

Katerina Paramana

Lecturer in Theatre, Brunel University of London

Performance Artist and Choreographer, www.katerinaparamana.com

Article Title: The Contemporary Dance Economy: Problems and Potentials in the Contemporary Neoliberal Moment

Journal: *Dance Research*

Special Issue: 'Dancing Economies: Currency, Value And Labour'

DANCE RESEARCH

Issue: 'Dancing Economies: Currency, Value And Labour'

ABSTRACT

Michel Foucault suggests that 'conduct' is not only something we do, but something that is done to us, as well as a behaviour or practice that is an effect of other forms of conduct. How is the conduct of the dance field – in the different ways that Foucault is referring to it – affected by, and affecting neoliberalism? What is dance's role in the contemporary neoliberal moment? These are the questions I unpick in this article. I do so, first, by using Foucault's thinking on neoliberalism and the relationship between conduct, biopolitics and neoliberal governmentality in order to illustrate how bodies of individuals and that of society are affected by the neoliberal economy. Wendy Brown's work on neoliberalism, which builds on Foucault's thinking, is interweaved in this discussion to allow me to address neoliberalism's function and effects in the contemporary moment. Second, I examine some of the problems of the contemporary dance economy as I, and other scholar-practitioners, have identified them, and address their relationship to neoliberalism, conduct, governmentality and biopolitics – how they result from conducts suggested by neoliberalism or helping it do its work by becoming conducts of the field. I propose ways we might address them, suggesting that it is urgent that we do so if we are to advance the field and resist neoliberalism. For this, I use examples from conversations that recently took place in the field, such as at PAF London (2015), Sadler's Wells Summer University (2015) and *Resilience: Articulating Dance Knowledges in the 21st Century* and *Post Dance*

conferences (2015). I argue that dance has an important role to play in changing today's world, but needs to come to terms with what I refer to as its 'fears', assert itself and take action. In many ways this article constitutes a critique of the contemporary dance economy; a critique that, by showing the relation of our conduct to conducts imposed by larger economies, aspires at articulating our role as central to both advancing the field and effecting social change.

KEYWORDS

dance, contemporary, problems, potentials, conduct, neoliberalism, economy

ARTICLE

The Contemporary Dance Economy: Problems and Potentials in the Contemporary Neoliberal Moment

KATERINA PARAMANA

INTRODUCTION

Conduct is the activity of conducting (*conduire*), of conduction (*la conduction*) if you like, but it is equally the way in which one conducts oneself (*se conduit*), lets oneself be conducted (*se laisse conduire*), is conducted (*est conduit*), and finally, in which one behaves (*se comporter*) as an effect of a form of conduct (*une conduite*) as the action of conducting or of conduction (*conduction*).¹

In a talk in 2013, Franco Bifo Berardi argued that crisis and panic have become commonplace characteristics of everyday life. He described panic as the 'sudden perception that the relation of your body to your environment is broken and accelerated...that the outside rhythm is not the rhythm of your body, of your needs and desires, but of fear, competition and precariousness'.² Berardi therefore suggested – offering a bodily image – that the contemporary sociopolitical problem is *spasm*: a kind of physio-social condition where '[t]he body is less able to live and breathe in harmony with other bodies', due to the

'precarisation (continuous competition between bodies) of work and daily life'.³ Accelerated rhythms, competition and precarity are characteristics of most contemporary westernised societies in the twenty-first century. Several thinkers have argued that these are a result of the currently globally dominant economic system, neoliberal capitalism (for example, Harvey 2005; Žižek 2010; Barnett 2010).⁴ I suggest that our social body is not only suffering from 'spasm', but from Tourette's. As described by Agamben, Tourette's syndrome is a 'nervous condition characterised by lack of motor coordination', by a 'proliferation of tics, spasmodic jerks, and mannerisms', and an inability to begin or complete even simple gestures.⁵ As time is accelerated and the political and economic landscape is shifting so quickly and so drastically, we find ourselves with not enough time to meet, think, organise and act, but only respond with spasmodic, incomplete gestures.

I believe that dance, an art form that has the body at its centre, has a central role to play in our understanding of our experience of today's world and in changing it. Perhaps this is what the current appetite of the museum to house it is acknowledging. However, I also believe that in order for dance to contribute to social change, as well as advance as a field, it must become more aware, as an economy itself, of its relation to larger economies and carefully consider the actions that need to be taken towards this direction. Foucault's epigraph suggests that conduct is not only something we do. It is also something that is done to us – with or without our permission and/or knowledge – as well as a behaviour or practice that is an effect of other forms of conduct. How is the conduct of the dance field – in the different ways that Foucault is referring to it – affecting and affected by neoliberalism? What is dance's role in the contemporary moment? These are the questions I unpick in this article. I do so, first, by using Foucault's thinking on neoliberalism and the relationship between conduct, biopolitics and neoliberal governmentality in order to illustrate how

bodies of individuals and that of society are affected by the neoliberal economy. I turn first to Foucault's thinking because it most clearly traces the relationship of the micro to the macro, of the individual forms of conduct to systemic ones. However, within this discussion, and because Foucault developed his argument in the 1970s (before Reagan and Thatcher began to apply neoliberal policies and therefore before the potential of neoliberalism was fully realised), I interweave political scientist Wendy Brown's advancement of and departure from Foucault's thinking on neoliberalism, its characteristics and effects in the contemporary moment. Second, I examine some of the problems of the contemporary dance economy as I, and other scholar-practitioners, have identified them, and address their relationship to neoliberalism, conduct, governmentality and biopolitics – how they result from conducts suggested by neoliberalism or helping it do its work by becoming conducts of the field. I then propose ways we might address them, suggesting that it is urgent that we do so if we are to advance the field and resist neoliberalism. For this, I use examples from conversations that recently took place in the field, such as at PAF London (2015), Sadler's Wells Summer University (2015) and *Resilience: Articulating Dance Knowledges in the 21st Century* and *Post Dance* conferences (2015). I argue that dance has an important role to play in changing today's world, but needs to come to terms with what I refer to as its 'fears', assert itself and take action.

Here, it can be argued, that two assumptions have already been made: a) that we must resist neoliberalism and b) that advancing the field implies or requires resisting neoliberalism. I begin with the presupposition that we must resist neoliberalism, for the reasons I have already touched on, and on which I will further elaborate in the remaining of this article. I also believe that resisting neoliberalism is important to the field's advancement. This is because I understand advancement (of the field) as the continuous interrogation of what the

artform is, can be, and what it can *do* in order to better our conceptualization of the world, our relation to it, our understanding of our role in it and of the effect of our practices on it. Our practices are informed by our view of the world, and our actions in and in relation to it. I therefore see the field's advancement as tied to resisting neoliberal ethics and rationalities. I would like to also note that, although this paper is written primarily from a UK perspective, I believe it finds echoes in the dance/arts world of other neoliberalised countries.

This article constitutes a critique of the contemporary dance economy; a critique that, by showing the relation of our conduct to conducts imposed by larger economies, aspires at articulating our role as central to both advancing the field and effecting social change. In this sense, my critique follows Marx's notion of critique as one whose relationship between theory and practice is dialectical⁶: '[t]heory leads to concrete praxis, praxis with its newly emerging contradictions again requires theory'.⁷ The goal of theory, then, in the manner I argue for it in this article, is praxis itself (by praxis here I am referring to action more broadly, as well as to artistic practice). Let us first look at Foucault's thinking on neoliberalism and the terms important to this conversation – governmentality, conduct and biopolitics – before moving to a discussion regarding the contemporary dance economy: its problems, relation to neoliberalism and double strategies to address concerns within both.

1. ON NEOLIBERALISM

Neoliberalism not only affects economies, but institutes ethics and rationalities, presenting the economic rationalization of relationships and the emphasis on personal responsibility and self-care as solutions to systemic problems. The crisis that Berardi points to as commonplace in today's world is equally economic and social. It affects our relationship to ourselves, to others, to time and to space. Culture, art and art making, therefore, cannot but reflect these effects.

Unlike other theorists,⁸ Foucault does not believe that neoliberalism is a ‘resurgence or recurrence of old forms of liberal economics’;⁹ he instead believes that it is a ‘new programming of liberal governmentality’¹⁰ or, as he refers to it elsewhere, a ‘transformation of classical liberalism’.¹¹ Political Scientist Wendy Brown, who builds on Foucault’s thinking, refers to Foucault’s understanding of neoliberalism as ‘a reprogramming of liberalism’¹². According to Foucault, whereas in liberalism the state was to not interfere with the market, in neoliberalism, the state does the work for it: it ‘govern[s] *for* the market, not *because of* the market’¹³ and therefore society is regulated by it (the market).

Brown’s thinking on neoliberalism advances and departs from Foucault’s especially with regards to its evolution. She suggests that neoliberalism is not as Foucault suggests just a ‘reprogramming of liberalism’, but ‘a transformation of capitalism’.¹⁴ She argues this has great implications on what neoliberalism is and does. To explain this she examines the shifting meaning and role of *homo economicus* (‘economic man’) since Adam Smith. She explains that, at the time of Smith, *homo economicus* ‘pursued its interest through what Adam Smith termed “truck, barter, and exchange”’.¹⁵ However,

[t]hirty years ago, at the dawn of the neoliberal era, we get human capital that entrepreneurializes itself at every turn. Today, *homo oeconomicus* has been significantly reshaped as financialized human capital, seeking to enhance its value in every domain of life. In contrast with classical economic liberalism, then, the contemporary figure of *homo oeconomicus* is distinctive in at least two ways. First, for neoliberals, humans are only and everywhere *homo oeconomicus*. This was not so for classical economists, where we were market creatures in the economy, but not in civic, familial, political, religious, or ethical life. Second, neoliberal *homo oeconomicus* today takes shape as value-enhancing human capital, not as a creature of exchange, production, or even interest.¹⁶

Unlike liberalism, then, which considered the human a *homo economicus* in the sphere of the market, neoliberalism considers, treats and expects the human to be *homo economicus* in all

spheres of life – for they are all treated as markets.¹⁷ (We see this clearly, for example, in the neoliberal university, where the logic of metrics and rankings found in schemes such as the Research and Teaching Excellence Frameworks (REF and TEF) are applied and determine the value of our work).

Despite this significant difference with Foucault's thinking, Brown, like Foucault, understands neoliberalism as a *political rationality* that became a *governing rationality*. Let us see how Foucault, and Brown by extending Foucault's thinking, arrives at this conclusion.

Biopolitics

The argument for neoliberalism as a governing rationality has its roots at Foucault's notion of 'biopolitics'.¹⁸ Foucault argues that, whereas in seventeenth and the first half of eighteenth century techniques of power centred on the individual body and aimed at ensuring its discipline and organization through 'systems of surveillance, inspections, bookkeeping and reports', in the second half of the eighteenth century a new technology emerges.¹⁹ This technology is not applied to the individual body, but to a multiplicity of bodies: to a global mass, to populations. Its aim is to rule masses, not through an 'anatomopolitics of the human body', but through what Foucault refers to as 'biopolitics': processes (such as the ratio of births to deaths) and mechanisms (such as statistical elements),²⁰ which aim at taking 'control of life and the biological processes' and not only ensuring their discipline, but their regularization.²¹

It is from his notion of 'biopolitics' as a way to rule, to *govern bodies* from a distance that Foucault's thinking on neoliberalism develops. He argues that neoliberalism is a 'governing rationality': a way, as Brown articulates it, to 'govern as well as structure life and activity as

a whole' and direct the way we conduct ourselves, govern how we live.²² Neoliberalism, Brown suggests, drawing on Foucault, is concerned with 'governing *homo oeconomicus* (and the economy as a whole) "without touching it",²³ in the same manner that biopolitics is concerned with *governing bodies* from a distance. It does so by 'taking the formal principles of a market economy and referring and relating them to... projecting them on to a general art of government';²⁴ by extending, in other words, the rationality of the market to all spheres of life – not necessarily by monetizing 'all social conduct and social relations', but by 'cast[ing] them in an exclusively economic frame' the dimensions of which are both epistemological and ontological.²⁵

Conduct & (Neoliberal) Governmentality

Thomas Lemke, German sociologist and social theorist, observes that Foucault defines government as 'conduct, or, more precisely, as "the conduct of conduct" and thus as a term which ranges from "governing the self" to "governing others"'.²⁶ Lemke suggests that, through the articulation of the history of governmentality, Foucault attempted to demonstrate 'how the modern sovereign state and the modern autonomous individual co-determine each other's emergence', underlying that 'power is foremost about ... governing the forms of self-government, structuring and shaping the field of possible action of subjects'.²⁷ Neoliberal forms of government 'develop indirect techniques for leading and controlling individuals'²⁸ such as what I have been referring to as the promoting of 'personal responsibility' and 'self-care'.

The strategy of rendering individual subjects 'responsible' (and also collectives, such as families, associations, etc.) entails shifting the responsibility for social risks such as illness, unemployment, poverty, etc. and for life in society into the domain for which the individual is responsible and transforming it into a problem of 'self-care'This strategy can be deployed in all sorts of areas and leads to areas of social responsibility becoming a matter of personal provisions.²⁹

According to Foucault's work, Brown's advancement of it and Lemke's aforementioned

articulation, then, neoliberalism governs bodies from a distance by promoting certain kinds of conduct, by treating all areas of social life as markets, and promoting entrepreneurship, flexibility, mobility, risk, competition, and personal responsibility and self-care as solutions to systemic problems. Why is this thinking on neoliberalism and an understanding of how it works and what it does important to the dance world? How is dance affecting and affected by neoliberalism?

2. ON THE PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALS OF THE CONTEMPORARY DANCE ECONOMY IN THE NEOLIBERAL MOMENT

Foucault's thinking is useful because it points out that our practices are informed, affect, are affected, and often determined, by existing conducts, which are themselves based on rationalities that have been inscribed in them. Our practices, therefore, are based on rationalities that we may or may not have consciously chosen, but which, according to Foucault, are not intrinsically positive or negative.

I don't believe one can speak of an intrinsic notion of 'rationalization' without on the one hand positing an absolute value inherent in reason, and on the other taking the risk of applying the term empirically in a completely arbitrary way....One isn't assessing things in terms of an absolute against which they could be evaluated as constituting more or less perfect forms of rationality, but rather examining *how forms of rationality inscribe themselves in practices or systems of practices, and what role they play within them, because it's true that 'practices' don't exist without a certain regime of rationality.*³⁰

What is important is that we are aware of these rationalities – whether or not we practice according to them by choice – and understand *what kind* of rationalities they are, *how* they relate to rationalities inscribed in other forms of conduct, *what kind* of forms of conduct they themselves produce, *how* they manifest in our work, what *intention and effects* they have and, therefore, be able to decide whether we should resist them and consider how to do so.

I would like to now consider such rationalities. I will address, through recent discussions,

what I identify as the current problems in the field and consider the rationalities on which these problems are based, the conducts in the field in which they are inscribed, and their effects. I will argue that these problems stem from 'fears' that prevent the dance field's advancement and feed neoliberalism instead of resisting it, reproducing neoliberal forms of conduct.

A) (Problem 1)

Conflating Theory & the Mind with the 'Enemy' / 'Fear' of Losing the Body and the Art in the Dance

Contrary to common belief, the dance world still battles dualisms. I base this on conversations that I have been a part as a scholar and practitioner, as well as to recent writing and talks given by other scholar-practitioners, Bojana Cvejić and Jonathan Burrows, who I consider to be at the forefront of the field and with whom I have great political and artistic affinities. The interrelated dualisms I am referring to are: mind versus body, conceptual versus perceptual/bodily/visceral, theory versus practice and verbal versus physical articulation. I maintain that these binary oppositions reflect thinking in the field that prevents its advancement and its resistance to neoliberal ethics and rationalities. I will begin by addressing the first two, using the writing of Bojana Cvejić.

Mind versus Body & Conceptual versus Perceptual/Bodily/Visceral

In this section, I use Bojana Cvejić's text 'To end with judgment by way of clarification...', which addresses the problem of naming contemporary experimental practices, to begin teasing out some of the established rationalities in the field, which inform our conduct in it.

In 'To end with judgment by way of clarification...', Cvejić addresses the problem of naming some of the work that developed since the 1990s – for example by choreographers such as

Jérôme Bel, Vera Mantero and Xavier Le Roy – as ‘conceptual dance’.³¹ Cvejić provides reasons why the term is inappropriate. First, the term ‘conceptual’, she suggests, implies the ‘withdrawal of the perceptual’, when in this work ‘the word does not prevail over movement’, but rather investigates ‘other materialities of movement and body expressivity’.³² Cvejić believes that this work ‘approaches dance as writing in the Derridean sense, which doesn’t and cannot reiterate the writing of a text in the domain of theory’.³³ Although I agree with her observation here regarding the different materialities of movement, I believe that the argument based on the differentiation between the ‘conceptual’ and the ‘perceptual’ is problematic because it (re)establishes itself an unhelpful binary opposition equivalent to the mind-body binary – a Cartesian dualism that I believe continues to be problematic for dance. This is the first established rationality in the field that this discussion illuminates: that although dance points to the importance of the body, struggling against the conventionally accepted superiority of the mind, it sometimes ends up privileging, or favouring, the body over the mind. Dance, the dance act, is both a mental as well as a bodily act: there can be no ‘conceptual’ act that is not at the same time ‘perceptual’. This rationality, that there is a body separate from the mind and that the body is more important or has more things to offer, is inscribed into our conduct, our practices in the field, how we make and discuss work, relate to other fields of knowledge, and understand our relation to other forms of conduct.

Cvejić suggests that, due to their heterogeneity, the practices termed ‘conceptual dance’ evidence ‘a hybridity of different influences, trends, disciplines, media and genres...and an openness of differences, many not only concepts, but conceptualizations of dance beyond Modernism’.³⁴ They therefore cannot be considered an artistic movement under this term.³⁵ This last quotation strongly defends Cvejić’s point, but also opens up the question as to

whether the characteristics of the practices that she refers to are not the same as what is referred to – at least in the UK and still avoiding strict definitions – as ‘Live Art’. For example, the Live Art Development Agency offers a page-and-a half long statement that closely matches what Cvejić describes above. Although it is worth reading it in its entirety, I provide an excerpt here:

Live Art is a research engine, driven by artists who are working across forms, contexts and spaces to open up new artistic models, new languages for the representation of ideas and new strategies for intervening in the public sphere. Influenced at one extreme by late 20th century Performance Art methodologies...and at the other by enquiries where artists broke the traditions of the circumstance and expectations of theatre, a diverse range of practitioners in the 21st century – from those working in dance, film and video, to performance writing, socio-political activism and the emerging languages of the digital age – continue to be excited by the possibilities of the live event. The term Live Art is not a description of an artform or discipline, but a cultural strategy to include experimental processes and experiential practices that might otherwise be excluded from established curatorial, cultural and critical frameworks. [It] is a framing device for a catalogue of approaches to the possibilities of liveness by artists who chose to work across, in between, and at the edges of more traditional artistic forms.³⁶

The term Live Art seems to be appropriate for what Cvejić describes. But again, not naming these works ‘dance’ perhaps misses the point of their questioning of what dance can be and do. (At the same time, calling these works Live Art may in effect place them in a different academic department, which, as I will soon further elaborate, raises another set of problems and discussions regarding the importance of the autonomy of dance departments).³⁷

Next, Cvejić addresses the term ‘concept’ itself. She observes that although until the 1990s one could discuss dance performance by asking what kind of object it is in terms of its materiality, its relation to the body, its technique or style and what it is trying to communicate metaphorically, in the mid-1990s the relevant question became ‘what kind of concept is performed’ or communicated through the performance.³⁸ (Although I am not necessarily advocating for the use of the term ‘conceptual’, this point can actually make the

argument *for* using the term). Cvejić argues that this prevented the work's definition and categorization via the aesthetic properties that constituted the work. She notes that, although the work appears to have resemblances with regards to the clarity of procedures, these artists understand differently what the 'concept' is for every work. The choreographers of the 1990s, Cvejić suggests, consider choreography the object of the work, a concept to be questioned, expanded and modified, and not already defined (as composition, as organised bodily movement in time and space) and use new tools (semiotics, language theory, visual arts, popular culture, understandings of the spectacle in performance and society etc.) in the making of their work. For Cvejić, these choreographers understand 'writing' dance not only as movement, action and thought, but also as the assumptions, values and ideas upon which these are based.³⁹

Cvejić concludes that 'conceptual dance' is an inappropriate term altogether because the practices do not 'dematerialize the concept from its object'.⁴⁰ I would argue that, firstly, concepts in art never stay as mere concepts; they are manifested materially either as an object, an action or as a performance. Secondly, what Cvejić, as I understand her, is saying with the phrase 'do not dematerialize the concept from its object' sounds a lot like the concept of performativity.⁴¹ The concept is performed in the object it creates. The concept is enacted in the dance. Is this not what 'conceptual art' does also? The difference is that in dance this is done with 'dance stuff': with dance material, whether that is dance steps, technique, thinking or critique. The second rationality that is illuminated in this discussion is the insistence in the field to categorise, name, and, therefore, define practices. I suggest that the emphasis in what a work *is* rather than in what it *does* – how it pushes our thinking of what dance is and can do, and the relations it produces within the work and with its outside – is a reflection of a modernist approach to the artwork. This approach, in turn,

affects our approach to making and spectating work, the potential for the field's advancement, and its resistance to neoliberalism, because it neglects the importance of the work's production of relations within the work and with the economies in which it is embedded.

Nevertheless, I believe that there is certainly something in the work that the practices that emerged in the 1990s have in common. Perhaps it is what Una Bauer, in her writing about Jérôme Bel's work, referred to as 'the movement of embodied thought which refuses to fix itself in particular recognizable types of oppositional discourses, or oppositional response structures'.⁴² Perhaps what we are identifying as common is the rigour of the thinking in producing the work which is influenced by and draws on different theories and disciplines – not necessarily common amongst the artists – and is then embodied in the work, not to demonstrate the theory as if it was a text, but as a thought process that influences the making. Or perhaps what joins these artists is what dance critic Helmut Ploebst observed: that these artists 'launch political discourses: in the analysis, staging and contextual placement of the body, in the thematic location of their subject, in the texture of their work or in various co-operative methods, and even in economic strategies'.⁴³

I suggest a reframing. Although we do not need a name for these practices to exist, develop and further the dance field, I suggest that the commonality lies in the manner in which these works are made and the questioning and relations they produce in and through the work. It is a *specific economy* that joins these artists 'together': an economy of theoretical influences, of political struggles and strategies and of a shared understanding of the role of their work in the larger political and cultural economy.⁴⁴ A belief that dance can do more, that it should remain an open field for continuous questioning of itself and the systems in which it is

embedded. What joins these artists, then, is neither aesthetics nor the interrogation of dance as a medium, but an understanding of the importance of the politics and the role of the economy of their work in larger economies and how they are embedded in it. This kind of work draws on concepts that are performed in the work and importantly, in order to question dance, draws on theory and more specifically theory from different disciplines (for example, Jérôme Bel draws on linguistics and philosophy, Tino Sehgal and Mårten Spångberg on philosophy, political theory, economics and sociology). And by doing so – by not privileging the body over the mind, or vice versa, by engaging with theory from different disciplines that allows for a better understanding of the artform and the several economies in which the work is embedded, and by being able to articulate the relationship of their work to theory – these artists question existing forms of conduct in both the field and the neoliberal economy. It is this relationship to theory, the rationalities that it is based on which inform our approach and therefore practices in the field, and its implications to resisting neoliberal forms of conduct that I would like to now further explore. I will do so by using PAF London (2015), Sadler’s Wells Summer University (2015) and *Resilience: Articulating Dance Knowledges in the 21st Century* and *Post Dance* conferences (2015) as the vehicles of discussion.

Theory versus Practice & Verbal versus Physical Articulation

In 2007, as part of the first season of *Parallel Voices* by Siobhan Davies Studios, Jonathan Burrows invited Jérôme Bel, Bojana Cvejić and Xavier Le Roy to a discussion entitled ‘Not Conceptual’. The aim was to ‘investigate the thinking behind the most influential movement in dance of the past ten years’.⁴⁵ The discussion continued some of the threads in Cvejić’s aforementioned writing. Burrows begins the conversation by expressing his belief that it is important that we meet and talk about what we do. His belief in the importance of talking

has continued and is demonstrated by several other events that he initiated and/or directed. I was invited, upon application, to be a participant artist in two of these: PAF (Performing Arts Forum) London (2015) – initiated by Jan Ritsema, Bojana Cvejić, Mårten Spångberg and Jonathan Burrows and hosted in partnership with Independent Dance (ID) at Siobhan Davies Studios – and Sadler’s Wells Summer University, second edition (SWSU) (2015-2018), directed by Jonathan Burrows, in collaboration with Eva Martinez, Artistic Programmer for Sadler’s Wells. PAF London took place over two full days and was ‘a space to share an informal practice based on self-organisation, to research, experiment and determine one’s own conditions of work, and to generously exchange and produce knowledge’.⁴⁶ SWSU, on the other hand, offered twenty-one artists ‘the chance to take part in a four year project, meeting for two weeks each year to share work, hear talks, explore methodologies and philosophies of performance making and extend their own practice through self-study and focussed interventions’.⁴⁷ Both events were discussion-based. In fact, SWSU began with Burrows stating that there would be no workshops taking place as part of this university; that its aim was instead to create a space to think and discuss about our practice and the field of dance and ‘what we do with the information we have’. I will refer to threads of conversation that are most relevant to this discussion throughout the rest of this article, but I would like to address Burrows’ placement of importance on talking by first bringing into the conversation two beautifully-written, and highly important for the field, texts he delivered at two recent conferences: *Resilience: Articulating ‘knowledges’ through dance in the 21st century* (2015) and the ‘*Post Dance*’ Dance Conference.⁴⁸ I hope that I do them justice and not put words in Burrows’ mouth (and very much hope I did not do so with Cvejić either). These two texts, along with PAF London and SWSU, illuminate two continuing problems / ‘fears’ in the contemporary dance economy: theory and verbal articulation. Because I consider Burrows’ specific and performative use of language important to

conveying the ideas and feelings circulating in the field, I will provide four, at times lengthy, excerpts from his talks and then point to what is most germane to this conversation.

In his talk at *Resilience* (2015), Burrows expressed his feeling that some sort of revolution has taken place in the field, a revolution that occurred 'years ago in other art forms' and he invites everyone 'to celebrate that and to pause for a moment and take stock'.⁴⁹ In his *Post Dance* text, he locates the birth of this revolution at Mårten Spångberg's Panacea Festivals (1996-2001).

Panacea Festival seemed like the birth of something new we now call conceptual, which was a thinking mess and only afterwards became history, which mess we might seize and celebrate and not call conceptual or post-post conceptual, but rather some kind of a new way to deal with how we see and what we see and what matters, whether dancing or not, for which the term dramaturgy is somewhat inadequate and professorial, and which shift of perception is the real revolution. That we got smart to re-contextualise all the mess the body overwhelms us with, and overwhelms the audience with, and so stepped lightly aside from the usual heavy handed attempts to solve this art form called dancing that most of us would rather get up and do.⁵⁰

At *Resilience*, Burrows also points out that the work now taking place in university departments has been crucial for him not only financially, but because of 'the way that dance research is feeding [him]' by, for example, maintaining his interest in the wider field, 'challenging [his] assumptions and prejudices' and affording him to 'shape new ideas' regarding what 21st century and future choreography might be.⁵¹ He proceeds to address the complicated relationship of dance artists and academia (there is a 'prickly feeling out there about what happens when dance artists enter the academy'); that sometimes dance artists realize much later that the academy has addressed problems/issues they are currently concerned with ('And sorry [to the academic faculty that invited him as visiting artist] for those times when we waltz in and say what you've been saying for years, and the students get excited just because it's us'); and that perhaps we need to realise that these two worlds are not completely separate from one another, but ask 'similar questions, leaning on

each other and with an open door between'.⁵² He points to the importance of practice-based research, but at the same time of resisting theory becoming the new orthodoxy and of defending the intelligence of the body.

Practice-based research is about fighting for people to recognise that bodies can also be intelligent, but that sometimes I might want to stop being a body. That sometimes I might need the *space you give me to think*. And sometimes I want to fight for a body that doesn't have to be intelligent, my stupid, messy body, whose performative power comes from *resisting hierarchies of knowledge, and I hope we can always make space for that too*. And that reminds me of Adrian Heathfield asking 'What are you going to do now you've let words into the room, because you can't just push them out again?', which is a question for all of us in dance right now and that connects somehow to the influence of theory, and the way many love but *many mistrust it, and how theory enriches us but also becomes the new orthodoxy and how we must also resist that*.⁵³

He proceeds to acknowledge the importance of research, but cautions against the influence of the academy. At the same time he urges choreographers to write about their practice.

And let's open new perspectives through disciplined research, but never forgetting that kind of research which requires us to follow our noses without justification up seeming dead ends....Because the influence of the academy is strong and the scientific model is doing odd things to my artist friends. Because it's easy for artists to fool themselves into thinking they know what they're doing, and we all know how to talk the talk in interviews and it all gets diligently written down and believed, but the real joy is in the lostness which is an act of resistance, and a gift to the world....And from all the choreographers out there: please go on taking an interest in the ways we try to write about our own practice, and in turn go on writing yourselves about our work in ways which illuminates it even for us[...].⁵⁴

At *Post Dance*, he also recognises that (part of?) the younger generation in the field is behaving differently. That it is much more aware of the function of institutions, their role in it and are socially engaged.

And all the economic consequences we must also discuss, and digest, and conquer. And a younger generation has arrived out of all this and invented their own means of distribution, collectively, below the market, beyond consensus, socially active, intelligent with institutions, refusing the iconic and post-nothing at all but only present, because they had to.⁵⁵

There are a few points I would like to make on all this. First, Burrows points to the fact that

what he refers to as a revolution in the field, occurred years ago (earlier than the Panacea Festivals) in other artforms. I would agree. But why might that be the case? I suggest that it is because other artforms – the theatre and performance world and the visual arts, for example – had a developed discourse around their artform because they engaged with theory and with theory that comes from different disciplines, and articulated this discourse *in language*. The younger generation of artists that Burrows is referring to – and the generation of Jérôme Bel, Bojana Cvejič, Xavier Le Roy and Mårten Spångberg (and of less known artists that approached art making in a similar manner) which preceded it – is doing exactly that: engaging with theory from other disciplines – the visual arts, performance, political, cultural, gender and critical theory, philosophy and so forth – discussing and writing about it. This is the second point I would like to make, and made at PAF London and SWSU: that, as evident from Burrows' text and also by comments by participants in PAF, we are still very much afraid of engaging with theory and verbally articulating what we do. I suggest that this might be the case for two reasons: first, because from the moment one enters into dance training, it is the body that is being privileged over the mind, over verbal articulation and engagement with theory. Secondly, because, as Burrows points out, when a dance artist initially enters the (postgraduate, I would say) academic world, there is possibly a strange relationship of theory to practice, which may make the work 'dry' or, as I have heard many refer to it, 'overly theoretical'. My point here is twofold: yes, perhaps this is the case but a) perhaps, due to the lack of regular engagement with theory, the dance artist needs time to process, digest and embody what that theory means to her and how it might relate to and affect her making; and b) by whose standards is this kind of work 'overly theoretical'? In relation to what kind of work might we consider it 'overly theoretical'? There is lot of work out there that is neither 'dry' nor 'overly theoretical', but intelligent, relevant, radical and in no way short of art or the body. The body-mind binary, part of a

dancer's training from the very beginning, comes to chase us decades later in our dance artist life. This is not to deny that our society is still logocentric. This to point out that perhaps the dance world begins as, and continues for too long to be, bodycentric, perpetuating the binary. In the contemporary moment, it is highly important that we think and do through and with our *mindbody*. Our body does not exist in a capsule; it exists in relation to other bodies. Our subject is relational and social. It is therefore impossible to consider the body without considering other bodies and the relation we have to the specific sociohistorical, economic and cultural context. For this, not only is it important that we engage with dance studies/theory, but that we look to other disciplines, other kinds of thinking to inform our thinking and practices: our *thinkingpractices* or, if you prefer, our *practicethinking*.

I am not the first (and I am afraid will not be the last) who points to the importance of looking to other disciplines and to the necessity of interdisciplinarity. An entire issue was devoted by *Dance Research Journal* in 2009 on 'Dance, the Disciplines, and Interdisciplinarity'.⁵⁶ Interdisciplinarity's importance, however, is still debated in dance academia. In his text part of this *Dance Journal* issue, Ramsay Burt observes that, in Anglo-American dance academia, there is still resistance towards interdisciplinary methodologies and instead an insistence on medium-specific or intradisciplinary methodologies (methodologies which 'proceed in a circular manner, focusing on the medium specific properties and qualities from which such properties and qualities derive'⁵⁷).⁵⁸ He believes that the intradisciplinary approach neglects the fact that a) dance is a 'historical field in which social and political interests are at work'; b) that to examine how 'dancing bodies mediate ideologies' requires an interdisciplinary examination;⁵⁹ and c) that 'theoretical means are required for understanding the relation between singularity and context'.⁶⁰

He proposes that the reasons for insistence on medium-specific inquiries include: a) the difficulty dance has faced in gaining recognition in academia as an independent discipline; b) that 'much twentieth-century dance theory has taken the position that dance's essential ontology is its nonverbal character', presenting the belief that dance and verbal language are unassimilable as an axiom;⁶¹ and c) that, although in the 1980s and 1990s there is a 'development of interdisciplinary approaches to dance that question its ontology, spectatorship and relation to ideologies both in scholarship and in the making of work', there are still 'unresolved conflicts associated with the theoretical turn in Anglo-American dance studies' (such as concerns with changes in the canon if we were to consider certain works, for example, Balanchine's work from a feminist perspective).⁶² These conflicts have made it difficult for 'dance scholars to adjust to these changes'.⁶³ He suggests however, that both intra and interdisciplinary methodologies are necessary: that the specificity of analyzing choreographed movement is informed by 'methods of investigating the social particularity of the kind of public that the movement itself seeks to address'.⁶⁴

Jens Richard Giersdorf's contribution to this journal issue adds another reason for the resistance to interdisciplinarity, which also evidences how neoliberal rationalities affect the field: the corporization of universities. He first provides the reader with a genealogy of dance studies as a discipline (using the graduate programmes at Leipzig, Surrey, and Riverside as examples), which sheds light on current structures and learning content of dance programmes and on their relationship to interdisciplinarity. He suggests that disciplinarity is a symptom of the corporatization of the university. The neoliberal university's emphasis on 'excellence' and 'competitiveness' in order to attract high rankings (and therefore high numbers of students who are seen as consumers), makes it difficult for

dance departments (which often suffer budget cuts and restructuring if their rankings are not high enough) to situate themselves within larger discourses, because they have to justify their autonomy from other departments and their market value within the academy.⁶⁵

Although in his contribution to the same journal issue Gay Morris observes that the research that is most influential comes from scholars who have 'absorbed the ideas and methods of cultural studies',⁶⁶ providing as examples scholars such as Susan Manning, Mark Franko, Randy Martin, Ann Daly, Barbara Browning, Jens Giersdorf, Rebekah Kowal, David Gere and Thomas DeFrantz, more recent discussions reveal that the resistance towards interdisciplinarity persists. In 2013, Michelle Clayton, Mark Franko, Nadine George-Graves, André Lepecki, Susan Manning, Janice Ross, Rebecca Schneider and Stefanie Miller discussed these issues at Brown University in the US, as part of the Mellon funded initiative Dance Studies in/and the Humanities (Clayton et al., 2013). In this conversation, while Schneider, Franko and Lepecki agreed that interdisciplinarity is the way to move the field forward, George-Graves emphasises that it is important that dance maintains 'rigorous distinctions and distinct modes of inquiry at the same time we interrogate the space between disciplines and resist those feelings of being threatened, which I think is an important challenge'.⁶⁷

On the contrary, Lepecki emphasised that because of the current 'attack against the humanities and the arts' by neoliberal capitalism we should be thinking not only interdisciplinarily, but also 'strategically and tactically' in order to create strategies for resistance.⁶⁸ He suggested that we should consider how dance studies can contribute to political theory and, extending Hannah Arendt's thinking about 'the dancer as the exemplary political subject, because he or she has the courage to take initiative, to initiate (1958, 207)', he emphasised that 'the political subject is not only the one who acts, but also the one *who*

speaks'.⁶⁹

I believe it is important that we put aside (what Laura Cull referred to in her discussion about performance philosophy as) the kind of 'disciplinary territorialism...the triggering of some self-protective mechanism in the face of an imaginary imperial takeover' by another discipline and the fear that dance studies 'might become extinct in a generalized post-disciplinary academy'⁷⁰ and carefully consider the importance, especially in the contemporary moment, of Lepecki's call for thinking interdisciplinarily and strategically, and his definition of the political subject. As practitioners, being able to articulate verbally what we do and theorize our work is important not only for the dreadful funding applications, but also for how we want others to understand and engage with our work, how we are respected as artists by other disciplines, and, therefore, what power we have in the arts and in society and how we can negotiate what we want and are entitled to – as artists and citizens. The visual arts world has been looking at us, theorising our work and hosting it in galleries and museums. It is recognising the body and our artform, as Berardi does, as crucial in the contemporary moment. And that is great. But *we* need to be able to articulate the value of our work, what presenting bodies in these spaces might mean for us, how our needs – we are live bodies, not objects – are different than those of objects in the museum. *Critical Correspondence* (*Movement Research's* web-based publication, which provides a platform for the discussion of topics important to the field) initiated a discussion in 2015 on the relation of dance to the museum, in which artists and scholars such as Mark Franko, Yvonne Rainer, Sarah Maxfield and Mårten Spångberg participated.⁷¹ Perhaps PAF, and SWSU are other such platforms. We need to create more platforms and engage in conversations about what we do, how we can move ahead and how what we do is affected and can affect the several economies of which we are a part. And we need to be confident in

what we do and assert ourselves. We do not need to be the underdog, the apologetic artist whose work is appropriated. It is our current – still – relationship to theory and verbal articulation, and therefore confidence in what we do that I also believe creates some of the anxieties in the field about our work being ‘high-jacked’ by museums and potentially presented as an offering of a distraction in the regular exhibition schedule.

We also need to remember that in order to do interesting work in the museum and not just present our theatre work in that space, we need to create a dialogue and tension with the museum/gallery space and the visual arts discourse. We must always create tension with and critically situate our work within the economy of its presentation; and not only within the economy of its presentation, but within the several economies that our work is already embedded: the dance, performance, theatre, visual arts, cultural and neoliberal capitalist economies. Theory is not only important for the advancement of the field, but also – I as have attempted to illustrate in the previous section – for an understanding of the conducts promoted in our field and by neoliberalism and the relation between the two; for in order to resist neoliberalism, one must understand how it works. Which brings me to my last point.

B) (Problem 2)

Conflating Acquiring Funding, Working for Free and Self-Organisation with Future Viability/‘Fear’ of Loss of Existence

Quite a few of the comments made by participants at PAF London were about the difficulty artists are facing in their attempt to make work *and* make a living: that they are forced to wear several different hats – of the administrator, the funding applicant, the performer, the maker, the stage manager, the producer, the teacher and so forth – how in the end very little time is available for the making of the work, and that many are forced to perform or make and present work for free. The response to this concern is complicated, but this is where

theory from other disciplines comes handy. Participants at PAF and SWSU advocated that the solution is a matter of self-organisation: creating collectives that function outside of the funding and programming system and that make it possible for artists to do all of the things they need and want to do as artists (for example, find a studio space, deal with administration work, fund the work, make and present it). Yes, but: is this not what neoliberal capitalism relies and thrives on? On our ability to use our entrepreneurial skills and self-organise, on our flexibility, willingness to often work without pay, take personal responsibility for systemic problems (for example, inadequate and/or unfair arts funding), (take) care (of/) for ourselves and survive without any help from the state, without the flimsy existing social net that is slowly, but surely, disappearing? Would we not be feeding neoliberalism if we *just* did that? It is absolutely necessary that, while we are attempting to 'self-organise' in order to survive, that we assert ourselves, and constantly put pressure for what is being taken away from us by neoliberal capitalism: the social net, the social services, the state funding to which we are all entitled. Understanding how neoliberalism works, how we are affected by it through the conducts it establishes and the rationalities that are inscribed in them and how we might be feeding it by reproducing certain forms of conduct, is therefore crucial to our actions, the way we practice our practice and therefore to the field's advancement. It is for this reason that engagement with theory from dance and other disciplines, and political engagement are of utmost importance.

CONCLUSION: ON DOUBLE STRATEGIES (NOT AN 'EITHER OR' BUT 'BOTH AND ALL THE TIME')

In the preceding (as well as in PAF London, Sadler's Wells Summer Universities, and my PhD dissertation),⁷² I described what I consider the problems and 'fears' of the economy of contemporary dance – an economy that is contested and ill-defined, where financial, institutional and ideological interests interact as the 'field' of 'contemporary' dance. Dance,

as an artform, has a great deal to offer to the arts and wider world. As Sue Davies observed in a talk at SWDU, dance uses and can communicate ‘what is feelable and experienced’ and dancers are highly skilled at ‘chang[ing] our statehood’ using ‘visual imagery and imagination’.⁷³ Today’s world can greatly benefit from this. Dance is also very skilled at ‘seeing’ time and space and the relationship of the body to them, at finding ways to negotiate, organise, create and break rules, find joy in being in the same space and time with others, working with others, understanding the body – its mechanics, flow, experience and relation to other bodies – and listening to the body, its rhythms and needs. All of these are necessary to affect change in the contemporary moment, but we need to be aware of how and to what effect we use this knowledge to prevent being choreographed ‘according to the necessities of the global economy’, as Stefan Hölscher and Gerald Siegmund would also caution.⁷⁴ What is urgent now, which some of us have been or have started to do, is turn that inwards looking (*further*) outwards: turn our gaze to theory from other disciplines, become comfortable with verbal articulation and critically situate our work within the economies in which it is part and embedded, taking into consideration how the rationalities inscribed in our conducts relate to neoliberal ethics and rationalities.

My suggestion here is ‘not an either or’; it is not about choosing or privileging (thereby reproducing some of the existing hierarchies or establishing new ones) theory over practice, the mind over the body, verbal articulation over physical articulation, interdisciplinarity over dance and self-organisation over state dependence and so forth. It is instead about ‘both and all the time’ or what I refer to as *double strategies*. It about the importance of theory in relation to practice and the wider world, realising that, as Marx suggests,⁷⁵ moving from the one to the other is necessary; of verbal articulation for the practice and the field as a whole; of interdisciplinarity in order to critically situate ourselves and our work in

relation to it and resist and push for change both from the top (at the level of government, state, funders) and from the bottom (through self-organisation and grass roots work, for example). We agree on the 'what' – that change for instance is necessary – but we need to be able to articulate well the 'why', in order to effectively respond to more important questions: the 'hows' and the 'what kinds'. *How* do we go about advancing the field and effecting social change? *What kind* of steps do we need to take towards this direction? *What kind* of relationship with others (people, artforms, economies) do we want to have? *What kind* of artwork has the potential to effect social change? ⁷⁶ It is about thinking and practicing first as citizens, then as artists, then as dance artists. It is about *nuancing* our role in these different roles, the intention and aim of our actions – because capitalism thrives on abstraction – having confidence, being able to articulate the importance of what we do and realising that antagonism and dissensus are necessary ingredients for democracy.

NOTES

1. Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*, ed. Michel Senellart, trans. Graham Burchell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 193 (Lecture 8).
2. Franco Bifo Berardi, *TedxCalarts: Performance, Body & Presence* [Online Live Stream Lecture], 9th March 2013. Available from: www.new.livestream.com/tedx/tedxcalarts [Accessed 9 March 2013].
3. Ibid.
4. - Clive Barnett, 'Publics and Markets: What's Wrong with Neoliberalism?', in Susan J. Smith, Rachel Pain, Sallie A. Marston and John Paul Jones III (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Social Geographies* (London: Sage, 2010), pp. 269-96.
 - David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
 - Slavoj Žižek, *Living in the End Times* (London: Verso, 2010).
5. Giorgio Agamben, *Means without End: Notes on Politics* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), p. 50.
6. 'In the struggle against that state of affairs, criticism is no passion of the head, it is the head of passion'.
 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *On Religion* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2008), p. 44.
7. Ernst Bloch, *Subject-Object. Erläuterungen zu Hegel* (Frankfurt a. Main: Suhrkamp, 1972).
8. - Barnett 2010, p. 269;
 - François Gauthier, Tuomas Martikainen and Linda Woodhead, 'Introduction: Religion in Market Society' in François Gauthier and Tuomas Martikainen (eds.) *Religion in the*

- Neoliberal Age: Political Economy and Modes of Governance* (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), p. 14, my emphasis.
9. Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 117-8.
 10. Ibid., p. 94.
 11. Ibid., p. 131.
 12. Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution* (New York, NY: Zone Books, 2015), p. 56.
 13. Foucault 2008, p. 121.
 14. Wendy Brown and Timothy Shenk. 'Booked #3: What Exactly Is Neoliberalism?' *Dissent*. [Online] 2th April 2015. Available from: www.dissentmagazine.org/blog/booked-3-what-exactly-is-neoliberalism-wendy-brown-undoing-the-demos [Accessed 2th April 2015].
 15. Ibid.
 16. Ibid.
 17. Brown 2015.
 18. Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 2003).
 19. Ibid., p. 242.
 20. Ibid., pp. 243-6.
 21. Ibid., p. 247.
 22. Brown 2015, p. 117.
 23. Ibid., p. 57.
 24. Foucault 2008, p. 131.
 25. Brown 2015, p. 62.
 26. Thomas Lemke, 'Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique', in *Rethinking Marxism*, Vol. 14, no. 3 (2002): 49-64. Available from: www.thomaslemkeweb.de/publications-engl.htm, pp. 2-3.[Accessed 18 October 2015].
 27. Ibid., pp. 2-4.
 28. Ibid., p. 12.
 29. Ibid.
 30. Michel Foucault, 'Questions of Method', in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), p. 79, my emphasis.
 31. Boyana Cvejić, Xavier Le Roy and Gerald Siegmund, 'To end with judgment by way of clarification', in Martina Hochmuth, Krassimira Kruschkova and Georg Schollhammer (eds.), *It Takes Place When It Doesn't. On Dance and Performance* (Frankfurt: Revolver, 2006), pp. 49-58. Available from: www.mobileacademy-berlin.com/englisch/2006/texte/cvejic03.html [Accessed 18 October 2015].
 32. Ibid.
 33. Ibid.
 34. Ibid.
 35. Ibid.
 36. Live Art Development Agency, *What is Live Art?*, 2014 [Online] Available from: www.thisisliveart.co.uk/about/what-is-live-art/ [Accessed 11th November 2015].
 37. For a more detailed discussion, see: Katerina Paramana, 'Performances of thought, resistance and support: On the role and potential of performance in the contemporary moment', Ph.D. dissertation (London: University of Roehampton, London, 2015).
 38. Cvejić et al., 2006.
 39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

Ramsay Burt and André Lepecki are in agreement with Cvejić about the inappropriateness of the term. Burt argues that the term 'conceptual' prioritises a cerebral relationship to and in the making and viewing of the work, as well as an implication that the work consists simply in the execution of the choreographer's ideas by the dancers. Like Cvejić, Burt (re)establishes a binary opposition: the 'conceptual' versus the 'perceptual' or the 'cerebral' versus the 'visceral' or 'body-based', privileging perhaps implicitly the body over the mind. Lepecki points to the importance of not naming the project undertaken by these practitioners at all. Labelling the project would perhaps defeat the project itself, for labels close down meaning and the potential of what they refer to.

- Ramsay Burt and André Lepecki cited in Jeroen Fabius, 'The missing history of (not)conceptual dance' in Merel Heering, Ruth Naber, Bianca Nieuwboer and Liesbeth Wildschut (eds.), *Danswetenschap in Nederland*, deel (part) 7 (Amsterdam, Vereniging voor Dansonderzoek (Association for Dance Research, 2012). [Online] Available from:

www.academia.edu/4060526/J._Fabius._The_missing_history_of_not_conceptual_dance._In_Merel_Heering_Ruth_Naber_Bianca_Nieuwboer_en_Liesbeth_Wildschut.Danswetenschap_in_Nederland_deel_7._Amsterdam_Vereniging_voor_Dansonderzoek_2012 [Accessed 20th October 2014], pp. 1-2.

41. Here I am drawing from Judith Butler's thinking on performativity (who is turn draws from J. L. Austin's speech act theory: that with a statement 'we are doing something as well as and distinct from just saying something' (1962, pp. 134-5)). Butler argues that '[w]ithin speech act theory, a performative is that discursive practice that enacts or produces that which it names' (1993, pp. 12-13). Within performance, we can suggest that ideas/concepts are enacted in the work.

- J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

- Judith Butler, *Bodies that matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

42. Una Bauer, 'The movement of Embodied Thought. The Representational Game of the Stage Zero of Signification in Jérôme Bel' *Performance Research*, Vol. 13, no. 1 (2008), 35-41.

43. Helmut Ploebst, *No Wind No Word. Neue Choreographie in der Gesellschaft des Spektakels / New Choreography in the Society of the Spectacle* (München: K. Kieser, 2001).

44. This shared economy, particularly with regards to the political struggles and strategies, but also the shared understanding of the role of the work in the larger political and cultural economy and the belief that the art form should question itself and the systems in which it is embedded, is made evident by the *Manifesto for an European Performance Policy* in 2002, initiated and originally signed by Jérôme Bel, Maria La Ribot, Xavier Le Roy and Christophe Wavelet (*Freie Theatre*, 2008). The manifesto articulated a number of demands and made a series of proposals, and was submitted to the European Commission and its Cultural and Political Representatives:

'We want the European Community to:

- resource artists as much as art,
- invest in the ongoing needs and long-term growth of independent performers,
- actively support artists in research, development and in the ongoing process of their practices, in equal measure to the generation and placement of new works
- recognise and enhance the relationships between and across innovative contemporary practices
- facilitate strategies for cross-disciplinary dialogues, collaborations and funding

- initiatives
- support new strategies for increasing audience awareness and appreciation,
 - demonstrate a genuine commitment to innovation, risk and hybridity,
 - actively develop, recognise and support a more important number of active, flexible and inventive artistic structures and infrastructures
 - and to engage in a dialogue, set up the conditions for a new debate regarding these questions' (Bel et al., 2002).
- Freie Theatre, *Manifest: an die Europäische Kommission und deren Kulturpolitische Vertreter/innen*, 2008 [Online]. Available from: www.freietheater.at/?page=kulturpolitik&detail=61304&jahr=2002&id_language=2 [Accessed 5th October 2014].
- Jérôme Bel, Maria La Ribot, Xavier Le Roy and Christophe Wavelet, 'Manifesto for an European performance policy', *Freie Theater*, 2002 [Online] Available from: www.freietheater.at/?page=kulturpolitik&detail=61304&jahr=2002 [Accessed 5 September 2014].
45. Jonathan Burrows, Jérôme Bel, Bojana Cvejić and Xavier Le Roy, *Not Conceptual*, 2007. Part of the first season of Parallel Voices by Siobhan Davies Studios, to a discussion entitled. The aim was to 'investigated the thinking behind the most influential movement in dance of the past ten years'. Available from: www.youtube.com/watch?v=EkdI-87T2z0 [Accessed 5th October 2015].
46. *PAF* (Siobhan Davies Studios, London, 2015).
For more information visit: www.siobhandavies.com/whats-on/workshops/performing-arts-forum-london-hostedpartnership-in/
47. *Sadler's Wells Summer University* (London, 2015-8).
For more information visit: www.sadlerswells.com/jerwoodstudio/summer-university/
48. - Jonathan Burrows' keynote address for the Conference on Dance in Higher Education, *Resilience: Articulating Dance Knowledges in the 21st Century* De Montfort University, Leicester, April 8th 2015. Available from: www.jonathanburrows.info/#/text/?id=177&t=content [Accessed 5th October 2015].
- Jonathan Burrows' keynote address for the *Postdance* Conference in Stockholm, curated by André Lepecki for MDT and Cullberg Ballet (Stockholm, October 14th 2015). Available from: www.jonathanburrows.info/#/text/?id=183&t=content [Accessed 15th October 2015].
49. Burrows, *Resilience*, 2015.
50. Burrows, *Post Dance*, 2015.
51. Burrows, *Resilience*, 2015.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid., my emphasis.
54. Ibid.
55. Burrows, *Post Dance*, 2015.
56. Mark Franko (Ed.) 'Dance, the Disciplines, and Interdisciplinarity' *Dance Research Journal*, Vol. 41, no. 1, (Summer 2009).
57. Ramsay Burt, 'The Specter of Interdisciplinarity' *Dance Research Journal*, Vol. 41, no. 1, (Summer 2009), 4.
58. Ibid, p. 3.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., p. 4.
61. Ibid., p. 4-5.
62. Ibid., p. 7-8.
63. Ibid., p. 6-7.

64. Ibid., p. 20.
65. Jens Richard Giersdorf, 'Dance Studies in the International Academy: Genealogy of a Disciplinary Formation' *Dance Research Journal*, Vol. 41, no. 1, (Summer 2009), 28.
66. Gay Morris, 'Dance Studies / Cultural Studies' *Dance Research Journal*, Vol. 41, no. 1, (Summer 2009), 92–93.
67. Michelle Clayton, Mark Franko, Nadine George-Graves, André Lepecki, Susan Manning, Janice Ross, Rebecca Schneider, Noémie Solomon and Stephanie Miller, 'Inside/Beside dance studies: A conversation Mellon dance studies in/and the humanities' *Dance Research Journal*, Vol. 45, no. 3, (2013), 67.
68. Ibid., p. 17.
69. Ibid., p.18–19.
70. Laura Cull, 'Performance as Philosophy: Responding to the Problem of "Application"' *Theatre Research International*, Vol. 37, no. 1, (2012), 25.
71. Nicole Daunic and Abigail Levine(Eds.), 'Dance and the Museum', *Critical Correspondence*, 12th April 2015 [Online]. Available from: www.movementresearch.org/criticalcorrespondence/blog/?p=8048 [Accessed 5th May 2015].
72. Paramana 2015.
73. *PAF*, 2015.
74. Stefan Hölscher and Gerald Siegmund, 'Introduction' in Stefan Hölscher and Gerald Siegmund (eds.) *Dance, Politics & Co-Immunity: Thinking Resistances: Current Perspectives on Politics and Communities in the Arts* (Zürich: diaphanes, 2013), p. 8.
75. Marx 2008, p. 44.
76. These are questions that I have addressed in Paramana 2015, as well as in the following:
- Paramana, Katerina. 2015b. 'Re-turning to *The Show*: Repetition and the Construction of Spaces of Decision, Affect and Creative Possibility', *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts*, 20(5), 116-124.
 - Paramana, Katerina. 2014. 'On Resistance through Ruptures and the Rupture of Resistances', *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts*, 19(6), 81-89.