PERFORMANCES produced by visual artists have shifted significantly in the last decade. Instead of artists using their own bodies as the medium and material, with a corresponding emphasis on physical and psychological authenticity and oppositional transgression, as was the case in the 1960s and 1970s, today's artists do not necessarily privilege the live moment or their own body. Rather, they engage in strategies of mediation that include delegation, re-enactment, and collaboration. One only has to think of recent works by Tino Sehgal, Elmgreen and Dragset, Artur Zmijewski, Tania Bruguera, Phil Collins, Roman Ondak, Johanna Billing, Jeremy Deller, and Doris Garcia, to name only a few, in order to appreciate the distinctiveness of this shift. In the works of these artists, performance is delegated—or, to use more managerial language, 'outsourced'—to other performers. These people may be specialists or nonprofessionals, paid or unpaid, but they undertake the job of being present and performing at a particular time in a particular place on behalf of the artist, and following their instructions. Although the use of actors and performers has a long history in traditional theatre and classical music, what distinguishes this trend in visual art is the frequency with which performance is delegated to non-professional people who are asked to perform themselves. In tandem with post-structuralist critiques of the performative, delegated performance also differs from its '60s-era forbears in its modes of distribution. It can be mediated through video or exist in the gallery for the duration of an exhibition—both strategies that reduce the intensity of a one-off performance. This shift raises a number of questions about the present-day states of performance art, authorship, and, inevitably, the ethics of representation when an artist uses other people's bodies as the medium of his or her work; the results can often prompt accusations of exploitation or manipulation. This essay aims to explore this tendency more closely, and to reflect on some of the issues it raises around authorship and authenticity, and to provide a broader historical and cultural framework for understanding its development.

2. THE 1990S

To recap: I would like to assert that artists of the late '80s and early '90s—for example, Marina Abramovic, Chris Burden, Vito Acconci, and Gina Pane—turned to their own bodies as the privileged site of artistic action. Authorship and authenticity were bound together in the irreducible singularity of the individual performer. The artists' bodies are indices of authorship, even while they also carry a broader symbolic or metaphorical meaning as icons of gender and ethnicity and (in the case of some artists) the constructed, fragile, or performative nature of this identity. Today their bodies also function art historically, as signs of an artistic practice that consciously placed itself at one remove from the market: in Western Europe and North America, performance and body art of the late '60s and early '70s frequently stood as a refusal of the portable object and the circulation of commodities. This trajectory of performance and body art could be reductively summarised—both through the artists' own accounts and its critical reception—as grounded in the phenomenological immediacy of the live body, its singular authenticity, and its aim to chafe against the institutional frameworks through which the commodity object circulates. The presence of documentary photography and video does nothing to reduce the overall stakes of this authentic, indexical relation between the artist and their work of art. This convergence between visual art and performance in the '80s began to drift apart in the '90s in the work of Adrian Piper, Coco Fusco, Orlan, and the early efforts of Andrea Fraser, the artists remain the central performers, but they make a point of discursively embodying multiple and/or fictional identities. By the late '90s, the idea of an authentic artist-performer seems to be an anachronism, associated with figures like Stelarc and Pranko & and much of what is known in the UK as 'live art'. At the same time, in the early '90s, particularly in Europe, there began to be a shift away from this paradigm. Artists started to pay or persuade other people to undertake their performances. Authenticity was relocated from the singular body of the artist to the collectivity of the social body, particularly when those performers constituted an economic, gendered or racialised Other. This change can be seen, for example, in the...
early works of Maurizio Cattelan and Pawel Althamer. Cattelan's南方 Suppliers FC (1991) marks a significant change of tone from identity-based works of the '80s: the artist assembled a football team of North African immigrants to play local football matches (all of which they lost), in shirts emblazoned with the name of a fictional sponsor Rauss (the German word for 'get out,' as in the phrase auslander raus, or 'foreigners out'). The title alludes to immigrant labour, but also to the trend, then debated in the Italian press, of hiring foreign footballers to play in Italian teams. Cattelan's gesture draws a contrast between two types of foreign labour at different ends of the economic spectrum—star footballers are rarely perceived in the same terms as working-class immigrants—but without any discernable shred of Marxist rhetoric: through this work, Cattelan fulfills the megalomaniac male dream of owning a football club, and apparently insults the players by dressing them in shirts emblazoned Rauss. At the same time, he nevertheless produces a confusing image: the word Rauss, when combined with the startling photograph of an all-black Italian football team, has an ambiguous, provocative potency, especially when it circulates in the media, since it seems to actualise the unspoken fear of being del­egated by immigrants from outside Fortress Europe.

南方 Suppliers FC is therefore social sculpture as cynical performance, inserted into the real-time social system of a football league. As such, "Francesco Bonami seems to put too worthy a spin on the work when he claims that Cattelan aimed "for a democratic new way to play the artist whilst remaining central to the work as the coach and manager of the teams." At a push, Southern Suppliers FC could be said to share the performance litelight, but from all other perspectives it is highly manipulative and far from straightforward in its political message.

Pawel Althamer, by contrast, demonstrates a different approach to delegation: more minimal and discreet, and—in a manner that is perhaps typical of artists from ex-Socialist countries—less interested in the mass media as a site for interven­tion. Observe (1993) is a series of photographs that document a performance with homeless people in Warsaw, each of whom was asked to wear a sticker bearing a word, " observation view at Zacheta Gallery, 1996"
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globalisation, in which rich countries 'outsomce ' or are stripped of the light humour that accompanies a box or behind a wall for days on end. As such, he in countries already at the thin end of globalisation. in equities of capitalism, and more specifically of many of the projects mentioned above. Since 2000, most notably in Latin America, Sierra's works has been heavily criticised for merely repeating the wage. S ince these projects frequently take place over the course of that year his work shifted from installations produced by low-paid workers to displays of the workers themselves, foregrounding The men seem to be sculptural objects of desire, tions depend. , I Man y of these early performances perhaps surrogates for the artists themselves, who were a couple at the time. A hallmark of all the works made at this time is the light and humorous way in which the delegated performers come to signify class, race, age, or gender. These bodies seem to be a motonic chorsband for politicality, but the fact that is not the artists' own bodies being staged means that this politics is prepared with a cool irony and distance. A rupture with this mood arrived in 1999 with a couple at the time. A hallmark of all the works made at this time is the light and humorous way in which the delegated performers come to signify class, race, age, or gender. These bodies seem to be a motonic chorsband for politicality, but the fact that is not the artists' own bodies being staged means that this politics is prepared with a cool irony and distance.

In recent years, this financial arrangement has become increasingly essential to the realisation of delegated performance: Elmgreen and Dragset paid twelve unemployed men and women to dress as insomnia for the opening ceremony of the Prada Foundation in 2005. Tino Sehgal paid children to describe his back catalogue of works at the Triennial in 2005. Hito Steyerl, in her essay "Delegation, Authority, Art," argues that delegation is a form of capital that allows it to escape commodification, it is performance, by contrast, is a luxury game. It is telling that it takes place primarily in the West, and that the events and biennials are the primary sites of its consumption. Whereas once performance art sought to break with the art market by dematerialising the work of art into ephemeral events, today certain strands of delegated performance could be argued to recapitulate the artwork's commodity-modification by taking advantage of this genre's ability—precisely to its unprofitability—to elude media attention, which in turn heightens the value of the event. As Philippe Audey has argued, "Despite the claim... that performance's ephemerality allows it to escape commoditisation, it is performance's very ephemerality that gives it value in terms of cultural prestige." We have arrived at a complex scenario in which mediation and immediacy frequently seem inextricable.

### 3. Historical Precursors

**Live Installations vs Conceived Situations**

I have drawn two lines here: one between art of the late '60s and that of the present decade, and a second between art of the West and (implicitly) its peripheralities. Although I would like to argue that delegated performance is a new phenomenon, its historical precursors can be found in the '60s, and predominantly in cities outside the western centers of art production. We can see it in the tendency for making collective clothing, as in Hélio Oiticica's *Pirangos* (1965), Lygia Pape's *Divisor* (1968), or Lygia Clark's *Colecion de Eco* (1968). And yet, with the exception of Oiticica, none of these works directly emphasise the social specificity of the people who perform. Oiticica's *Pirangos*—strangely weighted capes made of poor materials that encouraged exaggerated movements when dancing—were produced in collaboration with samba dancers from the Mangueira favela.

The work clearly plays on the conventions of figurative art in a socialist realist tradition, as well as ideas of montessorian instruction in elevating an everyday family to the dignity of exemplary representation or ideal. However, the use of a real family as models for this task escapes such a reading, although the family is literally and symbolically elevated via the plinth, there is a class discrepancy between the performers and viewers, since the former were subject to the scrutiny of a primarily middle-class audience who came to inspect them. Several complaints were brought against the show, including the accusation that Boyo's *La Familia Oliveira* would have been more effective if shown within a labour union for this critic, exhibiting the work in a gallery showed a refusal to communicate with a non-specialist public. But Boyo, who preferred on the gallery through the use of other people, such as Robert Smithson's *non-site* of the same year, which fragments of the unbound natural environment (stones, slate, etc.) are removed from their original habitat and displayed in the gallery in geological containers, Boyo's other concern dematerialisation—the predominant theme of Experiencias 68 as a whole, influenced by Oscar Manoela's lecture *Aftey Pixa*, the *Demateriales* presented at the Instituto de Tella in 1969. In this lecture, Manoela proposed that the materials of traditional painting and sculpture should be replaced by the 'dematerialised' realm of mass communications media (radio, television, newspapers, magazines, posters, etc.). Paradoxically, Boyo's living family is both a dematerialised event (ephemeral, time-based, circulating in the media) and yet also irreplaceable material, since the Rodrigo family were present on the plinth throughout the exhibition. This conjunction of indexes of presence and media circulation arguably forms a blueprint for contemporary delegated performance, particularly 'art fair art' that consists with, indeed encourages, media attention.

When interrogated in 1998, at the time of restag *La Familia Oliveira*, Boyo confessed that he still didn't know how to describe the work, since it existed as both an idea and a concrete realisation: he referred to it as a 'conceptual proposition' since a group of people can't be the material of the work... It wasn't a performance, because it hasn't a script; it isn't body art; there's no clear category for this work, and I really like, the fact that the not even I can find a precise categorisation. I find
the fact that there is a certain feeling of being on the limit extremely important."

To me, this feeling of "being on the limit" refers not only to the collapse of reality and representation in this work, but also to the ethical unease produced by the class antagonism that characterized its conditions of reception. It imposed upon liberal viewers a sense of shame, as one critic wrote in a review of Bony's work, "the shared humiliation of looking at these people who have been paid in order to let themselves be seen." This complex dynamic was certainly present in Bony's mind when he referred to his role in this piece as a "nurse"—for him, La Familia Obrera was based less on politics than on the production of moral unease: "It is obvious that the work was based on ethics, for exposing them [the working to ridicule] made me feel uncomfortable." 26

The closest referent for Bony's work—and one that was not lost on the art press at that time—was Mascotta's 1966 happening in which twenty elderly, lower middle class people were paid to stand in a storage room, in front of an audience, and be subjected to fire extinguishers, a high-pitched deafening sound, and blinding white light. Mascotta's title—To Conjure the Spirit of a Catastrophe—borrowed its name from Jean-Jacques Lebel's happening To Conjure the Spirit of Catastrophe (1962), but its context was more indebted to a work by La Monte Young that the Argentinian artist had experienced in New York earlier that year. 27 Mascotta encouraged the participants to dress as poor people, because he felt that the process of acting would enable them to be more than merely passive objects. 28 In other words, he invited non-professional actors to dress and act as the social class beneath them. Mascotta's article I Committed a Happening (1967) begins by explaining his choice of title: the artist had been criticized for "concocting" a Happening when he increased their fee from 400 Pesos to 600 Pesos each for the economic circuit in which the work was presented—before that, each participant had paid 200 Pesos to attend—that he would be paying his elderly participants 600 Pesos each. Describing the participants, he noted that they paid him much more attention after he increased their fee to 600 Pesos from the 400 Pesos originally offered: "I felt a bit cynical", he wrote, "but neither did I wish to have too many illusions. I didn't want to demoralize myself for this social act of manipulation which in real society happens every day" (p. 199). Mascotta's cycle of payment and spectatorship, then, is deliberately positioned in relation to a larger, more pervasive context of exploitation. The artist describes turning the glaring spotlights onto the elderly participants in a manner that foregrounds everyone's consent: "Against the white wall, their spirit shamed and flattened out by the white light, next to each other in line, the old people were rigid, ready to let themselves be looked at for an hour." This feels like an extreme form of performativity, but Mascotta's anxiety seems to concern precisely the uncomfortable power dynamic of the spectatoral relation induced by the fact of payment: the elderly participants allow themselves to be objectified, and the audience members allow the event to proceed by remaining in their places. 30 The conclusion to Mascotta's text is revealing. He describes how the happening perturbed his friends on the left, who wished to know what it meant. Mascotta's answer was succinct: "an act of social sadism made explicit" (p. 200). 31

It is significant that the coercive approach to performance proposed by Bony is predominantly sculptural: one might say that it is a labour rather than a situation. Mascotta, by contrast, describes his happening as an event passing out of his control: handing out earplugs to the performers, he noticed the audience streaming in: "Something had begun, and I felt as though something had slipped loose without my consent, a mechanism had gone into motion" (p. 200). If sculptural states is a hallmark of some of the most notorious forms of delegated performance today (think of Santiago Sierra, or Elmgreen and Dragset), for many critics this is also a source of such performances' moral ambiguity. Rather than preventing people in a manner over which they have some degree of agency, subjects are directed by the artist to fulfill primarily formal requirements: standing in a line,
wearing certain clothes, behaving in a particular way. A further source, which is far harder to define, comes from a sense that the participants are being requested to perform themselves, they are asked to signify a larger socio-economic demographic, for which they stand as an authentic metonymic fragment. It is telling that the most radical performance works created in Argentina after those of Reyes and Moser were operated, by contrariety, on the audience as the privileged material of artistic action. The Círculo de Arte Experimental, a series of ten performance-based events organized by artists in Rosario from May to October 1968, shows a clear development from live installations (in which people are placed on display within a gallery) to constructed situations in which a more open-ended scenario unfolds without the artist's direct or total control. 

Many of these events appropriated social forms, behaviours, and relations and, as Ana Longoni has argued, most were based on a common idea: “working on the audience as the privileged material of artistic action.” The eighth action, conceived by Edouardo Favario, played with the authoritative conventions of the gallery: he shut down the exhibition space and put up a notice instructing visitors how to find the work, in another part of the gallery. He shut down the walls, which were made of glass, had to be covered in order to achieve a suitably neutral space for the work to take place. In this room the participating audience, which has come together by chance for the opening, has been locked in. I have taken prisoners. The point is to allow people to enter and to prevent them from leaving. (...) There is no possibility of escape, in fact the spectators have no choice; they are obliged, violently, to participate. Their positive or negative reaction is always a form of participation. The end of the work, as unpredictable for the viewer as it is for me, is nevertheless intentional. Will the spectator tolerate the situation passively? Will an unexpected event — help from the outside — rescue him from being locked in? Or will he proceed violently to break the glass? After an hour, the visitors trapped inside the gallery removed the posters that had been placed on the windows to prevent communication with those outside. Excitement — and the sense that this was all a joke — inevitably turned to frustration, but, contrary to Carnevale’s hopes, no one inside the gallery took action. Eventually it was a person on the exterior who smashed a window open, all guides to this subject attended to freedom through the ragged glass office. Some of the people present nevertheless believed that the rescue had ruined a work and began hitting him over the head with an umbrella. The police arrived and making a connection between the event and the first anniversary of Che Guevara’s arrest — closed down the event and with it the rest of the Círculo de Encuentro.

Although Carnevale’s action does not delegate performance to others, I have chosen to mention it here because it is paradigmatic for any discussion about authorial control, risk, and unpredictability. Carnevale’s lack of control within an apparently tightly structured framework is the source of her action’s aesthetic and political efficacy: on a formal level, it replicated an existing situation of political opposition whose extremity necessitated an equally bold response. Like Mariano and Bony, Carnevale did not have any ethical reservations about her intervention; producing an equation between the micro-oppression of the action and the macro-oppression of Argentinean society under the dictatorship of General Onganía, her situation enacted the same antagonistic division of the social as the latter, but in order to thematically oppose while also leaving open a space for unpredictable irruptions of agency.

6. OUTSOURCING AUTHENTICITY

Since the events of the Círculo de Arte Experimental operate upon the audience as privileged material, rather than hiring specific people to be seen by others, I am reluctant to refer to them as “delegated” or “outsourced” performances. Instead, I would suggest that this phrase be reserved for contemporary iterations of the tendency to hire other people as performers, particularly in art since the early ’90s. That these developments have taken place in parallel with managerial changes in the economy at large is not irrelevant. Outsourcing, which refers to the logical evolution of businesses “subcontracting” certain activities to other businesses, came from a sense that the participants are being placed on display within a gallery) to “outsourcing” the wholesale divesting of important activities to other businesses, from service customer call centres to financial analysis and research. With the growth of economic globalization during the past fifteen years, offshore outsourcing refers with not altogether positive connotations — to the use of hired labour and “virtual companies” in developing countries. For business theorists, outsourcing is presented as a tool for maximizing profits, but, curiously, all guides to this subject emphasise the importance of trust: companies give responsibility for some aspect of their production to another company, with all the risks and benefits that this shared responsibility entails. For those more sceptical of globalization, outsourcing is little more than a legal loophole that allows national and multi-national companies to absolve themselves of the legal responsibility for labour conditions in geographically remote contexts. In the light of the present discussion, it is telling that all the textbooks on outsourcing agree that its primary aim is to “improve performance”.

But if outsourcing is one of the most significant tropes of economic globalization, just as delegated performance is among the most characteristic modes of today’s visual art performance, then it is also necessary to ask what the differences might be between these concurrent tendencies. Repeatedly in the literature on economic outsourcing we find the same misgivings: delegating business involves relinquishing some (but not total) control, yet the stakes — increased profits — are always dependent on minimizing risk. I would argue that outsourced performance in an artistic context is at its best when, conversely, it encompasses this risk, when the relationship between artist, performer, and viewer is ever more improvisatory and contingent. This is not to say that the resulting work will be more illuminating or collaborative or co-authored, although this may be a result. This leads me to a provisional definition of the difference between live installation and constructed situations. The former will follow, more or less accurately, the effect anticipated by the artist; the actions of participants are to a large extent determined in advance; the emphasis is on form, and unpredictability is minimised — as with actors performing a play. The constructed situation, by contrast, knowingly courts the risk of failure from the outset and procedure are dependent upon actions that unavailing within a set of partially supplied connotations, and which may not even materialize. Despite this distinction, I would be reluctant to formalize such an opposition between the supposedly "authentic" situation and the compromised "live installation", as well as to endorse an ethical value system that privileges the active over the passive performer/participant. The aesthetic and political advantages of delegation are more important than the complex question of what constitutes ethical superiority vis-à-vis the performing subject’s agency and degree of self-representation. As an extension of this argument, I would propose that there is no compelling distinction today between live work and its presentation as documentation, since the latter presupposes and includes the former. The best video works continue to testify to the relentlessly idiosyncratic presence of the singular human being in ways...
that are just as awkward, painful, and exhilarating as encountering a live performer in the gallery, but they complicate this by suggesting the formative role of mediation in the construction of this authentic subject. Some of the most compelling examples of outsourced performance are those that permit 'authenticity' (subjects that are engaged, passionate, fragile, complex) to emerge within situations of intense artificiality. Phil Collins' 'The world won't listen' (2005–2007), a video trilogy produced in Bogotá, Istanbul, and Indonesia that depicts young fans of The Smiths passionately singing karaoke to a soundtrack of this British band, is an instance of contemporary delegated performance in which the artist (a longtime fan of The Smiths) finds a community of alters by tracking the global reach of his favourite group from the 'box. The videos take the form of a still-camera trained on each performer, who is positioned against a kitch backdrop (a sunset beach or an alpine view), fantasy vistas that parallel the escapist vibe of karaoke itself. The results are profoundly affecting, particularly the video filmed in Istanbul, where a young woman with glittery eye shadow sings an emotionally devastating version of 'Rubber Ring'. Since the video exploits the seductiveness of popular music, it inevitably invites comparisons with MTV and reality shows such as Pop Idol but the simplicity of Collins' documentation in stark and uncontrived when contrasted with televised performance. No one is competing for a prize, and there are no judges to reinforce normative standards of success. Indeed, any conventional musical standards, most of the performances are failures. The work of Polish artist Artur Zmijewski often revolves around the devising and recording of exercising situations. In Zmijewski's video 'The Singing Lesson' (2001), a group of deaf students is filmed singing the Kylie to MacLachlan's 1984 Polish Mass in a Wawel church. The opening shot is staggering in its evocative power: the image of the church interior, all elegant neoclassical symmetry, is offset by the cacophonous distorted voice of a young girl, clearly uncomfortable with being centre stage as the main performer. She is surrounded by fellow students who, unable to hear her efforts, chat with one another in sign language. Although Zmijewski's editing draws constant attention to the contrast between the choir and their environment, suggesting that religious paradigms of perfection continue to inform our ideas of beauty, his work derives its stark potency from the fact that this near unshakable social experiment actually took place. To have presented the work live would be too extreme an experience for both the performers and the audience's video, by contrast, allows Zmijewski to direct the viewer's attention away from the individuals in order to draw out larger points about religion, harmony, community, and communication. Like Collins's 'The world won't listen', The Singing Lesson asks us to devise new criteria for performance.

In these situations, the staged and the spontaneous are fused to the point where it is difficult to establish what 'unmediated' behaviour might be. Directorial control is essential to these works and yet the outcome is entirely dependent on the ability of the performers to surpass the artist's (and the viewer's) expectations. This argument can also be inverted even with Tino Sehgal, who rejects photographic documentation altogether, the almost hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery serves to foreground the excruciating inhospitality of our spontaneous behaviour. This is particularly true of works that require spoken interaction with his performers (a term Sehgal rejects in favour of 'interpreters'). In This Progress (2008), the viewer is led through the gallery in turn by four different performers of increasing age and engaged in discussions about the meaning of progress, development, and utopia. You hear yourself speaking in clichés, unable to break the conceptual structure that the artist has set in place. This object of that object (2004) also places the viewer within a trap: as you enter the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you. Although Sehgal's work proudly declares its hermetic artificiality of his staged situations performed live in the gallery, five people have their backs turned to you and encourage a discussion about subjectivity and objectivity. Their words sound depersonalised and any contribution you make to this discussion feels appallingly empty and hollow, as does the banal debate performed live in front of you.
not be its exploitation of the performers, but rather its examination of the constructions towards the society in which it finds itself and the modes of subjectivity produced therein. This, for me, is the dividing line between the facile gestures of so much 'art fair art' and those more troubling works that struggle to articulate difficult material through the use of conventionally unposed constituencies. At their best, delegated performances produce disruptive events that testify to a shared reality between viewers and performers, and that throw into question agreed ways of thinking about subjectivity, ethics, and economies. At their worst they produce the more spectacular of participations staged specifically designed for the media, rather than paradoxically mediated presence.

In this respect, it is worth noting the frequency with which delegating artists adopt strategies of manipulation and coercion which are not subject to the false binary of critical/complicit.

For example, it can be argued that Collins and Zdziezowski appropriate the rules of reality television, but they redirect it to entirely different ends: despite their artistic control, their representations are aimed at revealing an authentically subjective one that exists outside conventional criteria, and is constructed through mediation, despite poststructuralist critiques of the authentic self. Looking at their works through a reductively humanist framework of reification ensures that the greater import of their work is misunderstood.

In the most compelling examples of 'delegated performance', then, a series of paradoxical operations are performed: staged reality designed rather than paradoxically mediated presence.

...
The development of laser work followed a path through which black pupils, pronounced "important role" in diffusing psychoanalysis and promoting modern art. This was one of the bridges between psychoanalysis and cultural psychoanalysis.


Some of these performances are indicated in a metaphor for the contemporary and consumption in a commercial environment. They tend to be peer-to-peer. For example, "One of the main interests of the socio-technological work is the exploration of the new identity and its role in social experiments. This is the case of the work of the cultural producers "Social Art."

An artist Rubic. Archic. Anarchic. 1993. This is not to say that Schiavo's work is a failure; on the contrary, it is one of the most significant contributions to the current debate on the relationship between art and the social context. The idea that the ethical foundation is not just the concern of those who participate, but of those who watch, is not new. It has been discussed in the works of philosophers such as Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault.

In conclusion, it is important to recognize that the cultural producers "Social Art" have contributed to a more critical and participatory approach to the production of contemporary art.