The past decade has seen an unprecedented critical and artistic re-examination of the 1960s project of so-called “expanded cinema.” Triggered by present-day mutations in media technology and spectacle culture, artists and practitioners in a variety of media have gradually re-engaged with various intermedia, performance-based and projection-based practices, and helped propel this historical retrieval. As the organizers of the conference “Expanded Cinema: Activating the Space of Reception,” held at the Tate Modern, recently proposed: “Coined in the mid-1960s by Stan VanDerBeek, but with its origins in the experiments of early twentieth century avant-garde filmmaking, media-technologies and performance art, the term Expanded Cinema identifies a film and video practice which activates the live context of watching, transforming cinema's historical and cultural ‘architectures of reception’ into sites of cinematic experience that are heterogeneous, performative and non-determined.”[1]

In the United States—or more specifically, in New York City—one of the primary contexts for the emergence of “expanded cinema” was *dance*, in particular, the reconfigured forms of movement and the staging of movement generated by choreographers associated with what has come to be called “Judson Dance Theater.” While this context has been remarked on, particularly in relation to the work of Yvonne Rainer, who quite famously made the transition from dance in the 1960s to film in the 1970s (and now, in the past decade, back to dance), the larger stakes or consequences of this have remained largely unexamined. In what follows, I will tease out a handful of issues, related to an ongoing body of research.

This historical intersection between experimental dance and multimedia practice in the mid- to late-1960s allows us to differentiate nascent models of the relationship between the body and the screen. In emerging practices of expanded cinema, the entry into dance or theater allowed aspects of the cinematic apparatus to be broken down, disaggregated and recombined, opening an apparently closed and codified medium to the unpredictability and indeterminacy of live performance. Most frequently, the juxtaposition of multiple projections, of moving bodies and projection, of images and lights and shadows, had at its aims the creation of a phantasmagoria, generating a dreamlike space of dissolving and overlapping impressions in which reality and illusion interpenetrate and blur together. By contrasting selected works by two choreographers affiliated with Judson Dance—Trisha Brown and Yvonne Rainer—with better-known projects by VanDerBeek and Robert Whitman, we can tease out an immanent tension between a more analytic or Brechtian impulse that used dance to stage cinema as a physical, corporeal, almost sculptural element, and a more immersive or oneiric impulse that sought to place the bodily performance within—or in relation to—the illusionistic space of cinema. As Branden W. Joseph has argued, "Central to the emerging definition of expanded cinema was the interaction between performers and their images," often premised on the ambiguity and confusion of image and reality.[2] The often far drier and disjunctive uses of projection in Judson Dance offer a counter-model to this more dominant aesthetic.

For European audiences, the critical and historical context of "Judson Dance" may be unfamiliar. Never an official group or movement, Judson Dance was a loose collective of friends who performed at the Judson Memorial Church from 1962 to 1964: the dancers Trisha Brown, Judith

Dunn, Deborah Hay, Fred Herko, Steve Paxton, Yvonne Rainer, and Joseph Schlicter, and also, quite crucially, visual artists like Robert Morris, Robert Rauschenberg, and Carolee Schneemann, as well as composers Philip Corner and John Herbert MacDowell. It was a moment that transformed American dance and—in various all-too-codified accounts—propelled its transition from the classic "Modern Dance" of Martha Graham, Louis Horst, et al to a new practice of so-called "postmodern dance" that rejected personal expressivity and mythic and literary themes for a new embrace of everyday movement, nonprofessional dancers, and rule-based and aleatory methods of composition drawn partly from the experimental music of John Cage and others. It was also an exemplar of the new interdisciplinary and experimental models of art practice that emerged in New York City and elsewhere in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

The initial group emerged out of the weekly workshops given, in 1960 and 1961, by Merce Cunningham's accompanist Robert Dunn, at Cunningham's 14th Street studio (and some of the Judson figures danced with Cunningham or took classes with him). Dunn himself had participated in Cage's Experimental Composition class at the New School in 1957-1959, and sought to translate some of Cage's methods to other art forms. In the class, Dunn had dancers "make pieces," often by working with scores by Cage and Erik Satie. As dance historian Sally Banes has reconstructed, quoting Dunn: "These chance and indeterminate structures were given to the dancers not as musical forms but as *time structures*, 'derived from and applicable to all the arts or future arts which might take place in time.'"[3]

While the radicality of Judson Dance is frequently understood in relation to this larger arc of postwar avant-garde practices, the political and countercultural reputation of the venue also

shaped the perception of these choreographic experiments. Located near New York University in New York's then bohemian Greenwich Village, Judson Memorial Church, under the direction of the Reverend Al Carmines, was, by the early 1960s, a radical venture, engaged in draft counseling and countercultural causes, from civil rights and abortion rights to free speech (and its loft was also host to the Judson Poet's Theater, featuring works by Jackson Mac Low, Diane Wakowski, and others).[4]

Most typically, Judson Dance has become associated with an embrace of "everyday movement" and task structures, and a rejection of virtuosity, grandeur and conventional narrative and symbolic devices. Judson concerts frequently employed a mix of dancers and non-dancers, and prosaic, even awkward "everyday" movements from walking and running across a stage to moving heavy objects. Thus, while founded in workshops at Merce Cunningham's studio, Judson dance crucially rebelled against the virtuosity, classicism and control of Cunningham—to introduce more overtly Cagean, and later Minimalist, elements into dance and performance practice. Particularly in Rainer's hands, this new dance embraced the quotidian and a certain rougher, more direct physicality. In a 1972 interview, she recalled "trying to find an alternative to … narcissism, virtuosity and display. It lead me more toward making dance that was involved with task, work, rather than with exhibition."[5] And Trisha Brown vividly notes, "At Judson, the performers looked at each other and the audience, they breathed audibly, ran out of breath, sweated, talked things over. They began behaving more like human beings, revealing what was thought of as deficiencies as well as their skills."[6]

In Rainer's account, "The first *Concert of Dance* turned out to be a three-hour marathon for a capacity audience of about 300 sitting from beginning to end in the un-air-conditioned 90-degree heat."[7] This event has long since become myth, narrated in critic Jill Johnston's celebrated *Village Voice* reviews and subsequent critical and scholarly accounts. We tend to forget, however, that the first concert *started with a film*. In dance historian Sally Banes' detailed reconstruction of the event, the composer John Herbert McDowell recalled:

> "[The film] was Bob Dunn's doing and was beautiful. The dance concert was announced to start at 8:30. The audience was admitted at 8:15 and they went upstairs to the sanctuary to find that in order to get to their seats they had to walk across a movie that was going on. It was embarrassing and Bob's whole point was to discombobulate them … The film consisted of some chance-edited footage by Elaine [Summers] and test footage that I made, all of which was blue-y, and WC Fields in *The Bank Dick* … The last sequence in the film was the final chase scene from *The Bank Dick*. And then there was a marvelous segue from between the unexpected film and the dance. The first dance, which was by Ruth Emerson, started on the dot at 8:30. As the movie was just about to go off, the six or seven people came out, the movie sort of dissolved into the dance, and as the stage lights came up the dancers were already on stage and the dance had already started."[8]

Allen Hughes of the *New York Times* described it as a "moving picture assemblage," and noted: "The overture was, perhaps, the key to the success of the evening, for through its random

juxtaposition of unrelated subjects – children playing, trucks parked under the West Side Highway, Mr. Fields and so on – the audience was quickly transported out of the every-day world where events are supposed to be governed by logic, even if they are not."[9]

What does such a use of film suggest about the medium's place in "Judson Dance"? Not only was the projected film a discontinuous assemblage of fragments, but it was used, in effect, as a barrier, an obstacle. The concert employed film as a device to discombobulate the audience and denaturalize the dance performance. Projected in such a way, the unexpected short film framed and commented on the conditions of viewing embedded in dance, and implicitly contrasted them with cinematic spectatorship. This relationship is indeed crucial. As Carrie Lambert-Beatty's recent texts on Yvonne Rainer have argued, Rainer's 1960s dances insistently incorporated filmic structures—stills, repetition, looped structures, and split-screen presentations—into live performance, as well as basing movements on photographs and filmic sequences—in effect making her dance works mediations on the conditions of spectatorship between liveness and recording.[10]

Lambert-Beatty has focused on what this insistent filmic and photographic mediation means for dance, and for performance more broadly, in the 1960s at a moment at the cusp of a wider culture of insistent mediation. I want to ask, instead, what this siting in dance means *for film* – more specifically, for the various performance-based and more-or-less multi-media activities that came to be termed "expanded cinema." While critical accounts have emphasized the spectacular and immersive dimensions of such multimedia performances, the Judson works used film-based strategies quite differently, to foreground the distance between performer and viewer, to

juxtapose projected and live performance elements in ways that allowed them to comment on one another, and to displace narrative conventions without entirely abandoning them.

To set up a provisional differentiation, let us contrast the Judson uses of film with one of the most celebrated instances of multi-screen and multi-media practice affiliated with dance—the 1965 performance of *Variations V* by the Merce Cunningham Dance Theater. The event represented a hit parade of New York's interdisciplinary avant-garde, and a highly celebrated, if ultimately quite problematic, landmark in indeterminate and interactive performance. Built around Cage's experimental electronic composition, which had been commissioned for the New York Philharmonic's French-American Festival, *Variations V* famously incorporated technology that allowed the dancers' movement to trigger lights and electronic and recorded sounds. Developed with assistance from engineers Billy Klüver and Cecil Coker, the technical system was operated by Cage, David Tudor and Gordon Mumma. The multimedia artist Stan VanDerBeek provided set design, screening films (including found footage and distorted TV images by Nam June Paik) onto a series of projection screens placed behind the dancers.

In all its multi-screen cacophony, the work is a landmark of an emerging multimedia practice.[11] In a fairly typical account, the critic Calvin Tomkins described Cunningham's use of other media as a collage-like practice: "Movement, music, and décor coexist in the same stage space and same performance time … The result? Not a melding of these elements into a unified spectacle, not that at all. It is closer in feeling to collage, in which disparate elements are brought together without becoming fused."[12] And more recently, the art historian Gloria Sutton has discussed how *Variations V* mobilized "the body as the screen, interrupting the registration of the images during

projection," and indeed, available photographic and videotaped documentation present a resonant visual collage created by the interplay of live and projected elements.

Yet the utopian Cagean ethos of "interpenetration without obstruction" did not always work so well. In her recent autobiography, former Cunningham dancer Carolyn Brown described the work more derisively as "a three-ring circus, all rings vying for the attention of the audience," and protested that, unlike the constant breakdown of the electronic music gadgetry, "the visual components of *Variations V* worked beautifully, and indeed stole the show. The huge multiple images on the screen dwarfed us. We felt superfluous at best."[13] Not surprisingly, the work quickly dropped out the company's repertoire, ostensibly because the technology made it impractical for touring, but more deeply because Cunningham's work never truly embraced Cagean strategies of chance-generation and indeterminacy, nor engaged with filmic structures as anything more than another form of "décor." The project however was crucial to VanDerBeek's own emerging practice of multi-screen projections and projection performances, which would move away from dance to experiment with different ways to fragment, multiply and metaphorically and literally mobilize filmic spectatorship.

An almost diametrically opposed intersection of dance and film can be found in choreographer Trisha Brown's spare solo dance, *Home-Made* (1966). Brown is perhaps best known for her early "rule-game" constructions, and 1970s' works that seem to defying gravity, as dancers moved across rooftops and walls, and in one famous instance, down the side of a building—as well as her series of "accumulations" that break down and repeat a simple movement in a wavelike and almost filmic repetition. *Home-Made* was one of a string of three individual

dances—*Motor*, *Homemade*, *Inside*—that made up the dance, A *String* (1966), and that began to establish Brown's unique approach to performed movement. In her retrospective account, Brown describes the solo as kind of memory piece:

> "I used my memory as a score, I gave myself the instruction to enact and distill a series of meaningful memories, preferably those that impact on identity. Each memory-unit is 'lived,' not performed, and the series put together without transitions that are likely to slur the beginnings and ends of each discrete unit. The dance incorporates a film by Robert Whitman. A projector is mounted on the back of the performer and the film of the dance is projected onto the wall, floor, ceiling and audience in synchronization with the 'live' dance."[14]

The dance is about three minutes, and it premiered at Judson Memorial Church in March, 1966 (an earlier version, which did not incorporate film, was performed at the First New York Theater Rally in May 1965). As preserved in the 1996 reconstruction, Brown's careful bodily recreation of memory-acts is nearly eclipsed by the strange spectacle of the projector strapped to her back, and the dizzying experience of simultaneously trying to watch her and watch the projection that haphazardly seems to fly about the room.[15] The apparent self-reflexive structure, of a filmed action reduplicating a real performance or object, recalls Whitman's own 1963-64 *Cinema Pieces*, like the sculpture *Shower* (1964), which projects film of a nude woman showering onto the translucent curtain of a physically constructed shower, creating a visual and conceptual puzzle for viewers. Yet rather than focusing on the synchronization between live and filmed movements, what one experiences watching *Home-Made* is the irreconcilable disparity between

these two registers, as Brown's bodily movements perpetually throws the projected image out of bounds. As the critic Klaus Kertess observes, "Occasionally, the tiny image stays briefly on the drop at the back of the stage, dancing away in the other world of the film, most memorably when the live Ms. Brown simply turns and nods her head without moving the rest of her body. But for the most part, the image is a doppelganger in witty, delirious flight, careening about the stage and out over the heads of the audience when Ms. Brown turns her back."[16]

This volatilizing of the filmed body provides a link to some of Brown's subsequent experiments with gravity and verticality. Sally Banes describes Brown as "metaphorically setting herself in flight," and notes that, "in the last performance, a second performer followed with a movie screen to catch the image as the actions of the dance cast the picture all over the room."[17] If for Brown cinema provides a permission to use of walls as performance spaces, for other media artists, the relation is reciprocal—as this desire to mobilize cinema, to put film projection into literal motion, is echoed in late 1960s projects, like VanDerBeek's presentation of *Poemfields* at the *Cross Talk Intermedia* Festival in Tokyo in 1969, where he mounted projectors on multiple rolling carts, to be noisily pushed across the plywood floor and chased by moving screens.

Although unlike Rainer, the relation between the live performance and recorded image never becomes a generative structure in Brown's work, she intermittently used filmic and slide projections throughout the late 1960s. For instance, *Planes* (1968) employed an 18 x13-foot wall that operated as both a projection screen and a complex prop that allowed dancers to seemingly defy gravity. As Brown notes, "Three performers traverse the wall in slow motion, giving the illusion of falling through space."[18] In this multidisciplinary, far more spectacular work, "Jud

Yalkut's aerial film of New York was projected onto a wall that contained concealed hand- and foot-holds for the dancers. The dancers moved across the wall and sometimes revolved slowly upside down as the film played, appearing to fly through the city … as if … [to] free from gravity within this filmic space."[19] The dancers wore jumpsuit costumes that were white on one side, black on the other: "When the white side was shown to the audience, the dancer disappeared into the light play of the projection; when the black side surfaced, the dancer reappeared as a moving shadow."[20]

This projection of footage onto moving bodies, and the resultant confusion between live and projected action, is far more closely allied with the mid-1960s performances of Robert Whitman, which assembled projected film, light, live performers, props and sound in complex theater works—most notably projecting filmed footage onto performers who at times struggle to synchronize themselves to their recorded selves. First performed at the 1965 Expanded Cinema Festival, *Prune Flat* is perhaps the most poetic and most extreme instance of this. In a 1966 interview with Richard Kostelanetz, Whitman recalled how the work was generated by the unusually shallow space of the Film-Makers Cinematheque on 42nd Street: "I got interested in the idea of a proscenium stage because of its very peculiar arbitrary nature."[21] The very flatness of what was to be the performance space made the piece "about movies" and about the illusionism inherent to cinema: "I got involved with certain flatnesses – with certain movie ideas, in the way that I think about movies. Movies are fantasies. They do things to the space. They flatten it out. When you project on people, you flatten them out. People who have a movie projected on them are like Jolly Jump-Ups. They can disappear and reappear."[22]

While Whitman periodically lays claim to a more self-reflexive discourse of medium specificity—“it opens with a picture of a movie-projector. That’s the first image. I use it as a reference point – to tell people that this is a movie”[23]—viewing *Prune Flat* instead produces a vertiginous, almost hallucinatory confusion among registers, where the lines between live action and filmed representation are seductively collapsed. The seemingly-magically appearing and disappearing performers become as fantastic as those in a Melies film. Lynne Cooke proposes that “To distill an oneiric, physical world that embraces the illusory alongside the actual, Whitman uses a variety of projected forms – ranging from cast shadows to slides and film – that mimic, echo or presage physical counterparts, makeshift props, and improvised antics.”[24] In *Prune Flat*, the projected film creates the space in which all the action of the performance takes places: “on account of its subordination of the dramatic to the cinematic, it signals a radical reorientation: The image dominates the actual; the representational governs the phenomenal.”[25]

The very fascination of the work is the constant, and constantly shifting, oscillation that occurs—heightened by interruptions like the ultraviolet light that flashes later in the performance: “The ultra-violet light changes the space in a different way. It keeps the people flat, but it makes them come away from the screen a little bit. It also defines them in terms other than the movies being projected on them. It takes them out of the movie. They are not part of the background images any more…. It washes out the movie on them. It also makes them strange and fantastic.”[26]

In an interview recorded during the 2003 restaging of several of his work sat the Dia Art Foundation, Whitman recalled how “it seemed natural to use a person as a surface.”[27] This doubling of the live and the projected produces a complex temporal relation, between past and

present, recorded and real time, but also a host of spatial and kinetic ambiguities that leave the viewer perpetually unmoored by the strange split attention created and the apparent unreadability of the image.

Although deeply steeped in the emerging multimedia culture of Happenings and Expanded Cinema, Yvonne Rainer's filmic model is very different: it lies far closer to *montage*, to the setting up of relations between discrete part that generate suggestive but indeterminate narrative and critical resonances.[28] Almost since she started making dances, Rainer had accompanied them with live speech, audiotapes of recorded speech and recorded music, and, increasingly, projected slides featuring text as well as images. By 1966 or 1967, she also began incorporating short projected films into her increasingly multimedia "décor"—for instance, in *Volleyball* (1967), the short 16mmfilm short by Bud Wirtschafter, that Rainer projected as part of her 1968 concert *The Mind is a Muscle*. In the second-to-the-last section of the six-part work, a group of dancers perform partly behind a large hanging screen, which featured Rainer's tennis-shoe-clad feet and shins gently kicking a volleyball into a corner. In a 1976 interview, Rainer suggested that "the early films were mostly about physical, athletic, dance situations. They were about juxtaposing ideas about scale—like a huge projection of legs from the knee down on a screen under which you could see normal sized legs of people who came and went, who were dancing behind the screen."[29]

By juxtaposing a gigantic projected figure in front of the dancers, the film forced viewers to watch the bodies in movement by looking under and around the screen. Recalling the 1962 Judson *Concert of Dance*, Rainer used film as an obstacle, literally "blocking" of the dancers by

the screen. Quite importantly, unlike Whitman, VanDerBeek or Brown, Rainer rarely if ever projects film or images onto a body, but always onto a screen or prop that functions as a screen—"screen space" and live "bodies in motion" are placed in relation, but never merged into one another.[30]

The gradual incorporation of projected films and still images into Rainer's increasingly multimedia concerts worked via a montage principle – but it is a *spatial* montage, one that allows viewers to hold multiple elements in view at the same time, to focus on the edges and joins between them. It operates via a principle of contrast, not synaesthesia or bombardment. This spatial montage between live and projected elements intensified in Rainer's multi-media or transitional works of roughly 1969-1971. She notes how, in these works, "materials ranging from task through expressive dance through gymnastics to film were simply 'distributed' over a period of time. Material with specifically emotional 'content' was rarely differentiated in treatment from anything else. In this way I could fully presume to deal with all material as equivalent, fully accepting the consequence that certain things would 'pop out' of context in ways very unpredictable for an audience."[31]

While one might propose any number of cinematic models for Rainer's disjunctive spatial montage, her rarely-cited 1967 essay "Don't Give the Game Away" provides an unexpected source or inspiration: Andy Warhol. Indeed, her description of *Chelsea Girls* (1966) in a way reads like a game book for much of her own work. Besides the notion of "characters" as a sort of game- or rule-strategy (made poignant by lapses), she focuses in on "the dual-screen device with its constantly changing inside edge":

> "I began to watch on second viewing the inside edge rather than one screen or the other. Nico's child's head next to the looming Ondine; the moody purplish nervous detail of the Malanga scene next to a corner of the loaded static bed. The inside edge delineates another story, another interaction of characters, and more than any other part of the frame contains the condensed imagery, emphasizing how the image mashes up against the edge and is restrained from spilling out. This is a familiar concept in painting, if somewhat unfashionable in that area at the moment. To see it visualized to such an extreme in cinema is a new experience."[32]

In his own unorthodox way, Warhol collages Cagean compositional techniques with the most melodramatic, even sensational content, working with pre-made materials, but generating indeterminacy. For Rainer, perhaps, he provides not only a structural template but a permission to break with the prohibitions on content (personal, sexual, subjective) that had codified in post-Cagean 1960s art practice. Rainer would perhaps use such strategies most scandalously in the final performance of her 1969 *Rose Fractions*, at the Billy Rose Theater, in which she juxtaposed her dance collage with a Lenny Bruce monologue, placing *Trio Film* (a deadpan short featuring Steve Paxton and Becky Arnold performing nude) on one side, and a 1940 "blue movie" borrowed from Steve Paxton on the other. Rainer describes the program from the spectator's point of view:

> "To the right of the proscenium arch is a film or two nude figures—Steve and Becky – executing simple maneuvers with a large white balloon in a white living

> room (in Virginia Dwan's Dakota apartment) furnished with two white sofas and a rug. To the left … is a projection of a heterosexual 'blue movie' – a scratchy print, probably shot in the 1940s – that looks 'dirty' in every sense, down to the man's dirty fingernails … The porn film played until a hysterical house manager ran backstage and ordered it turned off."[33]

The purpose of the juxtaposition was, in this case, overtly political: "If only for a few minutes duration, the audience would be exposed to these contrasting functions and representations that, when seen together, might turn the notion of obscenity on its head. Secretion, movement, nudity and play, from the everyday to the contrived and hilarious. In this context the moving ribcages became as 'obscene' as the pornographic display, the porn as funny as the *Snot* recitation."[34]

Perhaps all-too-neatly, we can see how the effect of multi-media collage in Rainer's hands was not synaesthesia and immersion, but shock and cultural commentary. Yet this moment—for her, but also for much New York-based 1960s avant-garde practice—was transitional. By the summer of 1971, Rainer would write: "I'm no longer interested in mixed-media. Either you make a movie or you don't make a movie. I didn't make movies: I made filmed choreographic exercises that were meant to be viewed with one's peripheral vision …. My movies were an extension of my concern with the body and the body in motion."[35] And by 1972-1973, Rainer would begin assembling her diverse performance experiments into long complicated films that in a sense "recontained" the entire array of aesthetic possibilities—live performance, still images, moving images, printed text, recorded sound, speech—into cinema as the exemplary hybrid medium. No longer expanded cinema, but perhaps cinema expanded.

[1] Organized by Duncan White and David Curtis, the conference took place in April, 2009. http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/eventseducation/symposia/18016.htm . Historically, Gene Youngblood's well-disseminated model of "expanded cinema" as a form of expanded consciousness and of quasi-synaesthetic media subjectivity has tended to efface the many other models operative during the 1960s and 1970s. The Austrian artist Valie Export, for instance, defines it as "The expansion of the commonplace form of film on the open stage or within a space, through which the commercial-conventional sequence of filmmaking – shooting, editing (montage), and projection – is broken up." Valie Export, "Expanded Cinema as Expanded Reality" in *Senses of Cinema* (2003) http://archive.sensesofcinema.com/contents/03/28/expanded_cinema.html

[2] Branden W. Joseph, "Plastic Empathy: The Ghost of Robert Whitman," *Grey Room* 25 (Fall 2006) p. 65.

[3] Sally Banes, *Democracy's Body: Judson Dance Theater, 1962-1964* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993) p. 3. See also Sally Banes, *Terpsichore in Sneakers: Post-Modern Dance* (Middletown CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1987).

[4] See Banes, *Democracy's Body*.

[5] Liza Bear and Willoughby Sharp, "The Performer as a Persona: Interview with Yvonne Rainer," *Avalanche*, no. 5 (Summer 1972) p. xx.

[6] "Trisha Brown, An Interview," in Anne Livet, ed., *Contemporary Dance* (New York: Abbeville, 1978) p. 48. Not surprisingly, Judson Dance has often been, perhaps not exactly *elided* into a certain art history, but situated or read in relation to it, as in Rainer's famous or infamous 1966 essay, "A Quasi Survey of Some 'Minimalist' Tendencies in the Quantitatively Minimal Dance Activity Midst the Plethora, or An Analysis of Trio A," where she proposed: "Just as Donald Judd's 'specific objects' and Robert Morris's 'unitary' forms had replaced illusionism with nonreferential forms and monumentality with human scale, so postmodern dance would replace fictional characters and technical virtuosity with 'neutral doing,' task-like activity, and human – rather than heroic – scale." In Gregory Battcock, ed., *Minimal Art* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968) p xx.

[7] Yvonne Rainer, *Feelings Are Facts: A Life* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007) p. 222.

[8] Cited in Banes, *Democracy's Body*, p. 40.

[9] Cited in Banes, *Democracy's Body*, p. 41.

[10] See Carrie Lambert-Beatty, "Moving Still: Mediating Yvonne Rainer's 'Trio A," *October* 89 (Summer, 1999), pp. 87-112; "Other Solutions," *Art Journal* vol. 63, no. 3 (Autumn, 2004), pp. 48-61; and *Being Watched: Yvonne Rainer and the 1960s* (MIT Press, 2008).

[11] Gloria Sutton notes that in addition to some of VanderBeek's films and Paik's videos, the found footage used included the film *Born Yesterday* (1950) and excerpts from commercials for coffee and Pan Am and a TV cartoon); email to the author, April, 2009. Also see her essay, "Stan VanDerBeek's Movie-Drome: Networking the Subject," in Jeffery Shaw and Peter Weibel, eds., *Future Cinema: The Cinematic Imaginary after Film* (MIT Press and ZKM/Center for Art and Media, 2003), and recently completed dissertation, "The Experience Machine: Stan VanDerBeek and Immersive Subjectivity in Expanded Cinema Practices of the 1960s" (UCLA, 2009).

[12] James Klosty, ed., *Merce Cunningham* (New York: Limelight Editions, 1975/1986) p. 45.

[13] Carolyn Brown, *Chance and Circumstance: Twenty Years with Cage and Cunningham* (New York: Knopf, 2007), p. 459.

[14] Trisha Brown, Undated Choreographers Notes, in Herbert Teicher, ed., *Trisha Brown: Dance and Art in Dialogue, 1961-2001* (Andover, MA: Addison Gallery of American Art, 2002) p. 301.
[15] See the 2-DVD set, *Trish Brown, Early Works 1966-1979* (Artpix, 2004).
[16] Klaus Kertess, "Story About No Story," in *Trisha Brown: Dance and Art in Dialogue, 1961-2001* p. 71.
[17] Banes, *Terpsichore in Sneakers* p. 79.
[18] Brown, Undated Choreographers Notes , p. 302.
[19] Hendel Teicher, "Bird/Woman/Flower/Daredevil: Trisha Brown," in *Trisha Brown: Dance and Art in Dialogue, 1961-2001* p. 276).
[20] Teicher, p. 276. The 20-minute piece was accompanied by the sound of a vacuum cleaner, and Simone Forti vocalizing pitches that resembles those of the vacuum.
[21] "Robert Whitman," in Richard Kostelanetz, ed., *The Theatre of Mixed-Means* (New York: Dial Press, 1968) p. 224.
[22] "Robert Whitman," p. 224.
[23] "Robert Whitman," p. 224.
[24] Lynne Cooke, "Robert Whitman: Playback," in Lynne Cooke and Karen Kelly, eds., *Robert Whitman: Playback* (New York: Dia Art Foundation, 2003) p. 12.
[25] Lynne Cooke, "Through a Glass Darkly: from autonomous artwork to environmental spectacle, from spectator to specter- Robert Whitman's art practice in the 1960s," *Robert Whitman: Playback*, pp. 60-62.
[26] "Robert Whitman," p. 226.
[27] *Robert Whitman: Performances from the 1960s* (Artpix, 2003).
[28] See Jonathan Walley, "From Objecthood to Subject Matter: Yvonne Rainer's Transition from Dance to Film," *Senses of Cinema* (2001)
http://archive.sensesofcinema.com/contents/01/18/rainer.html
[29] "Profile: Interview by Lynne Blumenthal" (1976), reprinted in *Yvonne Rainer, A Woman Who ... : Essays, Interviews, Scripts* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999) p. 68.
[30] When I asked Rainer if she ever projected film onto bodies, she exclaimed, "No I would never do that!" explaining, "I'm not a painter." Conversation with Yvonne Rainer, October 4, 2009.
[31] Rainer, "Interview by the *Camera Obscura* Collective" (1976) reprinted in *Yvonne Rainer, A Woman Who ... : Essays, Interviews, Scripts*, p. 155.
[32] Rainer, "Don't Give the Game Away," *Arts Magazine* (April 1967) pp. 44-45.
[33] Rainer, *Feelings Are Facts*, pp. 314-316.
[34] Rainer, *Feelings Are Facts*, p. 316.
[35] Rainer, Untitled Essay (Summer 1971) published in Yvonne Rainer, *Works 1961-1973* (Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 1974) p. 209.