

*Title: All of this belongs to us?*

Can communication design make dance film more accessible to the general public?

In this phase of late capitalist communication, ideologically framed as being one of the most open and connected points of history, is art accessible? My research asks how accessible dance film, a hybrid practice is to the general public, from the perspective of design as a mediating agent in cultural production and practice. I will argue that design works to maintain boundaries between the artists, publics and institutions. These boundaries maintain the status quo and perpetuate the need for accessibility programmes. Design reproduces division and inaccessibility and helps create questions such as the artist's responsibility to the audience. Dance film like many other art forms receives large sums of public funding, but for the most part is an unknown entity. (Ms. D Towers, 2011, pers.comm., 2 June). If art becomes accessible, its worth would decrease, and no longer have market value (Graw, 2009). The meaning of art is off limits to the general public, accepted only when it serves to perpetuate the myth that the institution is all knowing. I will examine this connection between artist, audience and institution by examining findings from a focus group between specialists and the general public, by drawing on my own practice based research, and critiquing existing literature. Design is used to sell art, and design programmes to access art, but what about designing space for open dialogue about art itself? By using dance film as an example I will argue that until we expose design as an ideological agent working to maintain the status quo, open dialogue about art will not take place.

Graw, I. 2009, *High Price: Art between the market and celebrity culture*: Sternberg Press, Berlin