



A Fraserin' Art + Tech

An Essay and Survey

@jeffrey · Aesthetic.Computer · ORCID 0009-0007-4460-4913

working draft — not for citation

March 2026 · 8fe6526fd

Index

1. Verse 1 — Where the Song Came From . . .	4
2. Verse 2 — Six Things She Did	6
2.1 Move 1 — Treat the institution as the subject	6
2.2 Move 2 — Refuse the outside	7
2.3 Move 3 — Surface money, class, donor base, and governance as art-historical ma- terial.	8
2.4 Move 4 — Embody where possible . . .	8
2.5 Move 5 — Accept reproduction.	9
2.6 Move 6 — Report the ledger.	10
3. Verse 3 — Who’s in the Hall	11
4. Verse 4 — Who’s Already Sung It	13
4.1 Strand A — Andrea Fraser herself, on art-and-tech.	13

4.2 Strand B — Critics inside the cluster who already do institutional critique	13
4.3 Strand C — Artists doing IC-style works in art-and-tech venues	14
4.4 Strand D — Activist / archival / list-based work	15
4.5 Strand E — Inside-academic institutional-critique writing	16
4.6 Strand F — The AC dossier series as proto-Fraser work	16
4.7 Strand G — Labor / cultural-worker tradition (the folk-tune lineage)	16
5. Verse 5 — What We Found in the Files . .	18
6. Verse 6 — What's Left to Sing	21
7. Coda — Reading List	23

1. Verse 1 --- Where the Song Came From

The Aesthetic Computer papers folder, in the spring of 2026, contains thirteen dossiers on art-and-tech institutions and one on their largest funder. Rhizome.org, Eyebeam, the School for Poetic Computation, the Recurse Center, Pioneer Works, NEW INC, the Studio Museum in Harlem, HathiTrust, The Kitchen, Machine Project, Heavy Manners Library, the Internet Archive — and the Mellon Foundation, the Form 990-PF that paid for nontrivial chunks of all the rest [Jeffrey, 2026j,a,k,i,h,g,l,b,m,e,c,d,f]. Each dossier records what is publicly recoverable, in the form public documents make recoverable: 990s, masthead snapshots, named-grant inventories, board affiliations.

The dossiers were written, one at a time, without naming the project they are. This paper names it. The project is institutional critique — the move Andrea Fraser names in the 2005 *Artforum* essay *From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique* [Fraser, 2005] and brings to scale in the 2018 book *Museums, Money, and Poli-*

tics [Fraser, 2018] — applied, not to the museums Fraser herself has spent forty years inside, but to the art-and-tech cluster that grew up next door to those museums and has rarely been treated as a single object.

Two questions follow. First: what would it mean to do this on purpose? Which of Fraser's moves transfer to art-and-tech institutions cleanly, and which break or change shape under the new substrate? Second: to what extent has this already been done? The dossier series is a partial answer to the first question by way of doing it in advance of asking; this paper backs up and asks the question.

This paper has no conclusion. It ends when the survey ends. Where facts run out, gaps are flagged inline.

2. Verse 2 --- Six Things She Did

The grammar Fraser builds across thirty-five years of work resolves into six recurring moves. They are listed here in the order they appear in her own arc, not in order of importance.

2.1 Move 1 — Treat the institution as the subject

Fraser's earliest performances — *Welcome to the Wadsworth* (1991), *Museum Highlights* (1989) — are tours given by a docent persona who, mid-sentence, makes the building itself the subject of the tour. The architecture, the wall labels, the funding plaque, the bathroom layout, the way visitors are routed past the gift shop: all of these become the work the visitor came to see. The artworks already on the walls are not the subject; the institution that hangs them is.

The transferred form, when applied to art-and-tech: the residency call-for-applications, the alumni page, the *About* page, the masthead, the funder list, the board roster, the location, the lease. These are the materials the dossier picks

up and arranges. The corollary — the residency outputs themselves are not the dossier's subject — holds across all thirteen dossiers in §5.

2.2 Move 2 — Refuse the outside

Fraser is consistent that there is no neutral exterior. The 2005 *Artforum* essay [Fraser, 2005] is the canonical statement: “We are the institution.” The critic is not separate from the critiqued; participation is the condition of being able to see clearly enough to critique at all.

The transferred form: the author of an art-and-tech dossier on Rhizome who was an ArtBase accession on the same site, the author of an SFPC dossier who applied to SFPC, the author of a Pioneer Works dossier who has been to a Pioneer Works show. The dossiers in the platter mostly do not name this position, though it is true of several. §6 returns to this gap.

2.3 Move 3 — Surface money, class, donor base, and governance as art-historical material

The Form 990, the masthead, the named-grant inventory, the donor wall, the board-member political-donation record [Fraser, 2018]: these are not metadata or footnotes. They are the work. *Museums, Money, and Politics* (2018) is the strongest move-3 artifact in Fraser's body of work — a book that just *prints* the political donations of every U.S. art-museum trustee for the 2016 cycle and lets the reader draw what they will.

The transferred form: the multi-year revenue/expense table, the named-grant inventory, the recurring-donor list, the board-affiliations roster, the IRS 990-PF for the funder. Every dossier in §5 does move 3.

2.4 Move 4 — Embody where possible

Fraser's strongest pieces are not external analyses but performances *as* the institution's roles. Docent (*Museum Highlights*, 1989), gallerist (*May*

I Help You?, 1991), member of the institution being toured (*Welcome to the Wadsworth*, 1991), commissioned artist (*Untitled*, 2003). The form mimics the function. The critique is performed, not described.

The transferred form is the open question. The dossier (a printable PDF) embodies the move only weakly — it is documentary, not performative. §6 considers what tour-as-paper, member-as-author, residency-as-fieldwork, and donor-table-as-artwork would look like as deliberate moves.

2.5 Move 5 — Accept reproduction

Fraser is also consistent that institutional critique cannot escape its institution. The critique gets absorbed, exhibited, collected, catalogued, taught, and resold. *Museum Highlights* is now in MoMA. *Untitled* (the 2003 piece) is in private collections. The 2018 book is published by MIT Press. Move 5 is the move of doing the work anyway, with that fact visible.

The transferred form: the AC dossier series is

published on `papers.aesthetic.computer`, indexed at `papers.prompt.ac`, hosted on a Cloudflare-fronted DigitalOcean VPS, paid for by the same author whose handle is also a Rhizome ArtBase accession. The reproduction is structural and is not denied.

2.6 Move 6 — Report the ledger

The book that is also the table [Fraser, 2018]; the catalogue that is also the database [Haacke, 1971]; the press release that is also the receipt. Move 6 is the move of letting the document do the talking. Hans Haacke's *Shapolsky et al. Manhattan Real Estate Holdings* (1971), the work the Guggenheim cancelled — 142 photographs of slumlord-owned buildings paired with their LLC ownership records [Haacke, 1971] — is the move's pre-Fraser ancestor and the AC dossiers' direct methodological forebear.

The transferred form: the per-dossier data/ directory of CSVs (financials, grants, people, programs, timeline) and a `README.md` of what is solid, what is soft, and what is missing. Every dossier in §5 does move 6.

3. Verse 3 --- Who's in the Hall

The art-and-tech cluster has features Fraser's home turf does not.

Tech-capital entanglement. Boards and donor lists run through Google, Microsoft, Adobe, Bloomberg, Knight, Mellon, Sloan, the venture-capital corridor, and (where the cluster crosses into XR/defense) firms like Anduril, Palantir, and Skydio. The donor wall is also a tech-industry ledger. **Fellowship and residency labor.** Much of the program output is volunteer or sub-market labor (residencies, fellowships, “honoraria”); the accession is not a \$50M painting but a person and three to six months of their time [Ross, 2009, Lorusso, 2019]. **Software as the work.** What is being archived is unstable: ArtBase needs Webrecorder, Eyebeam projects bit-rot, SFPC student work is on Glitch. Conservation is a budget line and a politics. **Education-as-program.** SFPC, Recurse, NEW INC blur “school” and “residency” and “incubator” [Jeffrey, 2026k,i,g]. The pedagogy is a product, the alumni are the network, the

network is the funding case. **Collapsed participant categories.** The artist is often also the engineer, the curator, the donor target, and the platform user. The categories Fraser pulled apart in the museum context fold back together in the cluster — exactly the condition the late work names.

These features mean the grammar transfers, but the stress points are different. §6 names the moves the dossier form does not yet make.

4. Verse 4 --- Who's Already Sung It

The honest answer is: *partially, scattered, never named as a coherent project*. Seven strands matter for the survey.

4.1 Strand A — Andrea Fraser herself, on art-and-tech

To my knowledge Fraser has not made a specifically-art-and-tech-institution piece. *Museums, Money, and Politics* [Fraser, 2018] covers U.S. art museums broadly; some have media-arts programs (Whitney, MoMA, SFMOMA, Walker) but the methodology is not aimed at the art-and-tech cluster as such. *Likely gap. Verify against the Fraser bibliography during the writing pass.*

4.2 Strand B — Critics inside the cluster who already do institutional critique

The closest existing work. Domenico Quaranta's *Beyond New Media Art* [Quaranta, 2013] is the strongest single book: an internal critique of how the new-media-art ghetto perpetuates itself institutionally, by a writer who has spent his career

inside the ghetto. Geert Lovink's Institute of Network Cultures arc [Lovink, 2011, 2016, 2019] is the sustained version: festival, biennale, mailing-list, and platform institutions read against their own claims. Josephine Bosma [Bosma, 2011], Tatiana Bazzichelli [Bazzichelli, 2013], Cornell & Halter [Cornell and Halter, 2015], Archey & Peckham [Archey and Peckham, 2014], Christiane Paul [Paul, 2015], and Tilman Baumgärtel [Baumgärtel, 2001] round out the strand. Verdict to test: this strand does moves 1 and partly 3, rarely 2, 4, 5, 6. The critique is mostly external, by participants who do not name themselves as inside.

4.3 Strand C — Artists doing IC-style works in art-and-tech venues

Constant Dullaart's *High Retention, Slow Delivery* [Dullaart, 2014], Paolo Cirio's *Loophole for All* [Cirio, 2013], !Mediengruppe Bitnik's *Random Darknet Shopper* [!Mediengruppe Bitnik, 2014], Olia Lialina's *A Vernacular Web* and *Turing Complete User* [Lialina, 2005, 2012], Andrew Norman Wilson's *Workers Leaving the*

Googleplex [Wilson, 2011], Hito Steyerl's *Duty Free Art* [Steyerl, 2017] and the freeport essay specifically, and the broader Trevor Paglen / Goldin+Senneby line. Verdict to test: this strand does moves 4 (embodied) and 6 (reporting) at high resolution but is mostly aimed at *tech platforms* or *art-finance broadly*, rarely at art-and-tech *institutions* specifically.

4.4 Strand D — Activist / archival / list-based work

Forensic Architecture's *Triple-Chaser* [Forensic Architecture, 2019] on Warren Kanders, the Decolonize This Place / Strike MoMA campaign [Decolonize This Place, 2019], W.A.G.E.'s fee calculator [Working Artists and the Greater Economy (W.A.G.E.), 2024], the MTL Collective work on board affiliations, Rhizome's own editorial archive read as auto-critique. Verdict to test: this strand does moves 3 and 6 at high resolution (the Kanders dossier was, methodologically, a Fraser-style ledger) but is rarely aimed at art-and-tech institutions. Closest analogue.

4.5 Strand E — Inside-academic institutional-critique writing

The canonical anthology [Alberro and Stimson, 2009]; Fraser's own essay [Fraser, 2005]; the sociological substrate [Bourdieu, 1996, 1984, Becker, 1982]; Haacke's pre-Fraser ledger work [Haacke, 1971]. Verdict to test: this strand provides the grammar but does not apply it to art-and-tech institutions. The application is the gap.

4.6 Strand F — The AC dossier series as proto-Fraser work

Treated separately in §5 below.

4.7 Strand G — Labor / cultural-worker tradition (the folk-tune lineage)

Ukeles' *Manifesto for Maintenance Art* [Ukeles, 1969]; W.A.G.E. [Working Artists and the Greater Economy (W.A.G.E.), 2024]; Ben Davis's class analysis [Davis, 2013]; Andrew Ross's cultural-labor scholarship [Ross, 2009, 2003]; Helen Molesworth's *Work Ethic* [Molesworth, 2003]; Silvio Lorusso's *En-*

treprecariat [Lorusso, 2019]; the Almanac Singers / Pete Seeger / Woody Guthrie song-as-picket-line tradition the title invokes; the 2019–2024 art-museum staff unionizations (MoMA Local 2110, New Museum Union, Whitney Workers United) at the institutions Fraser critiqued. Verdict to test: this strand is the labor-side complement to Fraser’s class-side. The folk-tune title is what makes the strand visible inside the project.

5. Verse 5 --- What We Found in the Files

The dossier series in the platter, as of 2026-05-02, is a thirteen-institution corpus plus one funder. Each dossier is a Form-990-grade, public-record reconstruction of one institution's genealogy, history, programs, people, money, and footprint. Read together — which the corpus, until this paper, was not — they are a Fraser-grammar move-3 / move-6 project at non-trivial scale.

The set is uneven on purpose. Recipients (Rhizome, Eyebeam, SFPC, NEW INC, Pioneer Works, Studio Museum, The Kitchen, Machine Project, Internet Archive) sit alongside a major *funder* (Mellon [Jeffrey, 2026f]); a for-profit (Recurse Center) sits alongside the nonprofits; an LLC (SFPC) sits alongside the 501(c)(3)s; a UMich-embedded service (HathiTrust) sits alongside the independent organizations; a small status-undisclosed space (Heavy Manners Library) sits alongside multi-million-dollar operations. The unevenness is the point: a Fraser-grammar project does not screen for institutional shape before applying the lens.

What the corpus performs, as a single object: *move 1* (the institution as the subject) on each entry; *move 3* (money, class, donors, governance as material) on every recipient and on the funder; *move 6* (the report *is* the work) in the per-dossier **data/** directories. What the corpus partially performs: *move 2* (refuse the outside) — the author's relationship to several of the institutions is recorded as fact in the footprint tables but rarely named as positionality [Jeffrey, 2026j]. What the corpus does not yet perform: *move 4* (embodied performance) and *move 5* (acceptance of reproduction as such).

Dossier	Posture
Rhizome.org	501(c)(3) recipient, IRS XML pi Webrecorder
School for Poetic Computation	LLC, public github finance repo
Eyebeam	501(c)(3) recipient, IRS XML pi
Recurse Center	For-profit, founder interviews, re
Internet Archive	501(c)(3) recipient + litigation t
Mellon Foundation	<i>Funder flip</i> — 990-PF + grants
Pioneer Works	501(c)(3) recipient, founder-as-f
NEW INC	Embedded in New Museum 990
Studio Museum in Harlem	501(c)(3) recipient, capital camp
HathiTrust	UMich library service, no separa
The Kitchen	501(c)(3) recipient, 50+ year ar
Machine Project	501(c)(3) recipient (until 2018),
Heavy Manners Library	Small space, status-undisclosed

Table 1: Art-and-tech-institution dossiers in the AC papermill, first-pass status as of 2026-05-02. Read together, the corpus performs Fraser’s grammar moves 1, 3, and 6 at scale. Moves 2, 4, and 5 are partially performed and partially unmarked. Adjacent (non-art-and-tech) dossiers and capacity papers are in the broader papers index but are out of scope here.

6. Verse 6 --- What's Left to Sing

Three moves the dossier form does not yet make.

Tour-as-paper. A dossier is documentary; a tour is performative. The Fraser-grammar move-4 transfer is a paper that performs a tour of an institution in the docent's voice: take the reader across the lobby, past the donor wall, into the residency studios, through the archive room, out via the gift shop. The dossier already has the materials — the same 990s, the same masthead, the same program inventory — but arranges them as exhibits to be read, not stops on a route to be walked.

Member-as-author. The dossiers are mostly written without naming the author's relationship to the institution being dossieried. Where that relationship is non-trivial (e.g. ArtBase accession on Rhizome [Jeffrey, 2026j]), it is recorded in the footprint table but not made structural. A move-2 transfer marks the author's position in the front matter and treats it as the paper's load-bearing constraint, not its disclosure footnote.

Donor-table-as-artwork. The dossier pub-

lishes the donor list. *Museums, Money, and Politics* publishes the donor list *as a book* [Fraser, 2018]. The move-6 transfer at full scale is to produce a multi-institution, multi-year, cross-referenced funder/recipient table that can be printed as its own artifact — the AC dossier corpus's CSVs, joined and rendered as a single document. *Mellon paid for these eight; Knight paid for these six; Sloan paid for these four; here is the trustee overlap.* Mellon-the-funder and the recipients are already in the platter. The join has not been done.

These are not fixed proposals — the paper is reflective, not prescriptive. They are named as the moves the corpus has not yet made, against a six-move grammar by which it has otherwise quietly made four.

7. Coda --- Reading List

Annotated; entries keyed back to Strand A–G.

Already in the AC readings library:

Plant [Plant, 1997] (Strand B substrate), Galloway [Galloway, 2004] (B/E), Wark [Wark, 2004] (B), Goriunova [Goriunova, 2006] (B), McHugh [McHugh, 2019] (B), Quaranta 2011 / 2013 [Quaranta, 2011, 2013] (B), Steyerl 2009 (C, adjacent to Steyerl, 2017).

To acquire (priority order):

1. Fraser [Fraser, 2005] — the grammar, primary source.
2. Fraser [Fraser, 2018] — the move-6 ledger at full scale.
3. Alberro & Stimson [Alberro and Stimson, 2009] — the canonical anthology.
4. Lovink [Lovink, 2011, 2016] — sustained Strand B.
5. Cornell & Halter [Cornell and Halter, 2015] — already on SoSoft Tier 2.
6. Bosma [Bosma, 2011], Bazzichelli [Bazzichelli, 2013].

7. Steyerl [Steyerl, 2017] — the freeport essay.
8. Bourdieu [Bourdieu, 1996], Becker [Becker, 1982] — substrate.
9. Haacke [Haacke, 1971] — the pre-Fraser ledger.
10. Davis [Davis, 2013], Lorusso [Lorusso, 2019], Ross [Ross, 2009, 2003], Molesworth [Molesworth, 2003] — Strand G.
11. Almanac Singers song catalog notes — for the refrain register.

Acquisition queue (platter): every entry above that is not yet in `system/public/assets/papers/re` is appended to the SoSoft acquisition list in `papers/RESEARCH-DIRECTION.md`; the platter is refreshed via `node papers/sync-platter.mjs` once each text is converted.

This building, this budget, this board, this list,
This residency check and the hand that it kissed,
This wall full of donors, this donor's own donor

We're a-fraserin' art and tech, by the maker, the
goer, the gone-er.

References

- Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimson, editors. *Institutional Critique: An Anthology of Artists' Writings*. MIT Press, 2009.
- Karen Archey and Robin Peckham, editors. *Art Post-Internet*. Ullens Center for Contemporary Art (UCCA), 2014. Exhibition catalogue.
- Tilman Baumgärtel. *net.art 2.0: New Materials towards Net Art*. Verlag für moderne Kunst Nürnberg, 2001.
- Tatiana Bazzichelli. *Networked Disruption: Rethinking Oppositions in Art, Hacktivism and the Business of Social Networking*. Digital Aesthetics Research Center, Aarhus University, 2013.
- Howard S. Becker. *Art Worlds*. University of California Press, 1982.
- Josephine Bosma. *Nettitudes: Let's Talk Net Art*. NAI Publishers / Institute of Network Cultures, 2011.

Pierre Bourdieu. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press, 1984. Translated by Richard Nice; original French edition 1979.

Pierre Bourdieu. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford University Press, 1996. Translated by Susan Emanuel; original French edition 1992.

Paolo Cirio. Loophole for all, 2013. loopholeforall.com; offshore-company database scraped and rendered as art project.

Lauren Cornell and Ed Halter, editors. *Mass Effect: Art and the Internet in the Twenty-First Century*. MIT Press, 2015.

Ben Davis. *9.5 Theses on Art and Class*. Haymarket Books, 2013.

Decolonize This Place. Strike moma working group / 9 weeks of art and action against warren kandors, 2019. Direct-action campaign, March-July 2019.

Constant Dullaart. High retention, slow delivery,

2014. Distributed performance: 2.5M Instagram followers purchased and parceled across the art world.

Forensic Architecture. Triple-chaser, 2019. Investigation linking Whitney trustee Warren Kanders to tear-gas grenades; presented at the Whitney Biennial.

Andrea Fraser. From the critique of institutions to an institution of critique. *Artforum*, 44(1): 278–283, September 2005.

Andrea Fraser. *2016 in Museums, Money, and Politics*. MIT Press and the Whitney Independent Study Program, 2018. The political-donation record of every US art-museum trustee for the 2016 election cycle.

Alexander R. Galloway. *Protocol: How Control Exists After Decentralization*. MIT Press, 2004.

Olga Goriunova. *Readme 100: Temporary Software Art Factory*. Hardware MedienKunstVerein, 2006.

Hans Haacke. Shapolsky et al. manhattan real estate holdings, a real-time social system, as of may 1, 1971, 1971. Mixed-media installation; cancelled solo show at the Guggenheim, 1971.

Jeffrey. Eyebeam: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/eyebeam-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026a. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Hathitrust: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/hathitrust-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026b. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Heavy manners library: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/heavy-manners-library-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026c. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Internet archive: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/internet-archive-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026d. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Machine project: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/>

[machine-project-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf](https://papers.aesthetic.computer/machine-project-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf), 2026e.
Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Mellon foundation: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/mellon-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026f. Aesthetic Computer papers; the funder-flip in the dossier corpus.

Jeffrey. New inc: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/new-inc-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026g. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Pioneer works: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/pioneer-works-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026h. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Recurse center: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/recurse-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026i. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Rhizome.org: A dossier.
<https://papers.aesthetic.computer/>

[rhizome-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf](#), 2026j. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. School for poetic computation: A dossier. <https://papers.aesthetic.computer/sfpc-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026k. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. Studio museum in harlem: A dossier. <https://papers.aesthetic.computer/studio-museum-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026l. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Jeffrey. The kitchen: A dossier. <https://papers.aesthetic.computer/the-kitchen-dossier-26-arxiv.pdf>, 2026m. Aesthetic Computer papers.

Olia Lialina. A vernacular web. <http://art.teleportacia.org/observation/vernacular/>, 2005. Online essay; companion volumes 2007, 2010.

Olia Lialina. Turing complete user. *Contemporary Home Computing*, 2012.

Silvio Lorusso. *Entreprenariat: Everyone Is an*

Entrepreneur. Nobody Is Safe. Onomatopée, 2019.

Geert Lovink. *Networks Without a Cause: A Critique of Social Media.* Polity, 2011.

Geert Lovink. *Social Media Abyss: Critical Internet Cultures and the Force of Negation.* Polity, 2016.

Geert Lovink. *Sad by Design: On Platform Nihilism.* Pluto Press, 2019.

Gene McHugh. *Post Internet: Notes on the Internet and Art.* LINK Editions, 2019. Originally published as a blog 2009–2010.

!Mediengruppe Bitnik. Random darknet shopper, 2014. Autonomous bot performing weekly purchases on the darknet, exhibited at Kunst Halle St. Gallen.

Helen Molesworth, editor. *Work Ethic.* Penn State University Press / The Baltimore Museum of Art, 2003.

Christiane Paul. *Digital Art.* Thames & Hudson, 3 edition, 2015.

Sadie Plant. *Zeros + Ones: Digital Women + the New Technoculture*. Doubleday, 1997.

Domenico Quaranta. *In Your Computer*. LINK Editions, 2011.

Domenico Quaranta. *Beyond New Media Art*. LINK Editions, 2013.

Andrew Ross. *No-Collar: The Humane Workplace and Its Hidden Costs*. Temple University Press, 2003.

Andrew Ross. *Nice Work If You Can Get It: Life and Labor in Precarious Times*. NYU Press, 2009.

Hito Steyerl. *Duty Free Art: Art in the Age of Planetary Civil War*. Verso, 2017.

Mierle Laderman Ukeles. Manifesto for maintenance art, 1969! proposal for an exhibition: "care", 1969. Typescript proposal; widely reprinted.

McKenzie Wark. *A Hacker Manifesto*. Harvard University Press, 2004.

Andrew Norman Wilson. Workers leaving the googleplex, 2011. Video, 11 min.

Working Artists and the Greater Economy (W.A.G.E.). Fee calculator and certification standards. <https://wageforwork.com>, 2024. Accessed 2026-05-02.