WHEN I THINK ABOUT THE END OF CHOREOGRAPHY...
ABOUT THE CHOREOGRAPHY...
...I think about the meaning of the word and its Greek roots, literally meaning:

DANCE
And how it happened that these two supposedly opposed words come together in one term...

Because, let’s be honest: the body cannot write.
...I think about Roland Barthes and how the symbolic death of the author must mean the birth of the reader and perhaps by extension to the theatre, the birth of the spectator.

And then by extension to dance, would the death of the choreographer mean the birth of the dancer or the birth of the dance-watcher...
...I THINK ABOUT MÅRTEN SPÅNGBERG WHO WRITES ON HIS BLOG:
Dance has been banned from history because of its ephemeral status as Peggy Phelan wrote in 1993, performance becomes itself through its own disappearance. When something dies something new can emerge, but if dance has no history, this means that either dance is new, like NEW, all the time, or is rendered immobile exactly due its lack of history. Is it possibly so that dance precisely because it lacks history cannot issue transformation, and at the same time because it has no history it cannot produce contemporaneity?
...I think about the death of probably the two most important contemporary choreographers

PINA BAUSCH
MERCE CUNNINGHAM
MICHAEL JACKSON
PATRICK SWAYZE

2009
...I THINK ABOUT ANDRÉ LEPECKI AND HIS DEFINITION OF CHOREOGRAPHY AS A SYSTEM OF COMMAND.
...I think of Trajal Harrell’s piece *Tickling the Giant Sleep*#9 in which his dancers take a sleeping drug before the 8-hour performance installation. I think about how the choreographer is perhaps more of an attendant, both in the sense of physically being there but also in a sense of caring.
...I THINK ABOUT BORIS CHARMATZ AND HIS COMPANY’S MANIPULATION OF LIMB CHILDREN IN ENFANT.
...I think about Roberta Jean and Steph McMann’s piece *Road Postures* at Dance Umbrella 2013 and how it was basically a solo for Steph and how Roberta chose to describe her role in the programme notes as artistic direction, and not as choreography.
...I think about Gillie Kleiman and how it says on her Chisenhale profile that she does dance stuff that doesn’t always look like dance.\(^5\)

...re-re-twothousandth-re, a piece by trio collective which was performed at
In 2011 and I think about how we basically likened the act of choreography to the act of editing past choreographies together.
I think about my first choreography that I ever made called *Hybrid* and how deeply uncomfortable and unethical I felt asking my dancers to improvise on tasks and make material, then selecting the bits that I liked, putting them together and saying that I was the choreographer of the piece.

And I think of all the programme notes that say choreography in collaboration with the dancers and I think about what that really means and about the (im)possibility of collaboration.
...I think about the fact that choreography doesn’t necessarily need people...
...And that we can find choreography in everything
...I also think about the blurry line between dancer and choreographer and how most of us probably describe ourselves as both.
I think about Michael Kliën, who in 1994 declared

“Choreography and Dance to be fully independent of one-another; i.e. as autonomous disciplines requiring specialist skill-sets for each.”

"
The piece was called:

68% CHOREOGRAPHY

and it was a performance-installation for a machine and a violin.
...I think about Marquez & Zangs and what they mean when they say that they want to:

"Raise questions and awareness of what choreography can do as it is too commonly reduced to the word dance."
...I think about Charlotte Ashwell and Eleanor Sikorski’s online dialogue on Bellyflop [Magazine] about curators including circus into a dance programme.\textsuperscript{8}
...I think about Marcel Duchamp placing an upside down urinal into a gallery in 1914 and declaring it art

...and that then makes me think of Andy Warhol and his Brillo Boxes which were just copies of real Brillo Boxes

...and that then makes me think about Arthur Danto declaring the end of art because anything from now could be art

...And that makes me think of Noël Carroll writing about *Trio A* being the end of dance because from 1966 onwards everyday movement, indeed every movement, could be called dance.
BUT ISN’T IT TOO EASY TO SAY THAT ALL DANCE IS REALLY JUST MOVEMENT OR ALL MOVEMENT IS CHOREOGRAPHED?
...I think about the recent move of dance to the museum/gallery [Tate] with all its potentials and problems, and I think about the exploitation of choreographic strategies by visual artists.
...I think about Tino Sehgal and what it does to dance when someone who clearly comes from a background in dance and whose practice clearly used well-known strategies and tools for producing choreographic works situates himself in a fine art context, not as a choreographer who makes work in the museum, but as an artist operating in the art world.
I think about Alexandra Hemsley and the Swedish Dance History Vol.4, where they write in the editorial:

“An expanded choreography owns the future. Dance as we know it, is soon, if not already dead as opera or Dixie-land jazz. Very dead. Yet, the future, more than ever, belongs to choreography, but only if it acknowledges its potentiality as an expanded capacity. Choreography is not the art of making dances (a directional set of tools), it is a generic set of capacities to be applied to any kind of production, analyses, or organization. Choreography is a structural approach to the world and dance its mode of knowing the world it ventures into. Dance is the future embodied, a promise of that to come.”
...I think about what the organisers [Mårten Spångberg] of the Expanded Choreography: Situations. Movements, Objects,.. conference last year in Barcelona wrote:

“Choreography is today emancipating itself from dance, engaging in a vibrant process of articulation. Choreographers are experimenting with new models of production, alternative formats, have broadened out the understanding of social choreography considerably and are mobilizing innovative frontiers in respect of self-organization, empowerment and autonomy.

Simultaneously, we have seen a number of exhibitions in which choreography is often placed in a tension between movement, situation and objects. Choreography needs to redefine itself in order to include artists and others who use choreographic strategies without necessarily relating them to dance. At the same time, it needs to remain inclusive of choreographers involved in practices such as engineering situations, organization, social choreography and movement as well as expanding towards cinematic strategies, documentary and documentation and rethinking publication, exhibition, display, mediatization, production and post-production. In short, choreography is currently experiencing a veritable revolution. Aesthetically, it is turning away from established notions of dance and its strong association with skill and craft, to instead establish autonomous discourses that override causalities among conceptualization, production, expression and representation. At the same time it is gaining momentum on a political level as it is placed in the middle of a society to a large degree organized around movement, subjectivity and immaterial exchange. Choreography is not a priori performative, nor is it bound to expression and reiteration of subjectivity; it is becoming an expanded practice, a practice that is political in and of itself.”
...I think about the choreographer, this choreographer, who withdraws (voluntarily or involuntarily) from the scene and is replaced by:
DANCERS
CURATORS
OBJECTS
THINKERS
TEXTS
IMAGES
MACHINES
POWERPOINT
PRESENTATIONS.
...I ALSO THINK ABOUT ITS FUTURE.
How protective should we be?
How open-minded?
How expanded can we go?
IF ANYTHING CAN BE CHOREOGRAPHY THE TERM PERHAPS RENDERS ITSELF...
WHAT IS
CHOREO
TO SAY,
LEFT FOR

GRAPHY

TO DO?