

Being a thing: the work of performing in the museum

Abigail Levine*

Because of this high status of the object in our culture, something has to be a thing.

— Tino Sehgal, *New Yorker*, 6 August 2012

I enter the sixth-floor galleries at the New York Museum of Modern Art from a utility hallway that doubles as a green room for performers. I greet the security guards in their dark suits and ties and my fellow performers, dressed only in the white lab coats that are our pre-performance uniform. Just before ten thirty, my partner and I remove our coats, hang them on their assigned hooks and take our places facing each other in a narrow doorway to begin a *reperformance* of Marina Abramović and Ulay's work *Imponderabilia*. Two security guards take their places near us on either side of the doorway. They ask if we are ready. We nod. They signal to a supervisor who opens the gallery doors. Our day begins. We will stand, silent and still, for an hour and fifteen minutes until we are replaced by two other performers who will do the same.

As many critics and scholars have noted, museums are ushering performance back into their galleries at a furious pace. Some speak of the trend with an oddly literal metaphor – performance as new life to reanimate culturally and economically dead spaces. Roberta Smith writes of the Whitney Biennial: “The 2012 incarnation is a new and exhilarating species … an emerging curatorial life form, at least for New York” (Smith 2012, *The New York Times*). Although rarely acknowledged, on a more fundamental level, the new “species” entering the museums is not a “curatorial life form” but the performer, the artist who is an interpreter rather than a creator of a live work. While there is a long history of visual artists performing their own work in museums and galleries, as well as some tradition of presenting dance concerts in these spaces, the number of performers being employed by museums and the hours they work have much less precedent. In the rush to fill these spaces with performance, museums and artists seem unprepared to handle the conceptual, practical, and ethical considerations that come with situating the work of performing within the museum.

Visual-arts institutions were designed to collect and sell objects. The work and skill of performing has no historical legacy in this context, nor, importantly, a way of being effectively harnessed within its economic structure.¹ There is no rubric for assigning aesthetic or

*Email: abigaillevine@gmail.com

economic value to the work of the performer. As museums usher performance back into their galleries, they must reckon with the work of performers, both their contributions and their costs. There are also attendant questions: Is performing different than other forms of labor? When one compensates performance labor, what is it that is being paid for? What are the consequences of further formalizing performing at professionalized labor? These issues are of considerable theoretical interest. They are also of immediate practical concern. Increasingly, performers are becoming employees of both artists presenting in museums, as well as the museums themselves. Although the museums command significant financial resources, performers in these exhibits are generally paid little, if at all. In our contemporary economy, workers are increasingly being told that creative satisfaction, flexibility of schedule, personal fulfillment, and other intangibles are to be considered substitutes for more substantial financial remuneration, a situation familiar to all performing artists. Dance scholar Randy Martin characterizes the appealing and vulnerable position of dancers at work: “Their love of art subsidizes their pursuit of perfection –making them the ideal laborers in an idealized creative economy” (Martin 2012, 66).

To explore these issues, I look at recent models of performers’ work in museums –Abramović’s reperformances at the MoMA in 2010, her direction of the 2011 gala benefit at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles (MOCA) and Tino Sehgal’s museum-wide, performance-based exhibit at the Guggenheim in 2010. Both Abramović and Sehgal identify their work within the visual arts and represent one dominant model of that field’s approach to bringing performance in the museum. Yvonne Rainer enters into this conversation through her critique of Abramović’s performances at the LA MOCA. In the light of her critique, I look at Rainer’s 2011–12 dance retrospective at Dia: Beacon, which presents an alternate model of bringing performance into the museum space, one more informed by the conventions and economics of the performing arts.

Working in the museum

In the 1977 version of *Imponderabilia*, performed in the Galleria Communale d’Arte Moderna in Bologna, Abramović and Ulay positioned their work as the gateway to the museum. In the changed social reality of 2010 New York City, the piece was moved from the museum entrance to the back wall of a gallery on the sixth floor. Two security guards stood on either side of the doorway at all times. When the gallery was empty at the very beginning and end of the museum day, it became clear that *Imponderabilia* was being performed in double, one iteration surrounding the other. Any viewer who walked between the two performers had to pass between the two security guards, as well. As the weeks of the exhibition progressed, the guards developed their own ways of interacting with both the public and the performers. They found ways to smooth the flow of the audience through the work and to make sure the performers were as comfortable and safe as possible. One guard, for example, began asking viewers to hold their bags by their sides as they passed through the doorway. She explained to me that this served the dual purpose of keeping people’s hands in sight and keeping zippers and buckles further from the performers’ bodies. The performers, likewise, developed a series of gestures to communicate with the guards. If we felt concerned with a situation, a discreet cue sent the guards



Figure 1. Reperformers in *Marina Abramović: The Artist is Present*, Museum of Modern Art, May 2010. Photo: Erica Papernik.

into action. The work of the reperformers and the guards became entwined; at times, the similarity of our postures was humorously striking. The physical arrangement of the double *Imponderabilia* underlined our performances as labor, as well as the different character and purpose in the work of the performers and the guards. Had *Imponderabilia* become a performance of one class of labor surrounded by another? Was the visibility of our performance predicated on the invisibility of that of the guards? Or, yet more ironically, were both layers of this work primarily making visible the specter of Marina and Ulay's now mythic performance?

During the run of the exhibit, I operated as if there were a definite separation between my "job" – showing up at the museum each day and assuming my performance post for an allotted period of time – and my performance work – the more subjective undertaking of fulfilling the possibilities of the performance structure and sharing an experience with my audience. However, our resemblance to the guards belied this distinction. Writing about waitressing as affective labor, philosopher Emma Dowling addresses the difficulty of untangling the "affective work ... in relation to the other more explicitly material



Figure 2. Hallway converted to performer green room for *Marina Abramović: The Artist is Present*, Museum of Modern Art, March 2010. Photo: Abigail Levine.

forms of labour without which the service element of the work would not be possible" (Dowling 2007, 118). The arrangement of guards and performers in *Imponderabilia* served to highlight the often unrecognized affective work of the security guards, and the importance of their "performance" to the experience of the audience. The complementary conclusion that performing is material labor is a notion which has historically met with resistance. The disconnect of performance and labor stems from the economic dismissal of performance as an activity that is non-productive, as well as the more familiar desire to imagine art as a world above material concerns. Performing relies on and invests in the body, which cannot be transferred, preserved, or entirely controlled; it does not provide a readily sellable object. The body in performance is tied to the historically deva-lued realm of physical labor and, in its more exposed states, to the feminine realms of prostitution and childbirth. Thus, if performance is understood as work, it is of a sort that is degraded and undesirable. Performers are, therefore, in a double bind, needing to assert what they do as work, while also being socially penalized for doing so.

The job of the reperformer *as museum employee* was to create an experience for viewers via the structure of Abramović's performance works. Abramović, however, did not articulate our work in these terms. She spoke of our endeavor only in relation to the performance pieces themselves. She trained and tasked us solely with fulfilling the potential of her works and of finding our own relationship and experience within these structures. She never made a link between our work and the audience beyond the practical considerations of shared space and safety. All 40 reperformers took up Abramović's proposition and, without exception, found challenging, engrossing

experiences within the work. We spoke regularly of the ways in which Abramović's training and this performance opportunity were supporting our creative growth, and we acknowledged the likely aid this association would have to our careers. Like Abramović, we never considered our performing as service work for an audience. However, as the numbers of visitors to the MoMA exhibit climbed into the hundreds of thousands, each one paying a \$20 admission fee, we became increasingly aware of the economic dimension of our work within the museum's operations.² The gap between what we were doing as museum employees and what we felt like we were doing as Abramović's performers became increasingly clear.

Tino Sehgal and dancers in the museum

Abramović has not been the only artist to bring large numbers of performers into museums in recent years. Tino Sehgal presents works in museums and galleries that often involve dozens of both professional and non-professional performers. Sehgal describes his works as immaterial creations: sets of instructions to be carried out by "interpreters," the term he prefers to "performers." While many of his works are structurally akin to postmodern dance and performance art, Sehgal insists that his work be understood as visual art. He lays out the criteria that grant his works this status – the pieces are on display for the entire time a gallery or museum is open; the works are repeatable and, therefore, transferable from space to space like a painting; and, most remarkably to many, they are sellable and collectable. There are obvious benefits to the claim of the status of visual art. As Sehgal himself states: "You send your children to the museum, and that's the official version of who we are, as a society" (Collins 2012); the museum is a space that grants social and historical significance to an artist. In addition, the *New York Times Magazine* reported in 2010 that Sehgal was selling his work "in editions of four to six (with Sehgal retaining an additional 'artist's proof') at prices between \$85,000 and \$145,000 apiece" (Lubow 2010). The profits Sehgal is able to achieve from such sales are unheard of for works of dance.

By locating his work in the visual arts, Sehgal separates *his* work as an artist, both conceptually and economically, from the work of his interpreters. In the performing arts, the institutional presenter of a dance or play generally does not become the owner of the performance work. Sehgal, by contrast, transfers ownership of his work – the instructions to produce the performance – to a museum or collector, independent of performance dates and hiring performers. However, the work cannot ever be realized without the participation of performers and, therefore, cannot practically be separated from the bodies that enact it. Sehgal grounds his distinction between creative act and execution of the work in the tradition of conceptual art, which claims the idea as the true work of art, while understanding its performance as simply following instructions. In an essay about Sehgal's work, Dorothea von Hantelmann quotes Sol Lewitt's definition of conceptual art: "The idea or the concept is the most important aspect of the work. The execution is a perfunctory affair" (von Hantelmann 2010, 144). Sehgal often employs non-professional performers in his work. However, the preparations of the pieces always include a period of training and rehearsal. Additionally, some of his works are complex choreographies that necessitate the use of trained dancers including "Kiss" (2007) and "Instead of allowing some thing to rise up to your face dancing bruce and dan and other things" (2000). The performance

of these works could never be described as “perfunctory.” While dance critic Claudia La Rocco notes that Sehgal’s distinction of his work from the category of dance is “a little disingenuous” considering his reliance on trained dancers and choreography, its economic advantages are undeniable (Collins 2012). There is no way that Sehgal could command the prices he does for his art works if they were categorized as dances.³ Swedish choreographer Mårten Spångberg understands Sehgal’s work as a “reading of conventions of historicity in choreography and performing art, and moreover a critique of the economies playing those conventions of labeling” (Spångberg 2002, 207). Unfortunately, while the performance of his works levies a critique on the economies of the worlds of art, the practical structures of his exhibitions – the limited compensation and acknowledgement of the work of his performers – run the risk of reproducing the inequities of those same economies in a new context.

The performance quality Sehgal elicits from the dancers in his more highly choreographed works echoes the object status that he claims for his work and further mutes the interpretive contributions of his performers. Von Hantelmann writes that, in one of Sehgal’s works: “The body produced the impression of an object; at certain moments it even appeared as an undefined, anthropomorphic mass” (von Hantelmann 2010, 131). Writing of watching a dancer performing an early Sehgal piece, dance scholar Ramsay Burt observes: “The effect for me was to render the interpreters anonymous, servile and almost disturbingly deindividuated” (Burt 2010, 273). He connects this impression to the fact of these performers’ work: “involved in servile, non-productive labour, the interpreters were active and alive but not part of the community, their state of silent non-communication rendering them barely human” (Burt 2010, 276). This muting of the performer’s personness is a provocative part of Sehgal’s aesthetic project. It disconnects performing from a presentation of individual identity, allowing for other possible ground for connection between performer and audience. However, this move also becomes part of the economics of Sehgal’s art production – one which, if not carefully contextualized, implicitly devalues the work of performers.⁴

Sehgal’s work is emblematic of the conceptual gap between the visual-arts tradition and the act of performing – there is no system for articulating the importance of performance interpretation within the context of visual art, as there is in the fields of dance, music, or theater. In the visual arts, value is placed on a creation, either of an object or, more recently, a performance. The act of performing – the embodying of an artist’s concept – does not have a place in the economic or art-historical system of visual art. Performers, therefore, find themselves without a basis for asserting the value of their work. Claire Bishop introduces the term “re-skilling” to describe the transfer of dance and the dancer into the venues and compositions of the visual arts (Bishop 2011, 1). This term, which she derives but distinguishes from the economics term “*de-skilling*,” goes beyond simply moving one artistic discipline’s practices to another. It is “the bringing to bear of one set of competencies on those of the newly elected discipline” (Bishop 2011, 5). She notes that: “As viewers too, we need to re-skill” (Bishop 2011, 6). In the case of performers in the museum, viewers of performance must learn to “see” the contribution of the interpreter to an artwork. In a broader sense, the visual arts must integrate the notion of the skill and work of the performer into its rubric of aesthetic and historical value if performance is to have a substantial and sustainable life in the museum.

Performing the gala

After the storm of popular and critical attention given to her MoMA retrospective, Abramović's celebrity soared. Capitalizing on this confluence of art and stardom, the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles (MOCA) asked Abramović to design and direct their 2011 gala benefit. (Lady Gaga was the previous year's director.) Abramović's main design was a performance entitled "Better than Flowers." The piece involved 120 performers, each transformed into a centerpiece for a table of gala diners. Most of the performers sat under the tables on revolving platforms with their heads popping through a hole in the center of the table. They turned themselves slowly in circles, enabling eye contact with the guests. At the more expensive tables, the display was different. A naked performer (female only, as per museum stipulations) lay across the table with a skeleton on top of her – a re-performance of Abramović's *Nude with Skeleton*. There were instructions by each plate, which Abramović read to the crowd at the start of the meal: "No touching, feeding, offering drink, or disrespecting the centerpiece. All communication and connection with the centerpiece must be non-verbal" (Binlot 2012).

Choreographer and filmmaker Yvonne Rainer brought the event to wide-spread attention in the art world when she drafted a letter to museum director Jeffrey Deitch, decrying the performances as "exploitative ... titillation for wealthy donor/diners" (Rainer 2011). Central to her concerns was the effect of the gala context would have on the meaning of the performance works and how that would affect the performers. After attending a rehearsal for the gala, Rainer commented, "the fifty heads – all young, beautiful, and mostly white – turning and bobbing out of holes ... [at] otherwise empty tables appeared touching and somewhat comic, but when I envisioned 800 inebriated diners surrounding them, I had



Figure 3. Centerpiece performer in Marina Abramović's *Nude with Skeleton*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles gala dinner, November 2011. Photo: Frazer Harrison/ WireImage.



Figure 4. Centerpiece performer at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles gala dinner, designed by Marina Abramović, November 2011. Photo: Frazer Harrison/ WireImage.

another impression” (Rainer 2011).⁵ Writing about the gala, Claire Bishop noted a similar problem transferring Abramović’s performance to the context of the gala. She read the event as a “media stunt dressed up as performance art to raise money” (Bishop 2012, 229–230). Neither Rainer nor Bishop believed the gala performances were able to transcend the context of a fundraising event. By extension, the performers were relegated to the position of party entertainment, occupying a discomfiting space between human and object. According to Bishop, although the flowers were replaced by human heads, “the table decorations don’t become more than table decorations” (Bishop 2012, 203).

Performers who published accounts of the event, however, understood their experience quite differently. They defended the performances as art, felt genuine connection with the diners around them, and spoke of themselves as empowered by the experience. One performer imagined addressing her diners: “You feel sorry for us because we’re being stared at? But we’re staring at you. Marina gave us all permission to create our own performance space around us – it was a gift” (Finkel 2011). Another performer wrote: “In a rare and beautiful moment, the power dynamics that have existed for hundreds of years between artists and the wealthy had been reversed” (Hill 2011). Some did not share this view. One performer felt objectified by the situation and said he would turn down the job if it were offered to him again (O’Neill 2012). Guests seemed generally uninvested in the experience. They were reported to have ditched their lab coats in irritation and, largely, to have ignored the rotating heads just past their dinner plates. One guest made a line out of salt near a performer’s nose to look as though she was snorting cocaine. Another more generously said: “I know you’re not supposed to talk, but if you want a vodka at

any point, just blink" (Trebay 2011). The context of the gala, an event with an explicit economic agenda, changed the dynamics and accepted rules of engagement between performer and audience. Negotiations of power and gaps in experience came to the fore. Perhaps, however, the change of the performance's frame simply exposed dynamics that are always present in such exchanges but are muted by more conventional performance situations.

Economics and economies

Many are touting and debating performance's return to museums on aesthetic grounds. However, economic strategy underpins the curatorial choices and, in some cases, those of the artists, as well. Curator Andy Horwitz organized a panel during the 2012 Under the Radar Festival, which included Performa director Roselee Goldberg and Philip Bither, curator at the Walker Arts Center. The discussion took up the inclusion of dance and theater in visual-art contexts and the questions it raises for artists and presenters. Writing about the panel in *The Brooklyn Rail*, Alexis Clements wonders why there was so much attention given to the parsing these disciplines, a debate that struck her as "largely semantic" (Clements 2012). She concludes: "The most obvious answer, particularly within the context of the US arts economy, is money" (Clements 2012). She notes the significant differences in the economics that govern the performing arts and visual arts, including the differences in compensation structures and labor protections in each field. She credits these differences with turning discussions around these issues into something of a "turf war," despite the wealth of interesting aesthetic questions they raise (Clements 2012).

As these two cultural sectors interact, museums are using presenting models that derive either from the visual or performing arts. The visual-arts model, employed in the Abramović and Sehgal exhibits, follows conventions of gallery presentation: performance works are displayed during all gallery hours, as a painting or sculpture would be. In this model, while the presenting artist selects performers, the museum or gallery acts as employer. The artist remains uninvolved in any contract negotiations with the performers. On aesthetic grounds, the visual-arts model stretches performance in important directions. Extended exhibitions challenge the time structures traditionally associated with performing. Both duration and gallery presentation ask an audience to involve themselves differently in crafting their engagement with the work and the performers. However, on a practical level, unless budgets are increased or reconfigured, the visual-art model depends on low-cost performance labor. Museums are already decrying the large, new costs of bringing in performance work, and curators are struggling to justify the expense. In Abramović's MoMA exhibit, for example, eight performers were present in the galleries at all times. The galleries were open 40 hours per week. Thus, over the course of the 12-week run, the museum paid for an excess of 3800 performer hours. Unless obliged to do so, there is little chance museums will agree to pay wages commensurate with major theaters for such extended runs.

The performing-arts model, used during Yvonne Rainer's retrospective at Dia: Beacon, as well as Sarah Michelson's recent performances at the 2012 Whitney Biennial, follows presenting conventions of the theater and, most closely, concert dance. In this model, performances take place on a series of dates for a limited time. The museum pays the choreographer or dance company a set fee for their performances, and they in turn negotiate

contracts with their performers. While this is no guarantee of fair pay, its comparability to unionized performing-arts conventions grounds the performer's work in an established history of regulated labor. Despite this history, this model is also deeply flawed. The labor and production costs almost invariably exceed the income from performances, leaving artists to find creative, sometimes exploitative, solutions to the disparity. The program for Michelson's Whitney performances credited numerous volunteers and interns. A recent performance of a Steve Paxton work at the MoMA was billed to potential performers as a "workshop," allowing the museum to forgo payment for their work.⁶

For her part, Yvonne Rainer chose to limit the number of professional performers she employed in her retrospective at Dia: Beacon based on her budgetary constraints. She had only enough financing to pay her core group of five dancers. Thus, for the works that required larger casts, she used students from Sarah Lawrence College, who received college credit in exchange for their work. Throughout the years since her return to choreography, Rainer has refused to work with performers if she is unable to pay them what she deems an adequate wage (Rainer 2012). The regard for the performer's contribution to her work that this principle signals extends to Rainer's casting and choreographic choices, as well. She has worked for years with a group of mostly female dancers who all have long, distinguished performing careers. Most are also recognized choreographers. These performers will never disappear in the choreography; instead, they challenge and, often humorously, complicate Rainer's aesthetic choices. The performer's contribution to a work is generally more acknowledged in the field of dance than in performance art. Rainer goes further, even, than most choreographers to highlight the work of performance making as a dialogue between creator and performer.



Figure 5. (L-R) Emily Coates and Yvonne Rainer in Yvonne Rainer's *Trio A Pressured (Facing)*, 1999–2011. Dia:Beacon, Riggio Galleries. October 2011. Photo: Paula Court.



Figure 6. (L–R) Emmanuelle Phuon, Pat Catterson, Emily Coates, and Keith Sabado in Yvonne Rainer's *Trio A Pressured (Facing), 1999–2011*. Dia:Beacon, Riggio Galleries, October 2011. Photo: Paula Court.

Although the model of Rainer's smaller-scale retrospective is more economically tenable, I do not propose that artists necessarily compromise their artistic projects because of financial considerations. Abramović and Sehgal's exhibitions have pushed museums and the arts in important ways. Museums and the visual arts offer many new aesthetic and theoretical provocations for the act of performing: opening new possibilities for the relationship between performer and audience; challenging the equation between performer and presence; expanding the way performance is experienced temporally. Likewise, performers alter the visual-arts spaces they inhabit – complicating narratives of art history, unsettling the dichotomy of object and subject, and challenging the ever-increasing commodification of art. However, if these projects are to go forward, performer wages and working conditions must carry weight in curatorial conversations. This, in turn, necessitates a clear articulation of what the work of performing is and how it fits into the larger aims of an exhibition. In this regard, as well as in the ways these issues extend into the works themselves, Rainer is an essential point of reference.

In his introduction to the volume *Dance (Documents in Contemporary Art)*, André Lepecki notes that one of dance's "constitutive elements" is a "contract, or promise between the choreographic planning and its actualization in movement" (Lepecki 2012, 16). The double language of contract and promise speaks to the dual nature of the performer's work. Performing is a physical labor like any other. However, there is an intimacy of exchange that gives it another dimension. Performers understand themselves both professionally bound and personally compelled to complete their work. The question remains, particularly on an institutional level, as to whether the performing arts and visual arts can meet on ground that acknowledges and supports the complex conditions of the work of performing.

Notes on contributor

Abigail Levine is a dance and performance artist from New York. She has performed recently with Marina Abramović, Carolee Schneemann, Clarinda Mac Low, and Mark Dendy. She has presented her own performance works in the US, Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico, Brazil and Taiwan. Abigail holds a Masters from NYU in Dance and Performance Studies.

Notes

1. I focus in this piece on the situation in the United States. Fundamental differences in the economic structures of cultural sectors, for instance in the United States and Europe, make it difficult to address these situations collectively.
2. For further discussion of performer pay and contract negotiations surrounding the Abramović retrospective, see Brooks et al. (2011).
3. For performing a recent work of Sehgal's at the Tate Modern, the museum paid interpreters "a little more than the London Living Wage, which is about thirteen dollars an hour" (Collins 2012). Collins writes that "especially those who are performers by trade" consider this "a decent job" (Collins 2012). However, this pay is not even at the accustomed level of performance pay by independent artists and small companies. Because of the nature of freelance work, a wage that would be adequate in a full-time position is not enough to survive on in such employment arrangements. This is accounted for in the pay structures common to the performing arts. However, it has not been adopted by the visual arts in their hiring. In recent works that have required performers, again at the MoMA, performers were told they were being paid the same wage (\$24/ hour) as art handlers. However, they were only paid for the actual time in performance. Thus, some who performed, for example, for 42-minute stretches with a four-hour break between were only paid \$32 for more than five hours at the museum.
4. I focus here on performers who identify as professionals in the field. See Claire Bishop's *Artificial Hells* for an extended discussion of the related practice of the "hiring non-professionals or specialists in other fields to undertake the job of being present and performing on behalf of the artist" (Bishop 2012, 219).
5. Rainer was alerted to the situation by Sarah Wookey who refused a spot as a performer of *Nude with Skeleton* on grounds of economic exploitation. In "An Open Letter from a Dancer who Refused to Participate in Marina Abramović's MOCA Performance," Wookey makes an eloquent case for the need for collective acknowledgment and organizing around labor protections for "cultural workers" (Wookey 2011). She notes "current social, cultural, and economic conditions that have rendered the exploitation of cultural workers commonplace, natural, and even horrifically banal" (Wookey 2011). She cites professional arrangements in Canada and Europe that guarantee living wages for performers, as well as regulations that govern unionized film and stage actors in the US, as models of fair labor practices.
6. The Paxton performances were a part of the MoMA program, Some sweet day, curated by Ralph Lemon. The performers were not hired but offered the chance to audition for MoMA/ PS1's Summer School program. They participated in a three-day rehearsal/ workshop with Paxton, presented an open rehearsal at PS1 and performed three times at the MoMA as volunteers (<http://momaps1.org/summerschool>). Other choreographers presented in this series, paid dancers a flat fee. The amounts varied. For discussion of ways to bring transparency and fairness of exchange in working artistic relationships, including in the absence of financial resources, see: "The Dancer's Forum Compact For A Working Artistic Relationship Between Dancers and Choreographers" <http://www.nyfa.org/level4.asp?id=220&fid=1&sid=51&tid=199>

References

- Binlot, Ann. 2012. "Marina Abramović's Divisive MOCA Gala Left Heads Spinning as Will Ferrell and Sasha Zhukova Looked On." *Art Info*. www.artinfo.com/news/story/750513/marina-abramovics-divisive-moca-gala-left-heads-spinning-as-will-ferrell-and-dasha-zhukova-looked-on

- Bishop, Claire. 2011. "Unhappy Days in the Art World? De-skilling Theater, Re-skilling Performance." *The Brooklyn Rail*. www.brooklynrail.org/2011/12/art/unhappy-days-in-the-art-worldde-skilling-theater-re-skilling-performance
- Bishop, Claire. 2012. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso.
- Brooks, Rebecca, Lai, Gary, and Levine, Abigail. 2011. "Three Reperformers from Marina Abramović's 'The Artist is Present' Respond to the MOCA Gala Performances." *The Performance Club*. <http://theperformanceclub.org/2011/11/three-reperformers-from-marina-abramovic-the-artist-is-present-respond-to-the-moca-gala-performances/>
- Burt, Ramsey. 2010. "Performative Intervention and Political Affect: de Keersmaeker and Sehgal." In *Dance and Politics*, edited by Alexandra Kolb, 257–280. Bern: International Academic Publishers
- Clements, Alexis. 2012. "Dividing Divisions: What's at Stake in the Theater Vs. Visual Arts Debate." *The Brooklyn Rail*. <http://brooklynrail.org/2012/02/theater/dividing-divisions-whats-at-stake-in-the-theater-vs-visual-arts-debate>
- Collins, Lauren. 2012. "The Question Artist." *New Yorker*, 6 August.
- Dowling, Emma. 2007. "Producing the Dining Experience: Measure, Subjectivity and the Affective Worker." *ephemera: theory and politics in organization* 7 (1): 117–132.
- Finkel, Jori. 2011. "Marina Abramović's Silent Heads from MOCA Gala Speak Out." *Los Angeles Times*. <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/culturemonster/2011/11/marina-abramović-s-silent-performers-speak-out.html>
- Hill, E. J. Better than Flowers. 2011. *EJ Hill tumblr*. <http://ejhill.tumblr.com/post/13087633816/better-than-flowers>
- Lepecki, André. 2012. "Introduction." In *Dance (Documents of Contemporary Art)*, edited by André Lepecki, 14–23. London: Whitechapel Gallery.
- Lubow, Arthur. 2010. "Making Art Out of an Encounter." *New York Times Magazine*, 15 January. www.nytimes.com/2010/01/17/magazine/17seghal-t.html
- Martin, Randy. 2012. "A Precarious Dance, a Derivative Sociality." *TDR, The Drama Review* 56 (4): 62–77.
- O'Neill, Blaine. 2012. Email to the author. 27 November.
- Rainer, Yvonne. 2011. Open Letter to MOCA Director Jeffrey Deitch. *Art Info*. <http://blogs.artinfo.com/artintheair/2011/11/14/read-yvonne-rainers-final-letter-decrying-marina-abramovics-moca-performance/>
- Rainer, Yvonne. 2012. Email to the author. 15 February.
- Smith, Roberta. "A Survey of a Different Color. 2012 Whitney Biennial." *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/02/arts/design/2012-whitney-biennial.html>
- Spångberg, Mårten. 2002. "In the Beginning Was Equation." In *Dance (Documents of Contemporary Art)*, edited by André Lepecki, 206–208. London: Whitechapel Gallery.
- Trebay, Guy. 2011. "A Career Provocateur." *New York Times*. www.nytimes.com/2011/11/20/fashion/marina-abramovics-crossover-moment.html?
- von Hantelmann, Dorothea. 2010. *How to Do Things with Art*. Zurich: JRP|Ringier.
- Wookey, Sarah. 2011. "An Open Letter from a Dancer who Refused to Participate in Marina Abramović's MOCA Performance." *Art Info*. www.artinfo.com/news/story/751666/an-open-letter-from-a-dancer-who-refused-to-participate-in-marina-abramovic%E2%80%99s-moca-performance