, Marx attempts to reconcile necessity and freedom through a historical materialist analysis of the political-economic conditions that might extend

---

implication, then, there are alternative experiences and organizations of experience which are possible, and some which are desirable." Nancy L. Schwartz, "Labor, Politics, and Time in the Thought of Karl Marx,"

leisure to all. Marx criticizes the abstract freedom of liberal democracy since it cannot guarantee freedom to the working class whose time is consumed by the need to work. Marx's apt criticisms of liberalism's focus on abstract rights, abstracted from the concreteness of the everyday lived experience remains useful for thinking about time as a collective resource that is unequally distributed across necessity rather than simply time as individual private property. Marx argues the burden of necessity falls disproportionately to the working class thus denying them their humanity. In his critique of the unregulated working conditions of industrial capitalism, Marx apprises us of the distinctly political nature of time by referring to capitalism's control of time through time discipline and the manipulation of "necessary" labor time. Whereby earlier generations of workers remembered work not disciplined or compelled by waged labor, later generations lost "time-consciousness" or an understanding of the historical nature of time as determined by the system of capitalism. Marx's analysis remains relevant insofar as it reconnects historical materialism as related to the workers' collective consciousness of themselves as historical producers. "Time consciousness" releases time from economic rationality and determination by politicizing time. To politicize time means to understand time as up for political contestation.

The Fight for Time

In Chapter II, I analyze the relationships between the historical development of industrial capitalism and capital's colonization of time, which gave rise to the fight for time. I begin with Marx's analysis of the unregulated working conditions of industrial capitalism with special attention paid to the political struggle over the length of the "working day." In his analysis of primitive accumulation, Marx demonstrates how the

---

190.

accumulation of capital is made possible by dispossessing people of alternative ways of eking out an existence, which he argues compels individuals to work for a wage in order to survive in a market economy. Although Marx refers broadly to dispossession in all its various forms, I argue the accumulation of capital depends on the general dispossession of time from the masses through the colonization of "necessity." In other words, the organization of production (work) and consumption (need) come to be determined by capitalism since other alternatives are rendered either impossible or "inefficient." The extent of capital's colonization of time is related to the degree of reliance on the market and the ability of labor to resist compliance, but the control of time remains a consistent factor. I argue the colonization of necessity is made possible through the manipulation of "necessary" labor time.

Marx's analysis of the working day is useful since it offers a way to develop a theory of "time-consciousness" as related to historical materialism or the ability to understand how capitalism structures our everyday existence including many of what we believe to be our personal values. With regards to the meaning and use of time, a structural understanding of time relates our understanding of time as related to "productivity" and "efficiency" to capitalism's need for both in its pursuit of profit. This internalization of a particular understanding of time is forced through the reduction of our free time to a very limited number of hours left after "work." In other words, productivity and efficiency in our personal lives make it possible to fulfill necessities beyond "financial necessity." How we came to collectively internalize or accept these temporal values is relevant to the discussion at hand. For this reason, I spend some time considering how the transformation of time under early industrial capitalism came to be

accepted by the masses. The introduction of early industrial capitalism was rift with collective resistance to capital's colonization of time. I argue it is the historical amnesia of time not determined by capitalism's needs rather than human needs, which explains why most people feel the need to work under the conditions of capitalism, is simply a fact of life and not something that might be contested. In other words, capital's colonization of time is not reducible to the force of time discipline through mechanical clocks and waged labor as documented by historians, but the workers' acceptance of this new understanding of time. The *form* of time as an independent variable rather than a dependent variable is thus well established, but it is the *content* of time that still matters for reasons contesting the hegemonic ideology of capitalism. Capitalism's power is related to its ability to inform the content of time not only through the structural need to work, but the economic justification of the need for ever increasing levels of productivity in order to ensure economic growth. If this is the case, then the politicization of time necessarily involves the creation of a collective "time-consciousness" not over the form of time, but over the use and value of time.

Time Consciousness

In Chapter III, I develop the concept of "time consciousness" as a way to reorient individuals to the political nature of time under the conditions of capitalism. Time consciousness potentially enables individuals to recognize the objective possibilities of contesting capital's colonization of time that move them beyond apolitical or non-transformative coping mechanisms of dealing with the time constraints associated with capitalism. Georg Lukács' *History and Class Consciousness* offers an analysis of consciousness in relationship to history. In other words, Lukács attempts to link time as a

category informed dialectically by experience and understanding, which is reminiscent of Marx's understanding of the commodity cycle. In contrast to Marx's analysis of commodity fetishism, Lukács offers a detailed analysis of reification or the petrification of social relations. Reification is related to a lack of time consciousness or an inability to recognize the fluid nature of history. Reification of time-consciousness limits the realm of what is considered possible. Time consciousness is a theoretical category of analysis which aims to render the dialectical relationship between the objective and subjective aspects of time as shaped by capital's colonization of time. I argue capitalism dominates social time by masquerading as absolute time.

Critical Thoughts on Leisure

An analysis of capital's colonization of time would not be complete without critical thoughts on the culture industry. I argue the colonization of time extends beyond production through the commodification of free time and leisure. Adorno and Horkheimer's criticisms of the culture industry are useful for thinking about why a qualified understanding of leisure remains politically relevant. The ideas informing the good life come to be dominated by materialist values conducive to the profit margin of capitalism. Taken uncritically, free time is commonly assumed to be the realm where individuals make conscious choices with regard to the allocation of their time that is left over after work in the realm of production. Critical theory takes issue with this assumption through its critical assessment of mass or popular culture, which it designate the culture industry, a form of mass manipulation through "'entertainment' [meant] to sugar-coat the ideological content of oppression while eroding cultural standards in order

to quell any forms of expression which might contest the given order"[398] much to the detriment of critical consciousness.

Developing a Politics of Time for Today

In the final chapter, I turn to the work of André Gorz. Gorz has consistently rendered the fight for time central to questions of freedom. In Critique of Economic Rationality, he argues against time as informed by "economic rationality" and reinforced by the "ideology of work" since each erases alternative economic responses to growing levels of unemployment. He is particularly critical of labor for buying into the "ideology of work" by supporting "job creation" rather than contesting it. Job creation, Gorz argues, is only made possible by applying economic rationality to previously unpaid domestic labor, i.e., the service sector.[399] Gorz argues that this economic trend creates a "dual economy" between those with access to full-time employment and those who serve them. Economic rationality and the ideology of work have only contributed to capital's colonization of time by rendering alternative economic arrangements invisible.

The rise of the service sector lead Gorz to engage feminist critiques of the sexual division of labor since women are disproportionately represented in service work and the commodification of domestic and care labor bears at least some resemblance to the "wages for housework" campaigns first waged by feminists in the 1970s as a proposed solution to gender inequality. By way of Gorz, I revisit the feminist critiques of the sexual division of labor through the lens of time. I argue the sexual division of labor disadvantages women with regards to "discretionary time" since they are gendered to bear responsibility for a disproportionate amount of "necessary" domestic and care labor

[398] Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner, introduction to *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*, eds. Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner (New York: Routledge, 1989), 10.

in the household, which is replicated in the market. I argue the persistent conflict between "work" time and time needed to attend to human needs presents itself as an opportunity to develop a political consciousness of time. Historically, this conflict has been of particular salience to women whose time is further constrained by the sexual division of labor. Feminist criticisms of the sexual division of labor disrupt Aristotle's justification of the division of labor between the private and the public realms by demonstrating the dependence of the public sphere on the private sphere. By revisiting the domestic labor debates, Gorz places them within the larger economic trends of the growth of service sector jobs, which are disproportionally filled by women. Examining the plight of women helps establish the need for being able to set limits on one's time and the importance of being able to think of time as something that might need protection from relationships and the needs of others if women are to have access to "discretionary time" not overly determined by "necessity." The gendered preoccupation with necessity is politically significant for there is an argument to be made that there is a correlation between how people spend their time and their self-consciousness, especially if their time is spent disproportionately in service to another in a relatively more powerful position.

Where to Go from Here?

The political nature of time is intimately related to the historical development of global capitalism and should be treated as such. Analyses of time abstracted from the temporal constraints of financial necessity as determined by the organization of production and consumption under capitalism lack political insight as do analyses that fail to take into consideration the sexual, racial, and global divisions of labor. Capital's colonization of time is made possible through the compulsion to work for a wage in a

---

[399] Gorz, *Critique of Economic Reason*, 4.

market economy. The more reliant individuals are on the market for meeting their needs, the stronger capitalism's hold on time. Reducing dependency on the market through the growth of a welfare state or a guaranteed basic income creates the concrete possibilities for valuing time in terms other than those defined by economic rationality. The fight for time must include objective possibilities for contesting capital's colonization of time.

Bibliography

Ackelsberg, Martha A. *Resisting Citizenship: Feminist Essays on Politics, Community, and Democracy*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Adorno, Theodor W. *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. Edited by J. Bernstein. London: Routledge, 1991.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Free Time. In *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*. Translated by Henry W. Pickford, 167-175. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Edited by Gunzelin Schmid Noerr and translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Adorno, Theodor W. *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life*. New York: Verso, 2005.

Anderson, Bridget. "Just Another Job? The Commodification of Domestic Labor." In *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. Edited by Barbarah Ehrenreich and Arlie Hochschild. New York: Metropolitan, 2002.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Aristotle. *The Ethics of Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics*. Translated by J.A.K. Thomson. New York: Penguin Books USA Inc., 1976.

Aristotle. *The Politics*. Translated by Carnes Lord. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Austin, M.M. and Pierre Vidal-Naquet. *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1977.

Askenazy, Philippe. "France's 35-Hour Workweek." *Dissent* (Fall 2007), 29-35.

Banta, Martha. *Taylored Lives: Narrative Productions in the Age of Taylor, Veblen and Ford*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Belkin, Lisa, "When Mom and Dad Share It All." *New York Times*, June 15, 2008. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/15/magazine/15parentting-t.html.

Bloch, Ernst. *Brecht*. Edited by Ericka Munk. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

Booth, William James. "Economies of Time: On the Idea of Time in Marx's Political Economy." *Political Theory* Vol. 19, No. 1 (February 1991), 7-27.

Booth, William James. "The New Household Economy." *American Political Science Review* Vol. 85, No. 1 (March 1991), 59-75.

Booth, William James. *Households: On the Moral Architecture of the Economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Bronner, Stephen Eric and Douglas MacKay Kellner. *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*. Edited by Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Bronner, Stephen Eric. *Moments of Decision: Political History and the Crises of Modern Radicalism*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Bronner, Stephen Eric. *Ideas in Action: Political Tradition in the Twentieth Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Bronner, Stephen Eric. *Socialism Unbound*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001.

Bronner, Stephen Eric. *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Bronner, Stephen Eric. *Imagining the Possible: Radical Politics for Conservative Times*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Bronner, Stephen Eric. *Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Married Parents' Use of Time 2003-2006." http://www.bls.gov/news.release/atus2.nr0.htm.

Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus, and Other Essays*. Translated by Justin O'Brien. New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

Cobble, Dorothy Sue. *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Cobble, Dorothy Sue and Michael Merrill. "The Promise of Service Work Unionism." In *Service Work: Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Marek Korczynski and Cameron Lynne Macdonald. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Cohen, Lizabeth. *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.

Coontz, Stephanie. *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.

Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

De Grazia, Sebastian. *Of Time, Work, and Leisure*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1962.

Delphy, Christine and Diana Leonard. *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Dohrn-van Rossum, Gerhard. *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders*. Translated by Thomas Dunlap. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Douglass, Frederick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*. Edited by John W. Blassingame, John R. McKivigan, and Peter P. Hinks New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Duffy, Mignon. "Doing the Dirty Work: Gender, Race, and Reproductive Labor in Historical Perspective." *Gender & Society* Vol. 21, 3 (June 2007): 313-336.

Ewen, Stuart. *Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Feenberg, Andrew. *Lukács, Marx and the Sources of Critical Theory*. Totowa, NJ: Roman and Littlefield, 1981.

Fitzpatrick, Tony. "Social Policy and Time." *Time & Society* Vol. 13 (September 2004): 197-219.

Folbre, Nancy. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values***.** New York: New Press, 2001.

Franklin, Benjamin. "Advice to a Young Tradesman, Written by an Old One" in *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, *Vol. 2*. Boston: Tappan, 1840.

Fraser, Nancy and Axel Honneth. *Redistribution or Recognition?: A Political-philosophical Exchange*. Translated by Joel Golb, James Ingram, and Christiane Wilke. New York: Verso, 2003.

Frederick, Christine. *The New Housekeeping: Efficiency Studies in Home Management*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1916.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor." *Signs*: *Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Vol. 18, Issue 1 (October 1992): 1-43.

Goldman, Lucien. *Lukács and Heidegger: Towards a New Philosophy*. Translated by

William Q. Boelhower. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.

Goodin, Robert E., James Mahmud Rice, Antti Parpo, and Lina Eriksson. *Discretionary Time: A New Measure of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Gorz, André. *Critique of Economic Reason*. Translated by Gillian Handyside and Chris Turner. New York: Verso, 1989.

Gorz, André. *Ecologica*. Translated by Chris Turner. London: Seagull Books, 2010.

Gorz, André. *Farewell to the Working Class: An Essay on Post-industrial Socialism*. Translated by Michael Sonenscher. London: Pluto Press, 1997.

Gorz, André. *Reclaiming Work: Beyond the Waged-based Society*. Translated by Chris Turner. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999.

Hartsock, Nancy. "Globalization and Primitive Accumulation: The Contributions of David Harvey's Dialectical Marxism." In *David Harvey: A Critical Reader*. Edited by Noel Castree and Derek Gregory. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd., 2006.

Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1989.

Harvey, David. "A Conversation with David Harvey." *Logos* 5.1 (Winter 2006). http://www.logosjournal.com/issue_5.1/harvey.htm

Heilbroner, Robert L. *Behind the Veil of Economics.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1988.

Hemingway, John L. "Leisure and Civility: Reflections on a Greek Ideal." *Leisure Sciences* Vol. 10 (1988): 179-191.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell and Anne Machung. *The Second Shift*. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

Holz, Hans Heinz, Leo Kofler, and Wolfgang Abendroth, *Conversations with Lukács*. Ed. Theo Pinkus. (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1975),

Hooks, Bell. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center***.** Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000.

Hooks, Bell. *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2000.

Hunnicutt, Benjamin Kline. "The End of Shorter Hours." *Labor History*. XXV (Summer, 1984), 373-404.

Hunnicutt, Benjamin Kline. *Work Without End: Abandoning Shorter Hours for the Right to Wor*k. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988.

Jay, Martin. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1984.

Julkunen, Raija. "A Contribution to the Categories of Social Time and the Economy of Time." *Acta Sociologica*. Vol. 20, No. 1 (1977), 5-24.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated and edited by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Kaufmann, Walter. "The Inevitability of Alienation." In *Alienation*, edited by Richard Schacht. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970.

Kellner, Douglas. Introduction to *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* by Herbert Marcuse. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.

Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space: 1880-1918*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Lasch, Christopher. *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Lichtheim, George. *Georg Lukács*. New York: The Viking Press, 1970.

Little, Adrian. *The Political Thought of André Gorz*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Lodziak, Conrad and Jeremy Tatman. *André Gorz: A Critical Introduction*. Pluto Press: London, 1997.

Lukács, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1971.

Lukács, Georg. *The Ontology of Social Being*, Vol. 3 *Labour*. Translated by David Fernbach. London: Merlin Press, 1980.

Lukács, Georg. *The Young Hegel: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2000.

Macdonald, Cameron Lynne and David Merrill. "Intersectionality in the Emotional Proletariat: A New Lens on Employment Discrimination in Service Work." In *Service Work: Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Marek Korczynski and Cameron Lynne Macdonald. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Mainardi, Pat. "The Politics of Housework." In *The Politics of Housework*. Edited by Ellen Malos. Cheltenhan: New Clarion Press, 1995.

Marcuse, Herbert. "On the Philosophical Foundation of the Concept of Labor in Economics." *Telos* Vol. 16 (Summer 1973): 9-37.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1974.

Marcuse, Herbert. *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. *Communist Manifesto*. International Publishers: New York, 1948.

Marx, Karl. *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. Edited by Dirk J. Struik. New York: International Publishers, 1964.

Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Penguin Books, 1973.

Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Introduction, Section 2, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1857/grundrisse/ch01.htm.

Marx, Karl. *Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society*. Edited and translated by Loyd D. Easton and Kurt H. Guddat. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1976.

Marx, Karl. *The Marx-Engels Reader*. Second Edition. Edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. I. Translated by Ben Fowkes. New York: Penguin Books, 1981-1990.

Marx, Karl. *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section I. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S1.

Marx, Karl. *Capital*, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Section 2. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm#S2.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. I*. Chapter 10, Section 5. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch10.htm.

Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Part VIII, Chapter 26. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch26.htm.

Marx, Karl. *The German Id*eology. Edited by C.J. Arthur. New York: International Publishers, 1996.

McCarthy, George E. *Marx and the Ancients: Classical Ethics, Social Justice, and Nineteenth Century Political Economy.* Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1990.

McWilliams, Wilson Cary "Democracy and the Citizen: Community, Dignity, and the Crisis of Contemporary Politics in America." In *How Democratic is the Constitution?* Edited by Robert A. Goldwin and William A. Schambra (Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1980).

McWilliams, Carey Wilson. *Redeeming Democracy in America*. Edited by Patrick J. Deneen and Susan J. McWiliams. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2011.

McWilliams, Wilson Carey, "Values and Politics." 1979. http://www.iscv.org/Civic_Idealism/McWilliams/ValuesPolitics/valuespolitics.html

Mumford, Lewis. *Technics and Civilization*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1934.

Noonan, Jeff. "Free time as a Necessary Condition of Free Life." *Contemporary Political Theory*, Vol. 8, 4, 377-393.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Odih, Pamela. "Gendered Time in the Age of Deconstruction." *Time & Society*. Vol. 8, No. 9, (1999), 9-38.

Okin, Susan Moller. *Women in Western Political Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

O'Malley, Michael. *Keeping Watch: A History of American Time*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1990.

Pachter, Henry. "The Right to Be Lazy." In *Socialism in History: Political Essays of Henry Pachter*, edited by Stephen Eric Bronner. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Parenas, Rhacel Salazar. "The Globalization of Care Work." In *Service Work: Critical*

Perspectives. Edited by Cameron Macdonald and Marek Korczynski. New York: Routledge, 2008. 135-52.

Patel, Raj. *The Value of Nothing: How to Reshape Market Society and Redefine Democracy.* New York: Picador, 2009.

Postone, Moishe. *Time, Labor, and Social Domination: A Reinterpretation of Marx's Critical Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Radin, Jane Margaret. *Contested Commodities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Rattansi, Ali. *Marx and the Division of Labour*. London: Macmilliam, 1982.

Roediger, David R. and Philip S. Foner. *Our Own Time: A History of American Labor and the Working Day*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Rojek, Chris. *The Labour of Leisure: The Culture of Free Time*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2010.

Rojek, Chris. *Leisure and Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Rojek, Chris. *Decentering Leisure: Rethinking Leisure Theory*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 1995.

Rojek, Chris. *Capitalism and Leisure Theory*. New York: Tavistock, 1985.

Rojek, Chris. "Did Marx have a Theory of Leisure?" *Leisure Studies*. 3 (1984), 163-174.

Rosenzweig, Roy. *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Rutherford, Janice Williams. *Selling Mrs. Consumer: Christine Frederick and the Rise of Household Efficiency*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2003.

Sayer, Liana C. "Gender, Time and Inequality: Trends in Women's and Men's Paid Work, Unpaid Work and Free Time." *Social Forces*. Vol. 84, Number 1 (September 2005): 285-303.

Scheuerman, William E. *Liberal Democracy and the Social Acceleration of Time*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Schor, Juliet B. *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Schor, Juliet B. *Plentitude: The Economics of True Wealth.* New York: Penguin Press,

2010.

Schwartz, Nancy L. "Labor, Politics, and Time in the Thought of Karl Marx." Ph.D. Diss. Yale University, 1976.

Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *On the Shortness of Life*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.

Smith, Mark M. *Mastered by the Clock: Time, Slavery, and Freedom in the American South*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Snyder-Hall, R. Claire. "Feminism in Action: History, Ideology, Tradition." In *Rational Radicalism and Political Theory: Essays in Honor of Stephen Eric Bronner*. Edited by Michael J. Thompson. New York: Lexington Books, 2010, 127-139.

Stipleman, Brian. "'Necessitous Men are Not Free Men': The Political Theory of the New Deal. Dissertation, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, 2008.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1919.

Threadcraft, Shatema Annice. "'Labor,' Free and Equal: The Black Female Body and the Body Politics." Dissertation. Yale University, 2010.

Thompson, E.P. "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism." *Past and Present*. Vol. 38 (1967), 56-97.

Trachtenberg, Alexander. "The History of May Day" available at http://www.marxists.org/subject/mayday/articles/tracht.html

Walzer, Michael. *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Weeks, Kathi. "'Hours for What We Will': Work, Family, and the Movement for Shorter Hours." *Feminist Studies* 35, No. 1 (Spring 2009), 101-127.

NICHOLE M. SHIPPEN CURRICULM VITAE

EDUCATION

2011 Ph.D., Political Science, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Dissertation: "The Colonization of Time: Production, Consumption, and Leisure"

2007 M.A., Political Science, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

2001 B.A., Interdisciplinary Arts and Science: Emphasis on Arts, Media, and Culture (*Cum Laude*), University of Washington, Tacoma

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS & FELLOWSHIPS

2008-2011 Visiting Assistant Professor, Women's and Gender Studies Program, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio

2007-2008 English Department Teaching Assistant, Rutgers University

Fall 2007 Part-Time Lecturer, Political Science Department, Brooklyn College, Graduate Center for Worker Education (City University of New York)

2004-2007 Political Science Teaching Assistant, Rutgers University

2002-2007 Part-Time Lecturer, Political Science Department, Rutgers University

2002-2004 Rutgers Graduate School Excellence Fellowship, Political Science Department

PUBLICATIONS

2011 *Hope in the Face of Despair: Essays on the Political Thought of André Gorz*, edited by Nichole Shippen for the book series, "Logos: New Perspectives on Modern Society and Culture Critical Perspectives on Culture and Society" (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, book proposal in process)

2011 Martha A. Ackelsberg, *Resisting Citizenship: Feminist Essays on Politics, Community, and Democracy*, (Routledge, 2009), *New Political Science*, Book Review

2011 Juliet B. Schor, Plenitude: The New Economics of True Wealth, (Penguin, 2010) Capitalism Nature Socialism, Book Review

2010 "Labor," *The Encyclopedia of Political Thought,* edited by Michael T. Gibbons (Wiley-Blackwell), forthcoming 2011.

2008 "André Gorz" and "Simone de Beauvoir," *The International Encyclopedia of Revolution and Protest: 1500 to the Present*, edited by Immanuel Ness (Wiley-Blackwell, April 2009). Available online at http://www.revolutionprotestencyclopedia.com/public/.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Ohio University, Athens, OH:

Spring 2011	Introduction to Political Theory (POLS 270)
Winter 2011	Marxism and Critical Social Theory (POLS 490Z/590Z)
Spring 2010	Women and the Global Economy: Production, Reproduction and Consumption 200 & WGS 100
Winter 2010	Women and Gender Studies 100
Fall 2009	Women's and Gender Studies 100
Spring 2009	Women and the Global Economy: Production, Reproduction and Consumption 200 & Women's and Gender Studies (WGS) 100
Winter 2009	Advanced Feminist Theory: Post-Colonial and Post-Colonial Feminist Theory 450/550 Undergraduate/Graduate Seminar & WGS 100
Fall 2008	Women's and Gender Studies 100

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ:

Summer 2008	American Government
Spring 2008	Civic Engagement and Service Education Partnership (CESEP) Program, Psychology Department, Instructor
Fall 2007	Expository Writing, English Department, Instructor
Fall & Spring Semester 2006-07	Nature of Politics, Teaching Assistant (The course material for this introduction to political theory varies widely from professor to professor.)

Summer 2006	Women and Public Policy, Instructor
Fall & Spring Semester 2005-06	Nature of Politics, Teaching Assistant
Summer 2005	Advocacy and Activism, Instructor
Fall & Spring Semester 2004-05	Nature of Politics, Teaching Assistant
Summer 2004	Nature of Politics, Instructor
Spring Semester 2004	Shaping a Life—Introductory feminist and writing course for all Douglass College Freshmen, Instructor
Summer 2003	Nature of Politics, Instructor

Brooklyn College, Graduate Center for Worker Education, City University of New York:

Fall 2007	Modern Political Theory: Machiavelli to Nietzsche, Graduate Seminar, Instructor.