

# MOVING IN BETWEEN RESISTANCES – AN AXIS-THOUGHT ON CHOREOGRAPHIC CREATION IN AN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

 **ÂNGELO NETO**

Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa,  
Escola Superior de Dança  
aneto@esd.ipl.pt

## ABSTRACT

This text proposes to think about the process of choreographic creation in an educational context creating a dialogue between artistic and philosophical creation, reflecting, in this way, how creation asserts itself as a practice of artistic education. It establishes a plane of discussion starting from the philosophical creation of concepts, under the voice of Gilles Deleuze, to choreographic creation and how it, by its specificity, creates a mesh of thought about the choreographer-interpreter relationship. This approach underlines the resistance as a common ground that allows, on the one hand, to reflect on the creative act in its theoretical and empirical aspects and, on the other hand, to establish a bridge with the educational context. In this last point, John Baldacchino allows to examine the mechanism of resistance that is established in the articulation between artistic education and the School. Finally, the text projects itself to a plane of choreographic creation process, underlining the importance of collaboration and devising among the agents of creation. Thus, the choreographer-interpreter relationship advocates a place of questioning about the process of choreographic creation as an act of resistance and tension between the School and artistic education.

Keywords: Artistic education; Choreographic creation; Collaboration; Resistance.

Between the movement of persisting and resisting, dance contains this paradoxical germ of appearance and disappearance. What's left of a choreographic work? What persists? Movement is all at the same time as it moves, ceasing movement may not cease the body, there can be a potential movement contained in stillness. However, in the choreographic work, the creation of movement implies resistance, it implies persistence. Choreographic creation is, at this juncture, seen through two main perspectives by Gilles Deleuze and John Baldacchino, since they constitute a dialogue that one wishes to create in the field of artistic education. Deleuze puts creation as an act of resistance and gives a set of concepts to think about the creative act (Deleuze, 1994, 1995, 2006; Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). This text cartographs a journey from the act of creating as a way of resisting, proposing that it is contained in a plane that crosses philosophy and art through the 'concept', viewed as an object of encounter with multiplicities and, therefore, capable of articulating the approximation of creation on the philosophical and artistic planes. From this articulation, a passage is made to the educational context since there is a pedagogical nucleus in the concept itself. This passage is suggested by Baldacchino since it places artistic education as a way of resisting (Baldacchino, 2008, 2013, 2015). However, it is a different form of resistance, advocating resistance as a form of conservation, that is, as if artistic education could exist in the School, but outside it. Artistic creation is presented as a practice that cannot be seen as utilitarian or serving the School. This text aims to find a place between different modes of resistance, to think about choreographic creation in an educational context. Thus, to 'resist' triangulates three distinct planes of relationship: the creation of concepts; the escape from School; and the devising in the process of choreographic creation. Resistance becomes a metaphor to think about the ephemerality of the choreographic creation process and how this process contains immanent resistance mechanisms in its tension with the School. It is not associated with a mechanism of counter-current or exclusion, but exactly the opposite: it consists in a process of contextualization of the creative act in its articulation with the world. It is an opportunity to think structurally about creation, on a transcendent plane, and to place it in the field of choreographic creation in an educational context. I would like to emphasise that the idea of resistance is built in terms of the methods and the processes of choreographic creation, not utilizing this process as a way of resist to something. The choreographic work is, on the one hand, resisting time, resisting the School, resisting humanity itself and, on the other, surrendering to the ephemerality of the body that dances and that, with movement, disappears.

## FROM NOTHING TO DISAPPEARANCE – CONTEMPORARY CHOREOGRAPHIC CREATION

I started to grasp the relationship between resistance and dance in the paper “A view on contemporary choreography in its educational potential” (Neto et al., 2020). It is something intuitive, that dance cannot resist, but is interesting to think how artistic education and artistic creation are ways to slow this disappearance. Louppe (2012), poses the following question “What is there at the beginning of the choreographic work? [replying] Nothing” (p. 257). This seemingly simple answer hides a set of premises that need to be reflected in the discussion that is intended to be fostered. First, one can think of materiality, that is, the author underlines the fleeting state of dance and the immateriality of movement, contrasting with other artistic manifestations that find a material support *a priori*. In this respect, Lepecki (2006) refers that dance exists in a perpetual point of escape, in an amnesiac movement where “(...) dance offers nothing but fleeting vanishing visions of its momentary brilliance in a series of irretrievable nows” (p. 124). This is an aspect that involves the existence of a body that dances, that is, a curse that tends towards its own disappearance. Lepecki (2006) adds that although it is an ephemeral art form, it can be reproduced continuously over time. Learning a dance technique contains a resistance to forgetfulness, expressed by the need for repetition and passage of a legacy often associated with iconic figures in dance history. Precisely, in the attempt of retention, the choreography emerges as an anchor in all this escape movement: “choreography activates writing in the realm of dancing to guarantee that dance’s present is given a past, and therefore, a future” (Lepecki, 2006, p. 125). Thus, choreography fights against forgetfulness, functioning as an anchor that allows to fix an artistic practice. Choreographic creation is thus an act of counter-current to the inevitable path to disappearance. This line of thought does not intend to propose choreographic creation as a form of salvation of dance, since it is this perpetual escape from materiality that characterizes it. It is proposed that the body is the first material support of this escape. The deserted body of movement is, in this context, what exists before the choreographic work, a body-nothing-empty. It is an agent, instrument and object (Fazenda, 2012), a place where learning is operated and meaning is shaped. It is capable of being a learning agent, an active body in the process of relationship and affection. The dimension of instrument and object, proposed by Fazenda (2012), repositions it and gives it a triple valence. This multimodal vision is fundamental to think about its infinite possibilities, and it becomes an important aspect in the relationship between education and creation. It is a place of encounter with the world and, at the same time, an encounter with its uniqueness. The body is therefore a paradoxical instance. Gil (2001, p. 68) defines it as a body-in-flow that can be “(...) deserted, emptied, stolen from its soul and traversed by the most exuberant flows of life. A human body because it can come (...)”. Bodies operate as interchange surfaces that reconfigure and change continuously. The body, in its possibility of becoming, as

Gil (2001) proposes through Deleuze, exalts an important line of force in the horizontality of the processes of creation and teaching-learning. Thus, the body-becoming is not related to imitation or confrontation with an external model to which it wishes to reach, i.e. “Becomings are not phenomena of imitation or assimilation, but of a double capture, of non-parallel evolution, of nuptials between two reigns” (Deleuze & Parnet, 2007, p. 2). Becoming belongs to geography, belongs to the movement of entry and exit, contains orientations and directions. That is, the movement of ‘becoming’ or the entry into the becoming implies an exit from history itself, an overtaking of oneself. The bodies that participate in the processes of choreographic creation are “(...) bodies-in-the-making (...)” (Manning, 2009, p. 5). The body becomes the very movement of becoming, that is, the *unfinishing* expresses itself through the movement of building and resisting. Dance, through the body, operates in a set of representations of the world itself. The body is, from the beginning, a vehicle of thought about the signs, that is, about the forms and concepts. This, in its relationship with thought, continues to share the same sense of escape. ‘Nothingness’ remains present as the only fair answer. So, what underpins the process of choreographic creation? How can the choreographer find forms of resistance? How can the body be agent-instrument-object in this resistance? Returning to Louppe (2012), the author adds that “A choreographer must find everything in himself and in a specific relationship with the other” (Louppe, 2012, p. 257). Here we highlight the capacity for the relationship that the choreographic work is born from. It is important to retain attention on this relational aspect since it exposes a set of layers to the choreographic work itself. If, on the one hand, it is the choreographer’s relationship with the world that contributes to the choreographic work, on the other hand, the relationship between the interpreter and the choreographer is capable of “(...) weave [new] threads from the invisible, give body to what does not exist (...)” (Louppe, 2012, p. 257). The threads that are created from what does not exist are matter that resist, are forms of materialization of the impossible. There is no process of choreographic creation without the relationship, without the encounter bodies in a state of becoming. Thus, Charmatz & Launay (2011) stress the need, regardless of the nature of the creation process, to be planned in deep articulation with the interpreter, thus valuing his contribution. As it is referred to in this text, the interpreter substituting the dancer is an option in line with the fact that the interpreter in an active agent in the choreographic process (Neto et al., 2020).

### **CREATE AND RESIST – A CARTOGRAPHY FOR ARTISTIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL CREATION**

After contextualizing important aspects related to choreographic creation, I intend to think on artistic creation in an educational context, as a resistance movement, taking Deleuze as its starting point. In this way, it is important to think about creation in its articulation with artistic education and how they intersect in an ontological plane that approaches

a mechanism of resisting. Resist what? Resist who? Before answering these questions, through Deleuze, it is possible to start a discussion capable of conforming a platform, on which thought will be built. Deleuze (2006), addressing the creative act, completely disarticulates the relationship between the work of art and communication. It is far from its informative dimension, as well as from its functional dimension since it does not contain any kind of information. The work of art does not contain any kind of functional utility of communicating anything but has "(...) a fundamental affinity between a work of art and an act of resistance." (Deleuze, 2006, p. 322). This is the thought that settles on the platform, where the work of art is not intended to be an act of communication, but rather an act of resistance.

Deleuze, under the context of the creative act, thinks about the formulation of a 'concept' in different contexts of creation. He claims that "(...) philosophy is a discipline that is just as inventive, just as creative as any other discipline, and it consists of creating or inventing concepts. Concepts do not exist ready-made (...) Concepts have to be produced" (Deleuze, 2006, p. 313). This is a relevant aspect for thinking about artistic creation and how it is deeply associated with philosophy. The creation of concepts is the engine for thought in Deleuze and is, therefore, a mechanism of resistance. It is important to emphasize that the author constantly brings the artistic creation and philosophy closer to the aspect of creation and how the creation of concepts becomes a common plane to art and philosophy. In this context, Deleuze (2006) says that doing philosophy is, like making art, inventing and creating concepts. The creation of concepts is thus a form of thought that is expressed in its specific domain, but which contains a common ground to art and philosophy: the resistance. The author opens the possibility of seeing the concept in many ways; however, he distances it from the deterministic view, that is, to seek the origin of the concept. What interests is the context, the echo and how it resonates: "(...) in what situations, where and when does a particular thing happen, how does it happen, and so on? A concept, as we see it, should express an event rather than an essence" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 25). Thus, in addition to reaffirming the creative capacity of philosophy, a new valence is introduced regarding the 'concept', since it does not aim to express an essence. The 'concept' is in the order of the event. This text does not intend to philosophically deepen the 'concept' but, at this point, tries to trace a succession of links between the 'concept', the 'creation', the 'resistance' and the 'event'. By mapping these connections, we can see the work of art and its ability to, instead of communicating, resist. And, in this way, we can understand the order of this 'concept' in the plane of the event in the philosophy of Deleuze so that, in the process of mapping the concepts, it can approach artistic education.

According to Deleuze (1990), the event is coextensive with the becoming. The event subsists in language; however, it happens on the surface of things. This surface does not relate to exteriority but rather to the threshold, with border zones, "And just as events do not occupy the surface but rather frequent it, superficial energy is not localized at the

surface, but is rather bound to its formation and reformation” (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 103–104). It is in this area that the connection, the relationship of exchange and affinity is established. In this way, there is a fundamental difference between the event and the accident, since “The splendor and the magnificence of the event is sense. The event is not what occurs (an accident), it is rather inside what occurs, the purely expressed” (Deleuze, 1990, p. 272). That is, it expresses the inner substance of the event and its ideational nature to the detriment of what happens by accident on the surface. In this way, the Deleuzian event is rhizomatic and is constantly in motion, as “Events not only manifest in space, but through their spatiality they also change and reconfigure reality material” (Beck & Gleyzon, 2016, p. 329). It is, in this plane, that the ‘concept’ appears shaped in a matrix in the becoming, in a field of problematization. This is the place of resistance. This is where Deleuze places the ‘concept’ in its relationship with the threshold and how it manifests itself in this state of connection. To better understand the ‘concept’ and how it can be a point of articulation between philosophical and artistic creation, it is necessary to deepen the thought about it. Deleuze & Guattari (1994) propose three points to understand the ‘concept’. (1) It is described that this relates to other ‘concepts’, that is, there is a relationship of its components with a genealogy of ‘concepts’ that move in past or present historical relationships. (2) The ‘concept’ is an aggregating force of its components. There is a consistent internal zone and a peripheral zone of neighbourhood that overlaps with other components. This zone is therefore a transfer threshold zone and where the inherent becoming operates. This characteristic stems from the first utterance previously, that is, the creation of a new ‘concept’ implies the construction of a bridge over the same plane and, through it, an articulation between concepts is made. (3) The ‘concept’ is presented as a point of coincidence, juxtaposition, and accumulation of its components. Moreover, there are no simple ‘concepts’, the ‘concept’ contains a root of multiplicity. However, each is linked to a problem, essential for its existence and for its creation, containing a critical and political force of freedom: “A concept’s full of a critical, political force of freedom” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 32). Through language, as discussed earlier, the ‘concept’ gains spatiality and manages to shape materiality itself. This potential force is also a mechanism of resistance, as “(...) concepts are only created as a function of problems which are thought to be badly understood or understood badly posed (*pedagogy of the concept*)” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 16). It is interesting the expression *pedagogy of the concept* since it sends us back to an educational dimension. Bianco (2005) reveals the pedagogical potential of the ‘concept’, not in a dimension of pedagogical practice where the ‘concept’ functions as an instrument, but where the ‘concept’ contains a pedagogical dimension or, as the author points out, a *pedagogycity*. This view relates directly to the “(...) relativity and absoluteness of the concept are like its pedagogy and its ontology, its creation and its self-positing (...)” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 22). Bianco (2005) states that it is not a particular philosophy, but that modern philosophy presents pedagogical concepts or, as in the previous

excerpt, relative concepts. These concepts are related to events and not to essences since they are articulated with other concepts about the same plane of immanence. This image, enunciated by Bianco (2005), is mirrored in Peters (2004) who, aligned with pedagogical aspects, claims that philosophy is a construct with two main axes: the creation of 'concepts' and the disposition of the plane of immanence. This, in turn, goes in the direction of creation, becoming fundamental to think about the mechanism of resistance of the artistic work. Although Deleuze is not clear about the transversality of the 'concept' concerning philosophy and art, he distances it from science. The three planes and all their elements are irreducible: "(...) plane of immanence of philosophy, plane of composition of art, plane of reference or coordination of science; form of concept, force of sensation, function of knowledge (...)" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 216). The turning point corresponds to the overlap of immanence and composition planes, i.e., the act of creating belongs to both philosophy and art and, in both cases, there is an act of resisting.

Thinking is to create, and the artistic work corresponds to this event loaded with a political and critical force of freedom. As Deleuze (1994) affirms, "To think is to create - there is no other creation - but to create is first of all to engender 'thinking' in thought. For this reason, Artaud opposes genitivity to innateness in thought, but equally to reminiscence, and thereby proposes the principle of a transcendental empiricism (...)" (p. 147). Through transcendental empiricism, thought corresponds to a movement of creation that goes towards the discovery of multiplicities (Deleuze, 2006). Deleuze (1994) also explains transcendental empiricism stating that it does not consist of a reaction against 'concepts' or an appeal to lived experience, but rather integrates the creation of 'concepts' and makes them become objects of encounter, an encounter with multiplicity. Transcendental empiricism dilates the experience that corresponds to a transformative view of the encounter with the 'concepts'. Deleuze is, by this set of blocks of thought, an author who allows reflecting on choreographic creation since dance is, eminently, an experience that takes place on the threshold of the body with the world.

The mapping carried out so far has made it possible to create a line of thought between creation, the 'concept' and the event that, in turn, led to transcendental empiricism understanding the relationship of the individual with experience. Moreover, understanding how thought is also a form of creation. However, the initial resistance was apparently forgotten in the first lines of this text. Or it appears, fleetingly, in gaps in the dialogue of the written text and the transcribed. As mentioned, resistance is associated with creation, regardless of the philosophical or artistic context. It is an act present from the moment it is created. Parnet asks, in this context: "As you said in a recent lecture, philosophy creates concepts, and whenever one creates, as you said in this lecture, one resists. Artists, filmmakers, musicians, mathematicians, philosophers all resist, but what do they resist exactly?" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 95). Deleuze offers two main axes in this thought. The first is related to the resistance of the artist to the external forces that dictate a certain direction, against trends, against

popular opinion. That means that creation has a resistance force that has a rhythm, and that no one should rush a process of creation. It is proposed, then, that this timeless aspect echoes what was previously constituted on the 'concept'. Thus, instead of a temporal milieu, the concept belongs to a spatial milieu. There is a proper time for creation, the work creates a spatial matrix capable of shaping reality itself, regardless of time. The second axis relates to the example that Deleuze (1995) gives with the Italian writer Primo Levi, through his book *Is this a man*. After leaving the concentration camp, he felt the urgency of his publication stating that the dominant feeling was "the shame of being a man". There he states that "This feeling of shame is one of philosophy's most powerful motifs. We are not responsible for the victims but responsible before them" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 108). It becomes a strong metaphor present in his work to think about the resistance in artistic creation. If, on the one hand, it expresses shame on man's ability to re-commit atrocities, on the other, it demonstrates the shame of his individual survival to the detriment of countless other deaths. Deleuze (1995) describes this feeling as "(...) 'the shame of being a man', and I believe that at the basis of art, (...) consisting of liberating the life that men have imprisoned" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 96). Here, artistic creation is placed in a plane that had not yet been previously thought: the metaphor of shame as a way of liberating life by the work of art. It is not intended to explore a saving idea about the work of art, but rather to understand what core exists in this expression and which components can echo in the framing of this text. The liberation of life by the artist is related to the formation of the world, as discussed earlier with the creation of concepts, such as small possible worlds. Thus, "The creation of concepts in itself calls for a future form, for a new earth and people that do not yet exist" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 108). It is in this movement to the future on which the resistance of the creation of the work persists, it is not just a question of persisting, but it is a question of creating a thought without time. Resistance, immanent to artistic creation, allows the work of art to become a potential of life, a potential to come, in a new plane that expands in the world. There is a dilation, an exaggeration that Deleuze (1995) refers to as "(...) kind of giant, it's a kind of exaggeration in relation to life, but not an exaggeration in relation to art, since art is the production of these exaggerations, and it is by their existence mere that this is already resistance" (p. 96). Resistance allows the work of art to become an expanding potential, that will not save humanity, but endures beyond its creator. To create is, in this way, to architecture a potential of life, a field of forces crossed by concepts, which is not shaped by time. An overtaking, for moments, of humanity, in a demiurgic built on the threshold of thought with the world through transcendental empiricism.



## SCHOOL THAT RESISTS SCHOOL - THINKING ABOUT ARTISTIC CREATION IN THE EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

After this set of reflections on the creation of the work of art, it is important to think about its relationship with the School. That is, to think about the process of creation and how it relates to artistic education. Through the resistance of the work of art, it is possible to establish a plane of thought that questions the School in its accommodation of the processes of artistic creation. Baldacchino (2008) places artistic education in a way that sustains this thought, as he thinks of artistic education as a process that emerges 'outside' the School. This movement of escape from School resonates with resistance, since the creation builds its own space and, in this way, 'escapes' the School. To create an artistic work is to create a world, to create a living space that communicates with the world. By assuming this position, one cannot forget the relationship of the creator with the outside, since transcendental empiricism establishes and praises this pathway. Through the relationship with multiplicities, the work of art becomes a generator of new multiplicities. Focusing attention on the concept as an 'object of encounter', through the bridge already established between the creation of concepts and artistic creation, it can be affirmed that artistic creation produces 'objects of encounter'. The encounter with the concepts allows for an overtaking of oneself by the overflow mechanism, as "(...) concepts simultaneously surpass the dualities of ordinary thought and give things a new truth, a new distribution, a new way of dividing up the world" (Deleuze, 2006, p. 22). This effect lies on the basis of the resistance of the work of art and the process of artistic creation that forms a transversal plane between Deleuze and Baldacchino. In this way, the idea of creation is called 'encounter' with other forms of division of the world, surprising and vivid forms. The embodiment of the concept and, by extension, of the artistic work, echoes in what Baldacchino (2008) refers to as *groundlessness*. The author establishes a paradoxical relationship between art and education that resonates in the intensity contained in the idea of 'concept' developed previously. In a brief overview of the text, there are three important axes on art and education that the author presents. The first is related to the vision of artistic creation, where art is taken as a construct not departing from a natural or necessary process, denying the possibility of any kind of methodology, but underlining artistic creation as a practice. The second is related to the term already referred to as *groundlessness*, where there are no aesthetic or pedagogical imperatives; artistic education exists on a horizontal plane in continuous reformulation and it is through 'doing' that artistic education is advocated. The last axis develops the idea of art as 'unschool' learning. Thus, artistic practice is considered as an independent act and can never be seen as a tool at the service of learning.

No possibilities for art or learning could ever emerge unless a radically different set of conditions give way to a state of affairs where knowledge is a matter to be discovered but never determined,

and where a fixed ground is transformed into a wide horizon.  
(Baldacchino, 2008, p. 241)

Approximations between these three axes and the previously developed thinking are easily found. First, it is important to reflect on the constructive burden of artistic creation in its relationship with a movement of becoming, since art, according to the author, "(...) is a construct that in turn constructs other constructs. It returns onto itself, and refolds back and forward, and it is never contained by or within a fixed and objectively defined meaning" (Baldacchino, 2008, p. 243), where "Every creation is singular (...)" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 7). Consequently, artistic creation places the work of art in this place of movement, seen as an object of encounter. This way, there is a double meeting, a multiplicity of meetings or an encounter with the multiplicity. A first encounter happens between the creator and the created, that is, an encounter with a work of art whose process integrates a degree of indetermination and which gives a degree of independence from its creator. On the other hand, it is assumed as an object of encounter and relationship with the world. It is, through this double indetermination, that the process of artistic creation approaches the School. The indeterminate potential is the root that allows thinking on artistic creation fairly in the School context. If, on the one hand, it is in the School that this takes place, on the other hand, it creates its own space. It is, in this proper space, that artistic practice develops as an act of encounter with multiplicities. The 'escape' from the School proposed by Baldacchino is the guarantor of an artistic practice truly belonging to the sphere of artistic education. Artistic creation resists the School through the expansion movement, it resists because it opens its own space in the educational space. The articulation of the planes of resistance and escape allows us to think about the act of creating in an educational context and, through this deepening, conform a space of its own. One does not intend to think of artistic education as it has been referred to for resistance, as a place of salvation or segregation. We intend to think of the process of creating in an educational context as a place of its own, since it cannot serve any other purpose than that of the work. The work of art, from this perspective, already contains a pedagogical potential associated with the creation process. Thus, it is a process of encounter with multiplicities; the work of art does not need to be justified in educational terms as it already has an immanent educational potential and is already 'out of school'. However,

The notion of an outside does not stem from an anti-educational position. Rather, it comes from the desire for art to retain its specificity as it exercises its power to resist reification (...). The arts could not be staked on hierarchies of knowledge (...). This is where the relationship between art and education gets out of joint. If art conforms, it has no use to learning. If it becomes synonymous with learning, then it is not art anymore. (Baldacchino, 2008, p. 242)

Baldacchino (2008) does not place himself in a position against the School, nor does he propose art as an anti-pedagogical place. He rather claims that art must retain its characteristics, must resist the hierarchies of knowledge. It only makes sense to think about artistic creation in an educational context if it remains as it is, that is, if it remains a place of resistance, as it was thought through Deleuze. Baldacchino (2008) introduces the idea of disarticulation between art and education as a necessary paradox for achieving the artistic education plot. This is a pivotal point, where artistic creation and education, due to the impossibility of articulation, create a cross-cutting and important field of discussion. Deleuze is a key author to immerse in what is the creative act and how it creates and relates with the world. Thus, through the space that the work of art opens, it becomes possible to think about its existence in the educational context. It was necessary to trace a path from the surface of concepts to the paradoxical relationship between art and education, in order to see artistic education as a place of artistic practice. This, in turn, is a practice that cannot be at the service of a pedagogical purpose or follow a methodological structure, but which, by its mechanism of resistance, opens new worlds in the School. Disarticulation is configured as the point of relationship between art and education and allows, as a paradoxical movement, to reflect on the problematization of artistic practice in the educational context. Baldacchino (2008, p. 242) adds that “If there is such a thing as art’s pedagogical objective, it remains that of expressing, sustaining and fulfilling such a double bind, such a paradox”. The educational potential contained in artistic practice is expressed by the maintenance of the school’s paradoxical escape movement. The false ease of art corresponds to a “(...) tautology that presumes the relationship between the arts and learning on a set of given assumptions which keep folding onto each other and which would likewise insist on an equivalence between implicit causes and desired effects” (Baldacchino, 2014, p. 435). The implicit causes correspond to the set of external artistic attributes - such as creativity or critical thinking -, as forms of legitimation of artistic practice, while the desired effects stem from a utilitarian and functional view of artistic practice and its relationship with the world. Baldacchino (2013) discusses the implications that emerge from the tension between productivism and autonomism in the pedagogy of the arts and its implications in the contexts of contemporary artistic practices. It is not intended to expand the thought to a critique of the School and its instrumentalist relationship with artistic practice. Nevertheless, Baldacchino (2014) underlines some aspects that resonate in what has been mentioned about artistic creation and how this is, or may be, an act of resistance in Deleuze:

the arts and education are bound to yield desired results. Inasmuch as these assumptions appear benign and rational, they are conservative because they leave no space except for the same values that are imposed on the arts; an imposition that presumes a set of aesthetic and ethical imperatives that would, in turn, require

the arts to provide an experience that must be universally accessible and by implication, acceptable. (Baldacchino, 2014, p. 437)

Artistic creation ceases to be an act of resistance when conformed or subjugated to an institution. The artist resists the external forces that offer a direction for the artistic object. The work of art loses its strength of resistance when the outside world strangles its own world, when the space of the work is constrained by the outside world, not in terms of its relationship with multiplicities, but by the strangulation of multiplicities. The creation of the work of art is requested to strengthen its capacity to resist, not in an anti-pedagogical sense, but in the sense of its conservation. Creating, as an act of resistance, presupposes that the creator feels the 'shame' of being, feel creation as an overtaking of himself. It consists of a possibility of encounter, to find something that has not been lost, but that is continuously found. Thus, in this way, to create and to resist becomes a mechanism of survival of artistic education in the School. As discussed earlier, and like the concepts, the work of art gains its own autonomy and, if it does not find this 'self-autonomy', it cannot be considered a work of art, but an exercise of acceptance and fitting in the world. The work of art has the potential to create a world, to propose new surfaces of exchange, of discussion, of thought. From the dialogue between Baldacchino and Deleuze, it can be affirmed that the concern to make the act of artistic creation in the educational context pedagogical or utilitarian destroys the 'pedagogy' contained in the work of art. There must be room in the School for the work of art to create space for its world. This world or space that opens in the School and serves as an escape creates a field of paradoxical forces of approximation and remoteness. Fitting means not resisting, it means breaking the paradoxical articulation between art and education, it means entering the School's tautology, a pleonastic or a repetition machine without finding the difference. Once again it is reiterated that resistance is not related to a purely revolutionary attitude, against a system or, in Baldacchino's words, an *anti-pedagogy*. Resistance is the guarantor of what is most precious in artistic creation: the possibility of forming a small world that creates relations with the greater world.

### **DANCE THAT RESISTS SCHOOL - COLLABORATION AS A DOUBLE RESISTANCE**

After a long thought that inevitably departed from the specificity of choreographic creation, it was possible to establish a set of tools to repair the lines of force that are established in the practice of artistic creation in an educational context. Obviously, they are cross lines to different artistic areas, but we intend to resume the specific domain of choreography. As previously mentioned, dance and resistance approach by their escape from forgetfulness and materiality. Charmatz & Launay (2011) affirmed that choreographic creation contains a multiplicity of methods and construction processes that are reconfigured by the relationship between

the agents of creation: interpreter and choreographer. Choreography is thus a singular and, at the same time, plural creation procedure. The processes of choreographic creation contribute to the association of conceptual principles in their relationship with physical work, that is, they sustain a physical agency through an immaterial plane. This relationship mechanism approaches what was thought for the creation of concepts, where the concept is created from a singular problematization capable of creating relationships with other concepts in the same plane of immanence. Choreographic creation is a practice that implies a multiplicity, since

There is no single method for working with performers. All have their merits as far as I am concerned: previously composed work, work proposed by others or by myself, work composed by two or three people or by a single individual. This reflection on what is at stake gives way to a great variety of rehearsal modes, to open modes that make the idea of a rough version acceptable. What is essential, however, is that the project be planned around the performers, as roles are not interchangeable. (Charmatz & Launay, 2011, p. 46)

There is, in the voice of choreographer Boris Charmatz, a sharing of the process of choreographic creation where he attributes to the agent who dances, the interpreter, a fundamental role also in the creative process since it is understood as a subject capable of, through his characteristics and singularities, actively contributing to the creative process. In an educational context, the choreographer, who may or may not be a teacher, admits, according to this possibility, a collaborative construction with the interpreter (student) in the creation of the choreographic work. This corresponds to a first process of resistance since it allows a form of creation that installs an indeterminate factor in the creative process. Thus, the choreographer is not alone in decision-making process of creating the work but shares it with the student-interpreter. Collaboration and mutual construction imply that both agents leave themselves and project themselves on a common plane of the work. Therefore, there is an exit from singularity towards multiplicity, where the aggregating factor of the relationship ceases to belong to hierarchies and is fulfilled in the internal logic of the work. Thus, it is possible to 'exit' the school and means of deterministic operation. Given the characteristics inherent in choreographic creation, this is a place of utmost importance to think about collaboration in the creative process. The choreographic work only materializes and, therefore, resists, through the interpreters. What is proposed is to think of a double resistance in the creation process because, in addition to dancing, the bodies are affected by the immaterial plane of creation once it belongs to them. There is a reconnaissance mechanism that creates a 'small' world within the 'great' world of the School and thus manages to escape its outer forces.

As we have seen, the creation of a choreographic work implies that the relationship between the figures of choreographer and interpreter is,

therefore, an important place to think about the choreographer-interpreter or teacher-student connection. Butterworth (2009), in the educational context, suggests a *Didactic-Democratic framework model* for teaching choreography and proposes an important structure to think about these connections. This model presents an approach to creation through the *devising process* in a continuum of five different generic approaches in a choreographic process. In this context, *devising*

involves dialectic between the acts of making and doing, or creating and performing, of being an artist and/or interpreter. By implication the notion of shared roles and responsibilities is important.

Perhaps by collaborative methods, or by collective decision-making processes, the creation of dance as art is attempted by more than one artist. (Butterworth, 2009, p. 53)

The model assumes that the interpreter has some knowledge and mastery of the concept of choreography, where the choreographer and the interpreter vary between roles depending on their relationship. It goes from a didactic relationship, where the choreographer teaches the interpreter through the imitation mechanism, to a democratic relationship, where there is a collaborative approach to sharing authorship. Thus, “Within the didactic-democratic model, a dance artist-practitioner is defined as an experienced, multi-skilled individual: a dancer who may also choreograph and teach, a teacher who may also choreograph and dance or a choreographer who may also dance and teach” (Butterworth, 2009, p.178). The author argues that this model allows identifying personal preferences of interpreters and choreographers, such as recognizing the specific needs of agents in the application of choreographic skills and conferring a deeper knowledge of the influence of contextual factors in the choreographic process. These processes do not follow a progressive linearity, only propose a reflection of the role of agents in the choreographic process about interactions, leadership methodologies and choreographic approaches. Here, different levels of knowledge are explained, thus printing teaching methods, social interaction, and particular learning. From the Didactic-Democratic it is observed that there are processes of devising that allow the sharing of roles and responsibility for the methods of collaboration or joint decision. This is, therefore, based on premises where “(...) artists might develop trust and respect, come to common understanding and clarify intentions, roles and agendas” (Butterworth, 2009, p. 189). The author also stresses that “In the crucible of devising, each group must strike its own balance between the productive engagement of artistic egos and the generosity of the collaborative spirit” (Butterworth, 2009, p. 189). During the devising process, there is always the risk of an overlap of the compromise between artistic and aesthetic ideas and personal vision. Yet, there are many benefits from this sharing, as for an “(...) ensemble of dancer creators engaged in creating original work, the compounding ideas and energy provide personal knowledge of intent

and context for all members. The developing work cannot be mindless; it demands critical thinking” (Butterworth, 2009, p.189). The process of devising in choreographic creation echoes in a view of horizontality of the teacher-student relationship, thus being an instance of double resistance. The approximation of the Didactic-Democratic framework model allows, in detriment of proposing a model for choreographic creation in an educational context, to propose a thought about the relationship between the agents of creation and, through devising, to affect the double resistance that is proposed. Choreographic creation should be an opportunity for an artistic practice founded on a shared creative process, where there is room for the unknown, for sharing visions of the ‘great’ world. These are lines of force that foster Deleuzian resistance mechanisms as they expand the possibilities and cause agents to transpose themselves. They project the creation to new planes that are constantly changing, in a rhizomatic complexity of connections. The bodies synthesize these creation potentials in the acted sense, that is, they operate as surfaces of exchange of concepts in a horizontal plane of the event. Through this shared vision, the work gains its uniqueness by aggregating power, capable of creating a magnetic field that captures fragments and gives them meaning. Artistic practice resists the School, due to its internal consistency and, through this choreographer-interpreter relationship, this consistency is exposed. The choreographic work thus advocates a true object of encounter and thought, a thought that circulates freely. Creating, as Deleuze has given us to see, generates a world, forms relationships and senses, creates thought. In a sense, it creates the created. This is the common force to philosophy and art; this is the fragility that circulates between the exchange surfaces. As Louppe (2012) mentioned, the beginning of a choreographic work inaugurates a set of possibilities, where ‘nothing’ hides an indeterminate potential of creation. Dance strongly contains the tendency to disappear, contains an immateriality that places it in this paradoxical place. The materials of creation are subtle, do not pre-exist, the process of creation is also the process of articulating and finding words and phrases and discourse. Thus, it makes no sense to think about the creation from a functional point of view, or as a tool, as advocated by Baldacchino. Artistic education derives exactly from the disarticulation between the creative process and the School in the sense of its determination. Disarticulation forms a place of its own, a place where the choreographer and interpreter both share the verb ‘to create’. Choreographic creation, as a double resistance, underlines the central idea in this text. On the one hand, it consists of a mechanism of ‘survival’ of dance itself, where materiality is formed by the condensation of materials derived from the relationship between interpreter and choreographer. On the other hand, it embodies a place of indeterminism and disarticulation with the School. It is not intended, on purpose, to contextualize a specific teaching regime, but to think of choreographic creation as a practice that is part of the educational context. This double resistance is not related to an anti-pedagogical claim or segregated position. It is a consequence of the dialogue

established between Baldacchino and Deleuze in their ways of resisting. Double resistance results from the bending of resistance over resist, a repetitive metaphorical pleonasm. Keeping this line of thought (that is, the relationship between the place of creation and the School), it becomes necessary to return to the 'small' and 'great' world as dialectics capable of thinking about creation in an educational context. Thus, the consequent place of choreographic creation is seen as a small world, an instance of its own that is created from the inside out. The great world relates to instances outside the small world, such as the School, society, or history itself. A small world, in this context, consists of the set of networks that are formed from the creation of concepts and sensations resulting from a choreography. The small world is the place where creation operates, where the creation process branches out, where the devising mechanism is produced, where the choreographer and the interpreter are amazed by concepts and sensations that did not exist before. Empiricism is, in line with what has been previously worked on, a form of encounter and production of this world. A surprising encounter with new structures that are formed, shared and negotiated. Collaboration is the guarantor of this way of looking at the choreographic creation and building of the small world. The small world is not related to quantification, but to clipping, a cut with the great world, captured only in a fragment. The cut-out of a place proper to choreographic creation implies the departure from the great world, an exit from its powers of attraction. In order to expose this process, collaboration between the agents of creation becomes fundamental. This way of seeing creation causes the body to lean over the unknown, a body inclined to come down. Only through the cut-out, the smallest, or smallness, it is possible to operate this action, an action of listening, dilution of powers and hierarchies. This is the genesis of the materials of creation, seen as a block of concepts and sensations proper to the small world. An origin on the run, but an escape from the encounter, an escape that is accompanied, as one who meets together and is surprised.

## REFERENCES

Baldacchino, J. (2008). The Praxis of Art's Deschooled Practice. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 27(3), 241–250.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2008.00580.x>

Baldacchino, J. (2013). What creative industries? Instrumentalism, autonomy and the education of artists. *International Journal of Education Through Art*, 9(3), 343–356.

[https://doi.org/10.1386/eta.9.3.343\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/eta.9.3.343_1)

Baldacchino, J. (2014). Art's False "Ease": Form, Meaning and a Problematic Pedagogy. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 33(4), 433–450.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-013-9396-x>



- Baldacchino, J. (2015). Art's Foreignness as an "Exit Pedagogy." In T. Lewis & M. Lavery (Eds.), *Art's Teachings, Teaching's Art 8*, 19–32. Springer Netherlands.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-7191-7>
- Beck, C., & Gleyzon, F.-X. (2016). Deleuze and the event(s). *Journal for Cultural Research*, 20(4), 329–333.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14797585.2016.1264770>
- Bianco, G. (2005). Otimismo, pessimismo, criação: pedagogia do conceito e resistência. *Educação & Sociedade*, 26(93), 1289–1308.  
<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302005000400011>
- Butterworth, J. (2009). Too many cooks? A framework for dance making and devising. In J. Butterworth & L. Wildschut (Eds.), *Contemporary Choreography: A Critical Reader* (pp. 177–194). Routledge.
- Charmatz, B., & Launay, I. (2011). *Undertraining: on contemporary dance*. Presses du réel.
- Deleuze, G. (1990). *The logic of sense*. Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition*. Continuum.
- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations: 1972-1990*. Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2006). *Two Regimes of Madness*. Semiotext(e).
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. (2007). *Dialogues II*. Columbia University Press.
- Fazenda, M. J. (2012). *Dança Teatral: Ideias, Experiências, Ações*. Edições Colibri.
- Gil, J. (2001). *Movimento total - o corpo e a dança*. Relógio d'Água.
- Lepecki, A. (2006). *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement*. Taylor & Francis.
- Louppe, L. (2012). *Poética de dança contemporânea*. Orfeu Negro.
- Manning, E. (2009). *Relationscapes*. MIT Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262134903.001.0001>

Neto, Â. C., Fernandes, J., & Xavier, M. (2020). Um olhar sobre a criação coreográfica contemporânea no seu potencial educativo. *Convergências - Revista de Investigação e Ensino Das Artes, XIII*.

<http://convergencias.esart.ipcb.pt/?p=article&id=390>

Article received on 14/03/2021 and accepted on 30/06/2021.

Creative Commons Attribution License | This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.