

Claire Bishop and Julia Austin

Trauma, Antagonism and the Bodies of Others: A Dialogue on Delegated Performance

Art historian Claire Bishop has pioneered the concept of antagonistic aesthetics: a provocative new paradigm for understanding socially engaged, collaborative forms of art/performance practice.

In her groundbreaking essays 'Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics' and 'The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents', Bishop offers a trenchant critique of dominant theories of socially collaborative practice.[1] In addition to targeting Nicolas Bourriaud's influential manifesto of relational aesthetics, which proposed to disrupt capitalist systems of exchange by creating harmonious micro-utopias in the space of the gallery, Bishop also takes aim at the work of 'politically correct' scholars such as Grant Kester, who grounds his blueprint for dialogical aesthetics in an ethics of respect, empowerment and authorial sacrifice.[2] While Bourriaud's and Kester's formulations of collaborative practice correspond to markedly different traditions, both approaches endeavour to heal or repair a damaged social bond. Bishop's contribution is to challenge the presumed radicality and political value of such ameliorative, heteronomous projects, at the same time setting forth an alternative discursive framework that is tuned toward antagonistic goals.

Influenced by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, who contend that social antagonism and conflict are essential components of a healthy, fully functioning democratic society, Bishop argues that in order for critical reflection to occur, socially collaborative practice should avoid what Shannon Jackson has playfully termed 'feel good' or 'do good' models.[3] Instead, Bishop promotes projects that intentionally structure 'feel bad' experiences for the gallery-goer. As she describes below, the works produce a 'difficult knot of affect' and give rise to a complex set of ethical questions. Even more controversially, in defending the work of notorious artists such as Santiago Sierra and Artur Źmijewski, who clearly refuse the other-directed terms of 'do good' practice, Bishop also appears to endorse a 'do bad' model of collaboration that courts charges of egoism and manipulation.

In 2008, Bishop turned her attentions to the phenomenon of delegated performance, a collaborative mode of practice that emerged in the early 1990s when artists in the West began to adopt the strategy of using other people as their medium and material. [4] During

that year, Bishop and curator Mark Sladen staged the exhibition 'Double Agent', which platformed the tendency and presented the work of seven artists: Christoph Schlingensief, Donelle Woolford/Joe Scanlan, Phil Collins, Paweł Althamer, Artur Żmijewski, Barbara Visser and Dora García. After debuting at the ICA Gallery in London, 'Double Agent' travelled to the Mead Gallery in Coventry and the Baltic Centre for Contemporary Art in Newcastle.

Though delegated performance encompasses a wide range of approaches and thematic concerns, as a helpful guideline the phenomenon can be categorised into five specific, if interrelated, modes of practice. The first uses surrogate bodies to examine issues of authorship and authenticity. The second utilises or even deliberately exploits the bodies of Others in order to re-invigorate some of the ethico- political debates that undergird the practice of working with marginalised constituencies. In the third model, artists collaborate with non-professionals so as to re-enact painful historical events and probe the fabric of cultural memory. In the fourth model, artists tackle glocal crises by bringing members of the public into contact with hired representatives of an economically underprivileged group/ 'problem' community. Finally, artists use delegated performers to interact with and engage spectators in highly artificial and socially awkward situations, thereby compelling us to re-examine the concept of unmediated behaviour and the supposed authenticity of live encounters.

The following conversation focuses on the second, third and fourth models of delegated performance and considers the disturbing affects and problematic ethics of delegation as well as the tendency's traumatic rehearsals of the past.

*

Julia Austin: Let's begin with the obvious: delegated performance can be shocking. In part this is due to the fact that a core strand of delegated performance concerns itself with glocal zones of conflict. But it is also a result of the unique way in which delegated performance utilises the body. As you have described, in contrast to the body art of the '60s and '70s, in delegated performance artists no longer use their own bodies as medium and material but chose to foreground the bodies of hired, non-professional participants (often 'authentic' representatives of a marginalised, socially vulnerable group e.g. immigrants or workers in the informal economy).

During the '70s, a number of Western artists also used the body to respond, albeit obliquely, to a geopolitical crisis of devastating proportions: the war in Vietnam. However, in the case of artists such as Vito Acconci and Chris Burden, feelings of trauma at the ruptured social contract were inscribed directly onto their own bodies through acts of self-mutilation. In contrast to this model of indexical immediacy, the body of the artist within delegated performance is typically removed from the scene. Artists can instead be seen to register their sense of trauma through the act of outsourcing which deliberately

reproduces the broken social contract (the myth that globalisation benefits us all) in the uneven relationship between artist and hired help.

However, in describing early examples of delegated performance you state that 'the fact that it is not the artists' own bodies being staged means that this politics is pursued with a cool irony and distance'.^[5] You suggest however that the political tenor of the work shifted in 1999 with Santiago Sierra's displays of dark-skinned and economically underprivileged workers. How does this later work re-approach the act of delegation so as to affect within the viewer feelings of discomfort and even distress?

Claire Bishop: Prior to Sierra's decision to exhibit Latin American workers in 1999, it is true that delegated performance tended to use white bodies. Some of these were working class (eg the brass band players in Jeremy Deller's *Acid Brass*, 1997, and Annika Eriksson's *Copenhagen Postmen's Orchestra*, 1996), but this is not as central to the work as the question of music – in other words, these projects are more concerned with leisure rather than labour.^[6] They do not thematise otherness or make an economic point, but rather construct a humorous juxtaposition of traditional music and pop (acid house and trip-hop respectively). Sierra's work, by contrast, foregrounds the visibility of race as cheap labour and the focus is on payment: the alienated worker who is willing to perform demeaning or pointless tasks for the minimum wage.

But an element of discomfort is present in most delegated performance, since we are always looking at people who have been paid to perform some aspect of themselves (rather than a skill or talent): gender, sexuality, ethnicity, economic status, disability, etc. This is true whether it takes the form of Beecroft's tableaux of women with particular skin colours (1995 onwards), or any number of works that involve refugees. This awkwardness derives from the way in which these works mess with your enjoyment in looking: our immediate reaction is to feel conflicted, finding an uneven power dynamic between the viewer and these (supposedly) reified subjects.

JA: How far do you agree with the idea that delegated performance stages a 'return of the real' via the bodies of 'authentic' racial and/or economic Others; and to what extent do you think that spectators' ethical objections are based on the 'authentic' status of participants (as asylum seekers, sex workers, homeless people etc)? If viewers simply objected to the idea of collaborating with participants drawn from underprivileged groups, why were charges of exploitation not levelled at Jens Haaning's project *Middlesburg Summer 1996* (1996) which presented the bodies of twelve authentic immigrants from Turkey, Iran and Bosnia?

CB: Delegated performance might well stage another 'return of the real'. But this comes back to your first question about indexical immediacy, which has been tied to questions of the 'real' (in a psychoanalytic sense) by art historians such as Hal Foster and Margaret Iversen. There is no less indexicality in delegated work than in '70s era body art. It is simply that other people are now put on display, rather than the artist him/herself. The most interesting work in this genre problematises the idea of modernist authenticity: artists create

artificial situations that restrict their performer's agency – often inviting accusations of manipulation – but in effect showing how unclear the distinction now is between authentic and constructed subjectivity.

To answer your question about *Middelburg Summer*, Jens Haaning's installation in which a Turkish-owned clothing factory relocated its operation into Middelburg's gallery, the Vleeshal. In this work, I sense that the artist no longer remained in control of the conceptual space he established and the dominant tone was one of the viewer's alienation, rather than the alienation of the performing subjects (in this case, workers going about their daily tasks). For example, the critic Lars Bang Larsen noted that when entering the Vleeshal, 'you must, as a spectator, assume a peripheral and rather reticent position, in contrast to the specular command traditionally wielded at art exhibitions. The atmosphere and the activity make you feel like an intruder.'[7]

Incidentally, *Return of the Real* is the title of a project by Phil Collins (2005 onwards), in which he interviews people who felt their lives had been ruined by reality television. The title doesn't just refer to the revenge of these subjects upon the cliché-ridden apparatus of reality television. It also implies that, in the process of interviewing these people, exposing them once more to the scrutiny of the camera, Collins in turn inflicts a return of reality television upon them. Although this is not Collins' strongest project, it gets to the heart of what I want to argue about the construction of subjectivity in delegated performance: that it is always an invested, two-way interaction between performer and artist, and that the 'pure' representation of a complete subject is impossible. As Žižek says, the desire to empathise with a fully knowable subject is a liberal superegoic injunction. In many of these works, the performer occupies the position of the neighbour, a traumatic presence that disturbs us by coming too close.

JA: Along with many others, I'm interested in the power differentials that structure the act of outsourcing performers. As you have pointed out, delegated performance 'is a luxury game. It is telling that it takes place primarily in the West, and that art fairs and biennials are the primary sites of its consumption'.[8] I think that it is also important to point out that the phenomenon is primarily authored by white Europeans; a fact that acquires particular significance in regard to work that explores West/Rest relations through the display of dark-skinned, semi-naked bodies. Yet the culturally marked body of the artist is typically disappeared from the site of the performance. On occasion however, artists choose to propel their own (white) bodies into the thick of action. I'm thinking particularly here of Vanessa Beecroft's 2007 piece, *VB61: Still Death! Darfur Still Deaf?*, in which she placed her own white body amidst a sea of black bodies.[9] Carrying a bucket of fake blood in her hand, a sombre Beecroft traversed the space, stepping over the 'corpses' in order to daub them with 'blood'. The piece was conceived as a protest against the international community's failure to intervene in the genocide in Darfur. It was also intended as a comment on Western indifference toward images of 'suffering Africa'. How might such inclusions of the artist's own body serve to re-frame the power dynamic between participant, spectator and artist?

CB: It is quite clear that one of the reasons for the shift to delegating performance is in order to broaden the range of topics and problems that can be addressed in contemporary art. Issues of globalisation, economics, representation and exploitation (to name but a few) are hard to articulate by the singular artist using his/her own body. The Beecroft work you cite seems to be a very rare example of 'old' and 'new' types of performance combined: the artist herself and paid performers (in this case 30 Sudanese women, lying on the floor of the Fish Market in Venice). VB61 seems to be an updating of Herman Nitsch's *Theatre of Orgies and Mysteries* (which frequently involved participants being ritualistically spattered with animal blood), with a touch of Marina Abramovic's *Balkan Baroque* (1997, in which she washed animals bones as a quasi-purgative mourning for the war in the Balkans), combined with Beecroft's characteristic attention to formal symmetry. The work is so formal that the main question for me is not the power dynamic between performers/spectators/artist but whether or not this is a powerful and substantial work of art. I happened to be in Venice at that time but I heard nobody mention or discuss the piece.

JA: You have remarked that one of the most controversial forms of delegated performance is the tableau vivant. You suggest two possible reasons for its notoriety. One is the sense that 'participants are being requested to perform themselves: they are asked to signify a larger socio-economic demographic'.[10] The other is the entirely instrumental use of participants to fulfil aesthetic agendas, for example standing in a line. In the tableaux of Santiago Sierra, participants are often made to stand in a straight line and turn their backs to the viewer or camera. For me, Sierra's insistence upon this latter instruction serves to relinquish the viewer from the ethical responsibilities that Levinas outlines in his theory of encountering the face of the Other. Instead, I suggest that Sierra's work operates by licensing our scopophilic desires. However, in foregrounding the economic dependency of the participants, Sierra offsets our pleasure in Other-ing by inspiring a concomitant emotion: guilt. Would you agree with this reading? How have you experienced the act of viewing Sierra's tableaux?

CB: I have experienced very few of Sierra's live performances. The most memorable were at the Venice Biennale in 2001 and 2003, and these experiences became the basis of my analysis of his work published in 2004.[11] I have also seen two performances at the Lisson Gallery in London: *Workers Facing a Wall* (2002) and *Worker Facing Into A Corner* (2002). Despite their simplicity, these were very tough pieces. Being invited to scrutinise these people while they stood in silence facing a wall (with all the connotations of childhood punishment that this carries, not to mention excruciating tedium), produced a difficult knot of affect. If it was guilt, it was a superegoic, liberal guilt produced in relation to being complicit with a position of power that I didn't want to assume. It was akin to the self-awareness felt in relationship to minimalist sculpture, but now charged with identification and disgust and awkwardness. But this production of bad affect, I would argue, is precisely the artistic strength of Sierra's work.

JA: While there has been much discussion of the ethico-political implications of hiring racial and/or economic Others, critics have tended not to raise the same questions in

relation to projects involving people with disabilities. This despite the fact that disabled bodies feature prominently in the work of Artur Źmijewski and Christoph Schlingensief, and are at the centre of Paweł Althamer's long term collaborations with the Nowolipie Group (a class of adults with multiple sclerosis that Althamer taught for fifteen years). Do you think this reluctance is due to a shift in art world priorities away from identity politics art and toward art that addresses globalisation? Or do you think that it has more to do with an unintentional desire to disavow the antagonisms that exist between able and disabled bodies?

CB: This is very perceptive. I think it is true that today's artistic priorities have rendered identity politics unfashionable in favour of an orientation towards issues of globalisation, transnational communities, ecological crisis, states of exception, and so on. But this shift also testifies to the fact that it is even more difficult to talk about disability than race. There is no body of theory to draw upon, and reactions to physical deformity can be far more awkward and visceral than a confrontation with racial or sexual difference. Amongst the artists you mention, I think it is important to note the differences between them. For Althamer and Schlingensief, mental (rather than physical) disability serves as a point of inspiration. The untrained and unpredictable behaviour of their 'families' of collaborators are a creative force that they want to harness. For Źmijewski, his early videos confront the disjunction between able bodies and disability head on. His unflinching approach to documenting physical limitation and deformity is extremely raw. But like Sierra's 'bad affect', it is also has a poetics.

JA: Though much delegated performance responds to contemporary socio-political tensions, a smaller number of works have elected to revisit some of the traumatic cornerstones of Western twentieth-century history. Artur Źmijewski has notoriously explored the Holocaust in *The Game of Tag* (1999) and *80064* (2004). In *African Twin Towers – Stairlift to Heaven* (2007), Christoph Schlingensief touched upon one of the most brutal chapters in colonial history: the German genocide of the Herero people; a cold-blooded and internationally unheeded rehearsal for the holocaust in Europe less than thirty years later.

In *Foreigners Out! or Please Love Austria!* (2000), Schlingensief retroactively engaged the past in order to confront unfolding social events. By erecting a pseudo-concentration camp to house 'unwanted foreigners' and proclaiming Austria's complicity with Nazi Germany, Schlingensief drew direct parallels between Jörg Haider's success in the 2000 Austrian elections and the Third Reich. Nevertheless, his often heated exchanges with the public at the site of the 'camp' were marked by his refusal to adopt a clear stance on the project, thereby denying viewers/participants a clear moral frame of reference. It struck me that in doing so, Schlingensief not only sought to return political agency to the viewer/participant, but also hoped to unlock or channel the repressed regions of the national psyche. At your recent talk on Schlingensief at University College London, you pinpointed this convergence of political potential and psychoanalytic technique by suggesting that Źižek's notion of overidentification could offer us a way into the piece.[12] I was hoping that you could expand a little more on this in relation to Schlingensief's work.

CB: I think it's important to say from the beginning that the psychoanalytic concept of overidentification, which Žižek proposed in the early 1990s as a way to analyse Neue Slowenische Kunst, has absolutely nothing to do with a therapeutic channelling of the repressed.[13] It is not to be understood in the Anglo-American tradition of homeopathic quelling. Rather, Žižek takes the idea from Lacan, for whom therapy is the painful, almost existential process of coming to terms with your unconscious symptoms, desires and aversions, however socially unacceptable they may be.

Having said that, Žmijewski's work shows a clear interest in psychic economies of repression: for example, by repeating traumatic events (*Game of Tag*, 80064, *Repetition*). Indeed, one of his exhibitions was titled *Einmal is Keinmal* (if it happened once, it didn't happen), which I read as an allusion to Freud's claim that it takes two traumas to make a trauma (since the first cannot be integrated into consciousness and representability). But it is hard to speak of overidentification with Žmijewski. The idea fits more aptly to Schlingensief's *Please Love Austria*, a *Big Brother*-style shipping container in the centre of Vienna, emblazoned with the slogan 'Ausländer Raus' (foreigners out), and containing refugees as contestants for the 'prize' of Austrian citizenship. Although in retrospect – and particularly in Paul Poet's film documentation of the project – it is evident that the work is a critique of xenophobia and its institutions, in Vienna the event (and Schlingensief's charismatic role as circus-master) was ambiguous enough to receive approval and condemnation from all sides of the political spectrum.[14] This has led the work to be interpreted as an 'overidentification' with the right-wing FPÖ party. Schlingensief's gesture of replicating their language (with slogans such as 'ausländer raus') and taking its logic to the extreme (producing a reality television show that toys with the lives of refugees) became an ambiguous means of criticising the FPÖ. It made all too visible what is intolerable in society but accepted on a daily basis. To frame this in Žižek's psychoanalytic: the gesture of overidentification frustrates the system by taking its immanent laws to their most logical, dystopian consequences, thereby revealing its obscene superegoic underside.

JA: In your talk on delegated performance at Warwick University, you shared your experience of watching Žmijewski's video piece 80064 (2004), in which the artist persuaded Auschwitz survivor Jozef Tarnawa to have his camp number re-tattooed on his arm. [15] What I remember most vividly about your description was the phrase 'I almost couldn't bear to watch!' The comment appeared to be both an exultant exclamation and an awkward apology (after all, you did watch). As you explained, the emotional intensity of the piece partially came from your not knowing if Tarnawa would consent to the process or if Žmijewski himself would at the last minute draw back. *The Game of Tag* (1999) was even more clearly framed as a psycho-social experiment. The video recorded the behavioural responses of a group of participants who were instructed to strip naked and begin a game of 'tag'. The controlled variable was the environment they were compelled to play in: one was a symbolically neutral space; the other a Nazi gas chamber. As with 80064, the outcome was uncertain. Indeed, in *Repetition* (2005), Žmijewski's re-enactment of the infamous Stanford prison experiment, the project ended after a few days due to participants deciding to quit. Do you think that Žmijewski's tests are intended to

include us spectators? If reading them as an assault on sensibility is reductive, how can paying attention to the aesthetic qualities of his work help us to understand his ethico-political concerns?

CB: Źmijewski's experiments are absolutely designed to test the viewer – even more than the subjects being filmed (otherwise, why film?). Through these works, and particularly *Them* (2007), Źmijewski hopes to create a space for the emergence of the political. This is why it is wrong to reduce his works to ethical complaints that do little more than express our own confused feelings about the way people treat each other. If we take the work on the artist's own terms, it is impossible to separate the aesthetic and the political. His 'art' is to import aspects of the psychology lab, anthropological field work and ethnographic research into performance and video art, in order to scrutinise his own culture and its taboos (most consistently, as a series of works interrogating the Polish relationship to the Holocaust).[16] His mode of filming is unflinchingly direct, and the editing almost painful in its depiction of fragile, complex, uncertain subjects thrust into difficult situations, often goaded by the artist himself. These videos offer no consoling solutions, no reassurance that the artist is taking the 'correct' position on our behalf, but ask us to interrogate the political and ethical assumptions underlying our affectual response to what he shows.

JA: On the subject of Źmijewski's aesthetic, you mentioned that he took a seemingly perverse approach to editing the video for the project *Them* (2007). The film documents a series of art workshops involving four ideologically disparate groups from Poland: Jews, Catholics, socialists and nationalists. During the workshops, the groups were invited to explore their different ideas of 'Poland'. As expected, a number of conflicts arose between the groups. All the same, you maintained that the process was without major incident and the participants felt that the interactions had largely been civil, and even occasionally amicable. Źmijewski clearly had other ideas, editing the piece in order to amplify social breakdown and erase any reconciliatory moments. As you memorably put it, Źmijewski constructed an alternative narrative for the project that ended on a point of 'nihilistic conflagration'.[17] Since video plays such a central role within delegated practice, do you know of any other examples of artists insisting upon editorial control in order to produce anti-ameliorative work? Is this instrumentalised use of participants simply a reverse mirror for projects such as Penny Woolcock's *The Margate Exodus* (2006)?

CB: This is also very perceptive! Of course I am not against instrumentalisation *per se*; it depends on what participants are being instrumentalised *for*. If it is to make a proposal about the nature of human relations and interactions, exploring issues of group identification and the role of images in constructing this, as well as reflecting on the limits of collaborative authorship and 'fly on the wall' documentary as a genre (and I would argue that Źmijewski's *Them* does all of the above), then this instrumentalisation is perfectly justified. If it is to reinforce a government's dubious social inclusion policy and create the impression of community consensus (when the reality is quite the opposite, caused in no small part by that same government's two tier, privatised welfare and education system), then instrumentalisation is not justified. And when the result of the latter is also a badly acted film, it becomes intolerable! To answer your question about other video-based 'anti-

ameliorative' works: the documentation of Schlingensief's *Please Love Austria* is antagonistic rather than ameliorative, but it would be wrong to argue that he or Źmijewski are ultimately nihilist. The construction of a better world is the horizon towards which both of their practices are oriented; they simply operate by oblique negation rather than obviously constructive gestures.

JA: I have noticed that delegated performance tends to keep the lines between artist, participant and spectator distinct. In contrast to participation art, which hinges on the activation and often physical involvement of spectators/participants, delegated performance could be seen to restrict our sense of agency by confining us to the act of looking. In Santiago Sierra's work *Polyurethane Sprayed on the Backs of Ten Workers* (2004), we are confronted with the traces of a performance that involved the humiliation and debasement of Iraqi immigrants; this at a time when the pictures from Abu Ghraib were still very raw in many of our minds. Why do you think Sierra wanted to engineer a scenario in which his audience would be destined to arrive 'too late'?

CB: There are a couple of points to bring up here. Firstly, regarding Sierra's work. This is, in my view, not one of his strongest pieces, so I am reluctant to defend it. But it can be placed in relation to his work circa 1997-8, which used labour to produce sculptural objects and environments, and to *Spraying of Polyurethane over 18 People* (Lucca, 2002), in which he covered young prostitutes with plastic sheets and sprayed polyurethane over their front and back genital areas. The polyurethane is clearly an aggressive 'ejaculation' over these women, and the 2004 work that you mention can be read the same way. I had not made the connection to the Abu Ghraib photos before, but this doesn't seem inappropriate.

Secondly, the idea that delegated performance restricts our agency compared to participatory art. There are two positions on this, as Rancière has articulated so well in 'The Emancipated Spectator'.^[18] There is the theory that physical participation is active, whereas looking is simply passive. And there is the theory that observing with critical distance (as in Brechtian distanciation) is active, while the performers are passive. In both cases, active is privileged over passive, and the theatre is divided into those who have capacity and those who have incapacity. For me, Rancière's argument indicates the limit of this discourse. My aim is to find new ways of discussing spectatorship that moves beyond this binary. We badly need a framework that will allow us to discuss the content and meaning of these works, rather than focusing on cul-de-sac issues of agency and exploitation, and the irresolvable, near meaningless designation of certain acts as 'passive' and others as 'active'.

Endnotes

[1] Bishop, Claire, 'Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics', *October* 110, (Fall, 2004), 51-79 and 'The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents', *Artforum*, (February, 2006), 179-185.

- [2] Bourriaud, Nicolas, *Relational Aesthetics*, (trans.) Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods with the participation of Mathieu Copeland, (Dijon: Les Presses du réel, 2002). Kester, Grant, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*, (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004)
- [3] Jackson, Shannon 'Where is the "social" in social practice?: comparing experiments in performance' in Tracey C. Davis (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 138.
- [4] Whilst the lineage of delegated performance, which emerged in the early 1990s, can be traced back to Western body art practices in the '60s and '70s, Bishop maintains that the tendency owes more to the collaborative work of Latin American artists such as Oscar Bony and Oscar Masotta who piloted the technique of using economically underprivileged, non-professional performers. See Bishop, Claire, 'Outsourcing Authenticity? Delegated Performance in Contemporary Art' in Claire Bishop and Silvia Tramontana (eds.), *Double Agent*, (London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 2009), 115-119.
- [5] Bishop, Claire, 'Outsourcing Authenticity?', 114.
- [6] Although Jeremy Deller has subsequently produced a chart showing that *Acid Brass* links two types of regional working-class music.
- [7] Larsen, Lars Bang, 'Jens Haaning, de Vleeshal', *Frieze*, (Nov 1996), http://www.frieze.com/issue/print_back/jens_haaning/
- [8] Bishop, Claire, 'Outsourcing Authenticity?', 114.
- [9] Though the bodies are female, Beecroft has shaved their heads and instructed them to lie face down on the floor: their bodies are thus rendered gender-neutral.
- [10] Bishop, Claire 'Outsourcing Authenticity?', 118.
- [11] Bishop, Claire 'Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics'.
- [12] Claire Bishop, public lecture at University College London, 12 February, 2009.
- [13] Žižek, Slavoj 'Why are Laibach and NSK not Fascists?' (1993), http://www.nskstate.com/appendix/articles/why_are_laibach.php
- [14] Poet, Paul (dir.), *Ausländer Raus! Schlingensief's Container*, (Monitorpop, 2002).
- [15] Claire Bishop, lecture at the University of Warwick, 10 October, 2007.

[16] Incidentally, it is not insignificant that Źmijewski has recently collaborated with the cultural anthropologist Joanna Tokarska-Bakir at University of Warsaw, creating video documentation to accompany her book on anti-Jewish prejudice, *Anthropology of Prejudice: Blood Libel Myths* (2008). In the event his DVD was not included in the publication.

[17] Claire Bishop, curator's talk at the Mead Gallery, Warwick Arts Centre, 14 June, 2008.

[18] Rancière, Jacques, 'The Emancipated Spectator', *Artforum*, (March, 2007), 271-280.

Editorial Note

Performance Paradigm issues 1 to 9 were reformatted and repaginated as part of the journal's upgrade in 2018. Earlier versions are viewable via Wayback Machine:
http://web.archive.org/web/*/performanceparadigm.net

© 2009 Claire Bishop and Julia Austin



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under a Creative Commons AttributionNonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-ncsa/4.0/>