

# Spatial relations
# dance in the museum

Wookey, Sara

*Award date:*
2021

*Awarding institution:*
Coventry University

# *Spatial Relations*:
# *Dance in the Changing Museum*

**Sara Hastings Wookey**

**PhD**

**July 2020**



# *Spatial Relations*:
# *Dance in the Changing Museum*

**Sara Hastings Wookey**

**PhD**

**July 2020**

***A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the University's requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy***

Content removed on data protection grounds

Content removed on data protection grounds

Content removed on data protection grounds

Content removed on data protection grounds

# Abstract

My practice-informed-research project is a written thesis informed by my experiences as a dance artist performing in and creating work for the museum. Moving past the outdated question of *why* dance in the museum, my thesis asks *how* dance is currently situated in the museum and what is its potential there? Through examining different modes of attention of the dance artist and her social-spatial skills we first come to understand dance as a relational, site-based practice in the museum and, later, through evidence provided for by the case studies, discover the potential for dance to play a more significant part of change taking place in the museum. This thesis looks critically at the practice of dance in the museum through the lenses of spatial theory, somatic enquiry, and relational aesthetics. Looking through these particular lenses has value as it re-considers the human body, movement, and the museum as contributing aspects to the production of spatial relations and offers a wider contribution to knowledge vis-a-vis the dance artist's story, a story not yet told in the museum.

My research is within a UK, EU, and US context over the last six years (2014-2020) and begins with the premise that dance is a relational, site-based practice. By applying the lens of public practice to dance in the museum and as a form of relation I build on the work of Nicholas Bourriaud (1998). My practice follows in the lineage of Post-Modern dance artists such as Yvonne Rainer who make claims for everyday movement as dance and borrows from Gabriella Giannachi's (2012) theories on presence as modes of encounter to argue for the dance artist as part of and affective to the human ecosystem of the museum. I explore three case studies as ways to understand what *seeing*, *doing*, and *being* in the museum through the detached, absent, and present dance artist can tell us about the potentiality of dance in the museum that has been unexplored thus far. The findings of my research suggest that the spatial relational aspects of dance in the museum provide opportunity for the dancer to engage more fully within the human ecological environment of the museum as a way to contribute to institutional change and policy making and towards more creative, inclusive, just, and sustainable cultural spaces and as examples for our contemporary moment.

# Acknowledgements

As much as relation is the subject of my thesis it is also true that relation made the thesis come about. I could not have accomplished such a monumental task without the irreplaceable support of many. I first want to thank my advisory team: Directors of Studies, Dr Natalie Garrett-Brown and Dr Victoria Thoms, along with supervisors Dr Katerina Paramana, and Dr Susanne Foellmer. Thank you for encouraging me forward in finding my voice. A special thank you to the Dr Sarah Whatley and the Centre for Dance Research (C-DaRE) Coventry University for providing an institutional frame for practice/research approaches and making a case for it in the wider academic field.

Much of this thesis comes out of my cherished long-time collaborations with artists, architects, designers and urbanites. My longest-running collaborator, dear friend and professional partner is urban designer Rennie Tang. My fellow post-graduate researchers, Dr Marie-Louise Crawley, Dr Rebecca Stancliffe, and Dr Acatia Finbow for championing me forward and sharing experiences that supported my journey. And those I connected with later in my process, Emilie Gaultier and Erica Charalambous. I thank each of you for being my fellow travellers. My professional contacts Dr Emily Pringle and Christiane Berndes for trusting in the artist's process and movement-based practices in the museum. Thank you to those who hosted my residencies in quiet and beautiful environs: Mikaela Szolossi and family, Penpynfarch, Art House Jersey, and Clem Cecile.

My significant mentors and teachers, which are too many to mention here, Yvonne Rainer whose ongoing persistence for dance on its own terms and liberalist approaches has made all of the difference. The late Edward Soja who embraced my dance-based perspectives in regards to the experience of space and whose eloquence and committed approach to spatial equality will never be forgotten. Thank you to fellow scholars Dr Vivian van Saaze and Dr Gabriella Giannachi for ongoing conversation and connections with Tate. As well as Dr Rosemary Candelario for collegial support and sharing recourses, Dr Kathy Carbonne for committed connection to our weekly phone calls during lockdown, and Selena Tempelton for deep friendship and writing encouragement.

My work would also not be possible without the help of gifted women operating from a place of wisdom informed by the body, movement, mind, and spirit including Tara Brach, Ali Gunning, Isabel Mortimer, Sarah Pritchard, Judith Stephenson, Judith Simon, and Fiona Wright.

There are no words to express my deepest gratitude for my parents. My mother Barbara and father Wayne Wookey who, as educators, believe in a lifetime of learning and of service, thank you. Your contribution to helping me in finding the words to express myself and to share the gifts of experience for the bettering of our world has left its mark throughout this project and will certainly shape the next phase of my practice. My dearest Vasilis Tsolis whose intimate partnership, love, patience, intelligence, and humour grounded and moved me through my research and writing. You remind me to always look to the opportunity within the challenge.

For all those mentioned and to my extended network whom are too big to mention but have influenced and supported me in so many ways, may our spatial relations across geographic and disciplinary spaces continue onward.

# Content Outline

# Introduction

> [W]hen I lived in NYC, I had a loft near the Hudson River. The street was perpendicular to the river and my bed was parallel to the river, placed north-south, with my head to the north. When I couldn't sleep, I would picture my friends in bed all over the city. Knowing their homes and where in their homes their beds were, knowing the streets of the city and its grid, I could lay them all out in relation to me – the river, their streets, the compass and each other, a map of more or less right-angled sleepers. This was my insomnia pastime, born of my penchant for 'seeing' people in space (Rethorst 2012: 15).

This thesis explores dance as a relational, site-based practice in the museum and the ways it is informed by the qualities of dance and the social and spatial skills of the dance artist. One of the skills of the dancer is thinking and imagining spatial relations and is exemplified in the quote above by dance artist Susan Rethorst. The late American urbanist, organisational analyst, journalist, and self-prescribed 'people watcher' William H. Whyte (1980) – also discusses the invisible lines and points of connection in space that are created through the everyday movement of people in his research of public space. He calls those observations 'choreographies'. For my thesis, I consider the museum as a place to better understand relations across and through space and make a case for how the dance artist is situated to best serve the social-spatial needs and potentials of the museum as a civic space. This thesis begins with complicating the positioning of dance in the museum by expanding or 'stretching' our understanding of what particular forms of relation and differing approaches to attention in the museum the dance produces. It considers the dance artist in the museum, as she situates herself and interacts in both the public and non-public spaces of the museum. By investigating a variety of spaces my thesis considers ways in which the dance artist interacts within a variety of sites and with both visitors and staff of the museum through spatial relating.

What this thesis sets out to answer is: Can the qualities of dance and, in particular, the social, spatial skills of the dance artist inspire new kinds of relationalities in the museum? What does a new kind of social relational space today mean? What modes of relation might be possible and resonate beyond the walls of the gallery? How might the skills of the dance

artist contribute to creating relations that are less hierarchical and towards more relationally focused spaces of museums and our world? By answering these questions this thesis supports the concern for *how* dance is in the museum and moves past outdated concerns for *why* dance is in the museum. In this way, my thesis prompts a thinking about what new spaces of relation might feel like whilst discussing the potentiality of the dance artist as a conduit for relating to site, self, and each other both across and within space. The 'how' that led me to think seriously about dance in the museum gave way to tracking my experiences there, as a dance artist. This thesis, therefore, is an opportunity to both reflect critically on my practice and the practice of others. Through engagement with practice and theories on dance in the museum, I bring a new voice of the dance artist to the table and contribute to, and disrupt, what continues to be a developing area of concern. It is my interest to contribute to discourses on dance in the museum in order to challenge current thinking and understanding of what dance does and can do there; what being in the museum means for dance (and the dance artist), and the larger cultural moment. A hypothesis that I will be exploring in the course of my thesis is that dance is about relation and the museum is a microcosm or model for trying out ways to be in the world. The museum as a place to practice and to rehearse spatial relations and to acknowledge the institution's social, spatial, and cultural context influence on the possibilities for relation and in collaboration with dance. Furthermore, this thesis will be considering what qualities and skills the dance artist brings to the museum that allow for, not only relation, but also, further infrastructural and policy changes in museum and of our time.

Often dance programming in the museum happens as one-off events and in unregulated conditions, with lack of best practice examples, exchanges, and negotiations. Alongside these unregulated conditions are concerns of how dance collaborates with and finds equal footing with its somewhat distant cousin, the visual arts, and within its host institution, the museum. My thesis emphasises a temporality of the presence of the dance artist as important to its potential in the museum. However, as dance becomes part of the changing focus of the museum, it also risks becoming instrumentalized within it. This thesis aims to work against the possibility of dance being absorbed by the museum for the purpose of fulfilling its agendas alone and by giving a voice to the dance artist by making a case for

dance as a way of *seeing*, *doing*, and *being* – a way of knowing through spatial relations. The epistemic and ontological phenomenon of dance in the museum, and in our contemporary moment, feels important to make evident and to move forward the discourse on dance in the museum. This thesis explores how dance resides in the museum in different ways in order to amplify the potential for its presence there. Only in this way can a movement towards understanding the social potential of the dance artist's presence and of dance, in general, in the museum be made possible. Otherwise, dance remains either a form of entertainment or a tool for engaging its visitors through participatory arts programming[1] agendas. I believe strongly that dance is, and deserves, more than the two options of existence in the museum.

Although the primary focus of this research is on dance as relation[2] in the museum, it suggests a possible wider stretch to include dance in the museum as an example of ways of being in the world, in the wider social context, beyond the walls of the institution. I, therefore, open up a space to consider the role the dance artist might play in the museum that can also resonate within a larger social context and in other areas of our contemporary moment. This widening perspective includes an opening towards philosophy and ideas from spatial theory such as Edward Soja's (1996) writing, influenced by Henri Lefebvre (1991), on 'feltspace'[3] that suggests there is more than one way to experience space. The notion of 'feltspace' is useful for my research in that it aligns with the idea of embodiment often used in dance as a way to describe being in one's body and a physical awareness of ones' body in and with space and with other people. For the sake of my thesis, I use the idea of 'feltspace' as a jumping off point and extend that to include relating to site, self, and each other through a consideration of dance as a form of relation. The purpose of my thesis is to move beyond current practices and thinking of dance in the museum as being in service to it, alone, and towards an understanding of dance as both an autonomous artistic practice and one that can be a means of human

[1] Artist engagement activity sits around such programming of dance and a case is made for the 'reach' and 'social worth' of it in a museum context, particularly with regards to its participatory potential.

[2] I am referring to the social-spatial relations that emerge in the museum when dance enters. There are, of course, the professional relations that also emerge as a part of working as a dance artist in and with museums. However, the scope of my research will not allow a consideration of what those relations might mean in the context of dance, per se, but the amount of time I do engage in professional dialogues and interactions with collaborators, museum staff, and audiences that are a part of dance in the museum provide useful insight into the idea of dance as relation in the museum in my thesis.

[3] 'Feltspace' is a term used by Edward Soja in his book *Thirdspace* in which he engages Henri Lefebvre's theories on spatial practice.

connection. I am interested in what the experience of the dance artist offers to ideas of sociality, experience, and possibilities for social change – all with a consideration towards space and spatial contexts.

When I first read the epigraph by dance artist Susan Rethorst in *A Choreographic Mind* (2012) that opens this thesis, I was struck by the familiarity of the image she describes, of relation through a sensory spatial 'map' – a map of an understanding of one's physical position in relation to others' physical position and across geographic space. It was striking because I felt such experiences were part of my own and, therefore, a dance artist's sensibility. I shared Rethorst's 'seeing people in space' as a way of connecting, of relational systematic thinking, and imagining[4]. Long before reading Rethorst's book and starting this thesis lived in the vast city of Los Angeles, having moved from the smaller-scale city of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. In need of connection across such geographic distanced space[5] back to my friends in Europe, I devised an activity to connect across the vast physical space between us. I first would walk to a small pocket park in my neighbourhood and find a relatively open area of grass. I would then figure out the coordinates of Amsterdam in relation to Los Angeles and to the position of my body in the park. For example, Amsterdam lies at a somewhat northeast direction from Los Angeles. Therefore, I would sense which part of my body was facing in that direction, or towards the northeast corner of the park. From there, I would imagine an invisible line from that part of my body, out across the space, connecting on the other side to those I was focused on in another country, time, and space. Somewhat like the lines drawn across maps on those screens in an airplane that track the trajectory of the flight, my lines are imagined as visual lines, but they are *felt* lines of connection. The lines I feel seem to run straight across from where I am and to the person on the other end of that line with whom, in a sensory way, I am tethered with. It is not quite like the curved line of the flight route that moves over Greenland to get to America from Europe. These felt lines of

[4] There are other examples of dance artists who both understand and employ in their work an approach to 'seeing' people in space, namely, the work of William Forsythe (*Synchronous Objects)* that I will speak to later in this thesis.

[5] Although I reference back to a time in the past, upon finalising my thesis I was re-experiencing a need for connecting across spaces as I was on 'lockdown' in my flat during the Covid-19 global pandemic that forced the world inside and cut off our physical connection to each other, except for live-in family or friends, and sparked new ways to connect socially online and across imaginary physical spaces as written about in my blog posting *Felt Lines of Connection in a Time of Isolation & Physical Distancing* (April 3, 2020).

connection are more similar to 'desire lines' or the shortcut routes carved into the landscape and made visible through developed erosion or carving out of a path made by the repetitive footfalls of walkers who choose the more direct route. Both the imagined map of connections imagined by Rethorst that connects her in her to those across the New York City and my imagined lines of connection between cities are acts of relating to and of 'seeing' people through a corporeal, felt sense of the imaginary, that are an important part of relating.

These ways of connecting are also recognisable to me as a dance artist working in museums where I navigate my own bodily position and my role as an artist in, and as part of, that site and in relation to others in and through space. Spatial relating is also a part of my process of organising my thoughts. As part of my writing this thesis I have created a stack of hand-drawn mappings of my thinking as a way to arrange, on a page, the various threads of my practice and, through a series of circles and lines, connecting them back and around to each other. Creating islands on the page where thoughts can take shape and sit next to other thoughts, these maps are very much a part of my practice of thinking and that come from my training in dance-making or choreography. As a dance artist I was trained in ways of organising, arranging, and making sense of varying sets of information by bringing it into a whole. My training as an artist is a sensed-based understanding of corporeality and proprioception through physical movement and, most often, within a space with others. These sensibilities stem from my training in dance and that has been supported by other somatic practices[6], and as an inter-disciplinary artist working across dance, architecture, design, and visual arts. My practice has extended across different venues from the theatre, to the street and, more recently, the museum. This has meant working with a diversity of publics and within varying spatial conditions. I approach museum spaces the same way I approach public space and based on my experience working across varying spatial contexts. Because of this approach, I have sometimes been referred to as a public practice or social practice-based artist[7]. Yet, it is distinctly my training as a dancer and dance-maker that has offered me

[6] Including, but not limited to, Alexander Technique, Body Mind Centering [sic], Body Weather Laboratory, Feldenkrais's 'Awareness Through Movement', Kinetic Awareness, and Yoga.

[7] Within a North American context, I am considered a public practice artist. What is unique to my work within social practice, a term that has been discussed by Shannon Jackson (2011) and Bishop (2012), among others, is that – unlike the artists discussed by such writers – I come to social practice through dance and, more specifically, as a trained dance artist and not as a visual artist.

the skills necessary to relate to others through space and to extend my understandings and knowledge through my practice and with others. I am interested in understanding the everyday performance of the site and to develop ways my practice then stretches the everyday towards performance and considers the experience of the public.

My thesis will return again and again to the idea of the dance artist as a social-spatial thinker, as argued above, as a reason to suggest a new way of doing dance in the museum. In asking *how* can dance be in the museum and by recognising the skill set of the dance artist, I move towards a proposal for a new role of the dance artist in the museum. In this way my thesis works to further unpack what dance not only is as a product on display or educational element in the museum but to understand that dance, as a practice in the museum, produces relation. I acknowledge that the space of the museum contains a sociality and, by dance entering that sociality, it can be shifted and changed. As this thesis builds an argument for dance as a practice of spatial relating in the museum, it also acknowledges that the museum is a fluid, ever-changing entity affected by the people inhabiting it. The dance artist is now one of those people and my thesis includes her voice and, by doing so, helps to fill gaps in current debates of dance in the museum. Those gaps are about the potentiality of dance as a maker of relation in the museum and how relation is partly a spatial matter. This thesis addresses gaps in knowledge in both dance and the visual arts fields by looking at dance in the museum from inside the dance from the dance artist's perspective. It makes a case for the skills of the dance artist who, as introduced in the quote by Rethorst above and my own experience, has the ability to 'see' people in space as well as 'feel' space a way of relating and of instituting other ways of being in the museum and, therefore, prompting the museum into change.

I am compelled to write this thesis having worked in museums over the last two decades as a dance artist, researcher, and consultant. I am interested in the impact dance can have on the idea of relational practice within the museum and in society. Relational practice was first coined by Brazilian artist Lygia Clark in in the 1970s. At that time, she referred to the material objects in her work as relational or, 'objetos relacionais'. These objects were relational in that they offered a therapeutic practice, which she considered to be separate from art making (In Terms of Performance – Relational, Helguera 2016). I take my cue from

Clark and pick up on the relational aspect of art by applying it to dance. Similar to, but different from Clark's definition of relational, I look at dance as a relational practice in the way it serves as a connecting device between people, site, and self. One might argue this, too, has therapeutic benefits but it is not my intention to suggest so, at this stage of my research enquiry. Perhaps, as the research progresses beyond this thesis, it will become a subject of concern. For now, I look to challenge us to consider how dance produces relation in the museum as a starting point for current, as well as its future, potentialities there. What the dance artists brings into the institution is attention as a form of relation. I will map out a set of three examples of how different modes of attention: detached, absent, and present lend themselves to particular sets of relations involving the dance artist, the museum site, visitors, and museum staff. By doing so, I make visible the ways that the social and spatial sensibilities of the dance artist manifest themselves in her work in and with museums and that her skill set of complex spatial-social reasoning is an asset both to the museum and to our contemporary moment. This thesis argues to move dance beyond entertainment and spectacle – or, even, as something that engages, enacts, and produces participation of visitors in the museum – to a quality of relating in the museum. A significant aspect of this thesis is directed at these concerns and it aims to expand the current thinking on the socio-economic rationale and political drivers for museum programming of dance and associated rhetoric. In this way my research is validated by its fulfilling a gap in understanding and critical thinking in relation to dance's role, and the dance artist's position, within the art institution. The practice of dancing in museums that this thesis offers up has little to do with responding to the artwork hanging on the walls, although this is not out of neglect, but in order to draw attention elsewhere, and everything to do with being a human being moving within and throughout the space, with others, and oneself in the museum that is far from depending on painting and sculpture, for example. What my practice aims for and what this thesis does is reveal to us where the possibility and new, uncharted territories of attention and relation, or what is now called dance, in the museum, resides. We simply need to move towards that potential in order to realise the value of dance's inclusion as a relational experience in the ever-evolving space of the museum.

## Experiential Turn of the Museum

This section discusses the ways in which museums, in their shift towards experiences have turned to dance to fill a need of engaging and participatory programming. What is important in this shift is that the product of dance or what it produces (for museums and visitors) in terms of experiences can also overshadow the role of dance as a practice, a way of being in the museum, as a quality of relating and of questioning the value of experience. In *Performance Research Journal's* issue *On Labour & Performance* (2012) Stevphen Shukaitis writes about value of the social in art. In the article he writes, 'Regardless of changing trends in arts and cultural policy, it is this social value of the arts, and cultural labour more generally, how they take part in renewing social bonds and sociality more generally, that is precisely not recognized or rewarded' (53). The being together, the making something in the moment with others, the physical shared space, and the general liveness of it all is, I agree with Shukaitis, of great value and largely under-appreciated in the discourse on art. What my thesis does is apply that concern to the discipline of dance in the museum.

Dance in the museum is arguably part of the wider discussions about a cultural shift towards experiences that people seek out over looking at an object, particularly in the last ten to fifteen years. Thus, my goal is to open up a window into the perspective of the dance artist and those on the outside looking in (audiences, curators, theorists, funding agencies)[8] in order to have a voice among the collective voices in the discourse on dance in the museum. I want to open a discussion on the relations of the practice of dance in museums beyond the discussion of the audience. In order to do that, I want to first make clear that the dance artist, in her absent, detached, and/or present attention to and relation with the audience also create space for other relations, with other people and things (the site of the museum) to emerge. Another goal of this thesis is to explore and make visible the ways that dance, as a form of relation in the museum, demonstrates the significant role that the dance artist plays in shaping those relations and in furthering the aspirations of the museum as a social experience over time and as it adapts to the needs of our contemporary moment.

[8] In my professional relations and discussions with such stakeholders of dance in the museum, I find there are varying degrees of understanding.

Whilst the museum's experiential turn is certainly new for museums in its overall history, it is not necessarily new in the short-term understanding of the museum over the last few decades. As exemplified in 2007 when Catherine Wood, Senior Curator International Art (Performance) at Tate Modern, wrote, '[a]rtistic practice can no longer revolve around the construction of objects to be consumed by a passive bystander' (2007: 11). This suggests that museums have been thinking about other ways to present art that engages museum visitors as more active participants. In order to do so the museum, as has been discussed, has brought in artistic practices such as dance as a way to move past a passivity of viewing on the part of the visitor. We know from what has been said here that the experiential, performative turn of the museum has positioned dance within its programming. What my thesis does is to question that position and to offer up alternatives to it or, what I will later refer to as, 're-positionings'. As Dorothea von Hantelmann (2014) asserts, this experiential, performative turn is about a shift towards the experience that an artwork produces, rather than the meaning it depicts. It places the viewer of the artwork at the centre of concern for museums. In positioning the spectator at the centre of concern, the dance artist is then positioned to deliver on the expectations of that spectator and, in turn, the expectations of the museum for her to be engaging and, at times, her work to be participatory. These positionings can be problematic for dance and for the dance artist. Professor in Performance and New Media, Gabriella Giannachi adds to my thinking of new positionings or possibilities by saying, '[a] primary emphasis on considerations of use, or "what the work communicates" (as opposed to medium, what the work is) opens up new possibilities for collection and display' (2012: 5). However, Giannachi, is referring here to potentialities for collection and display of artworks and my interest is in how the idea of relation might replace the idea of display and suggest further opportunities for dance to be something other than a practice or a product on show in the museum. I will discuss, in more detail, Giannachi's thinking that becomes helpful in the case study chapters following in this thesis and, in particular, on her referencing relations as an ecological matter.

As dance has become a part of the turn to experience, new spaces are also being built in museums for such activities. Most recently, the Marie-Josée and Henry Kravis Studio (or 'The Studio') space for 'live and experimental programming' as part of the renovation at the Museum of Modern Art opened in 2019. The press release (The Expanded and Reimagined

Museum of Modern Art to Open on October 21, 2019) describes, 'The Studio in the heart of the Museum will feature live programming and performances that react to, question, and challenge histories of modern art and the current cultural moment'. The objective that the performances there will 'react' to histories of modern art and the cultural moment is further evidence that performance in the museum is sometimes considered a service to the purposes of the museum and its visitors over its innate, autonomous position as a practice that may, or may not, be in reaction to other artworks or to the history of modern art. The well-known Tate Modern, as another example, established an entire floor called the Tate Exchange[9] in 2016 that the museum refers to as '[a] place for all to play, create, reflect and question what art can mean to our everyday' (Tate Exchange at Tate Modern, 2016) as part of the Switch House extension by the internationally recognised architecture team Herzog & de Meuron. It is not surprising then, given the duration of dance and performance in the museum and the more recent responses from museums to take it up and integrate these new practices into museum contexts and to build physical spaces for dance, that dance in the museum has become a very current concern. Dance in the museum has prompted debates within the dance and the museum sectors about its relevancy in the museum. As dance has sometimes felt, to some extent, a strange fit in the museum primarily focused on the display, conservation, and selling of objects, it has also been finding a position for itself as a sustainable practice, an art form on display, a tool of engagement and learning, and also, in some cases, as part of the permanent collection of the museum.

In addition to the experiential turn, there has also been a history since Marcel Duchamp's readymade of moving things into the frame of art that didn't belong there before. In the last ten years we witnessed a fascination from visual artists bringing readymade formats of theatre or choreography into art practice. The artists have, however, often borrowed it in a non-expert way. What I mean by this and extracting from Wood (in Malzacher

[9] The Tate Exchange is run by Tate Learning, and initially it invited outside organisations and academic institutions (such as Trinity Laban Conservatory of Music and Dance; Wayne McGregor Studio; and Goldsmith University) to programme and to take over spaces of the museum with their own projects. In its first year it also hired performance artist Tim Etchells to create a theme across the year for those outside entities to connect and/or relate to in their choice of programming. It is important to note that these are paying institutional partners. The partners pay a few thousand pounds a year, which is more than most freelance artists could afford, should it have been opened to them. The partners gain space within the year to programme.

and Warsza, 2017) is that the visual artists are usually not trained in dance or choreography. Live or performance artists often engage the human body as their medium of choice but, more often than not, also do not have training in dance or choreography. More likely, they are trained in the visual arts or, perhaps, theatre. Therefore the visual artist (including live and performance artists) are not 'experts' (43) within the field of dance or in dance making. This concern is highlighted in Wood's statement that,

> The motivation [of visual artists] has a lot to do with [visual] artists trying, on the one hand, to overcome the obsolete connotations of a certain kind of body-centric performance art from the 1970s as very self-oriented medium and finding formats to experiment with communality and sharing. Artists look for ways of gathering, of being together, and making art experiences – the performative context offers them that (43).

This move from performance or live art approaches to performance in which the body was central, but lacked the sociality that Wood is suggesting, is of interest to my thinking about the recent (in the last fifteen years) inclusion of dance in the museum as part of the performance context Wood is referring to. More specifically, in reiterating Wood's use of the term 'gathering' and 'of being together' as belonging to what this renewed 'performative context' I acknowledge that dance is a part of that performance context and agree with Wood that visual artists are not 'experts' in the field of dance making. However, my thesis takes a step further by suggesting that the performance of dance is not the only aspect for contributing to a need for 'gathering', 'being together', and 'making art experiences' in the museum. Dance, as I argue, is made up of the skills of the dance artist who provides such services to the museum. This thesis asks us to ponder what else those skills might do in the museum. What ways might the dance artist's skills contribute to another kind of museum and as a mode of thinking and being in the museum as a space of change? This thesis responds in part to a moment in time where dance has seen a renewed and increased profile in the museum and the museum has become a place to experience in which the moving human body has become an important component to that experience, not just static artworks. Museums are containers of artwork and heritage and also perform functions of communication, education, socialisation, and integration (Fontal, 2008). In moving into further discussions of dance as a relational, site-based practice in the museum, and one directly related to the points made above, it is important to recognise that the museum is a

space of possible social encounters[10] and dance, as relational site-based practice brings that potentiality of the museum forward, amplifies it, and puts it into motion.

The museum has become a place for a variety of different activities suggesting that the viewing of material artworks may, at times, come in as a secondary activity to its programming. The museum, a complex venue, offers up exhibitions, performances, and talks directing the public to discover a wide range of activities that they might find elsewhere but, being in the museum, offers a certain cultural cachet that other venues may not. Events such as sleepovers, late night parties ('Lates'), book clubs, physical workouts, and meditation courses are on offer at museums. For example, *Mindful Awareness Meditation* at the Hammer Museum in Los Angeles, which inspired other museums across the continent, such as The Wexner Center[sic] for the Arts in Columbus, Ohio to add their own flavour of mindfulness offering amongst artworks in the galleries called *On Pause*. These more recent experiences move beyond the arena of activity found in the café and museum shop over the last few decades and suggest being either an addition to or, sometimes, a replacement for the community house, local shop, library, gym, theatre, hotel, school, and club. The museum as an all-inclusive venue seems to be a go-to place for so many things that it is not surprising that dance, given its history of bringing people together in a shared experience, has been ushered in as one of the means in which the museum bills itself as more than a museum.

In her book *The Social Work of Museums,* Lois Silverman argues that the museum is a 'social agent', an 'agent of social change' (2009: 19). She claims that, '[f]undamentally, museums offer interactive social experiences of communication in which relationships are activated and people make meaning of objects' (21). The difference between what Silverman is stating and what this thesis argues is that it is not necessarily only the programming of installations, shows, and events that museums do to incite such social work, but rather it is the programming of live performance, the actual engaging of human beings, that is at play. In this case dance artists are being engaged by museums and that prompts an understanding of

[10] The museum, as a public site for gathering socially, acquired its modern form during the late 18th and early 19th centuries alongside other institutions: the international exhibition and the department store. What I am proposing here is that the sociality of the museum has always been present and is also changing. I will cover this more as the thesis progresses.

what the dance artist, as a person and not only her dance work, brings to this kind of discourse. However, despite existing writings on the museum as a place for social relations, as a new public site, and even as a social service (Bishop 2012; Silverman 2009), the museum is not generally recognised as a 'site' within which a kind of spatial seeing of each other or social-spatial understandings of relations takes place. What I am trying to say here is that the ways in which, as exemplified in Rethorst's quote at the beginning of this chapter and my experiences of imaginary mapping, the dance artist engages a site and makes sense of the spatial, social connections within, contributes new understandings of the museum as a social site and is capable of mentally mapping out and prompting trajectories of movement and interactions within the museum.

More importantly to this thesis, it is the dance artist who plays a unique role in the kinds of relations that are produced in the museum. It is through this thinking that I want to give voice to the dance artist in the ongoing discourse of how dance is and can be in the museum. As my research gives rise to the dancer's voice as a necessary contribution to our understanding of dance's prospect in the museum it creates connection across space with others. I acknowledge that the silenced dance artist's voice is part of a wider, cultural concern even more problematic in the museum. My thesis calls attention to the possibility that the silenced dance artist's voice may be due to spatial, temporal, and social-coding in the museum that affect the way dance – and human relation – is experienced, seen, and felt. It calls attention to the way dance artists practice an embodied seeing that is both social and spatial. I begin this introduction chapter with the idea of 'seeing people in space' as one of the ways dance artists engage spatial relations and human-to-human connection, even when they are not physically in the same room together.

My inquiries have prompted dialogue with museum studies, dance and performance studies, spatial theory, human geography, and sociology. More specifically, my thesis challenges Bourriaud's (1998) ideas on relational aesthetics. Bourriaud's research looks primarily at male visual artist's practices and what my thesis does is it opens up a space for the female dance artist voice – a voice that speaks to embodied practice, tacit knowledge, and the soft skills of collaboration and communication. I am supported in this expanded thinking by the writings of Claire Bishop (2012, 2013, 2014), Miwon Kwon (2002), and

Shannon Jackson (2011, 2012, 2014) who, unlike Bourriaud, expand their research to performance and theatre artists whilst questioning the validity of participation and engagement agendas. What sets my research apart from all of the theorists mentioned above is; One, I speak from a practitioner/researcher perspective and; Two, I make dance (as different from other artistic practices as made clear above) central to my argument. I use the term 'relation' both to suggest that dance is a relational practice, and that it produces relations even across multiple options of placement or positioning of the dance artist in the museum. My thesis claims that the actual physical presence of the dance artist is one way but not the only way to position dance in the museum. Being physically present is not always necessary to accomplish a bringing forth of relation because it is the skill set of the dance artist that can be implemented to provoke the kinds of qualities of attention and approach that quantifies spatial relation and connectivity that are necessary to my argument. These skills can be brought forward through other approaches and modes of attention and with the aid of material objects. In this way my thesis complicates the idea of observing dance and of *seeing*, *doing*, and *being* in the museum on the part of the dancer, museum staff, and visitor. In moving forward, I suggest various ways dance can be in the museum as a form of relational experience that will start with unpacking a history relevant to my concerns about dance in the museum.

## A Short History of Dance in the Museum

Dance entered museums as far back as the 1900s. The dancer Olga Desmond performed in the museum as early as 1908, using tableau vivants and living statues à la grèque' (see Brandstetter, 2015); And participatory activation of the museum that directly involved its audience goes as far back as the 1940s (Giannachi, 2017). For example, the 1939 New York World's Fair presented, alongside other things, performers who 'posed as statues' (2017: 184). We now, therefore, know that dance in the museum is not necessarily a new phenomenon. What feels important today in our considering dance in the museum is to look at the (renewed) phenomenon through current socio-spatial times we are living in. Dance has been in the museum for a long time and what is new is that other arts and their hegemonies are only realising that now dance is worth considering, debating, and understanding as a staple element in museums. It is time to embrace that dance has, and continues to be, visibly

present in the museum and to move past the question of *why* dance is in the museum to *how* dance is in the museum.

Dance in the museum can look and feel different depending on its context and position in the museum. For example, it can take the shape of a theatre-like environment with the audience on one side looking at the dance as in the work *Fase: Four Movements to the Music of Steve Reich* (2012) at Tate Modern by Anne Theresa De Keersmaeker; or it can take the shape of the audience who walks along with the moving dance and looks to the dance artist for direction as seen in the work of Katie Green in *Choreographing the Collection* (2017) at the Dulwich Picture Gallery; and in the work of William Forsythe's *Choreographic Objects* (2009-2019) there is no dance artist present and the audience is looking elsewhere and inward towards their own experience as the performance. I am interested in the range of being-ness of the dance artist in the museum from meandering alone or with others as a performance gesture to dancing in front of an audience. These insights offer different perspectives of relation through a consideration of the physical and metaphorical positioning of the dance artist in the museum. These perspectives challenge current modes of being and of behaviour in the museum that the dance artist introduces and that play a key role in the potentiality of relations. To encompass a range, I have named three positions of the dance artist in the museum (*detached, absent,* and *present*) and how those positions might reveal more about how dance is in the museum and how we might open up wider fields of knowledge to dance's potentiality in that site.

The scope of my research on dance in the museum is Post-Modern and Contemporary Dance within the particular economic and cultural contexts of two regions: North America and Western Europe[11] during a five-year period: 2014 to 2019. I chose this period because it encompasses all of the experiences that are featured in my case studies as well as a period in which there was a rise in dance being presented in museums and within the region I was researching. Some dance events included *Dancing Museums*, a European Union funded project that I will speak to later on in this thesis and several significant programmes at Tate

[11] This includes the United Kingdom (UK) which, on writing this chapter and during the period of my research, was still part of the European Union (EU). The UK officially left the EU in January 2020.

Modern and the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) for which I attended and included in my research. Throughout my writing, I include references to the period of the late 1960s to mid-1970s, specifically the work of the New York City downtown dance scene Judson Dance Theater[sic] artists, that has influence on the inclusion of dance in the museum today and on my own practice and research approach having studied and worked with Yvonne Rainer, a signature artist during that period and up through to today and whose work is featured in my fist case study.

The programming of dance within museum settings, as well, has a long tradition in the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States (US). There has been an increasing interest by major museums such as the Tate Modern, Tate Britain, Baltic Gallery, Whitworth Gallery in the UK, and others such as the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) and the New Museum in the US to curate and to acquire dance[12] as a central component of its identity and programmes on offer. Some key examples of dance in the museum in the past decade include, *MOVE*: *Choreographing You* at Hayward Gallery in London (2010), then in Dusseldorf (2011) and Seoul (2012); *Danser sa Vie*, at the Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris (2011); the exhibition *Dance/Draw* (2011) at the ICA Boston; the exhibition *Dancing Around the Bride*, at the Philadelphia Museum of Art (MoMA) (2013) and Sarah Michelson's commissioned work for the biennial Documenta 13 in Kassel, Germany titled *Devotion: The American Dancer* (2013) for which she was the first dance artist to win the top prize. Lastly, Xavier Le Roy's 'Rétrospective' (2014 and ongoing) is also important to mention as it borrows a format from visual arts of installation, but with dance artists and a choreographic approach. There is also *LINE* (2010) and *Inventing Abstraction* (2013) and, more recently, *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done* (2018) all at MoMA. Projects such as *Dancing Museums* (2018-2021), a multi-year-long series of events active across seven EU countries since 2014, illustrates that dance artists, who have human-to-human experience at the centre of their practice, have become highly sought-after international curation, learning, programming, and 'mediation' teams within the museum. Each of these examples present dance on display to be seen by the visitor. One example is Musée *de la Danse,* that also included audience participation as

[12] Whilst writing this thesis the Van Abbemuseum in the Netherlands approached me with an offer to purchase one of my collaborative works, *Punt.Point.* It was in this professional relation that I gained insight in and experience of collecting dance by the museum.

part of a durational and large-scale model that I will speak to later in this thesis. It is important to note here that the dance artist Boris Charmatz who is behind Musée *de la Danse* made a political move in renaming the entire Centre Chorégraphique in Rennes, France as the *Musée de la Danse*. In his *Manifesto for a National Choreographic Centre* he writes,

> Dance is much broader than what is simply choreographic: its territory must enlarge if we wish to see the overly enclosed space open up, in which it still stands in our society. The space of a National Choreographic Centre must expand well beyond that which is simply choreographic (*Manifesto for a National Choreographic Centre* 2014).

I identify with Charmatz's use of words such as, 'overly enclosed space open up' and his point of how dance 'stands in our society'. What I read in his statement is that there is a need to widen the arena in which we claim as dance and as choreography in order to expand out and into the area of society so that dance and choreography can have greater impact. To begin that process, it is important to Charmatz and to me, that language be not only considered but how we name things must change. In saying that I begin, in this thesis, to put forward the possibility of re-thinking and potentially, re-naming dance as a relational and site-based practice in the museum and, by doing so, re-consider the museum as the site within which to rehearse relations. Within the re-naming there is a re-imagining of possibility for the wider reach of the dance and the museum, together, to change – not only within their respective arenas – but, more importantly, the greater societal moment they are both in.

As the range of experiences of dance in museum has multiplied in complexity there is even wider room for analysing, reflecting, and writing about how dance in the museum reflects a relationality that can be affective to towards the greater good in our contemporary moment that, thus far, has not been fully explored in either dance studies or museum studies and, therefore, makes this thesis an important contribution to the current discourses surrounding the practices of dance and museology. Part of the problem or lack of significant discourse or, even, coverage on dance in the museum is the contemporary dance community has often recognised dance in the museum as beginning in the 1960s with the Post-Modern dance movement. As we learned from the opening of this part of my chapter is that dance has been in the museum long before that, beginning, in the early 1900s. This turn to the

Post-Modern generation as a starting point for understanding current practices of dance in the museum today is understandable in that the dancers and choreographers of that generation were either expanding the reach of their work to other audiences through invitations to perform in museum, such as the case of Merce Cunningham, or, like the Judson Dance Theater artists breaking away from proscenium stage as a venue for their work and because they did not find an invitation to present in theatres. However, such neglect of dance's history in the museum before the 1960s is disconcerting in that it limits our understanding of the roots of dance in the museum and, because of that, history is left incomplete and clues that might support other modes of knowing in our current moment are either forgotten, left out, or lost forever. The question this raises for me is, what might we learn from dance's past lives in the museum that can tell us something about relational practice and the museum as a site for exchange and through movement?

Despite potential lack of information more recent examples of how dance artists, such as Merce Cunningham, entered the museum and what they did there is, indeed, helpful to our current interest in dance in the museum in the way it opens up the possibility of discovering what dance can and has been in the museum. Again, as an example, Cunningham's prolific body of work for dance in cultural spaces that he called *Events* demonstrates his ability, willingness, and inventiveness as a dance artist to not only re-make his works for the space of the gallery but to re-name what he did in order to separate it out from his other works and approaches. To clarify what he means by the title of his dances for museums or the word he chose ('Events') he states,

> Event consists of complete dances, excerpts of dances from the repertory, and often new sequences arranged for particular performance and place, with the possibility of several separate activities happening at the same time—to allow not so much [for] an evening of dances as the experience of dance (Museum Event No. 1 (Events) - Merce Cunningham Trust n.d.).

The emphasis on 'experience of dance' rather than 'evening of dance' suggests that the element of time on the watching of dance (whether seeing it as a full evening from beginning to end or, as Cunningham did, offer dance as an ongoing activity in the museum that can be experienced by the audience over time and more like an installation in which the audience

can come and go. Some of the *Events* included seating for the audience but there was an open, lit space in which the museum visitor could come and go at their own leisure and during the dance performance run. Currently, we are witnessing dance in the museum go beyond something to look at as an audience member, in the way that Cunningham's *Events* suggested, and more to offer the audience member a participatory experience. This focus is driving dance artists to rearrange their practice to suit the needs of the museum for visitors to be more directly engaged. Examples of these include Musée *de la Danse* (2015) and *Dancing Museums* (2015-2021) which will be further investigated in this thesis. Before we get to those examples, it is important to discuss my interest in the *how* of dance in the museum.

My research will give rise to the dancer's voice as a necessary contribution to our understanding of dance's prospect in the museum it creates connection across space with others. I acknowledge that the silenced dance artist's voice is part of a wider, cultural concern even more problematic in the museum. My thesis calls attention to the possibility that the silenced dance artist's voice may be due to spatial, temporal, and social-coding in the museum that affect the way dance – and human relation – is experienced, seen, and felt. It calls attention to the way dance artists practice an embodied seeing that is both social and spatial. I begin this introduction chapter with the idea of 'seeing people in space' as one of the ways dance artists engage spatial relations and human-to-human connection, even when they are not physically in the same room together. The question is *how* might dance offer insight into such spatial and relational prospects

## How versus Why (is) Dance in the Museum

There have been numerous debates on why dance, as an artform and practice, is in the museum since the start of my research. Such discussions have been a part of events such as: *New Conversations for Dance & Museums* (2014) at Pavilion Dance Southwest; *Dance & Museums Working Together Symposium* (2015) at The Horniman Museum and Gardens in partnership with Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music & Dance; *Dance and Art Forum: Why Dance in Museums?* (2017) at Siobhan Davies Dance. There is even the widely visited video online called *Why Dance in a Museum? How Art Became Active* as part of the *Tate Shots* (2018) produced by Tate as part of their online educational services.

I find the *why* question problematic because this question does not allow for consideration of the ways in which dance is, and might be, situated in the museum as relational potential. The arguments of *why* stagnates the discussion on dance's potential in the museum by trying to justify it as a thing that has value there[13]. The discourse on dance still has yet to explore the position of the dance artist *already and solidly in* the museum and its effect on relations. My thesis steps out of the grip of justification, accepts that dance is in the museum (now for a long time), and that it will continue to play a role there. It moves into a larger arena and space for considering dance, not only in the museum, but looks to the museum as a practice in its own right and how it collaborates with dance to co-produce spatially supported relations. In this way, I accept that dance has entered the museum, affects and is affected by it, as it collaborates and co-exists with its own relational attitude with the museum as it co-constructs experiences of relational through *seeing*, *doing*, and *being* in the museum.

The interest to understand the why of dance in the museum is also part platforms of my own creation, including the publication, *WHO CARES? Dance in the Gallery & Museum* (2015) that I initiated and co-edited with Siobhan Davies Dance. The book lays out a series of interviews I conducted between 2014 and 2015 with dance artists and curators in the UK and the US about why they (curators) chose to program dance or (dance artists) to show their dance work in galleries and museums. This publication serves as a significant piece of data collection that led me to begin to question, not *why*, but *how* dance is (and can be) in the museum. The information gathered from the interviews led me to understand that dance was becoming and is a stable presence in the museum. Through this new research enquiry, my experience, and data collected, my thesis has come about. However, the approach to *how* is often not the one taken up by the dance artist nor the museum and, therefore, opportunities

[13] It is important to note here that my advocacy for better working conditions and equitable pay for dance artists in the local, national, and international cultural sector has been widely known through, most notably, my *Open Letter to Artists* (2011), as well as my continued leadership service on the *Independent Dance Committee* at Equity UK (the performing arts union) since 2016 and as a Governor for the *Northern School of Contemporary Dance* in Leeds, UK since 2018.

for the kinds of relation this thesis is speaking to become hindered by problems in the way dance is situated in the museum.

## Problems and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum

Within current museum and arts funding agendas supporting experience through participation and engagement in the last two decades, the dance artist has often been expected to 'activate' and 'engage' spaces and artworks within the museum and create 'participatory' performances for its visitors through programmed events. Some examples of such agendas can be seen in the works by Boris Charmatz's *Musée de la Danse* (Tate, 2015) a *BMW Tate Live* Commission and *Dancing Museums* (various locations 2014-2017)[14] a European-funded (*Creative Europe*) project. Both of these projects had significant audience engagement and participation components to them – from a mass open warm up for museum visitors and dancers lifting visitors up to see artworks close up to a large-scale public disco party. Thinkers, such as Hal Foster (2015), have written specifically about the problem of the call to activate the visitors to the museum and the issues and concerns that arise from doing so. He writes,

> Another reason for this embrace of performance events is that they are thought to activate the viewer, who is thereby assumed, wrongly, to be passive to begin with. Museums today can't seem to leave us alone; they prompt and prod us as many of us do our children. And often this activation has become an end, not a means: as in the culture at large, communication and connectivity are promoted for their own sake, with little interest in the quality of subjectivity and sociality effected. All this helps to validate the museum, to overseers and onlookers alike, as relevant, vital or simply busy; yet, more than the viewer, it is the museum itself that the museum seeks to activate (25).

I agree with Foster and call on another way to consider dance in the museum not as an activator but as something already activating through the quality of its being in the museum. Furthermore, my thesis acknowledges dance in the museum beyond simply being a problem

[14] I am specifically referring to the first iteration (DM1) of the project that took place in this period. There is currently a second iteration (DM2) of the project called *The Democracy of Beings* that began in 2018 and will run through 2021.

to solve and towards a quality of relation in the museum. In my interest in dance as relation I discuss – through the case studies – modes of attention of the dance artist including a detached, absent and present way of being in the museum.

In my wanting to move beyond the 'problems', it is important to make clear, again, that artworks, spaces, and people do not need activating. Artworks, spaces, and people are already and innately 'activated', as in performing their being-ness in the museum, or what von Hantelmann (2010) describes as the performative aspect of artwork, as well as the performance of the everyday in which the sociologist Erving Goffman (1990) has written about extensively and, also, emerges from the work of urbanist William H. Whyte (1980) whose detailed study of pedestrian movement in public spaces is described as 'choreography'. The misunderstanding on the part of museum specialists and, also sometimes, dance artist themselves that dance is in the museum to facilitate an activation of other either artists' work, a temporary yet elevated experiences of the museum's spaces, or alluring engagement its visitors (and sometimes all three) is not useful to the forwarding the potential of dance nor of the museum. Current ways of doing dance in the museum do not always serve dance as an autonomous art practice, nor are they always necessary to the viewing experience of artworks or physical encounter with a building by architects. Other people's creative work is not dependent on dance to exist more fully for the witness. These concerns have been further explored by Marie-Louise Crawley (2018) who has written on dance being of service to the artwork in, specifically, in the archaeological museum. Her research has helped me to probe ways dance can reside in the contexts of contemporary and modern art museums a bit further and ask, 'If the seeing is not on the art, might dance shift our focus on our relations *through* the space of the museum, with each other and, ultimately, to oneself?' I am interested in and desire something more enlightened through practice and understanding of dance for the museum, its visitors, the staff, and for dance artists making work in the museum. Dance can add a dimension of experience to an event (such as looking at art) already taking place but it is not an 'activator' or 'enhancer' of experience in the way that some museums are asking it to be. The disconnect between what museums sometimes expect and want dance is capable of for the museum as a site that houses the people who inhabit it – for *everybody* involved, including the dance artist herself. This interest going beyond current engagement and participation agendas of dance in the museum and towards,

what I am naming as 'spatial relating'. This thesis is motivated by my interest to address some of the issues of dance in the museum by proposing other ways of integrating dance in the museum. Therefore my research project argues for another kind employment of the dancer in the museum: that of a skilled practitioner and creative force for change.

I now turn to *Dance Research Journal*'s (DRJ) special issue, *Dance in the Museum* (2014) as it highlights a broad range of issues arising when dance is presented in the museum. One of the main issues, according to DRJ, is there are two systems of spectatorship (that of the theatre and the other of the museum) that create dichotomies of social, spatial, temporal, and economic conditions. In this thesis, I will pick up on the social and spatial conditions of the museum and some of the issues that arise when dance is brought into the museum to engage museum visitors and when visitors are asked to participate. Some of those issues, for example, are that dance artists are often invited into museums where there is little to no expert experience or understanding of the field of dance on the part of curators and learning staff and, therefore, it is the dance artist who must articulate both her tangible needs (such as clean floors, water, warm-up space and room temperature) and more intangible needs (such as including her perspective on the context for which her work will be presented and in relation to the museum as frame). My thesis focuses on the more intangible concerns but does recognise the set of tangible issues that are part of the negotiations when dance enters the museum but not in a way that adds value to dance.

Whilst I acknowledge that all of the conditions named in DRJ are important to understanding dance in the museum and the differing systems of spectatorship, I am interested in unpacking the social and spatial conditions through a slightly different, but related phenomenon, of *dance as 'seeing others in space': of relation in the museum.* More specifically, my research points to the skills of the dance artist in social-spatial matters that contribute both to shaping the context in which her work is presented in, as well as, to the museum as a site for relational exchanges. Despite and, perhaps, because of the different systems of spectatorship between theatre and dance, the dance artist initiates certain sets of spatial relations with, for example, other dance artists, curators, museum staff, visitors, site, and self. My interest is in making visible the ways that the dance artist in the museum, both dancing and not dancing, present and not present, co-creates a multitude of socio-spatial

connections. Further along in this thesis I will address, more specifically, the proposal that 'seeing people in space' is an untapped skill of the dance artist that extends beyond her work in museums. In returning to the DRJ source, and as a starting point forward, it states that there are, '[t]remendous possibilities for dance to reimagine itself outside of the darkened theatre, the evening-length program[sic], the company, and thus launch a whole new project for choreography's and for dancing's imaginations' (2014: 3). My thesis picks up on the idea of 'dancing's imaginations' both by looking at the how dance can be in the museum and the possibilities of relating both physically and imaginatively but, also, the capacity for relating is aided and made possible by the qualities of dance and the dance artist's skill (to return to Rethorst's quote) to 'see people in space'. My thesis goes a step further by saying we also feel people in and across space and that felt connection or, what Edward Soja (1996) calls 'feltspace', is another knowledge piece that the dance artist that she brings with her into the museum.

Here is where a case is made by *rendering visible the socio-spatial skill set of the dance artist that is transferable to the museum* and, therefore, as *a source for relating in the museum*. Dance in the museum as an engagement and participatory role and my thesis claims that dance is not dependent on quantifiable, ticking box-like aims at audience engagement but rather offers new perspectives of dance's role. What this thesis examines in order to further evolve that thinking is the less visible area of concern: *that of dance as attention that creates different kinds of relation in the museum*. These relations may be with visitors, but also, and what my research will make clear is with the site itself, museum staff, and the dance artist. By focusing on such lesser researched areas of concern, this thesis makes known other ways of thinking about what dance does in the museum in terms of attention and relation which has to do with alternative modes of engagement and participation yet to be discussed. In these ways, my thesis allows us to understand the ontology and epistemology of dance in the museum through sets of relations not currently being addressed. Therefore, this thesis opens up a niche research territory as it aims to build new knowledge in the area of dance and museum studies, sociology, and spatial theory.

What is disconcerting about agendas of engagement and participation, and as emphasised in Dance Research Journal (DRJ), is a neglect to acknowledge dance as being

anything other than a means of reaching audiences[15]. Such agendas undermine dance as an innately attentive and relational practice that offers up other modes of engaging and participating in the museum that I call 'relation'. The main difference is that my practice and research does not stop with audience reach but moves out to connect with museum staff, the site, and to oneself in ways that engagement and participation, as situated in the museum, fail to address. An example of such limiting agendas can be seen in how Arts Council England (ACE) puts emphasis on having large audience numbers by requesting applicants for project grants to state how many people will experience the work. The higher the number, the greater chance of receiving funding[16].

This thesis makes a case for quality of relations, over quantity, and considers not only the experience of not only the visitor but, equally important, that of the museum staff and artists who play a part in spatial relational exchanges in the museum. My thesis also moves beyond arguments of the relational in live performance only which has, until now, mainly focused on dance taking place in the same space and time as its audience and towards *another kind of relation: that between dance artist and site, museums staff, visitors, and self* and that is not necessarily dependent on the dancer performing for an audience. It includes such situations as part of relational practice but it is not limited by it. My research also opens up a discourse on the role the space of the museum has on spatial relations. This concern for space follows from Walter Davidts's (2017) proposal for a triangulation of relations between art, architecture, and the museum, whereas this thesis suggests a triangulation of relations between the museum, dance artist, visitors, *and* museum staff. In other words, site, self, and

[15] In addition to the problems of over-focusing on visitor experience in terms of numbers, dance is sometimes also referred to as a tool or mediation device for learning. Although I see value, to some degree, in such uses of dance, the concern is that such use of dance can undermine it and, at times, exploit it. Some believe that is turns dance into a lesser artform than the visual arts (see Crawley, 2018). Although I address such issues in the second case study of my thesis, want to name my concern here.

[16] At the time of writing ACE was following its protocol set out for 2020 but, on July 22, 2020, released a new version of their project grant applications that scaled back expectations placed on artists applying for projects on the potential outcomes on the delivery of projects in several ways, including audience numbers. This change in expectation was due to the incredible change and losses to the UK arts sector caused by the Covid-19 pandemic – which meant large audience numbers were not going to be possible in the near future due to social distancing measures – and not by a reconsideration on their part of what such expectations of such large audience numbers do or suggest to the valuing of artistic practice and to the more untapped sources of skills for creating meaningful connections (despite the numbers), or what I am trying to argue for here.

each other[17]. These relations are, first and foremost, due to a physical sharing of space, but also possible to imagine as well. This was exemplified in the discussion of Rethorst 'seeing' the connections as invisible lines of connection between where she was laying in her bed in her apartment in New York City and in an imaginary map of spatial relation to where her friends were laying in their beds in their apartments across the city. This complex spatial thinking is, as I will argue, due to ways in which the dance artist understands and *feels* relations as spatial as well as the way she moves physically and imaginatively *through* and *across* space as connection and relation in the museum. As this thesis strives to complicate further the idea of seeing and sensing across spaces it looks to both performance and inter-personal exchanges and moments in the museum to suggest that the museum is a site for dance as a relational practice and for trying out ways to be together in a shared space[18].

Several strands of thinking (Davidts, 2017; Franko & Lepecki, 2014; Pringle, 2019; and Silverman, 2009) point to the museum as a space for gathering, socialising, discussing, and debating the role of arts in society and of shaping the contemporary moment we live in. My thesis picks up on these debates, contributing to and helping to fill in an area of necessary consideration that is still not fully researched: that of the position of the dance artist, her multiple methods of attention and modes of being in the museum that give rise to varying sets of relational, inter-subjective, and socio-spatial networked connections both actual and imagined.

## Clarifying Terminology

[17] I am trying to be consistent in my thesis in using the words *each other* because I find the word *other* problematic as it negates a connectedness or shared experience by a dichotomisation that is contrary to my discussion of relation.

[18] As I work on editing this chapter in March 2020 the UK government has recently followed suit to other countries around the world and put a stop to social activities due to the Covid-19 pandemic. This measure includes 'social distancing' and 'self-isolation' in order to prevent the spread of the disease. It comes at a time in my research that obliges me to consider both the contributions and contradictions some of my questions and findings take. My conclusion chapter will more directly address this shift in experience of being alone and together in the social realm of the museum and society at large. For now, I invite you to ponder with me on what dance has and most definitely will still offer to relational practices and research on sociality in and beyond the museum.

The kinds of interventions I am arguing for necessitate a discussion of how I am using key words and concepts and how these might differ from more accepted definitions and meanings. Below are a few key terms that will be used throughout the thesis and the reasons why they are used. The term *dance* is used in the wider sense to include not only the physical movements of the body, but also the actions of resting, pausing, and stillness as modes of bodily attendance and presence that come from a competency of the dance artist and as a source of her art form. My use of the word *dance* encompasses an awareness of a being both in motion and at rest. This thinking is at the core of how attention is manifested and relations emerge as part of dance in the museum. It can be found, most prominently in the second and third case study of my thesis that build an argument for the body at rest as a mode of being in the museum and informed by the experience and dexterity of the dance artist.

I will also be using the word *dance*[19] because I want to demonstrate that it is both necessary to re-insert the word into the discourse of the museum (which tends to default to using the word performance) and, also, because there are particular skills within the training of the dance artist that are useful to my argument of relation that choreographic training may not directly cover. This is not a finite statement but one that still asks for further investigation, which this thesis, due to its scale and scope, will only touch on if only by its insistence on the term *dance*. I choose the term *dance* because it is a word that is often left out or replaced by the word *performance* in both museum and performance studies discourses on dance in the museum. For example, this can be seen in the writings of Catherine Wood (2018; Wood in Wookey 2015) but has been argued for in the writing of dance studies theorist Susan Foster (2019) as well as by performance studies theorist Andre Lepecki (2016). My interest is more in an integration of dance in the museum in a way that maintains the integrity of the practice and is in contrast to the tendency for museums, such as Tate Modern, to consistently use the word *performance* even when presenting works by such dance-trained choreographers as Anna Theresa De Keersmaeker of Rosas dance company. As I build a case throughout my

[19]Dance artist and choreographer Boris Charmatz's argument for using the term *dance* over *choreography* is useful to my thesis and the progressive argument of the essential role of the dance artist. This is in contrast to what William Forsythe, another dance artist and choreographer, suggests in his making a case for choreography as a source of knowledge and a knowing through doing (dance). Forsythe's work *Choreographic Objects* will serve as an essential reference point for my second case study.

writing for the sensibilities brought about through dance training, I stay with a consistent use of the term *dance* in order to make clear that it is a training in dance and choreographic practices that allows for and creates certain qualities that, I will later, argue are essential to the spatial-relational opportunities for museums.

Dance and somatic training engage with an ethos of care and politics of the body in dance that differs greatly from that of performance art and live art. For example, dance artists often warm up their bodies, rest before and during working hours, and are mindful of the amount of energy needed to maintain their practice and, usually (but not always), know when to stop. Dancers, therefore, need the museums to support such approaches to presenting the art of dance. Other tangible needs are things such as water, food, properly heated environments, and dressing rooms. As part of my work with museums, I am often having to negotiate such tangible needs. I usually have to make a case for why dance has such requests and ones that the museum curators, learning experts and programming teams may not be accustomed to offering to as visual or even some performance artists may not have such necessary conditions for working in. In this way my thesis supports a use of the word *dance* as a way to both advocate for it as a term to use in museum programming and marketing of its presentation of dance as well as to recognise how dance is different from other art forms and, thus, asks to be called *dance*.

This thesis addresses dance through 'Contemporary Dance' or 'Post-Modern Dance' in a North American and Western European context and dance that has taken place since the late 1950s and onward, starting with Merce Cunningham through Judson Dance Theater[sic] and beyond. I recognise that there are limitations to this framing and, in particular, to current debates on inclusivity in the arts. During the time, and prior to writing my research proposal, discourses on the whiteness of the Contemporary or Post-Modern dance culture and the embrace of abstraction, in particular, within and emanating out of the era of Judson Dance Theater coming out of Cunningham's work, were starting to emerge (see Does Abstraction Belong to White People? | Wexner Center for the Arts 2019). The debate of diversity and inclusivity in dance and the arts, in general, is an urgent one spurred on by social movements in the US that have infiltrated across the UK and elsewhere. In particular the 'Black Lives Matter' movement that was felt most strongly in the UK during the Covid-19 pandemic and

prompted necessary and long overdue discussions and debates about the need for equality within the arts sector at all levels, most notably, higher management and senior leadership in the arts. There is much work to be done in the dance sector in the UK and internationally to recognise its shortcomings in the areas of diversity and inclusion and in confronting systemic racism and violent forms of communication existing within the sector. Although my research is on the role dance can play in the museum more broadly in terms of relational practice it speaks to the need for more democratic forms of artistic and institutional practice. As my work leans towards greater means of connection and kinship whilst calling into question behaviour in the museum and its socio-spatial and economic structures, my project contributes to the urgent and much needed conversations on inequality in the arts and, too, encourage action going forward. The actions are in practicing a willingness to reflect on and to change ways of working as a dancer in the museum and, in doing so, prompt (through example) the institutions with whom I work with to, as well, critically look at modes of operating and so that we may all relate in new and more just ways.

In the scope of this thesis, it was also not possible to address the dance and choreography debate and to cover both terms. However, towards the end of the thesis there is a re-visiting of the terms in order to shed light onto choreography as playing a role in the overall argument of dance as relation in the museum that I intend to make clear. With similar associations but different to dance is the term *dance artist.* I trained, first and foremost, as a dancer and, later in my practice and career, I worked in social practice and collaborative projects with visual artists, architects, designers, and where there was mutual influence across practice. The term *dance artist* is used to highlight the creative, artistic, multi-focused being of the artist and then, more specifically, that dance is at the forefront of this practice. I am choosing to use the term ‘dance artist’ rather than ‘dancer’ in this thesis because it offers a broader platform on which to discuss multiple skill sets and artistic approaches that I feel are essential to the discussion of dance in the museum. They are essential in that dance is an art form and a tool of engagement. The words *dance* and *artist* support a more complex analysis of dance in the museum that more broadly covers the varying overlaps and differences between, on one hand, an art form of the body and movement and, on the other hand, that of the visual. These two aspects of dance, the body moving and being seen (and seeing) are part of dance and relevant to my discussion of ways dance is seen, presented and

made present in the museum. In addition, the term *dance artist* is a more common term in the United Kingdom (UK), where I reside, than in a North American context, where I was trained. I have, therefore, chosen to use *dance artist* as a term in the field of dance here in the UK. This inclusivity can best be exampled by a useful list of traits of the dance artist and the ethos behind such use of the term on the Independent Dance (ID) website where the term *artist* is first used. It reads, 'We develop our programme to foster greater international exchange, raise the profile of independent artists' practice, and embrace opportunities that enable artists to interact with a wider artistic and cultural field and contribute to the growth and evolution of the art form'. The term dance artist is in their statement[20]. It further says that ID seeks to:

> Support dance artists in their ongoing learning, practice and exchange of ideas. Stimulate the continued evolution and reach of the art form. Sustain professionals in their flexible careers by providing a stable and responsive framework of activity for artists at different points in their development.

The phrase *Dance Artist's Skill Set* relates directly to concepts like *skill set, sensibilitie*s, and/or *qualities* of the dance artist. Throughout my thesis I am referring to what is sometimes called 'transferable skills' (Cools 2016). Such skills are transferable in that they are relevant both within the dance sector – including skills of collaboration, creativity, agility, and resiliency – that are also desirable in the workplace and outside of the dance sector such as in academia and business, to name two. An example of a transferable skill can be found in a recent Harvard Business Review online article under the topic of 'Leadership'. The article, *Lessons on Agility from a Dancer Turned Professor* (Jordan, 2020) refers to the skill of agility as one in which ballet dancers are trained in and skilled at. Dramaturge and writer, Guy Cools in his address to the European Dance Network (EDN) – a group of specialists in dance across the whole of Europe – in 2016 made a convincing argument that not only are skills, like the one mentioned above, applicable to different sectors in and outside of the arts, but skills such as collaboration

[20] It is also of interest to my research to note that the equivalent of ID in the US, Movement Research based in New York City, does not put forth any statement on its ethos around dance, the dancer dance artist and so forth.

and intuition[21] are key to bringing about, or re-investing in a social cohesion. Referencing Richard Sennett's book *Together, the rituals, pleasures of cooperation* (2012), Cools discusses social skills, such as collaboration, that are necessary in the workplace and for social solidarity in general. In terms of intuition, Cools quotes Sennett by saying,

> When we speak of doing something "instinctively", we are often referring to behaviour we have so routinized [sic] that we don't have to think about it. [I]n the higher stages of skill, there is a constant interplay between tacit knowledge and self-conscious awareness, the tacit knowledge serving as an anchor, the explicit awareness serving as a critique and corrective (Sennett in Cools, 2016: 50).

Tacit and implicit is knowledge held by the dance artist according to Cools who says,

> Artists (also according to Sennett) are unique in that they still train and educate themselves in the skills of a craft, learning to understand and work with their materials. The main materials for the dance artist are the human body and space. The art of choreography is much more than creating 'dances'. It is about how bodies relate to space and how this relationship constantly transforms and changes depending on the historical, geographical, economical, and social context. As a result the craftsmanship of dance develops a lot of somatic skills and knowledge (e.g. the awareness of one's own and other bodies) and spatial skills (e.g. how to navigate space). Furthermore, dance and the performance arts in general are necessary collaborative practices and as such they are also ideal training grounds to (re)develop social skills (Cools 2016).

The somatic knowledge that Cools speaks about is what that I will continue to argue for as a skill set of the dance artist in the museum in this thesis and as one, as Cools pointed out, that includes 'awareness of one's own body' and others and 'spatial sensibilities'. Through these and other skills, such as the collaborative nature of dance artist, there is a rich set of potentials to bring to the museum in both furthering and re-instating sociality within and through its

[21] Intuition will be mentioned again later in my thesis as part of my methodological underpinnings of my research. As a dance practitioner/researcher the skill of intuition has also played a role in my research approach.

shared spaces. I will now move on to further explain the kinds of museums that my research addresses.

My research is on museum spaces that collect and/or display work. All three of my case studies took place in different museum contexts, including a private museum in London, England (2014-2017), a public museum in Eindhoven, the Netherlands (2014-2017), and a public/private museum in (again) London, England (2014). Two out of three case studies refer to themselves as museums, and one refers to itself as a gallery. For the sake of my research I will be referring to the *museum* across all three case studies. Each of the venues focuses on collecting not selling artworks. All of the case study museums, to differing degrees, experiment with programming across genres of visual art, performance, live art, and dance. The questioning of cultural values is important to all of the venues I will be looking at and an example of how museums, and some galleries, are concerned with their role in society and are therefore daring to experiment with alternative programming and debates about art in our current moment. An example of this can be found on the Van Abbemuseum's[22] statement on their website that reads, 'The museum has an experimental approach towards art's role in society. Openness, hospitality and knowledge exchange are important to us' (Who We Are n.d.). Raven Row, another museum, also, wishes to explore programming that is, '[i]mprovisatory and un-dogmatic', and has 'the qualities that might constitute Raven Row's success, its 'cultural value', will remain open to question' (About Raven Row n.d.).

I now shift to speak to the term *relation* in my thesis and what I mean when I use that term. Dance is relational in ways that are unexpected and integrated into the museum's complex social and spatial structures. This thesis approaches relation and the social through the corporeal and is less focused on the subjective, psychological aspect: It approaches what I refer to as *relation* more as a cartographer, mapping the connections in and through space and the positioning of the dance artist that allows such connections. My argument for dance as a relational practice leans on the theory of Nicolas Bourriaud (1998) whose term 'relational aesthetics' suggests there is a relational quality to art. He said, 'Art is a state of encounter'

[22] Spelling is original to the museum and the preferred merging of the name of its founder (Henri van Abbe) and the word 'museum'.

(18) and he set out to change the way art was critiqued. His theories on art as a set of relations, and as a way to reform inter-subjective encounters, is of interest to how dance can be relation in the museum. Although his laying the groundwork for a discussion of relationality within art makes my theoretical inquiries into dance as a relational practice possible, there are differences between what Bourriaud was arguing at that time (over twenty years ago) and the more current concerns of this thesis. Whilst I agree here with Bourriaud, his references are mainly visual artists, such as Phillip Parreno and Douglas Gordon, leaving space for further critical thinking about how dance artists are engaging sociality within their work

Much has changed in the art, dance, and museum world in the time since Bourriaud made his claims. As was stated in the *Introduction* chapter, today art is expected to be engaging and participatory. This pressure comes from organisations, institutions, funding bodies, and from the visitors to museums. We are living in a time in which people expect and seek out opportunities to be a part of the experience of art. The relational that Bourriaud is claiming is one that fosters an interaction between artist and viewer through creating situations that call forth inter-personal relation and that has spawned the more recent experiential turn of the museum. Again, as was pointed out earlier, this experiential turn of has included inviting dance to fulfil agendas that bring art experiences to the public in an inclusive and active way. What sets my interest apart from Bourriaud's is that my argument that dance is, already, a form of relation and does not require a changing of practice in order to do that for it is the skills of the trained dance artist that comes through her work as a form of relating. In this way, dance does not *do* relation it *is* relation. It has always been relation. Dance artists, unlike visual artists – to whom Bourriaud is addressing – come from a practice of being in the room together to train and to perform. It is a social practice. It is about publics, liveness, and lived experience. Such statements uphold my argument against dance being used as a tool to be instrumentalised, for the sake of engagement and participation agendas, in the museum and to recognise dance as a set of qualities that, by their nature, produce relation. Finally, Bourriaud's concern for the aesthetics of the artworks in which relational practices produce varies greatly from my interest in practice *as* the artwork or, in this case, *as* dance. Along the trajectory of my thesis, I move further and further away from the product of dance and towards the practice of it that contains the sets of skills that make, not only, dance possible but that belong to the human being, the dance artist within the dance, who

employs her skills and even, sometimes, as an offer to others to pick up on and try out. In this approach to practice, the after affect is that she, the dancer, becomes less and less the centre of focus. Such ways of creating pull relation through so that relation itself becomes the practice and the artist, unlike in Bourriaud's claims, less of a figure at the core of the experience. For all of these reasons Bourriaud's writing, today, feels out of date in the way he discusses relational practice as, 'a world of forms', 'a trajectory which is all his [the artists] own' (43). A significant and defining difference between my theories on dance as relation in the museum and Bourriaud's notion of relational aesthetics is that my research speaks from the voice of the practicing dance artist in the museum, who also happens to be a woman, and it extends the invitation of relation, not only to museum visitors, but also to the museum staff and to the artist herself. As I will expand on this thinking further in this thesis, I first want to make some other clarifications of how Bourriaud's work is both helpful and problematic for me. I am interested in a potential thread of techniques of encounter through my own practice that can be problematised by Bourriaud's theory. According to Bourriaud, there has been, for several years now, an increase of user-friendly artistic projects that are, '[ex]ploring the varied potential in the relationship to the other' (61). What my thesis will attempt to do is to explore those more 'varied' potentials of dance in the museum. As I acknowledge that my research on how dance, a form of relation, also aligns with a 'convivial' and 'user friendly artistic project' that can be 'participatory', I also stand by my particular approach to dance in the museum that refuses to be subsumed by the museum and advocates for a place in which dance both sits and is recognised within the museum and as a change-making, necessary, and relevant component of its ecology.

## Outline of Thesis

This section introduces the outline of the thesis going forward. Following this *Introduction* is a *Contextual Review* discussing in more depth the key theorists, some of which, are introduced above as well as practitioners of dance, performance, and visual art that inform my research. The way I approach such a review is that artistic practice holds equal weight in its contributions to my research as does conceptual writing. I am aware that the expected *Literature Review*, in historical practice, has indicated a theoretical field. I am using the term *Contextual Review* in order to operate theoretically within a more expanded form.

The chapter, therefore, will engage with theoretical writing alongside issues raised in this thesis of dance in the museum. Themes including participation and engagement, relation, presence, and socio-spatial concerns. I will also discuss relevant performances and events that helped to clarify my thinking. Due to its inter-disciplinary nature this thesis becomes involved with a multiplicity of thinking that I attempt to bring together in a cohesive statement.

As I aim for a critical examination of different modes of relation of dance in the museum, my thesis approaches a meeting ground of dance, sociology, and spatial theory. The theories help me to build a context for how I have arrived at my thesis concern. My thinking about dance in the museum has been influenced by a variety of practitioners and theorists from the three areas named. More specifically, theorists such as: Tony Bennett (1995) who helps me understand the history of the public museum and how it emerged; Nicolas Bourriaud (1998) and Claire Bishop (2012,2013) who argue on the ideas of social practice, the relational, aesthetics, engagement, and participation; André Lepecki (2010, 2016); and Gabriella Giannachi (2012) who challenge my understanding of subjectivity and of presence; Richard Sennett (2012) and Catherine Wood (2007) who discuss notions of social currency and ways of being alone and together; Edward Soja (1996) and William H. Whyte (1980) who understand the socio-spatial dynamic as a way of both feeling and choreographing space. I will also be looking at Maaike Bleeker (2008, 2015) and Susan Foster (2010) on considering the body of the audience and kinesthetic empathy; and Guy Cools's (2016) reference to the transferable skills of dance artist. I also am helped by Miwon Kwon (2002) who questions the artist that parachutes into a site to create work (and in a site in which the artist has little to no understanding). I find this a useful reference in terms of the amount of time I spend in each museum and how that duration influences the relations that emerge and their ability to be sustained. My thesis is also influenced by my practice in Feldenkrais Awareness Through Movement that has taught me to stay open to a kind of not-knowing and to observe my own bodily movements as I engage my imagination and to trust in an integration of understanding through and knowledge of the body.

The *Methodological Approaches* chapter, which follows the *Contextual Review,* speaks to the kinds of research approaches taken in this thesis that include practice as influential to the thesis writing. The bulk of the thesis consists of three case-study chapters that offer

evidential support for the argument of dance as attention and relation in the museum. Through a consideration of the *absent, detached,* and *present* dance artist in the museum, I reinforce a way to understand the dance artist's position within the museum and as a relational, site-based practice. At times in this thesis there are instances of journal entries and longer dialogue texts from interviews. These are intended as interruptions or insertions. These entries re-position the flow of text as a way to create insight into other ways of transferring knowledge (both of others and my own). As my focus is on relation, it felt right to include my own dialogue with self that exist inside of my journal notes as well as longer, informal, live conversations with curators, collaborators, dance artists, museum staff, and visitors (or stakeholders of dance in the museum) in order to give space for the dialogical and relational.

My research crosses departments of curation and learning within the museum that collects and/or displays work. All three of my case studies are focused on collecting, not selling, artworks as is consistent with museum practices. All of them, to differing degrees, experiment with programming across genres of visual art, performance, live art, and dance. There are three different museum contexts included across the case studies: a private museum in London, England (2014-2017), a public museum in Eindhoven, the Netherlands (2014-2017), and a public/private museum in London, England (2014). The first case study lays the groundwork for the following chapters. It begins with the dance artist performing in the museum in front of a seated audience. Because of the dance artist's detached presence as a mode of (in)attention towards her audience and as a performer (who does not look back at her audience) as well as the intimacy of a small-scale private museum allows for different kinds of social and spatial relations between self, site, and each other to emerge. Once we move into the second case study chapter and into a medium-sized public museum, the dance artist is physically absent. In her place, and as the focus of attention, is a material prop that carries particular sets of knowledge of the dance artist and an offer for museum visitors and staff to take up and to insert their own understandings and experiences – to be taken up by me in the following case study. Lastly, the dance artist returns to the museum, this time a large-scale public-private museum, to test the ways a shared movement practice with staff, her everyday movement explorations through and practice in the museum, often unseen by others, might constitute forms of co-habitation and dance as relational presence. As noted

earlier, I chose the three concepts of the detached, absent, and present within differing spatial contexts because this approach allows an accumulation and evolution of learning across a variety of experiences of dance in the museum. The culmination of autonomous case studies provides collective evidence that support findings to my overriding research concern of how dance is a relational and site-based practice in the museum. Each case study and their totality of support in my thesis is important to help address my research questions.

The shifting mode of attention and positioning of the dance artist in and outside of the museum across my case studies suggests that there is not one way to do dance in the museum. Introducing and investigating contrasting positions in disimilar museums provides a palette of experiences of dance in the museum in which to navigate, learn from, and make a case for dance not only a relational practice in the museum, but that relational practices are not limited to one or even two approaches but have a myriad of possibilities to consider. I explicitly chose the following accounts because they were experiences that I had in the museum as a dance artist. Although my experiences varied across case studies – for example, I moved between being a dance artist performing to collaborating and to researching in the museum – the nature of my being there was because I am a dance artist and brought certain services, perspectives, and discussions to that site.

In the first case study chapter, *The Detached Dance Artist*, I will discuss *Trio A* (1966) as part of *Yvonne Rainer Dance Works* (2014) at Raven Row in London. This chapter discusses how being instructed to perform dance whilst not looking at the audience opens up other kinds of relation with the dance artists performing together as individuals and with the gallery space in the museum. The intimacy and allowance of a private museum and one connected with the life of the city beyond its walls due to a transparency of architecture will also factor into the discussion on the social potential of this particular work in this kind of space. What I aim to offer up is a contribution to the body of writing on this iconic dance and the relational. I will do this by looking at the averted gaze of the dance artist performing *Trio* A, the body of the performer and audience, and how that enables an 'easy-to-be in the room with' (Sennett, 2012) approach that makes being alone together possible and, therefore, opens up other important sets of relations of dance in the museum.

In chapter two, *The Absent Dance Artist*, a collaborative project, *Punt.Point* (2014-2017), is featured. Commissioned by and for the Van Abbemuseum (Van Abbe) in Eindhoven the Netherlands that was on offer for a three-year period of time in the museum and in collaboration with an urban and graphic designer. The discussion of the absent dance artist complicates an idea of the dance artist as subject in the museum. The chapter includes a discussion of the ways her work is enacted, negotiated, and performed in her absence, and how her absence contributes to another kind of relational potential in the work: that of the museum visitor to visitor and the dance artist with museum staff. The chapter will also discuss how *Punt.Point*'s invitation to play with the verticality and horizontality of the body and engage with the politics of bodily movements acknowledged a negotiation of allowance and potential of interaction. In addition, it will make visible the attention to interaction as relation, as part of the work that emerged between museum staff across curation and learning within the museum. This case study leaves us to consider other ways of seeing in the museum that are not about the artworks but about the space, and our relations in, and across it – as a choreography of connections. In other words, a kind of spatial, overarching social experience.

*The Present Dance Artist,* the third and final case study chapter, discusses my *Associate Research* role at Tate Modern (2014-2017) and the idea of the present dance artist in the museum. Different from works such as *The Artist is Present* (2010) by Marina Abramović at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) and *These Associations* (2012) by Tino Sehgal, the dance artist as present in the museum in my research is one who is available for social interaction and challenges the physical and metaphorical separation of performer and audience. The chapter focuses on an opening up of interaction in the museum as it attempts to dissolve certain hierarchies between artist-visitor-museum staff. It ends with questioning what such efforts afford in order to better understand the potentials of the dancer as part of the human ecology of the museum and, perhaps, because of that new perspective, a much more impactful way of dancing in the museum, that directly supports change, can occur.

Through the case studies, or varied forms of beingness, a broader palette of options of relational practice open up and expand knowledge of what dance might become in the museum. The three case studies all argue that the dance artist, as a practicing artist, can challenge thinking about what dance does to social and spatial relations in the changing

museum. As I pursue a critical reflection of the three case-studies, I will examine an existence and extension of the individual in the museum as she moves herself, from a detached, absent and then present attention in the space, towards a larger, more complex social arena. This arena includes not only museum visitors, but the site itself, museum staff, and the self. What emerges is a complex consideration of overlapping sets of relations and the potential for the dance artist to call on her skill sets of socio-spatial skills that are transferable. By doing so, I suggest the potential for our contemporary moment and through relations that are enacted through a presence that we call dance or, in this thesis, relational practice. Following on from here, I will address key researchers and practitioners who have contributed to the development of this thesis and whose interest in the body, movement and public space have been informative in productively challenging and confirming ways.

# Contextual Review

In this chapter I provide evidence for the practical and theoretical inquiries of my research that provide support for a series of question emerging from the overriding concern for *how* dance is a form of spatial relation in the museum? In what ways is the position of the dance artist in the museum, and the site itself, effective on the emergence of spatial relations? Lastly, how are the transferable skill sets of the trained dance artist contributing to dance being a quality of attention that contributes to a re-thinking of the dance artist's positional role within the museum going forward in a time of institutional change? This review is a constellation of enquiries into the ways in which practitioners and theorists have taken on addressing the role of the body, movement, sociality, perception, and space in a quest for knowledge, understanding, and expression that will help me answer the research questions. I begin by theoretically positioning my research amongst theorists and practitioners in order to challenge my thinking and to make clear how my voice can contribute to filling the gaps in the discourses on themes relevant to the topic of dance in the museum. My thesis addresses an ontological reasoning for dance in the museum that moves towards the potentiality of its presence there, through a consideration of its multiplicity of attentions and resulting spatial-relational opportunities in and *with* the museum.

This chapter aims to connect my research with others who are re-thinking (epistemologies) whilst suggesting other ways of being (ontologies) in the museum that incorporate dance and that might also counteract some of the more assumed and problematic approaches in the field. As mentioned in my *Introduction* chapter, I assert that practice, as well as theory, have been influential to my research. Therefore, this chapter is called *Contextual Review* not *Literature Review,* and includes a review of theoretical texts, as well as dance and performance events, related to the themes of this thesis. Below I will diverge slightly to share a story that will help to contextualise my conceptual inquiries that are based in experience, observation, and a felt sense of the world.

During the course of writing this thesis whilst living in London, I began to sense a loss of awareness of spatial relations amongst people in public sites in the urban environment and

compared to five years ago when I first moved to London. People, then, were, as they are now, looking into their mobile devices in public. Yet, now it seems the looking at devices happens, not only when seated in public and on shared transport, but whilst walking down the street. People, me included, seem to not be looking at each other as much and, in many cases, not looking to see where they are going – causing an instable socio-spatial relationship in which one or more parties are in another time-space dimension. This phenomenon happens, as well, when people are wearing headphones. Although I am speaking to the sense of seeing in this thesis, the sense of hearing, when cut off, also affects awareness of one's spatial, social surroundings. What I mean by this is the state of actually seeing each other as we share public space. Whether it be on public transport or as pedestrians or, even, in pubs, restaurants, and meeting places, this lack of seeing felt strange to me as a dance artist trained to engage the physical, spatial, and temporal elements of an environment. At one point near the end of my thesis writing, I recall sitting in a café next to a woman who was wearing a headset listening to music and the social divide between us seemed to shift the shared eating space we were both in. It was striking to me that, although we were in the same physical space and were only a few feet from each other, the relational potential of conversing was lessened by the fact that our attentions were different. She was focused on her experience coming through the headset and I was seeking to understand the diversity of experiences we were having in lived space. What struck me was how our attention plays a role, as much as our physical positioning, in determining the kinds of spatial relations that are possible. My thesis aims to highlight the potential of relations as influenced by the physical positioning as well as the mode of attention the dance artist brings to the museum and in relation to others. How might her position and attention influence others in that space with her and to bring about social experiences within the museum and through bodily-spatial sensitivities. To further unpack my thinking and as part of this chapter, I will be bringing in and embedding practice and theory to help challenge and reinforce such concerns through a multiplicity of approaches.

## Re-Thinking Experience & Other Modes of Being

One of the approaches in my research is to look at dance in the museum through a sociological lens. In this way my perspective of what experience and ways of being mean can

be supported and challenged. One of the first theorists I look to in understanding modes of being together is Richard Sennett, sociologist, and social analyst theorist (2009, 2012) whose research on how individuals and groups make social and cultural sense of the cities they live in and points to ways of knowing that are based in experience. His thinking philosophically carries on from the work of John Dewey, American educator and social reformer. Sennett's work is especially important to my research in that he claims that people have the ability, as interpreters of their own experience, to produce new knowledge. Claiming that the experience of the dance artist produces a knowing in the museum, Sennett's work underpins my argument that knowledge is an embodied, felt experience. A body-based approach to knowing is challenged, however, by societal obstacles that prioritise thinking over doing and, in the case of the museum, seeing over being. My work on relationality in dance helps to re-direct interest to the human experience of the museum and in relation to site, self, and each other. In order to re-direct attention to the body, I look to British cultural anthropologist Tim Ingold and American theorist and cultural critic Vivian Sobchack (2004).

Human-environmental studies has been looked at by Tim Ingold (2011, 2013, 2015) who suggests an ontological turn in social anthropology and rejects a singular view of the world and a breaking with language-centred experiences, or epistemologies. I am querying epistemology by asking what dance is in the museum and expanding on the work of Ingold. There is importance in Ingold's calling for an embrace of beingness that is body-centred and phenomenological. Thinking that is phenomenological – that calls on lived experience and interpretive understandings of the world – opens up ways of perceiving and imagining space that are useful to my argument. As I make a case for dance through a consideration of the position of the dance artist, or her beingness in the museum, I expand on Ingold's proposal and open up further clarification of the way the dance artist perceives and imagines lines of connection between herself, the site, and each other. As he strives to define anthropology, Ingold claims that it is close to art and architecture (2011: xi). Beginning with the differences between anthropology, as committed to observing and describing, but not changing, life, and art, and architecture as having the '[l]iberty to propose new forms never before encountered, without having to first observe and describe what is already there' (xi). Ingold also says that art and architecture, to the extent they are affective in change 'must be grounded in profound understanding of the lived world'(xi) and that 'reading the world' is key to understanding it

and that texts should support that reading of the world but not replace it' (xii). The proposal that art and architecture are capable of putting forth new ideas and being grounded in a particular understanding of the living world suggests that dance, as a part of the arts, is capable of producing deep understanding of our environment that is different from an anthropological way of knowing. My next thought is that the deep understanding of the world comes through the physical realm as a way of perceiving the world through bodily movement. I am supported in this through by what Ingold says is a '[c]lose coupling of bodily movement and perception (94) that art and architecture can offer'. How might dance, producing tacit knowledge and corporeal ways of being in the world, of perceiving it, support the idea of relationships between self and the world? And what makes that possible? What makes relations possible is a form of attention, as I understand Ingold, and that form of attention is an attentiveness through physical movement that qualifies as an instance of action in which the mover is an agent of change. 'Action', he says, to varying degrees is 'skilled' (94) and that, '[a] practitioner is skilled because she continually attunes her movements in the perceived environments without interrupting flows of action' (94). This tuning of movement in response to the ever-changing conditions of a site is a way to describe my experiences in museums and as informing the work that I engage there. My dance practice is in response to my surroundings and is about tuning myself into it and those I am sharing the space with.

Although I can appreciate Ingold's arguing for practice as a skilled contribution to our world and the case for the body and movement, it can also be the case that dance in the museum does, indeed, interrupt flows of action. In order to change our perception and understanding it is sometimes necessary to re-position ourselves, both physically and mentally, to experience our environment in new ways. The dance artist in the museum, in the story I am telling in this thesis, is one who is capable of both visual interruption but also more subtle forms of integration in the museum. In discussing the spectrum of possibility we begin to recognise that dance is capable of multiple modes of attention in the museum and is also dependent on a skill set that, as I make a case for, specifically for the dance artist that can be extended to others in bring out further modes of knowing. My suggestion that such embodied understandings can be transferable to spaces such as museums and shared with others is somewhat different from Ingold who, as I understand, has not discussed the transferability of skills. In my thesis, I will be exploring how the skills of the dance artist can be brought about

not only through her own body, but through an object as a way to prompt experiences of being in the museum that are dance-like or like a dance artist might experience it through ways of *seeing*, *doing*, and *being*.

Claiming capacities for attention and responsiveness developed through embodied practice and experience[23] (11) suggests that humans are 'not just a mind in a body but the whole organism as it moves in its environment' (11) and 'dependent on how we move' (46). Ingold's theories are both useful to the dance artist and ask for further reflection. Despite the relevant and insightful contributions of Ingold, he refers primarily to the hands and the feet of the body and his use of the metaphor of walking which feels somewhat limiting from a dance artist perspective. Although Ingold argues that we are a 'whole organism' as we move in our environment, he addresses only a fraction of the whole body (hands and feet) and, therefore misses the opportunity to expand on how the whole self is affective to spatial relations. As Ingold is not a trained dancer, but an avid walker, he (if we follow his line of thought) is skilled in experiencing the world as a theorist and as a walker but not with the perceptions of a dancer. This means he is limited in his understanding of the perceptual possibilities the body can offer. This is where I step in and build on Ingold's very valuable insights and previous research to expand it towards a dance model. My thesis picks up where Ingold leaves off and looks to the skilled dance artist as a way of knowing the world through physical positionings and modes of attention. As much as I am helped by Ingold's work, I feel it necessary to expand on his argument for an embodied, practice-based way of being in the world and as a form of knowledge. This thesis, therefore, stretches our understanding of the body as intentionality and by focusing in on the museum as a world in which to explore. My research zooms in on a particular site, the museum, in order to look closely at certain worlds more fully and precisely. In my research, I make a case for the bodily sensibilities, skills, and qualities of the dance artist – moving through the museum with her (skilled) body – as a form of relating and as a contribution to the proposal set forth by Ingold. Ways of relating to the world that are body-based, through movement, and in physically shared spaces can, as my thesis will continue to build a case for, not only offer us a way to experience our environment

[23] Ingold shares that the inspiration behind this thinking comes from psychology (not philosophy) and, specifically, from the ecological approach to perception started by American psychologists James Gibson (1979).

but, more importantly and unlike other areas of practice and thought, contribute to changing conditions of the museum and, therefore, contribute to changing our world.

A phenomenological approach that argues for the corporeal knowledge of the world that is attained through experience is also mirrored, although differently, in the writing of Vivian Sobchack. In claiming that our experience emerges *through* our body and, innately, our senses, Sobchack argues for the body as the realm of sense-making and not just as a visual subject[24]. This exploration of bodily experience as a way of making sense of our world, as a dance artist, is both necessary and innate to my way of doing practice and research on the subject of thinking *with* and *through* the body. What Sobchack deems important is that a being in the body, a felt sense of embodied presence is important and that the, '[l]ived bodies material reality' is 'something more than the merely visible' (2004: 181). As a film specialist, Sobchack is unexpectedly critical of visual culture. She writes, 'I want to foreground the way in which our culture's reduction of vision to the merely visible constitutes our *epistemological* relation to our own bodies and the bodies of others as impoverished, alienated, and two-dimensional – and, conversely, I want to explore those structures that constitute our *ontological* relation to our bodies as rich, ambiguous, and multidimensional' (182).

Her reference to an 'epistemological relation to our own bodies and the bodies of others' supports my interest to articulate the ways in which the dance artist practice encourages relation with self, site, and each other in the museum through her embodied practice and sensibilities as a body, as a dancer. This 'with-ness' comes about through an expanded experience that is, as Sobchack would argue, more than the visual confirmation and, as Ingold pointed out earlier, as important as the textural description. This 'with-ness' or being with, or in relation to, is one of feeling one's own position within the environment. What dance artists and, people like Sobchack, understand as being in one's body or, as she describes as, being 'housed in our bodies' (183) or 'lived bodies' (187). She goes on to further articulate her argument for the body within the visual experience of the word by saying,

[24] Although Sobchack's area of research is film she insists on a more full-bodied sensory experience over a visual one and in making sense of a contemporary image-saturated culture.

> [I]f we are to understand vision in its fullest, embodied sense, it seems imperative that we move from merely thinking about 'the' body (that is, about bodies always posited in their objective mode, always, seen from the position of another) to also feeling what it is to be 'my' body (lived by me uniquely from my side of it, even as it is always also simultaneously available to and lived by others on their side of it' (187).

Here Sobchack asserts a re-thinking of vision through embodiment. In this thesis, I work somewhat the other way around by suggesting that there are different ways of seeing dance in the museum (as will be made clear in my first case study) as a way to introduce a trajectory through my thesis that moves from *seeing* to *doing* and to *being*. I take a cue from Sobchack in that I suggest that if we are to understand dance as a phenomenon in the museum more completely it is essential to embrace that the body[25] and movement are forms of attention and relation. Both Sobchack and Ingold are insisting upon a criticality to how the body is a producer of knowledge. What sets my work apart from theirs is that, instead of articulating from the frames of anthropology and film, I make a case for dance, and as a dance artist myself, as a medium of exploration. As I pointed out with Ingold that my interest is in the relational not only the felt experience, it is with Sobchack's definition of epistemology that we begin to link epistemology to relationality and, therefore, to presence. This takes us onto one more theorist looking at notions of presence as a form of relating.

Exploring how the performance of presence can be understood through the relationships between performance theory and archaeological thinking, Gabriella Giannachi has influenced my using dance practice as a platform to engage with acts of presence in which phenomena of self, each other, and place are explored. Her interest is in a collaborative presence or, what she refers to as 'co-presence' (2012: 0) and ways we inhabit and engage within space. Co-presence here is referred to as a phenomenological one in which there is co-presence of audience and performers (17). This suggests, according to Giannachi, not only the experience but the perception of the experience and ones' consciousness that brings

[25] Sobchack dedicates part of her book to unpacking what 'the body' might mean (see above long quote) that I find essential to the overall interest in dance. However, given the scope this thesis I have only touched on this topic as a way to introduce and to recognise this line of thought.

attention 'outside of the self' and to an awareness of being present and, in so doing, co-creating presence (0).

This co-presence and co-creating will be useful to my argument of dance as relation in the museum. Similar to Giannachi, I am looking at the presence of the dance artist and dance as relation and to sociality. My thesis, however, does not suggest the dance artist necessarily invites audiences in to dance with her or calls on them to participate but, rather, to consider how the presence of the dance artist in the museum as a co-presence that is in relation to other presences. These other presences are the site and each other (visitors), including museum staff. In other words, the dance artist coming into the museum is, one not there to deliver on museal engagement agendas focused on the visitors to the museum, but rather to enter into a system of relations already in existence in the museum. My insistence on dance relational, site-based practice in the museum is challenged by what performance scholar Bertie Ferdman argues when she says that site-based practices have '[m]oved away from a concern with location – which reached its heyday in the 1980s – to a concern with interaction and mediating situations' (in Davida, Gabriels, and Hudon 2018:19). Whilst I agree that a concern for interaction and mediating situations is reflective of our contemporary moment, I would also argue that the site, or location, of artistic practice (in this case the museum) does hold weight in terms of its role in shaping experience. I will pick up on this thought throughout the case studies in this thesis and how each site proposed different possibilities of relation and in collaboration with the dance-based activities within it. In this way I proposed considering the museum itself *as* a performance, as a player in the making of spatial relations. It seems that the physical and socio-political, and even economic conditions of museums are not fully considered in the discussion of dance in the museum and one of the contributions this thesis hopes to make.

## The Museum as Site for Relation

The museum, as suggested by Tony Bennett (1995, 2017), is a controlled site. Borrowing a Foucauldian-lens, Bennett discusses ways the museum is constructed to see and be seen in order to control human behaviour (1995: 27). I find his writing useful in thinking about the museum as a site that is highly regulated, historically produced, and politically

informed. I am interested in ways that his argument addresses the concerns that I have about the museum as a socially controlled space. What my research does is look at modes of intervening in the spaces of the museum through various approaches and physical positions that might gently disrupt the modes of operating in and of museum in order to open up other spaces (both physically and imaginatively) of agency, exchange, and connections between people. How are ways of seeing and of looking at dance in the museum complicated by the physical and imaginary positioning of the dance artist in the space?

In my call for dance as a site-based practice of relations I also want to make clear that dance does not necessarily deliver relations, it takes part in relations already in existence. It enters into and collaborates with them. The dance artist is the participant *and* the engager of relations in this complex social fabric of the museum. I will also argue throughout my thesis that this web of relations stretches to include *everyone* in the museum from the visitor, to the coat checker, to the curator, and the educator, and beyond. Importantly, it is what I am calling the transferable skills[26] or qualities of attention, gained through training in dance, that the dance artist brings to the sociality of the museum, to co-relating, that allows for and opens up a shift within how we feel space and help to produce the networked relational site of the museum.

I will speak in each case study to the ways in which the social, spatial, and economic context of the museum influences the kinds of relations dance produces. There are numerous other arguments related to dance in the museum, dance as a site-based practice, relationality, and other related subjects suggesting a complexity of ideas of which this thesis is a part. My thinking about dance in the museum has been influenced by a variety of practitioners and

[26] The term 'transferable skills of the dance artist' is more often used by dance programs in Higher Education to prompt a wide range of career options for the student of dance. It is less commonly used in the professional dance sector. More relevant to my thesis in the discussion of transferable skills has been the program *Inclusive Dance* initiated by Fontys School of the Performing Arts in Tilburg, the Netherlands. The approach of this project to the idea of the skills of the dance artist are more aligned with what I am proposing in terms of the intangible and embodied knowledges as well as listening and communication skills of the dance artist. I have taken part in, and contributed to, several events, presentations, and interviews that took place between 2016-2018 and, therefore, an exchange with the program and people behind it has been influential to my thinking. A good resource for the idea of the transferable skills of the dance artist can also be found in the (unpublished) lecture *On the Transferable Skills of the Dance Artist* (2016) given by Dr Guy Cools for the European Dance Network (EDN) Atelier: *The Relevance of Dance*. Cools was also a part of the Inclusive Dance project.

theorists and from differing fields of practice such as dance and performance studies, sociology, spatial theory, and museum studies. For example, Claire Bishop (2011, 2012, 2014) has written extensively about the problems of engagement and participatory arts in the museum. She claims that such work is difficult to critique aesthetically and this is partly due to the question of authorship of works in which '[t]he artist relies upon the participants creative exploitation of the situation that he/she offers, just as participants require the artist's cues and direction' (2011: 7). Bishop focuses on art and performance that create participatory experiences between artists and spectators. Her concern is in how genres problematise a concern for aesthetics and authorship, or what she refers to as an, 'ethics of authorial enunciation' (22). In suggesting that, '[i]ndividual authorship is suppressed in favour of facilitating the creativity of others' (22) she argues that, '[m]aking social dialogue a medium dematerializes[sic] a work of art into social process' (22). In other words, art that is fixated on being socially useful may not be available for an aesthetic critique, nor stand as an autonomous artwork.

What is useful to my research to pick up on in Bishop's arguments is the idea of 'social processes' as 'dematerialising a work'. In my case studies, I set out to define dance in a way that avoids an either-or situation and suggest that dance can be many things and one of the things that it can be is a mode of relating. I also make evident that dance as a mode of relating does not necessarily take away from dance as an aesthetic quality or an artform, but I do focus on the processes within dance and, more specifically, the skill set of the dance artist to complicate thinking around art making, production, aesthetics, and ownership by stating that the nature of dance as relation does not always, and because of the transferable skills embedded in the practice, necessitate the physical presence (or something to look at) of the physically present dancing body. I stretch that thought further by arguing that the qualities or skills (at least some of them) of the dancer can come through a material object. In these ways my research considers Bishop's claims whilst also challenging her on ideas of social dialogue, dematerialisation, and processes of art/dance making. What I am making an example for is dance *as* an art of relation that incudes, but is not limited to, a physical body engaged in movement through time and space that can be evaluated by its aesthetic qualities. In my research I consider the guard of the museum engaged in a discussion with another staff member a relational element of dance's influence in the museum. Therefore, I am less

concerned with the aesthetic and autonomy argument that Bishop has so thoroughly discussed, but to extend a looking at the varying degrees of presence in the museum that the dance artist brings, and by making conscious choices of where she situates herself. Whether detached, absent, or present, the dancer is helping to determine the kinds of relations that are made possible and in collaboration with the site and those sharing it with her. In this way the dance artist, is *also,* by way of *being in the museum,* part of its overall human ecology. Because of this statement, creating a separation between the (dance) artist and the participant in the work becomes impossible and unnecessary within this ecological thinking. The dance artist is also a participant in the larger context of the museum and one that begs for further enquiry. What is also important to my argument is that we consider the dancer in the museum in this way and through how she operates within that site and what she does for it. This consideration also asks the dance artist to spend time in the museum, rather than produce her work on a one-off basis or approach.

The idea of duration of the dance artist working on site is help by the writing of Miwon Kwon (2004) who aligns with my call for the artist (although she is referencing visual artists, not dancers) supports a relationally-based experience and, yet, sometimes does so in a short-sighted way by 'parachuting' into communities to make work and then leaving soon after to move on to another community. Referencing the turn in site-specific art making, Kwon critiques the term 'site-specific' by questioning the relationship between the artwork and its site. Kwon claims that site-specific art has been influenced by the hyper-mobility of artists who fly around the world delivering projects across a large site-base. In this way there is less engagement with the site and, as I argue here, with the people who make up the site. In this thesis I pick up on that to reflect on the relationship between the dancer and the museum. As mentioned, Kwon's writing looks at the work of visual artists who create site-based sculptural work, such as Richard Serra, and not of dancers making performance projects. What Kwon's thinking does is offer me a chance to consider the dancer in the site of the museum in terms of temporality.

The dance artist who spends very little time in the museum creating in one-off projects often has little reference to the site in her work and, as well, does not engage at a deeper level with the site and its visitors and staff. What sets my case studies apart from the many

practices I critique in my thesis is the amount of time spent onsite. All of my case studies suggest a term span of five weeks to five years of the dance artist working in and with the museum developing and delivering projects. Therefore, my thesis suggests the dance artist situates herself in the museum for varying periods of time. I use these temporal differences to suggest roles that the dance artist plays within the museum, as in one way a foreign space for the dancer. My thinking is influenced by Julie Kristeva's (1994) claim for the value of the tourist or 'stranger' to a city as a contributing factor to an experience and understanding of it. How might a considering of the dance artist as a foreigner or tourist in an unfamiliar landscape offer to the museum and the perspectives of the museum for those who work within and visit it? More importantly, as my thesis asks, what qualities of attention and modes of relating differently might the dance artist contribute to the culture of the museum and in informing its ongoing and changing identity as a site for being together in public?

This proposal points to dance as having embeddedness in the museum, not only on the macro-level in terms of its longevity there as an artform, but more precisely, on the micro-level which is at the project-level. This temporal frame is important as time-spent in a site affects the outcome of the practice and of the experience with the museum. I invite, therefore, a consideration of the temporal into my overall project of spatial relations and across my case studies. For time is a necessary element to consider within a spatially-focused research agenda as it sways and influences relational practices. What is problematic for me, about engagement practices, is that they tend to focus on audiences. This focus on the museum visitor or audience for dance can be at the expense of recognising the possibility of relation, not only with visitors of the museum, but to and with museum staff, the site of the museum and, to some extent, the artist herself.

In returning to the concern for dancer being asked to activate artwork in the museum and our evolved understanding of ways dance can be so much more in and for the museum renders such requests even more problematic in that they miss the opportunity for dance's more impactful contribution to the museum as an institution, made up of people in relation. Again it is necessary to re-visit the problem of focusing so intently on the visitors' experience in the museum which is part of the 'activation' ask and, again, neglects to recognise the greater human ecology of the museum and the role dance place in that. To highlight such

concerns, Gil Hart, Head of Education at the National Gallery and one of the UK partners on the *Dancing Museum* (DM), emphasises that the DM is not a curatorial project, but one focused on audience engagement. For Hart, this project is not about art history, but about how audiences might engage with a collection (Crawley, 2018). My thesis aligns with the argument that dance's value is beyond being of service to the artwork and soley to visitors and takes a step further by claiming that dance, as a mode of relation, cannot simply be an activator of something outside of itself. Again, the site – which includes artworks and visitors *and* staff – is already activated. Any distancing of museum staff from visitors and from artists in this ecology is problematic in the way it creates dichotomies of difference, privilege, and concern. I am not only talking about difference and privilege of museum curators over visitors, for example, but also the other way around – privileging museum visitor experience over that of museums staff. So many times I have worked with curatorial and learning departments in museums whose aim is to create insightful, challenging, and democratising programmes for its visitors and, yet, does little to either encourage such experiences amongst staff or, more importantly, apply it to the troubling hierarchies of power within the institution. I will, however, reserve further thinking on this for later on in my thesis.

Dance, by default is a form of relating, so it does not need to be anything else or a tool for looking. It is a way of being. Dance is part of a complex map of inter-connectedness that already exists – not an external entity that plays the role of interlocutor. Dance is a process based in qualities that produce a beingness that is not dependent on responding, activating, or enlivening things on the outside. It is life itself. The dance artist who attempts to articulate a relation to other artwork will always be over emphasising what we already know: that by nature we are in relation to what is in the room with us: the artwork, visitors to the museum, staff, and other dance artists. My case studies aim to further amplify this thinking and to make visible the ways in which dance is more than an instrument that activates and, rather, is a quality in and of itself. That quality is a relational one first and foremost. Any expectations of it as an instigator of looking at an object is questionable within the context of my argument and problematic for calling forth another potentiality of dance in the museum. The issue of how dance is in the museum is relevant and necessary to social and spatial relations. There is also an ethical element to including dance in the museum that recognises the expectations on the dance artist and requests to comply with the needs of the museum – the relevance of

my research is in its criticality of the role of the dance artist in the museum and to call on its potential there – and for society. I will now turn to practitioners whose work in the museum play a necessary part in articulating my interests. Many of the concerns that drive my engagement in the literature are mirrored in the practice by the following artists.

## Practice Review

As stated earlier in this chapter, my thesis approaches a theoretical review to include practice-based projects in addition to written source material. Practicing artists provide insight into and knowledge of areas that are of concern for my project. One of the themes I will be discussing here is the positioning of the artist in relation to her audience. I am particularly interested in how the spatial and social conditions of the museum-based performance pieces that I will be discussing frame particular positions of power that often place the artist at the centre of focus. I will look to three well-known artists, one of which is trained in the visual arts and two in dance. All three of them work extensively in museums presenting their performance-based works and with varying degrees of approaches to engagement and participation practices in which I will be looking at through the framework of relational qualities and modes of attention towards site, self, and others. I am particularly interested in the ways in which the physical position and stance of the dance artist in these museum-based projects either support or take away from what I might call democratic relational practice influenced by their spatial context and posture or movements of the dancer and/or performer.

I begin by interrogating the work *The Artist is Present* by Marina Abramović at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in 2010 that was one of the catalysts for a return of performance to the museum. As internationally recognised and well-known figure in the arts, Abramović, draws a crowd. Her body-based performance works have significantly contributed to the evolution of the genre of performance over the last fifty-years. In this most recent work Abramović sat for six days a week, seven hours a day in a plain chair in the museum's large atrium. It is estimated that she sat for seven hundred hours in the museum

where visitors[27] waited in long lines to sit across from her in the museum for as long as they wanted, gazing into her eyes as she was gazing back at them. Documentation of the event includes a series of photographs taken of each person who took part. Many of them have tears in their eyes. The title of the work *The Artist is Present* reminds me of the saying, 'the doctor will see you now'. This title and the performance itself suggests that the artist holds some form of higher knowledge, understanding, and power that is being sought out. This is different than the skill set of the dance artist I have been discussing in that the skills I am referring to are transferable, shared, and employed to create connection, work towards communication, and question codes of behaviour in the museum. My question about Abramović's work is: To what degree is this physical set up of the artist in the museum suggesting her position of power, a separation between self, site and others as well as an inequality of relation based on a superiority context. How much does this project suggest that the artist with a capitol 'A' is somehow more important than the one person, who is an image without a name, and who is sharing space, although not equally, by sitting across from the artist?

When the artist positions herself in the centre of her work to such an extent and within a celebrity context the potential for 'horizontal hierarchies' are not possible. The verticality of status that is put forth, and exemplified in this work, and in Abramović's practice in general, creates a look and feeling of inequality. New York Times art critic Holland Cotter, in reviewing the show, mentions the status symbol that Abramović has and the kind of presence she exudes. He writes that Abramović, '[i]s simply, persistently, uncomfortably there. As of 5 p.m., she won't be, though. The lights will dim. The audience will move on. Something big will be gone, and being gone will be part of the bigness' (May 30, 2010). This thesis argues against such 'bigness' of the 'Artist' and for the *a*rtist and for a levelling of hierarchical stratification, putting the 'Artist' on top and the rest down below within spatial relational practice. In the case of *The Artist is Present* such dominant positions of presence grossly exaggerated the position of the 'Artist' as separate from and more important than her audience. The possibility I am arguing for is a re-positioning of the artist – in the case of this thesis, the dancer – in the

[27] Close to one-thousand and four-hundred people filled the seat across from the artist, some for only a minute or two, a few for an entire day.

museum in order to discover a more commonality and to extend privileges of access and allowance. Here I will emerge other ways the artist is in the museum, not as a spectacular presence, but as one connected more deeply into the complex social fabric of the museum.

Another well-known artist, Tino Sehgal, created *These Associations* (2012) for the Tate Modern Turbine Hall as part of its *Unilever Series*. The work was a significant marker in the history of dance and performance in the museum in the way Sehgal used the space and instructed the performers, or what he calls, 'interpretors' engaged with spectators there. The work consisted of a group of seventy performers[28] using movement, sound, and conversation. The event took place during the opening hours of the museum as a moving configuration of people who stepped out of the dancing and singing to interact with museum visitors by walking up to them and telling them personal stories and other anecdotes about themselves and as a way of engaging with the audience. One of the performers, Katerina Paramana, in her discussion of her experience points to the 'production of sociality' or a 'mode of sociality that emphasised the importance of relationships and of spending time with others' (2015: 96) in the work as a problem. Her argument is on how the ideas of relationality did not manage to come through the work and, therefore, turned in on itself as a work more about individuals than as a social cohesion of a group (114 - 115). Claiming that the work and Sehgal's interest in challenging and insisting on change within neoliberal capitalist agendas, Paramana states, failed because, according to her, '[s]oon after opening, it [the work] ruptured the sociality upon which it and its philosophy were based' (47). According to Paramana, Sehgal set out to identify problems of individual and self by looking at systems of capitalism and communism and attempted to, '[c]reate the possibility of the construction of a better system than both [capitalism and communism], by exploring a reconfiguration of the relationship between the individual and the collective' (95). Despite Sehgal's focus on the idea of 'associations' amongst people of the collective and of human-to-human interaction it is surprising that, according to Paramana, his work did not articulate the very thing it set out to do (53). Although Paramana's main argument is in how the sociality within the group of performers worked or did not work and my focus is on the sociality between the dance artist or performer to the site, each other, and self in the museum, her research finding help to illuminate what I am trying to bring to

[28] Sehgal does not use this term but prefers to use the word 'interpreter'.

the fore: that dance in the museum is capable of a sociality that is both spatial and promotes relation in the museum. More precisely, what is useful to my argument for dance as a relational practice in the museum is that, as Paramana points out, we cannot assume all dance or movement-based performance practices bring about, according to her research a collective sociality, and in my words 'relations', in a positively productive sense. There is also, as we have just learned, the possibility for failure. It is also of interest to note that not all of the performers in Sehgal's work were trained dance artists and, therefore, not necessarily trained in the skills that promote more sensitive modes of interaction and collaboration. However, as Paramana *is* a trained dance artist that gave her perspectives into her experience as a participant in the work. Her dancer-perspective produced specific understandings about how Sehgal's work operated in terms of social cohesion – something dancers have knowledge about. Building on the work of Paramana, and as both a fellow dance artist and, also, an audience member to Sehgal's work, I find it helpful my thesis to describe my experience here.

When being approached by one of Sehgal's 'interpreters' in the Turbine Hall I distinctly recall the man stepping outside of the performance he was in, walking over to me, and starting to speak to me. Although I do not remember the actual words, I remember that it was a personal story. I recall, in a physically-felt way, the memory of the intimacy of that moment – the close proximity to his standing in front of me. I could see his facial hair close up. His voice was nearer a whisper than a mid-day conversation level of audio. What I distinctly remember was the unexpected openness I felt to both listening to what was being said, shared with me, and what felt like an invitation to converse, to share back, and to engage in dialogue, in an unexpected encounter with a stranger who chose to speak with me on that day at Tate. I was visitor and he was a performer assigned to begin a convivial connection. I thought I was being invited into a conversation[29] that would then evolve forward and back between us. What I also remember is that I spoke back to him asking him a question in relation to the story he just shared. At that point, he abruptly and without warning cut off what I was asking him, shifted tone, and said one last thing to me that sounded like an overly-rehearsed line of text about this being a work of Tino Sehgal. Without a moment to respond, he left me

[29] It is pertinent to note that these 'conversations', according to Paramana, were called 'conceit' by Sehgal and he instructed his interpreters to consider them a 'gift' to the visitor (Sehgal, 17 July 2012 in Paramana). For me, as a visitor, it was not a gift but, rather, a trick.

standing there alone as he ran back to the group performing in the space. It was both disappointing and socially awkward for me. I recall a vast space left between myself and the group performing. The feeling of abandonment and embarrassment came rising up in me. It was as if there was a hint of connection between us and, as it was in his control and this was a performance he was in, thick imaginary wall came down between us. What I thought would be an association (given the title is *These Associations*) with this individual through our shared moment quickly became a play in which I was a pawn in a game and only he knew the rules.

The illusion of an equally shared connection in this work struck me as something that I had little interest in repeating and one of the reasons I find it essential to explore ways to articulate my own ideas, thoughts, and arguments for dance as (another kind of) association in the form of relation in the museum. I am interested in a transparency and intention of engagement that does not lean into the old hierarchies of artist and spectator found in the theatre, but experiments with varying forms of absence, detachment, and presence in the museum in order to expand other ways of relating on balanced terms. My thesis, also, does not assume that dance presented in the museum and often to unexpected audience members coming in as visitors is one that is always well received or even wanted *as* an experience. Dance, as witnessed by a museum goer, may in some cases create a potentially uncomfortable situation, especially if the visitor was not expecting to encounter dance in the museum. To continue, I will further uncover how dance can both contribute to and challenge current practices and thinking about artworks that suggest relational qualities but also beg for further reflection.

We see clearly in the work of Boris Charmatz that what appears to be an equal relational opportunity turns out to be more of a constructed event in which the dance artist, again, creates certain conditions that may, or may not, be comfortable or even inviting for the visitor. We start, as an example, with *Flipbook* (2012) at Tate Modern where Charmatz opened up his rehearsals to the museum public; and 2015 moved into Tate for a weekend of events with two dozen dance artists that he invited in *If Tate Modern was Musée de la Danse?* in which he and his colleageus 'took over' the museum. The occupation of the museum by Charmatz began with him conducting a mass warm up for anyone to attend, went on to integrate museum visitors into his live performances, and finished by hosting a club-like open

dance event in the Turbine Hall of the museum. The final dance party was called *Adrénaline: a dance floor for everyone* and included an oversized disco ball hanging from the ceiling that spun lights over a crowd of people dancing to musical beats.

As a spectator to some of the events over the weekend, I found myself overwhelmed with the number of choices available for viewing dance, finding those events at the time they were to begin, navigating the vast spaces of Tate, and dealing with the intense heat of the spaces (some unairconditioned) in the middle of summer. Overall, my experience was not necessarily positive and left me wondering what a museum of dance, for me, might look and feel like. My museum of dance would, firstly, consider the relational practice of dance in the museum as one that integrates rather than takes over. Although Charmatz's event at the museum attracted an excited audience it left something to be desired in me. It was a sense of belonging that was sometimes missing for me, the wandering audience member, always late for the start of the next event, watching silently and uncomfortably from the side-lines not sure how long I to stay, sweating in my standing still position of watching. I was not sure if I should try and see everything or commit to just one event. Similar to my experience I had as spectator to Sehgal's work, as explained earlier, I sensed that Charmatz did very much want to connect with audiences, create an authentically connected weekend. This was due, in part, to what I also felt with Sehgal's work: I felt consistently that the Charmatz and his dancers had command of the spaces and we, the public, were there to watch and sometimes do, but in the space there was not a sense of being equal players, informed by the practice, given space to infuse our own intelligences nor contribute to a public dialogue. I will also add that Charmatz did little to nothing to include local talent. Flying in his colleagues from New York, Paris, and elsewhere when there is such a high number of skilled and available dancers in London and the UK was an initial signal to me that Charmatz is not concerned with inclusionary approaches. His unwillingness to operate in an open, community-engaged way that would have led, possibly, to a stronger sense of connection and relation on the part of those, like myself, who live and work in London as a dancer, was neither felt nor seen.

Continuing the thread of inclusivity as part of relational practice in regards to and in delving further into the audience experience at Charmatz's event, I turn now to Tamara Tomic-Vajagic, a dance scholar and fellow spectator of the events at Tate, who helps to

expand my thinking and broaden an understanding of what made *Musée de la Danse* work, or not for her, as a relational experience based in connection. She makes a point in an essay about her experience and the experiences of the people she spoke with about their time in the *Adrénaline* event that closed the weekend and invited everyone, for the first time, to dance together. She writes,

> Having participated in one day-cycle of the weekend event, and having exchanged impressions with friends in attendance, I came to the conclusion that one's perception of *If Tate Modern Was Musée de la Danse*? was contingent upon one's participation in *Adrénaline*. Those who stayed felt more positively toward the entire event than those who did not. In some sense, then, *Adrénaline* was the glue that could amalgamate the heterogeneous events programmed by Boris Charmatz. Yet, the notion of *Adrénaline* as a coagulator seems inherently alien to the porous nature of this dancing interval. A dialectic emerged from the ambiguity of *Adrénaline*'s nature as a "non-event" relative to the choreographically induced act of dancing (Adrénaline: A Dance Floor for Everyone and expo zéro, 2015).

It is of interest to my thinking that Tomic-Vajagic points out that people felt more positive about the weekend events if they took part in the open-ended, 'non-event' that closed the weekend. This free-for-all party and invitation to dance together was, as suggested by Tomic-Vajagic, both a potential connecting element of the weekend that tied together the more autonomous dance events curated specifically by Charmatz and, due to its open-ended approach, a loose tool for tying together such disparate aspects of the entirety of the weekend's events. What is, however, useful for my thesis up to this point is that what Tomic-Vajagic is suggesting is that people enjoyed participating, of being together dancing and on common ground. By the end of the weekend, after watching a display of dances performed throughout the museum, the spectators to those dances could now dance themselves. It is important to also note here that the weekend, as I mentioned, started with a mass warm-up led by Charmatz. Although this, too, was a chance for museum visitors to move together they were led by Charmatz who was in the centre of the Turbine Hall wearing a microphone headset that amplified his vocal directions across the space and followed by the crowd. What *Adrénaline* offered was a chance to move without the commanding voice of a super-star choreographer and to discover dance in the museum without the dancer either dancing for

them, directing them, or even being visibly and physically present[30]. This non-presence of the artist is more common in the visual arts where the artist creates a work for the museum but is not necessarily physically present in the showing of the work. What might the invitation to freely move together and the non-present dance artist tell us about other possibilities of relating through dance in the museum? It is worth considering, now, the way that a visual artist makes performances in the museum and to also learn about issues that raises.

Turner prize winning and well-known visual artist Anthea Hamilton was commissioned by Tate Britain to create a new work for their Duveen gallery. The work titled *The Squash* (2018) was inspired by a photograph Hamilton found of dancer Erick Hawkins dressed in what looked, to Hamilton, like a squash but was made clear on the wall text at Tate that Hawkins was inspired by Hopi Indian culture when creating the costume that consisted of a large colourful full-head piece in an abstract gourd-like shape. The wall text also says that Hamilton had lost the original source of the image so, therefore, worked from her memory of it. In making the work she invited the dancers with whom she was working with, '[t]o explore their own interpretation of the image and how it might feel to imagine life as other, as vegetable' (Wookey Works, 2018). Without going into the blatant issues[31] such statements raise, such as issues of appropriation of artworks and of cultures, I will focus in on the one main issue that is most jarring to the concern for my thesis. That issue is the problem of 'othering'. I will then go on to discuss yet a further issue of Hamilton's work at Tate that speaks to problems within participatory agendas.

To begin, the othering that Hamilton suggested the dancers embody is highly problematic to the dance artist performing in such a work in the museum. What Hamilton seems to suggest is that the dancers in her work explore being 'other' or outsiders, excluded from being a part of the event, the museum, and society? A suggested exploration in an exclusion to belonging, of being together. Although I might be swayed in my concern should Hamilton's interest in such exclusionary approaches have been made evident to me on my

[30] It is not evident to me if Charmatz and his dancers attended the *Adrénaline* event, but it is clear that they did not take a leading role in its playing out in the museum.

[31] For a further discussion of issues, refer to *On Seeing the Squash at Tate Britain* at http://sarawookey.com/dance-in-museums/on-seeing-the-squash-at-tate-britain/

initial experience as a spectator to her work. My feelings based on the information I was given at that time, are in stark contrast and opposition to the interest in my research to make a case for the role of the dance artist in the museum as both human subject and to fight against her being instrumentalised and silenced like an object. This work of Hamilton – however aesthetically intriguing with such still humans in colourful, dynamic costumes – in which dancers were wearing full head covering, moving slowly, and in silence being told to explore what it feels like to be a vegetable is more than troubling and, therefore, takes a place in my thesis as a way to demonstrate such opposition for the sake of clarity of my own position on dance in the museum. I am interested in the dance artist as human and any instrumentalising or, in this case, blatant, and unapologetic objectification of the dance artist for the sake of art in the museum is worth discussing and must be written about[32]. The voice of the dance artist needs to be heard, not only in these instances of concern, but to contribute to a way forward for dance in order to avoid future failures of its recognition and care as was found in this particular work of Hamilton's.

At one point in its six-month run, instructions for the museum visitor to interact directly with the dance artists were given out. The printed instructions that were handed to the visitors and created by the *Schools and Teachers* team as part of *Tate London Learning* with activities 'devised' by designer and performance artist[33] Enam Gbewonyo. The instructions went as far as to suggest that the visitor interrupt the dance artist and, later, it was discovered without informing the dance artist. I became aware of the event through students studying[34] with me at *Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance* who had

[32] It is surprising and problematic for me that the work received little attention paid to the disturbing and unethical concerns I raise here. Many of the art critics were art (not dance) critics and next to no one from dance (besides my one blog post about my experience), as far as my research could find, wrote about the work from a dance artist perspective.

[33] Worth noting here that she is not a dance artist but a designer and performance artist. Therefore, it suggests she works from the visual and, also, through a politics of the body more in line with performance art than dance and as discussed in my *Introduction* chapter.

[34] These were first year BA students who were taking part in my yearly course called *Ways of Seeing* and includes a section on dance in the museum in which I show them documentation of dance in the museum projects, including Charmatz, Sehgal and others, and encourage them to form questions and to debate their responses to a wide array of work. In our discussion of work at Tate, several of the students mentioned being concerned about their being asked to interrupt the dance performance. As dancers themselves they had empathy for the dancers in Hamilton's work and a sense for how it would feel as a performer to endure such intrusions and interruptions of flow by the visitors, especially without any warning it might occur.

attended the museum on a school trip and on a day that the instructions were given out. One of the students shared the document with me at the time I was leading a class on dance in the museum.

The document title was *A is for Anthea*[35] and consisted of a set of instructions, laid out in a designed, almost map-like, way. The wording began with, 'Anthea Hamilton's installation[36] *The Squash* disrupts the traditional gallery space' and followed by, 'Let's see how you can play a part in this'. It then suggested six approaches to choose from and written as such, 'Reach: Interact; Disrupt: Interrupt; Sight: Sound'. Further down the one-page document that was handed out, museum visitors were asked to choose from a selection of actions to perform. Some of the more problematic ones for me are under the theme 'Disrupt: Interrupt' and suggest the audience member take the paper document holding the instruction and to, 'Stand on the paper, jump up and down on it like it is a mattress, watch how the space changes as you jump'. It also suggests rolling the paper up to make a sound cone (or megaphone-like device) and either, 'Copy what the performer does', or 'Repeat either the word INTERRUPT or DISRUPT[37] to the performer'. I assume they meant using the paper-made voice amplifer?

These prompts are problematic to begin with as one can imagine their disruptive nature but, given that disruption was an intention behind Hamilton's work (as learned from the wall text) it can be understood. However, what is not understandable and even more problematic is that this document and the prompts to the audience was not discussed with nor communicated to the dance artists in the work. I am not aware of Hamilton was informed but there is evidence pointing to the face that the dancers were not. The paper document of

[35] Although not the topic of this section, I cannot help but make note that the title harkens back to *The Artist is Present* in the way it centres the artist as an all-important entity and, again, with a capitol 'A' to emphasise not only the importance of the word artist but, also, the subjectivity of the artist as a key to both marketing and engaging people through learning about the work. Again, this centring, fetishising the artist is a problem for me and my interest in more democratic modes of relation.

[36] What is striking about the wording of the text is the use of the word 'installation'. It is not referred to as a performance or a dance even thought a significant aspect of the work is the dancers moving slowly about the objects, or artworks created by Hamilton, in the space. This choice of wording also neglects to recognise that dancers were hired to perform the work and it did not only consist of sculptural objects. Therefore, the neglect of the word dance performance is worth noting.

[37] Capitalisation is original to the text and not my emphasis.

prompts ends with a set of questions, 'If you interacted with the performer how did they respond'? Based on reports from students who attended the event, the answer to question one was that the performer did not, unsurprisingly, respond well. At some point, when the disruptions were happening one of the dancers wrote out on a piece of paper a question about what the intention of the distractions were. It was communicated back to the dancer, through a written note from one of my students, that it was an assignment given to them from Tate. The other two remaining questions on the paper, 'how did your actions make you part of the artwork'(?) And, 'How did it feel to disrupt the traditional gallery space'(?) suggest that the instructions were meant to 'make you a part of the work'. That kind of language is less about inviting, offering, and opening a space for consideration and more of a command that, by its nature, *makes* you into a participant. This will be addressed later in my thesis but, lastly, the third and final question on how it feels to be disruptive with no follow through or communication around that is more than problematic.

For obvious reasons this approach to of dance in the museum is ethically troublesome in that it refused to include the dance artists as part of the planning that had consequences on her performance and safety. Possible implications could be injury to the dance artist as well as concerns of infringement on the integrity of the work by Hamilton, should she not have been informed. As a more extreme case to Charmatz's work in which, as I argue, the audience is somewhat left out of feeling included during large parts of the events. Here we have an exclusion of the dancers from the institutional decisions being made by the museum that affect her well-being. In terms of Hamilton's work at Tate, it is less a case for arguing there was no relationality within the work and more about a lack of understanding of the relationship that needs to be in place between the artists working in the museum and for other artists as well as the museum's public engagement team (to name one out of many teams in the museum). The museum not only missed an opportunity to engage in a conversation with the dance artists but, more so, risked upsetting the integrity of the work[38] as well as the safety of the dancers.

[38] Given that the information on this upsetting approach came quite late in my research I did not take on the task of fully investigating if, indeed, Hamilton was consulted by the museum in regard to their decisions or if Hamilton knew about the plan and failed to discuss it with the dancers.

Being disruptive in the museum, as will be discussed in one of my case studies, does not have to put others at risk. Intervening in the museum is different from taking a position in the museum and is also different than having agency. Being disruptive in this situation is meant to be a learning experience for students in the confines of the museum but overly focuses on the experience of the visitor to the extent it uses dancers at their expense to get an experience across to the visitor. I think this is an issue and begs to be looked at closely and to consider other ways of working as and with dance artists in the museum. Advancing my argument for relational and spatial practices that have the body in mind I move away from the kind of top-down approach that Tate took on the occasion of Hamilton's work and for its audience. Such approaches not only leave out of a discussion of what relationality can be and look like but also what is safe, ethical, and educational. In the above discussion, intervening in the work of the dancer in the museum without her consent is not something I would ever advocate for no matter how much agency of the visitor I might be interested to support. The kind of positions artists take in the museum and the directions given to audiences there, such as cuing to sit silent across from a celebrity artist in front of a gazing crowd (Abramović ), being falsely invited into a 'dialogical' exchange in which the artist determines the rules (Sehgal); and, lastly, giving prompts for the audience to interfere with the dance artists (Hamilton) are far from the spatial relationships this thesis champions. Following on from here is a description of the methodologies I employed in my thesis that support my advocating for particular approaches of dance in the museum.

# Methodological Approaches

As part of the five-year research period that led to the completion of this thesis, I was in residency at Tate as a *Learning Research Associate* for six-months (January to July 2017). At the end of my residency I presented my research findings on dance in the museum and, in particular, of my experiences at Tate as a dance artist exploring modes of presence in different spaces of the museum and through working with and interviewing museum staff. As part of my presentation I aimed to frame those experiences within my research questions, contextual review and methodological approaches. At the end of my presentation Dr Emily Pringle, Head of Research at Tate, asked me if as a practitioner I felt like a researcher in the museum. The question was not an easy one to answer. What came to mind and what I shared with her and the group of artists, curators, learning experts, and academics in the room was that I had always considered myself a practitioner / researcher. What I was saying was that, by nature of my being in a museum as a Post-Doctoral researcher did not make me a researcher. What made me a researcher was my practice in dance (as a dancer and choreographer) and the rigour of my practice physically, mentally, and conceptually. I further explained to the group gathered that as a dance artist making choreographies and working collaboratively with a dramaturge, the word 'research' was always a part of the choreographic process and human movement is central to my practice / research concerns. My research has been and still is based in an embodied process or the idea of a bodily knowing accompanied by close readings of theoretical texts appropriate to the themes I am working with. For example, I was choreographing a new dance work called *Face* in 2004 and, as part of the creative process, my dramaturge at the time, Dr Guy Cools, gave me a copy of Roland Barthes's *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (1980). Having read through it already once, underlining and highlighting specific areas for me to focus on, I developed an understanding for how one might incorporate theoretical texts within and alongside practice-based knowledge of dance making. I tell this story in order to help you, the reader, understand the dynamics of my chosen methodology. This example also helps to reinforce the ways in which knowledge is acquired through a variety of processes, asking for a multiplicity of research methods.

Practice is often misunderstood. Practice *is* research *and* a method of data collection. Practice is often defined in the field of dance as an on-going process from training the body to creating a live performance event to reading about a particular conceptual interest or idea. Practice is where questions get asked and explored through the act of dance making. Often this way of researching is about working with others and includes oneself into the observations. In this way practice become the route through which data is collected about the many ways of knowing through the body and through experience, not just through observation and analysis. According to dance scholar Susan Foster (in Brandstetter and Klein, 2012) practice and specifically body-based practices such as dance have been considered important avenues for learning and development in the realm of knowledge and understanding. Tracking back to Ancient Greece and the use of verbal articulation, over writing, as a form of communicating what one knows Foster argues that dance is a way of knowing that does not necessitate it being written down in order to be passed along as knowledge. Within the humanities-based dance studies sector, writers such as Foster have dealt with the problems of the ephemeral and ever-changing nature of dance which can pose problems within a more fixed, fact-based form of knowledge.

In these ways, knowledge is demonstrated in practice or of the doing rather than conceptually conceiving of ideas along the lines of more traditional research. I am supported by these claims and my research is part of a larger collection of thought in and outside of my field. I aim to promote more research through the contributions I will make to the field. My research engages, as a key method of enquiry, my artistic practice and is submitted as substantial evidence of a research enquiry. My practice is the conduit to all the different forms of relation I will chart. My experience as a practitioner / researcher is that both my movement practice and my writing allow me to articulate experiences and knowledge but the writing does not replace the moving. Fellow dance artist and choreographer Yvonne Rainer writes about such tensions as she grapples with her own writing about her practice in her book *Works* (1974). She writes,

> When I first started dancing in performances, someone said “But she walks as though she’s in the street.” If it could only be said “She writes about her work as though she’s performing it,” I would be happy indeed.

> That such a thing was possible. So here I am, in a sense, trying to "replace" my performances with a book, greedily pushing language to clarify what already was clear in other terms. But, alas, gone. This has seemed a good reason to compile a book "out of" the remains of my performances, letting the language fall where it may. Let it be said simply "She usually makes performances and has also made a book", There can be no comparison, therefore no need for apology (vvi).

The sentiment that Rainer is expressing encourages us to consider that in a practice-led approach, words evolve from what has already been said in another context: dance. In this way, Rainer gives no apologies for an attempt at articulating dance nor does she believe that written language is a replacement for the moving, knowing, body. A dance practice, such as Rainer's is what makes the theorising possible. My research expands on the idea of dance as a theoretical practice. This extension allows for a further means to understanding the ways in which the dancer's skills bring about a way of *seeing*, *doing*, and *being* in the world. In my theoretical enquiry into the knowledge the dance artist generates I also point to the skills of the dance artist and the cultural context of the museum, in which dance exists, as determining factors. Finally, my interest is in how dance practices develop original insight, ways of knowing, and in how that implicit knowledge is disseminated and shared.

I argue in this chapter, the dance artist's practice / research is capable of taking in and applying conceptual thinking but also, more importantly, how dance produces new understandings and knowledge *through* the body and as a way of comprehending and perceiving that holds value. Understanding, as I will argue, also comes through the awareness of body in relation to and in space. In doing so, the dance artist engages with a complexity of methodologies suited for such processes. The epistemic value of practice / research is a body-centric one that encourages us to embrace the body, lived experience, and forms such as dance as a recognised form of knowledge production. In order to address this value both the design of my research and my research methods place the body at the centre. The knowing that dance produces is also made possible by the skill set of the dance artist and her abilities to listen, respond, intuit, improvise, imagine, and sense, that supports spatial relations. These skills reference back to the story of dancer Susan Rethorst's imagining a spatial trajectory of connection between herself and fellow artists across New York, that was at the very start of my thesis. This kind of skill, of understanding human-to-human connection, is one example of

the many qualities of dance and of the dance artist. This skill, in addition to the ones already mentioned, and others including resiliency, flexibility, agility and determination are all abilities that can be brought to the fore as ways of knowing. In order to come to these concerns in my thesis I chose to approach my data collection through being live in a space, to look closely at lived experience of dance in the museum, and to include my voice in and amongst other voices. The only way to demonstrate how dance produces relation in the museum is to step inside of the research and to track experience, both of my own and others, and to *be* in relation to the sites, with the people in those sites, and to myself (through self-reflection). Simply put I cannot research relation by only reading books on the topic. If I want to capture the felt experience of spatial relations as a body, as a human, as a dancer, practitioner, and researcher I must experience in order to know. The reading about relations then supports the lived experiences.

In this chapter I will be laying out what my methodological approaches were within my particular research project and why they were essential to my process and in support of the kinds of methods I employed. This will first include a discussion of practice / research approaches and structures that were influential to developing my methods, the design of my research methodology, and ways I collected data. I will work to substantiate my choices throughout this chapter as a way to ground my research within my chosen design approach. Both the design of my research and my research methods point to the value system in my practice / research that places the body at the centre. I will return to the narrative that began this chapter as well introduce new ones along the way in order to continually reinforce the value of the corporeal influence on research and how the body, movement, and dance are qualities of experiencing our world and, through doing so, put forth new understandings of it.

## Practice / Research Approaches

This section is both a chance to articulate theories of practice / research approaches and to re-engage the key themes of body-centric, movement-based approaches as laid out in the *Contextual Review* and discussed through the work of Ingold (2011, 2013) and Sobchack (2004). In making a case for awareness, sensation, and intuition, the above writers help to

move forward my thinking on methodology driven by values that are found in artistic practices such as dance and choreography.

Dance making or the practice of dance as a form of knowing is supported by Penelope Hanstein (2017), who suggests that theory takes on multiple forms just as artworks, mathematical theorems, and scientific discoveries can produce new knowledge. In her words, 'theory, like research, has many definitions and applications'. However the differentiating factor is that some research asks for a theory the comes from 'quantifiable data' that can be tested whilst other forms of theory that are more 'inclusive' and work to understand 'nature and behavior (sic) of a specific set of phenomena' (62-88). What Hanstein is talking about is qualitative analysis that considers lived experience as a source for both understanding our world and for producing new knowledge or theory that is, as this thesis aligns with, body-based, and human focused. In this way dancing is a conduit for perceiving and that practice (of dancing and writing), as Susan Melrose (2017) suggests, is knowledge. Along her line of thinking Melrose discusses knowledge and being an expert, as not necessarily dependent on a 'thingness' and she argues for what she calls 'expert intuition' (1). This expert intuition aligns with a value of practice / research in how, in its approach, is about knowing that is not necessarily a cognitive process but one that comes through a physical doing or being in the body as a source of insight and attention. This idea can be drawn back to the theories of John Dewey (1963) in which he describes what he calls 'interactions' (42) as producing 'situations' (43) that people are a part of and are a way of learning, hence a way of knowing.

Embodied knowledge suggests there are many ways to know and that the physically felt space and socio-spatial concerns that I have discussed in my *Introduction* chapter are indicators that understanding comes through the sensory, somatic as well as through the conceptual. This epistemological proposal is not new as it has been written about across dance and performance studies (Phelan 2003; Schneider 2001; Foster, 2019) and in sociology (Silverman, 2003). What my thesis provides and adds to current discourses is a dance artist perspective that further makes visible such nuanced and specialised skills. The use of the term here 'specialist' is in line with what Melrose referred to as 'expert' (2017:2) when discussing

certain sensibilities of dance artists[39] or what Pakes refers to as embodied 'knowledge' developed through practice[40] (2006: 12). In explaining why practice has value, I look again to Melrose and to Robin Nelson and Anna Pakes who argue for movement-based practices, choreography, and lived experience as having epistemological value. Each scholar has laid the groundwork for my own enquiries and leanings within the fairly new field of Practice-based-Research (PbR). My methodological approach has been intuitive, I 'followed my nose' and let my instincts guide me or as Melrose (2017) might say, I engaged an 'expert intuition'(2017:1). Melrose makes claim that the intuitive, in-the-moment decision-making that dance artists do when dancing, is a form of expert knowledge or 'expertise'(6). In my research I had to take necessary actions to complete this thesis, such as engaging in practice, close reading, and writing. Yet through these actions, and over time, the intuitive nature of what I was doing, and sometimes not doing, meant that ideas and thoughts not readily on the surface seemed to float up and reveal themselves as important parts to my argument. As an example, I arrive, at the end of my thesis in a very different place then where I started out. This move between what I intended and what actually became apparent is not through cognitive, analytical thinking alone. It has something also to do with an unknowing that becomes a knowing through the body, through movement, through a being *with* the research in a present way without willing it forward – giving it space to breath its way into the doing, the writing, the case making, and ultimate unexpected conclusion. My thesis is also influenced by my practice in Feldenkrais *Awareness Through Movement* (ATM) that has taught me to stay open to a kind of not-knowing and to observe my own bodily movements without judgement and to trust in an integration of knowledge through the body; A way of learning to learn. As part of my five-year long research/practice experiences I was working closely with Fiona Wright[41], a dance artist and ATM practitioner and mentor. These qualities gained through a dance and somatic-

[39] In this text she was specifically talking about the late choreographer Rosemary Butcher and her expert skills of seeing decision making processes of dancers performing in her work. This skill is linked to my argument of the ability of the dance artist to 'see' spatial connections between people in a site which includes a kinesthetic understanding of movements that have happened and will happen or are about to occur in a space. This also has to do with the way Butcher was able to see decision making in process.

[40] Pakes argues that embodied knowledge can only be learned through practice (like riding a bicycle) and not by 'rote or in the abstract' (12). This kind of knowledge, she claims, is '[t]he domain of praxis, the variable and mutable world of human beings, intersubjective action and encounters' (18)

[41] Wright, in addition to giving me one-to-one Awareness Through Movement sessions from her studio, also joined me for a day at Tate during my research residency to move with me in the space of the museum and to provide her expert perspectives as a Feldenkrais practitioner.

based education are what informed my choice of research methods, data collection, and writing.

Understanding by doing or, as Nelson calls it, the 'know-how' (2006: 107) is about conceptualising or reconceptualising. According to Nelson practice is an experiential process in which the body and lived experience constitutes a 'way of knowing' (108). She is not saying that looking at subjects, observing, and analysing as a form of data collection through writing is the knowing. What Nelson is saying is that a way a moving through experience is essential to knowing. The method of doing as a form of getting to know is not experienced in isolation but in constant, ever shifting, ongoing and changing relations that are both a way of doing research and the very thing I want to make evident in my thesis. In other words, the relational practices that make up my methods of enquiry are also the qualities of attention, of doing alone and together, and of connectivity in the lived sense that my thesis calls on as its subject of research. Relational practice, in this way, serves as a method I engage in. This knowing through dance is supported by what Pakes (2017) points to as the mind-body 'problem' and as something to contend with in our contemporary moment in order to make a case for dance to be explored philosophically (88). What my research does is to draw on the argument for dance as having epistemic value. In this way I look to the dance artist whose knowledge of, not only, how to make dances but how to employ her skills to re-shaping the museum as a relational site is also a source knowledge. In order to do this it was important that I engaged methodological approaches that could draw out that line of thought and where the dance artist remained central to my research inquiries.

Another thinker who considered the body and its movements as central, influential, and informative to understanding culture was French anthropologist Marcel Mauss in his text, *Techniques of the Body* (1973) discusses ways that the body adapts to its environment and how the environment is influential to bodily movement. To help expand this thought, I turn to Vicky Hunter who speaks to embodied practice in site-based dance as a 'distinct form of dance practice' in that it engages with and explores the environment through 'corporeal means' (2015: 2). Whilst a knowing of Mauss's work is important to my thesis, his concern for gesture is different to my concern for movement and I find his cultural assumptions in relation to the body problematic today. On the other hand, Hunter's concept of a 'distinct form' (2) is

useful in making my argument for the museum as a site, not as response to it, but in collaboration *with* it. The relational aspect of dance that I am arguing for includes a relation between dance artist and the site of the museum in how they mutually influence each other. More contemporary thinkers, such as Richard Sennett (2009) who makes a case for the social skills of craftspeople, or artisans, and as discussed by Cools (2016), are of greater use to my thesis claims. With the help of Sennett, Cools makes a link to dancers, as experts both in their craft and as communicators. He claims that the social (and transferable) skills of the dance artist, '[a]re necessary to collaborate in the working place and for social cohesion in general' (2). This reference to the way the dancer's skills are important for a working together and for 'social cohesion' supports my argument for the dance artist as playing a participating role in the way museums operate at the social level.

In order to further unpack my thinking, I learn towards research done on outdoor urban public spaces through the work of Edward Soja (1996), a postmodern political geographer and urban theorist. His theories find possibilities for the imaginary within an already complex and the performance-like environment of shared public space. The concept of 'thirdspace' or 'felt space' that Soja introduces is another way to discuss the way that a space *feels* and will be key to my claims of dance as relation in and with the museum. Highly influenced by Henri Lefebvre (1991), Soja's work argues that there is a triangulation of space including a 'Firstspace' or a seeing of space which is how space is perceived. Such as looking out at a landscape; 'Secondspace' is a conceptualization of space that is seen that may include mapping it and describing it, in order to navigate it; and a further aspect, 'Thirdspace', of how one feels space or how space is lived. This three-sided sensibility of space or 'trialectics' (10) offer combined perspectives of space including what I understand as visual, cognitive, and sensory. These concepts address the materiality of space, or real world, as well as imagined representations of space and, most important to my thesis, the other way of understanding the spatiality of human life. What Soja refers to as, 'a distinct mode of critical spatial awareness' (10) is a way to understanding socially produced space. Such opportunity of connecting in the space of the museum and in an embodied, felt way is part of an overriding opportunity to move past current models of spatial, relational understanding. These old models have been fixated on a concrete materiality of spatial forms, or things that are

empirically mapped, and of space conceived through the ideas about space – in mental or cognitive forms.

What we have learned thus far is that space can be felt and our connections in space may not, necessarily, always be tangible and tactile but are, nonetheless, able to be imagined and felt. In this way the space of the museum becomes a site to practice 'Thirdspace' perspectives, or to make the space of the museum felt as a series of relations. We have come to understand that the dance artist in the museum brings with her skills that include a bodily knowledge or way of knowing through the body. This practice is about the ways the dance artist feels space and senses those sharing space with her through imagined socio-spatial perspectives, such as the one described in my introduction chapter. The focus on practice asks for further articulation of what is transferred, not only through the practice of making dances, but of the presence of the dance artist as she positions herself in a site, with others and in relation. Practice as a method of enquiry asks for particular conceptual frameworks that include the body as central to understanding, and sensibilities and artistic values of the practitioner, such as being aware of one's own perspectives, values, and biases as well as a multi-modal enquiry about many possible methods and idiosyncratic processes. Within frameworks, sensibilities and values, approaches to research, and production of knowledge experience and non-linear, circular, and spiraling networks come about and through many points of entry. These points include observation, data collection, journaling, interviewing, reflective practice, and thinking through the body. This way of researching is supported by a Practice-informed-Research (PiR) approach which follows.

## Practice Informed Research (PiR)

There are a number of different approaches to practice as a form of research. Those include Practice-based-Research (PbR), Practice-led-Research (PlR), Practice-as-Research (PaR) and Artistic Practice. After consideration and because the significant part of my thesis is a written component that is informed by my practice, I have settled on Practice-informed-Research (PiR). Below I will further articulate what PiR is and why it was the best choice of methodological research for this thesis, followed by my research design, and clarity of approaches to data collection that align with the value of PiR and my design choices.

My research is informed by my practice as I take practice-based experiences as case studies to support my arguments. I develop a research approach that engages data collection approaches such as moving with others, journaling, conversations, moving and walking as a mode of processing. Although I made use of practice as a resource for data collection in my research I understand that PiR is different from PbR or PaR in that it does not produce new practice component as part of the thesis, but rather it reflects back at practices already created as a way to support arguments and make cases for what is being articulated. . It also enabled me to argue for this kind of data within academic research.

One might ask why I did not choose PbR or PaR methods. As a dance maker, would I not want to create a new work? My answer to that is that because, having accumulated over twenty years of practice experience, this was an opportunity to reflect back on my extensive practice history and to have the time, recourses, and support to do so. As a producing dance artist working in a fast-paced environment driven by production and an art market, I do not often have the luxury of time to reflect, question, and to think critically about my practice. This thesis is a chance to unpack thinking developed in my practice as well as to evolve that thinking through other contexts and through more rigorous examinations. Arguably, PiR is both a method and conceptual framework and offers a platform for experiences of dance artists and others in order to collect multiple knowledge bases. In this way, PiR is an important methodology for my project in that it allows me to engage my more experiential practices in dance, collecting data from others through discussions, observation, exchange, and reflection. In these ways, PiR is the most appropriate methodology for embodied ways of knowing.

The emphasis on PiR as my methodological approach to the project is to claim perspective is operating in its declared situatedness. Enabling a theorising from and through the experience of practice, PiR foregrounds the practitioner experience through written articulation. As well, the writing embodies the dance mind by aiming to speak, through language, about what dance does and how the sensibilities of the dance artists make certain outcomes possible. The methodology of PiR is an experimental one that values an approach that is not necessarily about finding answers to research questions but about producing more

questions. This production of more questions is similar to Bojana Cvejić's argument for choreography as producing 'problems' (Cvejić in Brandstetter, 2013: 50). It is helpful to consider Cvejić's argument for art to invent new problems. Encouraged by Cvejić's thinking, my topic of dance in the museum and puts forth solutions, but also creates new 'problems', or necessary questions going forward. The approach of PiR allows my concluding argument to address new problems and puts forth the questions. One of which is, how to move dance forward not only as an artform presented in museums or as tool for learning but as a practice, a quality of being, that supports social, spatial relational exchanges in the museum?

In addition to engaging PiR as a method of research, I have also been influenced by processes of data collection and of organisational approaches. As part of my site-based research and interactive, human-to-human investigation I looked for patterns, common findings, and tentative 'hypothesis', or further questions. I then selected the relevant data across three select sites. Those sites consisted of a small-scale private museum in east London, a medium-sized public museum in the northern part of Eindhoven and a large-scale private-public museum in the centre of London order to test out ways that differently sized and varying cultural and socio-political institutions played a role on how dance could be in the museum and the kinds of relations that emerged there. I then looked at all of my material – my data – and selected how to interpret it and what interpretive approaches would help to understand dance as a form of spatial relation in the museum.

To some extent William H. Whyte's research methods and data collection of public-private plazas in New York City in the late 1970s and early 1980s has been and continues to be an influence on my methods. Whyte's use of video documentation and observation revealed patterns of behaviour in humans that correlate with certain conditions of a site (1980: 102-108). For example, Whyte found that the changing light of the sun and wind exposure upon an outdoor urban plaza had, to a high degree, an effect on where people sat and how they moved in the space. Whyte's use of observation, note taking, and mapping are useful to my methodology. I am also observing human behaviour, including my own, in museums. Whyte charted, graphed and mapped the spaces, often with hand drawn black dots or dashes on graph paper that tracked human patterning and self-organization of pedestrians

and city dwellers (70-71). However, his method of observing behaviour in public space was to mount video cameras on top of skyscrapers in New York City, gazing down on pedestrians below (103). The difference between Whyte's approach and mine is that he despite embedding himself inside of the research, and amongst the people he was observing he never considered his own movements and behaviour as part of the equation. There was little to no self-reflection on the researcher's role in the study and as part of the human make-up of a site. I go into my research with the understanding that I am a player in the mix of other and my way of behaving and physical movements and positioning are also up for scrutiny.

From the film documentation take by Whyte and his team of researchers, we see them sometimes walking around and through plazas such as the one in front of the Seagrams Building and Paley Plaza in New York City, but they are walking with clipboards, paper, and stopwatches distinguishing themselves from others. The researchers, also, tracked what they saw, not what their *own* body was experiencing. They did not insert themselves into their own study. My method has been to both note what I was witnessing with my eyes but, also, and equally important, what I was experiencing, with my body. Whilst inhabiting and moving through the public spaces of museums I took note of my experience on the felt sense. In this way, I was not aiming to distinguish myself as a 'researcher' by carrying paper and pen that would distinguish me as different in relation to the museum from the visitors. I did, however, sometimes wear forms of identification – in the form of a bade that labelled me as artist or researcher but I deliberately either used this symbol as either a tool for re-inserting into my research as a way to question such positions or I chose not to wear it when possible. As an example, when I was walking in the public spaces of the museum doing site-based research, I took off my identification and blended in with the other visitors of museum or I would use my pass to get access to non-public spaces and to engage as a staff-like participant in the museum. When I was clearly visible as an artist or researcher I attempted to play with that position as a means to intervening in the site. What my practice-based approach contributes to methodological approaches on understanding human behaviour in public spaces is that in order to fully understand the workings of the spatial, temporal, and social in public spaces one can benefit from having multiple experiences and perspectives.

To manage these multiple perspectives, I borrow from Wouter Davidts's (2017) methodological approach to triangulatory thinking. My research engages a triangulation of knowledge gained from a critical reflection of my practice, an engagement with and experience of practices of a community of other dance, performance, and visual artists, and through close readings. In Davidts's use of triangulation he engages across art, architecture, and the museum as a way of articulating the role architecture has on the experience of art and the museum. He names how one artistic medium (architecture) informs the experience of art is helpful to my argument in my thesis of how dance, as an artistic medium, effects experiences of relationality in the museum and, in turn, has influence on how the museum operates as a physical space where people engage. Such approaches of triangulation also help me in considering the multi-layered sets of relations in the museum and in understanding what dance brings to those sets of relations, between self, site, and each other. I adopt the method of thinking in threes in order to unpack complex concerns across varying spatial conditions of differing museums as well as three different case studies containing individual approaches and positionings the dance artist takes in the museum.

## Design of Research

When I started this research project I did not know that the theme of spatial relation was what I wanted to explore. I started from the assertion that dance was in the museum – there was no longer the need for asking why it was there and I set out to discover further dimensions of *how* dance was and could be in the museum. This meant taking to task assumptions on ideas of engagement and participation of dance in the museum and to stretch my thinking to ask 'how else' can dance be in the museum? This is when 'relation' emerged as a topic of significant consideration that also included a concern for the role of space within relational experience. The term *spatial relation* as a theme came about as I engaged in the research – through a repeated cycle of argument development, data collection, and analysis as an iterative, emergent process. My research or reflective process, is designed to gather input and generate insight from stakeholders such as other dance artists, curators, learning experts, and museum visitors. I took a generative, or an exploratory approach to research that I conducted and then used findings as insights to further decide what problem to solve and create solutions for it. These solutions aim at being new or an improvement to solutions

for the existing problem. The design of my research is a multidimensional approach to practice as informing research. This approach is explained through the different sections below and was a way for me to reflect on my practice through critical thinking, frameworks, and understanding.

A body-based, human focused qualitative approach is important for my research on dance as a form of relation in the museum and that determined the methods I used to collect data. I am interested in a knowing of dance in the museum from a practitioner's point of view and in producing new knowledge through a bodily experience of the museum, not one based on visual observation alone. This thesis has proven to me that through writing and engaging in theoretical debate other insights and ways of knowing emerge. However, the methodology through which this thesis came about asked for certain approaches that invited in influences from practice – how practice was the conduit to data about experience and the body. The productive tension, where some of the learning took place, was in evidencing my practice-informed-knowledge through to the written form. If research (at least at higher degree level and beyond) is the generation of new knowledge, then treating dance practice as a form of research raises important epistemological issues. This chapter, therefore, aims to explain why practice has epistemological value in my research and the issues that raises.

Qualitative research provides insight into problems in the field and will offer understanding, reasoning, and motivations for my particular research question and a different epistemological understanding. Whilst a scientific enquiry is useful, other larger cultural approaches are possible. I do not take a distanced view as the researcher but prefer to be inside of my research. My understanding of this epistemological frame is that I am not interested in obtaining an objective view, but rather, to declare and disclose my particular position *within* the research and to problematise it. Only in this way can I internally debate my own ideas and assumptions whilst opening up to the public debates within relevant discourses. In other words, I wish to substantiate, through critical enquiry, the issues put forth in my research and for it to make a difference. These kinds of research paradigms can be identified as Post-Positivist – or a framing that argues for value and currency in terms of feedback from participants through informal interviews and data collection as well as a flexible perspective in engaging multiple methods carried out in research.

Potential questions regarding objectivity in my research may arise within a Post-Positivist approach. In defence of my research, validity can be found in acknowledging that the data collected is, as with any research project, mediated by my participation and contributions within the field. I also think it is essential to consider whether the research is useful for identified groups that are being researched. As a research study in which my own experiences form the basis of my case studies there are assumptions and limitations at play. I am aware that some of what I argue comes from a subjective experience and cannot be assumed as universal. There are certainly limitations to my research in which I was focused: primarily on North American and European works and within a contemporary, Post-Modern framework. I am aware of the potential problems with ethnographic research in the way spatial and temporal boundaries of what is studied may not be clearly delineated or defined. In addition, potential issues around the relationship between my own experience as a focus of study and to what extent that perspective can be objective or not.

As a way to learn from lived experience and as part of a qualitative method I observed and interacted with research participants, including myself, and in real-life environments. This form of ethnographic research in which I included myself within the research was also a phenomenological one in that I not only lived the experience but did so through the reality of the body. Remember the previous story, early on in my thesis, of my having to answer the question about being a researcher at Tate during my talk given; to Rainer's quote on writing and practice; and Rethorst's ability to 'see people in space' as a way to engage relation? All of these instances referred to lived experience as a way of thinking, of being in the world. Focusing on my lived experiences within the museum enabled me to explore both my own and others' experiences and perceptions from an intentionality.

In gathering information I also needed a reflective practice and made use of mapping and journaling. This method of understanding multiple strands of enquiry and action led to my create a series of hand-drawn maps . I called these *mind maps* and sketched out my thinking in non-linear ways and to see where connections were being made. I also engaged mapping as a way to remember, to trace pathways taken in the museum during site-visits and residencies as a way to track movement, sensory experience, and in relation to the conditions

of the site. Journaling consisted of personal reflections during residency periods and as part of field research that informed my writing and offered a more performative approach to articulating my thoughts. I have, therefore, included some of those journal entries in this thesis as a way to, again, emphasise how reflective practice is important to my research design as well as to an iterative process.

Alongside the reflective practice is an iterative approach that revealed more and more to me as time evolved. I went back again and again to reflect on and try out a practice of being (and not being) in the museum. Through a process of trying out ideas again and again, going back, trying differently, doing multiple times as a process of knowing. As a dance artist, a step-by-step method (as in following an idea) versus engaging in movement improvisation in which I source from one movement to craft the next one; or try out one idea, learn from it, and then try again in a more informed way. This repeating of processes is what converges a result that is dancing, moving, and sourcing, over and over, the ever-evolving process. In these ways I was sourcing methods of making dances that now, in my thesis, acknowledges such practices as a significant part of my lineage of influence to my research.

Based on what has been shared, it should be evident by now that my research methods were not employed in a top down manner, but like moving across a terrain or landscape, I was figuring out as I went along. I was feeling my way through, going back, trying again and again to articulate my experiences and to fine the answer to my questions. This way of researching is reflected back by dance scholar Susan Foster who says, 'The field [dance] can thus be seen as an ongoing process of enquiry marked by a high degree of reflexivity because the evanescence of dance itself foregrounds the theoretical dimensions of scholarly research by emphasizing the constructed nature of any object of study' (in Brandstetter, 2012: 31). This quote suggests to me that dance can be both the subject of study *and* a method of research. Therein dance, as part of my thesis, is both the subject of study and a way of studying, a method of enquiry, and a way of analysing information.

In order to support such ways of working my research was based in qualitative, not quantitative analysis (that is rooted in hard data collection), and, therefore, allowed for implicit knowledge to emerge. Implicit knowledge allows for a knowing of complex

information to evolve through practicing, through doing and in a manner that allows for the incidental encounters with others and peripheral events that happen spontaneously to occur and that contribute to the research. I believe that implicit knowledge or what scientist and philosopher Michael Polanyi (2009) calls 'tacit knowledge', that '[w]e know more than we can tell' (4). Polanyi claimed that the wisdom gained through experience and through the body, cannot be quantified through charts and numbers. The body and movement, through their expressions, demand different criteria for analysis and methods of data collection. I believe that we experience through the body and our perception and experiences shape the world that we live in. In considering a further quote by writer and a philosopher Alva Noë (2005) who says, '[p]erception is not something that happens to us, or in us. It is something we do' (1). I am led to believe that this doing is essential to and part of knowledge development and transfer. I am not, then, inclined to use methods that are objectively driven and I acknowledge that I situate myself in a wider field of study with a long history that has challenged such paradigms of thought.

Thus far I have discussed the ontological focus of dance as relation in my research that reflects an approach exploring lived experience (my own and others). My research engages a context of experience, how different histories allow a phenomenon to be understood, and investigates human social phenomenon. The phenomenon in this thesis is to be found within the spatial nature of relations and how dance is a form of relating *through* and *with* space, each other, and oneself. This methodological belief that what is relevant is subjective, or relativist ontology, does not use objective measurements to find the truth, but rather, engages multiple versions of reality. I believe that through experiences and talking with people we can better understand context and create meaning. For example, in my research, I aim to speak about my changing perspectives of working in the museum over time and with others who have similar yet differing experiences and perspectives. In this way I am open for my view to be challenged and changed through the process of engaging with others and through gathering new knowledge. Again, and to point back to my introduction to this chapter, both my design of the research and the research methods serve a purpose in talking about relations, embodied practice, and situating the self. The remaining part of the chapter discusses the data collection methods I used to carry-out the overall research design as described above.

## Data Collection

My methodological approaches draw on qualitative, ethnographic research methods such as participant observation, fieldnote writing, and interviews. I look at multiple, overlapping, but distinctly different modes of attention of the dance artist in the museum from absent to detached and present. These different modes led me to further question and complicate the idea of practice as a way into and informing research. This methodology is very much available for debate and does not intend to necessarily be resolved but to open up thinking and prompt potential behavioural shifts in the field. My way of collecting data is supported by my design methods that consider my overriding interest in the body and movement as research and means of knowing. My focus was to devise a research project to collect data and to work with methods that help me to collect data that reinforced importance of the body. As did my research design, my method of data collection reflects and points back to my making a case for myself as a researcher and participant open to being observed. I have often relied on storytelling (both my own and others) as a way to gather evidence. These stories are about my own and other's experiences in dance and in the museum. These stories are the tethers to which I connect to ways of knowing through the body and the body as a source of information or data. These experiences guide my choices for how to do research that does not leave lived experience behind but brings it forward, holds it up to the light of inspection and asks, 'How can we know about spatial relation through embodied practices of dance in the museum?'.

In this section I discuss what methods I used to collect data and why those methods were important for the research values already laid out in this chapter. I will discuss the approaches I selected in order to best address and resolve the central concerns of my thesis and to explain the approaches I have taken to address the problems. My research question is, 'how is dance a relational and site-based practice in the museum?' In order to try and answer that question I have needed approaches to data collection that support embodied, lived experience through creative practice as part of the theoretical enquiry and written output. As was exemplified in the discussion at the beginning of this chapter on my being a researcher within my long-standing dance profession, in dance artist Yvonne Rainer's

description of writing about her work as a practitioner of dance, and, finally, in Susan Rethorst's articulation of an embodied way of knowing, of spatially relating. Such references have made clear that research methods on relational and site-based practices of the dancer must include a bodily perspective in order to support a valuing of the body and movement and as a dance practitioner / researcher.

It is hard to talk about spatial and relational practices from an outside, visually-oriented observational perspective, one must be on the ground, inside of the research to understand, through a bodily perspective, how spatial relations work. It would be like trying to describe the texture, smell and taste of a piece of fruit simply by looking at it and describing it. One must have a felt and sensory experiences of the object of study in order to bring it into a place of knowing. My experience as a practitioner / researcher is that the whole body, not only the eyes (for looking) and hands (for writing) must be involved.

A site, as well, can be understood by looking at it, observing, analysing, and writing about it yet my research asks for site to be felt, to be lived in. Therefore, methods such as site-visits, walking explorations, moving with others, and improvisational practices have proven the best source for gathering data on the effects of a site on relational practices, and in collaboration with dance. The methods I am advocating for above will be brought back through to my conclusion chapter as support for my calling on the skills of the dance artist to be brought forward in the museum as a way to re-think, experience, and to live it.

Approaching ways to collect data for my project, I decided that the way to get the most relevant evidence (because relation is rooted in lived experience) is by being on the ground, in the museum, interacting with others (not only museum visitors but staff of the museum), moving, talking, journaling, observation, and interviewing. I gathered data through conversation, experience, and being there live. For example, I engaged in a practice of moving in the museum through walking, sitting, and small exploratory movements in the space. I applied participant observation models in which I observed the everyday movements in the space of the museum that included paying attention to my own actions and those of others. My moving as a way of gathering information included residencies in the studio drawing on choreographic processes such as journaling, dance making, and questioning through the

body. My studio-based practice included research into the expressing of my ideas through the body and to arrive at understandings and further questions. During the writing phase I also engaged in a moving practice in my apartment. I would often step away from the computer to move and then write. Or, I would move and write interchangeably[42] as a way to process information, organise thoughts, and track ideas. Parallel to my own research years, I was also participating in the *Choreographer's Working Group*, an ad-hoc gathering of female, mid-career dance artists / researchers based in London who practice together through improvisation of movement and writing in a studio. We would have paper and pens along the periphery of the studio and whilst moving, we could stop and pause at any moment to record a thought, an idea or an image onto the paper. Afterwards we would discuss what was left behind as a trace on the paper of our moving experiences. These were often short, direct and sometimes abstractly constructed, almost poetic musings of what it is to be a body moving alone and together with others in a shared space.

Over the course of my research period this interaction and practicing with cohort helped me to establish my own practice of moving and writing that was fluid, repetitive, and generated insights into my research questions. These insights contained different textures than did the museum movement practices in that, in the group of dancers in the studio, we established a method of improvising and writing that was interchangeable. This being with dancers was only part of my process of thinking through my research in a bodily way but, in retrospect, it was a significant part of feeling out how what is argued on paper needs to come from the experience, the being in the body not only prior to writing but, also, as part of and during the writing process. What such practice did was to complicate a hierarchy of doing, observing, analysing and recording, and suggest different ordering systems in which the moving is embedded across the other forms of research, data collection, and writing. All of these activities allowed meaning to emerge through dialogue, storytelling, and shared, unique experiences. In this way the method of primary data collection was overall a relational practice.

[42] This might mean moving, having a thought, and then writing it down before continuing to move again.

Curing my research also spent the good portion of year two (2017) attending dance events in the museum, looking from the perspective of the museum visitor and audience to dance, as I observed my own and other's behaviour. I then moved on to look more closely at my history of practice, some of which form the basis of my case studies. For instance, I returned to my practice-based works through notes, documentation, and memory. The *doing* took the form of more concrete actions such as returning to museums I had worked in to conduct interviews with key stakeholders, going through documentation as data for my research, and looking over writing and other material documents pertaining to the practices. I also researched by continuing my artistic practice, making new work within collaborative projects, and teaching alongside my research. These practices alongside my research for this thesis informed the looking (back) to previous practices and kept me presently, physically engaged with my current and ever evolving career as a professional dance artist in the field.

All of the methods mentioned thus far support my claim for dance as relation in the museum. As the interlocuters they provide processes, participant observation, ethnographic and semi-autoethnographic approaches that are the best means of gathering data to support my thesis question of *how* is dance spatial relation in the museum. These are unique methods in that they include subjective research within all my case study chapters that I have been or am currently immersed in.

As a way of synthesising all of the data I collected and to put them into a written form, I found it important to speak out loud either when still or moving. For example, I recorded my talking both to myself and with others. I would speak out loud into a recorder as well as record (with permission) meetings with my thesis advisors and progress report presentations as a way to hear myself speaking the thinking back. I would then transcribe the recordings as a way to articulate those thoughts in writing. I also engaged in walking as a means of letting thinking be put into motion. This included walking in museums but, also, in urban parks and on practice and writing residency retreats in Jersey, Wales and the Lake District over the course of my studies and sometimes recording my thoughts whilst moving. It is of interest to note that walking in nature provided a different pace of processing thinking and producing answers to my questions. The contradiction of my nature walks as a researcher looking at the museum as a site of study continues to haunt me and, in some ways, is calling me forth to

investigate further and for some time after I have fulfilled my current fascination with museums.

To return to my discussion, and to conclude, my research engaged in what I call a method of being with my writing and data collected by sitting with the questions myself. Spending time in retreat spaces in order to let the thinking emerge and reveal itself to me. I spent six months in residency at Tate, as mentioned above, as one of the sites of my case studies in order to better understand how my practice, in real time, might exist and be in the museum. I also had retreat time in an artist retreat in Wales, a friend's guest house in the Lake District in the UK, a modernist flat in London where I house sat for a fellow artist, and, finally, times on my own when my partner was away and I had the place to myself. Despite the challenges of solitude it is also necessary, at times, for the deeper thinking required of such a project as this one.

To conclude this chapter I re-iterate that it has articulated my methodological design and ways of collecting data, all through a PiR approach that kept the body central to the research. I offered a synopsis of how I approached the research questions and how I was influenced by an understanding of methodology within a wider study in my field. I will now move on to the first of three case studies that will substantiate my argument for dance as a relational, site-based practice in the museum and demonstrate the findings that emerged from, as described above, my approach to research and knowledge production. My PiR approach and ways of collecting data as discussed in this chapter help to show how the information that I collected through these processes was essential for the evaluations and perspectives of the detached, absent, and present dance artists that are further developed in the following three case studies. I have confidence that my chosen methodological approaches within my research design and data collection produce a useful and insightful contribution to discourses on my chosen topic. We begin with the first case study of *The Detached Dance Artist* in the museum. It is through her experiences with the space, each other, and herself whilst dancing in and inhabiting the museum that help illustrate ways that intuitive, body-based perspectives of the dance artist are necessary to producing new insights on what dance does when it enters, even in a detached way, the museum.

# The Detached Dance Artist

This chapter provides evidence to show how detachment, or a detached mode of attention, is an important form of relation. Detachment allows us to understand relation in new ways and through a discussion of seeing. The refusal of seeing the audience as a tool of detachment in this chapter will be emphasised as a source to other relations and as an embodied experience suggesting we not only see with our eyes, but with the entire body (Ingold 2011: 45). This focus on seeing and not seeing will be followed by two progressive case studies which will follow a trajectory of actions from *seeing* to *doing* and, finally, *being*. In this chapter, and as a starting point, we expand our thinking to consider that seeing *with* the whole body and a *with* dance as a detached presence in the museum can be a way of connecting. In the museum, unlike in a conventional theatre the dance artist and audience are exposed, seen, in the light, not sitting anonymously in the dark. Seeing and being seen, is a large part of the experience of museums. My interest is in other ways to look and not look – to feel connections amongst each other in and with the space, as well as with oneself in a non-confronting way. This chapter investigates a being 'alone together' (Albright, 2020) through spatial relating. What I am trying to do here is to argue for detachment as a kind of relation that contributes to knowledge. How might a detached dance artist propose relations not yet discussed in the discourse on dance in the museum? By employing the word 'detached', in this chapter, I make the claim that the dance artist can be both physically present *and* removed, or distant in her attention towards the audience and the other dancers moving with her. She is, however, attending to her body in motion and to the site. She sees her body and the space of the museum whilst dancing. She is, in sending her attention elsewhere, unattached to a need to sway the viewer by the dance, and she shows little concern for pleasing others.

We gather together to dance and to see dance. In this gathering together we see others dancing and, as is often the case in the museum, others watching dance with us. Dance in the museum offers a purpose for gathering. In this gathering, we may reflect not only on what we see but, also, on what we *are* (together): a group of individuals convening in a public space. This collection of individuals includes not only the dancers, audience, and museum

visitors, but the museum staff – all human beings. The importance of the museum for problematising the seeing of dance focuses on the dance artist who is detached from communicating with her audience and, in doing so, aligns with the 'performative turn' in Western culture (1960s). A paradigm shift across areas of practice and thought, including the arts, and the concept of 'performance' was employed not as a metaphor for theatricality but, rather, as human behaviour. In this way 'performance' can suggest that we are always performing or that there is a performance of the everyday. Representation, therefore, is put into question and human behaviour put forth as determined by the context with which one is in. Therefore, the word *performance* can be used both as a metaphor and as a tool for framing and understanding cultural and social phenomena. This double use of 'performing' is reflected in sociologist Erving Goffman's (1990) use of theatre language such as 'acting' to help us understand human behaviour. My chapter focuses on was how detachment, as an important form of relation, allows us to be alone whilst together, sharing a space and engaged in different activities – performing togetherness as individuals.

Theories of detachment can be found in psychology, as in emotional detachment, in sociology where detached observation might be employed, as well as in Eastern philosophies, including Hinduism and Zen Buddhism, and, finally, in twelve-step recovery programmes. In consideration of the scope of this thesis, I will be focusing on detachment as an idea in dance and through choreographic structures, implementing detachment *through* the embodied practice of dancing. Therefore, I do not claim to be in direct dialogue with theories of detachment that are outside the scope and focus of my thesis but, rather, to use detachment as a way of performing movements in order to make a case for dance as a means of relating. I am less interested in defining detachment and more interested in how it helps me to understand potentialities of relation in dance. By explaining the relations that a danced version of detachment might enable, I contribute to the subject of relation that is explored throughout my thesis and is at the heart of my research inquiry. I will make my case for detachment as an important form of relation by exploring the work *Trio A* (1966/2014) by

Yvonne Rainer[43] which was presented at Raven Row, a small-scale museum[44], in London in 2014 as part of the *Yvonne Rainer Dance Works* exhibition. I will be sourcing my unique experience as a dancer in the work as evidence for my argument.

Making dance easier to see was not of interest to Rainer. She was more interested in complicating the seeing through a refusal of the dancer to look back at her audience. This way of seeing and not seeing has the potential of relating differently, perhaps more democratically, a way of levelling the theatrical situation. This interest in seeing, or other modes of relating, is built into the choreography of *Trio A* and is precisely why it makes for an excellent case study in the research on the detached dance artist as an important component of relational practice of dance in the museum. This chapter takes seeing or a looking at dance forward as a point of discussion. The concern for ways that seeing as a dancer performing and as an audience looking at dance invites a larger discussion. There is a long history of dancers looking and not looking back. From Classical Ballet in which the ballerina looks out into the darkened theatre to more recent developments in dance from and through the Post-Modern dance period including, for example, *Parades and Changes Replay* (2009) by Anna Halprin in which the dance artists perform a very direct eye-to-eye contact with the audience as they stand on the edge of the stage both in stillness and in action. For the sake of the scope of my thesis, I choose to use *Trio A*, as an example of an iconic dance that is well known for its refusal of direct, shared, visual connection between dance artist and audience.

The dancer performing *Trio A* is instructed by Rainer not to look at the audience, instead she is to avert her gaze elsewhere (to the corners of the room, the ceiling, floor, and her own body). These instructions are specifically choreographed into the dance so the dancer

[43] Rainer challenged preconceived notions of dance and ushered in Post-Modernist thinking and practice in dance. She has, and continues to be, highly influential on dance practitioners, choreographers, artists, and scholars.

[44] Raven Row bills itself as a *gallery* yet, I am referring to it as a *museum* within a UK-based context, due to its conditions and for the sake of consistency in my thesis. I use the word *museum* in this case and, as discussed in my 'glossary of terms' in the *Introduction* chapter, because Raven Row is a non-selling, although privately run, cultural organization. In addition, what makes Raven Row have the quality of a museum, rather than a gallery, is that Director Alex Sainsbury is interested in curating and presenting works across fields that emerge from and/or reflect ideologies of the 1960s and 1970s counter-culture, suggesting he is less interested in the market value, or selling, of work – which he does not do – and focuses, instead, on presenting and in the critical questions the work produces.

knows exactly where to look at any given moment. There has been a long-time fascination in Rainer's work and interest in what it contributes to complicating our understandings of seeing contemporary dance. I am extending that interest by suggesting that *Trio A* performed in the context of a museum space offers other ways of considering dance as a relational, site-based practice. I am also stretching our understanding of the positioning and actions of the dance artist in the museum as a detached form of connection. This is a central shift in this chapter from the detached dancer as has been explored historically to the detached dancer as an example of relation in the museum in our contemporary moment. The nature of the dancer and her refusal to connect visually to the audience (that is seated in close proximity, fully-lit by the light of the museum) opens up new possibilities to speak about other kinds of relations, such as those between dance artists, site, and self. The choreographic instructions for seeing or the use of 'gaze'[45] that the dance artist is to follow consists of seeing the space, for example the corner of the room, floor, ceiling, or her own body, such as an elbow, hand, or foot. In one moment in *Trio A*, the dancer faces the audience and has her eyes closed in order to avoid catching the onlookers gaze. What this other way of seeing and not seeing suggests is that there are other ways of relating through dance that do not depend on a visual mode of attention between audience and dance artist in the museum. Rainer was interested in another mode of performing in which the dance artist does not cater to her audience but, rather, focuses on the execution of the movements. As Rainer was attempting to circumvent exhibitionist impulses of performing by assigning task-based choreographic instructions, she also engaged the intelligence of dancers whose ability to physically articulate such complexities could be seen. This dancing body as a thinking body has a long history within Rainer's work. We will next look back on the history of *Trio A* as part of Rainer's wider work as emblematic, of her valuing of the body as a thinking, moving entity within which thinking and dancing could not be separated but, as she insisted, *could* be witnessed.

[45] I use the term 'gaze' here as it is used by Rainer when teaching the dance. However, in my thesis I refer to *seeing* as a means to discuss a mode of attention to and inside of the dance in this chapter. 'Gaze' as used by Rainer has connotations with a feminist concept of the 'male gaze', coined by Laura Mulvey in her 1975 essay on cinematography titled *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema*, and the problems of gender inequality in dance and art when it comes to viewing performance. I am not using the term 'gaze' here in the way that Mulvey does, yet I do recognise that her theories have value to me, as a dancer and scholar of dance. For this thesis, however, I am using 'gaze' as a way to talk about seeing dance and how seeing in a detached way is an important form of relation in the museum. These relations are informed by the work of previous feminist theorists who, like Mulvey, critique the 'gaze' of the spectator in looking at performance but my thesis does not directly build on such texts.

This relevancy is due in part to the instructions for the dancers of *Trio A* to never look at the audience and to perform the dance in a matter-of-fact way that offers no particular emphasis on movements, dynamic changes in tempo, nor any narrative, or meaning to convey. The dance is performed in silence by (originally) three[46] dancers in roughly five minutes. The dancers move in their own timing and, therefore are not in sync. They, also, are instructed not to look at one another or to interact in any way. What made such a dance that distances itself from its audience and between dancers so interesting to my research was that *Trio A* was performed in the main gallery of Raven Row, a museum site that did not allow for much physical distance between the dancers and the audience and that had viewers on both sides of the space. Therefore, as the dance was built with the idea that the audience would be seated somewhat farther away, as in a theatre situation, and only viewing the dance from the front of the space, and not on both the front and the back sides, the efforts to perform in a detached way in Raven Row were emphasised by the contrasting intimacy and spatial configurations of the environment. The tension of detaching within such a site and the other modes of relation that emerged brought to light that detachment in dance *is* an important form of relation and the conditions of the site is a determining factor in those relations. What this chapter strives to do is to amplify detachment as a relational reality that is lived *through* the experience of dance in the museum and in the museum's physical context. The museum is an important aspect of shaping relationality of dance. Therefore, the context of the museum will be included in the main focus of my thesis: my experience as a dance artist in the museum and as a key source of information in making my case for detachment (as well as other modes of attention) as mode of relating. What *Trio A* contributes to my thesis is that, through an insistence on a removed presence of the dance artist, the opportunity to see what other sets of associations (in particular, between dance artists and between visitors) emerge when the dance artist is not focused on either seeing nor engaging her audience.

We gather together to dance and to see dance. In this gathering together we see others dancing and, as is often the case in the museum, others watching dance with us. Dance in the museum offers a purpose for gathering. In this gathering, we may reflect not only on

[46] The original dance was for three dancers but has been performed in solo and larger group forms.

what we see but, also, on what we *are* (together): a group of individuals convening in a public space. This collection of individuals includes not only the dancers, audience, and museum visitors, but the museum staff – all human beings. The importance of the museum for problematising the seeing of dance focuses on the dance artist who is detached from communicating with her audience and, in doing so, aligns with the 'performative turn' in Western culture (1960s). A paradigm shift across areas of practice and thought, including the arts, and the concept of 'performance' was employed not as a metaphor for theatricality but, rather, as human behaviour. In this way 'performance' can suggest that we are always performing or that there is a performance of the everyday. Representation, therefore, is put into question and human behaviour put forth as determined by the context with which one is in. Therefore, the word *performance* can be used both as a metaphor and as a tool for framing and understanding cultural and social phenomena. This double use of 'performing' is reflected in sociologist Erving Goffman's (1990) use of theatre language such as 'acting' to help us understand human behaviour. My chapter focuses on was how detachment, as an important form of relation, allows us to be alone whilst together, sharing a space and engaged in different activities – performing togetherness as individuals.

The dance, *Trio A*, is discussed in this first case study in order to lay the groundwork for the following two case study chapters. Here we learn about alternative forms of engagement practices that move forward an understanding of the ways that the dance artist's detached mode of performing, the site of the museum, and my experience performing the work are key sources in determining dance as a relational practice in the museum. This detachment allows for being alone whilst together in the space of the museum and complicates current thinking about and implementation of audience engagement with dance in the museum. The phrase 'alone while [sic] together' in reference to *Trio A* can be found in Catherine Wood's book *The Mind is a Muscle* (2007). The reference to 'alone together' was also mentioned in an interview I conducted with Wood and then later, was re-introduced to me through the work of the French philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy's book *Être singulier pluriel* (1995) (translated as *Being Singular Plural*). Nancy's theories have been engaged by Anne Cooper Albright (2020) in her discussion of the choreographic works of Alain Platel, and they are helpful to my own thinking of what it means to apply the term 'alone together' to my first case study and to the work of Rainer in the museum. What Albright makes clear, is that

Nancy's work '[d]isplaces the traditional philosophical take on consciousness as the foundation for selfhood (Descartes's (in)famous *Cogito, ergo sum*) and instead posits our being in the world as a being with one another in the world' (82). She then goes on to state, '[t]he "with-ness' is primarily bodily, and he [Nancy] calls on us to recognise the ways in which it operates in our lives' (82). Nancy, according to Albright, describes this idea of 'with' as '[t]he plurality of we 'others' that serves as the ground from which any sense of individuality emerges' (82). As described in this chapter and supported by Albright's description of Nancy's thinking is that a being alone together is '[n]either a collective subject nor intersubjectivity but is the space between people, a singular dis-identification that acknowledges both our mutual proximity and the labour of crossing over'(82). In these ways my experience of performing Rainer's *Trio A* in the intimate space of Raven Row with the audience seated close in and all around me is the ideal study on the 'space between people' that references our 'mutual proximity' and the 'labour of crossing over'. As a reminder, of those mentioned in the introduction chapter of this thesis, there are artists attempting to engage with relational practice and, in some way, like Rainer, experimenting with proximity, connection, and intimacy – or what Albright is speaking about and what my thesis is interrogating – as a way of relating. Some, however, produce problematic consequences that I will now address.

We return now and, also, begin to introduce anew to the work of Marina Abramović, Boris Charmatz, Pablo Bronstein, Tino Sehgal, Lucy Suggate, and Anthea Hamilton. As I have argued, already, some of these examples employ ways of seeing dance and performance in the museum yet do so in ways that undermines the potentiality of relation in dance. These artists often position the dancer or performer as central to and, therefore, somewhat different, or separated out, from the public. Therefore, missed opportunities for another way of relating – not driven by hierarchical agendas – can and do occur. What detachment allows us to do is be together in a shared space without an emphasis on the dancer's seeing and being seen as the central, all-important entity of the work and in the space of the museum.

In contrast to such attempts, *Trio A* also does not impose itself, upon its audience. One of the aims of the dance is to free both dancers and audiences of the pressures to engage. When the dance artist is relieved of the pressure to make eye contact and, as well, communicate across a space to her audience it frees up another kind of space in which the

dance artist can begin to interact with other dance artists, with the site and with herself whilst the audiences engages in a relating across space to each other, to other audience members. As argued by Wood (2007) and cultural anthropologist Richard Sennett (2012), there are other ways of relating and socialising in a shared space both (alone) together. In detachment there is room for other modes of attention and relations (within the space and with one's own bodily experience of dancing and of watching dance) that create a differently shared experience of relating. This case study, therefore, argues not only for detachment as a kind of relational strategy but, also, as a way of being at ease together. In these ways, might dance contribute to creating more equally shared space that includes dancers and audiences and puts people at ease, making space for other experiences of being together?

In the case of dance in the museum, there is a potential for not only dance as relation but as a place to rehearse more democratic spatial relational practices. How might the site of the museum serve as a space for practicing relations and what qualities of that site support the kinds of democratising relational practices *Trio A* suggests are possible? In order to answer that I will discuss, first, what *Trio A* represents, the spatial conditions of Raven Row, and my experience as a dancer in Rainer's work as part of the museum's series of performances. What my research shows is that the space between people is what allows and does not allow, in the experience of the detached dance artist, a 'crossing over that space'. More specifically, the dance artist who does not project her attention out towards the audience looking back at her and across that spatial divide opens up another space for other modes of relating with each other, oneself, and the site. As we move through this chapter, I will be discussing how relation emerges through those spaces made available by the detached approach of the dance artist.

The 'space' that I am referring to in this section and throughout this chapter is the space between the dance artist, other dancers, and the audience. This space is both the physical space of the gallery in the museum and the relational space, supported by the detached dance artist and the built environment of the museum. Within this space is, as Nancy suggests, a being with that does not depend on inter-relating nor collective experience, but rather allows for a being with that also gives room for a being alone whilst together. Therefore, I take the liberty here to borrow from Nancy's idea of alone together but add

parenthetical brackets around the word 'alone' to suggest that togetherness or a 'with-ness' is understood differently when we include the idea of aloneness. Unlike Nancy, my thesis argues that these experiences (of being alone and of being together) although not totally separate nor totally co-dependent are, as a combined experience, unique to the way that dance can create a space for those somewhat dualistic elements. It is precisely , then, that created space that allows for such possibilities. Below I go deeper into the sources for this case study (the dance *Trio A*, the site of Raven Row ,and my experience as a dancer) and draw forward an understanding of ways of seeing dance through a sense of being alone and together at the same time that is enabled by the detached gaze and bodily attitude of the dancer. First, though, a short history of the dance *Trio A.*

## Trio A: A Dance of Relation

*The Mind is a Muscle, Part 1*, an evening-length dance work by Rainer contained a section called *Trio* A. This section later became its own independent dance and has been become one of her signature pieces. First performed by dance artists David Gordon, Steve Paxton and Rainer *The Mind is a Muscle, Part 1* premiered on January 10th, 1966 at the Judson Memorial Church in New York City (NYC) and then, later, on April 11-15, 1968 at the Anderson Theatre, also in NYC. The section *Trio* A went on to become its own separate dance and has been performed in different variations from solos to large groups and with differing degrees of interpretation. What remains constant is the quality of unenhanced delivery, a kind of nonchalance that does not communicate through facial expression or narration and, instead, plods along in a task-like way unencumbered by the presence of an audience. It is a highly structured dance in that every detail of movement is prescribed including where the dancer looks at any given moment so that she never makes eye contact with the viewer. It is a dance in which the dancer is removed in her attention outward and suggests that an inward focus and detached way of being together (dancer and onlooker) through a performance of dance might be possible. Such alternative modes of performing is influenced by the philosophies of the late John Cage – an influential sound artist whose collaborative and life partner the dance artist Merce Cunningham (and with whom Rainer studied) – who believed that '[a] piece of music was a social occasion' and, yet, created experiences with music and through live performance in which the audience and performer were 'autonomous' in their experiences

that provided a model for society in which no person was more important than any other person just as no note was more important than any other note (Krause 2011: 36-44). This approach to equality was taken up by Rainer whose dance also suggested that no movement was more important than any other movement and that the dancer and the audience were equally sharing space without one being more important than the other.

For Rainer the dancer is moving, the audience looking, and both actions are equally valid as forms of autonomous action that are placed in the same space together through a performance context. Rainer was also interested in equality within the experience of seeing and dancing. She attempted, through making such challenging work, to escape the more narcissistic tendencies of performing for an audience in order to create a space where the dance artist and the audience might engage in their respective tasks: dancing and seeing without the pressures to relate or to connect. As Burt (in Lepecki 2004) states, *Trio A* '[a]ttempted to forefront the actual weight, mass, and unenhanced physicality of the dancing body by eliminating the kind of presence that is produced when the audience senses[47] the performers' pleasure in exhibiting themselves' (37). In an attempt to express her desire to escape the tendency towards exhibitionism, Rainer instructs her dancers to not interact, make eye contact or connect through temporal or spatial connections with the other dance artists (guests) in the space around her or with those watching. The choreography is made so that the front of the dancer's body is only once facing directly towards the audience. In this instance, the eyes of the dancer are closed. The dance artists in Rainer's work are instructed to perform *Trio A* without reaching across the spatial divide to other dance artists or to the audience, and that the gestures be minimal, non-sequitur actions, in which one movement does not lead logically into the next, and that the movements are not intended to represent or have meaning, or a story attached to them. There is a democratic approach to no

[47] I will reference the aspect of audience sensing as experience of a performance through a discussion of Fischer-Lichte's theory following this section. It is interesting to note, here, that Burt chose that word and that Rainer, on the other hand moves away from any sensorial pleasure on the part of the dance artist and the audience in a performance context. Rainer was not only not interested in understanding as experience in dance but also questioned what kinds of experiences one might have and chose to strip away sensorial or representational elements in her dances in order to complicate what seeing, experiencing and, perhaps, understanding of dance might mean.

movement being more important than any other movement and that principle is extended to the idea that any one dancer is any no important than the other dancer, or to spectator(s).

In order to understand further the interest in equality, we will briefly revisit the way that gaze was taught to me as part of my training as a dancer and as a way to contextualise Rainer's unique approach to the performing of dance. This look into the past helps to reinforce the ways that a seeing and not seeing in the dance work of Rainer is different from the more expected modes of presentation by the dancer. This other way of seeing has direct impact on ways of relating that are somewhat new to the experience of dance. I will begin with a brief description of my dance training and how it suggests a certain kind of relating across the space of the theatre. I do this groundwork in order to support my claim that, within the dance artist's positioning of herself and her approach to her audience in the museum space, she reflects a thinking about and new experiences of dance and of relation.

As a dance artist, I was trained in stage presence[48]. I learned to project my gaze and to expand my movements in space so that they registered visually for an audience looking at me, from the front row to all the way up in the back balcony. This projecting out into space through the limbs of my body and face was imaginary to some degree, but it also required me to extend beyond my own centre, to be 'big' in the space, and to look up and out. To dance was to be present in a big way and, in so doing, was to be shared generously. Anything less than a projected attempt was not, according to those I studied and worked for, performing dance. That presence with the audience, to meet them in the space between the edge of the stage and the edge of their seat – and to give in to that space between me and my audience – was expected of me by my dance teachers and the choreographers with whom I worked. This changed in 2010 when I met and began working with Rainer. What the training of stage presence teaches dance artists is to understand physical attention to their bodies in their own kinespheric space and gestures moving outside of that kinesphere. I only touch on Laban

[48] This stage presence supported the idea of attachment as a form of connection. This meant being attached to an idea of how dance communicates with its audience and that the outcome often sought is one of mutual understanding and agreement on dance as a physically expressive and emotive form of art. This can be most easily recognised in Classical ballet or the works of more modern choreographers such as Martha Graham. Not until Merce Cunningham emerged on the scene did dance start to question itself and to explore ways of dancing that focused on form over content and that not looking out towards the audience was also a way of performing.

theory of the kinesphere here as a way to recognize his contribution to some of the ideas I am working with and to open up thinking about the body of the dance artist and that of the audience. To return to my thought process, the distinction between inside and outside one's kinesphere is useful when considering the space of relating to one another or the space that one takes up in terms of scale while aiming to connect. For example, if one is trying hard to communicate (both physically and emotionally) then they may lean forward, moving towards the edge of their own kinesphere. If, however, one is not attempting to be heard, to listen well or to interact at a deep level then they may sit back into their chair, keep a still distance and not move forward into the space and, therefore, remain solidly within their own kinespheric space. By staying inside of one's own kinesphere there is less possibility to interfere with the kinesphere of others. This quality of remaining close to one's own centre or, what I think of as the spine of my body, also suggests a relaxed, sitting back, grounded quality of being in the room together. This being at-ease is also a quality of detachment. By allowing for a sense of ease, of being in the room together or what Richard Sennett (2012) referred to as 'behaving with minimal effort' (2012: 211) we do not over-extend ourselves and, therefore, allow a kind of being alone together that is free of pressure and easy going. In considering these thoughts, I turn now to Rainer's approach, through her dance, to disengage with the audience and, later, I will demonstrate how that approach allows for another space to open up for relating with ease and with less effort. The deepening of thought on how the kinaesthetic exploration of the dance artist allows for an experience of both body and space also points to such an exploration as having an effect on the audience is summed up in the following quote,

> [T]he body is concerned with the dancer's ability to articulate and experience both the body itself and the space in which it moves. This kinesthetic exploration requires a specific focus on internal consciousness and the perception of an interior space and attention between the dancers, and this tension is something that also affects the audience by way of using their whole sensorial spectrum. (Maar in Butte et al. 2014: 108).

This quote suggests that dance is experienced through the sensorial points directed towards the audience and towards the dance also being an embodied spatial relationship with others. In order to unpack that thinking further, we need to consider the bodily experience, not only, of the dancer but – equally – of the viewer. This case study reveals that the body of the audience is important to the discussion of relation and on par with the bodily presence of the dance artist within the experience of seeing (and not seeing) dance. This thinking will be reflected in the next section when I discuss Maaike Bleeker's insistence on the body of the dance spectator as factoring into ideas of performance as well as in my concluding thesis chapter that will argue for particular sensibilities of body, space, and relation that the dance artist has that are played out in the museum with potential to affect other spatial-relational environments.

> The body on stage draws a lot of attention, not only from the audience but also from theorists. What is more, the powerful and fascinating presence of bodies on stage appears to be capable of capturing the attention of both audience and theorists to such a degree that the other bodies present – those of the audience – are almost or completely forgotten (2017:14).

Bleeker's insistence on the body of the viewer as not 'just looking' at dance or performance but of their bodily presence are useful to my case study. Here we have considered *Trio A* as an example of how dance in the museum is more than something to look at or a tool for engagement of material objects and site. Beyond that thinking is a deeper social and political stance that claims a democratic approach to equality. This stance asserts that no movement is more important than any other movement in the dance and that no dance artist is more important than any other dance artist or audience member. My interest in the dance artist dancing and the audience member seeing the dancing as acts of holding equal presence in the space of the museum will be further elaborated through the following two case studies and made even more clear in the conclusion of my thesis. Perhaps this equality of relation helps to move past the pressures on the dance artist to engage and enliven her audience and for the audience to be agents in the relational potentiality of dance. Jacques Rancière says,

> It is in this power of associating and dissociating that the emancipation of the spectator consists, – that is to say, the emancipation of each of us as spectator. Being a spectator is not some passive condition that we should transform into activity. It is our normal situation. We also learn and teach, act and know, as spectators, who all the time link what we see to what we have seen and said, done and dreamed. There is no more a privileged form than there is a privileged starting point' (2011: 17).

As Rancière claims the 'emancipation of the spectator', I call on the 'emancipation of the dance artist' as a co-creator of space along with the audience, the site and herself. If, as Rancière claims, 'every spectator is already an actor', I claim the same for the dance artist and go a step further to claim that every dance artist is already a spectator, seeing herself within the dance, those around her, and the site where she is dancing. I will go a step further and claim that it is the stance of the dance artist – both in the choreography and approach – dancing and, more importantly, her attitude of detachment that allow relations to emerge. Therefore, as the dance artist is busy with her attention to spatial relation, the audience is able to make sense of their own spectatorship in that same space. Because *Trio A* does not deliver an easy-to-access performance of dance nor direct the audience through the experience, it is able to offer up another space for the audience member to consider their own subjectivity and physical presence within the event, opening up new possibilities for being together in public space through dance. Bleeker's concern for what is at stake in seeing and what bodies are involved in seeing propel my own concern for how we might consider seeing in the museum to include, not only another person, but the space itself and, ultimately, one's self. I consider dance in the museum as an act of relating on multiple levels and determined by the physical and metaphorical positioning of the dance artist. I agree with Bleeker and my thesis points to, through *Trio A* as a case study, the equality and intelligence of the audience, and the dance artist. One experience as example, is that Rainer has instructed dance artists in her work to 'get on with the business of dancing while the audience gets on with the business of watching, you just happen to be in the same room together' (Wookey in Main, 2017: 159). This kind of hands-off, non-willing, letting two parties equally engage supports my argument that a detached dance artist offers up other ways of being together in the museum that are, when put under inspection, offering up sets of relation that complicate the usual dynamics and power relations of dance artist and viewer. It suggests other kinds of relations that are about letting others do their thing, keeping the focus on one's self and

allowing the space to hold a frame for the potential of an equality of relations to emerge. Now I turn to a discussion of the way *Trio A* supports the creation of such a space of relation.

As we have learned *Trio A* is a dance that has been performed, since the beginning, in alternative spaces. As I position my experience inside of the dance and, specifically, in a museum context in order to provide evidence for my argument that dance is a relational, site-based practice in the museum and that performing in a detached manner is one way to relate. As Rainer's dance was aimed at presenting a different kind of dance that argued for an alternative approach to the more assumed modes of presentation and display of dance so, too, does my thesis aim to present a different kind of dance in the museum through a discussion of detachment and ways of being at ease that allow for another kind of being alone whilst together. In the value system of *Trio A*, as mentioned, each movement of the dance is equal in quality, weight, in terms of effort, and use of time, and in terms of phrasing to all other movements. In this way, no movement is more important than any other movement. Therefore, an ethos of equality is embedded into the dance[49] (see Wookey in Main, 2017). There is no hierarchy of action in the same way that Rainer claimed that anybody could perform the dance as long as they put the work into learning it regardless of any prior professional dance training, body-type, and age. These values[50] point to Rainer's interest in creating certain conditions towards a more democratised dance and environment for viewing and performing (Banes 1981: 104). This quality is rendered most visible in the space of the museum with its more intimately designed spaces, well-lit rooms and quality of attention for seeing. *Trio A,* through its choreographic approach and insistence that no movement is more important than any other movement, represents an inherent democratising of dance, an equalising of importance movements.

[49] There is often, on the part of curators, a tendency to misunderstand the placement of the 'political' in Rainer's work as being attributed to the 'everyday movements' of the dance (see Lax 2019) but, as I argue here, is in the choreographic structure of the dance.

[50] Rainer is not the only artist to hold such values. Others such as John Cage and Merce Cunningham (with whom Rainer trained with) as well as artist Joseph Beuys were interested in creating art and dance works that – through the way they were constructed and performed – were models for a more just society that aimed for equality between people, places and things (Krauss 2011).

*Trio A* was created at a time when dance artists were also rejecting Modernist aesthetics in dance. They turned away from story, myth, virtuosity and expression in dance making and included walking and running (Banes, 1981) in their work. For Rainer, this led to choreographing a dance in which the movement sequences, includes both everyday movements built within more complex dance sequences, were put together one after the other in a nonsensical manner. The challenge of the choreography insists on the dancer focusing her attention on the executing of the ongoing, difficult juxtaposition of sequences. The intensity of focus required of the dancer moves her attention away from having to project or present herself to the audience and towards the task of articulating the movements with her body in order to fulfil the demands of the dance. *Trio A* asks for a focus on the labour of dancing and away from an expression outward towards the audience. There are also no stops or pauses in the dance, only one long movement phrase that completes itself with the last gesture: a quiet touch of the right foot, relaxed and balanced on the toes, just behind the left standing leg whilst the torso faces the back corner, eyes looking into the palms of the hands held low on the left side of the body. What *Trio A* offers us is both a dance that is challenging to watch due to its nature of ongoing-ness and uninflected, non-dynamic movements done in silence, and also a dance in which the dance artist is detached in her attention to others and, therefore, opening a space for different sets of relations between dancer and site, with the other dance artists, and with oneself.

Much of this writing is by dance, performance, and visual art scholars whose experience of *Trio A* seeing the dance whilst Rainer's writing, as does my own, demonstrates an understanding of the work from having performed it. I find both the perspective of the audience and of the dancer of *Trio A* informative to my thinking. In particular, my concern for the detached positioning of the dance artist is echoed by Burt (in Lepecki 2004) who quotes, 'Rainer was not only concerned with minimizing the space, time, and movement dynamics of her choreography; she also sought to deconstruct modes of performance and presence by disrupting the way the performer conventionally presented herself - or himself to the audience.' (36). A deconstructing of modes of performance has led me to examine, more closely, the mode of detachment.

Where Burt leaves off on a discussion of presence or disrupting conventional modes of performing, I pick up on the particularities of detachment and open up a discussion of it not as a 'disruption' but as an opportunity for relations to emerge. The provocation is complicated in a productive way through Burt's writing about the tensions of such a presence. At the end of his chapter, Burt makes statements that suggest the impossibility of escaping a projecting of self in dance performance by saying that, '[h]owever much Rainer attempted to escape a communication with and, more specifically, a seduction of the audience (see her 'No Manifesto') one is 'always implicated in the very 'power' one wishes to oppose' (38). This somewhat challenging statement in which one cannot escape the power one aims to upend, also suggests that there is, to some degree, a communicating that happens between dance artist and audience. This element of communication is, according to Burt, inevitable. However, as made evident in this case study, such attempts to circumvent the identity of the dancer who communicates and seduces the audience through the act of performing do, nevertheless, instil a changed environment of performance simply due to the efforts on the part of the dancer to perform differently. The tension, from my experience as a dance artist performing the work, is not in the failure of my attempts to turn my gaze elsewhere but, actually, in the productive friction of space that can be felt between myself and the audience despite the lack of eye contact, projection and communication therein. This felt space is where the relational potential resides and is an important element to my overall argument that dance, in differing forms, produces relation. Those relations may or may not be picked up as recognisable as they are somewhat unexpected and unusual within the context of a dance performance. These spatial relations are not, in my thesis, prescribed as being between dance artist and audience necessarily but, rather, as Burt's writing nudges me towards understanding, that there is a less discussed 'felt' space between them.

That felt space is a relational one. In these ways the possibilities for relation are extended. This thought is echoed by Burt as he ends his writing by saying that, 'despite the impossibilities set forth by Rainer in *Trio A*, in the attempt to reduce dancing to its minimum and avert the gaze, there is an opening of possibilities of presence within the discourse of performance' (44). This possibility of presence is key to my thesis, yet I have chosen to open up the idea of presence and break that down into three distinct, what I call, 'modes of attention' including detached, absent, and present. These modes of attention are all

important forms of relation that dance produces in the museum. The museum, as a host for such relational practices, also plays a critical role in shaping the kinds of spatial relations that are possible when dance enters. Now we step into the museum to understand how it supports, in this case, connectivity and sociality in and through its spaces.

## Raven Row: A Site for Relations

I move on from a discussion of *Trio A* to introduce Raven Row by describing its conditions that both framed and amplified relationality. In describing the history and architectural significance of the site, I provide further evidence of how the museum – as a site for dance – provides a setting for relationality to occur. Again, as in the previous section, the intention is not to source a history of the museum or its architectural concerns but, rather, to lean on certain aspects or spatial qualities of the museum as it provides support for my interests of interactions between art (in this case, dance), people (dancers and museum visitors) and the space (museum gallery). In particular to Raven Row, I will be looking at its history as a domestic space as well as the smaller scale aspects that created certain productive tensions within the practicing of detachment, that helped to make visible the possibilities of relation and within a physically-limited distance as a space of opportunity between the dancer and the audience. As part of this opportunity I will introduce the idea of kinespheric space as a metaphor for socio-spatial relations in which the body of the dance artist is central. This body-centric approach also extends to a discussion of the body of the audience member that includes physical movement of the eyes as a way to discuss a seeing of dance, of relating through detachment.

Moving on from the discussion of *Trio A* as a dance of spatial and relational interactions, this section will address how the social cultural capital of the site as well as its physical construct, architectural features, and the culture of hospitality of Raven Row supported new spatial relations. The museum offers up a new context for considering the potential of dance as a platform to explore relation. The space of the museum allows for differing cultural contexts and more varying scales of proximity between dance artist and the

museum visitor[51]. It is important to note here that Raven Row is not dependent on government subsidies and as a privately-owned space, it has greater flexibility and a wider margin to its programming choices that more publicly funded institutions do not have. What I am pointing to here is that privately funded museums, such as Raven Row, are not dependent on state funding. Therefore, there is less expectation to include quantifiable participation and engagement agendas within programming and more ability to programme outside of the box and to take risks. For Raven Row, the *Yvonne Rainer Dance Works* exhibition[52] and performances signalled the first time the museum had presented dance since its opening in 2009. Both were unexpected choices for such a small-scale museum to present dance and, yet, they proved itself to be a significant event for dance in the museum and the arts and culture community both in the UK and internationally.

London-based dance artist Joe Moran, an audience member for the performances, whom I interviewed (February 5, 2018) said that the dance performances of Rainer's work at Raven Row was a 'pivotal moment' for dance in the museum. 'The residence', according to Moran, 'was a game-changer in how live dance and choreography are recognised as significant.' What Moran is suggesting is that, due to Raven Row's reputation as a significant cultural venue, having dance programmed there for the first time gave it a place in the London visual arts community as well as internationally to a degree that dance had not previously achieved. Its international weight, as example, was felt when the well-known choreographer from Belgium, Anna Theresa de Keersmaeker, attended the show. Seeing such a celebrity of the dance world that close, seated snuggly on a bench in such an intimate space alongside others who may or may not have recognised her, registered the cultural influence this show had on the international dance community, while also rendering visibly and tangibly the curious nature of it happening in such a space. I turn to Rainer whose response to the intimacy of the space was also curious. She said,

[51] The museum, is not always a comfortable place for a museum visitor to experience dance, for the visitor is longer in the dark, as when in a theatre, and therefore more seen by the other audience members making one's own movements more visible.

[52] The exhibition consisted of a selection of Rainer's films, photographs, notes and journal entries from The Getty Research Center [sic] in Los Angeles, where her archive is housed. These were displayed throughout the three-floors of the museum alongside the live performances taking place on the ground level main gallery.

> Regarding 'sociality' between performers and audience at the Raven Row Rainer show: The two rows of benches brought the spectators at times to within less than several feet of the performers — I imagine this must have been a somewhat novel experience for some of them (*On Curating*, Forthcoming).

What felt relevant to my interest in relations, that I will speak to further on, is how the structure of Raven Row asked us all to be together, equally sharing space. Unlike in a theatre, this space offered a few simple handmade wooden benches for the audiences to sit on. The shows were free to the public and spaces were on a first-come-first-served basis. In addition, the space required the audience to sit close together, either on the benches or (if you came later) on the floor or stairwell leading into the gallery for the duration of the one-hour show. As the audience witnessed the dances being performed, they sat both in close proximity to those dances, and also to each other. Again, it was the particular set up of Raven Row and its spatial context that allowed for such an experience.

The claim that the context of the museum is affective to the way art is received and experienced there is not new. What is most interesting to my thesis is how the museum plays a role in the framing and effecting of art and, in this case, dance as a relational practice. This is explained further by Wouter Davidts who says that, 'Art does not become public in and out of itself. It has to be *made public*: by and within the institutional space of the museum' (2017:22). Proceeding from a critical identification with the institutional frame Davidts's writing makes clear that there is a rapport between the artwork and the frame of the museum. If we begin with the premise that dance is a relational and site-based practice in the museum, then we can begin to see the potential for connection between the dance artist and the space. I am interested to expand Davidts's theory to say that the museum is not only a physical context within which dance happens but, rather, a collaborating element *with* dance to be included within the set conditions that allow relations to emerge. Those relations, being spatially oriented, are also deeply affected by the actual space of the museum and its effects on the experience (for both dancer and audience) of dance. This also points to the initial claim of starting out in my research that dance is both a relational and a site-based practice. This thesis further articulates that the site is not a static structure that dance simply responds to in relation but that it has a role to play in shaping the kinds of relations that dance produces.

The site collaborates and is in relation *with* the dance. As Davidts claims that art is a changing exploration of the 'conditions of publicness', he also states that this exploration is a direct result of a shift in art's relationship to the world at large. This relationship depends on a public platform that is granted by the institutions, in this case the museum, and because of this it also depends on the architecture, of that institution' (2017: 22). My interest is not on the dependency but, again, on the relational and collaborative potential of the dance and the site, including its architecture. This takes us to a discussion of both the architectural history that includes updated features of Raven Row's refurbishment. As will be explained in the next section, both the past and current conditions of the site open up new potentialities of relation that exist both inside of the museum and also in the outside world. These relations were made possible by the presence of the dance artist and, also, by the spatial context in which the dances were made public.

Architecturally speaking Raven Row is, in its scale, an intimately social space. Its Eighteenth-century domestic rooms have been reconstructed by the architectural firm *6a* that has added two contemporary galleries. It stands on the part of Artillery Lane that was, until 1895, known as Raven Row. Several flats in the building's upper floors host visiting artists and curators who are invited to contribute to the exhibition program. In the early twentieth century, 56 and 58 Artillery Lane housed many families who worked in the local food markets. It was, at that time, a domestic space and the scale of the building today still feels as if it were built for the human body. The new extension consisting of the main gallery space, where the performances took place, consists of two spaces set slightly below street level, almost sunken into the earth, and can be accessed by taking a short set of stairs or, visually, through the window at the back of the space connecting to the streetscape. The main space consists of the two galleries sitting one in front of the other on a diagonal. They are made to give the feeling of one larger space set off-centre or two separate spaces that are more or less equal in size. The dance performances used both spaces, sometimes crossing easily between them and, at other times, staying within one or the other. For those watching, if you were seated at the front on a bench, you were in one space looking into the gallery from the front, and, if you were at the back window looking in, you were seeing the dances from the back as you gaze into the space from the rear. This duality of viewing, mediated by the dancer, produced a curious form of detachment as a mode of relating that is the ideal example of how a site

collaborates with dance in the production of spatial relations. The large open window that opened up to the street at the back of the main gallery at Raven Row formed an extension to the external environment of the city and amplified the possibilities of spatial relations between the inside and outside spaces and with unexpected audiences. What seemed to happen at Raven Row was an emergence of connection not only between dance artists and audiences inside and outside the space but between those differently spaced audiences looking back at each other. Between the spectators from the inside and those on the outside of the physical space of the museum were the dancers moving through the complex movement sequences of the dance ever avoiding catching the gaze of the both audiences on either side. This detachment on the part of the dance artist allowed for a space to open up for both audiences to see each other. Separate physically but still able to see across a space and have a connection due, in part, to their not engaging in a mutual seeing with the dancer who moved between them. These particular conditions and tensions make this example, or case study, a key contributor in support of my overriding argument for detachment as mode of relation in dance and how the social-spatial construct of the site of the museum contributes to that theory. The case to be made here is that the site conditions of that particular museum, and in collaboration with the detached quality of the dance, are elements that, together, made possible new spatial relations to emerge. Rainer also commented on the open window to the street saying,

> What I remember most vividly about the relationship was the window at the back of the adjoining gallery, which was visible to the audience and through which they could see another group of spectators peering in from the street to watch the performance from the rear — THAT[53] was a novel experience for ME! (*On Curating*, Forthcoming).

Her description of the experience as 'novel' was felt for me, as well. As a dancer in the work and having performed *Trio A* in many different spaces, I have never had the experience of performing it for two audiences, on either side of me, simultaneously. What is more,. the overarching point of this section has been to point out the ability for Rainer's dance to engage in an intimacy within the site and with the audience as well as to produce a connection

[53] Emphasis is Rainer's.

between the spectators. This quality affirms the potentiality of dance as a relational, site-based practice and, more so, it points to how detachment leads to other kinds of connections and, again, is an important part of the discussion of relation.

The audience's ability to look out past the dancer and through a picture window at the back of the gallery and onto the everyday movements of pedestrians and those on the outside of the gallery, looking in, was another form of relation. This other form of relation was made possible by the detached dance artist. The space where an eye-to-eye connection between dancer and audience might have occurred was left open by the void of the detached dance artist. As the dancer was not insisting on a connection with the viewer, the audiences were given room to look both at the dance artist and also beyond her towards the audience opposite the space. In this way the dancer allowed for a more porous space for seeing and being seen. Her presence performed a kind of interstitial relational space wherein other connections, between audiences, emerged and by the fact that her detached presence could make space for those relations. The dance artist's presence also reiterated the value of equality that the dance artist promotes by not privileging an attention towards the audience seated inside or outside of the gallery. Returning to Moran's comment about this performance being a 'game-changer' for dance in the museum due to its being recognised on an international scape is one way to consider the impact of the events of the show. Another way, as I am pointing out, is that it also was a game-changer in that it was accessible and fair. Not only because it was free to attend[54], which meant people could come as many times as they liked, but it was the chance to be with dance that, by its very nature, argues against any valuing of one movement over another and through its mode of performance and in configuration of the space, also does not value one set of audiences experience over another in how it presents itself. Therein, another reminder of how detachment is an important form of relation. It is important because it does not impose itself on its audience nor does it set apart differing experiences but, rather, it aims to unite us under one common experience whist allowing for a multiplicity of experiences that form sets of spatial and equally valued relations to emerge. Both detachment and the space, in this case, promoted these ways of

[54] In a city like London being able to see internationally touring dance for free and more than once is rare.

seeing and relation in dance and in the museum. It was the dancer's approach to performing and the specific cultural character and architectural design elements of the museum that collaborated to create these unique conditions. To recap, we have discussed those conditions as being smaller scale and, therefore, intimate through closely-spaced seating arrangements as well as a porousness of the inside space to the outside world in which people could see out. It was in these ways that gave Raven Row a position within the discussion of detachment as a form of relating and that supported other modes and more fair ways of seeing and being with dance and with each other enabled by the detached dance artist. My being that detached dance artist has been essential in understanding its importance and I will now bring in a discussion of my first-hand experiences of dancing *Trio A* at Raven Row.

## Experience: Dancing in the Museum

Lastly, and as an important component of this research, I will draw on my experiences as a dance artist performing *Trio A* in Raven Row as a way to articulate how relations with site and with each other emerge from inside of the dance as well as in the period of time both leading up to and in between the scheduled performances. Performing a five-week run of 2 shows daily (consisting of four dance works, *Trio A* being one of them) I was a part of one of two casts of six dancers performing Rainer's repertoire[55] at Raven Row, a museum privately owned and directed by Alex Sainsbury. The performances were accompanied by an exhibition, curated by Catherine Wood, Senior Curator, International Art (Performance) at Tate Modern, and organized by Martin Hargreaves. As one of the dance artists performing Rainer's dance works in the museum, I will be speaking about my experiences with *Trio A* (1966), a dance that is particularly resonant for considering how a detached attention of the dance artist to her audience works to open up other sets of relations. With the dancer detaching from her audience, it is somewhat surprising to consider *Trio A* as a 'dance of social interactions' (Wood, 2007). We know something about these relations through Wood's experience and through her writing. However, the claims that Wood makes are made from the perspective of the onlooker (although a specialist on performance) to the dance, whilst I am discussing

[55] Repertoire included four significant pieces from the 1960s. Those include two reconstructed works, *Diagonal* and *Talking Solo* from *Terrain* (1963), that have rarely been re-performed since their inception, alongside more well-known works, *Trio A* (1966) and *Chair Pillow* (1969).

sociality from the inside perspective, as the dance artist. This interior perspective of what grants me the insight into the relations that open up from *inside* the dance in terms of seeing the site, one's own body, and a way of relating to those who are also inside of the dance, the other dancers. I will argue that this approach, although unexplored thus far in the discourses on Rainer's work, contributes to a wider understanding of dance in the museum. This knowledge is gained through a discussion of ways of seeing in dance and how a detached mode of attention is an important element to dance as a relational practice in the museum. Below is an excerpt from my experiences as a dancer in the project. Although some of the information may be repetitive in its details I think it is important to re-articulate certain aspects of my experience and to capture the essence of that time.

> I am waiting in a small gallery space in Raven Row ready to go 'on stage'. I am among 5 other dance artists with whom I have been working with for the past several weeks. We enter the performance area to perform *Trio A.* The audience, about thirty to forty in number sit in two rows on wooden benches at one end of the room while some sit along the stairwell leading down into the gallery and others sit on the floor. There are other unintentional audiences or pedestrians who happen to walk by an open window to the gallery, some of them are starting to gather and to sit on the window's ledge, dangling their legs inside of the gallery space, others pausing only briefly, standing as a group behind those sitting. It is the middle of summer and we are in the centre of London, near Spitalfields market, a well-visited local tourist destination in the eastern part of the city. The atmosphere feels both culturally sophisticated and wonderfully informal. The performances are taking place at this unusual venue featuring both local and international dance artists. I have only recently moved to London, but I have been engaged in working with Rainer and with these dances for years[56]. I feel that I am a guest and, yet, very much at home.
>
> The first dance, *Diagonal (part of Terrain) (1963/2014)*, begins with all of us congregating in the corner farthest from the audience. We begin and, after fifteen minutes, the dance ends and we come within inches of the bodies of the audience and those in the window and sometimes, nearly, brush up against the legs of those sitting along the stairs and on the floors as we make our way out of the space and onto the next dance,

[56] I began working and spending time with Rainer in 2018 in Los Angeles. I am on of seven certified transmitters of her repertoire, including *Trio A*, *Chair Pillow*, *Diagonal* and *Talking Solo*.

*Trio A.* I start with my arms swinging one way and then, the other, around my torso. I count silently to myself and remember that the hands are to move easily and with no extra effort or effect, 'like rocks on the end of a string' according to Rainer[57]. I look at the blank white wall in front of me. Soon, I am shifting my weight, standing on one leg and doing deep bends towards the floor while also moving my arms in small circular gestures and shifting my gaze from the side of the wall, to the floor and then to my foot. I am dancing in this small gallery with an audience in front and behind me and two other dance artists dancing in the space but none of us look at each other. I can sense the location of the audience and the dancers throughout on the periphery of my gaze but I never look directly at them. This not-looking is from the instruction of Rainer.

I continue to move across and through the space, navigating my way within the choreographed movement sequences and I am hearing Rainer's vocal directions in my head, like a script playing itself out over and over. I move around and among the other two dance artists never really knowing exactly where, in the dance, they are at any given time and in relation to me. We are all three in our own pacing, our own dance timing and yet, somehow we are relating across this space and through time. I have a very heightened awareness of my periphery, just outside of the space in which the tips of my hands and feet can reach and where it is in relation to others. Out of my peripheral vision and my sensibility to the space around me, I do 'know' where the other dancers are in relation to me in the same way that Rethorst (from the opening text of my thesis) 'knew' the location, through a felt sense, of her friends across the city of New York and in relation to her own bodily position in her bed. At Raven Row, the dancers and I are points moving in space that keep changing trajectories, direction and physical actions. I also sense, through my dancing, the audience on both sides of the space as physically present and part of this landscape of bodies relating across space. I have a sense of a crossing of a leg in the front row, a shift from someone in the back. I do not make eye contact or even look their way, but I can sense their physical presence, both as individuals and as a collective people. I can imagine invisible lines across the space and based on the gaze of theirs, mine and the other dance artists overlapping and weaving a complex web or map across the space and reminding us of multiplicity of gazes in and affecting the space and each other[58]. Without

[57] A quote by Rainer used when teaching the dance to others as a way to bring about the minimal use of effort she was interested in. In this case she resorts to physics as a way to get her message across.

[58] My blog post from 3 April 2020 discusses similar ways of relating across space that engage the imagination and a mental mapping of space in connection with others. See http://sarawookey.com/uncategorized/felt-lines-of-connection-in-a-time-of-isolation-physical-distancing/

> looking directly at one another we are present alone yet together seeing
> and relating differently yet equally.

It is not easy to perform *Trio A*. The challenge for the dancers is to continuously monitor and be aware of themselves and of their not responding to others while also staying out of the way of others so as not to collide. At one point in the dance, the dance artists perform a U-shape curve in the space while running. As they are not dancing in unison their own timing determines how fast or slow they make their way, individually, through the dance. At this point they can re-position themselves spatially engaged while navigating the area around the other dance artists without looking at them directly. Their peripheral vision engages to navigate around one another. Rainer once referred to this moment like suburban neighbours in Los Angeles reversing their cars out of individual driveways on the same street in the morning, one holding back a few seconds, to allow for the other to pull out first so as not to collide. The dance artist performing *Trio A* may adjust her movements and, through a felt sense of timing that does not require eye contact to pass by each other in a shared space that is, in this case, limited in size. Their spatial trajectories need only slight nuanced timings, that emerge from their individual sensibilities of time and space, in order to 'communicate' where they are going in space as they navigate their way through the dance. In this way the dance artists performing together also take on a detachment through not looking directly at one other. Although, I would argue, they have a *felt* sense of timing and a peripheral view of where they and others are in space. This way of relating is important when considering the idea of detachment. Detachment suggests that the dance artist can be in relation without actually looking at or directly addressing another but, nevertheless, there is a connectivity that is made possible because of the space and the performance taking place there. This way of relating is similar to Fischer-Lichte's (2008) concept of sensory, perceptual experiences. Fischer-Lichte describes the sociality and corporeality of performers as a kind of 'materiality' (74). She claims that the physical space or the site of performance has an 'atmosphere' that cannot be diluted down to specific elements but, rather, the 'interplay' between them (75). This discussion of atmosphere and its contribution to spatiality and a physically sensed

experience. In this case, again, it was the physical conditions of Raven Row that allowed for particular sets of experiences, of sociality, to occur. I now return to my internal experiences of dancing in that space.

> The on-going thoughts in my mind, as mentioned, while dancing shift between what move comes next and how to avoid that nagging feeling of being watched. I have this verbal script in my head while dancing that helps me to continually bring myself back to my experience and away from outside distractions and, more importantly, the distractions of my own mind while dancing. The voice of Rainer's descriptions of the movements of her dance, one after another, is the script that I return to in my mind. This continuum of dance moves described in this the script, is a form of relation to self and, perhaps the hardest to write about. I am interested in the tension between this witnessing self that includes being in the presence of another(s) and the space as well as the uncanny nature of being with oneself or being present with oneself.

There is specific and cognitive study in dance science (Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, 1990) on the idea of 'flow' in dance performance (and other activities) where one is present and in the flow in a way as to let go of other thoughts and judgements. My thesis is concerned primarily – although does cross over into ideas of presence in other areas – with varying forms of attention that allow for relation. By doing so I will touch on the effects of such approaches to presence and what it offers up in the area of the social and spatial conditions of the museum. My attempt here is less about presence and more about attention and the tensions of relating to self. I look to capture ways in which I have an ongoing dialogue with myself while dancing that, on one hand, is my mind wandering about and, on the other hand, my mind wanting to bring me back to the dance, to a bodily self that is engaged in the movement.

> By hearing the words in my head describing the dance I more easily let go of the intrusive thoughts regarding the audience and my own act of performing in front of them. This somewhat impossible task is not so much about getting it right or being in the 'flow' but in the act of trying to be with self, while dancing.

How might we reconsider dance in the museum through the idea of relating to oneself, to opening up a discourse on the interior experience of dancing in the museum from the perspective of the dance artist. What might this perspective add to an understanding of the skill set of social-spatial understandings at a felt level? As was mentioned in the introductory chapter, a focus on the experience of the audience has taken centre stage in asking both why and how we do dance in the museum. We can also benefit from examining the experience of the dancer and what this case study has taught us. What we have learned so far is that detachment is not about producing relation in space in a conventional way, but rather in a non-spectacular manner. This way of detaching, therefore, also has to do with the way one engages the space of the kinsephere both of their own, and others. Detachment also might suggest ways of relating that support the individual qualities of dance artist and audience and open up more democratic ways of being together. However, there are also other ways of relating in the museum in which detachment encourages an inclusion of a relation to oneself and the other dance artists dancing with her. What is made clear now is that the detached dance artist in the museum is capable of relation through a quality of ease. This also suggests the potential of equality and a more democratic approach to dance in the museum through a re-consideration of how the dance artist performs there. It also is the case that a detached presence allows for relations, under-explored in the discourse of dance in the museum, between dance artists, site and self.

This chapter began with a discussion of my training in projecting and relating to the audience across space as a dance artist performing in a theatre context. Later, this information helped to make clear that the position of the dance artist within the museum is a different one and that a dance, such as *Trio A*, specifically sets up conditions for understanding other modes of attention and relation between dance artist and spectator in the museum. This detached attention allows space for relations to site, each other and self. In introducing *Trio A,* as a first case study, I explained why it was a useful example of the detached dance artist and how that detachment was a way of being at ease within one's own kinesphere. This study also included a discussion of the audience in order to invite other kinds of relations to emerge between the site, other dance artists and self. This chapter then has served to exemplify my argument for detachment as one way, of many, that dance is a form of relating in the museum. I do not claim to know *all* of the ways that dance is a relational

site-based practice in the museum but, this and the following case studies, suggest that there are at least three ways that dance is a form of relation in the museum. By claiming these three different ways, I point to dance as a particular kind of reality rather than as a facility for viewing reality. The reality of dance that interests me considers dance as a quality of attention that emerges from the particular position of the dance artist and how she performs in relation to the site, the audience, and herself.

What is made evident here is that the dance artist, in her disengagement with the audience, leads us to another kind of engagement – one that is quietly prodding along, movement by movement, fulfilling the task of dancing with little else to say or communicate. This freedom from a pressured connection, communication or willed relation in the space is what also frees up the possibility of another kind of relating alone together. I also suggested in this chapter that the dance artist's movements, along with the movements of other dance artists, can overlap, slide past, and create moments of unchoreographed togetherness based on an aloneness. To feel sets of relations *through* space and with a bodily presence that may, or may not, adhere to current and somewhat problematic notions of engagement in the museum. This detached attention and the relations produced also point to an interest in more just ways of being together in the museum. This first case study asked us to move away from an expectation of the dance artist as she projects meaning onto her audience as a form of engaging them and step towards another way of relating that allows for a more autonomous experience of being together in the public space of the museum to give attention to the audience as part of relational practice. As I will further discuss in the next two case studies leading up to my conclusion, it is becoming clear that dance has the potential to be relational in differing ways a dance can create social-spatial relations that suggest more equalising approaches. These approaches begin to dismantle the concept of dance as separate from site in its production of relations and of the dance artist as central to the experience of and as the main point of focus of dance and audience as agents in relational practice, site-based practice in the museum. Instead, the approaches I am proposing thus far point us to a levelling of hierarchical thinking of dance in the museum and lead us to other, more encompassing ways of being in relation. The next chapter will begin by asking what the physical absence of the dance artist in the museum might contribute to the exploration of such relations in the museum. The strategy of inclusion that was discussed in this chapter is where the dance artist

is not an 'outsider' but very much on the inside of the relational construction of a performance moment and, as my thesis will make clear, a social and spatial construction in the museum. It is in the exploring of how the relational is defined more broadly in my thesis that allows for varying degrees of insider/outsider beingness in the act of dancing and looking, both alone and together. This broader perspective invites a discussion of more equalising relations. What was learned in this chapter is that the detachment and the spatial conditions of the museum allowed for a different set of connections between dance artists and between audiences. The logical next step in the evolution of my research is to explore what happens to spatial relations in the museum when the dance artist steps aside and allows for an even wider arena of relationality to open up. We turn now to the absent dance artist in the museum.

# The Absent Dance Artist

This chapter continues to reinforce the claim that dance in the museum is a relational, site-based practice, and offers evidence supporting the importance of understanding *how* dance is in the museum over *why* dance is in the museum. This chapter is the logical next step in the progression of my thesis as it brings the discussion of seeing forward from the previous chapter to further explore spatial relations. What we learned from the previous case study is that the detached dance artist, in looking towards her own body and spatial-relational experience alongside other dancers, she makes space for the audience to look elsewhere. In collaboration with the architectural nature of the site as well as its intimate and hospitable conditions, the detached dance artist fostered spatial relationality between visitors both within and outside of the space of the gallery. In the previous chapter there was an examination of ways of seeing dance in the museum and this chapter shifts into a mode of doing – of physically moving – in the museum that also includes talking and writing as forms. Here I propose another important mode of connection that invites the museum visitor to move through the museum in a consideration of their bodily presence. The museum visitor in this chapter, and unlike in the previous chapter, is not seated in front of a performance of dance, they are moving in and through the museum as a performative gesture. Such differences are not to suggest that the audience seated is any less engaged, as was made clear in chapter one through a discussion of Bleeker (2009). The differences do, however, point to varying spatial and relational patterns that dance offers in the museum. This case study suggests an engaging of the sensibilities of the dance artist in museum settings and, the same time and because of her absence, a space opens up for seeing and relating differently.

In considering the results of the detached dance artist study the next logical step forward is to examine the dance artist, in this next case study, who has exited the museum in order to further the spatial relational potential between visitors. For it was in her detachment that those relations opened up and, here we explore how her absence might encourage even greater opportunities for connection within the museum. Following on from the learning from the detached dance artist, the absent dance artist opens up an even wider social space that includes a seeing, not only, between museum visitors but, also, to seeing and relating with

museum staff. By shifting the focus away from looking *at* a performing subject, the absent dance artist allows an expansion of spatial relations to encompass different forms of communication in the museum, with different people, and as another important form of relation. The skills of social and spatial approaches of the dance artist are further highlighted as necessary components to the kinds of relationality that come about in this chapter and that are essential to the evolution of my argument overall.

Absence is not the only way I will suggest that dance resides in the museum as this would create a kind of unnecessary erasure of the dance artist in such spaces. The way I am speaking about absence in this chapter is the physical absence of the dancer and, yet, I am emphasising ways that her embodied knowledge, approach to movement, and lived space can be brought into the museum and shared with others even in her absence. The already stated suggests that the dance artist's skills of bodily and spatial awareness and means of relating are transferable and can be engaged in the museum through the use, in this case, of a material object. It is this material that contains information coming from the dance artist whilst she is in residency in the museum and during its implementation as an artwork on offer. It is, though, during the project's dissemination phase that she steps away and out of the museum. The absence of the dance artist makes space, both physical and imaginary, for the visitor to step in and to practice the offer of exploring physical movements and spatial connections. Through the support of such an invitation, or pass, the museum visitor can take up the offer and to perform proposed re-positions in the museum.

The artist who is not present takes a back seat in the work and makes room for another to physically step into her space. The visitor does not step in *as* the artist in terms of identity of, but rather, as one who is offered opportunities afforded to the dance artist in terms of aspects of play, agency, and response in and with the museum space. As such qualities have often been discussed and, specifically, about the agency of the visitor, my thesis asks: How 'free' are visitors in stepping out of 'just' being a visitor? I will argue that there is freedom for the visitor through the participation of the project and in the absence of the dancer but that the social, political, and environmental context of the museum, in this case, the Van Abbemuseum (Van Abbe), a publicly funded cultural institution in Eindhoven, the Netherlands and the site for this case study, that helps make it so.

It is the space left behind by the absent dance artist that holds potential in the museum and will be the focus of this chapter. That space was discovered in previous chapter in the way the detached dancer and the architecture of Raven Row supported spatial relations between audiences. Now in the absence of the dance artist and because of the physical and cultural conditions of the Van Abbe certain spatial relational potential opens up. The potential here is for others to step into the space the dance artist would otherwise occupy and participate in that space allowing for relations to emerge other than the one, as we have seen in the previous chapter, of only dance artist to dance artist and audience to audience.

One might ask in what respect this absence of the dance artist is different to the absent visual artist in the museum. Given the scope of my thesis and my interest to make a case for dance as relation I will not linger on the differences between the dancer and the visual artist. However, I will comment here that the absent dance artist is, in some way, similar to but different than the absent visual artist. The absent visual artist is an expected condition in the museum as it is more common than not, that the visual artist is physically absent in the presentation of their work in the museum. The dance artist, on the other hand, is expected to physically be present given the nature of her profession is the physical body. Thus the absent dance artist poses a more complicated argument for the idea of relation in the museum in that it reflects back to us not only our expectations of her physical presence but makes a case for the knowledge in which she can still engage in the museum, even in her absence, and which will be explained in this chapter. In some way, then this is a case for the dance artist to have equal footing with the visual artist in her ability and skill to create an object, as introduced earlier, that expresses certain skills of the dance artist and can be shared, in her absence, with the museum public. Such sharing of skills and claiming equal value is worth investigating and, yet, is not within the specifics of this thesis but touches on more overriding suggestions of equality and value that will be addressed in my concluding arguments. I will, however, be engaging a discussion of other projects using materials and bodily movement – one by a visual artist – as a way to further makes sense of how the dance artist's approach to relationality and materiality are set apart from that of the visual artist.

Here absence as a form of relation produced by the dance artist is the second step in our understanding of how dance can be in the museum. In these ways this chapter evolves

the idea of dance as a relational element in the museum further by exploring what happens when the dance artist cannot be witnessed as a physical presence but, rather, as an affective absence. The project that will exemplify this thinking is *Punt.Point* that was commissioned by the Van Abbe[59] in 2014. The project is a wearable artwork and prop for performing movements that are informed by the practice of dance artist. The material wearable is meant to accompany the visitor on her routes, tempos, and pathways of moving through the museum. In that way, it allows behaviour not otherwise granted in the museum. The project remained in the museum for the three-year duration (2014-2017) and, later on, was purchased by the museum and become part of the collection of the Van Abbe[60].

*Punt.Point* aimed to uncover new potentialities of relating with, through, and across public space. It did this through a wearable object that contains instructions and guiding materials. The project's intent was to encourage an awareness of ones' body and its relationship to the built environment and to others within it. It was also a prompt for communicating through the body as well as talking, drawing, and writing as relational devices.

What my point is here is that the collaborative and discursive nature of the process of bringing the project forward was informative to my interest in furthering ways that conversing as a form of relation might be built into the work and on offer to staff and visitors of the museum. In this way conversing became a form of relating in the museum that dance, surprisingly – given it is often assumed body-based, non-textural and non-verbal artform – could bring about in the museum. The museum, a space that inspires quiet reflection was now a place for talking, writing, moving, laughing, and story-telling among and between people in the museum. *Punt.Point*, as part of the *Storylines* commission allowed for this new approach to emerge. The museum, then, becomes a space for relations to come about through conversation prompted by physical actions, and shared experience.

[59] This merging of two words is correct according to the preference of the museum itself. It is, however, more commonly referred to as 'Van Abbe'.
[60] *Punt.Point* was acquired by the museum in 2017. The pouches are in now part of the permanent collection of the museum and can be re-installment in the future. Documentation and archival material are publicly accessible in the museum's library for research purposes. I retain Artist's Rights to the work.

This chapter continues to make a case for the position of the dance artist and the context of the museum as collaborating and contributing factors in expanding the opportunity for relating and of evolving spatiality and relationality in the museum. As was made evident in the previous case study, there are certain qualities of a museum, such as scale of the site, interior designed spaces (including amount of transparency between inside and outside space), architectural history, and cultural context that play a role in the potential for relations. The museum then emerges as a subject of study, more and more, along the trajectory of my case studies and as a central piece of the discussion. I will begin with a description of the *Punt.Point*, followed by a discussion of how the Van Abbe, as a cultural context for dance in the museum supports certain value systems around the body and space, access and transparency, and of relations supporting my interests. Finally, I will offer more expanded thinking on how dance is different from visual arts in the museum.

## Making Space and Other Stories

The Curator and Head of Collections, Christiane Berndes at the Van Abbe, invited me to make a new work as part of the museum's series *Storylines*[61]. The commission was to bring 'stories or narratives' into the spaces of the museum and, as part of a three-year long display of their permanent fine art collection. The exhibition called *Collection Now* (2014-2017) was a chronological journey across the history of art and its relation to society in the Twentieth and twenty-first Century. Less interested in inserting 'my story' and more interested in the idea of multiple stories that might emerge from a prompting of spatial relations between people and the museum, I set out to create a collaborative and inter-disciplinary work that could exist without my physical presence but that would offer a way into the museum that through a relational experience. I was considering story-telling or talking with another a form of relating and built the project to inspire conversation about physical presence and movement with the site, with one another, and with oneself.

[61] The museum had a space called the 'toolshop' designated in the museum for a total of, initially, five commissions as part of the *Storylines* program (*Punt.Point* being one of them).

Unlike the silent, observant audience member to dance, as was the case in the previous chapter on *Trio A*, in this case study there is no audience to the dance but, rather, a participant in an experience put forward *by* the dancer to move through the museum in new ways and to engage one's voice, both through a written platform and a verbal one through spontaneous conversations brought about through a seeing of each other and, therefore, through a sense of commonality and collective experience. In order to prompt such activities I needed to engage materials that would guide the visitor through the project and make available its content. I invited my long-time collaborator Rennie Tang, a landscape architect and urban designer based in Los Angeles, to join me in creating this new work. Together we worked closely with Berndes and Loes Jansen of the Mediation Department (formerly known as Learning) at Van Abbe and their in-house designer Gabriela Baka to realise the commissioned work.

These cross-disciplinary, cross-speciality professional collaborations informed *Punt.Point* in the way it inspired other relations across un-related entities and across differing fields of interest. An example of those multiplicities is between the artist and museum staff (inter-relation) and between curation and learning departments in the museum (intra-relation). In this case, it was Tang's and my own interest in the human body, movement and space – with Berndes it was a set of values around invitation and the challenging of traditional thinking around the position of the body of the visitor in the museum. These cross-over interests that allowed me to connect with those outside of dance were also the catalyst for thinking about what common element might the users of *Punt.Point* have that would create such bridges across diverse sets of interests and perspectives. That commonality was the human body, time, and space, or elements of dance.

The opportunity to work with a collaborator and between curation, design, and learning departments of the museum provided, as part of the process, a deeply conversational cross-disciplinary space for creating the work. There were several in-depth conversations that took place between Tang, Berndes, Jansen, Baka and me and over a year-long creation period. As a highly collaborative worker I invited different voices into the process and integrated this thinking in making decisions about the work and how it would be implemented into the museum. For example, Berndes's view of the project as an artwork sat

interestingly next to my understanding of it as a performance prop to engage a moving and relational practice in the museum. On the other hand, for Jansen, her interest was in the project being utilised as an educational or mediation tool that could be integrated into learning and used by tour guides showing groups how to take up the project. For both Baka and Tang, the design element of the project and it aesthetics as a material object were important. These, and other, perspectives all contributed to the making of the work and, also, to its reception and future life in the museum for which I will discuss in this chapter. At the centre of the work, however, was the role of dance and dance-based practices and skills could be shared with others as a relational, site-based work in the museum.

Tang's perspectives on relationality to site influenced my considerations of dance as a relational, site-based practice. As a collaborative team, we share an overall interest in space, time, and movement as well as to ideas of sociality and publicness. We also, through creating collaborative projects that incite such interests, share a concern for how dance is being invited into the architectural space of the museum as an 'activator' and an interest in other roles dance can play. Tang explains,

> Just thinking about the relation of architecture and dance, I think there is the more conventional way of thinking. Dance needing to activate a space. As in, "We need some dancers to activate this space", which Sara and I both [would] question. It is not this decorative thing that is plopped into a museum for activation (Tang, 2019).

My interest in dance, as is true for Tang, as something other than 'activating' a space opens up the possibility of another kind of experience, one not dependent on the presence of the dance artist nor her collaborator. What Tang is suggesting is that the museum does not need activating because, by nature of people moving in its spaces, it is already activated. In the case of *Punt.Point*, we were interested to illuminate the already-activated museum and to illustrate that phenomenon further. We invited participation into walking through a museum space and offered up options of dance-like behaviour that might call attention to the ways people play a part in the making of the museum without needing to insert a dance artist *as* the example but, rather, to invite visitors as do-ers of the activity to play that idea out even further. We offered suggestions of a re-positioning of the body including positions

that dance artists often take as part of caring for their body (such as laying down with legs up the wall) or being playful (as in doing a headstand). 'Re-position' is a term developed by Tang and I which plays on the idea of positions of the body that are somehow new and/or ones we would not normally take in the space of the museum, but that suggest alternative ways of being in public spaces, such as the Van Abbe.

Tang and I approached the museum as an innately performed site. We encouraged the unexpected potential of relation through, across, and with space by suggesting that one is already, by nature, relating to the site, and to each other through their movements. It was our aim that a creative project might make more visible this idea and to activate opportunities for spatial relating. Lastly, the project supported the notion of absence as a form of relation by suggesting that the dancer, who is not present and is not needed to 'activate' the museum (as it is already being activated by others). Yet, on the other hand, the dance artist can be the prompter for museum visitors to become aware of and to further play out their role as co-performing the site and in the emergence of spatial relations.

The project suggests trying out ways of being in the museum through a set of actions of the body culled from everyday postures, such as standing and sitting, and stretches those actions towards performance-like activities thus drawing people to look at each other in the way people look at a dance artist in the museum. They notice activity that is unexpected in the space of the museum and this provokes curiosity. This way of thinking stems from my training as a dance artist whose material is body, space, and time. It is also influenced by the work I did as a spatial-social practitioner working in Los Angeles on walking as a performance practice. Both my training as a dance artist and my experiences as a site-based, social practitioner support a sensibility towards the ways that physical movements, from dancing to walking, can give insight into a relation between body and site. This concern has translated into extending or stretching actions of movement from standing to leaning, laying down, lounging, and doing headstands in the space of the museum. In these ways, what I aim to make clear in this chapter is that the museum visitor and staff are part of the social fabric of the museum, as is the dance artist. Together they contribute to what the museum is and how it will continue to evolve over time.

The word ‘point’ or ‘punt’ (in Dutch) existed in a set of initial questions that Tang and I asked ourselves, such as: How can points in the space of the museum and points on the body, such as an elbow or head, be meeting points between the architecture and physical body? Quite literally, asking what physical ways might an elbow, back, or head make physical contact, a tactile meeting with the physical space of the museum? The interest in a tactile connection between the body and site further expands on the thinking about relation between the space of the museum and its visitor. Tang and I also asked, how might a relation between museum visitor, staff, and the architectural space of the museum inspire unexpected meeting points or points of connection? In these ways the project aimed to engage socially in and with the museum space and also with and between the visitors and amongst staff. What became clear through my research and data collection was that the connections or relational aspects of the project were made possible both by the physical movements performed in the museum and, also, through writing and speaking. Visitors writing in notebooks and talking with staff, asking if they are permitted to engage with the work occurred as will be made evident later on in this chapter.

The notebook for writing in that contained maps to draw on were spaces for relation between people to take place. The notebook served as a dialogical piece and a conduit of communication, exchange and relations between visitors. Over time the museum staff would gather any notebooks that had been fully filled-in, store the pages in the Mediation office and then replaced the notebook with fresh maps and blank pages with the questions. Not unlike guest books at bed and breakfasts or at gallery openings meant to be written in and as part of a thread of contributions from visitors, the *Punt.Point* notebook was an opportunity for museum visitors to share their experience with and suggestions for future visitors to the museum who took up the project offer. These notebooks were the means in which the museum visitor communicated, as a form of relation, with other museum visitors, their experiences in the museum and with the project. This relation on the page also provided information, analysis and data for me that I would later review, as feedback on the project and also use as the basis for this case study. This feeding back of information on how the forms of relation emerged through the absent dance artist model has been very useful to this study and has shed light on other ways that dance as a relational practice in the museum happens, which were more obvious, and also, less assumed. In these ways the project

produced a written dialogue not only between visitors but, also, with museum staff and the absent dance artist. Relation was not something led directly by the dance artist in which she instructed actions in the live sense. Rather the relational element was a prompt that came through the material object infused by the experience of the dance artist and put on offer to the museum visitor. The suggestion then emerged forms of communication as relation in a museum. In these ways, communication through the material object has come about because of the absence of the dance artist in the museum. The prompting of questions and invitation to engage with the object by leaving a note or a mark about one's experience could very easily have been the dance artist, if present, talking about the ways in which we move through museums and the relations between body, site and object. However, given the dance artists' absence, the authority or voice of opinion is handed over, literally, to the visitor. It suggests that the experience of the visitor, like that of the dance artist, is one to be written down, shared, and archived as part of the commissioned work.

Spontaneous conversations and exchanges between visitors and with staff are also part of the relational theme examined in this example. What *Punt.Point* contributes to my overall thinking and what it, specifically, opened up through my research is that museum staff, although not necessarily the initial focus for who the project's participants would be, became an important element to the experience of the project of participation and relation. It suggested that there are far more possibilities to extend the idea of relational practice of dance in the museum. It called into question the very impact of the research and development phase of a project as a space of contact with museum staff. Often expected to go unseen by the museum visitors, museum staff (especially guards) are ever physically present in museums and there is further potentiality within relational practices in the museum to enquire and understand what role the staff of museums play in bringing about creative contributions of relation in an already lively and engaged museum space such as Van Abbe. As one of the key figures in the operation of and care of the museum (including artworks, site and people) the guards of the museum often times have a relationship to the site they are protecting that is different from that of a curator or learning expert. How might museum staff, in particular guards, be considered as part of dance in the museum and seen through the lens of spatial relations and site-based practices? In trying to answer such questions Tang and I played along the borders of socio-spatial codes in *Punt.Point*. We incorporated Tang's expertise and

sensitivities to materials as a mediation between the body and the space as well as visually mapping spaces. In order to do that it was important to offer up what I refer to as a 'passport' for entry into another kind of social space, one often only reserved for the dance artist at work in the museum. The creation of the material object or 'passport' as the common item between museum visitors was also needed to challenge the social spatial-coding of the museum in order to develop a different kind of invitation for the visitor – and also to staff – to come in and take the place of the dance artist in the museum. The staff also engaged with acts of laying down, sitting, leaning, and other gestures during their lunch breaks and shared with me on my visits to the museum to collect data for my research. This 'passport' offers access to a social space that is typically only reserved for the artist, be it dancers or visual artists, who – as a designated visiting guest in the space called on to perform there – are granted privileges not usually extended to the visitor nor to the museum staff and, in the dance artist's absence, is on offer to pick up and to use as a passport to another kind of social-spatial place and open to everybody.

This material component, or wearable artwork, consisted of a felt bag, or what we referred to as a 'pouch', worn over the shoulder. There is a series of twelve designed bright yellow circular felt pouches each ten inches in diameter that are attached to a shoulder strap. These hang in a room just outside the entrance to the museum and before entering the galleries. Each pouch contains a guidebook, map, notebook, pencil and a cushion. These items, are all cut as circles to fit into the pouch designed to assist the visitor in performing a variety of 're-positions' that start with standing and end with a headstand[62]. The map identifies locations throughout the museum, including galleries, hallways, and corners where they will find small numbered yellow vinyl points attached to the floor. Each of these vinyl stickers has a number printed on it in grey that corresponds with the numbered 're-positions' illustrated through photographs in the guidebook. This map or connecting the dots references the way dancers create imaginary maps of connection and as exemplified in Rethorst's and my descriptive at the start of my thesis.

[62] These everyday actions are informed by my work with Yvonne Rainer, discussed in the last chapter, whose dances were often made up of walking, running and movements that are recognisable to the general public. However, the way Rainer organised such movements in her choreographies alongside more dance-like movements was what made her work both approachable and a challenge to do and to see.

The pouches, inspired by our residency experience, are what served as the 'badge' to another way of participating in the museum for the visitor in *Punt.Point*. In some way it was that very badge I was given in residency in the Van Abbe when creating the work that became a symbol of permission, of access, and of entry into another kind of museum. It was that very experience that I was compelled to pass on to the visitor and museum staff and, by doing so, new and different relations emerged within the museum and because of my absence. This shifting of experience from the visiting, commissioned artist to not only the museum visitor but, also, to the museum staff was where new thinking emerged regarding the ways that the absent dance artist might contribute new ways of implementing dance in the museum and suggest new modes of relation and, in this case, access and allowance (to be another kind of body in the museum). The pouch can also be thought of as a 'passport'. The passport grants access to another kind of museum space, to a journey through it and to be another kind of visitor, another kind of staff member in the physical space and, even if only imagined, in another kind of place[63]. This 'passport' is on offer as a way for people to participate in the museum in dance artist-like way and, by doing so produce meaning within the museum's social systems (von Hantelmann 2010: 9). I want to be clear, though, that by suggesting an absent dance artist who offers up her space for another kind of role in the museum is not doing so in order to negate or de-value the interest in a physical presence of the dance artist but, rather (and through the use of materials) to create a situation in which her artistic experiment, expertise and research speaks *through* the object that then becomes something more than an object, and towards a permission, a way in and through the museum as an offer, as a passport to experiences different qualities of (actually) presence in the site. In these ways, the dance artist, staff, and the visitor are not only passive bystanders or one-off entertainers, they are both part of the museum as a place and contribute to changing what it can and will become. In the next chapter I will further discuss the social impact dance can have to the overall make-up of the museum and to society at large.

[63] This statement moves into the realm of *place making*. Most helpful is the thinking of Henri Lefebvre (1991, 2013), David Harvey (2002), and Doreen Massey (1984) that call attention to the importance of making place. These texts suggest that space is a set of complex mobilities. It is a moving of energy in and out of a space, according to Lefebvre is what makes it a place. Harvey focuses on place as the site of relations (in Foster 2019: 29) and relationships among various attributes of the social that are always in motion. Body and place, each a set of relations, by coming into contact they mutually constitute each other.

I return to von Hantelmann's interest to investigate arts' relevance to society she discusses art's 'societal efficacy' (9) by asking what situation art produces and how is the audience situated? (18). In *Punt.Point* the audience is situated as a participant inside of the work and, as importantly, the participant is situating herself in the museum differently. The question of subject to object in von Hantelmann's argument of how art has social implications and relevance in the museum is one of interest to my case study. The object, or pouch, worn as part of *Punt.Point*, is not to be looked at or even handled with care as is the conventional relation between a person and an art object in the museum. In this case, the object is to be worn and used as a prop to aid a re-positioning by the spectator in the museum. However, the pouch was also considered an artwork to be collected by Berndes, the curator at Van Abbe. Therefore there was a productive tension between the performing of the positions, using the prop, and the prop as a valuable designed and unique art object. I turn, again, to my reading of von Hantelmann, who claims that the exhibition set up of museums – and in the case of *Punt.Point* as described above, the way the pouches were displayed in a gallery space, on a wall, with signage, and available to be picked up and used throughout the museum – was, to some extent a conventional display of the object prior to its use by the visitor. However, it is precisely this 'dependency on convention' that von Hantelmann claims is what, 'opens up the possibility of changing them' (20). My work in the museum both depends upon a display of the work and within recognisable constructs of presentation and installation but also aims to critically engage with and complicate them.

However, as this case study proves, it is the use of the displayed object, the tactile engagement with it and, specifically, the way the object serves the purpose of calling attention to ones' relationship with the museum, its architecture, its qualities of light and space that suggests another approach to the museum experience. The project is also about ones relationship with others in the space and how individual gestures of positioning affects the way the space is read as a whole, is felt. Lastly, the work of *Punt.Point* is also to call upon the visitor to sense their own relationship to the work and to the constraints of the museum in terms of physical behaviour and connection and, ultimately, to their own experience as a relational element in the space of the museum in the twenty-first Century. In this way, the body, movement and, ultimately, dance gains a place in the museum both as a thing to look

at and, also, towards a thing on par with the visual arts in its presence as art, as experience, and – unique to dance – as relation in the museum. As I will argue towards in my thesis, dance, then, begins to play a more significant role in the making of the museum of the future. Perhaps von Hantelmann is right in saying, 'In the canon of the twenty-first century, Balanchine would be as important as Malevich. This canon would also comprise a history of bodily postures and forms of embodiment. (*Five responses to the question: If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?: Dorothea von Hantelmann,* 2015). A project such as *Punt.Point* becomes all the more essential in learning about the ways in which bodily movements and positioning of, not only dancers but, also of visitors, and staff of the museum affirm that statement.

My interest in the object to open up relational potentialities emerged during an artist residency that Tang and I took part in during August 2013 at the Van Abbe. For one week, we had permission, by wearing individual, clip-on square laminated white badges that read 'Artist'. We were permitted to work in the museum, with our badges on, during the open hours of the museum. In that space we were visibly 'different' from others in that no one else had these badges. We were invited to be in the museum and there we began to try out different physical postures, positions and actions. We were given a 'go ahead' to be another kind of visitor. We participated in the museum in ways not granted to the visitors or staff. These badges with a capitol 'A' gave us permission to do these alternative acts, such as lounging in the museum, and nobody questioned us. We stood out from the rest in that, not only were we wearing these badges, but we were also trying out what we could do physically in the museum. We moved through the museum space displaying dance-like behaviour such as sitting and lying on the ground, interacting with a wall and, in a sense, caring for the body and being playful through movement in a public space. In some way, we took on the attitude of the dance artist in the dance studio in the way she might lay down on the floor before starting to warm up, or use the wall as a surface to lean against, place her back on or even roll along the floor as a way to 'wake up' the body or prepare for moving or as an act of dancing itself. We considered the museum as a site for exploration and for journeying through and became fascinated by the idea of a pass or permission. The ways that our actions and positions had an effect on others were also informative towards the idea of traveling through a site, discovering, being curious and, inevitably, engaging with others. As an example, people

we did not know, both staff and visitors, began talking with us, asking us question, being curious. They also shared their experiences around the topic of a headstand which often reminded people of childhood, of not being able to do it, and of wanting to try it out. The conversations were often with guards and museum staff who shared personal stories of never being able to manage to do a headstand to fear of balancing on ones' head to childhood memories of such playful, defiant behaviour. I would often share mine of being in school and being the one in gym class to stand on my head the longest. There were encounters with guards about walking on one's hands, and suggestions of spaces in the museum that would be good places to perform a headstand. There were smiles and laughter and people interested in playing with the idea of behaving differently in the otherwise restricted space. The badges along with our physical actions also had another affect: they invited varying forms of sociality. From quiet smiles, to confused looks, comments and conversations. Our presence as 'Artist(s)' in the museum opened up another kind of space in the museum: one of social exchange. Most memorable were the impromptu stories related to the act of doing a headstand. This full-body position that so defies recognisable, everyday behaviour (literally the inverse of standing on two feet) was a conversation starter almost every time it was performed. Access was also key in that we wanted anyone and at any time to be able to explore the project.

*Punt.Point* was free for the public to borrow whilst in the museum. They could wear the object diagonally across the chest or carrr like a bag over one shoulder or in one hand as they moved through the museum for as long as they wanted during their visit. It is important to mention that the entry to the museum is charged, although the *Storylines* projects, including *Punt.Point,* were available to access for free. By making the project free it encouraged visitors to take part and to be accessible to all. Above the hanging pouches was an image of two people, one sitting, and the other standing in the gallery wearing the pouches. Next to the image was the following display text, written by Tang and me,

> Standing is the most common way to experience a museum. In this position, your feet are the two points of your body that are in contact with the museum's architecture and give certain viewpoints of the artworks. There are, of course, many other points on your body. For

> example, elbows, hips, chin, head, etcetera. What if you were to move through the museum with this in mind? How might you try out different experiences of being a body in the museum? Imagine other ways to engage with the museum spaces that may offer other points of contact, comfort, interest and encounters. Imagine sitting, leaning, crouching, laying down and lounging. Or, perhaps, doing the ultimate flip of the everyday: a headstand in the museum (Display Text Van Abbe Museum 2014).

To begin, the museum visitor simply removes the adjustable strap of the pouch from one of the hooks on the wall in the toolshop and sets off to find the points located in the museum. The notebook in the pouch that they will carry with them consists of repeating sets of a map for drawing points and suggests of other points in the museum where performed positions might be done and a primarily blank page for writing notes and with two questions in Dutch and English, typed along the top inner edge of the circular page. Those questions were: 'What other types of positions would you like to see added to the collection?' and, 'Do you have suggestions for the next user?'[64]. We borrowed the term 'collection' from the museum and incorporated that word into the questions posed in order to open up thinking around the position, not only physically, but as having agency in the creation of a project and of the museum[65]. Tang and I were prompting reflections about the museum visitor as contributor to the evolution of the project and as a platform for conversing as a way of relating with other visitors who would use the pouch after them.

What Tang and I hoped for was that by taking on such re-positions the visitor would begin to relate with others around the way it happened during our residency. We also designed the project from our interest in visitors to the museum might take notice and interact with other visitors, who also might have a bright yellow bag, as well as with staff present in the galleries. Our hope was that these re-positions would have the potential to create a shift in the social space of the museum. In other words, we wanted to encourage strangers in a shared space to engage based on a common, similar experience of wearing a

[64] In retrospect, I would question the word 'user' as it a word often used when talking about the consumer or technologies. I prefer the term *participant*.

[65] This approach was welcome by Van Abbe, a museum known for its innovative, risky, and forward-thinking transparency of the museum's workings. Their approach is also something that will feed into the third case study and conclusion of this thesis.

light, soft, and very bright yellow bag. For example, how might someone who is wearing a bright yellow bag in the museum and then leaning or lounging in unexpected places in the museum suggest a discursive space? Might this action invite a new perspective of the site as well as a conversation, an exchange, a smile? How about gazing up at the ceiling? Might it also spontaneously invite conversation with other visitors or staff who have also tried out or are yet to tried out the project and have questions or insight into the way it operates in the museum? Can the project create an allowance of relation through rest, play, and a way of knowing through doing? The above curiosities were part of our criteria for selecting spaces in the museum to lay points and suggest re-positions as well as informed the 'manual' that Tang and I wrote as part of the acquisition hand over to the museum.

The manual consists of a set of instructions for future interests of the museum to re-install the work. As part of that manual it is required that the museum bring together one of the museum curators, one of the guards, and a paid[66] dance student from the local dance academy (Dance Academy Tilburg, Fontys) who will, as a collective, work for a half a day in the museum to decide, together, where the points should be laid. This was in keeping with the spirit of relation, (cross-disciplinary and cross-expert) collaboration and communication that the work upholds as a value. It was, also, essential to include the input of a trained dance artist and to highlight her contribution as part of its workings, decision making on such things as installing performance-like works as this one. This interest will be re-visited in the conclusion of this thesis as I argue for the dance artist as more embedded component of the museum, employed as part of the human infrastructure rather than only as hired temporarily on a project-to-project basis. It also spoke to giving the guard a voice, as a museum staff member, and to bring their voice in dialogue with the curator. This project, as a collaborative venture, considers ways that expert knowledge, epistemologies, and ways of knowing within curating and care taking, guarding and observing, and dance-based bodily and spatial expressions can work together. I will now move on to discuss what was learned through data collection that speaks back to the concerns and interests mentioned.

[66] The agreement in the manual is that the dance student will be paid 75 Euros for three hours of time in the museum, plus any travel expenses. The fee is also agreed to rise with inflation over the years and to match current wages at the time it is to be re-installed in the museum in the future.

Some of the data collected suggests that there was, indeed, an increased awareness of the spatial relations with site and each other as well as an agency that the visitor made known through their written texts and drawn images left behind in the notebooks. As part of my research for this thesis, I returned to the Van Abbe in late 2015, about half-way through its three-year instalment and, again, in 2017[67] after its closure. On both visits I had access to the archived notebooks and read through every individual page, documenting and archiving for my purposes. I also conducted interviews with Berndes, all of the hosts (gallery volunteers) who were in the museum during that period and two guards to ask them about their experiences of and thoughts about the *Punt.Point* from their perspective of museum staff. In reading the notes, upon my return to the museum to engage in data collection at the end of the project run (in 2017) I found the data to be pointing to a relation between visitors or what I call an intra-communication rather than what the project had, perhaps, intended to provoke which was a feeding back of information to those of us (dance artist, architect and museum staff) or an inter-communication. Looking back to the questions posed in the notebook which, to reiterate were: 'What other types of positions would you like to see added to the collection'?; And, 'Do you have suggestions for the next user'?. The latter question seemed to be taken up much more by the visitor than the former. Again, this observation was done as part of the data collecting that included my going through the archived notebooks in the museum library. What the intra-communication suggests is that there was an interest in visitors connecting with other visitors and less about supplying information back to the museum and the artists behind the project. What we thought would be a focus on suggestions back to the museum became an almost private thread of communication between visitors. This result points to the importance of the absent dancer as a means to relations in that the space left open for other voices that might normally be taken up by the commissioned dance artist is now taken up by the visitor. Despite the request for the user of the project to feedback information to the museum the offer to develop a dialogue between users was what emerged as another form of communication as relation.

[67] During that time, I also negotiated the selling of *Punt.Point* to the Van Abbe.

There were also several comments that suggested the museum visitor had an exchange with and a growing relationship to the site of the museum, its spaces and architecture. This pointed to the interest in relations to site that my thesis highlights. Some examples of the data that I witnessed included: A drawing of a man kneeling, knees on the cushion, leaning in towards the wall with his ear against the wall (as if eavesdropping in on another room) and smiling, with the text, 'listening'. And, a written text that says, 'It is a more through active discovery you learn the structure of the museum. I make contact with people quickly and they speak to me' (anonymous visitor). These above quotes suggest that some visitors and those engaging with *Punt.Point* felt, in one case, a connection with the space through listening and, for the other, that a space opened up for social contact with other people more easily, and that it took less time to make that contact. I will also speak later in this chapter of my own unexpected encounter with the visitor whose prompts to each other inspired me, in reading them as part of my data collection, to take them up and to insert myself back into my practice leading to the following case study on presence.

The 'hosts', as the gallery invigilators and volunteers are called at the museum, whom I interviewed, had slightly differing ideas and opinions about the project. Their more durational experience of being in the museum during the three-year run of *Punt.Point* gave them further insight into what the project afforded and, as well, what it may have missed.
I begin with Adde, a host in his mid-60s who says,

> And who is the artist, who are you? There was more to it. So, I think that could be interesting to the public, not just a yellow bag, but an artist with a certain idea. And you don't get it from the bag. Because I thought it had a lot of potential' (interview March 2017).

He suggests that there was a missing link, for him, back to the artist. The absent dance artist, as has been made clear in this chapter, leaves behind the material object but, for some, it also creates a desire for an understanding of who the artist is and a connection to what she stands for in the work, to her 'ideas' behind it. This need for a knowing, as Adde suggests, who the artist is and what her ideas are is left unmet by the material object that, again according to Adde, is not capable of fully capturing the potential for representing her or her ideas is worth

looking at more closely. In some way, Adde is refuting the very point of the project, that the absent dance artist is a means of relating in the museum. That absence is an important form of relation. If I extend my thinking further out and in consideration of what Adde has expressed, I can then elaborate more fully on what I mean by the term 'absent' which may or may not be how others experience it but that helps to define further potentialities of absence and continues to claim against the notion of the artist and her ideas as central or the romantic notion of the 'artist as genius' (Krause 2011: 51). I mean that the dance artist is not physically present during the public presentation or sharing of her work in the museum with and for the general public. However, this physical absence does not suggest a total absence. It only suggests a physical one. What I mean by this and to reiterate, within the physical absence of the dance artist there is also a presence. That presence is multiple. It is one, a presence of the dance artist's experience and suggestions as a prompt or offer embedded into the material object made available to the museum visitor; And, two, it is a presence of the museum visitor as an agent in the museum who becomes more visible through enacting physical re-positionings outside of the expected and imposed modes of behaviour in the museum.

For other hosts, the concern was less about the lack of physical presence of the dance artist and more about the quality of the visitor's experience. For some, the potential for spatial relations between visitors and for imagination were a highlight. For example, Marieke, a host in her late twenties and occasional tour guide in the museum asks,

> I was wondering, is it [Punt.Point] about how the visitor is feeling and experiencing the art or is it also about what it looks like to other visitors because it can become quite an interesting space when you see a gigantic painting over there and someone leaning, like totally bored, at the wall over there. Is that also a thing?.

One of three guards at the Van Abbe, Shafiq, shared a similar experience in what he described as watching visitors watching other visitors as part of *Punt.Point* and the kinds of conversations that emerged from it. He shares, 'They [museum visitors] look around, as if to ask, "Is it a kind of joke, or something?" And sometimes they ask us [guards] if it is possible and we say, "Yes, of course, you can do this" (interview March 2017)'. This latter example is how the project opened up a space of interaction between visitors and guards. By asking if

the permission to re-position one's body in the space was, indeed, allowed in the project the visitor and guard had an exchange that might not have otherwise happened. By removing the physical presence of the dance artist other kinds of social interactions emerge. Where her voice might be directing or instructing, the visitor is without a creative figure to guide them and, therefore, they work to make sense of the project through an interaction with the space of the museum and those they encounter there, including museum staff.

In addition to an awareness of and questions about the ways the project operated as a form of relation in the museum, the changing museum was felt by the museum staff I interviewed. Shafiq's concluding thought about having *Punt.Point* in the museum and in our time together was that, 'It [*Punt.Point*] is great! It is not the time, anymore, to watch a painting. More artists are talking to people, art is far more than a painting hanging on the wall. So, this is actually very, very good to have this in the museum'(interview March 2017). His comment on it not being the time to 'watch a painting' and that 'artists are talking to people' supports certain threads running through this thesis. Chapter one spoke to the opportunity of seeing dance differently in the museum, in particular at the dance artist, and this chapter addresses the idea of artists talking to people. I felt that my discussions and conversations with museum staff from curators and learning experts to hosts and guards was both informative and a form of relation itself. It also shed light on the contributions made by those working in the museum to an understanding of it as an institution and to how are operates within it.

Carrying over from the last chapter in which more inclusive ways of engaging with dance in the museum were explored, this chapter adopts the approach that the knowledge, insights, and understandings of guards in the museum is equally valid and contributing to the future of the museum as is that of the curator, for example. Included in this extended, relational practice of communication is the collaboration with Tang and how that relation contributed to the evolution of *Punt.Point.* It accomplished this by suggesting or prompting spatial relation through a bodily and spatial awareness and through movement in the museum. The approach to being in the museum through relaxing, being comfortable, taking it easy or being quite playful even, with the headstand, were ways to relate in and to the museum. Those re-positions *might* include looking at art, although not the intention, or it

might include as one visitor wrote in response to her experience, looking at the ceiling of the museum or nothing, as another wrote, 'I am going to close my eyes and not look at anything'. Therefore, the prompt to re-position was trying for many possibilities of participating in the museum to simply standing to performing a headstand to closing the eyes and sensing the body without the intention of seeing anything. In these ways the project suggested an awareness of ones' bodily position in the museum and of agency as a way to relate.

*Punt.Point* suggested how one might participate in the space of the museum first through the whole body, that includes the eyes looking, and reflecting on oneself as a bodily subject in the museum. On the invitation to create a project for this series at the museum, I considered ways that my experiences in and with the world are body-based, observed (both of myself and others) and in response to my surroundings. I began by considering the everyday bodily positions of museum visitors, through observation and site analysis. I then proposed the potential for those bodily positions to be more visible by metaphorically 'stretching' the everyday bodily position of the museum visitor so that they *performed* in the museum. For example, instead of simply standing with two feet on the ground, looking at a painting, I suggest a slight lean to the side, maybe an elbow on the wall to lean against. This was accomplished via inviting the visitor in a self-led movement through the museum proposing that the visitor re-position their body within the public spaces of Van Abbe. There is a double re-positioning (of dance artist and museum visitor) in this case study. The dance artist, who is absent, and the museum visitor who, in a sense, takes her place. What I mean by this is the dance artist, who is not physically present in the museum during the implementation of the work, leaves behind an offer in the form of a material object for the museum visitor to pick up and use as a means of accessing or stepping into the experience of being a performer[68] in the museum. This project allows for another kind of journey through the museum. It opens up the opportunity to call attention to the potential spatial relations of museum visitor to site, museum visitor to museum visitor as well as to museum staff, and museum visitor to oneself. These sets of relations are similar to the ones that the dance artist in case study one engaged with only, now, the its the museum visitor and staff who become

[68] As I touched on earlier, the concept of the 'pedestrian' in public spaces, such as museum, and in this case the Van Abbe, is already performing. What *Punt.Point* does is 'stretch' the everyday movements of the visitor towards movements that a dance artist might make, if given the opportunity, in the museum.

the focal point of the work, of the experience, and of shifting the feel and look of what a museum can be in terms spatial relations.

## Museum Values

Whilst creating this work at the Van Abbe I felt very welcomed. Both the curatorial and learning departments of the museum were interested in and held high value to the idea of inviting a physical, embodied practice into the museum. Berndes suggests that,

> [T]here is not only a creating of knowledge from the looking at artwork or listening to the guides that tell you about the artwork but there is also the experience of it. The bodily experience of being in the museum and the whole code system. How can we cross this code system that we created around the visitor to the museum since the nineteenth century when museums became very open to the public? How can we think of different ways of inhabiting the museum? (Interview with Berndes March 27, 2018).

I agree with Berndes in considering how the museum is a space for practicing ways of relating through the body and asking what else is possible there? What Berndes and I were connecting around was our common interest in creating a space wherein, through a bodily experience, other ways of being might emerge and challenge traditional models of behaviour. What I was exploring was how the absent dance artist who leaves behind a prompt for embodied, relational practices that collaborate with the site of the museum might encourage and open up ways that the visitors could further become aware of and practice an agency of physical movement in the museum. Berndes goes further to explain her own curiosity, as a curator, in how to invite the visitor into the museum. She asks,

> How can we engage our visitors in a different way? How can we move from a white cube space where people are, in a way, only allowed to enter with their eyes and not with their body? Because the body is the enemy of the artwork. Because the body can touch the artwork. It can destroy the artwork. So, how can we allow the visitor to come in with their whole body? (Interview with Berndes March 27, 2018).

*Punt.Point* aligns with the Van Abbe's interest in the visitors entering with their whole body, not just their eyes and, yet, there are differences between the museum's interests in the body and that of the dance artist. Where Berndes's interest is in drawing people to the museum and finding ways to continue to do that differently and to align with the needs of her visitors, I am focused, as a dance artist, to how I can suggest an attendance to the body as an instrument of moving in the museum. I am concerned with developing forms and methods for sharing that attention of attending to self and, also, to site and others, in the public spaces of the museum. In this case it was a material object that allowed for such offering without the need for looking at a dance artist performing in the museum. Numbers of people are not of interest to me as they might be with museums looking to, not only enhance experience, but to increase the number of people coming into the museum. What matters to me is quality of experience over quantity in numbers who experience the museum. Within these somewhat differing interests on the body that museums, such as Van Abbe have, there is also the ongoing concern for dance being instrumentalized by the agendas of the museum's continued interest of audience numbers. How might the re-positioning of the visitor that *Punt.Point* suggests and puts on offer be brought back to the dance artist to use to re-negotiate her role in the museum? These are questions to be further explored in chapter three and informed by this case study.

Similar to Raven Row, some of the architectural features, such as large windows to the outside environs led to my interest in prompting visitors to look out the window and onto the green spaces surrounding the site[69]. Wherein Raven Row's intimate spaces and hospitality was key to helping bring about relations, it is the cultural and institutional valuing of play and experimentation of Van Abbe that played a role in the project in this case study. Different from the more conceptual and, possibly, academic spirit of Raven Row, Van Abbe and, possibly the greater spirit of the Netherlands[70] , provided for experimentation with new ways

[69] My interest in the lived reality in the museum also had to do with renegotiating the spaces of the museum through an awareness of how it felt to be in it; stand in the light coming through the windows; catch a glimpse of a particular cut in the architecture; and engage in a relationship with space that was particular to Van Abbe and could not be replicated elsewhere.

[70]Having lived in the Netherlands for ten years (1996-2006) as a dance artist and choreographer, I became increasingly sensitive to the cultural appreciation of liberalism in terms of child-like play and open experimentation. Therefore, I was returning to a familiar place in 2014 to begin work on *Punt.Point* and the playful nature of the work found a home there.

to be in the museum that are open to childlike play, rule bending, and radical sociality as seen in the project *Play Van Abbe*[71]. The museum staff was open to the idea of trying on a new approach to the museum and played a part in the development of *Punt.Point*. This willingness to institutionally question modes of operating in the museum and the museum itself offered up potential for new and different ways of being that made working in the Van Abbe, with its staff and for visitors a key element of my research enquiries. For example, the directorial, curatorial and learning departments[72] of Van Abbe all invite artists to re-think, with them, ways to engage other narratives of experience with the collection. In my case, *Punt.Point* opened up a discourse on modes of relating in the museum from the perspective of the body and movement. That kind of bodily narrative in a museum has been welcomed by the Van Abbe and my work with them has been collaborative, discursive, and productively challenged.

At this point in my chapter it is important to dedicate some space to a discussion of how the relations made available by the absent dance artist in the museum and within specific cultural museum contexts, such as Van Abbe and was made clear with Raven Row, is different from the visual artist whose work of art also can exist in the museum without their physical presence. The term visual artist here suggests an artist trained in the visual arts of painting, sculpture or two-dimensional work that is then installed in the museum as a static object. Less traditional notions of the visual artists and interdisciplinary practice have emerged and complicated such discipline-specific assumptions, yet it is still useful to make a comparison between the way visual artists trained in a focus on material practice are different from dance artist who train, primarily, with the body as their medium. See chapter one of this thesis on problems of engagement arising in performance works by artists who are trained in the visual

[71] *Play Van Abbe* 28 November 2009 to 26 June 2011 was a series of exhibitions, projects, performances, lectures, discussions, and 'new techniques for mediating the public's reactions to art and its contexts'. The premise of the project was the idea of 'play' or 'role-playing' in which the museum visitor, museum worker, and artist all took an active part in co-creating. In addition, the museum aimed to 'play itself like an instrument' and to learn more about how it operates. This invitation for reflective and critical thinking about cultural production and the role that people in the museum can take was unique to the Van Abbe. It was also another reminder of how inclusivity and institutional-reflection is a part of the culture of the Van Abbe. I have not, thus, encountered such willingness on the part of other museums to engage in that level of self, institutional, reflection.

[72] In my time working with the Van Abbe there has been a number of changes in orientation of department focuses and ways to work across teams in the museum. As an example, the Education Department was renamed as a Mediation Department. There are also efforts to bring Curation and Mediation together as part of decision-making processes in the museum. More can be read in Bishop's *Radical Museologies* (2013) which features a chapter on the Van Abbe and its contemporary practices.

arts that include dance artists as a main feature of the work. Here I want to distinguish between dance artist led projects, such as *Punt.Point*, are different from projects led by a visual artist. What sets the dance artist apart from the visual artist is not only that her medium is the body but, as well, she is trained in a studio with other and, therefore, within a social environment. Her training is focused on ways that she physically shares space and interacts through space with others. There is a proprioceptive and kinesthetic response system she builds through this kind of training and in her experiences with others within a spatially-oriented context (the studio and the stage). There is also a caring for her body as the source of her work and an awareness of, and sensitivity to other bodies within shared spaces and as being, too, their mediums of practice.

In my comparing and contrasting the absent dance artist in *Punt Point* the absent visual artist in their work, it is also important to point out that it can be the case that visual artists invite dance artists in to perform in the visual artist's work. I have discussed some of those instances in my thesis as a way to point out further differences in practice – for example, Pablo Bronstein and Anthea Hamilton. My point here is to say that there are ways artists are using dance and engaging dancers in their work that have nothing to do with dance in the museum but, rather, operate as a tool to facilitate the artwork, but that is not dance. In my setting the dance artist apart from the visual artist, it is important to note that the use of a material object in *Punt.Point* is not to align with the object of the visual artist but to explore the possibilities of an object infused with the sensibility of the dance artist can be a prop within relational practice. Although there is some value to this argument I am making a case that the object is put into action through the body of the museum visitor. It serves as a tool for them to access and its aim is to prompt a physical action on the part of the visitor. What most visual art objects do is remain static and are less often put into the hands of the visitors and performed in the space of the museum.

The argument for the object as container for a choreographic thinking or, as I argue, the attention of the dance artist is not what is expected or commonly experienced with dance works based in objects made by visual artists. One example is the work of Franz Erhard Walther. As an artist, Walther creates images and objects that call on the viewer to 'act'. For example, one of the pieces is a large piece of fabric with holes for people's heads to fit into.

Once inside of the wearable work the visitors stand still as participants in the artwork[73]. According to the Dia Beacon catalogue (Work as Action n.d.) Walther considers the constraints visual artists historically face in terms of form, material, space, and subject. Walther sees his sculptures as places for the body, inhabitable spaces that modify their appearance and significance in accordance with multiple formal solutions, and also with the actions (which the artist terms 'activations') suggested to the public by the artist and by the works themselves. By these means, the artist reinterprets the definition of the artistic object, as well as the relationship between art and the viewer. For Walther, the body in itself is already the sculpture. I appreciate Walther's interest in bringing the body and object together. The issue I have is that his work does not encourage either a movement of the body, of people, in the museum. His work suggests a static and, to some extent, bounded – whereas mine is more fluid, flexible and evolving – of the visitor who wears the object and is connected, through it, to another.

I was first introduced to Walther's work after creating *Punt.Point* for the Van Abbe. Berndes suggested potential cross over interests between my practice as a dance artist in museums and Walther's work. Therefore, I became interested in what Walther was attempting to do and what I was aiming for as a dance artist working with body, movement and spatial relations. I was eager to learn where the similarities and differences were in our practices, especially because we were coming from different training: visual art and dance respectively. Walther's work is part of a lineage of practices that can be traced back to the well-known artist Oskar Schlemmer of the Bauhaus (1920s) in which dance artists wore and move about in the sculptural pieces and the material object was the centre of focus. He further challenges me to explore the differences between works that dance artists make and those that visual artists make, even when the visual artist is making performance-like work or objects that are to be engaged with in a physical way thus creating relations between the body and the material object.

[73] In his work Walther claims that the visitor to the museum, who interacts with his artworks, is a 'collaborator' and 'completes the work'. The question of authorship is relevant here and begs for attention. Given the scope of this thesis, however, this potential problem of participatory arts will not be addressed in detail. Where possible, I have tried to engage with the issue to suggest that I am both aware of it and find it problematic both in the work of Walther and others, including, at times, my own work (see the chapter on methodology in my thesis for more on this topic).

What I have come to understand is that, although artists working with relationality may have many overlapping interests as to how to bring museum visitors into dialogue or contact with each other, is distinctly different between visual artists, such as Walther and dance artists. That difference is in the movement of the human body in/across/with space and time and in relation. As my interest, as a dance artist, is in the lived reality of the museum, it also has to do with renegotiating the spaces of the museum through an awareness of how it feels to be there; standing in the light coming through the windows; catching a glimpse of a particular cut-out in the architecture; and relating to space that takes on particular resonance in each museum and in which the conditions and resulting affect cannot not easily be replicated elsewhere. In these ways I am constantly in response to a site through an embodied practice. The spatial conditions, qualities, and context of the museum play a role in the way it can support or resist certain practices of movement and spatial relations. What is different than, in the case of *Punt.Point*, is that the material object, also worn by the visitor, is being offered up as a tool from the dance artists and suggests that the body is the focus of attention. What I mean, more precisely here, is that the pouch in *Punt.Point* served the purpose to support the visitor's body as she moves through the museum and when she chose to sit, lean, lounge, lay down, or perform a headstand. The object, in this case, is not to be supported *by* the body (as was the case with Schlemmer's and Walther's work) but rather to be a support, a prop, *for* the body as in the work of Forsythe. Similar to a prop on stage in which the actor might engage with in order to emphasise a gesture, a movement, a context.

A German-born visual artist, Walther is influenced by Joseph Beuys and Gerhard Richter, and his contemporaries include Donald Judd and Richard Serra Walther creates museum-based works consisting of large fabric-based pieces that are folded neatly and placed in the museum for the visitors to pick up, unfold and place on their bodies. Often the pieces are meant to be worn by two or more visitors at a time in order to create a shared experience between people. These wearable objects were a connective element linking people together in the space, each looking across at another (or avoiding looking) confronted by or, perhaps, excited by both being contained inside of the artwork. In recognizing the viewer's (of art) presence, his work attempts to combat the sense of isolation and self-absorption associated with viewing (visual) art. In this way, and like *Punt.Point*, the object represents the behaviour

of the dance artist through the extension of an offer out to the museum visitor of the skills culled from the training of the dance artist. In the case of *Punt.Point*, the re-positions and, as well, the allowance to re-position oneself and play outside the rules of behaviour governing museum spaces is where the speciality of the dance artist lies. Wherein Walther's work is more limited in its restrictions of space and time. In this way *Punt.Point* emanates from and is built upon the dance artists sensibilities of the body, space and time set and is a way of physically sensing a spatial and relational experience[74]. My claim here is my project enables agency for the visitors whereas Walther's does not.

The dance artist William Forsythe also works with objects and his work is more in line with my way of thinking and the values of relational practice found in *Punt.Point* and as discussed above. In writing about his work *Choreographic Objects,* Forsythe claims objects can 'activate motion' and 'engender an acute awareness of the self within specific action schemata' (William Forsythe Choreographic Objects, n.d.). His built installations in museums do not require a trained dance artist but, rather, put the visitor of the museum in motion through creating a set of conditions for the visitor to physically navigate. For example, a series of weights hanging from wires moving in a synchronized manner that prompts the visitor to move through the space in order to avoid the strings and, resulting, in an 'readiness' of the body and what looks like dancing. The version I saw was *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No.2* (2015) as part of the Brighton Festival where the very young to the elderly engaged playfully and with interest to moving their bodies, prompted by the swaying of the pendulums.

The pouch or passport in *Punt.Point* is, therefore, similar to Forsythe's choreographic objects in that it is not meant to replace the dancer in the museum, but rather to suggest actions and behaviour of the dance artist as a way of behaving for the visitor. What makes *Punt.Point* similar to *Choreographic Objects* but different from his other work *Synchronous Objects: For One Flat Thing* (2009) is that those ideas of the dance artist, in terms of

[74] Perhaps this, too, is the problem with the works (mentioned in the prior case study chapter) of Bronstein and Hamilton, both visual artists whose skill set as trained artists do not necessarily grant them access to a knowledge of space, time, and movement of the body. Both works were limited in their choreographic potential and relied on stillness, slow movements, and more simple choreographic structures.

positionings of the body, are embedded into the object (the pouch) and brought to life through the physical engagement with the objects not through a visual encounter of the dancer. Nonetheless, the point here is that neither Forsythe nor myself are interested in an erasure of the dance artist but, rather, in a delivery of the actions, approaches, and sets of attention of dance, or the ideas within choreography as is the case for Forsythe. In this way one could argue that the works represent certain values of the actions of the dance artist and choreographer in body, space, and time as a mode of attention, of knowledge that can be shared as a way of relating to site, self, and others in space. Norah Zuniga-Shaw, who worked closely with Forsythe on another one of his projects, *Synchronous Objects: For One Flat Thing* says, 'Choreographic objects therefore are never about abandoning live performance.' (Klein and Noeth, 2011). Forsythe's concerns are helpful in my consideration of the absent dance artist. He asks, '[i]s it possible for choreography to generate autonomous expressions of its principles, a choreographic object, without a body?' (William Forsythe: Choreographic Objects, 2012). In terms of an 'object without a body' this case study looks more at the object that *is* the body. Perhaps the object is not the body, per se, but represents it as a container for certain sensibilities of the dance artist. These sensibilities include her bodily awareness, her interest in rest, play, and agency. This body of the object as dance artist in the museum is in direct relation to others, those of the museum visitors that engage with it, and in collaboration, a relational experience takes place. Forsythe furthers my thinking by saying, 'What else, besides the body, could physical thinking look like?' (Spier 2011: 90). The claim to physical thinking is of interest to me as it serves as something that can be shared, made on offer and taken up as a way of relating in the world. This physical thinking exists inside of the *Punt.Point* project in the form of the wearable material object that opens up potentiality for relation and as a passport to another kind of experience in the museum.

My work then is more like William Forsythe's *Choreographic Objects* in which materials are directly engaged with by the visitors and the aim of the works is to physically and metaphorically move the audience and less like Walther's work, whose wearable sculpture is held up and put on display by museum visitors. I will be reflecting further on the idea of an object that represents such thinking or certain 'principles' and also allowances and prompts to be like a dance artist in the museum. In these ways I align with the interest of Forsythe by giving permission to museum visitors to be a dance artist inside of choreographic

structures and as intelligent doers. Forsythe's quote about 'physical thinking' is helpful to me in that this case study provides an example of doing as knowing by inviting the visitors to do actions in the museum as a way to know it and the space in another way, another kind of knowing. Looking at a space while standing is very different than seeing it while lying down and looking up. Knowing then becomes about relating and relating as a way of knowing. The material component of my project is helpful to return to in considering 'physical thinking' and social encounters.

The sociologist Tony Bennett (2017), who was discussed in the introduction chapter of my thesis, considered museum objects as 'props for a social performance' of the visitors. For him, this social performance marks the actual core of the museum ritual. What the object in *Punt.Point* serves as is as a prop for moving and that moving is in relation with the site and each other and to self. Objects and props can be a part of dance performance in museums even when the intention is not on the object but its resulting function can point to ways it supports relational practice. Take, for instance, *Musée de la Danse*, a project mentioned earlier in this thesis. The title suggests that it is a museum of dance. However, as noted by Tamara Tomic-Vajagic (2015) dance scholar and spectator to the *Musée de la Danse* event at Tate Modern in 2016, a gigantic disco ball which hung in Tate's main entry way or Turbine Hall was an object or, even artwork that created a social space to occur that, without it, might not have otherwise been possible. She describes the feeling of the disco-like effect in the space for the final event of the *Musée de la Danse* weekend that was called *Adrénaline.* She writes, 'It [the disco ball] was a mobile, that is to say, a modern sculpture; it was also a choreographic object, a performative artefact that prompts and inspires, an invitation to dance, an extended hand' (Adrénaline: A Dance Floor for Everyone and expo zéro, 2015). Her description of the object and what it provided speaks directly to how the pouch or bag in *Punt.Point* was an invitation in the space of Van Abbe. However, the difference between Charmatz's project and *Punt.Point* is that the material object, or wearable bag, of *Punt.Point* deliberately engaged the object, as a prop but, also as an artwork and tool for moving the body. Whereas, as Tomic-Vajagic (2015) points out, *Musée de la Danse* may have taken-over the museum as a dance but, nevertheless, still involved material objects as part of that experience and delivery. Although Charmatz does not acknowledge the role the object plays in his work it does offer up another dimension of relational possibility in the way that the object in my work does. The

difference is in the conscious approach. Where *Punt.Point* deliberately engaged an object in place of the dance artist's presence, Charmatz defaults to the dancing body, only, as the source of his practice. What he neglects to recognise is that by purposely placing his dance project in the space of the museum that space and the objects contained within play a role in how the work operates, is received, and – as this thesis's interest – how relations are made possible.

By recognising the role of the object within *Punt.Point*, this case study suggests that the dance artist, in being absent, extends her experience through the support of a material object to the museum visitor to move in and through the museum differently. This material element contains information as a form of and extension of her affordances as a dance artist in the museum to visitors and, by doing so, invites others to position themselves in spatial relations with site, self and others. I am interested in further analysis of this idea of an extension and what that affords in terms of the relation between the absent dance artist and museum visitor. I turn to Susan Foster's discussion of the relationship between the circulation of objects and services and the production of value (2019: 9) which helps me to understand what *Punt.Point* produces in the museum and, by doing so, contributes to my thesis' concern for dance as attention and relation in the museum. In writing about value in dance Foster (2019) includes the idea of dance as a 'gift'. More specifically, she discusses the transmitting of dance from one person to another as either a gift or a commodity. This somewhat binary opposition of gift versus commodity is helpful, to some degree, when thinking about *Punt.Point*. It helps me to consider which of the two categories the case study falls under. Foster also clarifies that, 'In the starkest summary of their difference, commodity exchange establishes relationships between things or services whereas gift exchange constructs relationships between people' (10). *Punt.Point* challenges that idea in that the 'construction' of relationships between people did not require one half of that relationship to be present and, because of that, there was a different resonance of relation and one that allowed the other half of the relationship an open-ended option or a chance to 'opt out'[75] of the relation.

[75] The term 'opt out' was mentioned in a Skype conversation (February 3, 2020) that I had with Seema Rao, Chief Experience Officer at the Akron Art Museum. She said that offering museum visitors the chance to 'opt out' of participatory artworks and programing in the museum was important to her.

This offer also asks for something in return, but not in an obligatory way. This thinking opens up a consideration about dance in the museum as a gift or, what is more fitting for this case study, an 'offer'. *Punt.Point* does not require the presence of the dance artist, the one putting forward the offer. It, therefore, changes the meaning of the gift from one of immediate exchange to an offer that alleviates a need to show a response in the receiving a gift or, even, to what is on offer to one in which the receiver (museum visitor) is relieved of such responsive duty or pressure and is then free to either accept or take up the offer on hand or not without anyone needing to know. The giver is not present so there is an open-ended space for participation or no participation. This more open-ended or option to opt in or out is a reminder of the discussion on 'easy to be in the room with' approach of the detached dance artist as described in chapter one. This continuation of relations that are neither pressurized to engage nor expected to participate in the space of the museum shows itself as a theme in this thesis that will further be explored in case study three when the dance artist returns to the museum. Therefore, as an offer in the museum, the absent dance artist initiates or suggests a potentiality of relation, rather than forcing one into place. Different from Foster's claim that gift exchange is driven by, a mutual need for and connection to one another (2019:11) *Punt.Point* circumvents this mutual need. The absent dance artist in this case study has an interest in connecting with others, but not necessarily directly with the museum visitors. In fact, she is in contact more with those people whom she encounters in the making of the work including her collaborator and museum staff. She then builds the project based on those interactions. A material object was then made available to the receivers, the visitors of the museum, in order that they may choose if they wish to come into contact and connection with the museum and with others.

## De-centering the Dance Artist

*Punt.Point* as a case study evidenced that the absent dance artist in the museum is producing other forms of spatial relations. It did this by describing the ways that the pouch, or material object, was a container for certain sensibilities and qualities of attention of the dance artist that was then extended, as an offer, to the museum visitor. This offer suggested that the pouch served the purpose of a passport that allowed access to another way of being in another imagined space of the museum. That space included options for the museum

visitor to re-position themselves physically in the museum and to participate in its spaces and in spatial relations. As a museum that invites experimentation and a reflective discourse on the way the museum operates, as well as its spatial conditions and location, Van Abbe made for a useful site in which to research and understand how the absent dance artist plays a role in alternative forms of relation in the museum. This chapter began with a set of concerns about what the absent dance artist might afford in the museum in terms of new spaces of relations that included the site of the museum and its staff. It drew on experience from previous collaborative work and a one-week residency at the Van Abbe with Tang that led into the *Punt.Point* project. Through a discussion of these experiences, this chapter touched on collaboration as a model for relation. It also evidenced how communication, through the material participation as an offer, fed back from data collected from the notebooks that visitors wrote in and from interviews with museum staff. Earlier on in this chapter, I discussed two examples of participatory work in museums. The work of Forsythe and Walther helped to articulate how *Punt.Point* aims to both support a sharing of knowledge and access of the dance artist with a museum public and to claim the body of the participant at the centre of the work, not as the object. What this chapter points to is that dance, as both a relational practice and a maker of social spaces, has the potential to change what the museum is and what it will become. This change-making is not an isolated endeavour, but it calls on the museum visitor to play a role, a physical role in re-shaping the museum space as one of interaction. In order to move change forward, in this case, the dance artist steps aside to make way for others to stand (or lean, lay down, and do a headstand) in her place in the space of the museum. The surprise element in this case study was the way in which museum staff participated in the project and revealed untapped potentialities of dance as an instigator of relations in the museum. The question that we are left with as this chapter concludes and we enter into the next one is: How might the dance artist prompt further relational possibilities with and between museum staff?

The other point to be made in this conclusion is that the dance artist does not need to be the centre of focus, or even looked at, in the museum to shift the social space of the museum. This was evidenced both by *Punt.Point* and *Choreographic Objects*. She does, however, research in the museum the innate movement and behaviour of visitors and staff and builds a tool based on those findings and to suggest a presence in the museum after her

departure and in the practical implementation of the project. In this way, she is still present in the museum, but not in a physical, tangible sense[76]. This is not a ghostly presence, but a presence which is transmitted from one body to the next through a material object (or 'prop'), in line with the passport theme, a bag. This object is not an end result of the work but is a support (in the form of a cushion) as well as a navigator (map[77]) and a guide (instructions) to access other modes of being in the museum. The project exists in the participating through the use of the object and the resulting bodily positions or presence of the visitor (and staff) and relations that emerge from such use. Might *Punt.Point*, as a case study for the relational aspects of dance in the museum, then, indeed, point to another kind of way of being that might move us towards a future? And, by doing so argue for dance in the museum as an art of social engagement? The next chapter will contribute to this thought by looking at the present dance artist who returns to the museum with a new set of understandings of an enquiry about the spatial relational potentials of her art form. The next case study looks at yet another position of the dance artist and the kinds of social spaces her physical presence there promotes. In this way the dance artist, again, re-positions herself or, perhaps, simply walks through the museum as dance, as embodiment. I will end this chapter here with a quote by Shafiq, the guard at Van Abbe who concluded my interview with him in 2017 by saying, 'People walking around, that is also art!' and let that lead us into chapter three, *The Present Dance Artist* who returns to the museum walking about, as dance.

[76] Again, this is also true of visual artists.

[77] I realise that this mapping, as a way of relating, could be elaborated more on in future writing. However, this making sense of complex ideas and reasoning relates to my method of thinking through drawn maps mentioned in the methods chapter.

# The Present Dance Artist: Being (part of) the Museum

Here we step into the third and final case study where the dancer embeds herself into the everyday fabric of the museum as a form of presence that produces relations. This chapter addresses the dance artist who physically returns to the museum to further explore dance as relation. This relational quality is evidenced both during her time being physically present in the museum as well as when she is absent, having left a trace, an influence, from her having been there. The kind of relation I will speak about here is one that makes the museum more vibrant in terms of its attention to the lived environment. The museum is Tate Modern (Tate), a hybrid space that is both private and public, and sits in the centre of London. The dancer is on-site, in residency, at the museum both opening up her movement practice to staff and exploring her own practice of re-positioning herself in the museum. It is here that the dance artist comes into the fore, extending herself into the spaces of the museum where she encounters and connects with others, the site, and herself and where she practices a being with the museum and as part of its human infrastructure. In this way we further expand our understanding of the ontology of dance in the museum. For this case study, it is the dance artist inhabiting the site, both as a practicing artist and as a visiting researcher. These overlapping identities give the dance artist the opportunity to share her expertise of moving with others and to practice relations in and with the museum. This case study grows out of the previous two chapters applying the learning from them whilst adding further information and thought to the potentiality of dance in the museum as part of the fabric of its social environment.

Both the detached and absent dance artist suggested that the dancer is inside of her own research as a performer and creator. The detached dance artist moved alongside and with fellow dancers in front an on-looking audience of museum visitors. The absent dance artist co-created an offer to museum visitors to move on their own, extending opportunities to re-position themselves in the museum whilst moving in its spaces. In this case study, the present dancer reflects upon what it means to be embodied in, and to inhabit, the museum as a more integrated part of it. The first case study was about seeing and the second about doing, and this chapter is about being.

What I mean by 'being' is that the approach of the dance artist in the museum is not about producing but about a process of coming into being with the museum as a more integrated figure. It suggests that the skill set of the dance artist does not come through a performance of dance to be seen nor a material object to put into play but, rather, as a social being whose skill sets and sensibilities are put to use in a particular way. The project outcome is no longer a dance work (as it was with *Trio* A) nor is it a performance-like object created and then left behind by the dance artist (as was the case with *Punt.Point*). Instead, the present dance artist explores being in the museum and moving through it as a daily practice. She engages with and participates in the museum's public and non-public spaces, amongst staff and alongside visitors. In this co-mingling she begins to affect the operations of the museum through an embedding of her practice there over time. Her work is the process she both experiences and shares, leaving behind a quality of interaction, of sociality, of communing together.

In the ways described above, the present dance artist contains elements of both the detached and the absent dance artist. She is both there and not there in that she is present during opening hours and on particular days of the week at the museum, but she is not *always* there. She comes and she goes from the museum over the course of several months and years. In the time that she is not in the museum physically, there are traces of her presence that reside in the museum and infiltrate through an employment of her practice taken up by museum staff and will be further explained in this chapter. What is important to mention is that the previous approaches taken by the dance artist (detached and absent) as forms of relation, are all included here. Therefore, what we begin to understand in this final case study is that the detachment and absence in the presence of the dance artist is a quality of approach of being and moving in the museum with particular qualities of attention to site, self, and other that can be picked up, repeated, and engaged again and again. This influence of practice begins to suggest change in the ways that the museum operates. All these things are included in the project of the museum when dance artist is present. This chapter asks how the dance artist is part of and affective to moving dance and the museum forwards in new ways. Ultimately, it is about *how* the dance artist is in the museum and this chapter shows us that she can be there in all of these ways.

The purpose of this chapter is to bring together the thinking started in chapters one and two and to continue exploration of the potentialities and understandings of dance in the museum through the frame of relation. It also suggests that it is not only is the museum visitor but, also, the museum staff who play a role in what dance produces in the museum. The dance artist in this chapter is neither the focus of attention for a viewer nor is she creating a project for the visitor to step into. She is, like the staff, at work in the museum. What differentiates her from the staff in her work, however, is that she tries out different ways of being in the museum, of moving through it, and co-creating a sociality in a very deliberate way. Her presence is folded into the everyday of the museum sometimes calling forth its institutional spatial coding of behaviour. Her attention goes to the living, breathing, human make-up of the museum *as* a relational presence and in her co-habitation with it whilst also asking it to change. First, though, she must consider change within her own practice and approach to the museum.

This new approach of the present dance artist is simply to be in the museum – to reside, abide, and to be *with* the museum *as* a practice. This spending time in the museum, in order to learn more about what a presence in the museum as a dance artist does, *is* the project in this case. In order to clarify what I mean by presence as a producer of relation, it is important to discuss how it is also, as a way of being, embedded in the idea of relation. In my investigation of relation, I lean on the thinking of Gabriella Giannachi (2012) who discusses presence not as an isolated thing but one that emerges from an ecological condition in which presence cannot be separated out because it is in relation to other elements, things, people, and spaces. She writes, 'Presence could be read as the network formed by the subject and the environment they inhabit through a set of ecological exchanges' (Giannachi 2012: 51). Specifically, the dance artist cannot be analysed as a separate entity within the museum but, rather, as part of a larger human network operating and creating social exchanges there. This way of thinking in terms of connectivity as defined by an ecological thinking points to the case for the present dance artist as being a part of the human ecology of the museum. The significance, therefore, of this chapter is that it opens up a consideration of the dance artist as part of, and influential upon, the museum. This chapter extends my overall argument that the dance artist, museum visitor, and museum staff cohabitate to form a presence, a collective beingness in the museum. This phenomenon of people being in the museum and

their making the museum what it is, is why, in this case study, the museum is *the project.* The museum, that is evolving, changing, and remaking its future is influenced by the qualities of presence that the dance artists brings. Throughout this thesis, I have explored different ways that the dance artist can be part of that infrastructure, no matter how detached, absent, or present she is. This chapter makes further visible the position that the dance artist plays *in and through* her work in the museum that contributes to an understanding of her practice as being part of and contributing to the changing museum. The dance artist is a conduit through which people in the museum can actually be together, or confront each other, or to engage the practices the dancer is introducing. I am arguing here for the whole museum and for dance, not as part of a temporary work or an event in the museum, but as a more considered, integrated, and effective part of the museum. In order to discuss how the present dance artist integrates herself into the museum and the ways her presence, through detached and absent qualities, produces an 'after effect' in the museum I will begin with a discussion of temporality as a key factor of integration.

This chapter, unlike the previous two chapters, begins to address the element of time that the dance artist spends in the museum. There is, in this case, an abiding in the museum that is temporal. This concept of temporality is important to the project of dance in the museum and to a discussion of the presence of the dance artist there. The present dance artist resides in the museum consistently and over time. This quality of presence, this abiding in the museum, is an existence that feels its way through the museum over time and with a consistency that is not fleeting but, rather, embedded into the museum. In this way the dance artist begins to both inhabit the spaces of the museum while co-inhabiting it with others who are also there day in and day out. She moves across and between spaces suggesting a fluidity of movement and bodily gestures. She interacts and engages with the site, people, and self in order to understand the potentiality of dance as a relational practice in the museum through a process that is unencumbered by pressures to perform or produce. As the dance artist is spending time in the museum this beingness becomes in and of itself an important form of expertise. Her ability to engage in this beingness, a being there, a moving through the museum in and amongst its staff and visitors, emulates a quality of practice in ways that infiltrate and begin to affect the workings of the museum. The dancer, now present and over an extended period of time creates a permanency of effect on the museum itself. She is not

there on a full-time basis but, rather a on a more limited, flexible presence. However, there is a permanency of her presence in the museum, even when she is not there. That form of permanency over-time will influence how the museum thinks of itself and how it operates. Further on in this chapter, I will offer two instances that highlight the after effect the dance artist has through her presence in the museum as a more integrated figure.

I also look to Miwon Kwon (2002) to better understand the potentiality of site-based artists and temporality. Kwon (2002) argues against the artist who 'parachutes' in and out of the site where they make work. Dance artists are often, for example, invited in to make a work in a place where they have little or no experience that is far from their place of residence. At the end of their project, they leave and go back home. They can claim to understand the communities in which they are working, yet they may lack a full understanding of those communities given their short periods of time on site. For me, working within Tate on several projects since 2012 has offered the chance to better understand the conditions of the site, its cultural context, and get to know some of the people who work there[78]. These kinds of relationships with the museum are what helps to constitute a sense of presence with others that can be linked to what Giannachi (2012), again, points to regarding presence as an ecological condition. She writes, '[o]ne is never simply "present", but rather that one is present in a given environment and ecology'[79]. This given environment, the museum, take centre stage as topic in this final case study after looking, in the previous examples which were the dancer and, then, the object.

By committing to the museum as subject, this chapter takes on a slightly different point of view from the other case studies in that it addresses the museum as the central 'project' rather than a performance of dance or a performance-like experience as the central project. Therefore, my writing will be used to express a 'closer-in' approach that offers up a greater sense of what it feels like to be in the space of the museum, with others, and whilst

[78] This was also true in my work with Van Abbe in that I had met Berndes years before she commissioned my work and I had developed an ongoing dialogue with her as well as an understanding and familiarity with the Netherlands having been a resident there from 1996-2006.

[79] The word 'ecology' is derived from the Greek word meaning 'house' or 'environment'. My interest in the inhabiting of the museum might suggest that it is home-like or that, by inhabiting it, I make myself at home there.

moving. This chapter also sheds light on the conversations that took place as part of the experience of being in the museum that shaped the development of this thesis. Given that the focus of this thesis is relation, it is again important to place an emphasis on areas of practice such as journaling and informal discussions along with the more formal physical practices and academic writing. This chapter offers further space for the voice of the dance artist to come through, places value on relational practice and discourse, and complicates ideas of what constitutes academic writing within artistic practice. This chapter is organised across three sections: *Museum*, *People*, and *Movement*.

We will begin with the museum as a site of a certain scale, and what having access to different spaces in such a museum means to the present dance artist and to relations. This will be followed by a section on the people in the museum as a way to discuss how working with staff of the museum opened up new modes of thinking about the role dance can play there and, lastly, I will focus on the concept of moving in the museum and how particular physical experiences and ways of moving prompted both a breaking of behavioural coding of the museum and made evident the ways in which the dance artist has impact on socio-spatial interactions in the museum. My interest, again is in the dance artist who enters and inhabits the museum, not to inject something more engaging, participatory or performance-like but, rather, in a quiet, unassuming way to acknowledge the relations already at play in the museum and work within those in order to bring forward their potential and, also, inspire new opportunities of being and relating on site. We turn, now, to Tate.

## Museum as Project

Tate is a public-private museum located in the centre of London in the UK and is part of a network of four art museums[80]. It is not a government institution, but it operates as a public entity at arm's length from government and is supported by both private and public funds. Government funding is received from the Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) in the UK and the museum is required to report to Parliament. Private funding currently comes from commercial entities such as Hyundai. Whilst it is generally understood,

[80] These include Tate Modern, Tate Britain, Tate Liverpool, and Tate St Ives.

since its opening in 2000, to be a museum of modern art, Tate has traditionally placed a high premium on live art, performance-based, and participatory events with works by primarily visual artists such as Robert Morris' *Bodyspacemotionthings* and Carsten Höller's slides *Test Site* (2006) as well as numerous other smaller participatory performances presented as part of the *Long Weekend* series such as Jiri Kovanda' s *Kissing Through Glass* (2007). There is, also, a long history of dance by choreographers being presented, and through the exhaustive efforts of Catherine Wood, Senior Curator of International Art (Performance) at Tate Modern, it is at the forefront of museums presenting dance and performance. Some of those include *These Associations* (2014) by Tino Sehgal; *If Tate Modern was Musée de la Dance?* (2015) by Boris Charmatz; *Public Collection* by Alexandra Pirici and Manuel Pelmus (2016); and *Work/Travail/Arbeid* (2016) by Anna Theresa de Keersmaeker. Tate Research has also looked to dance practice as a way to understand learning and knowledge production and has taken a solidly ambitious approach to embracing practice-as-research across Learning and Participation teams and, more recently, in collections and conservation, such as with the *Collection Care Research* department. The later development will be useful to my concluding arguments for an ever-greater extension of the role of the dance artist in the museum. For all of these reasons Tate provides a useful context for looking at the last of the three case studies and ways that the site of the museum is an important element in relationality and possibility. As a way to exemplify the thinking of the museum as project, I introduce aspects or characteristics of the museum including the scale and complexity of the site as well as the access to non-public spaces and to staff interactions that were afforded to me. Later in this section, I will also address certain values within Tate Learning that made my time there so important in that it aligned with my own value system as a dance artist.

From February to June 2017 I was in residency in the museum as a *Tate Learning*[81] *Research Associate*. This period of time followed chronologically the *Yvonne Rainer: Dance*

[81] This chapter recognises the value of dance being a part of a Learning department in the way it approaches practice, critical thinking, and enquiry – and, also, does not fix it there. This chapter suggests that dance can be both a part of curation and learning, that one is not necessarily more of a fit than the other. Therefore, my work moves engages with both Curation and Learning in the museum. This thesis argues for dance as a relational element in the museum, which tends to fall under Learning departments in museums. Through looking at the relation within Learning, this thesis is further able to reflect upon what it means to have dance in the museum across differing departments, agendas, and ideas about relation. What is useful to my argument is that curation is not the only area where dance exists in the museum.

*Works* at Raven Row (2014) and the *Punt.Point* project at the Van Abbe (2014-2017). I was onsite at Tate for two days each week from 9am to 3pm over the course of the five-month residency to explore aspects of my presence as a dance artist in the museum. In my residency, I was interested in developing contexts to practice a being with the museum, with myself and with others. Whilst in the museum I did three things: First, I offered an open one-hour morning movement practice for any Tate staff to join me before opening hours (from 9am-10am on the days I was physically in the museum. This activity took place in the Clore studio at the museum. Secondly, and following the movement practice, I committed to engaging in solo experimental exercise of inhabiting the museum through small scale actions of walking, sitting, standing, and lying down in the public and non-public (staff-only) spaces of the museum. Thirdly, I gave an internal presentation to Tate staff upon my completion of my residency and based in the research conducted there and what I learned.

The open movement practices consisted of a series of simple, easy-to-follow, repetitive movements done across the floor for the duration of the hour for museum staff. As a Tate Associate, I had access through a 'FOB' key pass that, with a swipe of the round plastic key, opened doors into public spaces of the museum and to behind-the-scenes offices, break areas, and the Learning and Research staff-only spaces. I am borrowing the 'behind the scenes' term from a theatre context and from Erving Goffman (1990) who used this term when describing – through the metaphor of actors on and off a stage – when analysing human-to-human interaction in public spaces. His 'dramaturgical analysis' was one in which he discovered that individuals in a an 'on stage' situation work to maintain positive impressions while collecting impressions of others compared to a 'backstage' experience where they tend to let down their assigned roles. This analysis is useful to my argument of how spaces operate in a museum in terms of relation, however, Goffman's text does not exactly address what I was also interested in exploring at Tate, which was how these ways of being both 'on' and 'off' stage – or in the case of the museum, in the public and non-public spaces, might be further questioned as relational spaces suggesting certain techniques and qualities of behaving that, by the presence of the dance artist, can be challenged, provoked, and brought under playful scrutiny. Whereas Goffman is interested in the actor's roles played in the different spaces of the theatre (214), I am interested in the potentialities of physical movement that lead to spatial relational exchanges across the public and non-public spaces

of the museum. I also consider what moving together before opening hours in the non-public spaces of the museum might offer up within the more public spaces during the day. I was more interested in the ways that interactions and relation, even with professional roles played, might shift our physical experiences and ways of interacting. Most importantly. I am interested in how the presence of the dance artist might infiltrate an influence on ways of interacting among staff in the museum. To more fully articulate my interests, I will discuss in more detail the actual experiences I had at Tate and how those experiences contributed to my research interests and discoveries.

Moving in and being with the large-scale spaces of Tate for the duration of my residency was important in that it gave me the opportunity to understand what the physical presence of the dance artist might mean over time. It was also a challenging shift for me. Having worked in the small-to-medium sized museums up to that time, the scale of Tate Modern felt far larger and somewhat daunting as a social space. Although the scaling up was not necessarily essential, nor always useful for my enquires, it did offer me a passport to a new and expanded landscape to explore and to learn from the larger network of people and primary staff, who were willing to take part in my research experiments.

The overall building , unlike Raven Row and Van Abbe feels static and unmoving. Despite the cavernous and awe-inspiring Turbine Hall and parts of the new extension, the galleries are mostly windowless rooms laid out one after the other in a trail that can sometimes be confusing and hard to find one's way out of. It is also a concrete building, a former industrial site, that can feel stuffy on warm days. It is the artists, visitors and staff of the museum, the people inhabiting the museum, who create flows, life, and pathways through Tate that counter-balance its somewhat stultifying structure.

Buildings are not only about physical structures but also about what they allow the people who occupy them to do. Although the idea of human infrastructure primarily relates to parts of society that deal with human needs, such as health, education, and nutrition (*Don't Forget the Human Infrastructure* Brookings Institute, 2008). My use of the term here is meant to suggest that, within the institution of the museum, human beings make a large contribution to defining the space and to cultivating it as a civic space. These people include

artists, museum staff ,and visitors who belong to a system that is part social, part spatial, and part temporal network. Dance speaks to and interacts with those elements (the social, spatial, and temporal) of a site which is one of the reasons it is attractive for museum curators. When I asked Catherine Wood, the main curator of dance and performance at Tate, rather provokingly, in an interview for my book *WHO CARES? Dance in the Gallery & Museum* (2015), 'What [in terms of programming dance] is in it for Tate?' she replied, 'It's hard to talk about Tate as an entity. It's just a collection of individuals' (31). I would go a step further to say that the museum is a collection of individuals moving *through* and *with* each other. The people, unlike the building, are not still. They are the activating element that brings the site to life.

The museum is made up of a multi-layered network, a system, of people in spatial relation. The museum is a social space where those gathering there, including artists, staff, and visitors will shape the way the museum operates. It is relevant to mention here that Tate, upon opening the new *Switch House* (an extension of the former site), stated on its website[82] a vision for such a new space as 'a place to gather together'. The *Switch House*'s prescribed sociality also doubles as a way of saying that a built environment has impact not only on an art experience, but also on the social experience as a site that attracts people into its spaces. Tate has particular spaces that can both support and detract from relational experiences. As named earlier, one is the Turbine Hall, a former industrial space that housed turbines and is located at the centre of the museum. This space known for its large-scale art and performance works, and is one of the main, free, spaces in the museum. The permanent exhibition galleries are also free, but the temporary exhibitions and some performance, film, and lecture events are ticketed. The *Exchange Room* (as part of the new *Switch House*) is on the fifth floor andruns the length and width of the building. This *Exchange Room* has programmed events through partnerships with academic and cultural organisations that are usually free to attend with some being invitation-only. As spaces at Tate offer up varying degrees of access and of experience let us, again, reflect, on the idea of the 'passport' from the previous chapter in order to better understand how entry into different spaces is important the topic of this paper.

[82] https://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/projects/tate-modern-project

One of the main themes carrying over from the last case study on the absent dance artist is the idea of access or 'passport'. This access is often given to artists working in the museum temporarily to provide the opportunity to build a new work, as was the case with *Punt.Point*. The allowance given to me as a dance practitioner/researcher was in the form of a badge to wear as an access key that, unlike at Van Abbe, gave me the same direct access as staff members to some of the non-public spaces of the museum. In this case study, my access to Tate, that included passing through doors or thresholds between public and private spaces, allowed me to become a part of the museum in another way. It gave me a place amongst the back of house staff and the kinds of spaces in which the museum provides and modes of behavior there compared to the front of house experience. I was also given a 'hot desk' to use in the Learning staff office. At one point, I was also told what the verbal password was in order to access a private Tate garden just outside of the museum in which one has to ring a bell , someone on the intercom answers, the one-word pass is spoken, the gate opens and one enters. This private garden is reserved for Tate staff and residents of an apartment complex near the museum. It was, each time I visited, empty of people. I also worked in other spaces of the museum such as the Tate café and staff canteen. I engaged in an inhabiting of such spaces at Tate during my research period. I also, utilised these spaces to meet with other people including my thesis advisors and a group of students from Roehampton University who joined me one day, along with a separate visit from my colleague and Feldenkrais practitioner Fiona Wright. These visits gave me the opportunity to talk about my research and to invite others, who were visitors to the museum, into my practice of moving through the museum and, on occasion, to the staff canteen or private garden as my guest. This access felt both a different to me than the access I had and accommodation I had at Raven Row and Van Abbe. I believe this difference it has to do with both the physical scale and cultural weight of Tate. This cultural weight is due to the fact that Tate is, as was mentioned, a large-scale public-private museum known internationally as one of the most significant museums in the UK, unlike Raven Row and the Van Abbe[83] whose reputation, although, international do not

[83] It is of interest to note, however, that both the Van Abbe and Tate were former industrial buildings (one a cigar factory, the other a boiler house) that became contemporary art museums (although on vastly different scales). Both had additions made to its structure to both compliment and contrast the existing building. For

attract the kind of attention as does Tate. It therefore feels, at first, somehow odd to pass through publicly restricted spaces at Tate as a temporary guest researcher but, over time, became more familiar. On my first day at Tate I wrote,

> I arrive at the staff entrance to Tate Modern on a cold and grey February morning. The entry consists of two double glass doors located behind a parking lot on the north side of the building. There are spaces for cars and bicycle parking out front, a grassy area reserved for staff and, just beyond it, on the way out towards the Thames River is a private Tate garden only accessible by ringing a buzzer and saying a password known by Tate staff. It is 8.45am and I am reaching in my bag for my Tate identification badge – a clip-on identification that includes a color [sic] photo of my face and the words 'Hosted by Tate Modern'. Below that is my name in bold lettering and, below that, in a slightly smaller font is written "Learning". Then, a long grey, thick line with the word 'Temporary' embedded in white. And, finally, in red, 'THIS BADGE MUST BE WORN AT ALL TIMES' and an expiration date. I have tucked my FOB access button inside of the plastic covering. This button gains me access to locked doors and up to Learning staff offices, a top-floor canteen, and other Learning spaces, such as the Clore studio, through-out the museum. The words 'hosted', 'learning', and 'temporary' on this small surface are a reminder that I am a guest, a temporary guest, in a space that is not my own. Yet, I am an 'associate' of the museum, an affiliate, I am in relation and related to it. (Journal entry 02.02.2018).

This access is also what led me to better understand, not only in the public spaces, but in particular the physical and social coding across spaces of the museum. I am referring here to the invisible (assumed) and visible (through signage) social codes of behaviour governing museum spaces. My having access to the non-public spaces of Tate Modern[84] meant that I could extend my research to other types of people and other sites within the museum. This interest was carried forward from the previous case study in which the guards and hosts of the museum played a role in the understanding of the project and also had a voice, through interviews that I conducted, in developing an analysis for this thesis. The result of the Tate

Tate it was the well-known architect team Herzog and deMeuron who took on both the original renovation and a new *Switch House* building adjacent to the original building. For Van Abbe it was the lesser known Abel Cahen who re-designed the interior of the building.

[84] I also had access to staff spaces, with my 'Artist' badge, at Van Abbe and, certainly, at Raven Row in that there was no pass needed to move easily between gallery, office space and the kitchen (although some doors were locked due to security and the offices were treated as private to the staff). There was, however, something about accessing non-public private spaces hidden from view at a museum the size of Tate that felt more significant.

experience of access was a consideration of the bodily-self and modes of coping with the environment of the museum in terms of a physical presence and being together. This access also gave me the opportunity to extend, even further, the notion of the 'passport' and what the physically present dance artist might provide in the way of feedback to the thinking about dance as relation in the museum. My research at Tate was a reminder that there is a strong delineation between what artists are permitted to do in the museum and what the visitors and staff in the museum can do in terms of how they position themselves physically. Staff members are not necessarily given the same permissions to move, interact, play, engage, and participate in the same ways that the museum visitors are through projects and programmes developed both by museum staff and by artists, including dance artists. This differentiation between visitors and staff in terms of relational practices and allowance is one that my experience at Tate begains to address. I had, in the past, attempted to challenge such delineations by inviting museum staff and researchers into my movement practice as part of working with young people in 2014 when engaged as a dance artist on a project at Tate that will be discussed later. However, at this point, it is important to touch upon the opportunity I was given to bridge the gap of permissible behaviour of staff and visitors in order enquire about new modes of spatial relating. It is equally essential to think about the differences of allowances across museum staff and visitors within an investigation of the role that the museum, as a site, plays in this thesis.

Not every museum has the same rules for behaviour or possibilities for bending those rules. For example, one evening at Raven Row there was a panel discussion with Yvonne Rainer, alongside Catherine Wood, the show's curator, and Marin Hargreaves, who organised the performances. On that evening, there was a very long cue in front of the museum to get into the free, but ticketed, event that had been over-subscribed with many more people hoping to get a seat. The museum's director, Alex Sainsbury, decided at the last minute to let everyone, who arrived for the event, into the space to hear it. This meant that the room was over capacity to the extent that people were sitting right up next to the speakers, on stairwells, and in windowsill of the picture window that opened to the street. Certainly, this event, overly filled, would have not been permitted at other museums due to more strictly enforced rules of health and safety. At Tate the rules seem to be governed more tightly. The larger scale, public-private museums, with their guards and security, are more closely

controlled. In the case of Tate, it was the non-public spaces, the staff areas that were, although less physically guarded, just as coded. My point with this chapter is that the dance artist in the museum might help in shifting and questioning those codes.

How might these enforced or broken rules of public space and behaviour affect the potentiality of encounter, exchange, and relations? My residency worked to seek answers to that question and to uncover ways that the presence of the dancer and movement might open up additional ways of being in the museum and test those codes of behaviour. This speaks back to the notion of permission as discussed in the previous chapters. Arguing that the museum creates an 'institution of division' Tony Bennett (1995) makes a point that such division is often between the producers and consumers of knowledge that is supported by an architectural form. This form supports, as he claims, a separation between the private or 'hidden' spaces of the museum, where knowledge is produced, and the more public spaces where art is consumed by viewers.

As a dance artist working in the museum, access is often given to both public and non-public spaces. This access was true for the first two case studies as well as for this one at Tate. However, my access to spaces at Raven Row included the galleries and the private apartment in the museum, where I stayed for a period. At the Van Abbe the access was granted to the museum's public site but only to staff spaces when accompanied by a staff member. At Tate, I had more access to enter and exit spaces, moving freely between staff and public sites through the use of an electronic key. What I witnessed, as someone who had access to both public and non-public spaces, was that my movements, my physical positionings across the different spaces had different resonances and my interactions were mainly with staff. I will touch on this further in this chapter, but first I want to discuss my experiences in relation to what Bennett points out. Bennett's suggestion that there is a division between knowledge production and knowledge consumption aided by the architecture of the museum causes me to pause and ask: What kinds of movements and activities within the museum are supported or suppressed as well as seen and unseen depending on the structure of the museum? What allowances are made (or not made) for staff, museum visitors, guest resident artists, and researchers in positioning their bodies in the spaces of the museum in consideration of the built environment, including furniture, or other devices meant to be engaged with?

Following is a section on the people in the museum as a way to discuss how working with the staff of the museum opened up new modes of thinking about the role dance can play, and, after that, I will focus on the concept of moving in the museum and how particular physical experiences and ways of moving prompted both a breaking of the museum's behavioural coding and made evident the ways that the dance artist can impact the museum as a site of interaction. My interest, again is in the dance artist who enters and inhabits the museum, not to inject something more engaging, participatory or performance-like, but, rather, in a quiet, unassuming way to acknowledge the relations already at play in the museum and to work within those, to bring forward their potential along with new opportunities of being and relating on site.

## People in the Museum

The museum is more than its bricks and mortar. What is a building if not the specifics of space and the people who move through it? A monumental Brutalist piece of architecture, Tate is made up of the people that come to it and work within it. These people include, not only trained staff, curators, and intellectuals in the museum but also those people who serve the museum, from security personnel to front-of-house staff. The museum is a complex social space that the dance artist can navigate and make sense of. Tate is an example of such a museum. Tate is a blueprint for thinking about the ubiquity of the changing museum. Where the first case study demonstrated what the detached dance artist allowed the dancers and audience to do in terms of spatial relating and the second case study proved what the dance artist, in her absence, could prompt audiences and museum staff to do in furthering spatial relations, this chapter makes a final and essential case for what the dance artist allows and encourages the museum to do. It allows and encourages it to change.

Working with Tate, through my residency, came about because of my professional connections with particular staff of the museum. These relations had developed over time and through research projects in which I was an invited guest artist and researcher. It has been the Learning and Research areas of Tate where I have had most of my experiences and where my residency was housed. I have, however, crossed over into curation and collections

through my experiences as a dance artist and in working with Tate curator Catherine Wood as part of the Raven Row exhibition and, as well, with Pip Laurenson, Tate Head of Collections Care Research[85], through *Performing the Collective*, which will be described below and can be read in my *Appendix* at the end of this thesis. The professional connections I have had with Tate, prior to my residency and through my ongoing professional practice, have evolved into a long-term relationship with Tate and some of the people who work there. This relationship has allowed for both an unfolding of my understanding of Tate's values (mainly, through the Learning and Research streams) and for engaging in thinking about how the values in my practice align with those of certain departments the institution. My history of working with Tate Learning since 2012[86] and specifically with Dr Emily Pringle, Head of Research[87] at Tate Modern and Tate Britain, include my role as guest artist on the project *Performing the Collective: A research network examining emerging practice for collecting and conserving performance-based art* (2014). The aim of this project was to de-stabilise core assumptions about the nature of collections and, in particular, the nature of acquired performances in the collections. Although not directly connected to it, the event took place the year *These Associations* (2012) by Tino Sehgal was presented in the Turbine Hall as Tate's first live commission in *The Unilever Series*. Another project at Tate that I was a part of was *The Experience and Value of Live Art: What can making and editing film tell us?* an Arts and Humanities Research in the Arts (AHRC) funded project co-led by Pringle and Dr Pat Thomson, Professor of Education at The University of Nottingham. The project's aim was to bring together a group of young people (age 16-25), some of whom were part of *Tate Collective*, who participate in curatorial activities at Tate and some from outside of that group, to engage with contemporary artists in workshop contexts so as to participate directly with practice and

[85] However, I feel that my research has been best supported through Learning and Research.

[86] I was brought on as a guest artist and collaborator. I worked with the group of young people, museum learning experts, and academics involved in the project in the Clore studio at Tate for five consecutive days at the start of the three-year project. I was invited to work with them on the choreographic process of *Trio A* by Rainer (as described in chapter one of this thesis). In this case, because the body is the material of dance practice, we (including the researchers together with the young people and myself) began each day with a movement practice employing easy-to-follow and to remember repetitive movement sequences done across the floor, forward and back as one large group and to music. Each day was documented through video by filmmaker Camilla Robinson and then used, as material for making, by the young people as a way to feedback their impressions, thoughts and insights into performance practices.

[87] This is a new title (since 2020) for Pringle. While I was in residency her title was Head of Learning Practice and Research Tate, and by the end of my writing this thesis had implemented a research strand that focused on practice as research across Learning and Collections and Care.

experience through critical, creative, and reflective artistic processes for themselves. Lastly, I held the position of *Associate: Curation and Young People* at Tate St Ives in 2015 where I worked, again, with the *Tate Collective* to co-create a performance work called *Drift* for the site.

These kinds of professional relations through the Learning, Research, and Curation teams at Tate have led to the more recent residency opportunity that is the context for this case study and provided a sense of support and belief in my research enquiries at the museum. It is somewhat of a happy accident that my residency then took place at Tate. That residency happened because of my ongoing professional relations with particular Tate staff, such as Pringle, and my history with the organization through research projects since 2012 as well as my reputation as a successful international artist. Despite the scale of Tate as an entity, these kinds of professional relations within the institution are what make the museum both a social space and a web of relations in that took place in and through it and, as I will argue later, in which my practice and social, spatial, and relational skill set as a movement practitioner played a significant part.

## Movement in the Museum

My residency at Tate Modern provided the opportunity for me to explore how my physical presence might bring about an understanding of the potential for change in the museum through the presence of the dancer. The open movement practice in the studio initiated my thinking about what dance as relation is and what it can be in the museum. I was interested to test what moving together in a non-public space might offer up for those involved, including myself, in terms of a bodily presence. I was also interested in how a bodily presence might be carried with us out into the spaces of the museum that we inhabit through working, researching and resting there. This bodily presence was something I was interested in exploring in term of its role in fostering connections and new ways of interacting in the museum. There was no expectation that the movement practice would becoming a performance or shared event. In this way the practice of moving together in the museum spoke to my interest in the shared practice of doing dance in the museum in a non-public facing way, unseen by the museum visitors. I was interested in what moving together with

staff in a studio away from the public before opening hours might contribute to the idea of dance in the museum as a relational, site-based practice. It was an opportunity to include, for the first time in my research, the behind-the-scenes, less spectacular, non-public spaces of the museum as sites for dance and for relating. My experience at Tate has suggested to me that there is something worth investigating in the movements and positionings of, not only the dance artist, but also of the museum staff. As my previous case study focused on the museum visitor, this chapter focuses on its' workers. In a journal entry I made regarding the way moving might shift the dynamics in the room and between people. I write,

> I am moving with someone who is in a different and more senior position of power than I am in the institute. As we move, things shift and open and loosen in the space and in our conversation. We sometimes talk while moving and the more we move the more open and flowing the conversation. Moving and being present with others in the studio is a reminder of how pliable, open, and flexible dance artists can be and, therefore, how pliable, open and flexible the conversation while moving might become (Journal entry, Feb 15, 2015).

My interest in collective movement as a means to foster a levelling of hierarchy in the museum began with the *Experience and Value of Live Art* (2014) project at Tate where I invited young people, Tate staff, academics, artists (including myself) to take part in a collective, daily warm-up. It was after that 2014 project that Pringle pointed out the sociality that emerged from doing the warmup. We were all, I would say, in it together, getting through the movement sequences day in and day out. The influences of that project on my residency have become clear in my writing this thesis. In my 2017 residency, open movement practice felt like the next step in that inquiry into sociality as relational potential and, to some extent, as contributor to a levelling of the power structure creating a more horizontal rather than vertical hierarchy. I was, to some degree, striving to re-create that horizontality in the Clore studio in the mornings as part of my residency. As Hunter pointed out, this experience may not have, to the degree it did for the previous project, been as apparent, but there was nevertheless an effect on moving together and on the experiences of relation produced.

Tate Learning staff member and participant in the morning movement practice, Helena Hunter, commented in an interview on October 22, 2018, that while moving, she could 'occupy the space' as she 'occupied her own body'. While stretching (the body) and playing with space, she could feel the 'limits of the walls, the limit of her body'. It was, as she said, a 'different sense of presence', of 'being with space'. This 'being with space', that was made possible for Hunter through a moving of the body and an 'occupying' of the space, suggests that there are relations with site and self that emerged for her. The beingness (within space and body) seems to be about living inside and inhabiting a body and a site. What Hunter suggests is that, for her, an opportunity to occupy the space as well as her own body was very much a part of the experience of presence. This relation to self and to site (or the space of the studio in the museum) is part of the realm of relation that I have been exploring in my thesis. Theories of relation between body and space mentioned earlier in this thesis are a reminder, here again, that space is experienced through the body as 'feltspace' (Soja, 1996) and people have the ability to sense others and their spatial relationships, but that is affected by the spatial context of the built environment (Whyte, 1980). The idea of 'being with space' reflects the relation between oneself and a site that is relational. Hunter also recognized the results of such experiences as affecting, as she said, 'how I go about my day, how I communicate'. This moving the body, with others and with space, led her to feel an effect on her daily interactions with others. It brings to mind the question: How might moving together in the space of the museum, before opening hours, offer a more individual experience of moving through one's day in the museum and as staff?

In my question more directly to Hunter, I asked what might emerge from this moving together as we depart into our individual time in the museum. She commented, that she thought 'it created a different space'. As I am very interested in this different space I asked for her to explain further. She responded by sharing that she noticed a shift in the experiences of her workday following the group movement practice. She says, there was a 'shift into the normal day' and said it felt 'different' after having moved her body. Although it is difficult to decipher what 'different' might mean exactly, it does suggest a shift in the way Hunter experienced space and her relationship to it. The experience that Hunter had of having a feeling of 'being with space' that, in turn, offered her a different sense of presence in the museum is key to my research.

As stated in the introduction of this chapter, I also implemented some of the re-positionings from the previous case study, *Punt.Point,* on my own at Tate and, on occasions, with invited professional dance artists and researchers as guests who joined me in one-to-one. These people included my Feldenkrais teacher, Fiona Wright, my Director of Studies (at that time) Dr Natalie Garrett-Brown, and on one occasion a group of dance students from Roehampton University along with Professor Martin Hargreaves and Professor Erica Stanton. Rather than having the re-positions on offer for others, as was the case with *Punt.Point*, I took them up myself. In this way, I began to better understand, on an experiential and embodied-level, what the role or relation of site, in particular spaces in Tate, play and contribute to the idea of the social, relational through acts of re-positioning myself physically in the museum. It was a reminder of the relevance of embodied practice over imagined ideas in the understanding of how movement and action in the museum operate. In my journal of my experiences I wrote, 'I sit, back against the pillar, feet facing along the downward slope of the floor'. I am less interested in looking at or observing others and more interested in sensing my body in relation to space, others and self' (Journal Entry, February 21, 2017). I chose to enact the re-positions myself across various spaces of the museum in order to put myself into my own practice in order to experience a kind of presence within my practice in the museum. I felt compelled to be inside of my own work, to inhabit some of the positions I prompted visitors to take there and, now, at Tate, as a way of better understanding how my own embodied experience in my work could inform my interests in the idea of the present dance artist and her role within the larger human infrastructure of the museum – not as a separate entity to it. Might this re-positioning suggest not only a challenge to codes of behaviour (as *Punt.Point* did) but, also, to becoming part of the human ecology of the museum? By engaging and participating in the museum, I was able to inhabit the museum through a physical presence and draw conclusions as to the different options available to the relational dance artist in the museum[88]. The actions I initiated in the spaces of Tate were directly influenced

[88]At the same time as this practice is taking place, it would have been interesting (although this idea only gained momentum through hindsight and reflection) to have set up some form of communication between my solo explorations at Tate with the re-positions and those visitors and staff at Van Abbe. Although, the insight may have come through my data collection where I discovered how the written instructions, notes, and responses from the visitors to the Van Abbe became indirect prompts and suggestions for me and as a nudge to step inside of my own project and to shift perspective of the do-er of my own project.

by the re-positions proposed to museum visitors at Van Abbe, as discussed in the previous chapter. The open movement activities with Tate staff created a space to investigate moving together and connection through movement. My solo explorations of moving from vertical to horizontal were more about exploring my own presence in the site. At the end of my residency, I presented my research findings to the Tate staff along with invited guests. All of these opportunities produced through the dance artist's presence became part of, and had potential effects, upon what I will later explain as the human infrastructure and ecology of the museum. For the sake of my interests in this thesis, it is the social draw of the museum that I am most interested in engaging with in making my case for dance being, not only an art form that comes into the museum or a tool for relating, but a relational component of the larger workings of the museum and a contributing factor to its change and its policies.

As part of this exploration, I did not use the pouch from *Punt.Point* as a prop/object, nor did I wear my Tate badge[89]. I wanted to see what it felt like to be a part of the human movement of the museum without calling attention to myself, while at times taking on positions such as reclining, relaxing, and resting in both the public and non-public spaces when needed which may or may not be considered outside of the expected behaviour in the museum. What I learned during my residency was that, as in the *Punt.Point* project, taking on positions of the body not necessarily recognisable in certain spaces of the museum can be instigators of conversation, exchange, and potential change in how the museum considers itself as a space of interaction. As an example, at one point during my residency I took the liberty to lay down and have a short nap on a small sofa in the Tate Learning staff office. What I was proposing to Van Abbe's publics to do was to position themselves laying down on the floors in the museum's public gallery spaces as I was doing, but, on the sofa[90] within one of the Learning staff offices at Tate which was a loudly visible position in that context. The choice to position myself there, at that time, was because I felt a need not to intervene, but to rest. As a dance artist sensitive to the effects of dancing, walking, and standing on concrete floors of museums opposed to the more pliable, breathable, softer support of wooden floors in

[89] I did carry my 'FOB' access key in order to move between the public and non-public spaces of the museum when needed.
[90] I also positioned myself on the furniture in the staff canteen.

dance studios, the spaces of Tate challenged me physically. In responding to my need to take care of my body, to rest horizontally, I raised curiosity and some level concern. In re-positioning myself there I was a catalyst for three Tate Learning staff to refer to it at different times in my residency. One staff member, in seeing me laying on the sofa remarked, as I got up to leave, that I must be the dance artist in residence that she heard about. She and the two other Tate Learning staff, after one of the movement sessions, all remarked that no one, in their time at Tate, had ever positioned themselves horizontally on the sofa to nap or rest, not even during lunch breaks. It is something each of them had pondered but had not done. This example sheds light on the permission dance artists and temporary guest artists and researchers have in the museum. This permission is not necessarily extended for the visitors and staff and it illuminates the abilities of the dance artist to open up spaces of bodily re-positioning, of care, and because of that opening up conversational and relational platforms in those spaces. I enquired further about these responses with Hunter who answered my question about my act of laying down as an alternative gesture in the staff spaces of Tate by saying,

> Absolutely, because everyone is working there very hard and busily typing away at their computer just trying to get something done. And then one looks over and there is someone who has the audacity to be lying down and napping (laughter)! So, it is almost an irreverent act in a space where, I guess, productivity and work are the norm. I am sure in different office spaces and cultures that [napping] is encouraged. People have little sleeping pods and things like this. But, certainly, napping and resting is not part of the work culture here. So, when you see someone lying down you think, 'Wow' (interview October 22, 2018).

Such responses call up questions for me as to what the culture of dance, that values care for the body, of adjusting to space, of taking liberties to re-position the body, and, also, to feel a sense of comfort around others in order to offer the culture of not only relation but, also of work, at Tate. How might the dance artist introduce a way of being in the museum that puts the body first not only for visitors but for staff, as well? By putting the body first certain relational opportunities come forth due to the fact that we all share bodily experiences , such as fatigue, that we can identify with and share with each other through more empathetic space and approaches to being in the museum whether as visitor or as staff. My interest in

dance as relation in the museum includes the potential for dance to shift the museum's workings or day-to-day human infrastructure. This expansion of my concern for dance in the museum is supported, again, by Hunter's discussion of the kinds of experiences that emerged for her after the movement practice that I offered, as well as how she implemented those into her everyday experience in the museum. She shared with me an important part of her experience of engaging some of the warm-ups from my movement practice into her role as Learning staff at Tate. She explains,

> There was a lot of change happening within the *Learning Research Center* team when Emily [Pringle] was away and we had a new member of staff coming in. There was a different dynamic and with change there are always things to be re-negotiated and different ways of working. We used to have these *Team Meetings* where we came together to share our different ways of working. I think we would have a busy, stressful time and then one of these meetings we were in the Taylor digital studio – a really creative space the way it has been designed – it has some cushions, its digital, it has access to these projectors, a bit more of a dynamic space. I was talking with people and I asked if we should do a warm-up and kind of chill out, calm down. And I think we were all, like, 'yeah let's try this out'. And we did it and we all felt a lot calmer and we went about the meeting. Everyone was chilled out, talking a bit more openly, a bit more relaxed. And then the next time we had a meeting, I think Becky did some kind of breathing, yoga routine which was really nice. So, I guess these acted in a way to bring people together, as you were saying, horizontalise a bit. Create a space of calm and connectivity.

This story shared by Hunter provides evidence for dance (and in relation to site) as playing a role in the museum's ecology and its potential to shift the workigns of the human infrastructure. Her proposal of putting the warm-up experiences to use within a staff meeting, and as learned through the open movement practice I put on offer, shifted the dynamics in the room and created a different kind of relating. This example is in support of my wholistic argument that dance is a relational, site-based practice that, as is being made clear, an impactful presence on the operations of the museum at staff-level and, therefore, a part of the greater human ecology of the museum that has the potential to insight change in the way things are done.

Hunter refers below to the language I use when I instruct the movement practice and that I employed in the open movement practice at Tate. In my movement practice, or class, I say things such as, 'extend to the corner of the room with your arm but sense how your arm is an extension of your heart centre', or, 'I invite you to walk through the room and keep a gentle gaze so that you do not look directly at someone but, rather, sense into your own body as you share the space with others'. This language offers ways of relating to self, site, and others, and is not a language used by the staff in their meetings or in other work-related spaces at Tate. It is also a language that embraces equality and difference in that it suggests a collective action yet leaves open the way the movement is done, how it looks, or gets translated. The focus was on individuals responding to the prompts without an emphasize on what it looked like. There were also no mirrors in the Clore studio for us to see ourselves, and, as I was moving with the group, I was not stopping to look at them to make any judgements on how they were moving. I did keep an eye out for any issues that might arise, but I did not approach the movement exercises with the intention of making sure they were done 'right'. My intention was to offer prompts, suggestions, and a guide to follow that provided enough space for interpretation and individual responses. Hunter points out that, 'The language that you [in reference to me, the dance artist] use, the mode that you use, how you operate within the institution allows people to have access to that space and to feel that it is inclusive. Creating a space where things feel a bit more horizontal'. When I asked Hunter if she thinks that part of the shift in the social for her was due to a levelling of hierarchy in the room as we moved collectively as individuals together, she replied, 'I can imagine if you did have that it would be on a bigger scale with senior management and people in the bookshop and learning and all different hierarchies or positions. I guess it is just getting people there and how that is communicated to people across the institution'. Hunter touches on what may have been an area where outreach did not do what I thought it might do, which was to bring in a wider arena of museum staff across the institution. There was something about my movement offer being hosted by Learning and in one of their spaces that drew, primarily, those from that department although, at times, other staff members would pass by the transparent door of the Clore studio, peak their heads in and, once, sing along to the music. There was, in this case, a sharing of the practice beyond the walls of the studio as it spilled out audibly into the outside hallway of the museum. In this way, I was opening up my movement practice for those who attended, but it also had resonance for some Tate staff who happened to pass by

on their way into work. There are two points that Hunter makes about the human infrastructure that are important to this chapter: One, she refers to the way that moving together, in the meeting as a warm up, changed the environment in that, 'everyone was chilled out, talking a bit more openly, a bit more relaxed' and; Two, the kind of space where the meeting was held, the Taylor studio, was a 'creative space' in its design. It had cushions and was, '[a] bit more of a dynamic space'. What Hunter is saying is that both the movement warm up and the space, being dynamic, shifted the group dynamic. The movement *and* the space made that shift possible. Therein she feeds into my argument that the site of the museum *and* the presence of movement, are part of the process of co-creating a situation in relation. In this case it was the more creative and flexible space that mattered. This is a reminder that there is an ecological situation between self, others, and site that create conditions that are relational and affective.

My approach to the presence of the dancer in the museum through opening my movement practice and moving through the museum differs from, again, that of dance artist Boris Charmatz, the highly visible and central figure[91] staged *If Tate Modern was Musee de la Danse* (2015) project at Tate. The museum describes the project in its marketing campaign[92], as Charmatz 'taking-over' the museum for a weekend. This three-day 'take-over' began with a mass public 'warm-up' held in the very public and free-to-enter Turbine Hall at Tate. Over one-hundred visitors attended and took part. This open and public warm-up consisted of Charmatz in the centre of the hall, wearing a clip-on microphone, surrounded by a large group of museum visitors. As he gave audibly projected instructions, people moved and tried to make sense of his warm-up through their own bodily movements. This centred position of the dance artist, the disconnect between his spoken voice and his voice being projected over the speaker system, in addition to the large number of people, created more of a spectacle

[91] Charmatz is well-known in the international dance world for significantly renaming a whole choreographic centre (in Rennes, France) as *Museée de la Danse*. Therefore, his political presence as a dance artist who 'takes over' and, even, renames cultural institutions as a museum of dance was reflected in the weight of his being at Tate. His name now carries a certain cultural capital in which, my presence at Tate – despite my own and international reputation as a dance artist – did not garner the same level of cultural capital. Such capital is not, however, relevant to the kinds of research questions I was asking at Tate, nor conducive for the outcomes I was hoping to have there.

[92] https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/performance-at-tate/case-studies/musee-de-la-danse

of a performed warm-up rather than a warm-up itself. The purpose of Charmatz's movement activity was to offer an experience to the large audience at Tate in a participatory way. What was missing was the relational potential that my research addresses and that may require the dance artist to take a different position within the event – one less centralised and celebrated. Staging a large-scale public event that turns the dance artist into a gazed upon central figure – as was the case with *The Artist is Present* by Marina Abramović discussed earlier in my thesis – and the museum visitor into spectator of that figure whilst trying to mimic his moves within a crowd is a very different kind of presence of the dance artist models that I want to suggest as best practices. Although spectacular approaches are valid and important to the overall palette of options for how to do dance in the museum, there is at the other end of the spectrum, the dance artist who more gently, quietly, and unspectacularly moves with and alongside museum staff in a studio, before opening hours. By sharing my dance practice away from an audience, I weave myself into the museum, not as a star artist, but as a collaborating entity skilled in cohabitating with others, the site, and with myself. This approach to dance in the museum is important, particularly when compared to the approach taken by Charmatz, in that it recognizes both the abilities and knowledge of the dance artist *and also* her soft skills of communicating, empathising with site, self, and others as part of the fabric of relations that make up the museum. To further clarify and conclude, the main difference between what Charmatz was doing at Tate and what I was doing there has to do with the *how*. His was one of an artist-centric and highly-marketed event that, although has an effect on the museum, does not recognise or exercise a relational potentiality of dance as a quality of being together that is not dependent on such a display.

This consideration of what distinguishes a warm-up, and my open offer for a staff-only morning movement experience as performance, from a 'take-over' of the museum helps to clarify that my intention of practicing at Tate was not to perform, or to use my practice/research as an interventionist tool, but to simply inhabit a space with others in an attempt to try out what being present might look and feel like as a collectively embedded practice. I do not *insert* my presence as a dance practice into the museum. I approach integrating with the museum in a way that expands and experiments with the idea of what dance is, what my role as a dance artist is, and what these qualities and presences can be in the museum going forward.

The museum, itself, is a functioning institution where people work and others visit. In order to re-position (again) dance as a form of relational presence, we must first ask what kinds of positions (physically, socially and politically) the dance artist takes and what resonates from those positions (and the spaces she is in) that might allow for, produce, and support a new-found experience of dance in the museum that produces creative, inclusive, and sustainable relations. By doing so, we must also suspend our assumptions of what dance looks and feels like in the museum and, in turn, what new roles the dance artist might play in bringing this discovery forward. What I am advocating is a different kind of role for the dance artist within the human ecology of the museum. That role is not about status but, rather, about equality that celebrates a flattening of hierarchical curves. How does such a celebration within the human ecology of the museum begin? Might the dance artist play a role as part of the human ecology of the museum in helping to answer this question?

## Dance Artist as Part of the Human Ecology of the Museum

As this chapter moves the thesis towards its conclusion, I consider an example of the way the dance artist, as part of the human make-up of the museum, offers to re-thinking and re-positioning of systems of communication, interaction, and exchange. I look to complicate assumptions about the usual way of moving in the museum and the expected roles and interactions within it. In this way we bring dance and the dance artist into a discussion of the overall human ecology of the museum in order to discuss its relevance there. In my work, I seek ways of highlighting and prompting an embodied awareness of our physical and imagined position within cultural institutions as an infrastructural element. Helpful to this thinking is how Catherine Wood speaks about artists working to find their position in the museum and their part in shaping it. She says,

> Obviously, there are and have been other works [besides *Musée de la Danse*] in the museum and other artists that have been in our programme, like Tino Sehgal and Roman Ondak, and others who have worked with institutional critique on the question of human infrastructure of the museum. These artists have made choreographed interventions into it in ways that highlight it as being as important as the

> architectural structure that we always refer to in visual art: the white cube and the wall, the plinth and all those aspects of support (Wood in Wookey 2015: 28).

I agree with Wood that the human infrastructure is important, if not more so than the architecture of the museum in terms of the experiential, human-to-human relational moment. The architecture of the museum can play a role in the human experiences, relational potential, and infrastructural production, as has been argued in this thesis. However, I am less interested in an institutional critique that produces a product and more interested in the physical, human cohabitation of the museum as a practice. I am interested in the presence of the dance artist, an interlocutor, a human being present and part of something larger than oneself, larger than the museum itself. What I mean by this is that the dancer contributes to the changing museum in ways that are often not recognised nor made visible but have impact on the evolving institution and on the museum as a civic space, as a social project, and on our contemporary moment at large. Reflecting on this potential scale of effect, Wood comments on how the, 'level of attention to what the body can do and staging interrelationships between people' (Wood in Wookey 2015: 30) is important to the museum and how it is shaped and 'what it [dance and performance] does anthropologically to the structure of the museum' (34). To help ground these larger ideas that include the presence of the dance artist and how she contributes as a moving self and of bodily attention beyond the self/individual and out into the social, spatial assemblage of people there, I turn, again to Giannachi's (2017) interest in a collaborative presence. She refers to a 'co-presence' of being together and ways we inhabit presence collectively. She writes about how '[p]resence is the medium through which a subject engages with an environment (52) and makes a case for its presence as a 'relational tool' rather than how humans construct presence within a digital world' (52). Suggesting that presence is '[n]ot necessarily something in front of or before a subject but that it is inter-related and a means of networking or being a part of a network' (52). Giannachi confirms, again, for me that the dancer is both capable of imagining relations that are interconnected across space (as was exemplified in the opening quote of Rethorst in the introduction to this thesis) and of creating relations in real time and physical space (as described in the previous case studies) and that these skills are important to relation. This mapping and networked relating is also a part of the qualities that belong to the dance artist

and are what positions her as a catalyst not only for new forms of dance in the museum but as ways of being together in and as part of the museum contributing to an emerging museum and how the people in it behave, work, and relate.

As I align with the theories of Giannachi other discussions of presence and ideas form dance theorists, such as, Andre Lepecki (2004), emerge, challenge, and also support my own theories. For example, Lepecki looks to '[i]nvestigate how dance critically reconstitutes social practices while at the same time proposing ever renewed theories of body and presence' (1). I might suggest replacing the word 'body' in the above statement with the word 'being' as my interest, more precisely, is in beingness that can exist with or, in some cases, without the physical presence of the body of the dance artist who, even when she is not physically present, can leave behind a prompt, a trace, a way of being that can be picked up and practiced in the museum. Unlike Lepecki, and perhaps more like Giannachi, my research claims that presence is not dependent on the physical body but more so on the qualities or skill set of the dance artist. As we have learned through the previous case studies, the skills of the dancer can be transferred in an object that is left behind as a means to engage a presence of relation. However, in this case study what has emerged is that the dance artist, through her physical presence in the museum, brings about a mode of being with others as a way of *also* being part of the human fabric of the museum through and across time and with access to spaces in a way that being physically absent might not[93]. The museum is a networked environment in which the dance artist plays a part in shaping.

This thinking asks both the dance artist *and* the museum to re-consider presence as an inter-dependency in which the person and the environment produce relation. The dance artist is part of the network of the museum in a way that makes it difficult to separate her from it. Therefore, dance in the museum cannot be simply something to look at, engage with, or participate in but rather as part of a complex network of human activity called relation. This puts dance into a place for further consideration as having agency in the museum, not only as an inserted or interventionist element, but, as this thesis is concerned, as an important

[93] This somewhat new, emerging thought is worth researching further but is, for now, contained within the scope of this chapter and by the point I am making here.

element and valuable participant in the making of the museum. The participation of the dance artist serves as an essential relational element in and *with* the museum. Again, I look to Giannachi who claims that, '[w]hilst environments may be closed entities, in the sense that they are subjective, they are nevertheless open to change' (51). This openness to change makes possible transformations of museums as social and spatial environments and for the artist to collaborate within that. The dance artist, through her approaches of attention, is an instigator of change to the human ecology of the museum in that she introduces new behaviours and ways of positioning the body in relation to site, self, and other. She provides a consideration of social hierarchies within the museum that play out spatially in terms of access, action, and behaviours. From that providing for, that being there, findings arose during my residency at Tate where I moved through the museum in different capacities to better understand what the presence of the dance artist in the museum might mean.

## The Future Project of the Museum

This final case study represents a shift in the trajectory of my previous case studies in that, at Tate, there was a significant move from interests in a performed dance for a seated audience (in case study one) and a more interventionist strategy (in case study two) towards a quiet, unassuming, and more integrated embedding of dance in the museum. The present dance artist, in this case study, made a return to the museum and stepped into presence as a form of cohabitating the space that included both a detached and absent quality. She invited museum staff to move with her whilst also moving on her own in the museum as a way to embody previous prompts in her practice of re-positioning oneself. In this case, she took up her own offer and folded herself into the everyday fabric of the museum rather than as an artist to be drawn out as separate to others, to be seen performing, or to be expected to produce. She is simply in the museum, attending to her own presence there and noting its effect. Here is where the dance artist further investigated her experience of being a dance artist in the museum as a way forward. It was in the physical return or presence of the dance artist in the live sense at Tate – rather than the cool detached performing dance artist at Raven Row or the physically absent one at Van Abbe – where we understood the nature of dance as relation in new ways.

This chapter, as the final case study, has supported the grand gesture of this thesis of how dance is in the museum and, thus far, has provided evidence of dance as a relational practice that brings about spatial relations and change. There has also been a focus on how the museum context collaborates with the relational practices of the dance artist and helps shape experiences for the dance artist, the museum staff, and visitors. Both of the former case studies have led to this logical third case study where the dance artist returns to the museum and steps into her own practice to explore ways of being present as a dance artist, researcher, and public. Finally, we have come to learn that presence is a container for both detachment and absence and that the dance artist's presence – in all ways – holds influence on the ontology, not only of relations, but of the museum itself. At a time when the social potential of the museum is so predominant, a critical questioning of the conditions surrounding how we dwell, interact, and move through museum spaces feels pertinent and necessary[94]. These cultural shifts are integrally related to our daily lives and they call into question the nature of contemporary public space. In this chapter, I clarified my purpose which was to present a study of the dance artist who moves through the museum, connecting across space with others, and, in particular museums staff, while navigating her own physical presence and connection with the overall human ecology of the museum. What has emerged through this study is that the dance artist in the museum offers social-spatial ways to both physically and imaginatively sense spatial relations. I then moved on to discuss my relations with Tate, how the case study came about and what informed it. I articulated the residency context and what the passport to spaces of the museum offered in terms of access to public and non-public spaces. The discussion of the open movement practice and investigations of re-positioning myself in the museum led to further clarity on the human infrastructure, or ecology, of the museum and what qualities the dance artist offers to that ecology. The purpose of my focus on the human infrastructure in this chapter was to make the case that the dance artist is part of that larger ecology. As the dance artist engages practices that are open and transferable to the museum, she tests allowances and offers another way of inhabiting space and experiences of beingness in order to challenge and further complicate what the presence of the dance artist might mean as well as the future mission of the

[94] In the midst of social upheaval in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the *Black Lives Matter* movement in the UK and globally, this is a moment to critically reflect on the purpose of museums and its role in society.

museum. What is different now is that we understand dance not as a container or a representation for relation or even, as, I argued for at the beginning of my thesis, a relational site-based practice. Dance is a quality of being together, and that quality *is* relation. Dance *is* relation. Yet dance cannot function as relation without the skill sets of the dance artist – whether she is dancing, co-creating, or simply biding her time in the museum – and her collaboration with the museum as a site and with the people in it. If we turn towards such approaches, we begin to make sense of how the resulting relational aspects of each case study project, and, in particular, this last one was made possible because of dance's (and the museum's) relational qualities and potentialities.

Dance is not a stand in for relation, it simply is relation. The museum is not a shell to house artworks, it is a space for gathering, for experiencing art, and for being together. Taking a step further we can surmise that dance *as* relation in the museum means that the museum is a series of relational practices within which dance participates. We call it dance in the museum, but what I am now proposing is that the relational is the activity, the event, the experience of the dance and the museum being the project. Dance *as* relation means that dance is not necessarily a *thing* but a *quality of being*, of relating. To take that thought even further, it is the dancer's (and others') relationship to dance itself, to the self who is seeing, doing, and being that is relation. It is what dance communicates for itself. What dance communicates *is* a being in relation. What dance as relation and the museum as project offers is an opportunity to explore spatial and temporal relations in the museum to the extent that, as a practice, it can shift the workings of the museum as a relational site introducing new ways of being together, with a shift towards more equitable engagement within civic spaces. New information and experiences come into the ecological make-up of the institution and change occurs. What dance as relation does is to suggest particular embodied practices as ways of relating, that may or may not depend on the physical presence of the dance artist. The offering up of a complex presence of the dancer in the museum, her qualities of attention, of attending to, and abiding in and with the museum embeds her practice within the collection of individual people in the museum who are also helping to shape and move the museum towards being a more just and sustainable site for cohabiting.

In order to produce relation and to set aside assumed notions currently at play within the museum, this final case study made clear that dance in the museum is more than we currently understand it to be. It moved dance in the museum beyond a problem to contend with or something to fit into museum agenda and towards dance as a quality in and of itself. A quality of relating that the dance artist brings to an otherwise visually focused environment. It was no longer about seeing or doing, but about being. Given the context of my thesis, this quality of being, as we have learned, is one of relations – of bringing to life the ecological nature of the museum as a potential landscape of change. Change, in this chapter, was about how we relate, who has access to what spaces, and what spatial relations might tell us about the museum and its potential to be a space for social and relational evolution. This chapter is not simply about one museum. Tate is an example of a museum, a place to practice the whole museum, yet I can apply what I am arguing about at Tate and argue similarly about Raven Row and Van Abbe or any museum or public space as both would benefit from a dance artist on site navigating and contributing to its greater potential of socio-spatial relational change.

# Conclusion

This thesis's starting point was that dance is a relational and site-based practice in the museum. I argued that relational practice, although a common term applied to the practice of visual artists' who create live performance work for public spaces, in particular in North America, is a less common term for describing dance *as* a practice taking place in public spaces. What my thesis has thus far provided is a new conceptual framework, or lens of relational and site-based context, through which to consider the phenomenon of dance in the museum. By extending or stretching our consideration, thoughts, and understandings of dance as producing relation and the museum as an evolving project, I have contributed perspectives not yet fully realised nor discussed in museum and dance practice-based and theoretical communities.

My research on dance as a relational and site-based practice in the museum began in 2015, one year after the Dance Research Journal's (DRJ) special edition of *Dance in the Museum* was released. In that same year my book, *WHO CARES? Dance in the Gallery & Museum* (2015) went public and the European project *Dancing Museums*[95] began. These publications and event were significant triggers for my inquiry into *how* dance situates itself in the museum, not *why*, and to research other forms of possibility through 3 case studies. Both the DRJ issue and my own published collection of interviews on dance in the museum addressed some, but not all, of the issues I felt needed to be raised at the time and that now, feel ever more pertinent to consider. The issues, among others, raised in those publications included systems of spectatorship and concerns over temporal-spatial conditions of the museum compared to the theatre, single historical narratives that may not recognise the more complex and somewhat fragmented history of dance nor its use of generational transaction and inheritance as part of its legacy, acquisition of ephemeral works of art such

[95] Dancing Museums began as a partnership between five European dance organisations (La Briqueterie - Centre de développement chorégraphique du Val de Marne (FR), Comune di Bassano del Grappa (IT), D.ID Dance Identity (AT), Dansateliers (NL), Siobhan Davies Dance (UK) and the education departments of eight local museums. It is funded by Creative Europe to help define and implement new strategies in dance for audience development and participation in the museum. A second iteration of the project, for which I spoke about earlier in my thesis has begun and will continue until 2021.

as performance, and the notion of curatorial care and care of the body. Although these topics have been insightful to my research, what has emerged in my thesis is a concern for, not only, how dance is presented, acquired, and cared for in the museum but, also and of immediate relevance, how dance, as a relational quality and the spatial conditions of the museum work together to bring about a further potential for dance in the museum that is temporal, affective and a part of the ecological landscape of the museum in order to work towards positive change within the institution that argues for a space of relations not a space of transactions. This sentiment is reflected in a recent interview with the Director of the Manchester Museum, Esme Ward, who is quoted as saying, 'We also want to frame caring as not relating just to collections, but to people, ideas, and relationships' (The Lockdown Interviews 2020). This need for relating as a form of relationship is where dance can help.

Dance has been a part of museum culture for over one hundred years. Even though discourses on dance in the museum, as we now know, have become a regular part of theoretical inquiry over the last twenty years, the conceptual space in which dance in the museum has been excavated for its relational potentiality has been minimal. As I have explored earlier, museums have continually experimented with how to name, contain, collect, present, programme, and discuss dance – including commissioning visual artists to work with dancers to create performances and under the term 'choreography'. The dance community, on the other hand and simultaneously, has disagreed over *why* dance is in the museum, what the museum context *does* for dance and sometimes grapples with terms such as dancer, choreographer, performer, activator, educator, and interventionist to describe the role of the dance artist in the museum. I provided evidence in this thesis of how the museum, dance marketing, and fundraising efforts have defaulted to using the term 'activate' in terms of what dance can do in the museum and turning to museum interests that have often resulted in museums instrumentalising dance, and at times its audiences. The museum, as my thesis points to have also neglected their staff as pertinent voices in the relational development of the museum.

Within the search for another way to articulate what dance and the museum can do in terms of opening up possibilities of relational in the museum and across different areas, there is an opportunity for dance and museum intellectual and professional communities to

more thoroughly explore their wider potentiality. This exploration can begin with examining and making better engagement of dance and employment of the dance artist in the museum. Again, this is where my thesis has stepped in and played a role in the wider debate on dance and museum practices. We need further knowledge on how dance and the museum, as practices, as projects, co-create relations.

The title for my thesis, *Spatial Relations: Dance in the Changing Museum*, suggests that relating is a spatial matter and that the museum, as a site for dancing relations, is changing. What this thesis has taken forward from that title and set out to provide evidence for is not only that the museum is a space for dance but, to turn things around, dance is a site for change in the museum. More specifically and to clarify further, dance *is* the dance artist whose transferable skills emerge relation and the possibility for changing the way we experience the museum – not only as a guest or a foreigner to its spaces, but as an inhabitant who co-exists with others. The essence of this potential is for more interconnected experiences within a more relevant museum that reflects the times we are living in. This way forward for the museum, with the inclusion of dance as a collaborating element, extends out to more equitable spaces in which, as Donna Haraway (2016) might name as a being together as a way to build more liveable futures.

The questions that have guided my research are in what ways might the qualities of dance and the transferable skill set of the dance artist contribute to re-thinking and enacting the museum as a space for people in more equitably engaged spaces and in relation for a better world? As well, how might the qualities[96] of dance or the knowledge of the dance artist

[96] I have moved away, at this point in my thesis, from a discussion of transferable skills towards dance as a relational *quality*. Andre Lepecki's (2016) listing of the qualities of the dance artist are somewhat in-line with, but different, from the ones I have been speaking about in my thesis and for which I make a call for now as a way towards change. His listing of qualities of the dancer include ephemerality, corporeality, precariousness, scoring, performativity, and the performance of affective labor[sic] (14). The kinds of spatial relational skills I am arguing for as useful to our contemporary moment are ones in which help us to relate to self, site, and each other in more meaningful, just, and equitable ways. My particular approach to dance as a practice relating means that qualities such as corporeality are insightful in the way they centre around the body as a means of relating. Within this line of thought, I lean more towards qualities in dance as discussed by Cools (2016) such as agility, collaboration, instinct (see also Melrose, 2017), listening, communication, and spatial awareness that feel more relevant to what has, up to now, been a discussion of application of transfer of skills. Now I conclude that it is the qualities of presence of the dance artist – as dance – and outside of a theatre

help make sense of the challenges of our times and to create opportunity to the museum? A potential answer to the question that has emerged in my thesis is that the role of the dance artist/researcher within the institution can be far more deeply considered and fairly employed for the long-term as she influences not only what dance can be in the museum but how it can impact its institutional change and policy making. The question we are left with in this train of thought and now emerging here, in the thesis, is not *how* is dance in the museum but, rather, how does dance collaborate with the museum (or the people in the museum already) to re-shape what and how the museum is and what it can become – by extending out into our relations with the world, each other, and ourselves. Before I unpack this question, I wish to share a quote that I was reminded of when writing my this concluding chapter and that may add to the consideration I am suggesting.

The quote is by Tim Ingold from his book *Being Alive* (2011) and is a clear reminder of how much our environment shapes our way of being in the world and that, often, the environment of constructed sites (such as museums) have been designed for us. Not only are they designed for us but we too easily accept that we may not or cannot affect our environment through our presence there (in whatever form that takes). Ingold calls upon us to question the contexts of our environments and to be a participant in shaping them as social spaces and through our beingness. He states, 'It appears that people, in their daily lives, merely skim the surface of a world that has been previously mapped out and constructed for them to occupy, rather than contributing through their movements to its ongoing formation' (44). This quote speaks directly to what I have argued all along in this thesis and, more so, to the movements of the dance artist and the agencies that her movements afford in affecting change in our spaces and how we relate.

This deepening interest in and understanding of spatial relation again, points back to Rethorst's experience of spatial relating at the very opening of my thesis and that laid the groundwork for my continued insistence that the dance artist contributes, not only through

---

context and into another one (the museum) that things change. We now have a moving institutional entity in which the qualities of dance, of the presence of the dance artist, can collaborate, take root and grow towards a better future.

her movements but, also and equally important, by the quality of her approach to the world. The approach of the dancer engages both imaginary and the actual ways of spatially relating and contributes to the museum and to society in their ongoing formations. The key to application of such findings, as I arrive at my conclusion, is to develop new and well invested in opportunities for the dance artist that are creative, inclusive, and sustainable so that the qualities of her practice can have greater influence in the museum and where, currently, it is needed the most: in supporting new ways of relating and of change. In these ways my thesis has made the case that embodied practice is attention and relation that sheds light on the workings of the museum *as* a practice, project in and of itself, that needs the dancer.

As we have learned in this thesis museums incorporating dance, funding bodies for dance in the museum and, at times, dance artist's themselves often focus on ways that dance contributes to transactions that, primarily, focus on audiences' experiences. Although, useful in developing knowledge of how dance operates in the museum and what it can offer the museum's visitors I believe there are other modes of attention and focus that have been missed. Those less-focused on facets of dance in the museum is where my thesis has attempted to address, namely with the site of the museum as an effective construct, the under-considered staff of the museum, and the opportunity for the dance artist as a participating figure whose position in the museum opens it up for critical analysis. This reflection of the museum is brought about, in part, through the quality of the dancer's approach and her mode of attention and presence that can affect behaviour and ways of both visiting and working, of being in the museum.

In these ways, my thesis has taken up the question of *how* dance is in the museum, not *why* dance is in the museum. The concern for how dance is in the museum has been addressed in this thesis through presenting three evidentiary scenarios in which the dance artist positioned herself across different methods of approach, progressing from detached, to absent and finally, to present. There are more scenarios but the three examples I have selected offered a chance to reflect on how dance in the museum, up to now, has been contextualised as either performance for an audience to look at or as experience for museum visitors to join in with. What the last case study showed and for which this conclusionary chapter moves forward is that dance as qualities of relating, a practice of being in the project

of the museum. The terms 'engagement' and 'participation' have been widely used terms as defining elements for what dance looks like, does, and is in the museum. What my thesis has proposed is that we re-consider those terms and what they might mean in order to expand our knowledge of dance as a form of spatial relations. Only then, as dance artists, curators, learning experts, dance audiences, museum visitors, and stakeholders of dance in the museum, can we collectively move forward new ways of dancing in and with museums and of making the changes necessary for the way those practices give back to a bettering of society at large. To celebrate the museum as a live, complex system made up of individual people sharing and relating in and across space together.

As has been made the case in my thesis, dance is a mode of relating in the museum and this is made possible through the transferable skills of the dance artist. What we have learned thus far, through the three different evidences, is that dance is a mode of human-to-human connection that, although spatially dependent, does not, however, require the physical presence nor attention of the dancer in order to create relations in, with, and through the space of the museum as well as with one another, and with oneself. Finally, it is the consideration of the museum, as a site with its own social, cultural, and political contexts, that play a collaborating role in effecting the processes, receptions, and possibilities of dance in the museum and the kinds of exchanges it produces: dance's spatial relational quality in collaboration with the museum as its project.

My theoretical offer to the relationality of dance in the practice of the museum is that: One, I applied a relational practice discourse in order to open up the other ways to understand how dance operates and; Two, I insisted that the museum is a site affective to the practice and recipient of dance and therefore made the claim from the start of my thesis that dance in the museum is a site-based practice[97]. Three, the bulk of my thesis was dedicated to evidencing the multiple ways in which the position of the dance artist in the museum, both physically and conceptually, is possible. Those three ways produced multiple sets of relations. As an overview, we experienced the examples of the detached, absent, and present dance

[97] Too often, as was made clear in the thesis, 'site-based' has referred mainly to work produced for outdoor spaces and less so to work made for and with cultural institutions such as museums when discussing dance on site.

artist as a way to discuss the different positions the dance artist can take and their resulting spatial relational results. The relations that emerged were spatial in that they were across and through the spaces of the museum and, in more than one case, extended beyond the wall of the museum. Spatial relations that were made possible by the differing approaches of the dance artist in (or outside of) the museum included connections between the dance artists, between museum visitors and museum staff, as well as with the site of the museum, and with oneself.

My thesis also made a case for the cultural, social, and economic context of three different museums (including private, public and private/public organizations and institutions) in two cultural contexts (British and European) in order to make clear that the museum, as a site, participates in influencing the kinds of relations that emerge through dance's physical, intentional, detachment, absence, and presence in its spaces. Each of the individual museum's architectural features, hospitality approach, design elements, value systems, scale, public and non-public spatial codes of behaviour, and socio-political-economic contexts all affected the kinds of relations made possible through dance. Reflecting back on those differences within each museum across my case studies it is important to remind us, here, how the architectural, cultural, and geographically diverse spaces had impact on the practice of relations through dance that this thesis explored. I therefore looked at the built environment of each museum, including its immediate surroundings that encouraged or discouraged flows of movement, affected interactions, and aided or detracted from spatial and socially inspired exchanges.

Dance is no longer about what the dancer can communicate in her practice to an audience through a dance being performed. Dance is about the dancer's relationship *through* and *with* the space, the site, and *with* other people in that site and, as well, *with* herself. In these ways dance is a quality of being *with*, of being in relation to, even when the dance artist is physically absent. She can be absent because she is capable of leaving a trace of her knowing and, more importantly, extending that to others to engage with and participate in, to be in relation. The qualities of the dance artist are at the centre of this very (new) nature of relationality that I am exploring in my thesis and that supported by its research findings. Below I go in further depth to what each case study provided in terms of the position of the

dancer and the site itself as playing significant roles in the relational potentiality of dance in the museum.

## Research Findings

The case studies began by making evident, through a discussion of *The Detached Dance Artist*, that relation is not necessarily requiring eye-to-eye contact between dancer and audience in the museum. As we have learned the detached quality of performing of the dance artist suggests there are other ways of relating in which the dance artist and audience can be alone together, at ease in the shared space with no expectation, pressurised social interactions, or projections of meaning. In this first case study, letting space be a space of other kinds of relating which can only happen with a kind of at ease, detached position of the artist. In the *Detached Dance Artist* chapter we learned that engagement of dance in the museum does not necessarily mean that the dancer will be either looking at her audience or open to an exchange of communication. What detachment did provide to the interest of dance as a relational and site-based practice in the museum was that the position of being physically present yet remote or removed in stance was due to a kind of bodily attitude of ease, of not extending beyond one's kinesphere. Therefore, to be alone and together, or as the chapter title suggested '(alone) together' holds equal weight. The value of both states: aloneness and togetherness were made evident as valid modes of relating through a kind of non-relating of the dancer to the audience of dance in the museum. Detachment also taught us that a wider spatial relational space is possible when the dance artist is not engaging her attention towards her audience but, rather, allowing space for the capacity of her to connect with other dancers sharing the space with her and for her audience to connect with other audience members in and across the room. While dancing, the dancer relates, through her ever shifting physical positionings to both her own moving body (by deliberately and directly looking at her elbow, a hand, a foot, and other parts as directed by the choreographic instructions) and to those of other dancers. She relates in a spatial way, through the site, and therefore has the capability to move, or physically navigate around the other dancers with her in space but without directly looking at them or interacting with them by eye contact. She spatially relates. She does not 'see' the audience or the other dancers but 'feels' them through space and, by doing so, establishing a spatial relationship. What dance as relation does is

illuminate the presence of relating in which dance does not need to come in to represent, to replace, or stand in for, but that enables, amplifies, and encourages what is already there (relational potential) but requires her getting out of the way in order for it to emerge. This enabling of spatial relating was helped by a re-directed gaze or way of seeing *as* a dancer in the museum that proposed the opportunity and capabilities through which both peripheral, non-direct ways of 'seeing' of people, and a more direct seeing of the site of the museum space, and oneself (one's body) that supports my argument for dance in unexpected and new ways.

What we also learned from *The Detached Dance Artist* study was that the more intimate space of the museum as shaped by its social history (in the case of Raven Row, as a former domestic space) has influence on the relational experience there. In this case it was the sensitively repurposed and architecturally restructured spaces of Raven Row – including the small-scale size of the spaces, the crafted benches, the apartments made available to dancers that were former living quarters, the unexpected cut out window to the outside world from the gallery and, also, the approach of its Director (Alex Sainsbury) to invite, host, and cultivate conviviality in the spaces of Raven Row that all played a part in how the detached dance artist and the dance (*Trio A*) played itself out as an important form of relation in the museum. That form of relation was one of belonging and welcoming despite the detached nature of the dance. This dichotomy made for an interesting tension to the argument of inter-human relations that belongs to dance and has thus made for a jumping off point for the following studies. What led me to the next case study was a developed understanding, as gained from the first case study, that the spatial relations between dancers and between visitors, both in and outside of the Raven Row galleries, was that the detached dance artist could be further explored by the dance artist stepping even further away from performing for an audience and away, from the site of the museum. She could also be physically absent.

This first study in which the dance artist positioned herself between two audiences, revealed that no matter how detached she is, she is a portal for relational potential, in particular – in this case – between audiences. By the dancer stepping away even further in case study two she allows for an ever greater space of connection and, yet, what remains relevant to the trajectory of thought in this thesis is that her skills of spatial relating remains

in the museum even in her absence in order to continue to be a route for relational and spatial conditions to keep evolving.

This space of relating in case study two, *The Absent Dance Artist*, introduced the concept of the 'passport'. The passport invited the museum visitor to engage in physical behaviour (in the form of 're-positions') typically reserved for artists making work for the museum. This meant that permission usually only extended to the dance artist could now be experienced by the visitor to the Van Abbe and, by doing so, encouraged new kinds of spatial relations to emerge between museum visitors and the site that may not otherwise have occurred. This offering was made possible through a material object, the 'pouch', that contained information culled from by the dance artist's skills and transferred, through the object, to the user of it. In this way there was no need for the physical presence of the dance artist, only her skills of social-spatial relating and bodily approach. The *Punt.Point* project also called on and invited in other expertise to be valorised. Those other contributors were, for the development of the project: my main collaborator, Rennie Tang, who co-created the project concept and material object; Gabriela Baka for assistance with the designed material piece. The voices that came in later to the project in the form of response, provocations, and reflections were the visitors to the museum who took part (through the invitation to write into the material object) by naming their experience and suggesting other ways the project might operate in the museum. Finally, and the staff of the museum (through conversation and interviews) contributed their feedback on the project as having spent time with it and having particular knowledge of the space of the museum and its audiences. Through inviting in diverse perspectives and responses, recording and collecting those contributions, engaging with staff, having informal conversations, conducting formal interviews, and spending time data collecting for this thesis, I am arguing not only for the embodied and communicative knowledge of the dance artist and her collaborators in the museum but, equally so, the knowledges of museum visitors and staff. I am interested to make visible and to bring forward those understandings as valid and insightful. In addition to the activities that took place in order to invite in those voices, it was also the absence of the dance artist that made space for other experiences of the project and of the Van Abbe itself to find a place.

These methods of gathering information was in order to better understand and to make evident how the absence of the dance artist made even greater space for relations to occur that were not dependent on her presence. The absence of the dancer also suggested to us that a material object can be a carrier of the transferable skills of the dance artist (as laid out in the chapter) or as a way to translate certain knowledges of the dance artist, visitors, and staff and to put them into play in the museum. In this way we began to see how the dance artist, in collaboration with other specialists, shifted the dynamic of the museum to one of relationality not one shaped on transactions alone. The absent dance artist was a discursive prompt for a consideration of valuing perspectives on spatial, social encounters in the museum, and of new social co-operations.

Lastly, the museum also played a role in the project. The combination of the architectural construction of the Van Abbe with its views to the outside and interior build; as well as its culture of experimentation allowed for differing inputs and perspectives of the work. There was evidence of an alignment of values between the museum and my practice in terms of the importance of the body in the museum and of an embodied experience that made this project important to understanding a collaboration with the museum in my research on relations. Relationality, therefore, demonstrated in this second case study, is not necessarily mean that the absent dance artist makes room only for a furthering of spatial connection of visitors to the museum but, *also*, and somewhat unexpectedly between dance artist and museum staff. This realisation is what inspired case study three. I later picked up on this thread of spatial relations and the staff of the museum and took that further in the third and final case study.

What allowed me to evolve my thinking from the absent dance artist to the third and final case study of *The Present Dance* artist was my own learning through my thesis. My interactions with dancers, museum staff, and visitors that emerged as an element in the thesis confirmed my need for re-focusing dance in the museum as something that supports the

entire museum ecology[98]. This suggested to me that there was more to be understood about dance's ability to bring around relations and to affect the museum as a whole. To do that I had to articulate the dancer as a part of that human infrastructure and who is capable of inspiring change.

In order to further explore this thinking and benefit from the learning of my research, the dance artist needed to make a return to the museum to find out more about how she integrates her expertise there and in collaboration with others. The focus now needed to be on museum workings, engagement with staff, and across the spaces of the museum, not only the public-facing ones. The third case study was where the dancer stepped back into the museum and into her own practice as a dance artist moving in the museum. This present dance artist also invited museum staff into her practice and considered herself a co-inhabitant of the site. She tested out public and non-public spaces of the museum through movement, walking, and resting as a practice, as dance, as spatial relation. This final case study opened up a discussion urging further exploration of the dance artist as part of the human infrastructure of the museum. This final case study offered us evidence of ways the integration of everyday movements, practices, and experiments can become more deeply embedded into the human infrastructure of the museum and has potential to change its institutional habits and encourage change. This proposal was best illustrated through the example of Helena Hunter, Tate staff member, who re-purposed the 'warm-up' activity she experienced with me as part of my open movement practice offer to staff, in a tense meeting she was a part of and long after I had exited the building and my residency had come to a close. This example indicated that changed behaviour can be inspired by the presence of the dance artist and, even, after her departure. By investigating we might also consider methods

[98] It is important to note here the Darren Henley, Chief Executive of Arts Council England (ACE), put out a statement on his blog (Responding to the Covid 19 emergency March 31, 2020) in the midst of the Covid-19 crises that ended with the quote, 'At this moment, it's the whole of the ecosystem that we need to fight for, and that's what I intend to do' (Arts Council England 2020). This statement reflects ACE's need to consider the bigger picture of the cultural sector in making decisions on how to reshuffle their funding schemes in order to deliver emergency support for organizations and individuals. It is interesting to note how the global pandemic has created a renewed interest in ecological thinking that suggests we are all in this together. How might this way of approaching the museum, when cultural spaces reopen, guide us in developing new methods of inviting dance into the space and, perhaps, developing a more integrated approach that considers the dance artist as a part of the change to come? I will touch on this question further this conclusion chapter and one that will continue to influence my practice/research.

of levelling hierarchies of space and roles in the museum by suggesting an integration of the dance artist as a catalyst for how museum might operate differently.

As with the other two case studies, the institution played a part in the shaping of experience. The scale and cultural weight of Tate made my access to its non-public spaces and to working closely with staff so affective to my research. My spending time across spaces of the museum gave me a view and a feel for it in a way that visitors and, often, commissioned artists do not. This access was made possible by my connections with Tate and by being given a key to some of its spaces made visible the potential for the under-explored use of spaces of the museum to become places for relations to emerge and in which this chapter explored. What the results of my explorations told us was that there are untapped ways that the dance artist not only comes into the museum but plays a significant role in the overall, longer-term shaping of it. The dancer is capable of challenging codes of behaviour, encouraging a less hierarchical structuring of roles, and refusing a spectacle of the dancer in the museum. As she engages and participates in the ecology of people who make up the museum, the dancer fits herself into the museum and spends significant time in it, abiding there. Her movements through the museum are both a choreographic gesture and a source of information and insight into the day to day workings of the museum through a consideration and centring of the human infrastructure that exists within it and that constitutes its beingness. Again, a reminder that the museum visitor is not the only one with whom the dance artist relates with and that the potential of relational practices to involve museum staff feels new and necessary.

I am interested in further uncovering the approaches of dance in the museum – of thinking about how dance can infiltrate institutional spaces and across various museum departments. This third case study has led to my concluding thoughts as a call to action and based on what has been said and made evident, overall, along the trajectory of this thesis. This is all to suggest that we need a new discourse on dance in the museum. That discourse must also reflect the qualities of attention of the dance artist that have been mistaken for other things such as ‘activating’ or ‘enlivening’. The qualities of relating through and with space, with each other, and with oneself already exist in the dancer, in the visitor, and in the staff at work in the museum. Those qualities just need to be brought forth and made visible, encouraged, invited, and on offer. It is the dancer who is the one to help initiate and sustain

that bringing forth and making felt the existing opportunities of relating and to stretch open space for them to come forth.

Too often dance in the museum creates a vacuum, a gap between the artist, the public, and museum staff. This was exemplified in my thesis through an analysis of the work of both Marina Abramović and Tino Sehgal whose performances in the museum set clear boundaries between the performer and viewer or, even, 'participant'. There was a feeling of control on the part of the artist to determine how the relational aspect of the work would play out and, in some cases, the performer cut-short the participant's voice when they attempted to become an equal player or communicator in the event emerged. What might the presence of dance, as a more equal form of relation, in the museum do to complicate not only the behaviour of the museum visitor and staff but, as importantly, of the dance artist. If we consider relation as a practice in the museum as a capacity to challenge hierarchical patterns then the artist who chooses, in their work, to separate themselves out as more privileged in their spatial placement and attitude in the museum, to the audience, and to staff then the project of relational practice has failed as far as my research is concerned.

Although I have made the case in my thesis for the transferable skills of the dance artist, I am not suggesting she is superior because of those. Just as I have made the argument for the knowledge of the dance artist, so too, have I argued for the relational capabilities, knowledges, and experiences of the collaborator, museum visitor, and staff as part of the equation that creates relation. Therein, this multiplicity of ways of being, of knowing, is the dance, the dancer. As the dancer reconfigure herself in relation she gives rise to questions, concerns, and qualities of attention that will be the change needed going forward for dance, for the museum, for people, in our uncertain times ahead. We need the qualities and inter-personal skills within the dance and inherent to the dance artist to be engaged in the museum as a way forward, as a way of relating (again), of reinventing social closeness within, across, and through space.

At this moment that I am concluding this thesis I, along with every other resident of this country (as is the case in many other countries), have been instructed by the local and national Government to physically distance from each other (except who we co-inhabit with)

due to the risks of the Covid-19 global pandemic. This instruction also have unexpectedly opened up new possibilities of thought for which I feel compelled to share with you before I close my project as it helps to further amplify the points I have been making throughout my writing and that have come together in this conclusion and within unprecedented circumstances in our collective moment in time. The current situation of crisis produces very new and unchartered territories, that may ask for an opening up of an entirely new discourse on dance in the future, that also conceptualises media relations, and other modes of communicating and relating across spaces. My aim here is to begin to nudge forward such conversations. Thus, I am giving a rather short glimpse and hint at further problems, challenges, and new concepts evoked by the current situation, and for which my thesis has provided a ground (that is, on relations) to be further explored and reconceptualised.

As was mentioned above, during this Covid-19 crisis, in the UK and globally, museums are closed indeterminately. The dance sector has been sent home and has now, to some degree, gone online with classes, performances, and other activities. One example of online dancing experience is my offering and implementing my open movement practice (again) to Tate Learning staff through the online, and now well known, video platform call *Zoom* once a week for a month as a way to stay connected, be of service, and be accountable for myself to show up and move at the end of the many work-at-home days. I have also had numerous conversations with curators and learning experts of museums from London to Scotland and as far away as Singapore about what they are doing to stay engaged with their staff, each other, and artists at this time. There are some differing and many similar concerns across geographic spaces and cultural contexts of the ways in which people can stay in relation to the museum now and how museums will support people who eventually and over time come to return physically to the spaces, some eager to connect again and some afraid to do so. I have been logging these conversations in a series of notebooks that I refer to along this, now three-month period of time, listening out for the need and letting that guide an answer to my question to myself, which is: How can I help? What skills do I have that I can re-purpose at this time in order to be of service in the cultural sector and to the community? And, finally, what am I being called for forth to do in this time of crisis?

The answer that came back to me from these questions is that I, along with other trained dancers, have skills that – at this time, more than ever – are not only useful but very much needed. Those skills, as I have been making a case for since the beginning of this thesis, have everything to do with spatial relating, of knowing how to be together in ways that are inviting and inclusive, and consider the well-being and potential of the body at its core. The call forward that am suggesting here, now at the very end of my project, is a re-purposing of the dance artist's skills from skilled, technical craft to specialist in communication, relation and socio-spatial interests. The main concern for *all* curators, directors, and learning experts of museums that I have spoken with by phone over the last several months has been, 'How do we welcome the public back?'. My answer has consistently been, 'dance can help'. I also have come to learn from my research that the concern for the public of the museum cannot overshadow an equal concern for museum staff. Only in this extended human ecology of the museum can we begin to re-make the museum.

Physical distancing measures of two metres between people and the long-time lockdown (now in its seventh week) has meant a drastic shift in behaviour, daily physical routines, and social patterns being demanded of citizens without much warning or preparation time. Our deeply embedded, physically known choreography of the everyday, or how we are used to behaving in public in regards to spatial relating has suddenly shifted and without any rehearsal. It is like going on stage with no time to practice the moves. There we are, fumbling around trying to get it right. This awkward, social-distanced, dance. This demand to change behaviour so quickly is not an experience museum publics nor people, in general, are used to executing. It changes the way we 'see' each other,, not only, through the eyes, but through a feeling with the whole body. Observing myself and others moving along the sidewalks, streets, and parks of my neighbourhood of North London suggests that now, more than ever, people are wanting and needing to see each other for their and each other's safety and health. People, myself included, are seeing each other not directly, but we are sensing the positioning of our bodily movements and that of others. We are also anticipating the moves of each other, trying to predict which way, or that way, the person in front of us will go so that we can intuit that move ahead of time and adjust our own trajectories to get out of the way. The space between me and another is to be two meters or approximately six feet. This space of physical distancing and of needing to now see and sense each other's

movements in order to avoid physical contact or close proximity reinforces the importance of my project *Spatial Relations: Dance in the Changing Museum* and the discussion of spatial relations, how they will play out in our museums in the future, and how dance can be of significant assistance.

*Punt.Point* suggested in its three-year instalment in the museum, the invitation or offer to people to change their physical behaviour in public space is one that is best to introduce gently, openly, over a period of time (three years), and through repetition. Also, the *Present Dance Artist* case study at Tate engaged alternative acts of lounging, laying down, and napping in the museum as a political act of caring for the self, and prompted a rupture in the expected and routine behaviours of the museum. Such shifts of behaviour that were outside of the expected, everyday experience for staff in the museum not only provoked a response by staff but, as well, a source for trying out such acts of attention and of attending to the body and sensing into how it feels, what is needs, and how – through such awareness – has the capacity to shift what is happening in the room.

Perhaps, then, there is more to be found in regards to a quality of beign in the room together that the *Detached Dance Artist* taught us. Her 'easy to be in the room with' approach and the social space given between dancer and audience (due to the detached nature of seeing) is an example of where our shift of behaviour, physically and socially, might open up possibilities, freedoms and new ways of relating. However, if I turn to the transferable skills of the dance artist, again, I am remined that the dance artist knows how to support our learning new ways of moving in space with and amongst each other today. Again, seeing the world through the lens of a dancer can be seeing it as a choreography. By adapting to different social-spatial configurations within a new 'choreography' in public space is part of the learned skills of the dance artist. She knows how to do this and her agility, flexibility, and resiliency are all relevant qualities as we move forward.

Some examples of how the dance artist approaches and engages with being in public space can be found in the recent writing of Gia Kourlas, a dance critic for the New York Times, who suggests that choreographic thinking is one way to look at how people are moving through our cities in the time of this crisis in *How we use our bodies to navigate a pandemic*

(2020); and through the suggestions of dance artists, such as Yvonne Rainer, who has shared her own, very specific, choreographic tasks (borrowed from one of her dances) with others to engage with and try out in their domestic spaces written up in an article, also for the New York Times, called *A D.I.Y Dance for your Home from Yvonne Rainer* (2020).

We, humans, need time support in understanding ways to perceive what is happening around us, to adjust to the long hours now spent in our home spaces, and to change behaviour and physical patterns. This sudden extension of our personal, bodily space or, as was mentioned in this thesis, our kinespheres (or the space around us that feels personal or our personal space) was once at arms-length and now has been extended out to two meters as a protective, invisible circular sphere around our own bodies. This personal sphere of protection must not cross over with other's now extended kinespheric protective personal space. If these spheres overlap there is a possibility of infection. If we see others not abiding by the rules it can create discomfort or may appear as social irresponsibility. Regardless, the ability to sense personal space, to 'read' movement or the intended movements of others, to adapt dances to different spaces, and to contextualise the world around us as a choreography is a skill that dance artists have. 'Reading movement' is what Susan Melrose (2017) argues for as a form of 'expert-intuitive process' (11). Melrose claims that dancers are skilled in making creative decisions and can intuit that decision-making in others as they are moving. That form of decision making is of the body and through a felt sense or what she calls 'creative judgement' (189). These kind of skills of the dance artist are transferable to public spaces, not only on the stage, and may therefore be useful to museums whose publics will be re-entering the site with potential trepidation or, perhaps, elation. Either way, the people will need support in reconvening in safe, enjoyable, inclusive, and sustainable ways. The ability to sense and spatially read movement in space and to be able offer creative solutions to how to support publics through new relational expectations and ever-changing circumstances is one the museum may both increasingly want and most urgently need in order to re-open and stay open successfully and with a returning staff, visitors, and artists. In regards to my overall thesis the question that emerges as I conclude five-years of research on this thesis: What will dance and, in particular, the dance artist now brings to the museum in contributing to helping

with the complex needs of the institution and the people who work and visit there as the world emerges from its lockdown and stays open in the future[99]?

It is of interest to note, as I reflect back on my project now, in the time of social distancing, that the kinds of relations I have suggested as dance in the museum throughout this thesis did not impose one kind of relation but a multitude of relations. None of the relational practices included touch or skin-to-skin contact as is the concern with physical distancing measures at this time. The museums are closed right now. This closure is informative to my practice as I learn about how museums are dealing with constraints through providing different online content. It will be equally, and even more, informative for my practice to explore how the museums deal with the new situation once the lockdown measures will be eased, how they will re-emerge from lockdown. How will museums welcome visitors back in? What will their attitude be towards artists and the staff that work for them? How might the transferable skills of the dance artist help museums in these approaches?

What has, up to this point in my thesis, seemed a conceptual and practical exercise in understanding dance as relation now rises up as ever more necessary and relevant to our times. What is also made visible to me, now, are how the kinds of spatial relations suggested in the experiences of dance in the museum, in the differing awareness of each other, site and self, can provide insight into how we might relate in this moment and in the future not only in museums but in the multitude of public spaces, including libraries, parks, heritage sites, and others, as well as non-public but shared spaces of our homes and offices. How might the transferable skills of the dance artist offer understanding and support in helping to navigate, through sensitive, playful, safe and creative ways, the sensitive spatial relations in the museum between people when we come out of lockdown and as cultural spaces slowly open back up to us?

[99] I recognise that the economic fall out of the Covid-19 crisis poses a real threat to many, if not all, cultural institutions both in the UK and worldwide. What my conclusion is proposing is that, because of social distancing measures and, as well, the greater concerns for the cultural sector going forward, including its financial stability, people and institutions will be looking to do things differently whether or not the institution survives. Museum that do stay in-tack will be concerned with how to continue operating into the future. The chance of survival will certainly be a question of finance but, also, will be greatly influenced by and, potentially, its success of sustainability will be measured by how the institution takes care of and considers the people working for it and to listen to their needs, as well as those of the artists they bring in, and the audiences they serve.

What is curious to ponder and what my thesis offers is a way to consider the possibilities of engaging the dance artist in the museum in ways unheard of thus far. For example, the dance artist /specialist might develop structures, scores, or other chorographic devices that encourage both space for being on ones' own and for sharing space with others. I cannot help but think of *Punt.Point* as a way to support, through a material object, the use of space, of caring for one's body, and of respect for other people's spaces. The bright yellow cushion in the pouch, in this way, becomes a device for both defining one's own space, for oneself in the museum, and as a way to re-position physically there and in spatial relation with others that allows for distancing without a feeling of isolation. Connecting across spaces. Such forms of engaging spatial relating in the museum have been discussed and the offer of the detached, absent, and present dance artist in our rapidly changing times opens up new possibilities not just of dance but of our common, human contemporary moment. Museums then become truly a site to rehearse, to practice, to play out our new normal while also moving use towards more comfortable, engaging, participatory spaces of relating as we navigate new choreographies of togetherness. In this social readjustment period the findings of this thesis, although written pre-crisis, provides insight into how museums can engage the knowledge and sociological, spatial thinking of the dance artist by employing her to help in ways of *seeing*, *doing*, and *being* in the museum. Even, and maybe even more so, the challenges of our current cultural moment in which people have been told to stay away, stay home, avoid others and gathering in groups show us that we need help in negotiating relational space. We need support in what Giannachi (2012) names as, 'different forms of sociability', 'new habits of assembly', and 'practices of encounter'. We need practice. Dance as relation can help us to practice and to reconstruct our co-presencing in the changing museum.

Dance methodologies of making, techniques of body-based being, as well as epistemologies can be re-appropriated and adapted to other areas such as museum practices by re-focusing the purpose of dance. Dance artists can instil a sense of comfort, trust, and enjoyment through creative solutions. Dancers offer insight and meaning behind the consequences of how our bodies move through the museum as well as exploring new possibilities of somatic investigations and strategies taken from the canon of dance training.

The dancer has a role to play in the translation of our new cultural, public spaces. As dance inherently sits at the intersection of the physical world and of the world of meaning, and of feeling it is capable of speaking to the tensions of our contemporary moment and of offering solutions. The dance artist is a well-suited candidate for helping to solve such tensions by offering creative, imaginary, memorable, and novel experiences and in conjunction with developing research and solution-based approaches across the museum. Dance offers a rich connection between the movement of the human ecology of the museum and the knowledge and skills of dance makers. This is an opportunity for dance practice to both illuminate the meaning and experience of the museum in our times as well as to offer new tools, techniques and epistemologies for remaking the museum of the future. The museum then, becomes a space to 'rehearse' being together in new ways that put the body first, celebrate the social, and offer creative solutions to problems. The skills of the dance artist /specialist can be leveraged at the macro scale where dance making methodologies and imagination could be appropriated to help bring about new techniques for gathering. The dance artist, in her position as spatial relations specialist, will support ways that the museum, post-pandemic, as it welcomes artists, staff, and visitors as co-habitants who will need support and encouragement to re-connect, gather together, and also feel safe, cared for, and inspired. Therefore, this is a call for a practical application of dance derived research methods, practices, and approaches to related fields. To focus in on a particular mode of doing and thinking through dance and movement practice and to evaluate the potential impact this knowledge and associated skills might have on areas of research, practice, and policy in the museum and beyond. Dance as a discipline and a way of being can leave its fingerprint on institutional change in the museum and for the wider cultural sector. All of the above points to dance as a quality that, coming off of the transferable skills it delivers, that is not an application *into* the museum but, rather, an extension *through and in* collaboration with the museum as a project with its own spatial, social, political, and economic approaches or qualities of attention that can be made more visible and changed through dance.

## New Positions: A Call to Action for Dance Artists and Museums

My introduction chapter opened with a quote by dance artist Susan Rethorst (2012) whose ability to mentally and spatially map an imaginary web of connections across space

between her body and those of people whose location she could feel in relationship to her own is a consideration of the ways in which dancers relate to space and to others as a way of connecting. In order to make best use of and re-purpose this skill for our times and in the cultural institutions where she makes work, the dance artist must carve out a new position for herself in the museum. This position I am speaking of is a role in the museum that engages her participation in it as a source for change. This role is a paid position in the museum that is sustained over time, not a temporary, artist-in-residence offer. The dance artist as specialist on spatial relations in the museum. Now, more than ever, this role, whether we call it specialist, expert, or embodied knowledge professional or frame it as practice and/or reserch is needed and I call on dance artists and museums to answer that need through creating space this dance artist to enter. Creating that role, that position in which, up to now, has not existed but *is*, in the immediate sense, necessary, relevant, and possible. This role of spatial relational specialist will bring tangible and intangible skills. Tangible skills in knowing, understanding and communicating what dance, as an artform in the museum, needs from the environment (for example, proper flooring, enough space to move in and with others, healthy temperature of the room, among others). Intangible skills such as conceptual and embodied knowing of ways of relating are also to be brought in and have been made evident and argued for in this thesis. This call is for both dance artists to recognise their knowledgeable skill set and for the museum to create the ways and means for the dancer to come in and apply it the changing museum. In this way the dancer can serve in our understanding of ways of being together, to offer insight into ways of engaging with artists, staff, and visitors in more fair, equal, and just ways – recognising that the physical and cultural construct of the museum plays a role in those aims.

What is being called forth from dance at the moment is not necessarily to only present itself in the forms that we have known but, also, in new ways, through visionary offers, and sustainable presences. The museum and, at the moment, all places of public gathering, whether libraries, parks, theatres, cinemas, and other spaces are having to think about, plan, and, eventually, put into practice a moving *with* and apart from each other and in supporting new behaviours and inspiring ways spatial relating. Therefore, my proposal is not necessarily, anymore, a museum context specific but speaks to a much broader range of places and publics.

I call on dance artists, museums , and other spaces where people meet to open up a space for what the dance artist / specialist has to offer. This space for the dance artist / specialist will re-position her in the museum as an integral contributor within new spatial orders and relations in the museum, a space that welcomes people through inter-action, not transaction, and to also be a reminder to the tactile, embodied, nurturing ways that relating in interactive ways can offer even at somewhat further spatial distance between each other.

I call on an actual position or professional role for the dancer that comes about through a dialogue with museum specialists and that employ the dance artist / specialist skills in order to grow the museum towards a more communicative, relational space and to celebrate the opportunities within these challenging times. This role will include the development of new practice/research techniques, the application of embodied knowledge, and the transfer of skills. A new role for dancers as spatial relational facilitators in the soon to be re-opened and changing site of the museum can be done. New positions and placements for dance artists as skilled specialists of spatial relations can be created in the museum. The museum, in its own need and interest in moving forward, must embrace, learn from and support this position. If the museum does not create that position, the dance artist must do it. She must re-position herself in the museum by creating a never-before-thought-of role for herself in order to imagine new and liveable futures.

To conclude it is important that I distinguish my call to action from Boris Charmatz's *Manifesto for a Dancing Museum* (2009) despite the time and space this takes at this very last stage of this project. Charmatz's list of differing kinds of museums that can be imagined to include the body of the dancer and of dance, in general, as a guiding point for change includes a section called *an incorporated museum*. He defines an 'incorporated museum' as, '[i]t [the museum] can only develop provided that it is built by the bodies moving through it, those of the public, the artists, but also of the museum employees (attendants, technicians, admin staff, etc.), who bring the works to life, even becoming actors themselves' (2009). In reading this I am reminded that a museum does not *have to* be built by bodies moving through it, it is *already*, as was made clear in my thesis, made up of bodies moving through it (Whyte, 1980). We need to open up, see, and recognise this movement so that we can bring it forth as

something useful to us. The other issue I have with Charmatz's statement, although I respect its intention to change the museum through a dance perspective, is that it suggests artists (and staff, although the staff inclusion feels almost an afterthought to the artist in his statement) bring works to life. Artworks (as well as buildings), again, has been argued in this thesis, do not need to be 'activated'. Charmatz, in his approach perhaps, unintentionally, feeds back into and fuels the problem of the expectation that the dance artist is in the museum to activate, unnecessarily, the building and the artworks. Lastly, I am troubled by his suggestion that dance artists and museum staff become 'actors' in order to bring these (already active) artworks to life. This metaphor is an outdated one (see Goffman 1964, 1990) but, more problematic is Charmatz's referencing of a theater (or acting), skill, in which the qualities and sensibilities of the dance artist are overlooked. By overshadowing dance skills by something else, Charmatz feeds into troublesome assumptions of the silenced dancer's voice and misrepresents the potentiality of dance in the museum, of the dance artist. In all respect for Charmatz's interest to change the museum, that are similar to my own, of shifting the epistemology and ontology of dance in and with the museum, his approach is widely different than mine. Again, I must clear here that my thesis distinctly stands by dance and, although, builds upon the lineage of those, like Charmatz, who have come before I am also carving out a practical and theoretical space for my contribution and distinctive voice in the discourse on and implementation of dance in the museum.

My concluding call to action that my thesis has evolved towards is, as well, different from the *manifesto for a dancing museum* that Charmatz wrote, now over ten years ago, in that my thesis aims to re-configure the ways in which dancers engage with and participate in the museum. We need a new, updated, manifesto or, what I am naming here, as a 'call to action'. The question now remains: *How* will the museum and the dance artist answer that call? *How* will the curators, learning expert, and museum staff, together, with the dance artist create a expanse in the museum for her new position and to collaborate on constructing sites for renewed forms of spatial relation? I look forward to meeting and moving with you there.

# Works Cited

## Authors

Albright, A. (2020) 'Being Alone Together: Alain Platel and the "Disturbance of Violent Relatedness" in La Tristeza Complice (1995), Pitie! (2008) and Tauberbach (2014)'. in *Dance in Dialogue: The Choreopolitics of Alain Platel's Les Ballet C de La B: Emotions, Gestures and Politics*. ed. by Stalpaert, C., Cools, G., and de Vuyst, H. London: Methuen Drama, 71–83

Arts Council England (2013) *Great Art and Culture for Everyone | Arts Council* [online] available from <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/browse-advice-and-guidance/great-art-and-culture-everyone>

Banes, S. (1981) 'Democracy's Body: Judson Dance Theatre and Its Legacy'. *Performing Arts Journal* 5 (2), 98

Barthes, R. (1980) *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. New York: Hill & Wang

Bennett, T. (2017) *The Exhibitionary Complex*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Bennett, T. (1995) *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. vol. 67. London and New York: Routledge

Birringer, J. (2013) 'What Score? Pre-Choreography and Post-Choreography'. in *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media*. vol. 9 (1). Intellect, 7–13

Bishop, C. (2012) *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. New York: Verso Books

Bishop, C. (2011) *Participation and Spectacle: Where Are We Now?* [online] available from <https://creativetime.org/programs/archive/2011/livingasform/talks.htm> [21 July 2020]

Bishop, C. (2013) *Radical Museology or, What's 'Contemporary' in Museums of Contemporary Art?* 2014th edn. London: Dan Perjovshi and Koenig Books

Bishop, C. (2018) 'Black Box, White Cube, Gray Zone: Dance Exhibitions and Audience Attention'. *The Drama Review* 62 (2), 22–42

Bishop, C. (20066) *Letters and Responses: Claire Bishop Responds* [online] available from <https://doi.org/10.1162%2Focto.2006.115.1.107>

Bishop, C. (2014) 'The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA, and Whitney'. *Dance Research Journal* 46 (3), 63–76

Bleeker, M. (2008) *Visuality in the Theatre: The Locus of Looking*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Bleeker, M., Kear, A., Kelleher, J., and Roms, H. (2017) *Thinking through Theatre and Performance*. London: Methuen Drama

Bleeker, M., Sherman, J.F., and Nedelkopoulou, E. (2015) *Performance and Phenomenology: Traditions and Transformations*. London and New York: Routledge

Bourriaud, N. (1998) *Relational Aesthetics*. Paris: Les Presse Du Reel

Brandstetter, G. (2011) 'Transcription Materiality Signature. Dancing and Writing between Resistance and Excess'. in *Emerging Bodies* [online] ed. by Klein, G. and Noeth, S. Bielefeld: Transcript-Verlag, 119–136. available from <https://doi.org/10.14361%2Ftranscript.9783839415962.119>

Brandstetter, G. (2015) *Poetics of Dance: Body, Image, and Space in the Historical Avant-Gardes* [online] Oxford: Oxford University Press. available from <https://doi.org/10.1093%2Facprof%3Aoso%2F9780199916559.001.0001>

Brandstetter, G., Klein, G., Haller, M., and Lüken, H. (2012) *Dance [and] Theory*. Münster: Verlag

Brannigen, E. (2011) 'The Ambulatory Aesthetics of Yvonne Rainer's "Trio A"'. *Dance Research Journal* 46 (1), 41–60

Briginshaw, V. (2001) *Dance, Space and Subjectivity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan

Burt, R. (2003) ‘Memory, Repetition and Critical Intervention’. *Performance Research* 8 (2), 34–41

Burt, R. (2009) ‘What the Dancing Body Can Do: Spinoza and the Ethics of Experimental Theatre Dance’. in *Writing Dancing Together*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 204–216

Burt, R. (2007) *Judson Dance Theater[sic]: Performative Traces*. Abington: Routledge

Butler, J. (1988) ‘Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory’. *Theatre Journal* 40 (4), 519–531

Butler, J. (2011) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London and New York: Routledge

Butte, M., Maar, K., McGovern, F., Rafael, M.-F., and Schafaff, J. (eds.) (2014) *Assign & Arrange : Methodologies of Presentation in Art and Dance*. Berlin: Sternberg Press

Charmatz, B. (2014) ‘Manifesto for a National Choreographic Centre’. *Dance Research Journal* [online] 46 (03), 45–48. available from <http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0149767714000539>

Charmatz, B. (2009) *Manifesto for a Dancing Museum* [online] available from <https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/calendar/manifesto_dancing_museum.pdf> [21 March 2020]

Cools, G. (2016) ‘On the Transferable Skills of the Dance Artist’. in *Lecture for European Dance Network (EDN)Atelier: The Relevance of Dance*. held 2016

Cotter, H. (n.d.) *Marina Abramovic’s Silent Sitting at MoMA Reaches Finale - The New York Times* [online] available from <https://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/31/arts/design/31diva.html> [30 August 2019]

Crawley, M.-L. (2018) *What Remains? Dancing in the Archaeological Museum*. Coventry University

Crossick, G. and Kaszynska, P. (n.d.) *Understanding the Value of Arts & Culture | The AHRC Cultural Value Project* [online] available from <https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/publications/cultural-value-project-final-report/> [18 February 2020]

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2008) 'Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience'. in *Journal of Leisure Research*. 1st edn. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics

Cvejić, B. (2015) *Choreographing Problems : Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance*. London & New York: Palgrave

Dance Research Journal (2014) 'Interview with Boris Charmatz'. *Dance Research Journal* 46 (03), 49–52

Davida, D., Gabriels, J., Hudon, V., and Pronovost, M. (2018) *Curating Live Arts : Critical Perspectives, Essays, and Conversations on Theory and Practice*. New York: Berghahn Books

Davidts, W. (2017) *Triple Bond: Essays on Art, Architecture, and Museums*. Amsterdam: Valiz Press

Davidts, W. (2006) 'Art Factories: Museums of Contemporary Art and the Promise of Artistic Production, from Centre Pompidou to Tate Modern'. *Fabrications* 16 (1), 23–42

Dewey, J. (1963) *Experience & Education*. 1st Edition. New York: Collier Books

Diehl, H.A., Phelan, P., and Lane, J. (2001) 'Reviewed Work: The Ends of Performance'. *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 34 (3), 94

Finbow, A. (2017) *The Value of Performance Documentation in the Contemporary Art Museum: A Case Study of Tate*. University of Exeter

Fischer-Lichte, E. (2008) 'Sense and Sensation: Exploring the Interplay Between the Semiotic and Performative Dimensions of Theatre'. *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* (Spring)

Foellmer, S. (2015) ‘Re-Cyclings: Shifting Time, Changing Genre in the Moving Museum’. *Dance Research Journal* 46 (03), 101–117

Fontal, O. (2008) ‘Museums as Creators of Identity: Keys to an Inclusive Museology in Contemporary Art Museums’. *The International Journal of the Inclusive Museum* 1 (1), 89–96

Forsythe, W. (2012) *William Forsythe Choreographic Objects : Essay* [online] Munich: Prestel. available from <https://www.williamforsythe.com/essay.html> [22 August 2019]

Foster, H. (2015) ‘After the White Cube, Hal Foster Asks What Art Museums Are For’. *London Review of Books* [online] 37 (6), 25–26. available from <https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v37/n06/hal-foster/after-the-white-cube> [20 April 2020]

Foster, S.L. (2019) *Valuing Dance: Commodities and Gifts in Motion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Foster, S.L. (2010) *Choreographing Empathy: Kinesthesia in Performance*. London and New York: Routledge

Fraleigh, S. and Hanstein, P. (1999) *Researching Dance: Evolving Modes of Inquiry*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press

Franco, S. (2020) *Knowledges in Motion | NERO Editions* [online] available from <https://www.neroeditions.com/knowledges-in-motion/> [11 July 2020]

Franko, M. and Lepecki, A. (2014) ‘Editor’s Note: Dance in the Museum’. *Dance Research Journal* 46 (03), 1–4

Giannachi, G. and Kaye, N. (2011) *Performing Presence: Between the Live and the Simulated*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

Giannachi, G., Kaye, N., Slater, M., and Shanks, M. (2009) *The Presence Project: Home* [online] available from <http://spa.exeter.ac.uk/drama/presence/presence.stanford.edu_3455/Collaboratory/9.html> [27 February 2020]

Giannachi, G. and Westerman, J. (2017) *Histories of Performance Documentation: Museum, Artistic, and Scholarly Practices*. London & New York: Routledge

Giannachi, G., Kaye, N., and Shanks, M. (2012) *Archaeologies of Presence*. London: Routledge

Goffman, E. (2010) *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. Piscataway: Transaction Publishers

Goffman, E. (1990) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New Edition. London: Penguin

Harraway, D.J. (2016) *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham: Duke University Press

Harvey, D. (2002) 'The Art of Rent: Globalization, Monopoly, and the Commodification of Culture'. *Socialist Register* 38, 93–110

Henley, D. (2020) *Responding to the Covid19 Emergency | Arts Council England* [online] available from <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/blog/responding-covid19-emergency> [20 April 2020]

Hunter, V. (2015) *Moving Sites: Investigating Site-Specific Dance Performance*. London: Routledge

Ingold, T. (2011) *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. New York: Routledge

Ingold, T. (2015) *The Life of Lines*. London: Routledge

Ingold, T. (2013) *Making, Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. London & New York: Routledge

Jackson, S. (2012) 'Just-in-Time: Performance and the Aesthetics of Precarity'. *{TDR}/The Drama Review* [online] 56 (4), 10–31. available from <https://doi.org/10.1162%2Fdram_a_00211>

Jackson, S. (2014) 'The Way We Perform Now'. *Dance Research Journal* 46 (03), 53–61

Jackson, S. (2011) *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics*. London: Routledge

Janes, R. and Sandell, R. (eds.) (n.d.) *Museum Activism*. London: Routledge

Janevski, A. and Lax, T.J. (eds.) (2019) *The Work Is Never Done*. New York: Museum of Modern Art

Jordan, J. (2020) 'Lessons in Agility from a Dancer Turned Professor'. *Harvard Business Review* [online] available from <https://hbr.org/2020/04/lessons-in-agility-from-a-dancer-turned-professor> [21 April 2020]

Kourlas, G. (2020) *How We Use Our Bodies to Navigate a Pandemic - The New York Times* [online] available from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/31/arts/dance/choreographing-the-street-coronavirus.html> [21 April 2020]

Krause, A. (2011) *Art as Politics*. Porsgrunn: New Compass Press

Kristeva, J. (1994) *Strangers to Ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press

Kwon, M. (2002) *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge: MIT Press

Lambert-Beatty, C. (2008) *Being Watched: Yvonne Rainer and the 1960s*. vol. 43. Boston: MIT Press

Lambert-Beatty, C. (1999) 'Moving Still: Mediating Yvonne Rainer's "Trio A"'. *October* 89, 87

Lefebvre, H. (2013) *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life*. London: Bloomsbury Academic

Lefebvre, H. and Nicholson- Smith, D. (1991) *The Production of Space*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell

Lepecki, A. (2016) *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance*. London and New York: Routledge

Lepecki, A. (2012) 'Dance and Politics'. in *Dance [and] Theory*. Dortmund: transcript Verlag

Lepecki, A. (2004) *The Presence of the Body: Essays on Dance and Performance Theory*. First Edit. ed. by Lepecki, A. Wesleyan University Press

Lepecki, A. (2010) 'The Body as Archive: Will to Re-Enact and the Afterlives of Dances'. *Dance Research Journal* 42 (02), 28–48

Mackrell, J. (2014) 'Yvonne Rainer: Dance Works Review – Funny, Anarchic and Oddly Moving'. *The Guardian* [online] available from <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2014/jul/11/yvonne-rainer-dance-works-review-funny-anarchic-moving> [9 April 2020]

Massey, D.B. and Allen, J. (1984) *Geography Matters! : A Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press in association with the Open University

Mauss, M. and Brewster, B. (1973) 'Techniques of the Body'. *Economy and Society* 70–88

McFarland, E. (2015) *Dance & Museums Working Together Symposium Report-Content, Analysis & Recommendations*. London

Melrose, S. (2017) 'Expert-Intuitive and Deliberative Processes: Struggles in (the Wording of) Creative Decision-Making in "Dance"'. in *Contemporary Choreography: A Critical Reader*. 2nd Edition. ed. by Butterworth, J. and Wildschut, L. London & New York: Routeledge, 25–40

Melrose, S. (n.d.) 'Introduction: Running in (Epistemic) Circles'. *Artistic Research in Music: Discipline and Resistance: Artists and Researchers at the Orpheus Institute* 187–210

Mulvey, L. (1975) 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema'. *Screen*

Nelson, R. (2006) 'Practice-as-Research and the Problem of Knowledge'. *Performance Research* 11 (4), 105–116

Nicifero, A. (2014) 'OCCUPY MoMA: The (Risks and) Potentials of a Musée de La Danse!' *Dance Research Journal* 46 (03), 32–44

Pakes, A. (2017) *Knowing through Dance-Making: Choreography, Practical Knowledge and Practice-as-Research*. 2nd edn. New York: Routledge

Pakes, A. (2006) 'Dance's Mind-Body Problem'. *Dance Research* 24 (2), 87–104

Pape, T., Solomon, N., and Thain, A. (2014) 'Welcome to This Situation: Tino Sehgal's Impersonal Ethics'. *Dance Research Journal* 46 (03), 89–100

Paramana, K. (2015) *Performances of Thought, Resistance and Support: On the Role and Potential of Performance in the Contemporary Moment*. Roehampton University

Peric, T. (2016) *Understanding versus Experiencing: An Interview with Erika Fischer-Lichte* [online] available from <http://www.critical-stages.org/14/understanding-versus-experiencing-interview-with-erika-fischer-lichte/> [8 April 2020]

Phelan, P. (1993) *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London and New York: Routledge

Polanyi, M. (2009) *The Tacit Dimension*. Reissue. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press

Pouillaude, F. and Pakes, A. (2017) *Unworking Choreography: The Notion of the Work in Dance*. Translatio. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Preston-Dunlop, V. (2017) *Moving with the Times*. London: Dance Books Ltd

Preston-Dunlop, V. (2002) *Dance and the Performative: A Choreological Perspective – Laban and Beyond*. London: Verve Publishing

Pringle, E. (n.d.) *Reflection in Difficult Times – PRAM* [online] available from <https://practitionerresearchintheartmuseum.com/2020/04/08/reflection-in-difficult-times/> [29 April 2020]

Pringle, E. (2014) *Reflections on Trust and Sociability* [online] available from <https://valueliveart.wordpress.com/2014/03/16/reflections-on-trust-and-sociability/>

Pringle, E. (2019) *Rethinking Research in the Art Museum*. London: Routledge

Pringle, E. (n.d.) 'The Gallery as a Site for Creative Learning'. in *The Routledge International Handbook of Creative Learning* [online] Routledge. available from <https://doi.org/10.4324%2F9780203817568.ch25>

Rainer, Y. (1999) *A Woman Who… Essays, Interviews, Scripts*. 1st Editio. The Johns Hopkins University Press

Rainer, Y. (1965) 'Some Retrospective Notes'. *Tulane Drama Review* 10 (2), 168–178

Rainer, Y. (1974) *Yvonne Rainer. Work 1961 - 73.* Halifax & New York: The Press of the Nova Scotia College of the Art and Design and New York University Press

Rancière, J. (2011) *The Emancipated Spectator*. Reprint ed. London: Verso

Rethorst, S. (2012) *A Choreographic Mind: Autobodygraphical Writings*. vol. 38. Helsinki: Theatre Academy Helsinki, 117–119

Roy, S. (n.d.) *Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker Review – Dancers Send Tate Modern into a Whirl | Stage | The Guardian* [online] available from <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2016/jul/11/anne-teresa-de-keersmaeker-review-tate-modern-work-travail-arbeid> [10 October 2019]

Roy, S. (2015) *Musée de La Danse Five-Star Review – Human Heaven in Living Dance Archive*. [online] available from <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2015/may/17/musee-de-la-danse-tate-modern-sadlers-wells-review>

Schneider, L. and Goffman, E. (1964) *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. vol. 29. Tampa: Free Press of Glencoe

Seibert, B. (2020) 'A D.I.Y. Dance for Your Home, From Yvonne Rainer'. *The New York Times* [online] available from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/24/arts/dance/yvonne-rainer-do-it-yourself-coronavirus.html> [21 April 2020]

Sennett, R. (2012) *Together: The Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Cooperation*. New York: Yale University Press

Sennett, R. (2009) *The Craftsman*. New York: Yale University Press

Shukaitis, S. (2012) 'Symphony of the Surplus/Value: Notes on Labour, Valorization and Sabotage in the Metropolitan Factory'. *Performance Research Journal: On Labour & Performance* 17 (6)

Silverman, L. (2009) *The Social Work of Museums*. London and New York: Routledge

Sobchack, V. (2004) *Carnal Thought: Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Soja, E.W. (1996) *Thirdspace : Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Reprint ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Spier, S. (2011) *William Forsythe and the Practice of Choreography: It Starts from Any Point*. London & New York: Routledge

Tate (2011) *Michael Clark Company at Tate Modern – Press Release | Tate* [online] available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/press/press-releases/michael-clark-company-tate-modern> [29 August 2019]

Tate (n.d.) *Governance Tate* [online] available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/governance> [27 November 2019]

Tate (2016) *Tate Exchange at Tate Modern* [online] available from <http://www.tate.org.uk/visit/tate-modern/tate-

exchange?gclid=CjwKEAjwja_JBRD8idHpxaz0t3wSJAB4rXW5h1QdAjBS5yZRDPxkgglLdex7dUAW1Lwe6JaAbehbjRoC-UPw_wcB> [29 May 2017]

Tate Modern (2017) *What Is the Role of Participatory Artists Today? With Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance – Talk at Tate Modern | Tate* [online] available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-modern/tate-exchange/workshop/creative-collision/what-role-participatory-artists-today> [10 October 2019]

Thomson, P. and Pringle, E. (2013) The Experience and Value of Live Art: What Can Making and Editing Film Tell Us? [online] available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/projects/experience-and-value-live-art-what-can-making-and-editing-film-tell-us> [31 August 2019]

Tomic-Vajagic, T. (2016) *Re-Visitations: On 'Catalogue (First Edition)', Dancers, Knowledge and the Possibilities Found in Misunderstandings*. 16–18

Tomic-Vajagic, T. (2015) *Adrénaline: A Dance Floor for Everyone and Expo Zéro* [online] available from <http://scalar.usc.edu/works/caa/adrnaline-a-dance-floor-for-everyone> [23 August 2019]

Tomic-Vajagic, T. (2012) *The Dancer's Contribution: Performing Plotless Choreography in Leotard Ballet's of George Balanchine and William Forsythe*. Roehampton University

von Hantelmann, D. (2015) *Five Responses to the Question: If Tate Modern Was Musée de La Danse?: Dorothea von Hantelmann | Tate* [online] available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-modern/performance/bmw-tate-live-2015/bmw-tate-live-if-tate-modern-was-musee-de-la-7-1> [14 April 2020]

von Hantelmann, D. (2010) *How to Do Things with Art*. Paris: JRP Ringier & Les Presses Du Réel

von Hantelmann, D. (2014) 'The Experiential Turn: On Performativity'. *Living Collections Catalogue, Vol.1.* 30 June, 1 (1)

Walther, F.E. and Beacon, D.: (n.d.) *Work as Action* [online] available from <https://www.diaart.org/media/_file/brochures/walther-franz-erhard-work-as-action-2.pdf> [25 August 2019]

Warsza, J. (Editor), Malzacher, F. (Editor) (ed.) (2017) *Empty Stages, Crowded Flats: Performativity as a Curatorial Strategy*. 1 edition. Berlin: Alexander Verlag

Whyte, W.H. (1980) *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*. vol. 10. Conservation Foundation

Wood, C. (2018) *Performance in Contemporary Art*. London: Tate Publishing

Wood, C. (2014) *Yvonne Rainer - Exhibition Text* [online] available from <http://www.ravenrow.org/texts/59/> [5 February 2020]

Wood, C. (2007) *The Mind Is a Muscle*. London: Afterall Books

Wood, C. (2007) *Yvonne Rainer : The Mind Is a Muscle*. London: Afterall

Wookey, S. (2020) *Felt Lines of Connection in a Time of Isolation & Physical Distancing (n.d)* available from <http://sarawookey.com/uncategorized/felt-lines-of-connection-in-a-time-of-isolation-physical-distancing/> [3 June 2020]

Wookey, S. (2017) 'Transmitting Trio A (1966): The Relations and Sociality of an Unspectacular Dance'. in *Transmissions in Dance*. ed. by Main, L. Springer International Publishing, 143–161

Wookey, S. (2017) *On Seeing "The Squash" at Tate Britain (n.d.)* available from *<http://sarawookey.com/dance-in-museums/on-seeing-the-squash-at-tate-britain/> [13 May 2020]*

Wookey, S. (2016) 'Multimedia and Performance: On Encountering Dance, Live Art and Performance as a Space of Change'. *Art Review* (Special Edition: Tate Modern: Nought to Sixteen, a History), 52–53

Wookey, S. (2015) *WHO CARES? Dance in the Gallery & Museum*. ed. by Dance, S.D. London: Siobhan Davies Dance

Wookey, S. (2014) *Dance and the Museum: Sara Wookey Responds | Movement Research* [online] available from <https://movementresearch.org/publications/critical-correspondence/dance-and-the-museum-sara-wookey-responds> [26 February 2020]

Wookey, S. (2011) *Open Letter to Artists* [online] available from <http://theperformanceclub.org/2011/11/open-letter-to-artists/> [7 March 2020]

Wookey, S. and Drisko, K. (2009) 'Walking Los Angeles: From Documentation to Performance'. *International Journal of Arts and Technology* 2 (3), 202–217

## Dance Works and Events

Abramović, M. (2010) The Artist is Present. The Museum of Modern Art, New York. 14 -31 March

Barnes, M. (2017) *Museum Workout*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. July 2016 - March 2017

Bronstein, P. (2016) *Historical Dance in an Antique Setting*. Tate Britain, London. 26 April to 9 October

Clark, M. (2011) *The Michael Clark Company*. Tate Modern, London. 8 to 12 June 2011

Charmatz, B. (2015) *Musée de la danse*. Tate Modern, London. 15 to 16 May

Cunningham, M. (1964 – Present) *Events*. Various locations and dates.

Davies, S. (2017) *Dance and Art Forum — Why Dance in Museums*. 9 November

De Keersmaeker, A. (2016) *Work/Travail/Arbeid*. Tate Modern, London. 8 to 10 July

De Keersmaeker, A. (2012) *Fase*: *Four Movements to the Music of Steve Reich*. Tate Modern, London. 18 - 20 July

Forsythe, W. (2012) *William Forsythe Choreographic Objects : Essay* [online] available from <https://www.williamforsythe.com/essay.html> [22 August 2019]

Forsythe, W. (2015) *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No.2*. Brighton Festival 3 to 25 May

Green, K. (2017) *Choreographing the Collection* Dulwich Picture Gallery, London. 14 July

Halprin, A. (2009) *Anna Halprin/Anne Collod & guests*, with Morton Subotnick: parades & changes, replays. Roy and Edna Disney CalArts Theater. 11-14 November

Hamilton, A. (2018) *The Squash*. Tate Britain, London. 22 March to 7 October

Höller, C. (2006-2007) *Test Site*. Tate Modern, London. 10 October to 15 April

Kovanda, J. (2007) *Kissing Through Glass* as part of the *Long Weekend.* Tate Modern, London

Pirici, A. and Pelmus, M. (2016) *Public Collection Tate Modern*, London. 17 June – 3 July

Morris, R. (2009) *Bodyspacemotionthings* Tate Modern, London. 22 May to 14 June

Rainer, Y. (1966) *Trio A* as part of The Mind is a Muscle. Judson Church. 22 May

Rainer, Y. ([1996] 2014) *Trio A 1966/2014* as part of Yvonne Rainer: Dance Works Raven Row, London. 11 July to 10 August

Rainer, Y. ([1966] 2019) *Trio A 1966/2014* as part of *Muoviti Muoviti!* at Palazzo Grassi, Venice. 27 -30 May

Rainer, Y. ([1963] 2014) *Diagonal (part of Terrain)* (1963/2014), as part of Yvonne Rainer: Dance Works Raven Row, London. 11 July to 10 August

Rainer, Y. (2019) installation and live performances as part of *The Work is Never Done: Judson Dance Theater*. Museum of Modern Art. 16 September –February 3

Sehgal, T. (2012) *These associations* as part of Tate Modern *Unilever Series*. 24 July to 28 October

## Events with no specific author

*Art Book Club* (ongoing) The Columbus Museum of Art, Columbus

*Dino Snores for Grownups* (ongoing) *V&A Lates*. Victoria & Albert Museum, London

*Mindful Awareness Meditation* (ongoing) The Hammer Museum, Los Angeles

## Websites with no specific author

*SUPERFLEX/Texts/Discussion between Christiane Berndes, Charles Esche, Daniel McClean and SUPERFLEX (n.d.) available from <https://superflex.net/texts/discussion_between_christiane_berndes_charles_esche_daniel_mcclean_and_superflex> [21 July 2020]*

*Why Dance in a Museum? How Art Became Active Ep 1 of 5 – TateShots | Tate (2018) available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/art/videos/tateshots/why-dance-museum-how-art-became-active-ep-1-5> [19 April 2020]*

*Research | Tate (n.d.) available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/research> [27 February 2020]*

*The Expanded and Reimagined Museum of Modern Art to Open on October 21, 2019 (2019) available from <https://press.moma.org/news/museum-renovation-and-expansion-project/> [30 September 2019]*

*A Body Responds in Dance | The Metropolitan Museum of Art (2014) available from <https://www.metmuseum.org/metmedia/video/viewpoints/the-vine-1> [25 August 2019]*

*Does Abstraction Belong to White People? | Wexner Center for the Arts (2020) available from <https://wexarts.org/talks-more/does-abstraction-belong-white-people> [22 February 2020]*

*Lygia Clark - 40 Artworks, Bio & Shows on Artsy (n.d.) available from <https://www.artsy.net/artist/lygia-clark> [10 April 2020]*

*Explore Fields Transferable Skills | Inclusive Dance (n.d.) available from <https://inclusivedance.eu/explore/field/transferable-skills/page/2/> [28 April 2020]*

*XX|LA Architects Podcast: Interview with Rennie Tang and Sara Wookey (2019) available from <https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/interview-with-rennie-tang-and-sara-wookey-xx-la-episode-019/id1276057424?i=1000429611405> [9 May 2019]*

*William Forsythe Choreographic Objects: Essay (n.d.) available from <https://www.williamforsythe.com/essay.html> [24 February 2020]*

*Selfie Factories: The Rise of the Made-for-Instagram Museum | WIRED (n.d.) available from <https://www.wired.com/story/selfie-factories-instagram-museum/> [30 April 2020]*

*Museum Event No. 1 (Events) - Merce Cunningham Trust (n.d.) available from <https://www.mercecunningham.org/the-work/choreography/museum-event-no-1-events/> [21 March 2020]*

*Exposición - Franz Erhard Walther (2017) available from <https://www.museoreinasofia.es/en/exhibitions/franz-erhard-walther> [26 August 2019]*

*The Lockdown Interviews – 14 – Esme Ward, Director, Manchester Museum, June 2020 – Tincture of Museum (n.d.) available from <https://tinctureofmuseum.wordpress.com/2020/07/14/the-lockdown-interviews-14-esme-ward-director-manchester-museum-june-2020/> [16 July 2020]*

*It's All True: The World as a Stage II – Tate Etc | Tate (n.d.) available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/tate-etc/issue-11-autumn-2007/its-all-true> [30 April 2020]*

*Lecture by Dorothea von Hantelmann, The Exhibition. A Lecture Demonstration (2019) available from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h2fErhiPw3Q> [23 August 2019]*

*Responding to the Covid19 Emergency | Arts Council England (n.d.) available from <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/blog/responding-covid19-emergency> [17 July 2020]*

*'Yvonne Rainer | Raven Row' (2014) Frieze [online] available from <https://frieze.com/article/yvonne-rainer> [9 April 2020]*

*Ethos | ID: Independent Dance (n.d.) available from <https://www.independentdance.co.uk/who/ethos/> [22 February 2020]*

*Play Van Abbe (n.d.) available from <https://vanabbemuseum.nl/en/programme/programme/play-van-abbe/> [6 July 2020]*

*If Tate Modern Was Musée de La Danse? 2015 | Tate (n.d.) available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/performance-at-tate/case-studies/musee-de-la-danse> [28 February 2020]*

*The Tate Modern Project (n.d.) available from <https://www.tate.org.uk/about-us/projects/tate-modern-project> [28 February 2020]*

*Our Strategy 2020-2030 | Arts Council England (n.d.) available from <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication/our-strategy-2020-2030> [20 April 2020]*

*MoMA | Marina Abramović. The Artist Is Present (2010) available from <https://www.moma.org/learn/moma_learning/marina-abramovic-marina-abramovic-the-artist-is-present-2010/> [30 August 2019]*

*FHK Livestream 20-10 Deel 2 (2015) available from <https://fontys.mediamission.nl/Mediasite/Play/f60f3382466b478e8b3e9a33aedb5db11d> [25 August 2019]*

*William H. Whyte (n.d.) available from <https://www.pps.org/article/wwhyte> [21 July 2020]*

*In Terms of Performance — Relational — Pablo Helguera (n.d.) available from <http://intermsofperformance.site/keywords/relational/pablo-helguera> [6 June 2020]*

*On Pause: Online | Wexner Center for the Arts (n.d.) available from <https://wexarts.org/education/pause-online> [21 July 2020]*

*Dance & Museum - Pavilion Dance South West (PDSW) (n.d.) available from <https://www.pdsw.org.uk/news/dance-and-museum/> [3 March 2020]*

# Appendix: Professional History

The period in which I worked with museums has a longer history than from 2014. I have actually danced in museum spaces since 1996. This shift from the theater to the museum came about through my seeking more intimate and economical places to show my inter-disciplinary performance work, mainly as a graduate student in the US. This shift from the theater to the museum came about through my seeking more intimate and economical places to show my dance-theater work. I have worked in and with, among others, the Museum of Contemporary Art, San Diego; the New Museum, New York; Pallazo Grassi, Venice; and the Hammer, Los Angeles. Since 2010, I have worked primarily in and with museums as a dance artist, collaborator, researcher, consultant, and transmitter of Yvonne Rainer's repertoire work[100].

## History with Tate Modern and the Van Abbemuseum

In Spring of 2012 I was invited by scholar Vivian van Saaze, to speak to a small research group composed of curators and heads of learning programs from Tate Modern and Tate Britain, London; Jan Mott, Brussels, and the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven. The meeting was to be the first in a series of meetings and part of a larger project called *Collecting the Performative: A Research Network Examining Emerging Practice for Collecting and Conserving Performance-based Art*[101]. The event I attended was one of three and was focused on dance[102]. The others were 'activism' and 'performance and theatre'. At the meeting I gave a lecture and presentation on my work as a transmitter of Yvonne Rainer's repertoire work. The

[100] Rainer's work, in particular, has found such welcome in museum contexts likely because of her own straddling of dance and visual arts across her choreography, films, performance lectures and writing.

[101] By bringing together Dutch and British academic scholars and museum professionals, this two-year project aimed to provide greater insight into the conceptual and practical challenges related to collecting and conserving artists' performance. The research network examined emerging models for the conservation and documentation of artists' performance and drew upon the practices of dance, theatre and activism in order to identify parallels in the concept of a work and related notions of authorship, authenticity, autonomy, documentation, memory, continuity and liveness.

[102] The other dance artist involved was Bertha Bermudez, speaking via Skype from Amsterdam. She spoke about her work with Emio Greco, an Italian Dutch-based choreographer with whom she has worked with as a dancer and more recently as a 'Dance Researcher at International Choreographic Center ICK'.

interest in the room was on the practice of transmission from dance artist to dance artist as a form of preservation. It was here that I began to sense directly the position of the dance artist in the museum as a holder of knowledge and experience that was, to some degree, foreign to the curators and learning experts. I spoke about my being on the inside of the transmission process and the need for body-to-body transfer in dance as a means, and usually the most common and affective one, of passing on a dance from one person to the next. Although, in relation to that thought, I did highlight in my talk the notes, drawings and mapping, as skills dance artists have, in order to remember, recall and reperform work I have made. This material residue of the work seemed of great interest, as well as the more obscure passing on of information through a bodily approach. It was here too that I began to develop a professional relationship with curators and learning experts from the Van Abbe and Tate that led to future collaborative projects, two of which serve as case studies in this thesis. Some of those projects will be discussed further in my case studies but were: *The Experience & Value of Live Art* (2015), *The Physicality of Research* (Tate London 2017) and my role as a *Tate Learning and Research Associate* (2017-2018) as part of my doctoral work.