
Introduction: working memory

Sauver l'usine, c'est sauver la mémoire ouvrière de ce quartier, se rappeler que ce quartier est un quartier ouvrier, que ce n'est pas rien, que les ouvriers existent, sont encore là, même si on voudrait parfois nous faire croire qu'ils ont disparu. [...] Quoi faire de cette histoire pour ceux qui sont là, aujourd'hui, que cela leur serve, qu'ils puissent s'appuyer dessus?

To save the factory is to save the working-class memory of this neighbourhood, to recall that this neighbourhood is a working-class neighbourhood, that it isn't nothing, that the workers exist, are still here, even if at times one would like to make us believe that they have disappeared. [...] What to make of this history for those who are here, today, that it might serve them, give them something to lean on?

Stéphane Bonnard¹

It could be so many factories, so many neighbourhoods. But 'this neighbourhood' is the Carré de Soie (Silk Square), a rough patchwork of industrial sites and workers' housing in the eastern suburbs of Lyon, stitched together over the course of the twentieth century as high-polluting artificial textile manufacture replaced the artisanal silk weaving of Lyon's northern slope. The Carré de Soie straddles the communes of Villeurbanne and Vaulx-en-Velin; its coherence as a neighbourhood is a matter of debate. Its name is an exercise in rebranding, a euphemism assigned by developers well after the closure

of Textile Artificielle Sud-Est (South-East Artificial Textile, or TASE), the rayon factory that was once the area's largest employer. 'To save the factory' is to save what remains of the derelict factory's architecture, much of which the wrecking ball had already reduced to rubble before a successful lobbying effort by locals and preservationists to designate the building a heritage site.

Stéphane Bonnard is not (primarily) a heritage preservationist. He is, with Pierre Duforeau, co-artistic director of street theatre company KompleXXKapharnaüm. Since its founding in 1995, KompleXXKapharnaüm has worked out of a former metal parts factory in what is now the Carré de Soie. KompleXXKapharnaüm creates site-specific, multimedia performances that engage local memory, industrial and working-class heritage, and urban and economic change. Bonnard's reflection on the preservation of the TASE factory reveals much about the stakes of his company's work, the tensions inherent in deindustrialization and redevelopment, and the issues that will recur throughout this book.

Bonnard conveys urgency, even danger. The task at hand is not to preserve a corpse but to save a life, or rather a living connection between present and past congealed for the moment in the fragile structure of the factory itself. This temporal link establishes local identity that might persist despite socioeconomic upheaval. For Bonnard, to save the factory is not to recall that this *was* a working-class neighbourhood, but that it still *is* one. The original French dispenses with 'class' by making 'worker' into an adjective: at stake is worker memory in a worker neighbourhood. Bonnard identifies a group called 'the workers' and positions himself outside of it. *They* are still around, even if a separate, more shadowy 'they' – *on*, the French language's neutral, third-person singular, rendered here as 'one' – would prefer that we – and who are we? – not think of them, or think of them as cleanly, confidently gone. The continued existence of this group, the workers, complicates neat narratives of transition. Bonnard then shifts from memory, the reconstruction of the past in and for the present, to history, both the actual past and the stories we make of it. He asks how this history might be interpreted (what to make of it?) and moulded (what to make of it?) to serve the present needs of those who are 'here,' a group that for Bonnard includes the workers but might also include their families, new arrivals, even tourists. This group relies on that history as a source of stability even as the group shapes and reshapes it, thereby revealing how *unstable* it is. This interweaving of authenticity and fakery, of duration and ephemerality, of embodiment and absence, of time and space, makes up the fabric of history, memory, and, of course, theatre.

This is a book about how street theatre companies and their performances produce postindustrial space. It takes as its objects of analysis the institutions and events of contemporary French street theatre. At its core, this book is an exploration of how theatre and performance more generally participate in and make historical sense of ongoing urban and economic change. Theatre and performance enable us to make ongoing situations like deindustrialization and redevelopment intelligible as events, to make sense of past and future from within an unfolding present. This is a book about how street theatre reorders spaces and times and how it suggests to its publics ways of navigating the real or imagined transition from one kind of space, time, work, or economy to another. (The phrase ‘real or imagined’ recurs throughout the book, not as indecision, but as an inclusive disjunction that allows for the performative force of particular narratives and scenarios of change. As any theatre audience can attest, imagined circumstances sometimes produce real effects.) To produce postindustrial space is to recover from the trauma of deindustrialization, to ‘work through,’ in the sense of processing and moving on. It also entails continuing to generate surplus value in a changing economy, ‘working through’ in the way a performer soldiers on despite illness or injury. The ‘post’ in postindustrial suggests a period after something else. But other ‘posts’ (postmodern, post-traumatic, postpartum, post-punk) remind us that, even if we are situated chronologically after something, we are not necessarily over it.

Working memory

The production of postindustrial space is one historically specific iteration of a process I call *working memory*. If memory refers to a connection forged between past and present, then working memory suggests, most obviously, a connection between past and present forms of work. How might workers in a so-called creative economy commemorate the industrial labour that once occurred in the factories and mills that have since become their offices, studios, and rehearsal spaces? Just as importantly, how do persistent, residual practices and tropes make changes in the nature of work manageable and spatial transformations navigable?

As a modifier, ‘working’ also evokes the working title, something provisional that must be provided in order to move on with a task. There is embarrassment here. ‘It’s just a working hypothesis,’ says the academic to a colleague before handing over the execrable first draft. Translation:

‘Please don’t judge me.’ Or perhaps: ‘Please critique without judging. Trust that I am capable of making this better.’ As municipal governments stumble through the processes of deindustrialization and redevelopment, commemorative cultural projects might serve as apologies, as temporary stopgap measures before the ink has dried on the official narrative of industrial heritage or urban revitalization. The connections between past and present made by working memory are subject to revision.

This study is concerned with local, spatial, cultural, or collective memory, not with memory as neurological function, but nonetheless the cognitive scientist’s understanding of working memory is instructive. In cognitive psychology, working memory (as distinct from short-term memory, though common parlance conflates the two) refers to our capacity to manipulate information in addition to, or perhaps instead of, passively storing it. Psychologists Susan E. Gathercole and Tracy Packiam Alloway describe working memory as a ‘mental jotting pad’ used ‘in situations when there is no other external record.’² Working memory allows us to keep some information in mind while processing other material that will clarify, complicate, or otherwise alter it. Gathercole and Alloway offer mental arithmetic and the sorting of complex syntax as examples of simple classroom tasks that become difficult for students with impaired working memory. (As a beginning student of German, I regularly find my working memory tested by the deferral of verbs.) I must stress that I am *not* making claims about the brain function of theatre-makers, their audiences, former factory workers, or urban redevelopers. I am not a cognitive scientist. I adopt the term ‘working memory’ because it suggests the provisional nature of memory as work-in-progress, subject to manipulation, volatile and unfixed, but also as that which enables the performance of complex tasks: here, continued economic performance amidst shifting circumstances.

Working memory has particular conceptual power as a descriptor of provisional links between past and present required by historically specific conditions for the continued production of surplus value. Scholars outside the fields of psychology, neuroscience, and technology have typically not adopted the term working memory, perhaps because its provisional nature is endemic to the prevailing understanding of memory *tout court* in humanities disciplines. The notable exception is German cultural historian Aleida Assmann, who distinguishes between cultural working memory (canon) and cultural reference memory (archive). ‘The working memory,’ she writes, ‘stores and reproduces the cultural capital of a society that is continuously recycled and re-affirmed.’³ According to Assmann, a culture’s canon, its working memory, ‘defines and supports

the cultural identity of a group. It is highly selective and ... built on the principle of exclusion.⁴ This selection process Assmann calls canonization. The canon itself is not dusty and ossified. Assmann refers to the canon as a culture's working memory precisely because it maintains the past as *present* through 'continuous repetition and re-use.'⁵ Working memory refers not merely to what a culture *has* readily in mind and on hand, but to what a culture actively *keeps* in mind and on hand through rereadings, remountings, and restagings. For Assmann, the selection process of canonization is always ongoing: material may pass from the actively circulated working memory of the canon to the passively stored reference memory of the archive; conversely, material relegated to the archive may be reactivated by the artist or scholar to become part of the canon.⁶

I share Assmann's view of cultural working memory as an active process of repeated circulation and manipulation that keeps the past present, but my use of the term working memory diverges from Assmann's in a key respect. Whereas Assmann equates working memory with canonicity and therefore with durable, lasting value (even as she acknowledges that material may pass in and out of a culture's canon), I emphasize working memory's provisional, temporary nature. In my estimation, working memory maintains the past as present, but it also suggests an ultimately fictional endpoint at which the past will be laid to rest. To borrow again from psychology, if working memory enables a pupil to calculate a string of figures, to work with information already received, modifying it based on the arrival of additional information, it also relies on an eventual end to the sequence. Ultimately, the teacher finishes the equation; the students total the sum. Working memory has served its purpose, and the students can discard those figurative sheets of their respective mental jotting pads. Language operates similarly; the (near-messianic) arrival of the German verb clarifies the meaning of the preceding words and ushers in the full stop. The sentence is over. Working memory conjugates experience in two tenses simultaneously: the present perfect continuous links past and present, and the future perfect suggests eventual completion.

Thus, in this book, working memory refers to a paradoxical process that simultaneously keeps particular forms of work present and promises to relegate them to the past. Working memory is not merely necessary to navigate the transition from one economy to the next; it makes that transition intelligible, inventing the postindustrial as an imagined end to the turbulent processes of deindustrialization and redevelopment. This is why I refer to the production *of* the postindustrial rather than a shift *to* the postindustrial. The postindustrial is not a pre-existing, clearly

defined endpoint toward which a city or town might collectively strive, even if this is precisely how some municipal governments and private developers choose to represent it.

This book explores a contemporary manifestation of working memory in a particular geographic area, France, which makes its operations especially explicit. Though France has not featured prominently in Anglophone deindustrialization scholarship, it felt the economic crisis of 1973 acutely. The country was late to industrialize and so always had models to follow, first in Britain and then in the United States. Particularly in the decades following World War II, a period of continuous economic growth referred to in France as the *Trente Glorieuses* (Thirty Glorious Years), France benefited from an economic framework already installed and rigorously tested in the US, namely the Fordist dynamic of productivity gains supported by a culture of mass consumption.⁷ The collapse of the Fordist compromise left France in much the same position as its Anglophone precedents and thus robbed it of the clear sense of direction that had enabled its rapid postwar modernization.⁸ These drastically altered circumstances, characterized by pervasive uncertainty, make working memory both especially necessary and more readily apparent.

As I demonstrate below and throughout this book, working memory operates theatrically and performatively. To make historical sense of deindustrialization and redevelopment requires theatrical events and performative acts that revise, resituate, and re-embody particular pasts. Working memory depends on the ability to register thick, dissonant space and time (the perception of which is fundamentally theatrical) and the continued re-enactment with a difference of sedimented behaviours (i.e. performance). But if working memory always relies on the spatial and temporal logics of theatre and performance, the local manifestations of those logics vary. Particular artistic practices facilitate working memory's function in certain locations at certain historical moments.

I argue that, in contemporary France, street theatre is working memory's privileged artistic form. In part this is simply because the French encounter street theatre more than other kinds of live performance.⁹ But it also has much to do with the qualities of street theatre explored throughout this book: its attempts to rescript everyday spatial behaviour, its playful and reflective nostalgia, the relationships it establishes between performers and spectators, and its ability to link and relink spaces and times. Street theatre is not at all historical moments the most logical aesthetic component of working memory. But I will argue throughout this book for street theatre's necessity and peculiar force in the contemporary moment, the 'historical present' characterized by

what Lauren Berlant calls ‘crisis ordinariness,’ that roughly maps onto the period since the collapse of the Fordist compromise and the crisis and recession of the 1970s.¹⁰

Since the late 1970s, regional, departmental, and municipal governments across France have encouraged the conversion of defunct factories and warehouses into cultural spaces that commemorate regional cities’ industrial pasts while heralding their new identities as service economies and tourist destinations. When theatre companies occupy these buildings, they become part of the narratives of postindustrial transition disseminated by the governing bodies that facilitated the theatre companies’ relocation, though the respective missions of those theatre companies and governing bodies do not necessarily align. Theatre companies frequently work out of converted factories and warehouses; the spaces are relatively inexpensive and readily available. I am concerned with what happens when the work of theatre is to commemorate another kind of work, industrial work, that the theatre company itself has supposedly re- or dis-placed. This study insists on the connection between theatre’s economic, memorial, and historiographic functions, and explores how this connection is forged by contemporary French street theatre companies.

In one sense, the book explains the function of contemporary French street theatre in relation to the end of Fordist-Taylorist modernity and ongoing transformations in the nature of work, space, and time. In another sense, it *uses* contemporary French street theatre as an in-depth case study of the theatrical and performative operations of working memory, locally specific to a given space and historical moment. These are the two components of the book’s argument. The first determines the book’s scope, the second its broader significance.

Street theatre

There is a logic to the conjunction of theatre and street. Theatre as an art form unfolds in space and time. The street, too, as a site of movement, passage, circulation, congestion, of speed or slowness, is measured in minutes as well as in metres or miles. Then there are the people and things around us, and how they make us feel: theatre and street are inter-subjective and affective. ‘In the street,’ writes Henri Lefebvre, ‘a form of spontaneous theatre, I become spectacle and spectator, and sometimes an actor.’¹¹ Streets and theatres are places in which to see and be seen,

but also to hear and be heard, overhear and be overheard, or for that matter smell and be smelled, feel and be felt, touch and be touched. We act and are acted upon; we affect and are affected. Street and theatre are multisensory space-times in which people bump into or rub up against each other, literally or figuratively, pleasantly or otherwise. Our occasionally awkward co-presence fosters behavioural conditioning: codes of performance, rules (some stated, some not) of spectatorship. We can break these rules, bend them, adhere to and enforce them, test their limits, challenge their legitimacy, momentarily suspend them, or claim they don't apply to us.

Street theatre, however, need not transpire in a literal thoroughfare, or even outdoors. The street in question might be a derelict factory, an empty lot, a municipal swimming pool, the stairwell of a tower block, the inside of an automobile, or even, as Sylvie Clidière suggests, the wings of a proscenium stage. For Clidière, street theatre need only occur outside of purpose-built performance spaces (*'hors lieux préaffectés'*).¹² Thus street theatre always occurs in converted space, because it converts space by definition. There is an obvious connection here to what Anglophone scholars would more readily call site-specific, site-responsive, or site-sympathetic theatre. Contemporary French street theatre also shares with site-specific performance the twin genealogies of radical theatre and the expanded visual arts. But the 'street' is crowded with historical, political, and cultural meaning not evoked by the specificity of site.

The 'street' of street theatre stands in metonymically for public space or for space that performers and their audiences seek to make or claim as public. This public, however, is neither universal nor fixed. In the street we encounter the royal procession and the popular uprising, the nationalist parade and the general strike, misogynist harassment and the feminist march against it, the marketplace and the anti-capitalist demonstration, protest and counter-protest. Streets are everywhere sites of power and resistance (though historically the French have excelled at establishing *la rue* as overdetermined symbol of order and disorder). The contested nature of the street as public space is intelligible in the language of transgression that pervades the scholarly and media discourses surrounding street theatre. These companies do not merely *perform* in the street, but *invade* (*envahissent*), *storm* (*prennent d'assaut*), or *occupy* (*occupent*) the street.¹³ The opening sentence of Susan Haedicke's *Contemporary Street Arts in Europe: Aesthetics and Politics* is illustrative: 'Street arts interventions invade a public space, shake it up and disappear, but the memory of the disruption haunts the place for audiences who experience it.'¹⁴ Haedicke foregrounds French street theatre's most persistent concerns: the transgression of boundaries, overturning

of hierarchy or disruption of quotidian spatial practices, and the tension between ephemerality and the possibility of enduring impact.

Street theatre might make a claim to public space by expanding access to a particular site, thereby expanding the definition of 'public,' but this is not inherently progressive. As I discuss throughout this book, refashioning a derelict factory as public space might effectively deny former industrial workers symbolic and material ownership of their own working-class heritage. Street theatre might also reframe the definition of public without expanding it, so that the formerly excluded become included and the formerly included become excluded. Public space is neither smooth nor flat. Some may pass through public space more easily, freely, and safely than others.¹⁵ Some have the time to linger in public space; others do not.¹⁶ The constitution of publics and their spaces is contested and contingent.

I insist that the companies discussed in this book make street theatre even when their work takes spectators inside the walls of a repurposed factory. In referring to such spaces as the street I aim not to quibble over terminology but to make a strong claim about what performances in such spaces might accomplish, the histories and politics of which they become part, and the relations and systems in which they participate. Just as a literal street links one site to another, so the 'street' in street theatre establishes a connection among diverse performance practices and their myriad locations.

Crucially, though, such a connection does not negate the importance of site. Though I maintain throughout this book that street theatre companies bring spaces together within the generic category of 'street,' I also draw on the insights of site-specific theatre and its scholarship. Spaces have repertoires: as defined by Fiona Wilkie, 'a set of choices (culturally, traditionally, personally, or physically defined) available to people in a particular place' and 'created in part by what has gone before in that place.'¹⁷ Street theatre practitioners can attempt to renegotiate the repertoires of a space in performance; to claim a space as public is surely to propose a modified set of available choices and behaviours, and Wilkie adopts the term 'repertoire' because it allows for improvisation and emergence within existing frameworks. But repertoires do not simply disappear. During street performance, the spatial repertoires of theatre and street continue to intermingle. Not only that, but the particular repertoires of a given street will be intelligible to local audiences even if they are not apparent to tourists or the performers themselves. The 'street' allows me to make broader claims about what certain spaces do, but it does not efface the specificity of those spaces. In this study, the street is both metonym and specific site, with the understanding that, to

borrow from Doreen Massey, every site, regardless of scale, is networked to other localities and is itself multiple.¹⁸

Contemporary French street theatre is as diverse in aesthetic form as in its choice of location. A visitor to the International Festival of Street Theatre in Aurillac will encounter magicians, mimes, jugglers, and fire spinners; processions and parades; dance, circus, and installation art; and technologically sophisticated spectacles involving multimedia projection and elaborate, moving set pieces. Examples of street theatre discussed in this book include object theatre inside an automobile (in Chapter 1), a musical collaboration between industrial percussionists and a local wind ensemble (in Chapter 2), mock archaeological digs (in Chapter 3), rides atop gargantuan mechanical animals (in Chapter 4), and interactions with sculptures that emit sound in response to spectators' movements (in Chapter 5). The field is so expansive that practitioners, critics, and scholars alike increasingly drop the designator 'street theatre' (*théâtre de rue*) in favour of the plural 'street arts' (*arts de la rue*).¹⁹

My retention of the term street theatre derives neither from conservative contrarianism nor from an artificial limiting of scope. Rather, I insist on the usefulness of street theatre as an umbrella term because it suggests both an *institution* that establishes a public, and an *event*, a durational encounter that creates a relationship between performer and spectator and works on space and time in particular ways.

It might appear counterintuitive to discuss street theatre as a set of institutions as well as a series of performance events. Indeed, street theatre practitioners (particularly those who began working prior to the 1980s) frequently voice anti-institutional sentiments: Claude Krespin, founder of street theatre troupe Théâtreacide, remarks, 'street theatre captivated me [in the 1970s] but I fled when it was perverted starting in the 1980s [...] I have seen quite well who has nicked the money for twenty years in institutional culture.'²⁰ Krespin is referring to the proliferation, in the 1980s and 1990s, of professional organizations and street theatre production centres that offer competitive funding and residencies. His concerns exemplify a pervasive anxiety (taken up in Chapter 1) that street theatre's immediacy, spontaneity, and subversiveness have been corrupted by money and confined by mortar. Institutional culture, here, seems to suggest conservative fixity rather than radical flow.

But analysing street theatre companies and their bases of operation as institutions attunes us, firstly, to the conditions in which street theatre practitioners operate as *workers*. Shannon Jackson has demonstrated how resistance to institutional funding structures (such as that expressed by Krespin) is part of an ongoing tension between autonomy

and heteronomy that dominated the cultural creation of the 1960s and that continues to characterize the discourses surrounding radical performance. She rightly notes: 'If progressive artists and critics unthinkingly echo a routinized language of anti-institutionalism and anti-statism, we can find ourselves unexpectedly colluding with neoliberal impulses that want to dismantle public institutions of human welfare.'²¹ For my purposes here, this means simply that street performers, like the rest of us, need to eat. We can and should critique the conditions in which they must earn their crust, but we can hardly fault them for attempting to survive or even thrive in those conditions. Some of the street theatre companies discussed in this book participate (eagerly or reluctantly) in processes of redevelopment that might be thought of as gentrification. My goal in this book is not to condemn the companies in question but to examine the function of particular modes of theatrical labour in the wake of deindustrialization.

Institutional analysis attunes us, secondly, to what theatres do before, between, and after performance events. Christopher Balme contends that theatre is 'much more than the sum of individual performances; it consists of a complex set of institutional as much as artistic practices that need to be brought into historiographical focus.'²² This applies to street theatre as well, because, for Balme, 'an institution is by no means coterminous with the building and vice versa.'²³ A street theatre company, too, is more than the sum of its performance events. Examining theatre as an institution allows the scholar to analyse the construction of and engagement with a theatrical *public* that includes, but is not limited to, the eventual spectators of a given performance. This reorientation from spectator to public matters because the 'theatrical public sphere,' defined by Balme as 'a realm of interaction outside the coordinates of the performance event' involving 'forms of communication beyond the exchange of libidinal energies between performers and spectators,' is the broader arena in which the work of a theatre company becomes intelligible to those who attend its performances *and* those who do not.²⁴ The conversion of a derelict factory into a street theatre production centre modifies the spatial repertoires of the surrounding area even for those who never see the company perform.

In this book, street theatre consists of *both* a set of institutions that form publics and a series of events that engage with spectators. The events in question might not involve plot or character, but I call them theatre because they facilitate modes of spatio-temporal perception that are fundamentally theatrical.

Theatre excels at transforming one space into another. Purpose-built stages become plazas, bourgeois interiors, or post-apocalyptic wastelands

depending on the needs of the night. Between performances these spaces remain as potentialities. During performances these spaces do not neatly replace that of the theatre; rather, the audience is aware of both fictive space and theatre space simultaneously, just as (in those cases where character remains a relevant category) they are aware of the coexistence of actor and character in a single body. Spatial doubleness allows for the coexistence of actuality and potentiality and the perception of that coexistence by performers and audiences alike. Even postmodern or post-dramatic stagings that dispense with conventional settings do not preclude the audience from doing such imaginative work.²⁵ Site-specific projects take advantage of the inherent doubleness of theatrical spatial perception in order to knit together the histories, practices, and rules of theatre with those of their respective locales. Street theatre, too, evokes the street as it was or has been, as it is, and as something else: an alternative, imaginary space of potentiality. As on the proscenium stage, the space of potentiality does not replace the space of actuality in performance; rather, the imaginary and the real, the virtual and the material, coexist and commingle.²⁶ I use the term street theatre even when discussing encounters with multimedia projections (in Chapter 3) and with outdoor installation art (in Chapter 5), because those projects facilitate this mode of spatial perception.

Theatre also captures something of the *temporal* element, the event-ness and again-ness, crucial to all of the diverse practices under consideration in this book. During a theatrical event the audience oscillates between purportedly objective clock time and phenomenological time-as-experienced. Matthew Wagner calls this theatre's temporal dissonance; Tracy C. Davis simply calls it theatrical time.²⁷ Theatre makes explicit the everyday tension between measured time and felt time. Because of the frame of the theatrical event, which, regardless of narrative structure, must begin and end, Wagner argues that theatrical time is thick as well as dissonant: 'It is the nature of the theatrical present to draw out [the] human faculties of retention and protention, to use our awareness of the birth and death of the event – an awareness that owes its existence in large part to the temporal frame that is endemic to theatricality – to constitute each present moment.'²⁸ As the action unfolds, theatre audiences situate new information in relation to a remembered starting point and a projected endpoint.

Wagner argues that the dissonance and thickness of theatrical time enable audiences to grasp the dissonance and thickness of everyday temporal existence. Theatre, for Wagner, by virtue of the fact that it must end, offers a more readily intelligible microcosm of Heideggerian Being-towards-death. In everyday experience, the beginning (birth) and

end (death) are not as present as they are in the theatre. The thick time of theatre makes the present palpable as that which is between opening and closure. In other words, theatre has the capacity to make ongoing, unbroken processes intelligible as events.

Regardless of its actual dramatic structure, theatre's function is similar to what Hayden White has called 'emplotment.' Emplotment turns chronicle, a litany of occurrences, into history, an intelligible and coherent sequence of events.²⁹ According to Alain Badiou, 'Theatre indicates where we stand with regard to historical time, but it does so in a kind of readable amplification that is its own. It clarifies our situation.'³⁰ Though Badiou is not referring to *situation* in the sense used by Lauren Berlant, I connect the two: if theatre clarifies the situation, as Badiou suggests, it is thanks in part to how theatrical time facilitates the construction of events. Berlant describes the situation as 'a state of things in which *something* that will perhaps matter is unfolding amid the usual activity of life. It is a state of animated and animating suspension that forces itself on consciousness, that produces a sense of the emergence of something in the present that may become an event.'³¹ Theatrical time inspires more – perhaps false – confidence, lending the shape and direction of an event to the muddled middle of the situation. Theatrical time projects an ending, a way out of crisis from within crisis.

By describing the diverse array of practices under consideration in this book as street theatre, my point is not to conflate formal or genealogical differences but to make a stronger claim about how these practices produce space and time. Street theatre, then, is at once expansive and precise. Paradoxically, the expansiveness of street theatre allows a refocusing on these performances' spatio-temporal work: more specifically, for my purposes here, on how they produce the postindustrial.

Postindustrial space

What does it mean to be postindustrial? A. K. Coomaraswamy, Ceylonese Tamil philosopher and art historian, appears to have coined the term in his 1913 correspondence with British architect Arthur Penty, who credits Coomaraswamy in his 1917 treatise on guild socialism, *Old Worlds for New: A Study of the Post-Industrial State*.³² Thus in its earliest incarnation postindustrial society is an imagined socialist utopia based on medieval guild structures, a return to pre-industrial labour organization inspired by Victorian reformers William Morris and John Ruskin.

The postindustrial society as anti-industrial or even anti-capitalist vision returns in 1980s New Left ecological thought.³³ Though the 1910s guild socialists and 1980s eco-socialists paint differing portraits of postindustrial society, they share one frame: a leftist rejection of industrial, capitalist modernity.

Postindustrial society is perhaps better known not as modern capitalism's antithesis but as its logical progression, its next evolutionary phase. Daniel Bell depicts it as such in *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1973). Postindustrial society here is characterized by greater emphasis on services, information, and knowledge than on manufacturing. Bell connects these developments to what he sees as the end of ideology and (rather blithely) proposes that industrial capitalism has successfully met the material needs of most members of Western societies.³⁴ By contrast, Alain Touraine views postindustrial society as a threat to democracy that masks rather than ameliorates class domination, and fosters 'dependent participation.'³⁵ But triumphalist (Bell) and critic (Touraine) agree on the hypothesis of dematerialization and the idea of a radical break between the industrial and postindustrial as historical periods and modes of social and economic organization.

More recently, the dematerialization hypothesis has been framed as a shift from material to *affective* or *immaterial* labour. The concept of affective labour originally emerged to direct critical attention to undertheorized (and, more importantly, underpaid or unpaid) forms of work, particularly those in the domestic sphere. As a concept in feminist scholarship, affective labour demonstrated how women's unpaid work actually sustained the economy and was worthy of compensation.³⁶ As taken up by Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt (among others aligned with the Italian post-Workerists), affective labour refers to a uniquely contemporary form of work of which the primary product is not a material object but an emotional state, usually a sense of well-being, as in many of the service professions.³⁷ The post-Workerists have since expanded the concept and now speak of *immaterial* labour, of which the product is a set of social relations, symbols, or information rather than an automobile, mobile phone, or widget. Of course, as Sean Sayers convincingly argues, labour's primary product is never an automobile or a widget but rather a set of social relations.³⁸ Hardt and Negri claim that Marx's theory of 'formative' labour is outdated and unable to account for contemporary forms of work based on symbol manipulation and affect. But Sayers rightly notes that, for Marx, *all* labour is formative labour in that it produces materially grounded social relations. In the industrial economy, factory labour and domestic labour alike had to reproduce their own conditions of possibility by perpetuating the strict

spatial division of labour and the rationalization of time. Contemporary labour must reproduce the fusion of networked interconnectivity and precarious individualism that is the model for neoliberalism. A shift has occurred, but this is more of an organizational and rhetorical shift than a shift from material to immaterial products.

Ultimately, there is no such thing as a postindustrial society. Economies of the Global North continue to rely on manufacturing, even if much of that manufacturing now takes place in the Global South.³⁹ Increasingly common is a globally networked production chain in which parts of a single commodity are designed, produced, assembled, and marketed in far-flung locales. Sociologist and economist Pierre Veltz argues that France and other nations of the Global North have entered not a postindustrial society but a hyper-industrial one, 'characterised by the convergence between the industry of objects and the industry of relationships.'⁴⁰ According to Veltz, the distinction between manufacturing and services becomes increasingly outmoded as service logics infiltrate manufacturing and Fordist-Taylorist logics infiltrate the service industry. (Sayers would argue, based on his reading of Marx, that such a distinction between manufacturing and services was always illusory.) Even proponents of a shift from material to immaterial or affective labour acknowledge that one has not entirely replaced the other, suggesting instead that the self-employed artist has supplanted the unionized autoworker as the paradigmatic labourer of developed economies and that industrial work now demands affective tasks or qualities.⁴¹

Following Pierre Naville, Veltz observes that forms of labour (e.g. agricultural, artisanal, Fordist-Taylorist) do not cleanly succeed one another in a linear fashion; rather, they accumulate. Supposedly 'past' forms of labour persist long after they have ceased to define the dominant mode of production, and 'new' modes of production draw on pre-existing forms.⁴² This is the industrial sociologist's version of the relationship among emergent, dominant, and residual cultures.⁴³ The performance scholar recognizes this as repertoire: the recombination of existing elements to produce an intelligible new.⁴⁴ The production of the postindustrial occurs in a situation in which the relationship among – even the existence of – different forms of labour is fundamentally contested.

That contest plays out spatially in derelict and repurposed industrial sites, which lend material form to the dynamics of globalized capitalism. Redevelopment involves more than the rearrangement or renovation of the built environment. It entails remaking a space discursively – making it intelligible as something else – so as to encourage or discourage particular embodied activities. City officials and private developers might

represent disused factories, even entire working-class neighbourhoods, as blights or cancers, using medical rhetoric to foment public support for their invasive operations.⁴⁵ As physical renovations get underway, public and private partners might portray an area as reborn, renewed, rejuvenated, revitalized, reinvented, or even reclaimed. When a redevelopment project involves sites claimed or officially recognized as heritage, the structural, discursive, and embodied moves become more complicated. Architects and urban planners must identify what to preserve and how to preserve it, a process that also involves intervention by interest groups. In the cases addressed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 of this book, theatre companies and municipal governments alike insist that the converted factory buildings remain spaces of work and industry. This means that the sites must become intelligible as something else (cultural centres, theatres, public parks) while *remaining* intelligible as what they once were. This is why I argue that redevelopment and heritage projects cultivate a distinctly theatrical spatiality.

It has become commonplace to refer to such repurposed industrial sites – among many other spaces – as palimpsests. The metaphor is a textual one, from the Greek for ‘again rubbed smooth’: the page or slate bears traces of old writing, partially effaced, beneath more recent passages. Andreas Huyssen has expanded the concept to refer to the perceptible, material accumulation of a space’s past uses.⁴⁶ However, Doreen Massey argues that, by focusing on the historical accumulation of layers, the palimpsestic model of space fails to account for contemporary acts of erasure. ‘Palimpsest,’ she writes, ‘is too archaeological. In this story, the things that are missing (erased) from the map are somehow always things from “before.”’⁴⁷ Massey is concerned with what (or who) might get excluded or effaced in the *present*. But redevelopment projects might exclude people in the present precisely by relegating them *to* the past. If we describe repurposed spaces as palimpsests, we must not take this as the natural and inevitable accumulation of layers of use and meaning, but as active processes of effacing and overwriting through which living bodies and persistent practices are made intelligible as history. Embodied performances such as those discussed in this book can facilitate this process, hinder it, or do both at once.

Even if we are not happily and healthily postindustrial (and we are not), local governments and private developers might have a vested interest in presenting their communities as such, or suggesting that they will be at some point. Discourses of mourning and practices of memorialization are crucial to this endeavour. As Jackie Clarke observes, much memorial work is ‘predicated on the not unproblematic assumption that the industrial world is dead and gone.’⁴⁸ Clarke has documented how the

rhetoric surrounding individual plant closures laments the passing of a generalized way of life. But this 'language of class death ... does little to get to grips with the fact that the people who populated the old industrial order still exist. Indeed, one of the problems with this discourse is that in seeking to honour the past, it tends to present as complete and inevitable a process which is incomplete and historically contingent.'⁴⁹ Or, as Stéphane Bonnard insists in the epigraph to this book, 'the workers exist, are still here, even if at times one would like to make us believe that they have disappeared.' Nonetheless, the myth of the postindustrial society retains its power and can create problems for working-class and local identity.

If, as I claimed in the opening pages of this book, to produce postindustrial space is to recover from the trauma of deindustrialization, a preliminary step must be the construction of deindustrialization as a traumatic event in the first place. My point here is not to deny the real material and psychological consequences of deindustrialization and factory closure. My point, following Lauren Berlant, is that the language of trauma presents a crisis as exception rather than the rule (as *a* crisis, singular, manageable). Trauma discourse, Berlant argues, suggests that the historical present is 'the scene of an exception that has just shattered some ongoing, uneventful ordinary life that was supposed just to keep going on and with respect to which people felt solid and confident.'⁵⁰ In order for deindustrialization to be something from which a community might 'recover,' it must first be represented and experienced as a temporary wound, and not as the normal functioning of capitalism. (This becomes most apparent in Chapter 4, with the rhetoric surrounding the closure of the Nantes shipyards.) But, as Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott argue, deindustrialization is ongoing and forms part of the broader dynamic of capitalism; the most profound effect of the period of accelerated deindustrialization in the 1980s might be the revelation that the supposed stability of the Fordist compromise was illusory all along, a mere blip in the history of economics.⁵¹

The postindustrial must be produced, and I argue that it is produced performatively and theatrically. Performance, as never-for-the-first-time embodied practice that recombines existing strips of behaviour to produce something ostensibly new, is necessary to produce the postindustrial from obstinate industrial remains. It is the spatiality of theatre – its inherent doubleness – that facilitates the perception of industrial space both as what it is and what it is not (or not yet, or no longer). And it is the eventness of theatre – the thickness and dissonance of theatrical time – that enables the production of the postindustrial from within the process of deindustrialization.

This is not to say that the theatre companies discussed in this book *intend* to loosen the real or imagined constraints of industrial identity, or what David Byrne calls an ‘industrial structure of feeling.’⁵² I am concerned here more with effects and affects than with intentionality. Though I often refer in this book to theatre companies’ press packs, websites, and promotional materials, as well as to interviews with artistic directors, I treat these sources as components of the theatrical public sphere and thus as one way among others to approach the question of intelligibility. Even if we take such materials as statements of intent, or would-be performatives that establish horizons of expectation and frameworks for interpretation, there is never a guarantee that audiences will behave accordingly. Theatre companies and their performances act as part of uneasy, unstable, and unruly assemblages. Theatrical institutions and theatrical events might also do conflicting work: some of the events considered in this book make palpable the accumulation of forms of labour, their accretion, interpenetration, and recombination, even as the theatrical *institutions* are heralded as evidence of the tidy postindustrial transition that the events so clearly disprove.

Works ahead

The structure of this book mirrors the processes of deindustrialization and redevelopment. Though each chapter takes up different case studies, the overall trajectory of the work carries the reader from industrial ruins to (real or imagined) sustainable, postindustrial environments.

The first chapter is set in the urban landscape of the 1970s and 1980s, when artists were increasingly occupying industrial sites that had become derelict in the aftermath of the economic crisis. Bringing together street theatre historiography and performance analysis of two long-running, iconic productions – Théâtre de l’Unité’s *2CV Théâtre* (1977–97) and Générïk Vapeur’s *Bivouac* (1988–) – I explain why, in contemporary France, street theatre has emerged as working memory’s privileged artistic form. Ultimately, I argue that street theatre thrives in the remains of the modern industrial city because of its anxious relationship to a mythic urban ideal. The subsequent three chapters examine street theatre companies that, willingly or not, have become embedded within specific, ongoing redevelopment projects: Metalovoice in Corbigny (Chapter 2), KomplexKapharnaüm in Villeurbanne (Chapter 3), and La Machine in Nantes (Chapter 4). Each chapter explores a

distinct environment – rural town, sprawling industrial suburb, and regional city centre – and its respective industrial heritage, and proposes a model of how working memory operates. The final chapter considers installations by multimedia artist Fabrice Giraud and Compagnie Fer à Coudre, which invite audiences to imagine a fantastical, sustainable, postindustrial landscape, even as they question the purpose and value of human presence in that landscape. This concluding chapter serves as a capstone to the preceding exploration of performance, memory, work, and space.

This book is about street theatre as a form of work, its relation to other forms of work, and how the spatio-temporal practices of street theatre are called on to make those other forms of work intelligible as, and locatable within, history. By bringing to the fore questions of intelligibility and transmission, I adopt a historical and historiographic approach to contemporary material, the recent past and the not-yet-passed. Rather than focusing on street theatre's potential to make change, I am interested in street theatre's capacity to make *sense* of change, though I acknowledge that these two forms of making, these two kinds of change, are linked. In French, *sens* suggests both meaning and direction. By rendering an ongoing process intelligible as an event, street theatre simultaneously offers a sense of direction and the option of changing course. When I claim that street theatre produces the postindustrial, I do not simply mean that theatre companies are forces of gentrification (though they might be) or that street theatre has become part of the new urban ideal (though it has). I mean rather that street theatre creates a complex, fraught 'after but not over.' The necessity of theatre and performance – more specifically here, street theatre – to the production of the postindustrial means that street theatre companies benefit from and participate in redevelopment, but it also means that through street theatre the industrial might reassert itself in unanticipated ways.

Notes

- 1 Stéphane Bonnard, 'Quelle usine?' *Soie Mag*, no. 1 (December 2011): 6.
- 2 Susan E. Gathercole and Tracy Packiam Alloway, *Understanding Working Memory: A Classroom Guide* (London: Harcourt Assessment, 2007), 5. Prepared in affiliation with the Working Memory and Learning Research Group, Durham University.
- 3 Aleida Assmann, 'Canon and Archive,' in Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning (eds), *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 100.
- 4 *Ibid.*, 106.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 99.

- 6 The depiction of the archive as passive storage space is Assmann's, not my own. Rather, I side with (for instance) Alison Jeffers, Heike Roms, and Rebecca Schneider in conceptualizing the archive as the site of active, performative processes. See Alison Jeffers, 'Recollecting and Re-Collecting: The Ethical Challenges of Social Archiving in Post-Conflict Northern Ireland,' in Claire Cochrane and Jo Robinson (eds), *Theatre History and Historiography: Ethics, Evidence and Truth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 147–62; Heike Roms, 'Mind the Gaps: Evidencing Performance and Performing Evidence in Performance Art History,' in Claire Cochrane and Jo Robinson (eds), *Theatre History and Historiography: Ethics, Evidence and Truth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 163–81; and Rebecca Schneider, *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
- 7 See Jean Fourastié, *Les trente glorieuses, ou la révolution invisible de 1946 à 1975* (Paris: Fayard, 1979).
- 8 See Pierre Veltz, *La grande transition: la France dans le monde qui vient* (Paris: Seuil, 2008), 9–10; and Pierre Veltz, *Le nouveau monde industriel* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000), 7.
- 9 A 2008 study of French cultural practices showed that 62 per cent of French people over the age of 15 had attended a street performance at least once in their lives, compared to 58 per cent who had attended professional indoor theatre, 46 per cent who had attended amateur theatre, 32 per cent who had attended classical or modern dance, 29 per cent who had attended a rock concert, 24 per cent who had attended a classical music concert, and 23 per cent who had attended the opera. Of these respondents, 34 per cent had attended a street performance at some point in the last twelve months, compared to 21 per cent for amateur theatre, 19 per cent for professional indoor theatre, 8 per cent for classical or modern dance, 10 per cent for rock concerts, 7 per cent for classical music concerts, and 4 per cent for opera. The survey also revealed growing audiences for street theatre when compared to the previous study in 1997; other live art forms, by contrast, experienced stagnation or decline in audience numbers. Data available from Ministère de la Culture, 'Fréquentation des équipements culturels,' *Les pratiques culturelles des Français*, www.pratiquesculturelles.culture.gouv.fr/08resultat_chap7.php. For full results and analysis, see Olivier Donnat, *Les pratiques culturelles des Français à l'ère numérique: enquête 2008* (Paris: La Découverte, 2009). For a summary of the results pertaining to street theatre, see Anne Gonon, 'Les publics des spectacles de rue: exploitation de la base d'enquête du DEPS "Les pratiques culturelles des Français à l'ère du numérique – année 2008,"' *Repères DGCA* no. 6–10 (2012), www.culturecommunication.gouv.fr/Documentation/Documentation-scientifique-et-technique/Les-publics-des-spectacles-de-rue.
- 10 Lauren Berlant, *Cruel Optimism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 10.
- 11 Henri Lefebvre, *The Urban Revolution*, trans. Robert Bononno (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003 [1970]), 18.

- 12 Sylvie Clidière, 'Définition: Arts de la rue,' *Rue libre!*, last modified 2010, last accessed 3 August 2015, www.ruelibre.net/Definition,444.
- 13 There are far too many examples to cite them all. As an indicative sample, see 'Les arts de la rue envahissent la ville,' *Sud Ouest*, 25 May 2017; 'Les artistes envahissent gaiement la "Rue libre,"' *Le Parisien*, 29 October 2016; 'Les arts envahissent les rues,' *Presse Océan*, 28 August 2015; 'Les arts de la rue prennent Cheverny d'assaut,' *La Nouvelle République*, 11 August 2010; 'Les arts de la rue prennent d'assaut le centre-ville,' *La Voix du Nord*, 4 October 2009; 'Rue libre: les artistes occupent le bitume,' *Le Télégramme*, 28 October 2007; 'Les saltimbanques urbains occupent le terrain,' *Le Monde*, 24 July 2003; 'A Châtillon, les arts occupent la rue,' *La Tribune*, 29 September 2000.
- 14 Susan Haedicke, *Contemporary Street Arts in Europe: Aesthetics and Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 1.
- 15 Susan Bennett, 'Universal Experience: The City as Tourist Stage,' in Tracy C. Davis (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 76–90.
- 16 Nicholas Ridout discusses the importance of free time to publics and politics in *Passionate Amateurs: Theatre, Communism, and Love* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013). For an excellent analysis of the politics of free time, waiting, and busy-ness more generally, see Sarah Sharma, *In the Meantime: Temporality and Cultural Politics* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014).
- 17 Fiona Wilkie, 'Kinds of Place at Bore Place: Site-Specific Performance and the Rules of Spatial Behaviour,' *New Theatre Quarterly* 18.3 (2002): 250.
- 18 Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London: Sage, 2005).
- 19 See, for instance, Floriane Gaber, *Quarante ans d'arts de la rue* (Paris: Editions ici et là, 2009); Anne Gonon, *In Vivo: les figures du spectateur des arts de la rue* (Paris: Editions l'Entretemps, 2011); Haedicke, *Contemporary Street Arts in Europe*; and any number of materials published by the National Federation of Street Arts, *HorsLesMurs*.
- 20 Quoted in Philippe du Vignal, 'Les artistes catalyseurs de rencontres,' *Rue de la Folie* no. 8 (2000): 30.
- 21 Shannon Jackson, *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 16.
- 22 Christopher B. Balme, *The Theatrical Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 63.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 48–9.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 48.
- 25 Marvin Carlson remains the leading figure to discuss theatrical audiences' spatial perception. See Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003); and Marvin Carlson, 'Space and Theatre History,' in Charlotte M. Canning and Thomas Postlewait (eds), *Representing the Past: Essays in Performance Historiography* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2010), 195–214.

- 26 Haedicke observes something similar with regard to the spatiality of street theatre, but she places it in direct opposition to the spatiality of indoor theatre. She claims that, during street performances, ‘fiction does not work in opposition to reality; rather the *imaginary* re-frames, re-interprets, confuses, subverts, or challenges notions of the *real*. [...] [Street theatre] frames the public space and the everyday with art.’ Haedicke, *Contemporary Street Arts in Europe*, 1. I contend that street theatre’s intermingling of spatial repertoires has more in common with the proscenium stage than even street theatre practitioners might like to admit. I take up these issues in more detail in Chapter 1.
- 27 Matthew Wagner, *Shakespeare, Theatre, and Time* (London: Routledge, 2012); Tracy C. Davis, ‘Performative Time,’ in Charlotte M. Canning and Thomas Postlewait (eds), *Representing the Past: Essays in Performance Historiography* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2010), 142–67.
- 28 Wagner, *Shakespeare, Theatre, and Time*, 32–3.
- 29 Hayden White, *The Practical Past* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2014), 53.
- 30 Alain Badiou, *Rhapsody for the Theatre* (London: Verso, 2013 [1998]), 102.
- 31 Berlant, *Cruel Optimism*, 5.
- 32 Arthur J. Pentz, *Old Worlds for New: A Study of the Post-Industrial State* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1917), digitized by University of Toronto, accessed 3 August 2015, <https://archive.org/details/oldworldsfornews00pent>.
- 33 See, for instance, André Gorz, *Capitalism, Socialism, Ecology*, trans. Martin Chalmers (London: Verso, 2012 [1991]).
- 34 Daniel Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting* (New York: Basic Books, 2008 [1973]).
- 35 Alain Touraine, *La société post-industrielle: naissance d’une société* (Paris: Denoël, 1969).
- 36 For an overview of feminist approaches to affective labour, see Monique Lanoix, ‘Labor as Embodied Practice: The Lessons of Care Work,’ *Hypatia* 28.1 (2013): 85–100.
- 37 See Michael Hardt, ‘Affective Labor,’ *boundary* 26.2 (1999): 89–100; Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, ‘The Rod of the Forest Warden: A Response to Timothy Brennan,’ *Critical Inquiry* 29.2 (2003): 368–73.
- 38 Sean Sayers, ‘The Concept of Labor: Marx and His Critics,’ *Science & Society* 71.4 (2007): 431–54.
- 39 See Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989).
- 40 Veltz, *La grande transition*, 148.
- 41 Hardt and Negri, ‘The Rod of the Forest Warden: A Response to Timothy Brennan.’
- 42 Veltz, *Le nouveau monde industriel*, 41–2.
- 43 Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 121–7.

- 44 Diana Taylor conceives repertoire as a mode of knowing residing exclusively in the artist and requiring a clear act of transfer; she privileges the embodied over the discursive, relegating the discursive primarily to the realm of the archive (though both archive and repertoire are systems of knowing and *not* delineated spaces). Taylor is primarily interested in how individual elders or masters (e.g. oral storytellers or ballet masters and mistresses) act as embodied repositories of cultural knowledge. By contrast, following Tracy C. Davis, I define repertoires as ‘multiple circulating recombinative discourses of intelligibility.’ Repertoire for Davis is the unspoken and taken-for-granted fount of knowledge that allows us to process and comprehend new events or performances based on past experience. Repertoires reside (in potential) in both artists and audiences, who articulate, reconstitute, and exchange them, bilaterally and multiply, in performance. Davis’ conception of repertoire accounts for the complex relationship between the residual and the emergent, and is thus of particular import for understanding the intelligibility of repurposed spaces. Taylor’s conception of repertoire falls short in this regard. Taylor would require a direct act of transfer from factory worker to theatre artist and would be less interested in how visitors to a converted site understood and derived meaning from it. Taylor’s understanding of repertoire remains relevant to my argument, however, because theatre companies, developers, and municipal governments might have a vested interest in claiming a direct act of transfer from factory worker to theatre worker (see Chapter 4). Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); Tracy C. Davis, ‘Nineteenth-Century Repertoire,’ *Nineteenth Century Theatre and Film* 36.2 (2009): 7.
- 45 For in-depth analysis and critique of such processes, see Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995). See also Grant Kester, *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).
- 46 Andreas Huyssen, *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003).
- 47 Massey, *For Space*, 110.
- 48 Jackie Clarke, ‘Closing Moulinex: Thoughts on the Visibility and Invisibility of Industrial Labour in Contemporary France,’ *Modern & Contemporary France* 19.4 (2011): 449.
- 49 *Ibid.*
- 50 Berlant, *Cruel Optimism*, 10.
- 51 Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott, eds, *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization* (Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 2003).
- 52 David Byrne, ‘Industrial Culture in a Post-Industrial World: The Case of the North East of England,’ *City* 6.3 (2002): 280.