

Sunday November 15, 2015

Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal / Revue d'etudes sur les femmes Evaristus 231, Mount Saint Vincent University Halifax NS, B3M 2J6, Canada

Dear Ardra Cole, Krista Montelpare, Annalee Lepp and Ann Braithwaite,

I would like to sincerely thank the reviewers for talking the time to evaluate "Affecting Art and Theory." I agree with many of their insightful suggestions and feel they strengthen the quality of the manuscript. This letter will chronologically outline the revisions I made to the article while addressing specific reviewer comments and concerns.

As was suggested by one of the reviewers, I removed some of the theoretical content from the introduction and expanded the personal narrative. This, I feel, makes the introduction more compelling. I also improved the introduction by clarifying my purpose for each of the three article sections and cleaning up my use of presentation, performance and performativity. I define performativity in relation to the standard academic presentation in the introduction and use all three terms more consistently throughout the manuscript.

I agree that there was a slippage in the article between my use of academic presentation, academic text and academic legitimacy. I have addressed this concern in the section "The Limitations of the Traditional Academic Presentation," and elsewhere in the manuscript, by clearly flagging when I switch focus. Another important revision made in this section concerns my introduction of Gloria Anzaldua. As was suggested by a reviewer, her text *Borderlands / La Frontera* provides an excellent example of a well-known feminist work that connects content with form. By including this discussion, and removing Adrienne Rich and Andrea Dworkin, I was able to keep my consideration of Ann Cvetkovich by contextualizing her work as a more recent example of feminist writing that challenges what I am calling the standard or traditional academic form. Additionally, I expand on how marginalizing affect in the standard academic form aligns with the imperatives of the neoliberal university.

In "Feminist Performance Art and Affective Transformation" I begin by taking up a reviewer concern that it is important to be cautious when drawing distinctions between academic and artistic work. While both genres can serve the interests of creation and production, I propose that the unique properties of performance art make it less inclined to be production-oriented. I also take up the suggestion to include a more sustained discussion of how my Congress presentation was received by my audience. Here, I proffer that it was most likely the feminist character of my audience that enabled me to give an unconventional presentation in a academic forum in the first place. Lastly, I added brief mention that the institutionalization of feminist scholarship risks compromising the exploration of unconventional form.



I am grateful for the suggestion to include the work of Natalie Loveless and a discussion of research-creation. This is now how I begin the section "Practicing Performative Academic Feminist Theory." I also take up the reviewer suggestion to provide more explanation of my Congress presentation. Instead of discussing my Eucuentro presentation and Nietzsche's work on the relationship between art and theory, I concentrate instead on my body-based gestures. By doing so, I am able to clarify my argument concerning the embodied character of immaterial labour practices.

A final revision that deserves notice is the change I made to the manuscript's sub-title. The title is now "Affecting Art and Theory: The Politics of Shame and Creative Academic Performance" rather than "Shame, Pride and Creative Academic Performance." I feel this new title provides a more accurate representation of the article's content.

Again, I thank the reviewers for their thoughtful consideration of my manuscript. It is my hope that the changes I have made meet the expectations of *Atlantis*.

Sincerely,

Jessica Joy Cameron