

Etudes: an online theatre & performance
studies journal for emerging scholars

Screening Intimaesthetics: The Paradoxically Private-Public Dancing Body on New Media's Domestic Stage

By L. Archer Porter

Abstract

This essay examines the phenomenon of home dancing on new media through an investigation of videos that circulate the platform Instagram. By analyzing the case of a particular home dancer, the essay proposes that undergirding such mundane quotidian performances on the “domestic stage” are techniques of choreographing and aestheticizing intimacy—or producing “intimaesthetics.” This analysis reveals the subtle yet pervasive conditions of neoliberalism in our contemporary mediascape, and the ways in which it engenders paradoxes of performance, space, and media.

Screening Intimaesthetics: The Paradoxically Private-Public Dancing Body on New Media's Domestic Stage

By L. Archer Porter

The video begins with Danko in mid-dance, moving in a Beyoncé-like fashion: alternating heel lifts as if he were wearing stilettos, while casually swinging his arms forward and backward. Head down, eyes closed, and tongue out, Danko bounces to the beat of Beyoncé's "Deja Vu," which plays in the background. He jumps and claps his hands, then lands in a grounded position rocking his head—all while grinning and singing along. Shirtless and wearing red athletic shorts and a yellow bandana around his head, Danko's muscular physique is made visible. His figure is bathed in natural light, perhaps emanating from a nearby window. The edge of a mattress appears in the frame, barely in view, but nonetheless marking the space as a bedroom. The chest of drawers in the background holds various objects, most of which are unidentifiable, save the one vase holding three yellow roses. To the left of the dresser, and behind Danko, sits a large weightlifting dumbbell atop a pillow on the floor.

Danko continues in an improvisatory fashion for about one minute—leaning back-and-forth, swinging his arms, rotating away from and toward the camera, moving slightly in-and-out of frame. Occasionally, he lifts his left fist to his chin, as if to imitate a microphone, and lip syncs to the song's lyrics. He sings along while caressing his face and emphatically pulsing his hands in front of him, fingers spread. He then performs a modified grapevine, turns his back to the camera, and then sharply looks over his shoulder, pausing for effect. With an intense elation, Danko revels in the music, matching his movement to the energy of the song's lyrics and rhythm. The video ends with him still in movement. Just below the square frame of the Instagram video is a caption that reads: "Beyoncé at

Coachella was EPIC. OMG OMG OMG OMG Beyoncé I love and I know is right, if something I'm doing right in my life is LoVe Beyoncé What A Performance what a dancers what a musician, what a costumes. Beyoncé [heart emoji]."

The cultural reservoirs of new media today are steeped in the everyday: everyday people in everyday spaces, doing everyday things: cooking, cleaning, singing, walking, talking, eating, exercising—and dancing. Videos like the one described above reflect a phenomenon endemic to digital culture in which everydayness is imaged and circulated for potential mass viewership. Though the prominence of the quotidian in such media may, to an extent, reiterate some sense of banality of life and the activities that consume it, it is important to resist such conceptions and tap into the critical potential they harbor. In this essay, I activate such a potential in order to unpack how mediatizations of the everyday dancing body, particularly in the home, articulate a provocative politics of performance and aptly reflect how denizens of new media navigate a shifting terrain of information, communication, and cultural production. I maintain that the home, as captured in those domestically-situated performances, functions as a paradoxically public-private space for the dancer to, on the one hand, express a seemingly unseen and intimate dimension of their world and, on the other hand, actively shape their public persona, engage in public dialogue, and contribute to cultural repertoire. That is to say, the home dance video on new media demonstrates how quotidian performance in the digital landscape straddles the private and public, margin and center, personal and communal, and ordinary and extraordinary—while also deconstructing those very categories. Integral to this point is how such media mobilize a semiotics of the home to effectively *aestheticize intimacy*—or cultivate

what I am calling *intimaesthetics*: the image-based product of capturing what is unseen, intimate, and private and turning it inside-out, toward an outward, public mediatization available for potential mass consumption.

To expound this argument, I will delve deeper into an analysis of Danko's home dance video, introduced at the outset of the essay, as it is an exemplar of the source material I study.¹ This video appears on and circulates through the image-centric social media platform, Instagram – a platform that is an appropriate venue through which to investigate the paradoxes of performance in digital culture, and the role that intimacy plays in those paradoxes. Not only is Instagram one of the fastest growing social media apps available, but it also harnesses in an extraordinary way the “performance of images,” to borrow Isobel Harbison's phrasing. This characteristic describes how images on new media become imbricated with an individual's subjectivity, so that the image performs *for* the subject, and vice versa (15-16). The example studied here embodies this logic by demonstrating how everyday new media users might activate a performative extension of themselves – particularly in Danko's case – through the production of intimacy. That is to say, by disregarding the presence of the camera, Danko performs a seemingly unfettered, all-access, “authentic” version of himself that manifests through the image, as if to peel back the curtain on his unseen domestic reality. The viewer reads: *here is the subject, the real subject, in his own habitat*.

As Harbison's theory suggests, Instagram is indeed a trove of content through which individuals like Danko perform—content that not only *captures* that performance but also *is* the performance. Once online,

¹ The source material from which I found my research and develop my argument of intimaesthetics is a collection of over 2,000 publicly-accessible home dance videos that were uploaded to Instagram between 2010 and 2020. I liken this process to that of “building my own archive,” which reflects a process of curating, as well as one of revealing of an existing phenomenon. I refer to the individual in the home dance video analyzed in this essay as “Danko,” since his Instagram handle is “@dankodance.”

however, those videos acquire a social life of their own. In Danko's case, the intimacy that his video produces, discussed in further detail below, articulates with a wider public discourse around a globally-recognized event: Beyoncé's show-stopping performance in April of 2018 at Coachella, the popular music festival that takes place annually near Palm Springs, California. This correspondence reflects the slippages in performance, subjectivity, and spatiotemporal realities in digital culture today, thereby epitomizing the paradoxes of contemporary mediatized performance. Before delving further into Danko's case, however, it is first necessary to unpack the mechanisms by which intimacy is produced, imaged, and circulated. Integral to such a discussion is how the home, the choreographies of Danko's home-dancing body, and the mediatizations of this scene aestheticize intimacy for a global audience. In unpacking these elements, I first review the semiotics of the home and how they are linked to sociocultural fashionings of privacy, intimacy, and interiority. I then use that discussion to ground my conceptualization of intimaesthetics.

Introducing Intimaesthetics

In considering the constructions of privacy and intimacy through the setting of the home, it is important to consider the ways in which the domestic setting and its imaging are imbricated in a modernist construction of both space and the body. As Gaston Bachelard famously discusses, the home functions as a space of imaginative wandering and maternal protection. Bachelard writes, "the house shelters daydreaming, the house protects the dream, the house allows one to dream in peace" (6). Alongside Bachelard's characterization of home is Heidegger's discussion of "dwelling" as a space of consistency and protection for the development of human perception. Specifically, Heidegger argues that the

body's conception of space is conditioned by the staticness of dwellings: "To say that mortals *are*," Heidegger writes, "is to say that *in dwelling* they persist through spaces by virtue of their stay among things and locations" (359). Heidegger continues, claiming that "Dwelling...is the basic character of Being" (362). This conception of dwelling as fundamental to human-ness paints a picture of the home, more specifically, as integral to human activity and memory, as well as to the objects that capture our attention.

Both Heidegger and Bachelard speak to a romantic dimension of domestic space—spaces in which we "dwell"—as if they were a hallmark of human intimacy and introspection. Moreover, such a conception imbues not just the *idea* of home, but also its *image* as well. As Bachelard writes, "by approaching [images of the house] with care not to break up the solidarity of memory and imagination, we hope to make others feel the psychological elasticity of an image that moves us at unimaginable depth" (6). In referencing the "psychological elasticity" of the image of home, Bachelard suggests how images betray the imaginative and phenomenological dimension of the home—a quality that he takes great care to describe and protect. Of course, what Bachelard does not consider here, and perhaps even works against, are the ways in which images of domestic space enable home's entrance into visual culture, and thus prompt it to acquire its own semiotics and representational politics. Architectural historian Charles Rice asserts that the image of the modern home particularly channels a notion of bourgeois comfort and refuge. Other images of other homes, perhaps those reflecting a different socioeconomic class, might reflect a different reading. However, regardless of the particular associations to class that an image of home might generate, the Bachelardian and Heideggerian sensibilities embedded in that image tend to persist in the public imaginary – not as a

residue of modernist thought, but more as an actively maintained film on contemporary life.²

For the contemporary home dancer, the Bachelardian and Heideggerian notion of home may indeed be compelling, as it might enable the dancer to sense the home as a space to try on new characters, perform old ones, embody the spirit of an admired public figure, and to revel in the extraordinary-ness of the ordinary. That is, it might be a space where an individual has *learned* to perform, and a space for him to rehearse his public personae. At the same time, the home dance videos that individuals produce in the home and upload to new media platforms like Instagram *are* in the public domain, and they *do* engage in public discourse. That is to say, however intimate, personal, and private they may “feel” (a word that Bachelard or Heidegger might use), such videos nonetheless reflect an outward-oriented image that cultivates and aestheticizes intimacy.

Related to, and perhaps because of, the complexities of the home, its image, and their semiotic tethering to intimacy, I approach my languaging and theorization of “intimaesthetics” with great care. The neologism ‘intimaesthetics,’ if not obvious, fuses “intimacy” and “aesthetics” to name the twenty-first century formalization and imaging of qualities around intimacy. Of note, I use the term intimacy here in a particular and intentional way, as it otherwise tends to be deployed with a degree of abstraction. It appears, for instance, in titles of books to imbue their content with a certain poetic sensibility; and it slyly infiltrates discussions of human relationships, spaces of activity, psychological states, and, yes, performance events. However, across its many abstract uses, the term is seldom defined, unpacked, or analyzed. Instead, it tends to fly

² One might glean this “feeling” of the domestic environment in contemporary life through proverbs like “home is where the heart is,” and “there’s no place like home,” which continue to appear (likely in some calligraphic font) on coffee mugs, door mats, and motivational wall posters.

under the radar of critical detection and intentional use. The assumption underlying such perpetual abstraction is that intimacy is so natural, so universal, that it needs no definition. Indeed, the notion can be quite slippery, which is why I turn to the etymology of the word to ground it a bit more. Rooted in the Latin *intimus*, meaning “inmost,” and *intimare*, meaning “to impress, to make familiar,” intimacy reflects an interiority that operates on multiple registers. For instance, intimacy appeals to spatialities of closeness or enclosure; conceptions of an inner, human experience; and the possibility of close intersubjectivities – three facets that may be distilled even further down to registers of spatial, psychological, and social. Moreover, by connoting a multifaceted sense of interiority, these two roots (*intimus* and *intimare*) inadvertently reference notions of exteriority, as an inside can only exist in relation to an outside, and vice versa. The logic of this etymology suggests that intimacy is bound by, and wound through, the binary of interiority and exteriority: a binary that is linked to an array of other modernist dualities, such as privacy and publicity, body and mind, nature and culture, woman and man.

Due to intimacy’s tethering to modernist dualities, Lauren Berlant calls for its reframing. Specifically, Berlant wants us to disabuse ourselves of a diffuse, amorphous sense of intimacy. She writes that “rethinking intimacy calls out not only for redescription but for transformative analyses of the rhetorical and material conditions that enable hegemonic fantasies to thrive in the minds and on the bodies of subjects” (286). Following Berlant, I deploy intimacy as a way to uncover the mechanisms through which it is produced and rendered into an image.

I maintain that *choreography* is integral to this approach.³ By engaging such a lens, I mean to emphasize the constructedness of

³ This approach relies on multiple writings by Susan Leigh Foster, who has argued in myriad ways how the body both choreographs and is choreographed by historical, social, cultural, economic, and political

intimacy – that it is produced through actions and is, thus, performed.⁴ In the case of the home dance video on Instagram, intimacy (and its corollary sense of interiority) manifests through the interior space of the home; the storied meaning that imbues the surrounding domestic objects; the suggested solitude of the singular figure; the thoughts that occupy that figure’s mind; the interior dancing body; the practice of domesticity (which is often discussed in terms of invisibilized labor); and the cinematic closeness harnessed through the camera. By playing with these various manifestations of interiority, the home dancer choreographs a scene that envelopes his contextual world into the frame, resulting in a product that blurs text and context and demonstrates the inextricability of performance and quotidian life. This mingling is integral to the production of intimaesthetics.

While the intimaesthetic product in itself gestures toward the imbrication of performance and everyday-ness, its life on new media platforms like Instagram amplifies its political and economic charge. Neoliberalism in particular colors this charge by announcing the marketability of all corners of human activity, however private or personal, or, yes, intimate. As Boltanski and Chiapello maintain, “the new enterprise mechanisms...demand a greater engagement and are based on a more sophisticated ergonomics...[and] precisely because they are more human in a way, also penetrate more profoundly into people’s interior being. The latter are expected to ‘give themselves,’ as one says, to their work, and

contingencies. For a summary of Foster’s view of choreography consult, “Choreographies of Gender,” *Signs* vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 28.

⁴ My approach to a deconstructed notion of intimacy is modeled after Susan Leigh Foster’s approach to “empathy” in *Choreographing Empathy: Kinesthesia in Performance*. In this text, Foster engages in genealogical analysis of empathy/sympathy to expose “the power relations inherent between those who feel, and those who feel for or with them” (129). Because intimacy and empathy are both often deployed to capture ineffable “feelings” for, with, and between subjects, then Foster’s theoretical lens and methodological approach are most helpful to my purposes here.

the mechanisms permit an instrumentalization and commodification of what is most specifically human about human beings” (465-466).

While neoliberalism, as anchored to a series of 20th century economic policies and political conditions, arose before the age of the Internet and the proliferation of new media, it has nonetheless shaped and become exasperated through such systems. Wendy Chun notably argues that *interfaces* are what enable subjects to interpret, navigate, and participate in the neoliberalist landscape that Boltanski and Chiapello characterize. As Chun maintains, “Interfaces – as mediators between the visible and invisible, as a means of navigation – have been key to creating informed individuals who can overcome the chaos of global capitalism by mapping their relation to the totality of the global capitalist system” (*Programmed Visions* 8). In a subsequent work, Chun builds on these ideas by theorizing how the notion of *habit*, as linked to the Bordieuan concept of *habitus*, determines the nature of individuals’ interaction with interfaces (*Updating to Remain the Same* 7). Through this theorization Chun suggests that participation in neoliberalist systems occurs foremost in and through the body, indicating the ways in which neoliberalism is grounded in *practice* and becomes perpetuated through what David Harvey calls a “climate of consent” (40). Following Chun, I propose that interfaces enable the contemporary performer’s incorporation of intimacy into the mechanisms of neoliberalism *in and through the body*.

This approach to intimacy not only indicates its corporeal structurings, but also anticipates how it might engender paradoxes of body, space, and media. If intimacy is shaped by both interiority and exteriority; if it is harnessed through choreographies of/by the subject, but read as a natural phenomenon; and if it is defined by privacy, but able to be reproduced and circulated in the form of the publicized image, then intimacy itself is a web that stretches across semiotic and ontological

worlds. It crosses dimensions and thereby challenges its own conception in the popular imaginary. This maneuver is palpable through not only cultural productions on new media, but even more so, through home dance videos on Instagram. Danko's case in particular exemplifies the twisting and stretching of intimacy and how its aestheticization reveals its many contradictions and dualities. That is, together through form and content, Danko offers an intimaesthetic that pictures his reality at once from the outside looking in, and the inside looking out: he creates an image of himself in his home, performing as if no camera were present, and then subsequently publishes that image online for public accessibility. Thus, with an understanding of how I am deploying intimacy, and how I approach its aestheticization and circulation online, I now return to the case of Danko's home dance video, an in-depth analysis of which will help to further define the contours of intimaesthetics. This discussion will then gesture toward the ways in which home dancing on new media reflects wider trends of contemporary performance in digital culture.

Whose Celebrity? Danko's Celebrity

As suggested above, the setting of the home and the singular dancing body in the home are critical to a reading of Danko's home dance video as intimate and private, thereby pointing toward its construction of intimaesthetics. Though one might argue that the setting of Danko's performance is not *for sure* a home, and also not for sure *his* home, the evidence available on Danko's personal account, the semiotics of his dancing body, and the compellingness of its aestheticized intimacy together suggest otherwise. For one, the post appears on Danko's personal Instagram account, which offers other bits of his everyday life – many of which are set in the same location as this particular home dance

video. Moreover, the autobiographical voice utilized in this post, along with other posts on his account, embed the content even further into Danko's intimate world – as if to suggest that the viewer is not just seeing *any* scene, but seeing Danko's personal space and his activities in it. The furniture that appears in the frame further suggests that, not only is Danko dancing in his home, but he is dancing in his bedroom – a point discussed in further detail below. Collectively this information unambiguously places Danko in his home and does so in a way that subtly, but powerfully, influences how the viewer reads the performance. In this regard, Danko's setting in the home, his interior dancing body, and his relationship to the camera all work to aestheticize intimacy for a new media audience. Considering these three elements will enable a greater understanding of the choreographic mechanics of intimaesthetics and the ways in which that production blurs privacy and publicity, personal and communal performance, and autobiography and public memory.

When looking more closely at Danko's video, what is most immediately striking about the production is its *unstriking* qualities: Danko's cool, casual comportment; the smooth effortlessness of his improvisation; his comfort in his surroundings; his all-consuming engagement with the music; and his quotidian "home attire." These domestically-contingent features are compounded by Danko's relation to the camera and the ways in which he allows the camera to frame his figure and space. Though his body occasionally faces toward the camera, much of his dancing is directed toward other parts of the room, constantly shifting directions and even at times facing the back, thereby obscuring his movement. His gaze never meets the camera's lens, but instead drifts with his movement, engaging in its own choreography: closing his eyes, opening them, gazing down toward the ground, then toward the ceiling, looking beyond the camera, perhaps toward a mirror to check his

reflection. Danko also uses his movement to flirt with the frame, testing its boundaries and playing with his own visibility. For instance, his arms and legs repeatedly brush in and out of view throughout the dance. Then, at one point, he throws half of his body outside the frame, only to return again. These choreographies articulate a sense of obliviousness: *has Danko forgotten that the camera is on and rolling?*

Along with Danko's cool relation to the camera, the domestic scene itself also contributes to these choreographies. As mentioned above, the setting of the performance looks to be his bedroom, as a bed and other personal belongings occupy the space. Perhaps he has a roommate and does not feel comfortable dancing in the common spaces. Or maybe the bedroom has the most adequately stable structures on which to place his recording device. Regardless of whatever practicalities contributed to Danko's decision to record in the bedroom, the video carries signifiers of intimacy that contribute to the reading of the performance. The idea of the bedroom, after all, functions as a symbol of solitude, personal privacy, and mundane activity. It is a space where people get dressed and undressed, where they sleep and wake, where they reflect on the day's events and anticipate those of tomorrow. It is also a space that invites uninhibited, unseen dancing. The logic of the bedroom, then, is intimate, private, and individually-oriented. As a defined space, it seems so germane to a universal sense of human-ness, that it is often disregarded as a space at all – a microcosm of the Bachelardian-Heideggarian home.

While these elements of Danko's home dance contribute to a sense of intimacy, they also reveal how the performance is indeed choreographed, how the camera is not incidental, and how the space is part of the logic of the intimaesthetics. For instance, in watching the video, it initially appears like Danko disregards the spatial boundaries of the camera's frame. However, upon closer inspection, it becomes evident that

while parts of his dancing go in-and-out of view, he never fully leaves the rectangular boundary. For instance, the disappearance of half of his body into the unseen domestic space is only followed by a complete reappearance milliseconds later. A limb might momentarily leave the frame, but Danko's body remains, to some extent, within its boundaries for the entirety of the video. This frame-play occurs continuously – and, while it is conceivable to think that perhaps Danko's bedroom is not large enough for him to move completely out-of-frame, other videos on his Instagram account demonstrate that such a possibility is not the case. Instead, there is ample room to move beyond the limitations of the frame, and “dance like nobody's watching.” However, Danko largely concedes to the gaze by perpetuating its rule over space and the body. In other words, while Danko performs some freedom from the disciplining forces of the camera and frame, he nonetheless reinforces its power to command the dancer's movement – even in the “comforts of his own home.” Ultimately, this concession enables him to activate the affective potential of his dancing and frame some sort of subjective reality in which he publicly expresses his admiration for Beyoncé.

Considering this intimate logic of the bedroom, Danko's decision to dance in such a space, wearing shorts and no shirt, is semiotically fitting. One might imagine how such attire is typical for “around the house” kind of activities. Whether doing laundry, cleaning dishes, tidying up, or merely lounging around, a pair of athletic-esque shorts and bandana might be appropriate, as the shorts provide an ease of movement and the bandana would catch any sweat caused by that movement. Of course, this attire is also appropriate for a home dance experience, a moment of getting lost in the music of Beyoncé. Choreographies like these – not just the attire, but also the gaze, the relation to the camera, and the space of the bedroom – collectively suggest to the viewer that the camera's presence is merely

incidental, that Danko would be doing this dance regardless of whether or not it was being captured.

The discussion above reflects the language and form of the production: its corporeal, cinematographic, and spatial compositions. However, Danko's construction of intimaesthetics is also contingent upon the content of the video and its social life online. That is, Danko is engaging in more than a playful dance in his bedroom; he is creating a tribute to Beyoncé that maps his relation to her, while also contributing to global discourses around Beychella. Indeed, as the caption and exuberant improvisation illustrate, Danko's home dance video is a celebration of Beyoncé's 2018 performance at Coachella. To gain an understanding of the paradoxical nature of Danko's tribute and its production and circulation of intimaesthetics, it becomes necessary to briefly review the event to which he refers.

Beyoncé's Coachella performance almost immediately became a global sensation following the circulation of many self-produced videos capturing the performance, of media coverage around the event, and of memes created by fans. Her role in the festival was momentous from the start, though, as it was the first time in Coachella's twenty-five-year history that a black woman would be the headliner. According to reports, the performance exceeded expectations, with its incorporation of countless costumes and the appearance of many high-profile guest performers, including Kelly Rowland and Michelle Williams, the two other members of Destiny's Child – a cameo that prompted a reunion performance. News outlets, as diverse as *Forbes* and *Vogue*, noted the momentousness of the occasion: marking it as one of the most culturally important events of 2018 (along with, for instance, the royal wedding of Prince Harry to Meghan Markle). This sort of buzz resulted in the entire

event being referred to as “Beychella” – a proclamation that often accompanied the surge of tribute videos by fans across the globe.

Danko’s home dance video was, of course, one of such tributes that asserted the momentousness of Beychella and expressed admiration for Beyoncé. Unlike the more widely circulated news media buzz around the event, Danko’s performance carries a more personal and situational quality to it. As explained above, Danko orchestrates a particularly intimate scene that centers his own everyday experiences with Beyoncé’s performance. Thus, his home dance video enables him to express his admiration for Beyoncé, while also shifting the focus from Beyoncé to Danko, from the Coachella stage to the domestic stage – from the center to the margin. Through this line of transmission and correspondence, viewers understand that Danko is indeed a fan of Beyoncé’s; but even more-so, they get to experience his own creative expression in response to Beychella. After all, a home dance video *is* its own cultural product: it is its own dance with its own meaning and intentionality, one that is distinct from, but harbors a relation to, some other more widely-recognized concept, person, object, event, or idea. Indeed, this is Danko’s dance, not Beyoncé’s.

This way of engaging in public dialogue with a public figure while shifting the focus to the subjectivity of the everyday performer resembles what Gunther Kress calls “writing back,” which he views through a lens of media and representation: “The affordances of the new technologies of representation and communication,” Kress writes, “enable those who have access to them to be ‘authors,’ even if authors of a new kind – that is, to produce texts, to alter texts, to write, and to ‘write back’” (173). This notion of “writing back” is quite appropriate to our concerns here, as it articulates how individuals along the margins (everyday spaces and quotidian activities often left out and disparaged in relationship to the

visible, dominant center) simultaneously cite the public figure and their writings, while also creating a text of their own, one that sustains its own cultural economy. Perhaps this phenomenon of centering one's experience of and writing back to a celebrity – as Danko has done with Beyoncé – is dance's answer to literature's trend of fanfiction. Like the latter, the former “[blurs] the boundary between reader and writer” so that a fan-respondent of a text also becomes an author in her own right (155). As Henry Jenkins explains, the fan is writing in the margins of a text, but in doing so, is creating her own text. Notably, Abigail De Kosnik engages this approach to fanfiction, but applies it toward an understanding of digital cultural archives. As De Kosnik suggests, the creation of fan fiction in digital culture exists because something or someone is absent in the archives of mainstream culture (135). Thus, a contribution to a fan fiction archive reflects how one might not just *write back*, but altogether *rewrite* the codes of the dominant center – which, as De Kosnik argues, is a rogue act.

Extending the logic of Kress, Jenkins, and De Kosnik illustrates how the home dance performances on new media reveal how everyday performers in everyday spaces rewrite dominant culture, prompt a remembrance of something forgotten or absent, and refashion public discourse. These qualities are integral to the paradoxical nature of Danko's production. Though his dance is imbued with a playful, lighthearted, and seemingly apolitical quality, his engagements with celebrity choreographies emphasize the rogue nature of his production—specifically, through his reorientation toward the home, toward the embodied practices of the everyday performer, and toward the everyday remixing of celebrity. Danko is reverent toward Beyoncé and her performance, but also, in performing that reverence, he accrues his own “aspirational capital” and activates his own public persona (Yosso 78). In

the neoliberal fashion, this maneuver indicates how Danko is not just performing an intimate tribute to Beyoncé and aestheticizing his intimate reality, but borrowing from and repurposing her celebrity toward his own celebrity – even if it is a form of what Theresa Senft calls “micro-celebrity” (25).

Considering this dance between worlds, Danko’s case demonstrates the complexities of performance in the age of new media: the slippages in space and subjectivity; the role of the everyday in cultural repertoire; and the nuances of public memory. His screened intimaesthetics teaches us how contemporary performance might deconstruct modernist concepts like intimacy and privacy, turning them into images for public consumption – but in doing so, generates its own creative production and accrues its own capital. Though home dance videos like Danko’s may circulate through neoliberalist platforms like Instagram, their “rogue” qualities have the potential to work “within and against” the forces that tend to command digital culture, as well as contemporary performance on new media at large.

Works Cited

- Bachelard, Gaston. *Poetics of Space: The Classic Look at How We Experience Intimate Places*, translated by Maria Jolas. Beacon Press, 1994.
- Berlant, Lauren Gail. "Intimacy: A Special Issue." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1998, pp. 281-8.
- Boltanski, Luc and Eve Chiapello. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. Verso, 2005.
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. *Updating to Remain the Same: Habitual New Media*. MIT, 2016.
- . *Programmed Visions: Software and Memory*. MIT, 2011.
- De Kosnik, Abigail. *Rogue Archives: Digital Cultural Memory and Media Fandom*, MIT, 2016.
- Foster, Susan Leigh. *Choreographing Empathy: Kinesthesia in Performance*. Routledge, 2011.
- . "Choreographies of Gender," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1998, pp. 1-34.
- Harbison, Isobel. *Performing Image*. MIT, 2019.
- Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford, 2005.

Heidegger, Martin. *Basic Writings: Revised and Expanded Edition*, edited by David Farrell Krell. Harper Collins, 1993.

Jenkins, Henry. *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*. Routledge, 2013.

Kress, Gunther. *Literacy in the New Media Age*. Routledge, 2003.

Senft, Theresa *Camgirls: Celebrity and Community in the Age of Social Networks*. Peter Lang, 2008.

Yosso, Tara. "Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth." *Race, Ethnicity, and Education* 8(1). 69-91.