

IMPULSTANZ



Mette Ingvarsten

69 Positions

Vienna International Dance Festival

Saisonstart

T
Q
W

T
a
n
z
q
u
a
r
t
i
e
r

Weltpremiere

Florentina Holzinger

TANZ

Wien

DO **3.** / FR **4.** / SA **5.** +

DO **11.** / FR **12.** **0kt 2019**

Tickets auf tqw.at

69 Positions

Mette Ingvarsen (BE/DEN)

13. 7. 2019 22:00

14. + 16. 7. 2019 18:30

17. 7. 2019 20:30

Kasino am Schwarzenbergplatz



Bundeskanzleramt



METTE INGVARSTEN
bei ImPulsTanz

Performances

2019 *The Red Pieces*

69 positions (Choreographer, Performer)

7 Pleasures (Choreographer)

to come (extended) (Choreographer)

21 pornographies (Choreographer, Performer)

2006 *50/50* (Performer)

2003 *Manual Focus* (Choreographer)

danceWEB

2019 danceWEB Co-Mentor

69 Positions

Konzept, Choreografie & Performance
Mette Ingvarsten

Licht Nadja Räikkä
Set Virginie Mira
Ton Peter Lenaerts,
mit Musik von Will Guthrie (Breaking Bones)
Dramaturgie Bojana Cvejić
Technik Nadja Räikkä / Joachim Hupfer
Soundtechnik Adrien Gentizon Company
Management Kerstin Schroth

Eine Produktion von Mette Ingvarsten /
Great Investment
Koproduktion apap / szene (Salzburg), Musée
de la Danse/Centre Chorégraphique National
de Rennes et de Bretagne, Kaaitheater
(Brussels), PACT Zollverein (Essen), Les
Spectacles vivants – Centre Pompidou (Paris),
Kunstencentrum BUDA (Kortrijk), BIT
Teatergarasjen (Bergen)

Mit Unterstützung von Théâtre National
de Bretagne (Rennes), Festival d'Automne à
Paris, DOCH - University of dance and circus
(Stockholm)

Finanziert von den Flämischen Behörden &
The Danish Arts Council.
Die Serie wird gefördert durch die
Europäische Kommission.

www.metteingvarsten.net



Über 69 Positions

About 69 Positions

DE

Exzess, Nacktheit, orgiastische Erotik, rituelles Vergnügen, Publikumsbeteiligung und politisches Engagement - all das sind Ausdrücke der sexuellen Utopien der Gegenkulturen und experimentellen Performances der 1960er Jahre. Diese „Führung“ durch ein Archiv sexueller Performances dient Mette Ingvarsten als Filter, um ungelöste Fragen zu Sexualität und ihren Praktiken heute zu untersuchen. Ihr Körper wird zum Experimentierfeld und unbekannte sexuelle Praktiken entstehen im Verhältnis zu ihrer Umgebung.

69 positions führt die Besucher_innen durch einen Raum mit Performances, Büchern, Filmen, Texten und Bildern, die durch Bewegung und Sprache lebendig werden, um Verbindungen zwischen der Intimsphäre und dem öffentlichen Raum wahrnehmbar zu machen.

Mit diesem Solo beginnt die dänische Choreografin Mette Ingvarsten eine neue Serie, in der sie Sexualität und das Verhältnis von Körperpolitik und gesellschaftlichen Strukturen in den Mittelpunkt stellt.

EN

Excess, nudity, orgy eroticism, ritualistic pleasure, audience participation and political engagement, all expressions of the sexual utopia particular to the counterculture and experimental performances of the 60's. This guided tour through an archive of sexual performances, serves as a filter for Mette Ingvarsten to explore unresolved issues about sexuality in contemporary practices today. In doing so, her body turns into a field of physical experimentation and uncanny sexual practices emerge in relation to the environment that surrounds her.

69 positions leads visitors through a space with performances, books, films, texts and images brought alive through movement and speech in order to experience the connection between the intimate sphere and public space.

With this solo the Danish choreographer Mette Ingvarsten started a new cycle of work, where she places sexuality, the relation between the politics of the body and structures of society, in focus.

Interview with Mette Ingvarsten

by Bojana Cvejić

EN

What was the first idea that triggered the creation of 69 positions? Could you unfold the history of the project?

It all, in actual fact, as I say it in the performance, began with the email I wrote to Carolee Schneeman. But the letter I addressed to her was prompted by the interest I had developed in sexuality and nudity in performance before. These notions were present in my early work. Yet in the last few years I have entirely focused on choreography for nonhumans, including inanimate materials, so I was wondering why the concerns with sexuality were coming back to me ten years later. The fiftieth anniversary of *Meat Joy* was approaching, and I thought that if I wrote Schneeman in January 2013, we would have enough time to prepare and reinterpret *Meat Joy* in Paris on the 29th of May in 2014.

So your original plan was to re-stage Meat Joy?

My idea was to work with Schneeman and the original cast of *Meat Joy*. It wasn't about just redoing the same performance, but restaging it with the bodies that are fifty years older than at the time they originally performed *Meat Joy*. This would allow us to examine the difference between the original and the revival fifty years later. I proposed to Schneeman to use interviews as a method of collaboration,

so that the additional layer of this reconstruction would include the reflection on what it meant to create *Meat Joy* in the 1960s, the conceptual and political underpinnings of the work. I became interested in this work when on several occasions I tried describing and doing it at the same time, and began thinking about how the experience of doing *Meat Joy* would feel, especially the bodily contact with dead meat.

Apart from the interest in the performance of sexuality and nudity, and Meat Joy, there is also speaking and doing in the format of a lecture demonstration. How do you relate your wish to enter the experience of performing Meat Joy with a solo lecture performance?

I had expressed my reservations about reconstruction—a rising trend in dance and performance today, especially with respect to the works from the 1960s—to Schneeman, which made her echo it herself even louder when she writes: “I am not a fan of redo ...”. I didn't have fantasies about how the performance would look. My attempt at describing *Meat Joy* with my own body was sufficient as a point of departure. And I was interested in meeting Schneeman and her fellow performers, because I trusted that something unexpected could arise in the encounter and would lead the way into this work.

On the other hand, I've explored various written and spoken interviewing formats in the past. This led me to search for how a discursive inquiry could shape a new performance.

I prefer to call it a “discursive practice performance” instead of lecture performance, a familiar genre with its function and history. With a discursive practice performance I am trying to define the format by which the process of a production of discourse would give life to something else than that which it speaks about. Therefore, I shy away from the action of demonstrating or documenting the historical works because I want to create another reality of those works today. I've experimented with this in *Speculations* (2011), the solo performance based on speaking that I made in preparation for another, more large-scale choreography, *The Artificial Nature Project* (2012). It was also a way for me to reflect upon the thoughts and ideas I was going to develop in the next choreography and make this reflection public in discourse. What is performative reality? How to produce imagined or virtual realities, and how to relate them to, as it were, actual reality? These were the questions I was concerned with then, and I took them into *69 Positions* as well.

There is perhaps a new rhythm of research that shapes your work: a solo which searches out ideas for, and thus prefigures, a more large-scale group choreography.

Perhaps there is an analogy between *Speculations* and *The Artificial Nature Project*, on the one hand, and between *69 positions* and the group choreography I am starting to prepare for next year, on the other hand. I don't know what this group piece will finally be like, so the comparison is only tentative—and certainly, conceptual ideas never

translate into choreography one to one, as the nonverbal expression communicates in other ways. But what I know is that thinking in concepts and concerns that clearly relate to society is a strong motivation in my work. To expose ideas in an explicit manner feels important for the moment. I also like the process of preparing a new work, which gives me time to think and search, and what I search for in *69 Positions* is a performative form, a discursive model that expresses these thoughts, concepts and ideas.

Perhaps this is a way to extend the duration of thoughts. What makes you a theatre maker in a broad sense is dialogue. So you want to launch those ideas into a sphere where they can rebound. You want them to be there, resonating with an audience for a while, and you test them on a scene of thinking, before you take them onto another level, into a collaboration with performers. Now what is the occasion in which you actually did explain and do Meat Joy before you started the work on 69 Positions?

It happened in the context of *Expo Zéro*, a project by Boris Charmatz and Musée de la danse, which was based on inviting ten artists to create their own history of dance, taking as a point of departure their own body as a container of history. My intention was to select three works from the past five decades on the basis of strong preferences: works I would have liked to make, and works I wouldn't have wanted to make although they interested me for various reasons—only extreme and no lukewarm feelings about them. In the course of two editions of *Expo Zéro* I participated in, I realized that my interests gravitated towards naked women doing extreme actions of various kinds. *Meat Joy* was in my first selection, and so were actions by Marina Abramović

and Ulay, the works from the 1960s and 70s. I thought it weird that nothing from the 1980s and 90s caught my interest. It felt too close, and I wanted to take distance from it. Since *Expo Zéro* is a dialogic situation where the audience talks, I encountered strong responses to my working through *Meat Joy*. For instance, when I would speak about how it would be to bite my teeth into a dead chicken, people reported having a strong visceral experience of imagining the relation between the dead meat and the living body. At that time, I was working on the relationship between the animate and the inanimate in *The Artificial Nature Project*. So I think that that's where *Meat Joy* came.

You presented a version of this performance in Kortrijk. Could you put the chronology of the creation in order?

My letter to Schneeman dates from the 25th of January, 2013. When Schneeman declined my invitation, I sent her another proposal, but I never heard back from her. Then I thought: does it mean I should let it go? After a while, I decided that I would pursue my interest in examining the interaction between the dead and the living and see where that takes me. Furthermore, I started looking for other works that would be dealing with nudity, with sexual representation as well as questions of participation in terms of direct political engagement in the 1960s. This is how *Dionysis in 69*, Yayoi Kusama and Jack Smith, for instance, resurfaced. What began to preoccupy me is how to think of my own body becoming multiple, being multiplied by various perspectives. At the same time, Agnès Quackels, the programmer at BUDA cultural center in Kortrijk invited me to present the references in my work. It was a carte-blanc invitation on the basis of the idea that artists

would exhibit their work in an indirect way, through the references relevant for them. I first wanted to call my presentation *Ten references that I would like to share with you*, meaning a selection of ten works from the 1960s I wanted to plunge into. I remember you questioning it.

I asked you why it was that you were doing this, and what you wanted to achieve with describing nude and sexually explicit performances from the 1960s today.

It should be said that in that early version the historical and political context was missing. I deliberately evacuated it so the description seemed as if I was inventing something on the spot. It was conceived as an imaginative choreography. After our conversation, I realized that my actual interest was in the relationship between these works and the sexual liberation movement in the context of the Vietnam War. So removing the historical and political context also weakened the operation of the works that I was referencing. That led me to the idea of producing the frame of an exhibition, where the referential works wouldn't only be identified, but would also interact with my imaginary transposition of them today. The version from Kortrijk consisted of three parts—three rooms—starting with the works from the 1960s, my own works, and ending in reading the book by Beatriz Preciado.

Let's get into the subject matter of this work. Nudity operates in three registers: firstly, as a gesture of liberation in the social movement in the 1960s in the West; secondly, in the end of the 1990s it was present in contemporary dance, and so it was in your work too; thirdly, in this solo you are performing everything naked in close proximity of the spectators.

I recall you were speaking about the failed utopia of the 1960s, which was the creation of the communal body and the idea that people can discover their natural self underneath the clothes as a matter of freedom, also with the notion of “free love”. And that sexual liberation would ultimately lead people to political action and social change.

Right, and then the moral codes in public order don't change; people aren't walking naked in public spaces. But in the mid 1990s, with the work of Jérôme Bel and Vera Mantero, and later on Xavier Le Roy, Boris Charmatz and others, nudity becomes an instrument for intervening on the body, interfering with the human figure in the identifying criteria of gender, the human, animal or monster as living body, machine, etc. How did that play out in your own work?

In *Manual Focus* and *50/50*, nudity was a means of erasure of the identifying features which would increase the body's capacity to transform. Already in one of my first pieces, *Manual Focus*, I was interested in deforming and disfiguring the actual body through our perception of its mechanics, turning it upside down, so that it appears as an animal or a cripple, or just something other than a functional upright body. We were also wearing masks of old men over our heads, which shortcircuited opposites like old/young, artificial/natural, male/female. In *50/50*, I was much more busy with the codifications of the body in movement: the spectacular expressions of the body in the rock concert and opera pantomime, go-go dancing. I was thinking about language, and the body as a vehicle for language, and at the same time differing from it or surpassing it through affect. People go, like, “woooow” in the rock

concert, and they basically cannot control their own affective stimulation. So I was very much interested in looking into the spectacularity of expressions in high/low culture and their power of affective manipulation. How can I work on the affective potential of images that would be hard to perceive and place in a recognizable context? I remember thinking how to produce a noise in the image and a scratch in the sound.

But to get there, you had to defacialize the body: in Manual Focus, it's the masks that do it; in 50/50 it's the wig. And in to come the blue suits cover the whole body, thus blurring the gender of the performers. If we make a rapid comparison with the nudity performed in the 1960s–70s, performing naked was supposed to produce the “real”, a situation where reality should or might yield pleasure, for instance. The situations you create in your pieces forty years later are deliberately artificial, a matter of construction, and pleasure is barred from them. The implicit rule in the past twenty years in performance is that the performer isn't allowed to have (or show) pleasure so that the audience can have a different experience.

I was trying to disconnect pleasure and desire from the individual body, against the idea that your desire belongs to you.

But belongs to the space, the situation ...?

To the social structures whose power is to produce and control our behavior. I was concerned with thinking desire in relation to capitalism, while reading Deleuze and Guattari's project *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. For instance, how commercials sexualize products: you eat an ice cream but you actually have an

orgasm. You know what I mean? What you buy is the orgasm and not the ice cream.

Or orgasm is supposed to coax you into buying ice cream, because that's the point.

Exactly. If you could just buy orgasm without having ice cream, they would probably prefer that. It would be cheaper. In *to come*, I was keen on understanding how desire operates. I remember reading Freud and strongly disagreeing with his associations of desire with the drive, or with “warmth”, or the notion of lack. I was looking for other ways, and the principle of desiring production in Deleuze and Guattari echoed with me. They speak about desiring machines and assemblages, and I wanted to make a choreography that would expose the mechanisms of sex. What we basically do is apply sexual actions onto a group. So instead of saying “OK it's rocking or pumping”, it's the whole group that is actually rocking or pumping; or “it's vibrating” and then it's the whole group that is vibrating—and not making sexual actions into personal interactions between two bodies.

Manual Focus uses nudity to undo the identification of the body. 50/50 exploits the erotic potential of the body spectacle, especially in the scenes of shaking buttocks or breasts up in your face. Yet it is primarily and mostly to come that deals with sexual desire. And there is a narrative order of three parts, somehow revolving around sexual intercourse: the foreplay stage of a dancing party which woos bodies into an exchange of sexual desire, the soundless mechanics of group sex as the very act of sex, and the concert of orgasm as the peak of the intercourse. Three components laid out horizontally in an upset order.

Starting with the sex mechanics, moving to the orgasm and ending with the dance. The underlying idea of this structure is that if you put the three parts on top of each other, then you would have the full sexual act. You would have positions, you would have sound and you would have the sweat and the more exuberant movements.

Alright. But how did you decide to include your own work in 69 Positions and place it in the middle so that it copulates with the first part? It raises the question whether you are inscribing your works in the neo-avantgarde of the 1960s.

The choice of all materials in *69 Positions* has to do with the topics of sexual performances and nudity. I could have chosen the work of my colleagues from the 2000s, but my priority was to reexamine my own work with respect to these topics. I wanted to analyze what it is that I was interested in ten years ago and how my interests linked to sexuality now shift from the questions of identity coinciding with the body to the questions of private-public spheres. Thus, sexuality proves to be a good instrument to investigate the merging of the private and the public, or where the two spheres overlap today.

Another thought behind using my past work is the question of how I can disown it. All those pieces were made to contest the identitarian approach to the body. And they are not about me. They are more about denying the importance of the personal. So my wish was to consider my work not only from the perspective of how it was made, but as a material for producing another choreography through speaking. For instance, when I describe and do the scene of orgy with the audience, it's

not just a description of a sculpture that results from it; a social situation is evoked in which the audience deals with the limits between the private and the public.

Why this is a different mode of participation from watching the same orgy on stage perhaps has to do with turning the work into a score of instructions. There is more space in the distance from my seat to imagine myself in those positions. The identification is intensified and accelerated when you address the spectators with “you do this, and now you do that”.

My original intention in *to come* with using the blue uniform color of the suits was to stimulate projection. But I think this didn't happen so much from the audience just looking at the performance on stage. In *69 positions* I am trying to create a passage of the sexual act into the public sphere, which I literally mean as the audience in theatre. This also happens when I ask them to do the orgasm choir. I literally give it to them.

But you wouldn't be happy if they were going to do it for real, would you? Even in the performance to come the blue suits prevent the exchange of fluids between the performers; it's a safe image. Here there is a danger that the audience could potentially join. Yet you ask them to feign it, that is, fake it?

It has happened already that some people would join, and this means that they actualized the imaginary choreography. It's not that I don't want it to happen, but I think I prefer when it stays on this virtual level and not acted out. The whole piece operates through language choreography. It should stay in your head, happening in the imagination. This also

raises the question as to what participation is. The kind that I am attempting here involves thinking, placing yourself in the situation, not necessarily making the steps.

Hesitating?

I find most interesting the moment right before you make the step to do something. Because I wonder what it is finally that makes one pass from not doing into doing something, and that's actually political. Throughout the whole performance, people might be—at least this is what I heard from some spectators—in this awkward position of not knowing how exactly they should behave: Should I sit? Should I stand? Should I be close, should I be far away? Do I want to be a part of it or not? Should I participate? And all these questions, they are very important for me because they provide the possibility of coming out of the prescribed mode of behavior. We know we have to walk on the sidewalk, stand on the right, walk on the left—you know, all these rules that make up the public order.

The moment of turning inactivity into activity is what interests you, as long as it's also uneasy.

Yeah, because participation involves negotiation. Refusing to participate, in terms of interaction, is also an option. So when I'm jumping around like an idiot in *Dionysus in 69* and no one is joining me, in a certain way this is almost more interesting than when they would start to dance around with me. The opposite is also fine. But the impossibility and difficulty of, or resistance to, participation is symptomatic nowadays, and that's what this work is also about. So, what does it take for us to gather and do something together? I propose the space and the audience are part of

defining what this space will be. This is what I call “soft choreography”.

Let's speak about the third part in relation to sexuality, because it is the one that the audience might be the least familiar with to identify, except perhaps for “testo junkie”, the new practice of interfering with the physiological basis of gender expressions through hormonal therapy.

What interests me in this third part is to look at how the public space, which I here understand as the order that results from governmental, social and medical policies, invade the private body. The “testo body” is a good example of this kind of invasion by pharmaceuticals. Another example that Preciado invokes are non-gendered babies: all governments, except Germany, which recently ratified the third, neither feminine nor masculine, gender, prescribe that gender be defined at birth. Hormones are used to channel the baby's gender and sexual expression into that of a boy or a girl. With the birth control pill, the body is inducted into control in a soft way, as it is a voluntary action of the individual to take the pill and feel the freedom because “I can now fuck how I want”. Nowadays, when you bring your children to the doctor because they have a cold, the doctor immediately prescribes them antibiotics, while at the same time people are dying from simple infections due to the overuse of antibiotics that rendered them inactive. There are many procedures through which governments produce a form of control of the body.

I wouldn't say that it is the public which controls the private, because the public sphere is supposed to be the third stance between the state and the people, mediating and

monitoring their relation. As such, it hardly exists today. It is the alliance between private capital and the state which creates policies that control consumership. The medicalization that you are describing is propelled by the ideology of individual freedom.

You think you are a free individual when your sensations are affected and you feel good. This kind of affective manipulation dominates today, and it happens despite your awareness of the power of images operating on you. There's a kind of strange space between knowing that I'm not free but still feeling that I'm free when I buy my new sneakers – I am exaggerating to show the principle. And the third part addresses the affective manipulation.

So after “testo junkie”, which deals with the invasion of the body through biopolitical control, we shift to a pleasure mode. I ask people to become aware of the production of sensations that I narrate, because I ask them to imagine them, and therefore actively produce sensations in their own body. And I don't know whether this happens or not.

This exercise of imagination is entirely voluntary.

And the conscious activity isn't meant to morally preach to the people that they should be aware of their sensations. I am probing another way to deal with one's sensations and affects along the borders between the private and the public. As I am performing among them, I am also testing the degrees of proximity and distance, the intimacy of being together in such space, immersed in one's own sensations. I am looking for ways of coming close, or going far away. And lastly, the third part opens up another area of sexuality, where sexual practice no

longer takes place in between the bodies as a heterosexual, heteronormative or homosexual relation, but involves humans interacting with nonhuman objects. It inquires into the possibility of radically altering how humans could experience their sensations.

The three practices that you enact here are what you refer to as “sexual mummification”, the closing off of one’s own body by wrapping it in tape and producing total immobility; then making love with a marble statue, which recalls the myth of Pygmalion; and finally electrostimulation, which might probably exist, at least in the form of machines that osteopaths use to relax muscles in orgasmic-like sensations. The outcome of this journey through sexual performances ends with a shift from a we, a social formation of collectivity in the 1960-70s, and multiplicity in the example of your work, into a self, the private and solitary asocial individual. If I socially reframe the practices you describe, I can imagine that it is emancipatory for any gender to dissociate his or her desire from dependency on a sexual partner. Nonetheless, what distinguishes these practices from being like sophisticated practices of masturbation? Is this making a claim for an oversexualized or omnisexual way of being? What concerns me here is that sexuality falls on the independent individual, which has replaced family as the social unit. One model of living is destroyed for better and for worse, but no new happier alternatives are established. So where are we at?

I know that some people find these practices to be samples of extreme masturbation, which is solitary, alienating and sad. For me, this is not at all how I consider it. First of all, it resonates with the oversexualization of all objects in commercials.

The sexual acts with the objects that you are describing are in most cases mimetic of the traditional human image of sex (rubbing, licking, bobbing the body).

Yes, but doing it with an object rather than a human can threaten the normative modes of behavior and install possibilities for having pleasure in a non-normative fashion. And if these practices produce other kinds of pleasure than the ones we know from interaction with humans, then this will have social consequences. So when I lick the lamp, I hope that there is a transference of some sort of thing where you could say “hmm”—you know?

The spectator might salivate, and at the same time think, “Oh this must be disgusting. What am I doing?”

And for me this is about how you question “what do I know my pleasure to be, and how could I think it otherwise?” This would be a simple way of changing the normativity of sexual practices that control how we think we can feel or experience desire.

What’s potentially interesting about this, should it be a path of emancipation, is that it does it in an outlandish way, avoiding conflict that would jeopardize the value of social relations, as it were. Perhaps it dismantles the power structures, by divorcing desire from violence in the power to dominate others. This might be worth more thinking.

In 69 Positions the spectators travel through various modes of participation linking to different formats that the performance takes. It starts as a guided tour through an exhibition, but soon it turns into a demonstration rather than a lecture that would explicate some-

thing. How do the ways you approach the audience evolve in the course of two hours?

In the first part, the guided tour serves as a framing device: people come with the expectation of a theatre apparatus, and they find themselves in an enclosed space, standing with many others without the possibility to sit on a chair. The guided tour is also a pretext to keep them standing, and moving with me through the space. It is very important that they aren’t just watching the choreography, but that they also find themselves entangled with it, being a part of it.

Soon enough it becomes clear that this is finally not about guiding the audience through an exhibition, because I never leave them time to contemplate an exhibited document. There is a drive that moves me from one thing to the next. I have a program that I’m going through, but it’s constantly being adapted according to how the audience is responding. And so I call this “soft choreography”.

People look at each other in those fluid movements. They observe each other’s behavior, and they are trying to detect the other’s sensations. They perform surveillance on each other.

The audience members gazing at each other seems to mean “is this ok or not?”, “how are we supposed to behave in the situation?” In a recent presentation of the first part at the DOCH University in Stockholm, I was doing, as in every performance, the undressing from Anna Halprin’s *Parades and Changes* and, as usual, I was fixing my gaze on one spectator. He looked as if he was calm and comfortable with it, and I also said, “It’s going well”. In the discussion after the presentation, he said that

this was the most intimidating situation that he had ever been in. It is a clear demonstration of power reversed: I’m a naked woman looking into a man who is looking at me being naked, but I am returning the gaze that forbids him to look at anything else except right into my eyes. I wasn’t aware of how urgent the question of gaze becomes when the body is naked, and what power I exercise with my own gaze. So the participation in the first part is centered on the return of the gaze. The strategy of the second part is objectification: “I put myself in the position of being watched”. Again, it is about the reversal that recuperates the power of the objects in pornographic images. Not unlike Annie Sprinkle, who spreads her legs and invites the audience to look into her vagina, which empowers her by making her reclaim the ownership of her self-objectification, I use excerpts of my own pieces and I self-objectify. I try to have this all the time: that the body in the image has a voice and a capacity to think, contrary to women in pornography, whose voice is about sexual moaning. In *50/50*, the ass-shaking scene is a silent image. Here the image speaks back, and hopefully in this way undoes the objectifying gaze of the naked body in pornography. And about the third part, I don’t know yet, and still have to think about it.

There is something distinctive about your tone that you keep throughout the whole piece. It is a tone that affirms joy. Nothing offensive, unacceptable or manipulative in the way you address the audience. Everything you do bears a positive connotation. And your tone makes the participation easier, as if its subtext is: “Don’t worry, I’m not going to embarrass you too much. It’s not going to hurt. It’s nothing bad . . . if I can do it, you can do it, too . . . “. It feels like an antidote to

the uneasiness of the invitation to participate. Sometimes you exaggerate your joyfulness, and this reads like “why not dance like an idiot here”. This makes people react in a positive way. They mirror your joy because they also enjoy being in the aura of the performer.

There are several things to say about this. A lot of work on nudity revolves around the shock effect. This produces distance and rejection in the audience, which doesn't interest me. Generally, I am for joy and inventiveness—YES to invention! We can't change societal structures only through critical analysis, however necessary this analysis is. We have to be able to imagine alternatives. So either you say: these are the structures that suck and that we need to change; we can criticize them until they break. That's one option—that's not my way. And the other way would be to say, if we want to change then we have to have desire, we have to have energy, and we have to have joy. Maybe I'm also just a naïve optimist who believes in life So yes, we need to critically address the structures we want to change, but we also have to be able to desire change in order to effectuate the changes. That's why I invest in the imaginary and the potential.

And then we have to go back to the society and act according to these imagined desires, which isn't easy, because it meets resistance and requires violence to be implemented. People aren't only unwilling to give up conventions; it is the power of domination which won't allow it. Look at the conservative right-wing turn in politics everywhere.

This conservative backlash that we see now all over Europe is linked with the incapacity to deal with difference, with change, whether it's religious, sexual or political No matter

what type of difference, there is a kind of conservative “we have to keep to what we have or else our society falls apart”. But we actually need to think: How to include difference? How to include the Other and those modes of functioning that might destabilize the functioning and well-being of Western society? Should we go out onto the streets and do sexual mummification?

First of all, nudity would already disturb the public order; and therefore the work would be immediately swept off the streets by policemen. However, if you framed it as art and asked for permission to perform it in public, you might be immunized against law. This is an interesting political strategy to hijack art in order to provoke public order.

This question came up several times since I began this project. People asked me: Yes, so, what is your action? What is it that you want to change? And I am not so naïve to imagine that my show can change the world, but it can at least express the desire for change, especially in the sense I explained before: how to resist affective manipulation and experiment with one's own sensations and affects beyond the normative grip of individualist consumerism?

By the moment we are speaking now, 69 Positions has been performed only a few times, in three cities (Essen, Brussels and Bergen). Can you discern different responses in different contexts? Or is it determined by the venue and can still vary from one performance to another? What is the variety of reactions you have registered with the piece until now?

For instance, the two performances yesterday and today elicited two very different respons-

es. Yesterday people were joyful. They were with me and wanted to have a good time; it felt very easy. And today, the audience felt uncomfortable and stiff, not knowing where to put themselves as if they were disturbed by the whole thing. Surprisingly enough, most of them were students who planted themselves in the space. The performance really became a guided tour—which I didn't like so much. This performance was also given at noon. But I realized that it doesn't work with a homogeneous group. It is much more challenging and transformative to have a mixed audience of all ages and avenues of life. Especially because this piece allows for a kind of historical generational bridging of the remote periods from the 1960s up until today.

This performance might realize its political potential when it can include a multiplicity, a heterogeneous mixture in the audience. You would exactly go against the advice Schneeman gives in her letter: instead of redoing Meat Joy with the original aged cast, go to the retirement home and work with the old people. You are definitely not targeting a certain audience?

Indeed not. My principle is that whatever public is there is the public that I'm dealing with. So I think, if I am observing something, it is this: how sometimes the joy passes into the public and they are very much with me, and other times how there is a kind of scepticism, stiffness that produces a lot of tension in the space.

And how do you work with this tension?

I stick with my program, but while I am going through it, I am adapting and accommodating my actions to the situation. For instance, if people are glued to the walls, I literally go

behind them and try to mobilize them and redistribute them in the space by way of my own movement. I've developed different strategies, also in terms of how many people I am visible for in the space. I train my awareness of how people displace themselves so that I know how I can deal with them. There are techniques, like I keep on turning all the time and so on It's also important how I go in and out of the documents on the wall, because it allows those spectators who have phased out of the performance to reconnect. It happens that they can come back. I see people with faces like “Oh, no more orgy for me. I can't deal with it”, and then they go and look at what's on the wall. So these shifts in attention are important for the piece.

And my last question would be: what are the the implications, or conclusions, that you take from this work into the next work, which will deal with sexuality and nudity with a larger group of performers?

The ideas I develop in the third part of *69 Positions* are haunting me: how to undo conventional modes of sexual behaviour through experimental practices. This is something that I would like to elaborate more. And this comes through relations with objects and non-humans, but it also comes by reconsidering the body as a thing, or as a non-human. It might be a way to compose a group beyond personal integrity or human dialogue, which is in the core of sexual interaction. The other aspect I would like to extend from this work into my next choreography, and I still don't know how, is the bridge with the history of the normative structure to be undone, from which a future can be reimagined.

Pressestimmen

Press Excerpts

Camille Emmanuelle inRockS, 19. Dezember 2014

Between guided tour, performance and dance show, Mette Ingvarsten uses as her subject all expressions of the sexual utopia specific to the counterculture of the 60s: sexual liberation, ritual pleasure, the exposed, shared body... At a time when the slightest nipple is banned

from the social media, and when an ex-Femen has just been condemned for moral prejudice for exhibiting her naked body in the church Église de la Madeleine, this performance makes us examine our intimate and societal connection to the naked body. (...)

Quentin Girard Liberation, 17. Dezember 2014

Mette Ingvarsten starts with clothes on, and very quickly reveals her body. The title, *69 positions*, is misleading. If eroticism occasionally shows up, when she for the first time reveals a breast or kisses a light bulb after having read an excerpt of *Testo Junkie* by Beatriz Preciado, sexual excitement is not

what is at stake here. The choreographer wishes to show us how sexuality is a social construct, and the fact of being undressed or not has no signification. For her, nudity is an object, a weapon that can be used, reversed and toppled to defend a cause. (...)



Mette Ingvarsten *69 positions* © Charles Roussel

Jean-François Picaut Les Troix Coups.com, November 2014

This nudity is crude, not in a trivial or vulgar sense, but without fuss, without embellishment, one could say natural, if precisely in our public sphere our cultural conventions would not see it as taboo. This piece is not pornographic because the public, with whom the artist shares the stage, is never in a voyeurism situation and because she herself can never be reduced to an object. Members of the audience watch her, but

the opposite is true. She also talks to them, more or less constantly and specifically during striptease moments. The gaze and the talking (the language) establish her as a subject and obstruct all possibility of reification. This is Mette Ingvarsten's talent, to have turned a sociological, philosophical and political thought about the connection to the body and to sexuality within our western societies into a charming protean art work.

Gérald Mayen Mouvement, 21. November 2014

Mette Ingvarsten emphasizes it right away: sexual liberation, its enactments, will have had a central place in the eruption of performance art during the rebellion of the 60s and 70s. Today it is unthinkable to go back to the transgressive impact (...) In any case, this artist finds herself on the thinking front that rejects the idea of sexuality being a kind of subject in its intimacy, but considers it as an integral part of the public sphere of significations and cultural and social conditioning. (...)

But the point is somewhere else. The singularity of her strategy lies in the fact that

here again, it's about public sphere, totally transferred into the realm of representation, of codes, of culturally elaborated performances of the gaze and of movement, that are played during these clever games after all, mixed within the audience collective body. *69 positions* goes very far, works a lot on creating an original position, seeking ways to trespass this performance trap, which is made of legends surrounded by an aura, otherwise of intellectual neo-academic references, in any case twitch of recognition in well-informed circles, also leading to a-critical laziness.

METTE INGVARSTEN

DE

Mette Ingvarsten ist eine dänische Choreografin und Tänzerin. Ab 1999 studierte sie in Amsterdam und Brüssel, wo sie 2004 an der Hochschule für darstellende Künste P.A.R.T.S. graduierte. Ihre erste Performance *Manual Focus* (2003) entstand bereits während des Studiums. Zu ihren frühen Stücken zählen unter anderem *50/50* (2004) (2005), *It's in The Air* (2008) und *GIANT CITY* (2009) – Performances, die Affekt, Wahrnehmung und Empfindung in Bezug auf körperliche Repräsentation hinterfragen. Ihre Arbeit zeichnet sich durch Hybridität aus und erweitert choreografische Praktiken, indem sie Tanz und Bewegung mit anderen Bereichen wie bildender Kunst, Technologie, Sprache und Theorie kombiniert.

Ein bedeutender Aspekt ihrer Arbeit wurde 2009 bis 2012 in *The Artificial Nature Series* entwickelt, wobei sie sich darauf konzentrierte, die Beziehungen zwischen menschlicher und nicht-menschlicher Handlungsfähigkeit durch Choreografie neu zu gestalten. Die Serie umfasst drei Performances ohne menschliche Präsenz: *evaporated landscapes* (2009), *The Extra Sensorial Garden* (2011), *The Light Forest* (2010) und zwei Performances, in denen die menschliche Figur wieder eingeführt wurde: *Speculations* (2011) und die Gruppenarbeit *The Artificial Nature Project* (2012).

Im Gegensatz dazu schreibt sich ihre neueste Serie, *The Red Pieces: 69 positions* (2014), *7 Pleasures* (2015), *to come (extended)* und *21 pornographies* (2017) in eine Geschichte menschlicher Darstellung ein, wobei der Schwerpunkt auf Nacktheit und Sexualität liegt, und den Arten und Weisen, wie in der Geschichte der Körper Ort für politische Kämpfe war.

2003 gründete Ingvarsten ihre Kompanie und ihre Arbeiten wurden seitdem in ganz Europa sowie in den USA, Kanada und Australien gezeigt. Sie war Artist-in-Residence am Kaaitheater in Brüssel (2012–2016), der Volksbühne Berlin und Mitglied des APAP-Netzwerks.

Sie promovierte in Choreografie an der Universität UNIARTS / Lunds in Schweden. Neben Produzieren, Aufführen, Schreiben und Vortragen umfasst ihre Praxis auch Lehren und den Austausch von Forschungsergebnissen in Workshops mit Studierenden an Universitäten und Kunsthochschulen. Sie hat mit Xavier Le Roy, Bojana Cvejić, Jan Ritsema und Boris Charmatz zusammengearbeitet, ebenso wie in kollektiven Forschungsprojekten wie der Künstlerplattform *EVERYBODYS* (2005–2010), für die sie *everybodys publications* mit herausgab, aber auch das Bildungsprojekt *Six Months, One Location* (2008) und die performative Konferenz *The Permeable Stage*.

EN

Mette Ingvarsten is a Danish choreographer and dancer. From 1999 she studied in Amsterdam and Brussels where she in 2004 graduated from the performing arts school P.A.R.T.S. Her first performance *Manual Focus* (2003) was made while she was still studying.

Her early pieces comprise among others of *50/50* (2004), *to come* (2005), *It's in The Air* (2008) and *GIANT CITY* (2009) - performances questioning affect, perception and sensation in relation to bodily representation. Her work is characterized by hybridity and engages in extending choreographic practices by combining dance and movement with other domains such as visual art, technology, language and theory.

An important strand of her work was developed between 2009 and 2012 with *The Artificial Nature Series*, where she focused on reconfiguring relations between human and non-human agency through choreography. The series includes three performances devoid of human presence: *evaporated landscapes* (2009), *The Extra Sensorial Garden* (2011) *The Light Forest* (2010) and two in which the human figure was reintroduced: *Speculations* (2011) and the group work *The Artificial Nature Project* (2012).

By contrast her latest series, *The Red Pieces: 69 positions* (2014), *7 Pleasures* (2015), *to come (extended)* and *21 pornographies* (2017) inscribes itself into a history of human performance with a focus on nudity, sexuality and how the body historically has been a site for political struggles.

Ingvarsten established her company in 2003 and her work has since then been shown throughout Europe, as well as in the U.S., Canada and Australia. She has been artist-in-residence at Kaaitheater in Brussels (2012-2016), Volksbühne in Berlin, and associated to the APAP network.

She holds a PhD in choreography from UNIARTS / Lunds University in Sweden.

Besides making, performing, writing and lecturing, her practice also includes teaching and sharing research through workshops with students at universities and art schools. She has collaborated and performed with Xavier Le Roy, Bojana Cvejić, Jan Ritsema and Boris Charmatz, as well as invested in collective research projects such as the artist platform *EVERYBODYS* (2005-2010) for which she co-edited *everybodys publications*, but also the educational project *Six Months, One Location* (2008) and the performative conference *The Permeable Stage*.

Spielplan / Schedule

11. 7. / Do

FESTIVALERÖFFNUNG
Johann Kresnik | Gottfried Helnwein | Kurt Schwertsik & TANZLIN.Z
Macbeth
21:00, Volkstheater, Kat B

12. 7. / Fr

Doris Uhlich
TANK
19:00, Odeon, Kat I

Michael Laub / Remote Control Productions
Rolling
21:00, Akademietheater, Kat D

Filmvorführung
Wim Wenders
PINA
21:30, Kino wie noch nie

13. 7. / Sa

Annie Dorsen
Spokaoke
17:00, Arsenal, Kat O

Johann Kresnik | Gottfried Helnwein | Kurt Schwertsik & TANZLIN.Z
Macbeth
19:30, Volkstheater, Kat B

Filmvorführung
Wim Wenders
PINA
20:30, METRO
Kinokulturhaus

Mette Ingvarsten
69 positions
18:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat J

14. 7. / So

Workshop Opening Lecture
«impressions'19»
16:00, Arsenal
Eintritt frei

Mette Ingvarsten
69 positions
18:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat J

Doris Uhlich
TANK
19:00, Odeon, Kat I

Michael Laub / Remote Control Productions
Rolling
21:00, Akademietheater, Kat D

15. 7. / Mo

Annie Dorsen
Spokaoke
19:00, Festival Lounge im
Burgtheater Vestibül, Kat O

[8:tension]
Michiel Vandevelde
Andrade
21:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat M

16. 7. / Di

Vernissage
Karolina Miernik & Emilia Milewska / yako.one
Come on! Dance with me
18:00, OstLicht.
Gallery for
Photography, Kat Z

Mette Ingvarsten
69 positions
18:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz,
Kat J

Dimitri Chamblas & Boris Charmatz / Terrain
À bras-le-corps
19:30, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Tanztheater Wuppertal
Pina Bausch
Masurca Fogo
21:00, Burgtheater,
Kat A

17. 7. / Mi

Filmvorführung
César Vayssié
Les Disparates
Boris Charmatz & César Vayssié
Levée
17:30, Leopold Museum
Auditorium, Kat R

Zusatzvorstellung
Dimitri Chamblas & Boris Charmatz / Terrain
À bras-le-corps
18:30, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Ali Moini
My Paradoxical Knives
19:00, mumok, Kat P

Open House
Miller, Hill, Weber, Martinez & Guests
Unstable Nights
19:30, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

Mette Ingvarsten
69 positions
20:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz,
Kat J

Steven Cohen
*put your heart under
your feet ... and walk!*
21:00, Odeon, Kat I

Zusatzvorstellung
Tanztheater Wuppertal
Pina Bausch
Masurca Fogo
21:00, Burgtheater, Kat A

[8:tension]
Michiel Vandevelde
Andrade
22:30, Schauspielhaus, Kat M

18. 7. / Do

Filmvorführung
César Vayssié
Les Disparates
Boris Charmatz & César Vayssié
Levée
18:00, Leopold Museum
Auditorium, Kat R

Open House
Miller, Hill, Weber, Martinez & Guests
Unstable Nights
19:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

Dimitri Chamblas & Boris Charmatz / Terrain
À bras-le-corps
19:30, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Annie Dorsen
Spokaoke
20:30, Leopold Museum,
Kat O

Tanztheater Wuppertal
Pina Bausch
Masurca Fogo
21:00, Burgtheater, Kat A

19. 7. / Fr

Dance of Urgency, Q21
Frédéric Gies
*Good Girls Go To Heaven,
Bad Girls Go Everywhere*
14:30–18:08, frei_raum
Q21, Kat Z

Research Project Showing
Elio Gervasi
The Choreographic Engine
17:00, Probebühne
Volksoper, Kat O

Mette Ingvarsten
7 Pleasures
19:00, Akademietheater, Kat D

Open House
Miller, Hill, Weber, Martinez & Guests
Unstable Nights
19:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

Tanztheater Wuppertal
Pina Bausch
Masurca Fogo
21:00, Burgtheater, Kat A

ImPulsTanz Party
A-Side
22:00, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz

20. 7. / Sa

Diskussion
Jérôme Bel
*Think Tank: Dance
and Ecology*
ab 13:00, Arsenal, Kat Z

Open House
Miller, Hill, Weber, Martinez & Guests
Unstable Nights
19:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

[8:tension]
Tobias Koch, Thibault Lac & Tore Wallert
Such Sweet Thunder
19:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Steven Cohen
*put your heart under
your feet ... and walk!*
21:00, Odeon, Kat I

Juliana F. May
Folk Incest
22:30, Volx/Margareten, Kat K

21. 7. / So

Diskussion
Jérôme Bel
*Think Tank: Dance
and Ecology*
13:00, Arsenal, Kat Z

Musikvideoprogramm
Synthesize the Real
16:00, Leopold Museum
Auditorium, Kat R

[8:tension]
Michelle Moura
*BLINK – mini unison
intense lamentation*
19:00, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat M

Ali Moini
My Paradoxical Knives
20:15, mumok, Kat P

Mette Ingvarsten
7 Pleasures
21:00, Akademietheater, Kat D

22. 7. / Mo

[8:tension]
Tobias Koch, Thibault Lac & Tore Wallert
Such Sweet Thunder
19:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Filmvorführung
Jérôme Bel
Retrospective
19:00, Akademietheater, Kat P

Langheinrich & Hentschläger / Granular Synthesis
MODELL 5
20:30, Odeon, Kat N

Juliana F. May
Folk Incest
21:00, Volx/Margareten, Kat K

Mette Ingvarsten
to come (extended)
21:30, Volkstheater, Kat C

[8:tension]

Eric Arnal-Burtschy
Why We Fightt
23:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat M

23. 7. / Di

Open House
**Miller, Hill, Weber,
Martinez & Guests**
Unstable Nights
18:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

Jérôme Bel
Lecture on nothing
19:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat L

**Ismael Ivo / Balé da
Cidade de São Paulo &
Morena Nascimento**
Um Jeito de Corpo
21:00, Burgtheater, Kat B

[8:tension]
Michelle Moura
BLINK – mini unison
intense lamentation
22:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat M

24. 7. / Mi

Open House
**Miller, Hill, Weber,
Martinez & Guests**
Unstable Nights
18:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

Ian Kaler & Planningtorock
o.T. | RAW PRACTICE
19:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

[8:tension]
Eric Arnal-Burtschy
Why we fight
19:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat M

Lenio Kaklea
*Practical Encyclopaedia,
Chosen Portraits*
20:30, mumok, Kat M

**Claire Croizé & Matteo
Fargion / ECCE vzw**
Flowers (we are)
20:30, Akademietheater, Kat F

Zusatzvorstellung
**Ismael Ivo / Balé da
Cidade de São Paulo &
Morena Nascimento**
Um Jeito de Corpo
21:00, Burgtheater, Kat B

Mette Ingvarsten
21 pornographies
22:00, Volkstheater, Kat E

25. 7. / Do

Lenio Kaklea
*Practical Encyclopaedia,
Lecture demonstration*
18:00, mumok, Kat M

Open House
**Miller, Hill, Weber,
Martinez & Guests**
Unstable Nights
18:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

[ImPulsTanz Classic]
Akemi Takeya
ZZremix
Neuinszenierung
19:30, Odeon, Kat I

**Ismael Ivo / Balé da
Cidade de São Paulo &
Morena Nascimento**
Um Jeito de Corpo
21:00, Burgtheater, Kat B

[8:tension]
**Mira Kandathil & Annina
Machaz / Follow us**
Ask the oracle
– the future is now–
22:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat M

26. 7. / Fr

Open House
**Miller, Hill, Weber,
Martinez & Guests**
Unstable Nights
18:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K + Q

Lenio Kaklea
*Practical Encyclopaedia,
Chosen Portraits*
18:00, mumok, Kat M

Ian Kaler & Planningtorock
o.T. | RAW PRACTICE
19:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Work in Progress Presentation
Peter Stamer & Frank Willens
In the Penal Colony
19:00, mumok, Kat O

Zusatzvorstellung
**Ismael Ivo / Balé da
Cidade de São Paulo &
Morena Nascimento**
Um Jeito de Corpo
21:00, Burgtheater,
Kat B

Trajal Harrell
Dancer of the Year
21:00, Akademietheater,
Kat G

[8:tension]
Samuel Feldhandler
'd he meant vary a shin's
22:30, Schauspielhaus,
Kat M

27. 7. / Sa

IDOCDE Symposium
Tracing Forwards
27. Juli, 12:00 bis 28. Juli,
13:00, Arsenal

Steven Cohen
Taste
19:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat O

[ImPulsTanz Classic]

Akemi Takeya
ZZremix
Neuinszenierung
21:00, Odeon, Kat I

[8:tension]
**Mira Kandathil & Annina
Machaz / Follow us**
Ask the oracle
– the future is now–
22:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat M

28. 7. / So

Musikvideoprogramm
B-E-H-A-V-E
16:00, Leopold Museum
Auditorium, Kat R

[8:tension]
Teresa Vittucci
HATE ME, TENDER
18:00, Volx/Margareten,
Kat M

[8:tension]
Samuel Feldhandler
'd he meant vary a shin's
19:30, Schauspielhaus, Kat M

Frédéric Gies
walk + talk
19:30, mumok, Kat M

**Lisi Estaras & Ido Batash /
MonkeyMind Company**
The Jewish Connection Project
21:00, Volkstheater, Kat E

[8:tension]
Maria Metsalu
Mademoiselle x
22:30, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat M

29. 7. / Mo

Work in Progress Presentation
Peter Stamer & Frank Willens
In the Penal Colony
19:00, mumok, Kat O

Steven Cohen
Taste
20:15, Leopold Museum,
Kat O

Lisbeth Gruwez / Voetvolk
The Sea Within
21:00, Akademietheater, Kat F

Book Presentation
Mårten Spångberg Hg.
Movement Research
22:30, Volkstheater –
Rote Bar, Kat Z
mit Mårten Spångberg
und Anne Juren

30. 7. / Di

[8:tension]
Maria Metsalu
Mademoiselle x
19:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat M

Frank Willens
Radiant Optimism
20:15, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat K

Philipp Gehmacher
*It is a balancing act to live
without your attention*
Theaterversion
21:30, Odeon, Kat I

[8:tension]
Teresa Vittucci
HATE ME, TENDER
23:00, Volx/Margareten,
Kat M

31. 7. / Mi

**Amanda Piña /
nadaproductions**
Danza y Frontera
(Museum Version)
19:00, mumok, Kat K

Lisbeth Gruwez / Voetvolk
The Sea Within
21:00, Akademietheater, Kat F

1. 8. / Do

Philipp Gehmacher
*It is a balancing act to live
without your attention*
Theaterversion
19:00, Odeon, Kat I

[8:tension]
**Ellen Furey & Malik
Nashad Sharpe**
SOFTLAMP.autonomies
21:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat M

Liquid Loft / Chris Haring
Stand-Alones
(polyphony)
21:00, Leopold Museum, Kat K

Frank Willens
Radiant Optimism
23:00, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat K

2. 8. / Fr

Symposium & Performance
Chateau Rouge & Red Edition
Salon Souterrain:
Art & Prostitution
19:00–21:30, Volkstheater –
Rote Bar, Kat M

**Amanda Piña /
nadaproductions**
Danza y Frontera
(Museum Version)
19:00, mumok, Kat K

Alleyn Dance
A Night's Game
20:30, Odeon, Kat I

Zusatzvorstellung
Liquid Loft / Chris Haring
Stand-Alones
(polyphony)
20:30, Leopold Museum,
Kat K

Planningtorock
Powerhouse
22:00, Halle E, Kat H

3. 8. / Sa

[8:tension]

Ellen Furey & Malik Nashad Sharpe

SOFTLAMP.autonomies
19:00, Schauspielhaus,
Kat M

Liquid Loft / Chris Haring

Stand-Alones
(polyphony)
19:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat K

Dance Contest

Rhythm is a Dancer
Hosted by Storm
20:00, Arsenal, Kat Z

Agudo Dance Company

Silk Road
21:00, Akademietheater,
Kat F

Zusatzvorstellung

Alleyn Dance

A Night's Game
22:30, Odeon, Kat I

4. 8. / So

Symposium – Summer
Barbecue Performance
Party Remix

Future Clinic for Critical Care

FCCC'ing ImpulsTanz
The Musical: A Past
Present Future Clinic
Hosted by Jeremy Wade & Nina
Mühlemann & Tanja Erhart
12:00–18:00, Arsenal,
Kat M

Musikvideoprogramm

Collapse

17:00, mumok kino, Kat S

Zusatzvorstellung

Agudo Dance Company

Silk Road
21:00, Akademietheater,
Kat F

Philipp Gehmacher

It is a balancing act to live
without your attention
Museumsversion
19:00, mumok, Kat K

Alleyn Dance

A Night's Game
21:00, Odeon, Kat I

[ImPulsTanz Classic]

DD Dorvillier / human

future dance corps

No Change, or "freedom is a
psycho-kinetic Skill" (2005)
22:00, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat K

5. 8. / Mo

Wim Vandekeybus

/ Ultima Vez

Go Figure Out Yourself
19:00, mumok
Hofstallung, Kat K

Jonathan Burrows

Rewriting
20:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Agudo Dance Company

Silk Road
21:00, Akademietheater,
Kat F

toxic dreams & WTKB

The Deadpan Dynamites
– *The Art of the Gag*
21:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat L

Jonathan Burrows

Rewriting
21:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Wim Vandekeybus

/ Ultima Vez

Go Figure Out Yourself
22:30, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K

6. 8. / Di

Showing

ATLAS – create your dance trails

16:00, Arsenal, Kat Z

Musikvideoprogramm

B-E-H-A-V-E

Synthesize the Real

16:00, Leopold Museum
Auditorium, Kat R

Philipp Gehmacher

It is a balancing act to live
without your attention
Museumsversion
19:00, mumok, Kat K

God's Entertainment

TARZAN
20:00, Zacherlfabrik, Kat K

Jonathan Burrows

Rewriting
20:15, Leopold Museum, Kat M

Zusatzvorstellung

toxic dreams & WTKB

The Deadpan Dynamites
– *The Art of the Gag*
21:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat L

Wim Vandekeybus

/ Ultima Vez

Go Figure Out Yourself
21:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K

7. 8. / Mi

[8:tension]

nasa4nasa

SUASH
19:00, mumok, Kat M

Wim Vandekeybus

/ Ultima Vez

Go Figure Out Yourself
19:00, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K

Jonathan Burrows

Rewriting
20:00, Leopold Museum, Kat M

toxic dreams & WTKB

The Deadpan Dynamite
– *The Art of the Gag*
21:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat L

Anne Juren

42
21:00, Odeon, Kat I

Wim Vandekeybus

/ Ultima Vez

Go Figure Out Yourself
22:30, mumok Hofstallung,
Kat K

8. 8. / Do

[8:tension]

Marissa Perel

Pain Threshold
19:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Filmvorführung

César Vayssié

Ne travaille pas (1968–2018)
19:00, mumok kino, Kat Q

God's Entertainment

TARZAN
20:00, Zacherlfabrik,
Kat K

Zusatzvorstellung

Jonathan Burrows

Rewriting
20:15, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Simone Aughtterlony, Petra Hrašćanec & Saša Božić

Compass
21:00, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz,
Kat K

9. 8. / Fr

[ImPulsTanz Classic]

Ivo Dimchev

The Selfie Concert
18:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat K

[8:tension]

nasa4nasa

SUASH
19:30, mumok, Kat M

God's Entertainment

TARZAN
20:00, Zacherlfabrik, Kat K

ImPulsTanz Party

B-Side
22:00, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz

[8:tension]

Tatiana Chizhikova & Roman Kutnov

Time to Time
23:00, Schauspielhaus, Kat M

10. 8. / Sa

Final Workshop Showing

«*expressions '19*»
16:00, Arsenal, Kat Z

CieLaroque/Helene Weinzierl

AS FAR AS WE ARE
18:00, Arsenal, Kat M

[8:tension]

Marissa Perel

Pain Threshold
18:00, Leopold
Museum, Kat M

Dana Michel

CUTLASS SPRING
19:30, Odeon, Kat K

Book Presentation &
Musical Improvisation

Johannes Odenthal, Koffi Kôkô, Manos Tsangaris

Passagen
19:30, Schauspielhaus, Kat Z

Zusatzvorstellung
[8:tension]

nasa4nasa

SUASH
19:30, mumok, Kat M

Programmänderungen vorbehalten / Programme subject to change

Simone Aughtterlony, Petra Hrašćanec & Saša Božić

Compass
21:00, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz, Kat K

11. 8. / So

Zusatzvorstellung
[8:tension]

Marissa Perel

Pain Threshold
16:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat M

Kat M

Musikvideoprogramm

Collapse

16:30, mumok kino,
Kat. S

[ImPulsTanz Classic]

Ivo Dimchev

The Selfie Concert
18:00, Leopold Museum,
Kat K

[8:tension]

Tatiana Chizhikova & Roman Kutnov

Time to Time
19:30, Schauspielhaus,
Kat M

Zusatzvorstellung

Dana Michel

CUTLASS SPRING
19:30, Odeon, Kat K

Konzert

Hahn Rowe

Hahn Rowe in Concert
22:30, Kasino am
Schwarzenbergplatz,
Kat M



Mette Ingvarlsen © Virginie Mira

Medieninhaber und Herausgeber:

ImPulsTanz – Vienna International Dance Festival; Museumstraße 5/21, 1070 Wien, Austria
T +43.1.523 55 58/F +43.1.523 55 58-9; info@impulstanz.com/impulstanz.com

Änderungen vorbehalten

Preis: € 3,50

Intendant: Karl Regensburger; Künstlerische Beratung: Ismael Ivo; Künstlerische Leitung Workshops & Research: Rio Rutzinger, Marina Losin; Künstlerische Leitung [8:tension]: Christine Standfest, Michael Stolhofer; Dramaturgie & Programm mumok-Kooperation: Christine Standfest; ImPulsTanz social Programm: Hanna Bauer; Finanzen: Gabriele Parapatits, Katharina Binder; Kaufmännische Beratung: Andreas Barth – Castello Consulting GmbH; Festivalorganisation: Gabriel Schmidinger, Alissa Horngacher; Künstlerisches Betriebsbüro: Yasamin Nikeresht, Maiko Sakurai, Laura Fischer; Produktionsassistent: Oihana Azpillaga Camio; Produktionsleitung: Johannes Maile; IT: Hannes Zellinger, Zimmel + Partner; Presse & PR: Theresa Pointner, Almud Krejza, Zorah Zellinger; Marketing: Theresa Pointner; New Media: Maja Preckel; Online Redaktion: Maja Preckel, Marina Losin; Förderungen & Kooperationen: Hanna Bauer; EU Project Life Long Burning & danceWEB Scholarship; Programme: Hanna Bauer, Katharina Binder, Rio Rutzinger; Sponsoring: Andreas Barth, Hanna Bauer, Wolfgang Mayr – mayr & more; ImPulsBringer – Freunde des ImPulsTanz Festivals: Präsident Josef Ostermayer, Organisation Laura Fischer; Workshop Office: Carine Carvalho Barbosa & Team Koordination; danceWEB & ATLAS: Gabri Einsiedl; Technische Leitung Performances: Andreas Grundhoff & Team; Chiefs of Ticketing: Ralf - I. Jonas, Gabriel Schmidinger; Publikumsdienst: Gabriel Schmidinger, Alissa Horngacher & Team; Koordination der Künstler_innenwohnungen: Joseph Rudolf & Team; Gästekarten: Isabelle Nisanyan & Timothy Gundacker; Infoservice: Anna Korenitsch, Martina Dähne; Spielstättengestaltung: Maximilian Pramatarov, Nestor Kovachev; Technische Leitung Workshops: Hannes Zellinger & Team; Musikvideo-Programm: Christoph Etzlsdorfer (VIS Vienna Shorts), Theresa Pointner; Fotografie: Karolina Miernik, Emilia Milewska; Video: Maximilian Pramatarov

Redaktion Abendprogramme: Christine Standfest & Stefanie Gunzy; Satz (Kern): Valerie Eccli; Coverdesign, Introseiten & Art Direction: CIN CIN, Vienna – Stephan Göschl, Gerhard Jordan, Annika Perktold & Jasmin Roth; Print: Druckerei Walla.

Im Bild am Cover: Mette Ingvarlsen © Fernanda Tafner

Increase the power!



LUK LUKOIL
LUBRICANTS

GENESIS
motor oil

Spoke
#60

IMMORALITY

IMMORALITY

OUT
NOW!