

**Authored books:**

*Transversal Subjects: From Montaigne to Deleuze after Derrida* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

*Transversal Enterprises in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries:*

*Pygmalion Explorations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

*Performing Transversality: Reimagining Shakespeare and the Critical Future*

(Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

*Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early*

*Modern England* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

**Edited books:**

*The Return of Theory in Early Modern English Studies*, vol. 2, co-editor, with Paul Cefalu and Gary Kuchar (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

*The Return of Theory in Early Modern English Studies: Tarrying with the Subjunctive*, co-editor, with Paul Cefalu (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

*Critical Responses to Kiran Desai*, co-editor, with Sunita Sinha (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2009).

*Rematerializing Shakespeare: Authority and Representation on the Early Modern English Stage*, co-editor, with William West (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

*Shakespeare Without Class: Misappropriations of Cultural Capital*, co-editor, with Donald Hedrick (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000).

# Performance Studies

**Key Words, Concepts and Theories**

Edited by

Bryan Reynolds



palgrave

- 13 See Stephen Barker, *Autoaesthetics: Strategies of the Self after Nietzsche*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1992, 214.
- 14 Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, trans. and ed. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Random House, 1967, 78.
- 15 Stephen Barker, 'Free Fall?: The Vertigo of the Videated Image,' *Open Letter*, Eighth Series, No. 1, Fall 1991, 19–36.
- 16 Friedrich Nietzsche, 'On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense,' in *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870s*, trans. and ed. Daniel Breazzeale, Atlantic Heights, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1979, 79–100, 79.
- 17 Alphonso Lingis, 'The Will to Power,' in *Nietzsche: The World as Will to Power*, ed. Daniel Conway, New York: Routledge, 1998, 149–74, 150.
- 18 Friedrich Nietzsche, *Twilight of the Idols*, trans. Thomas Common, Mineola, NY: Dover Philosophical Classics, 2004, 25.
- 19 Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Books, 1974, 38.
- 20 Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, trans. Alan Bass, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, 26.
- 21 The doubled idea of 'without' as *not-having* and 'without' as *outside* of its fertile paramodern soil. To be without a system is not to have one and to have one but be outside – parallel to – it.
- 22 Since we are still addressing Hassan's problem, note that Chapter 7 of *The Post-modern Turn*, a 'defense against the peril of autobiography', is entitled 'Parabiorgraphy', and confronts Nietzsche's self-referential texts thus:  
  
The Nietzschean self may be a 'fiction,' an empty space where various personages come to mingle, squabble, and depart, yet it remains a 'fiction' more dense than its desires – including self-annihilation – than any neutron star ... Whatever the self may be, its earthly form reveals a fierce intricacy of asseveration. (149)
- 23 Samuel Beckett, *Stories and Texts for Nothing*, New York: Grove Press, 1967, 137.
- 24 Jacques Derrida, 'This Strange Institution Called Literature: An Interview with Jacques Derrida,' in *Jacques Derrida: Acts of Literature*, trans. Derrick Atttridge, New York: Routledge, 1992, 33–75, 60–1.
- 25 Maurice Blanchot, *The Writing of the Disaster*, trans. Ann Smock, Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1995, 58.
- 26 An unexpected recent example of yet another kind of paramodern can be found in Jonathan Franzen's recent novel *Freedom*, in which, constraining himself both directly and ironically to echo *War and Peace*, of which Franzen's book is a paramodern descendent, he para-constrains himself to end the book with a wholly ironic 'happy ending'.

## 4 Digital Culture!

Sarah Bay-Cheng

Few concepts have been more influential over the past 15 years than the advance of computer technologies. As many have written before (too numerous to fully recount here), nearly every aspect of contemporary society has been affected. The earliest use of 'digital' in a computational sense was first recorded in U.S. Patent 2,207,537 (1961) for an electronic communications system that enabled the 'transmission of direct current digital impulses over a long line'.<sup>2</sup> Little more than 50 years later, a search for the phrase 'digital culture' registers many thousands of discrete citations.<sup>3</sup> The combination of digital, or computational, technologies within society and culture has been rigorously explored by scholars throughout the humanities. In *Digital Culture*, Charlie Gere argued for a reading of the digital as formative in our thinking about how we process culture: 'Digital refers not just to the effects and possibilities of a particular technology. It defines and encompasses the ways of thinking and doing that are embodied within that technology and which make its development possible.'<sup>4</sup> More recently, N. Katherine Hayles has extended this consideration in *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis* (2012) to consider the effect within humanities research and scholarship, and her work joins many others exploring the impact of the digital humanities within academia and the effects well beyond college classrooms.<sup>5</sup>

Within theatre and performance studies, most studies have focused on the effects of new technologies within individual performances and how we perceive them. Andy Lavender's 'Digital Culture' in *Mapping Intermediality in Performance* (2010) provides an excellent overview, arguing for the ways in which new technologies shift the patterns and methods in performance practices,<sup>6</sup> one in a growing body of literature focused on understanding how performing artists across diverse genre – theatre, performance art, dance, installation, media, music, games, bioart – incorporate new technologies. The last 10 years have been particularly fruitful and we can point to a number of influential texts that have shaped our understanding of what Steve Dixon broadly referred to as 'digital performance'.<sup>7</sup>

Few of these, however, engage with the most recent evolutions of digital culture, namely social media and mobile computing, and there is still surprisingly little work on how performance studies methodologies are

shaped by digital culture. Jon McKenzie's *Perform Or Else* (2001) remains one of the few to consider these effects, which he outlines as three interconnected threads within a larger theory of performance in the 21st century: efficacy, efficiency and effectiveness.<sup>8</sup> Jason Farman's *Mobile Interface Theory* (2012) offers an important insight to mobile technologies as both performative and embodied, although here we see performance studies applied to the understanding of locative media but not necessarily the reverse. Few collections on performance studies as a changing practice mention digital technology at all. This omission is striking in light of recent critical attention to the digital humanities and platform studies in other fields, where the term 'performance' occurs regularly. Lev Manovich, for instance, observes: 'In software culture, we no longer have "documents," "works," "messages" or recordings in twentieth-century terms. Instead of fixed documents ... we now interact with dynamic software performances.'<sup>9</sup> Elsewhere, historian Tom Scheinfeldt writes of digital technologies as part of the 'performative humanities'.<sup>10</sup> While we see numerous studies of performance and new technologies, very few reflect a change in the practice of performance studies as a mode of inquiry functioning *within and as* digital culture.

How then might we formulate a shift in our thinking about the role of digital media in and as performance studies?

Cesare Casarino's essay, 'Three Theses on the Life-Image (Deleuze, Cinema, Bio-politics)', offers one path through these relations of media and performance and how these dynamics affect performance studies practices.<sup>11</sup> Writing partly in response to the Guy Debord's critique in the *Society of the Spectacle* and Gilles Deleuze's arguments about representation in *The Logic of Sense*, among others, Casarino cites a prior conversation with Antonio Negri, who argues that:

In the world of immateriality in which we live, reproduction – which is the first possible definition of biopolitics – and production can no longer be distinguished from each other. Biopolitics becomes fully realized precisely when production and reproduction are one and the same, that is, when production is conducted primarily and directly through language and social exchange.<sup>12</sup>

Responding to Negri, Casarino takes up this argument of biopolitics as a way of articulating the relation between contemporary capitalism and cinematic representation. For Casarino, the collapse between production and reproduction coalesces around and through post-Fordist capitalism, that is, an economy driven not by the manufacture and material exchange of commodities but by information and affect, what Paolo Virno calls 'the

commerce of potential as potential'.<sup>13</sup> A particular marker of this economy is what Casarino calls the 'life-image', a function of the split between material life and immaterial labor power. Replacing 'life' in this construct is the 'lifestyle', a desirable but unattainable fetish object to be consumed, and to which labor power (newly divorced from life itself) is sacrificed and exploited. For Casarino, this manifests in what he calls the 'spectacularization' of AIDS as a reactionary attack on 1960s radicalism in general and Debord's critique of the spectacle, in particular.

This collapse has implications for performance studies. What happens if we acknowledge that, at least in the digital domain, the distinctions between production and reproduction have broken down? What does this mean for the animating theories of representation over the past decade – that perpetual debate often referred to as the 'liveness problem'?<sup>14</sup> If biopolitics constitutes itself primarily in and through social exchange, might we call this performance? And if so, where does performance studies fit within the landscape of biopolitics?

The immateriality that Negri associates with contemporary culture has a long history that we can locate perhaps first in the development of cybernetics in the 1940s, but which more fully emerges in the late 1960s and early 70s. This emergence is not linked solely to cybernetic systems, but also to the pervasiveness of those systems and their intersection with (and eventually replacement of) lived experience. While Debord may have railed against the society of the spectacle in 1967, we should remember that he lodged his attack primarily against the representation of media images through cinema and television, against what he called 'the technology of the mass dissemination of images'.<sup>15</sup> The willing participation of people – of society – in and through these images constituted the newest and most dangerous form of false consciousness. Yet, his response to this perceived threat was not only to write a book, but also to make a film, a film that you can now watch (like so many documents of the 20th-century's avant-garde) on YouTube.

While Debord continues to garner important attention for his early (and we must admit 'spectacular') critique of image-based late capitalism, as compelling is Marshall McLuhan's assessment of life in the age of satellites in *From Cliche to Archetype* (1970). What is striking about this book is that it surpasses, or rather envelops and expands, McLuhan's earlier notion of the global village. McLuhan saw contemporary life as not only a global village – that is, social networks formulated laterally on the ground – but also as the product of a global theatre:

Since Sputnik and the satellites, the planet is enclosed in a manmade environment that ends 'Nature' and turns the globe into a repertory

theater to be programmed. Shakespeare at the Globe mentioning 'All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players' (*As You Like It*, Act II, Scene 7) has been justified by recent events in ways that would have struck him as entirely paradoxical.<sup>16</sup>

McLuhan described the effects of this global, satellite stage as having particular impact on the youth, concluding that: "The results of living inside a proscenium arch of satellites is that the young now accept the public spaces of the earth as role-playing areas. Sensing this, they adopt costumes and roles and are ready to "do their thing" everywhere."<sup>17</sup> Sometimes reduced to the pithy 'after Sputnik there is no nature, only art', we might also understand his meaning here as, after satellites there is no living, only performance. Or rather, no *public* living, since McLuhan understands this global performance as emerging in specifically public spaces. In a book published several years later (1977), Susan Sontag first demonstrated the fragility of the public domain as such. Seeming to follow both Debord and Walter Benjamin's analysis of history in the excess of images, Sontag points to the power of representation to detach from politics (not unlike Casarino's argument) and to embed the repressed political in the ostensibly private realm of images. She argues:

As we become further detached from politics, there is more and more free space to fill up with exercises of sensibility such as cameras afford. One of the effects of the newer camera technology (video, instant movies) has been to turn even more of what is done with camera in private to narcissistic uses – that is, to self-surveillance.<sup>18</sup>

Casarino's notion of biopolitics, through the lens of McLuhan's global satellites and Sontag's notion of self-surveillance, provides a compelling and disturbing context for analyzing contemporary social media. Though initially a product of it, online social exchange has evolved into the epitome of a post-Fordist economy based on the circulation of information, affect, potential and animated by images and self-surveillance. While we once feared Big Brother of 1984, we seem to have chosen to live in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, a world in which the power of vision from above – the *sur*-veillance – pales in comparison with the data-mining from below – the *sur*-extraction of biopolitical resources. Tracking the placement of our bodies in physical space (through CCTV, hidden cameras, external GPS devices) is not nearly as productive to contemporary capitalism as the aggregate of our digital movements, our 'likes', our 'friends', our bodily data, continually captured and wirelessly uploaded (e.g. Garmin

training devices, Zeo sleep-monitoring systems, and our own enabled self-tracking GPS devices, also known as mobile phones).

Disturbingly, we participate in – even seek out – these modes of exploitation. When we upload, project and transmit our biodata, we trade our biometrics for ... what? Badges, points, images, status? In an economy of social exchange, we are encouraged to provide biodigital assets (real physical measures that have hard currency value) for immaterial rewards. Is this not, to use Casarino's terms, the trade of labor power and life for 'life-style'? Another way to look at this is as a perversion of Pierre Bourdieu's notion of 'cultural capital', once the point of access of art to power, now cheapened to immaterial status points in an online forum. We give up everything for what is truly nothing, Benjamin's dwarf in the machine grown to impossible proportions. In the same paragraph in which Sontag identifies the effect of video as narcissistic self-surveillance, she further speculates that: 'Our inclination to treat character as equivalent to behavior makes more acceptable a widespread public installation of the mechanized regard from the outside provided by cameras.'<sup>19</sup> Although there is usually a brief concern when new surveillance cameras are installed, or we hear disturbing reports of drone activity in our neighborhoods, even the revelations of Edward Snowden and the massive National Security Agency's PRISM data collection program could not persuade the American public to change the way we share our private information online.<sup>20</sup> We have no fear of our own cameras, even in the wake of Edward Snowden's revelations on the NSA. On Facebook alone, over 200 million images are uploaded every day, with over 6 billion new images added each month. According to a Facebook engineer answering questions on Quora, there were over 90 billion images on the site in August 2011, making it the largest inventory of images in the world.<sup>21</sup> In a related move, Microsoft developed Lifebrowser – an embedded digital device capable of recording and rendering searchable all of an individual's online data, including searches, downloads and shared information. Such searches will allow the user (and potentially others) to analyze patterns of online behavior.<sup>22</sup> Or, consider Microsoft's 2004 patent 6,754,472, which protects the design for a method to convert human energy into a supply for electronic devices.<sup>23</sup> Even more troubling, perhaps, is the active patenting of the human genetic sequencing by international corporations.<sup>24</sup> The new iPhone 5s records an individual user's fingerprint for the purposes of unlocking the phone.<sup>25</sup>

Our daily devices – networked, biological, constantly self-monitoring and disseminating – have produced a fundamental confusion between not only production and reproduction and the public and private, but also between the biological and the technological. In an article I co-authored

with Amy Strahler Holzapfel, we argued that theatre was not a body (in contrast to longstanding, popular metaphors) but a network. Now perhaps this distinction is less significant in present contexts.<sup>25</sup> In digital culture, our most private space, such as the area just in front of our eyes or within our own cells, has become the most public. This media landscape – for it is still, more or less, a mediated environment – exceeds what modernists such as Debord, McLuhan or Sontag ever imagined. Each of these writers, though evenly prescient in their own way, conceived of imaging within a discrete and unidirectional medium – cinema and mass media, satellites and video. Sent from producer – whether good or evil – to the passive, but hopefully critically receiver. We now know that contemporary media – particularly, the ironically titled ‘social media’ – absorb and embrace all these simultaneously and in every possible direction. And, more importantly, because such media networks are inherently social, they are pervasively organic, capable of reproducing independently of any single agent or location. Hence, the proliferation of biological terms – e.g. viruses, memes – to account for digital functioning. Your typical social media site is both a diary and a megaphone, as loud and public as Times Square and as individual and intimate as your DNA. This ubiquitous, performance landscape *is* biopolitics. This is the moment, to return to Casarino and Negri, when ‘production and reproduction are one and the same, that is, when production is conducted primarily and directly through language and social exchange.’<sup>27</sup>

This environment holds a number of significant implications for performance studies. Most salient perhaps is the idea that the distinction between reproduction and production has eroded. This distinction between ontology and reproduction – an argument that has animated so much of our recent theoretical attention in performance and theatre studies – no longer serves a contemporary understanding of relations among media and liveness, or between commodity and performance. Although this was obviously a compelling framework, the always migrating and mutating media have slipped, morphed and memed their way out of the ‘liveness’ construct into something just as interesting and much more dangerous. The question is not whether performance can be commodified; commodification itself now eludes materiality and instead takes on the hallmarks of performance – ephemeral, relational, transactional. Rather than serve as a potential political efficacy, performance functions in service to Casarino’s lifestyle that circulates through social exchange. If we can set aside the distinction between performance production and media reproduction, performance studies might be able to respond to the rapid shifts of media, performance and politics, the fusion of which threatens to displace critical action and usurp all prior modes of resistance.

#### Whither resistance?

Some have located exceptions to this model in aurality, such as DJ Spooky’s work, or in radical resistance to image, as in Derek Jarman’s *Blue*, a 78-minute film showing only a blue field with accompanying audio. But even these gestures inevitably get recycled back into social media, which continually subsumes any and all image and audio production into its own ever expanding network. This is not an entirely novel mode of power production, but it is a peculiarly effective one. Although Michel Foucault argued that ‘as soon as there is a power relation, there is a possibility of resistance’, the biopolitical animated by self-surveillance and the translation of all lived experience (even the involuntary actions of the body itself) into disseminations of performance make such possibilities hard to identify and even harder to practice.<sup>28</sup> One might propose to go ‘off the grid’, but as drone attacks in remote villages (as well as closer to home) and pervasive satellite and ubiquitous data surveillance make clear, the grid is ubiquitous and inescapable. Indeed, it is so omnipresent that we might contend that nature – as an unaffected, digitally absent space – no longer exists. That is, it is impossible to locate a ‘natural’ space on earth independent from, or unaffected by, digital technology.

Both Debord and Sontag feared the political implications for excess images in capitalist society: ‘The freedom to consume a plurality of images and goods is equated with freedom itself. The narrowing of free political choice to free economic consumption requires the unlimited production and consumption of images.’<sup>29</sup> Sontag’s critique has been taken up in recent considerations of ‘slacktivism’, social activism reduced to simple and, often ineffectual, gestures such as ‘liking’ a social justice movement or reposting a political message via social networks.<sup>30</sup> While youth advocates and digital utopians have been anxious to define such gestures as potentially efficacious, most empirical data suggests that digital gestures have limited if any material effects, and that any political impact fades quickly. More often, such gestures produce a relatively superficial effect, but an outsized emotional affect. To cite only one example, the Youth Participatory Politics Survey Project – a project aimed at demonstrating the power of youth political movements online – opened the Executive Summary of its 2011 report with a compelling example of digital-political efficacy:

Over a period of just three days in October 2011, 75,000 people signed a petition started by 22-year-old Molly Katchpole on Change.org to protest Bank of America’s proposed \$5,000 debit card fee. Ultimately, over 300,000 people signed and more than 21,000 pledged to close their Bank

of America accounts. The movement attracted national attention, and Bank of America reversed its decision to charge customers.<sup>31</sup>

The sensation of action and impact is profoundly underwhelming in comparison with the limited significance of the gesture itself. Yet, this is praised as contemporary participatory politics.

Or, consider the global Occupy movement, which in 2011 was hailed as the harbinger of global youth empowerment – a nonhierarchical, political challenge – and has since largely dissipated into online archives and forum debates. In a January 8, 2014 call to arms on the political site Daily Kos, Ray Pensador called for action to reanimate the Occupy movement in opposition to what he called, ‘inverted totalitarianism’. His aim was specific:

On Monday, January 27th, 2014, starting at 10:00 A.M. all people of good will who consider themselves part of the Occupy Wall Street movement will show up at specific locations at government and business nerve centers around the country.<sup>32</sup>

As of February 20, 2014, I can find no mention of any such action either in news publication databases or relevant online sites.<sup>33</sup> Appearances of revolutionary movements such as Occupy and the Arab Spring may be at best illusory and at worst deceptive. We should beware what Casarino defines as the ‘paradox of bio-politics’. Dispersed

throughout the myriad and ubiquitous networks of production, it finds its best determination in the absolute indetermination of the limits separating it from production; it is most discernible when it is not discernible from production – and when both reign omnipresent.<sup>34</sup>

That is, the possibility that these mediated protests, communicated through digital networks, become the very tools to limit real political change.

Social media, for all its apparent and real political efficacy, is performance, but it is a performance of mediation – self-replicating copies without originals – deeply imbricated within post-Fordist capitalist exchange. Critics have repeatedly drawn on various metaphors to explain this digital context, variously economic and ecological, but it is clearly both: the *sine qua non* of the biopolitical, a theoretical model that does not distinguish between life and mediation, nor between experience and image. Instead, we are in, to return to Sontag, the ‘image-world’, in which ‘images have extraordinary powers to determine our demands upon reality and are themselves covered substitutes for firsthand experience’; they are ‘indis-

pensible to the health of the economy, the stability of the polity, and the pursuit of private happiness’.<sup>35</sup> Given this state of affairs, perhaps it is the mission of 21st-century performance studies to recover the antagonism from the perversely (de)politicized, spectacular performance.

## Notes

- 1 This essay draws on writing developed through invited lectures at ATHE’s Performance Studies Focus Group pre-conference (2012), the University of Toronto Festival of Original Theatre (2013), and the University of Zagreb (2013). I also received the opportunity to discuss these ideas at length with colleagues through the support of the University of Vienna (2012). I am grateful to all the colleagues and students who provided me with generous feedback and ideas in the development of this work. I am also indebted to my collaborators in the International Federation for Theatre Research working group on Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, especially Klemens Gruber, Chiel Katteb, Andy Lavender and Robn Nelson.
- 2 ‘Digital. n. and adj.’, *OED Online* (Oxford: OUP), accessed February 19, 2014, [www.oed.com/gate/lib.buffalo.edu/view/Entry/52611](http://www.oed.com/gate/lib.buffalo.edu/view/Entry/52611).
- 3 My institutional library search engine provides nearly 8,000 individual citations, while Google Scholar records over 18,500.
- 4 Charlie Gere, *Digital Culture* (London: Reaktion Books, 2009), 13.
- 5 N. Katherine Hayes, *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis* (University of Chicago Press, 2012). Since 2002, the online group HASTAC (Humanities, Arts, Science, and Technology Alliance and Collaboratory, [www.hastac.org](http://www.hastac.org)) has provided an online resource for exchange and thinking about the impact of new technologies in teaching.
- 6 Andy Lavender, ‘Digital Culture,’ in S. Bay-Cheng, C. Katteb, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, eds, *Mapping Intermediality in Performance* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), 134.
- 7 To cite only a few of the most salient examples, see Philip Auslander, *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Jon McKenzie, *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Gabriella Giannachi, *Virtual Theatres: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Matthew Causey, *Theatre and Performance in Digital Culture: From Simulation to Embeddedness* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Freda Chapple and Chiel Katteb, eds, *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006); Steve Dixon, *Digital Performance: A History of New Media in Theatre, Dance, Performance Art, and Installation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007); Susan Broadhurst, *Digital Practices: Aesthetic and Neuroaesthetic Approaches to Performance and Technology* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Susan Broadhurst and Josephine Machon, *Performance and Technology: Practices of Virtual Embodiment and Interactivity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Jennifer Parker-Starbuck, *Cyborg Theatre: Corporeal/technological Intersections in Multimedia Performance* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Steve Benford and Gabriella Giannachi, *Performing Mixed Reality* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011); Gabriella Giannachi, Nick Kaye and Michael Shanks, *Archaeologies of Presence* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

- 8 Op. cit., McKenzie, *Perform or Else*.
- 9 Lev Manovich, *Software Takes Command* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), 33.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Cesare Casarino, 'Three Theses on the Life-Image,' in Jacques Khalip and Robert Mitchell, *Releasing the Image: From Literature to New Media* (Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), 156-69.
- 12 Cesare Casarino and Antonio Negri, *In Praise of the Common: A Conversation on Philosophy and Politics* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, 2008), 148.
- 13 Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life* (Semiotext(e), 2003), 84.
- 14 Op. cit., Dixon, *Digital Performance*, 115.
- 15 Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (New York: Zone Books, 1994), 13.
- 16 Marshall McLuhan, *From Cliché to Archetype* (New York: Viking Press, 1970), 9-10.
- 17 Ibid., 10.
- 18 Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (London: Macmillan, 1977), 177. I have written about this elsewhere more extensively. See Sarah Bay-Cheng, "'When This You See': The (Anti) Radical Time of Mobile Self-Surveillance," *Performance Research* (forthcoming summer 2014).
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Quite the opposite. The global 'Quit Facebook Day' from May 31, 2010 had, as of February 19, 2014, garnered only 40,755 committed Facebook quitters. By comparison, Facebook.com reached 1 billion users in October 2012. According to Pew Research Center survey findings, 17 percent of online adults are on Facebook and half of those users who are not on Facebook live with someone who does. See Aaron Smith, '6 New Facts about Facebook,' *Pew Research Center*, February 3, 2014, [www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/02/03/6-new-facts-about-facebook/](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/02/03/6-new-facts-about-facebook/).
- 21 'How Many Photos Are Uploaded to Facebook Each Day?,' *Quora*, accessed February 22, 2014, [www.quora.com/permalink/TmkFN4YMB](http://www.quora.com/permalink/TmkFN4YMB).
- 22 'Lifebrowser,' <http://research.microsoft.com/apps/video/default.aspx?id=159531>, accessed February 22, 2014.
- 23 Lynnday Williams, William Vahlais and Steven N. Bathiche, 'Method and Apparatus for Transmitting Power and Data Using the Human Body,' June 22, 2004, <http://patentimages.storage.googleapis.com/pdfs/US6754472.pdf>, accessed February 22, 2014. See also Kris Verdonck's performance based on this patent, 'Patent Human Energy' (2007), [www.atwodogcompany.org/en/projects/item/168-patent-human-energy](http://www.atwodogcompany.org/en/projects/item/168-patent-human-energy).
- 24 Here, at least, there is some encouraging legal news. In a March 2012 decision, the Supreme Court declared that there should be some limits on patents for diagnostic tests using genetic material. However, corporations are still declaring patents on DNA sequences and are preparing a series of legal challenges to protect their research and development. See Heidi Ledford, 'US Supreme Court Upends Diagnostics Patents,' *Nature* (March 21, 2012), doi:10.1038/nature.2012.10270; Gina Kolata, 'Accord Aims to Create Trove of Genetic Data,' *The New York Times*, June 5, 2013, [www.nytimes.com/2013/06/06/health/global-partners-agree-on-sharing-trove-of-genetic-data.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/06/health/global-partners-agree-on-sharing-trove-of-genetic-data.html).
- 25 'iPhone 5s: Using Touch ID,' <http://support.apple.com/kb/HT5883>, accessed February 22, 2014.
- 26 Sarah Bay-Cheng and Amy Strahler Holzapfel, 'The Living Theatre: A Brief History of a Bodily Metaphor,' *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* 25(1) (2010): 9-28.
- 27 Op. cit., Casarino and Negri, *In Praise of the Common*, 148.
- 28 Michel Foucault, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984* (London: Routledge, 2013), 123.
- 29 Op. cit., Sontag, *On Photography*, 178-79.
- 30 See, for example, Kirk Kristofferson, Katherine White and John Pelozo, 'The Nature of Slacktivism: How the Social Observability of an Initial Act of Token Support Affects Subsequent Prosocial Action,' *Journal of Consumer Research* (November 6, 2013): 1149-66, doi:10.1086/674137.
- 31 Cathy J. Cohen and Joseph Kahne, *Participatory Politics: New Media and Youth Political Action: Executive Summary*, 2011, 1.
- 32 Ray Penador, 'Occupy Movement Call to Action: The Time Is Now,' [www.dailykos.com/story/2014/01/08/1267841/-Occupy-Movement-Call-to-Action-The-Time-Is-Now](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2014/01/08/1267841/-Occupy-Movement-Call-to-Action-The-Time-Is-Now), accessed February 22, 2014.
- 33 Coincidentally, January 27, 2014 was the same date that activist and folk singer Pete Seeger died.
- 34 Jacques Khalip and Robert Mitchell, *Releasing the Image: From Literature to New Media* (Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), 159.
- 35 Op. cit., Sontag, *On Photography*, 153.