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Abstract

*Dance Interrogations* explores ways to bridge the gap between the viewing or making of screendance, and the embodied experience of engaging with live performance. This researcher’s artistic practice brings together the multiple sites of screendance, improvisation, performance and disability studies in the development of a series of hybrid performance/screendance events and artifacts. *Dance Interrogations* involves a re-siting of the screen viewer into the physical body of the live audience within site-specific (non-theatrical) locations, and the inclusion of digital imagery that interacts with the skin surface of the live moving body in the same way that the improviser interacts with their imagination in performance. *Dance Interrogations* is embodied creative research that rethinks and reworks understandings of the body, how it is represented and our relationships with and within it.
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Prologue

This research is a re-investment with the technology of the body—with the stereoscopy of optic nerves, the hardware of bones, the force of blood pumping, and the interactivity of touch. When I am touched I find my body and yours.

I am coloured in by the ink of your imprint
and, in that same connection,
I am sending a million small pictures through that stream of sensation into your body.

Our networks spark one another as we search each other’s drives.

I want to wring this metaphor for all its worth and drain its battery,
run it down, running down, down and loaded, overloaded with hertz and loosing definition.

(Reid 2013–2015: 4 June 2013)

As contemporary dancers we do this. With ideokinetic and release techniques, we build images and scores for undoing the tensions and patterns in the body…articulating possibilities for shifting its weight, inverting its position, opening its spaces, diverting its trajectories, re-arranging its construction, awakening sensation…

The difference between engaging with the technology we carry with us
(the boxes, books, tablets, pads, phones, drives, displays)
and the technology we walk around in (the body)
is that the former is carrying us away from ourselves.

The technology we consume feeds our consumer so that we are striving ahead dissatisfied with the present moment.

We are gathering speed,
hurting through our 3D environments with the precision and velocity of a bullet.

The objects we handle become more slippery sleek,
requiring minimal touch to perform more tasks than we can register
into spaces far beyond our reach.

We are not ever here, in this physical space, engaging with the present moment.
And this makes me wonder how, if we are never here, if we can’t look up from our devices, what can we possibly have to share with one another?

(Reid 2013–2015: 4 June 2013)
I am proposing an interactive art in which the sharing of physical space also shares the power, responsibility, and creative voice. By dissolving the space between performer and audience, invading their intimate and interior spaces through proximity, touch, question, implication, I seek to interrogate the way we view the dancing body and implicate our bodies as creative and communicative vessels.

Dismantling and reforming digital architectures within the physical body,
giving weight to the transient,
significance to the incidental,
considering the global impact of a single event.
(Reid 2014a: 126)

It is a three-dimensional sharing of interior spaces both physical and metaphorical
…a fleshiing of the interface.
(PhD—Plotting her history, 2012a)
1 Introduction

This research project is an excavation and reconfiguration of screendance and dance performance practice. Through the production of hybrid screen/dance works, this creative researcher aims to explore ways to bridge the gap between screendance and the embodied experience of engaging with live performance. It is a phenomenological enquiry into other possibilities for the creation, interaction and reflection on our relationships with our bodies, as creative and performing artists and/or viewers, in an era of technological entanglement. Through an interrogation of my multi-sited creative practice I pose the following questions—

How can a hybrid and phenomenological approach to screendance and live performance create a new “live screen/dance” form that extends the possibilities for screendance to engage with the live bodies of performer and audience?

And how can this “live screen/dance,” with the body as creative interface, expose possibilities for embodied experiences of the creation and reception of live performance?

Firstly, let me share a word about my multi-sited creative practice and its political and empirical project. As a dance artist I know and make sense of the world through and in my moving body. This knowledge, this “sense-making,” is never fixed or pre-determined but lived and phenomenal. My dance practice, like my body, is ‘a continual and incessant materializing of possibilities’ (Butler 1988: 521) with the potential to extend to and include other corporeal and philosophical propositions. It is, for me, a social and cultural exchange that simultaneously reaches toward and lets go. It is an emergent research that resonates and reconfigures with each “telling,” each physical inscription. It has feminist and inclusive underpinnings, acknowledging that ‘all bodies exist with and through other bodies in social and political contexts’ (Phenomenology—practice based research in the arts 2015). My way of being-in-the-world as a dance artist is a sensory experience and an interpersonal social exchange. To deepen my practice, broaden my knowledge, and value these exchanges, I have had to consider strategies for survival as a dance artist. My survival is threatened by technological advancements (which demobilize the body before the computer) and stubbornly held stereotypes (which eject the older dancer from the performance arena). My artistic practice has become a political practice seeking other ways of occupying and viewing the dancing,
female body. Screendance has been one such strategy for enabling alternative and expanded views of the body, one that offers a feminist and inclusive perspective. By taking the tools of representation into my own hands, the camera, the editing and the direction/design, I have been able to reconfigure how I see and how I am seen. Improvisation as a performance practice has been another strategy for liberating the body from the limits of particular choreographic vocabularies (demanding particular body shape, age or ability) and empowering the dancer’s response in the moment.

As a significant contributor to the field of screendance over the past twenty years, my research engages with notions of site—the physical architectures of geographic location, building, body, and the multiple sites of screendance. Screendance has provided this dance practitioner with intimate access to the dancing body and moved me into locations and relationships unhindered by gravity, location, time or vocabulary. Through the dance of the camera and the choreography of the edit I have been able to “dance” the audience, sharing a kinetic experience of an event. The disjuncture I have since found is that, confined to the site of screendance, my dancing body is again fixed in relation to and distanced from the viewer. The in-between is deactivated; the exchange is one-way, as my on-screen presence becomes a “past” and my audience is again the invisible voyeur from a singular viewpoint.

In this research project I seek to ‘flesh the interface,’ (Reid 2014a: 117) that is, to involve live bodies (performer and viewer) and enable new, shared experiences of dance and the body—interrogating our physical bodies in the same physical location, unpacking the knowledge residing in the body and revealing the possibilities for understanding through lived experience. In a reconfiguration of screendance and live performance practice, this research employs a phenomenological methodology to articulate my political concerns, propose other philosophical viewpoints and expand my artistic language.

Phenomenology posits the body at the centre of lived experience and provides an ideal framework for dance research. Dance scholars (most notably Sondra Horton Fraleigh in her 1987 publication, The Lived Body) have taken up Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s notion of the “lived-body” as a positive concept of the body, one which ‘attempts to cut beneath the subject-object split’ (Fraleigh 1987: 4) and which acknowledges that ‘embodiment is not passive; it is articulate’ (1987: 13). Phenomenology provides a ‘multifaceted analysis…of the way our bodies both shape and are shaped by our life experiences’ (Albright 2011: 8) and in its view of
the body as meaningful, it has facilitated the voice of dance in philosophical and cultural discussion.

My multifaceted research is supported by and reflects a phenomenological approach in my use of improvisation and interactive performance. In my living of myself, of responding directly to and within the present moment—with my personal history (remembered, imagined and screen captured), and with that of each audience member’s body—I am proposing that perception is active and that knowledge is ‘experienced more directly through the body as a feeling, thinking, mysterious whole’ (Fraleigh 1987: 27). Through a re-siting of the screen viewer into the physical body of the live audience, strategies for expanding the ways we watch and engage with/in the moving body may be explored. Through an interrogation of my own embodied knowledge—as physical performer, cinematographer and editor—I consider the hybrid site of my live screendance body as the source of new knowledge, allowing the physical practice to ignite the theoretical. My dance interrogations are phenomenological, they are lived ‘as body by the performer and the perceiver’ (Fraleigh 1987: 53). I use the word and the act of “interrogation” as both metaphor and actualization of an embodied exchange, of the “being” of dancing, and as a questioning of the Cartesian dualities often imposed on the dancing, female body. This research aims to realize live screen/dance artworks through my experience of my senses, my body, and to focus audiences on their own experience of their bodies. “Our bodies” are the creative interfaces of this research.

This exegesis proceeds in two parts. Firstly, in chapter 2, I will provide a background to the field of screendance, illustrated through a discussion of specific screendance artists whose artistic and conceptual processes are primarily concerned with a reinvigoration of views of and engagement with the body and dance. I position my own screendance practice within this framework to illustrate a lived chronology. My picture of the field connects with particular aesthetics and philosophical approaches woven into my own screendance practice history. Beginning with Maya Deren as a seminal pioneering figure of screendance I trace a non-linear journey across the field to highlight practitioners incorporating improvisational, collaborative and/or hybrid methodologies, and social commentary, feminist or inclusive themes. My descriptions of their/my historical screendance works serve to offer a disciplinary background and a textural aesthetic for reading the following chapter that forms the artistic methodology of this project.
The second part of this document, *Interrogating Practice*, describes my practice-based approach to “screendance improvisation.” In this section I aim to employ a hyper-reflexive approach in content and structure as I provide examples of my practice-based methodology and the philosophical concepts underpinning and arising from these methods. With reference to data (personal journal, audience and peer reflections, interviews with scholars, survey responses, performance descriptions) collected during my candidature, I hope to demonstrate the interconnectedness of this hybrid research, an embodied reflective engagement with the multiple sites and experiences of the body. This artistic practice brings together the multiple sites of my current practice (screendance, improvisation, performance and disability studies) in the development of a series of performance/screendance events and artifacts. These components built to a resolving “live screen/dance”—a hybrid performance event titled *Dance Interrogations (a diptych).* In that artwork I fused the roles of physical performer, cinematographer and video editor into a live screendance body and re-sited the screen viewer into the physical body of the live audience. I created digital imagery that interacts with the skin surface of the live moving body in the same way that the improver interacts with their imagination in performance. I explored dance improvisation as an inclusive practice enabling expression and communication between and within bodies of differing abilities and ages, and in doing so, challenging traditional definitions of “virtuosity” and “vocabulary” in dance practice and performance. In my unpacking of *Dance Interrogations (a diptych)* I hope to demonstrate the interconnectedness of artistic methodology and philosophical discourse and the potential for “live screen/dance” to enhance sensation and stimulate imagination and inclusion in our artistic collaborations and our cultural perceptions—to reinstate the body at the creative interface.

Throughout this exegesis I will include links to video documentation of my practice and those screendance artworks relevant to or created as a result of this research. Although the PDF format of this document cannot offer a direct hyperlink, each link appears in this way (blue and underlined) with an associated footnote directing the reader to an online video file in my Vimeo channel’s “collection” titled *PhD video links.* In terms of my in-text citations, single

---

1 I am using “live screen/dance” rather than “screendance” to give equal weight to the video projections and the physical body in my live hybrid artwork.

2 An edit of the full show documentation in Vimeo collection *PhD video links* as *Diptych full show* https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561170

3 Examiners of this thesis were each issued with a Travel Document Wallet, a physical artifact accompanying the written exegesis. In this wallet they were provided with a USB memory stick of all the video examples as well as a DVD of the performance documentation to enable offline options for viewing. The wallet also contained items designed to “sensually enliven” the exegesis—a sprig of lavender for scent, a butterscotch sweet for taste,
quotations marks within a sentence indicate the words of another author or speaker with longer block quotations indented and in reduced font size and spacing. I will use italics to indicate a title of an artwork, film or publication and double quotation marks when I want to draw attention to a word—to its meaning or colloquial usage.

In chapter three I will include still images from my artworks or promotional materials. Sections of text hanging on the right side of the page are my own poetic reflections on my research. With this spatial formatting I am seeking to play with the rhythm and musicality of the written document—as I would in editing along a Final Cut Pro timeline, or in writing my body detail into a Labanotation stave. By shifting your attention within and around the frame of the page, from reading words to reading movement, I hope to edit your temporal and textural experience of engaging with this thesis, to keep the lived body of dance/screen practice and performance within the written exegesis.

the vinyl wallet itself for touch (the vinyl similar to the material of the train seats) and the “rosary” beads on which the USB memory stick hung both for touch and as a talisman of the era/institution.
2 Screendance (a background)

Screendance dismantled my proscenium arch, liberated my body in space and time, and enabled me to dance (and dance for) audiences existing in other spaces and times. The camera has provided me with a means to guide my audience more directly into my body—and then to ride my point of view and rhythms as I cut together my dance journey. (Reid 2014a: 118)

“Screendance” is a relatively new term used to describe a diverse range of work that combines choreographic and film/video practice. In his 2012 book Screendance: Inscribing the ephemeral image Douglas Rosenberg, also Director of the American Dance Festival’s International Screendance Festival, considers screendance as both a visual art form as well as an extension of modern and post–modern dance without drawing artificial boundaries between the two. He calls for a radical new way of thinking of both dance and film that engages with critical issues rather than simple advocacy. Rosenberg is also on the Editorial board of The International Journal of Screendance, a new, international, artist-led journal exploring the field of screendance. It is the first-ever scholarly journal wholly dedicated to this growing area of worldwide interdisciplinary practice. This journal is a platform for the new generation of screendance artists, including myself, who are concerned with developing the diversity of discourse in tandem with the practice to support its potential to evolve and respond to the changing relationships between our bodies and the screen.

In this new millennium, screendance has emerged as a new hybrid form, superseding terms such as “dance film,” “video dance” or “dance for the camera” which still largely suggested a documentation or translation of dance to the film form. The development of this field has developed with the tools of cinema since the early twentieth century, passing through the hands of visual artists with the advent of video culture in the sixties and seventies, and into the hands of dance practitioners seeking to preserve and promote their ephemeral art. With the domestic accessibility and affordability of the tools of cinema since the nineties (video cameras, mobile devices, personal computers with user-friendly editing software), screendance has become an integral part of all dance practitioners work—enabling the documentation of process and live performance, and as a new site for choreography, in which ‘the very nature of choreography and the action of dance has been questioned’ (Rosenberg 2000: 275). Now, the technological boom has necessitated a complete re-tooling in relation to dance making and

---

4 Rosenberg comments on Dodds’ criticality of the screendance community in her 2001 book Dance on screen: genres and media from Hollywood to experimental art, as not having the vocabulary to articulate its process and practice. (Rosenberg 2012: 112)
presentation—the dance has been re-shaped and recorporealized again through lens and software and into a new digital format for small screens and mobile interfaces.

Although many dance and visual artists have incorporated screen imagery within performances for stage or “live art”\textsuperscript{5}—including the projection of edited imagery within the overall design of the stage or site, or the use of live camera feeds showing close-up, alternative or augmented angles on the stage action\textsuperscript{6}—there still remains a disjuncture between live dance and the screen encounter. This disjuncture is in the live montage, that is, the consideration of the movement of the viewer’s eye (position, focal length) across and between live space and screen space. The journey between these different dimensions has physical implications for the viewer, moving the muscularity of vision between spatial dimensions (the reverse perspectives of camera space, narrow at the front and widening into the background, and stage space, wider at the front and receding upstage) and textural qualities (the edited screen image having the potential to impose more specific and dramatic shifts in focus and movement than for the viewer seated at a fixed position to the stage action). The composition of hybrid site performance requires an attention to the internal editing of the viewer’s body—of their looking inward and outward at the same time.\textsuperscript{7}

Cinema and media theorist and cultural critic Vivian Sobchack states:

> In a culture like ours, so preoccupied with images of bodies and bodies of images, we tend to forget that both our bodies and our vision have lived dimensions that are not reducible to the merely visible. (Sobchack 2004: 179)

The present day screen culture has again placed a proscenium arch on our vision; our ocular range fixed to a flat plane, which, although at a closer, often hand-held range to our body, denies any muscular adjustment in our vision or our bodies. There is a physical tension in this

\textsuperscript{5} Although the label “Live Art” was coined in the 1970s, the interaction of artist and audience in the immediacy of the performance can be traced back to the Futurists events in the early part of the twentieth century. In her charting of performance art, RoseLee Goldberg cites performance as ‘an experimental laboratory...whether autobiographical monologue or personal ritual, dance theatre or artists’ cabaret—providing incomparable material for examining contemporary viewpoints on such issues as the body, gender or multiculturalism.’ (Goldberg 1998: 9) It was in the happenings or collaborative concerts emerging out of the Judson Memorial Church in the sixties that choreographers and dancers, with their ‘very different understanding of bodies in time and space began to have a far-reaching effect on artists of many other disciplines...performance art (is a) hybrid medium.’ (1998: 18)

\textsuperscript{6} Australian Dance Theatre’s 2012 work, \textit{Proximity}, is a technologically complex and choreographically integrated recent example of such work. (Stewart 2012)

\textsuperscript{7} This is a concept also articulated by Susan Kozel, a practitioner who takes a phenomenological approach to the connections between bodies and technological systems.
body/screen interface; ironically offering increased mobility. This 'threshold is less an entrance than a site of fascination...expos(ing) multiple 'heres' and 'nows' that overlap confusingly with our own physical reality' (Morse 1999: 64). Our 'new habit of seeing: both intense and cool, solicitous and detached; charmed by the insignificant detail, addicted to incongruity' (Sontag 1977: 99) is our 'chronic voyeuristic relation to the world' (1977: 11). In this era of the spectacle and the screen, we are in temporal flux while spatially held. I support the opinion of Kyra Norman in her article for IJS relating to site-based screendance, that 'dance is more than the subject of the screen work, it may also be a means of approaching, exploring and articulating screen space (Norman 2010: 14). My enquiry proposes the potential for viewing with the whole body; that fluid approaches to creating screendance may return the viewer to their senses, to a physical engagement with space, and their ways of seeing.

In my charting of the field of screendance I will be focusing on those I consider to be genuinely hybrid in their practice, and whose approach resonates with my own—screendance practitioners who improvise with the camera, and choreograph in the editing suite; independent auteurs who creatively manage all aspects of production, creative and technical, artwork and written rationale. As I introduce my current hybrid practice, investigating the edges of live performance and screendance toward a re-inscription of the meaning of “screen/dance,” I will include some artworks in which live and screen bodies merge in a live performance setting. I choose to focus mainly on works merging live bodies and video projection that I have viewed in a live and non-proscenium arch setting. In this way I can stay within the terrain of my creative research and consider the works from an embodied viewing experience.

I will also include reference to particular collaborations in which dance and film artists successfully translate to the screen a choreographic idea originally created for a live context. I consider a “successful translation” to screen to be one that attends to the spatial and temporal parameters of the screen frame, e.g. by ‘replacing the artifice of the theatre by the actuality of landscape, distances, and place’ (Deren 1960: 64) and understanding the choreographic shifts both necessitated and enhanced by the shifts of angle, proximity, gravity, speed and location available with the choreography of the camera and the montage in post-production.

---

*IJS* is the abbreviation for the International Journal of Screendance referred to in the opening paragraph of this chapter.
The reason I include these works is two-fold. On the one hand they mark important milestones in the lineage of screendance, acknowledging the merging of tools and languages, an equalizing of the art forms into the realization of a new format, privileging other viewpoints. On the other hand, these examples connect with my experience of working as a translator of live dance performance to screen—charting how my viewing with the lens choreographs a different performative experience. I am attuned to the movement of my own body in the micro and that can support the live action in the filmic space of my documentation. I am considering how my viewing anticipates, chases or counterpoints to amplify the choreographic intention. In that role, my physical and choreographic sensibilities are channeled through the prosthetic of the camera, and my particular witnessing becomes the screen translation, a reinvention following my choreo-cinematic pleasure.9

One medium should not simply serve the other: the video does not exist to preserve the choreography in live terms; conversely the dance should not be subjected to the needs of film production to an extent that the movement is impeded. To achieve this active relationship, it is essential that practitioners of one medium develop an understanding of the other. (McPherson 1997: 49)

In the almost two decades since McPherson’s call for cross-disciplinary understanding a new form and hybrid population of screendance practitioners has grown into a global community. These new practitioners, my peers, are using screendance as a generative tool to create new processes for regarding the dancing body. It is a fluid field that Rosenberg, in his keynote address at the Light Moves Festival of Screendance Symposium 2014, regards as ‘driven by activism and supplying its own energy’ (Keynote Address 2014).

### 2.1 Screendance pioneers

Screendance is a primary site of production—it is an intentional space with its own architecture and context. It is where the work resides (it is site-specific). (Rosenberg 2012: 19)

A historical lineage of dance on film invariably opens with reference to the physical masters of the silent film (Buster Keaton and Charlie Chaplin) and the dancers, choreographers, and

---

9 This idea of simultaneously witnessing/creating resonates with improvisational scores or suggestions I recall from working with Deborah Hay. She would invariably ask dancers in her workshops to ‘follow your pleasure.’
directors of the Hollywood musicals for their contributions to the representation of dance on screen in the early twentieth century (Fred Astaire & Hermes Pan, Busby Berkeley). Similarly, the early cinematic experiments of the Lumière brothers and Georges Méliès demonstrated the capacity for cinema to manipulate and distort time and space and, as such, to possess choreographic potential. In this historical account of screendance, however, I locate its beginnings in the works of Maya Deren because her “cine-dances” are widely held to constitute one of the first practices that gave equal consideration to the art forms of dance and film.

Somehow, the core was centred around movement and dance, of everything she did. Those movies...they’re examples of choreographies. (Leo Lerman in Clark 1984: 264)

**Maya Deren** was an experimental independent filmmaker who produced cine-dance films and psychodramas during the forties and fifties in the United States. Although never a professional dancer herself, Deren’s broad artistic interests drew her to the creative potential of dance while touring with the Katherine Dunham dance group in 1942. At that time, Deren met Alexander Hammid, with whom she made her first film *Meshes of the afternoon* (1943). This film became recognized as a significant landmark in the history of American independent film, and is famous for its ‘four-stride sequence (from beach to grass to mud to pavement to rug)’ (Unterburger 1999: 115). It was after the making of *A study in choreography for camera* (1945) that Deren’s choreographic use of movement and gesture became apparent and her earlier films were regarded in that new light. In *Study*, Deren collaborated with dancer Talley Beatty discussing ‘very very closely what the camera will see, what the dance design should be’ (Unterburger 1999: 264). In her program notes Deren describes the film as ‘a duet between space and a dancer—a duet in which the camera is not merely an observant sensitive eye, but is itself creatively responsible for the performance’ (Unterburger 1999: 629) (Reid 2001: 99). The final sequence, Beatty’s leap, is in fact Deren’s “leap,” editing a cinematic manipulation that extends the temporal and gravitational possibilities of the dancer’s leap (Greenfield 2002: 23). Deren made space itself become ‘an active element of the dance rather than being an area in which the dance takes place’ (Deren 2005: 246–247)—she made cinematic space a participant in the choreography.

---

10 Deren is cited as a pioneer in independent and experimental film in many texts written by both screendance practitioners and film historians.
I intend this film mainly as a sample of film-dance—that is, a dance so related to camera and cutting that it cannot be “performed” as a unit anywhere but in this particular film (Deren in Clark 1984: 266).

Deren placed the body at the centre of her filmmaking. There is a physical assertion in her connections between the tools and content of her filmmaking, one that she also expressed as a writer/speaker and producer. She used all aspects of her physical body, of her technical and creative machinations to create and communicate—in front of and behind the camera, in edit suites, speaking in lecture halls, writing pamphlets, and in the facilitation and realization of screenings to get exposure for her films. She claimed that ‘the most important part of your equipment is yourself: your mobile body, your imaginative mind, and your freedom to use both’ (Deren 2005: 18). Deren worked defiantly on the fringes of art and filmmaking, as an independent filmmaker, in control of both the creative and the technical aspects of production, as a woman in a predominantly male-dominated arena, and as an artist working with abstract content rather than realism and linear narrative. She danced the camera, regarding not just the similarity between the lens of the eye and the camera, but also that this must extend to the body behind the camera, ‘whose movements are motivated by the meaning which the brain extends to the material which the eye registers’ (Deren in Cleghorn 2012: 124). She considered editing to be choreography, a premise upheld by screendance colleague Karen Pearlman, whose writing has developed valuable discourse between the fields of cinema and dance. Her comparison of editing to choreography is ‘to create a possibility of using knowledge about the craft of choreography to extend ideas about the craft of editing’ to the ‘movement of emotions and of events which also have cadences, pulses, breaths’ (Pearlman 2006: 54).

I acknowledge the legacy of Deren in my development as a screendance artist. Her work as a practitioner, as a writer and as an independent producer forged the beginnings of the screendance hybrid form. As an independent artist I draw strength from her role model—in her control of and sole responsibility for the creative, technical, administrative and promotional aspects of her work. As a woman dancing across both fields of dance and film/media I, too, am faced with a particular line of struggle—one that must assert the authority of the dancing body without denouncing its delicate individuality. Deren’s approach to filmmaking was embodied and inspired many screendance artists to expand on the movement possible with the use of hand-held camera in direct relationship to the body. I echo the words of filmmaker Amy Greenfield when I acknowledge that this has become ‘the hallmark of my use of camera’ (Greenfield 2002: 26).
The creative act extends beyond the artwork to the language and frameworks that can sustain it. Deren understood the need to develop a language to articulate her practice, acknowledging the body (particularly the female, dancing body) as central to the creative process. Her practice, which extends to her writing and lectures, sought to empower the body as agent and authority rather than simply passive content for cinematic consumption.

Deren elicited a language with which to talk about choreographic cinema; through her theoretical writings she engendered possibilities for filmic thinking, drawing upon the medium’s capacity for ritual, poetic expression and the invention of experiential realities; through her lectures she gave fascinating insights into filmic construction and the visual realization of the imaginary. (Cleghorn 2012: 125)

My particular pathway through this background of the development of screendance is informed by my identification with feminist film theory, as a framework which attends to the same issues facing dance—a need to re-define and re-represent the female experience and the body on film, to address the spectator as female, to give space to the previously unseen perspectives on and gestures of the body. Indeed, my research seeks to address these issues as I position myself, my female experience, within the “live screen/dance”—to rise to the challenge to ‘effect another vision’ and, by bringing the viewer into that frame, ‘to construct other objects and subjects of vision, and to formulate the conditions of representability of another social subject’ (De Lauretis 1987: 135).

Deren placed the female voice strongly into the landscape of filmmaking. Her surrealist approach (specific iconography, repetitions, shifts in speed and texture of footage) alluded to the psychology of the individual and also drew attention to the psychology of the gaze. Her images of women were expressing women’s experience, not servicing a viewer’s pleasure.

Yvonne Rainer went further in this regard by shifting the control even more strongly into the hands of her female characters, deflecting the gaze away from the subject by placing her female characters off screen in image but present in voice-over, literally foregrounding the authority of the woman’s voice. Rainer emancipated the dancing body from its passive role of servicing the needs of its audience in a stage context before moving solely into filmmaking. Rainer is best known in postmodern dance history as a re-definer of her art, with her 1965 No Manifesto a strategy for de-mystifying dance. She declared

NO to spectacle, No to virtuosity, No to transformations and magic and make-believe, No to the glamour and transcendency of the star image, No to the heroic, No to the anti-heroic, No
to trash imagery, No to involvement of performer or spectator, No to style, No to camp, No to seduction of spectator by the wiles of the performer, No to eccentricity, No to moving or being moved. (Banes 1987: 43)

Her declaration radicalized dance in the sixties, upending its vocabulary, context, and function. Her manifesto could be seen to have had extensive impact beyond the spheres of stage dance and into feminist film theory, predating Laura Mulvey’s seminal text, *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema* (1975) by several years. Her subsequent shift from dance to film signaled an important shift in both the demographic of independent filmmakers, and an attention to the non-linear narrative of the body and the woman’s experience in film. *This is the story of a woman who…* (1973), incorporating film and slides, was ‘Rainer’s penultimate live performance before she gave up dance for film making’ (Goldberg 1998: 15).

I made the transition from choreography to filmmaking between 1972 and 1975. In a general sense my burgeoning feminist consciousness was an important factor. An equally urgent stimulus was the encroaching physical changes in my aging body. (Yvonne Rainer in Armstrong & de Zegher 2006: 5)

I include Rainer as significant in the development of screendance because her first films were aligned to the theoretical terrain of dance, investigating notions of the female body. She then found that ‘the medium of film and its politics enabled a greater range of theoretical positions to be explored’ (Fensham & Walton 1991: 10). In a section of the journal article *Ages of the Avant-Garde*, Rainer writes about the issue of the body as an object of desire as a contributing factor to the invisibility or dismissal of the mature dancer. She suggests that we no longer find the aging body desirable because it reminds us of death (Marranca, Monk et al. 1994: 34). Yvonne Rainer states in interview with Rachel Fensham and Jude Walton that she clearly uses Freudian and post-Freudian ways of thinking in her work. Her film, *The Man Who Envied Women* (1985), was ‘based directly on the challenge sent up by Laura Mulvey and subsequent feminist theorists about the objectification of women in front of the camera’ (Fensham & Walton 1991: 14). Rainer offered other views on the female experience, demystifying the body and the dance and empowering the subject. Her work articulated sensitivity to how we view the body—all ages and types—and the dance—at close range. It reconfigured notions of virtuosity beyond a body designed for the pleasure of the viewer and toward a personalized body.

*Man is made small, and is the subject being watched.*
He is held inside the frame of a woman’s arm resting on her knee as she reclines in the foreground.

She has her back to us, large as the landscape and motionless, at rest in the moment…

A man, woman and child shift from pose to pose, a pedestrian account of the many ‘captured’ contrivances of the ‘family’… passive and disembodied, heads cut from frame…

my eye is drawn to the charge of the negative spaces between their bodies.¹¹

Rainer’s film works of the seventies could be seen as an evolution of the work of two filmmakers working with a choreo-cinematic sensibility in the preceding decades. Shirley Clarke and Hilary Harris both utilized a foregrounding of movement in their films, sometimes in the subject matter of dancing bodies but most often for the motion and emotion constructed in the edit. Both Clarke and Harris, working as independent filmmakers (responsible for all aspects of production and management of their work), provided views on a moving landscape that had the capacity to “move” viewers.

Movement is a kind of basic element of film and in abstract film you’re working with pure movement and pure emotion… not distracted by any conceptual idea… (you’re) finding a form that grows out of a purely visual experience. (The films of Hilary Harris 2006)

Shirley Clarke began her career as a dancer before moving into experimental filmmaking initially working with the architecture of the body and then choreographing the inanimate, ‘turning naturalistic objects into a poem of dancing abstract elements’ (Unterburger 1999: 85). Like Deren, Clarke’s hands on approach included her work with the camera and editing, and her advocacy for independent film with her founding of the Filmmakers’ Cooperative in New York in 1962. In my examination of her early short films which used dancers—Anna Sokolow in Bullfight (1955) and Carmela Gutierrez & Paul Sanasardo in A Moment in Love (1957)—I found her combination of cinematic devices with choreographic material played between naturalism and abstraction, between the physical and the emotional. Much of the movement in A Moment in Love is naturalistic or pedestrian (laying, walking, standing, looking) with Clarke providing a development of the movement with her movement of the camera. The camera tilts and pans up from a still pose to create movement through space. In a lifting turning sequence Clarke dissolves two shots of a couple turning in opposite directions adding to the kinesthesia of the image and suggesting some kind of emotional struggle or complex intimacy. Clarke’s postproduction techniques directly reflect choreographic devices.

¹¹ This is an excerpt from my notes while watching Rainer’s Film about a woman who… (1974).
working with overlaid shots of the two dancers to create the patterning, canon, and variety of angles of a larger ensemble (Reid 2001: 101).

**Hilary Harris**, a documentary filmmaker who won the Academy Award for Best Live Action Short Film in 1962 for *Seawards the Great Ships* (1961), was a pioneer in time-lapse photography. I see traces of Harris’ pioneering experiments in the work of American Director Ron Fricke, now considered the master of time-lapse photography. In Fricke’s films, as in Harris’ work *Organism* (1975), there is a privileging of movement, both within the frame and of the camera/viewer, as the vehicle for storytelling. Although his work was ‘considered too accessible for the strict avant-gardists…Deren herself awarded Harris one of her Independent Film Foundation awards’ (Greenfield 2002: 23). The counterpoints of the patterns of the movements of life, human and environmental, against the sustained gaze of extreme slow motion camera pans brings the viewer into a kinesthetic empathy with the subjects and, so, with our shared lived experience.

(There is an) ability for the camera or film to capture a sense of scope and size and complexity…and this can give us an understanding of something complex…I think the greatest most universal things can be expressed in the abstract film…the very personal ones…It’s a question of getting a kind of identification from the viewer to the beauty of life really…try to elevate them, that’s what I’m trying to do. (*The films of Hilary Harris* 2006)

Harris’ *Nine variations on a dance theme* (1967), inspired by Deren’s *A Study* (Greenfield 2002: 21), captured a choreographed dance sequence several times varying the angle, camera movement and proximity. These varying perspectives were then reconfigured in editing to develop a new choreographic pace, a new screendance. Harris presents us with several variations of the dance, performed by Bettie de Jong, building the complexity of the montage with the motion of the camera in a way that creates a singular kinesthetic build over the thirteen minutes of the film’s duration. The choreographic phrase ascends and descends from laying, kneeling, standing, to high leg extension and back again over about one minute in real time. In the first two variations Harris’ moving camera circles slowly at mid and low levels, with the third variation beginning to cut in different angles at close-up before finally pulling back. In the fourth variation he adds the flute to the piano music, cutting in extreme close-ups and moving over the landscape of body making it possible to read the textures of clothes and hair on arms. He accelerates the cuts in the fifth variation so that the phrase is lengthened and

---

12 After working as Director of photography on *Koyaanisqatsi* (1982) Fricke designed his own equipment and directed *Baraka* (1992) and *Samsara* (2011). (http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0294825/)
the linear development of the choreography disrupted, and the sixth presents an attention to
detail that gives a tactile sense of texture, of the sensation of floor, of weight-bearing. The
final three variations overlap and merge—firstly a repetition of fast cuts that attend to
movement through frame, side to side; then cutting between rolling camera angles so gravity
is disrupted—foreground to background, ascending to descending. Hair, wool, floor, roof—
all surfaces of body and beyond are brought into play, finally disrupting the chronology by
cutting across the sequence with shots repeated and out of order to over-extend the final
descent of face to floor.

A feminist reading of this screendance, however, might suggest that in this particular case the
invasiveness of the camera into the intimate areas of the dancer’s body, in combination with
the building speed and repetition of the edits, is fetishizing the dancer, the female body. When
I attended the Light Moves Screendance Lab in 2014, Simon Fildes showed Nine Variations as
an example of accomplished editing technique. Douglas Rosenberg raised the issues of
fetishism that he saw associated with it. Perhaps in response to Harris, Rosenberg created his
own screendance entitled 9 variations for Hilary (2003) referencing Hilary Harris’ 1967
version, with black and white footage and a similar sense of journey across levels, in this
instance from chair to floor but dismantled across three bodies and three types of “dancer”
tutu/classical, nightclub dress/burlesque, kaftan/modernist). There are issues raised for me
here in relation to the male gaze, if the director/cinematographer is male and the subject is
female, what mechanisms can be applied to dismantle the power imbalance, enable the subject
to confront the viewer? In Rosenberg’s film, the women assert their subjectivity through their
dismantling of movement motif, their direct gaze to camera, and gestures that deflect
intimacy/invasion—pulling down a lower lid to expose the eyeball, frenzied shaking of an
inverted or downcast head, adjusting the hem of the dress while she lays on the floor.

At about the same time as Rosenberg created 9 Variations for Hilary, I made my screendance
Luke (2002).13 In my work, however, the roles were reversed (male dancer being
viewed/captured and manipulated by a female camera/editor) and the issues of objectification
of the dancer/body were potentially subverted. The direct gaze of the dancer into camera
shared an understanding, equalized the relationship. We, dancer and camera, had shared
knowledge and history of this choreography which I had made for and with Luke’s body over
several weeks. We understood the positive and negative spaces of the choreography and our

13 Luke can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/1778205
bodies/vision within that, so we shared equal power to inscribe it with our identities. This was one of my earlier explorations of camera and editing and in it I was looking at ways to bring the viewer into the action, to move them by moving the camera, the angle, and the proximity—attending to the duet between camera/viewer and dancer/frame. The choreography of an edit, the manipulation of rhythm and pace, can heighten this shared dance, perhaps even influence the very breathing and heart rate of the viewer. In *Luke* I sought to amplify this potential, with the interplay of image and sound/silence, juxtaposing glimpses of an exterior world (coloured and audible) with the interior world (black and white, silent) of the creative mind and body in a studio. I described the work as a ‘meditation on studio practice,’ suggesting an invitation to the viewer to engage with the dancer’s embodied experience through my dancer/camera’s embodied experience.

Although not a dancer or choreographer, Rosenberg’s equally developed understanding and application of the tools of dance and media, and his research and advocacy for the hybrid form, could assign him the title of “screendance choreographer.” His screendance works feature strong solo dance performers and choreographers, including Molissa Fenley, Anna Halprin, Li Chiao-Ping, Ellen Bromberg, who ‘trust (him) enough to not hinder (his) vision and who won’t hold onto ‘choreography’ as if it is sacred’ (Reid 2001: 104). Rosenberg’s combination of camera work and editing, together with the particularities of his choices in dance performers, produces dance stories that reveal personal and cultural aspects of his subjects. *My grandfather dances* (1998) reveals, in Anna Halprin’s simultaneous verbal and physical telling of an anecdote about her grandfather, her cultural history, her spiritual and emotional landscape, and her present-day relationships with her family, the dance community, and with herself as a dance artist.¹⁴ Rosenberg adds to these narrative layers by dissolving between her narration to camera and her “dance,” connecting verbal and physical language, memory and embodiment, specificity and universality. His close-up tracking of Halprin’s fingers stroking the fabric of her costume, or intertwining her fingers, draws attention to the kinesthesia of the dance, to the textures and touch that contribute to Halprin’s memory of her grandfather. Within his mise-en-scene,¹⁵ Rosenberg positions Halprin with upstretched arms and raised focus in the lower half of the frame, opening the space above as she references “God.” He tends

---

¹⁴ Since the early 1950’s Anna Halprin has created new contexts for dance performance and participation. She is a pioneer in dance improvisation and many of her students were important players in the history of post-modern dance (including Yvonne Rainer, Simone Forti and Meredith Monk). She continues to work into older age teaching dance improvisation and promoting dance as a healing art. (http://www.annahalprin.org/about_bio.html)

¹⁵ “Mise-en-scene” refers to the spatial composition within the film frame.
to favour the placement of Halprin “remembering” (covering her face with her hands) in the
down right corner of frame—perhaps referencing the past as he leads the viewer’s eye from
right to left, from present to past (Reid 2001: 104).

I refer specifically here to Rosenberg’s work with Anna Halprin, as she is an artist working
with improvisation and location in ways that connect with my own practice. It is this notion
of connection that informs my research—following a clue, an idea, finding patterns,
phenomenological resonances. Susan Kozel, acknowledging the work of fellow
writer/thinker/practitioner Gaston Bachelard, states that if she ‘read(s) a phenomenology, or
witness (es) or experience(s) a phenomenological piece of work, it has the potential to resonate
within (her) on several levels: cognitive, emotional, physical’ (Kozel 2007: 24). In this research,
this survey, that resonance is a relationship to specific individuals whose rhythms and
realizations are grounded in the experiential, the personal. Anna Halprin is an example of a
dance practitioner who has sustained a dance career into older age through her continual
attention to and questioning of the “now.” She also shifts the “site” of her dance as a means to
access the lived content arising between body and place.

There is a secret to longevity in dance: I found a process, which enabled me to access my
creativity through dance…I stripped away many of the assumptions I had learned about dance,
and re-invented it for myself…I experimented with where dance could take place, and who
could be a dancer. I danced on the streets and the beaches and I danced with people who had
never taken a dance class in their lives…I started questioning what dance could be about and
I started making dances that had to do with my life and the lives of the people who dance
them…I have been playing for these many years in the open field of dance, where life
experience is the fuel for my dancing, and dance is the fuel for my life experience. (Anna
Halprin in Ross 2007: 356)

Rosenberg has since developed screendance and performance installations that engage with
issues of the body, illness and trauma, including Under the skin (2007)16 and Venous Flow: States
of Grace (2001).17 Also, like Halprin,18 notions of place, of environment and location, have

---

16 Under the skin was created while Rosenberg was on a yearlong residency in 2006 at Stanford University, to
develop a multi-media interdisciplinary project with the dance department, medical school and community
members.
17 Venous Flow: States of Grace was an evening-length multimedia production created by choreographer Li Chiao-
Ping and visual artist Douglas Rosenberg with original music by New York composer Stephen Vitiello. On
January 11, 1999, Li and Rosenberg were involved in a near-fatal auto accident that threatened to end her dance
career. This accident, combined with the subsequent healing process, served as a catalyst for this piece
(http://www.lichiaopingdance.org/index.php/works/venous-flow/)
18 Halprin has also dealt with issues of illness in her dance works/practice. Halprin is an early pioneer in the
expressive arts healing movement. She has led countless collaborative dance programs with terminally ill
patients, long committed to a belief in the connection between movement and the healing power of dance. Halprin
has also investigated numerous social issues through dance and through theatrical innovations. For the past
decade, she has led Circle the Earth, a contemporary community dance ritual to confront real-life issues facing
participant communities around the world. Halprin continues to make revolutionary work exploring the beauty
increasingly influenced Rosenberg. His *Five dance films about place* (2006) was shot in Wisconsin at the location of the annual artist retreats *Summerwork* that he and his partner Li Chiao-Ping run at their home, *The Farm.* It is also an ‘intentional space (that has been opened) to artists and communities from around the world to engage in a hybrid blend of art/life practice that is designed to be both generative and thoughtfully contemplative.’19 Rosenberg’s work moves between screen and live locations, interconnecting sites and re-presenting works in new combinations and formats. *Screening the body* (2001) and *Indeterminate identities* (2006) are examples of performance/installations in which Rosenberg’s earlier screen works are re-contextualized as they are screened alongside one another, or in concert with live dance or music.

It is this re-presenting of screendance works in live contexts, as installations, that resonates with my research—that an artist’s back catalogue of work, although made for screen, continues to hold connections to the author’s body. These artists are acknowledging and returning to their physical bodies, as they age or encounter illness, their physical shifts and challenges are recognized as valuable subject matter and as the mode of communication. It is this lived connection with my own screendance work and the potential to interconnect the screendance artifact with the live body/site that drives my research toward the creation of “live screen/dance.” It is this collaboration between my creative past and present that acknowledges and augments the metaphor of lived experience within my artworks, as I will discuss further in chapter 3.

---

19 I attended as guest artist at Summerwork 2014 as part of my research field trip. During the weeklong residency I facilitated the creation of the screendance, *they disappear,* which forms one of the screendance artifacts of this research.
2.2 Collaborations and translations

Screendance itself is a collaboration of art forms. While I have mentioned a number of screendance artists whose approach to camera and editing is kinesthetic and choreographic, many collaborate with “live site choreographers.” I now want to examine some collaborative projects in which a filmmaker has worked with a choreographer to translate, or re-site, a live dance work into a screendance. I am not referring to a documentation of a live work, that is, a recording of dance performed on stage, but the relocating of a choreographic idea within the temporal and spatial particularities of the screen. The works I have selected are those from well-matched partnerships between dancer/choreographers whom I regard as significant innovators in movement languages (Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker, William Forsythe, Lloyd Newson, Kirstie Simson) and experimental filmmakers with aligned choreographic sensibilities, most of whom have continued to collaborate with contemporary dance artists (Thierry De Mey, David Hinton, Katrina McPherson & Simon Fildes). In these works, neither form is compromised in service of the other; rather these artists could be seen to have contributed equally to the development of new platforms and audiences for screendance.

Thierry De Mey has collaborated in this way with two prominent contemporary choreographers to create new screendances—choreography that, as Deren upholds, can only exist in this form. His screen interpretation of Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker’s 1983 choreography Rosas danst Rosas (1997) is both amplification and distillation of the original choreography. Set in the striking and labyrinthine location of the RITO School in Leuven, Belgium, De Mey uses the multiple frames of architectural location and a multiplication of

---

20 I use the phrase “live site choreography” to refer to movement made for/on the dancer’s physical body—most likely a person-to-person exchange. This may then be re-sited onto the stage, studio or other geographic location. The transfer via camera to edit suite to digital file to screen involves a further series of sites implicating other types of choreography.

21 Hinton has recently collaborated with Siobhan Davies on All this can happen (2013), a film constructed entirely from archive photographs and footage from the earliest days of cinema, and again on the installation The running tongue (2015). The “dance” of both films is constructed through the collage of the edit, not from footage of dancing bodies per se.

22 Hinton went on to create a screendance entirely of found footage “Birds.” With no dancers featured, its award for Best Dance Film at the IMZ Dance Screen 2000 was considered controversial at the time. Bob Lockyer writes that it ‘caused a lot of fuss, as many said you can’t have a dance film without dancers. I think you can’ (Lockyer 2002: 161). At later festivals definitions began to explicitly cite that dance could include the animation of objects or non-human motion.
dancing bodies\textsuperscript{23} to reconfigure De Keersmaeker’s rigorous, repetitive dance vocabulary (itself a reconfiguration of the everyday actions of laying, sitting, walking, standing).

The camera traverses, emerges and inhabits the space as another participant in the ever-increasing population of dancers. With long, smooth tracking shots De Mey keeps pace with one dancer as she passes through halls, past windows, between walls, meeting and passing new bodies which provide echoes of or continuity to De Keersmaeker’s walking, turning, and falling phrases. The opening sequence of the film involves an extraordinarily long (three minutes) continuous panning and tracking shot following a relay of four dancers as they wind their way through the deserted building. The only still camera shots are near the start of this sequence—one to bring the camera inside the building, another pausing as a dancer rests for a moment in a doorway. These shots give the viewer a sense of the real time it takes to traverse and introduce the location, the four main characters, and the somewhat foreboding mood of the dance. The quartet that resolves this opening journey uses low side camera angles, close-up detail of body parts, intercutting between solo and group, with rhythmic repetitions of the percussive unison floor sequence, accompanied by the live sound of the dancers’ breath and movement. The hypnotic musical score accompanying the majority of the film is also written by De Mey, echoing and supporting his rhythmic editing style (Reid 2001: 105–106).

With choreographer \textbf{William Forsythe}, De Mey created \textit{One Flat Thing Reproduced} (2006). Again, he has used scale of location, in this case an enormous abandoned warehouse, to amplify the choreography and to provide viewpoints not available in a theatre setting. Described as ‘a play for fourteen dancers and twenty tables on the music of Thom Willems,’ (\textit{Vimeo—Dance-Tech.TV} 2016, para.1) \textit{One Flat Thing Reproduced} was first staged live in Frankfurt in 2000. In the film, the use of wide overhead angles interspersed with close tracking shots makes for a heightening of sensation for the viewer, a defiance of gravity mixed with an eye-level intimacy. It is worth noting that Forsythe is a renowned innovator in terms of his reconfiguring of the classical dance vocabulary with his improvisational techniques, and by drawing on ‘influences from many different disciplines…as paradigms or strategies for actually creating movement’ (Sulcas 2002: 97). In collaboration with media specialists and educators, he has developed new

\textsuperscript{23} The original choreography was performed by four dancers including De Keersmaeker herself, while De Mey’s screendance increases the number to eighteen, including every dancer who has performed the work in its history as part of the company’s repertoire. In this way De Mey has attached a temporal, lived history of the dance work to the screen work.
approaches to dance documentation, research, and education. I think it is his capacity to work with what is essentially a classical dance vocabulary but to consider other spatial perspectives, his ‘curiosity about “ways of seeing,”’ (Sulcas 2002: 102) that enables its successful translation to the screen context. For One Flat Thing Reproduced Forsythe was working with a classical alignment, but one that was ‘not symmetrical but distributed evenly throughout the entire field of vision…not privileged high or low, just everywhere…it’s like a cloud of perspectives instead of a channel of perspective’ (William Forsythe interviewed by Thierry De Mey 2006). He also understands the differences between the sites of stage and screen, that the film is not designed to be a document of the stage work, that it is another work.

What I like about film is that you can become intimate…I like the way you can feel inside the dance instead of always outside the dance…and although this work was designed to be seen from a distance…you can recuperate the intensity because of the way you compose it…it is not a linear experience…you are going back and examining it closer. (William Forsythe interviewed by Thierry De Mey 2006)

Forsythe’s comment about ‘recuperating the intensity’ when creating a screen work echoes with my experience of creating screen translations of live performance, particularly dance work that is about the details of intensity—of subtle gestures, or points of contact, of individual nuance, of spoken word or breath or pant, of frames and details within and around the body. For several years I translated the stage works of Phillip Adams’ Balletlab to the screen. These works are visceral, complicated, full of effort and affectation, with much three-dimensionality to the visual design—a small house constructed within a theatre decorated in stunning 1950’s detail; taxidermy creatures as corps de ballet; live wood-chopping as a background to intricate partnering on a woodpile. Adams’ work is intensely visceral, tactile and embellished; it is not shape making from a distance. The challenge for the filmmaker is to find a way inside, a dancer’s viewpoint, moving around, with and in counterpoint to the action, coming close enough to feel the air moving, a breath, a slap…anticipating a flow, riding a rhythm, responding as one of the participants in the dance. Just as Adams brings other

24 Professional companies, dance conservatories, universities, postgraduate architecture programs, and secondary schools worldwide use Forsythe’s 1994 computer application, Improvisation technologies: a tool for the analytical dance eye, as a teaching tool. 2009 marked the launch of Synchronous objects for one flat thing, reproduced, a digital online score developed with The Ohio State University that reveals the organizational principles of the choreography and demonstrates their possible application within other disciplines. Synchronous Objects is the pilot project for Forsythe’s Motion bank, (project leader Scott deLahunta http://motionbank.org) a research platform focused on the creation and research of online digital scores in collaboration with guest choreographers. (www.williamforsythe.de/biography1.html)

25 You can view promotional excerpts of my screen translations for Balletlab of Nativity, Origami, Fiction, Brindabella, Axeman’s Lullaby and Miracle on YouTube. (https://www.youtube.com/user/BalletLab)
locations and eras into the performance space, shifting its site, so must the camera move into this new site and find its cinematic dimensionality. It is also worth noting that I would edit together shots from different performances.\textsuperscript{26} This can mean having to find creative editing solutions if not all performers are in the same relationships to each other or the soundtrack/live text in each performance, but it enables a larger dynamic catalogue of filmed material.

\ldots there are no grounds to think that moving-picture dance documentation needs to be restricted to a single performance. (Carroll 2001: 120)

\textbf{Lloyd Newson's DV8} would be one of the most successful companies to create works with equal intensity in both stage and screen sites. Part of this success could be in the capacity to create rich filmic locations on stage, and to fully utilize real locations for camera. Another element giving their screen works their power is the authenticity of the content—real physical and psychological risks; deeply personal or controversial subject matter; and performers with control, charisma and close-up craft (by which I mean they appear authentic, i.e. not "acting," at close-up camera range). Newson clearly understands the need to trust the editor's intuition,\textsuperscript{27} stating that he "is willing to lose vast sequences of choreography if it aids the overarching rhythm of the film" (Lockyer 2002: 159).

DV8 have translated several works from stage to screen. The name of the company, an acronym for Dance and Video 8, has from the outset declared a 'strong commitment to film and video that reflects its ongoing interest in how two primarily visual media can enhance one another and reach a crossover audience from within both forms' (DV8 Artistic Policy 2016, para. 5). \textit{Dead dreams of monochrome men} (1989), with director David Hinton and editor John Costelloe, was instrumental in setting me on the journey to becoming a screendance artist. I was shown the work by former BBC producer/director Bob Lockyer when he conducted a "Dance for camera" workshop with Danceworks (dance company I was a member of at the time) in Melbourne 1990.

\textit{Dead Dreams of Monochrome Men} is a rework of the 1988 stage production based loosely on the

\textsuperscript{26} I prefer to capture multiple performances to maximize opportunities for capturing the “best” performances from varying angles, and I prefer to be hands on with each shot rather than setting static, wide angles. In this way I establish continuity with my embodied view, a particular dynamic and intimacy, and I have the advantage of being able to recall this body memory when looking for particular shots in the edit suite.

\textsuperscript{27} Karen Pearlman proposes that ‘editors’ intuitions about cutting or shaping the movement of film are founded in the same bodies of knowledge and experience that choreographers’ intuition draw upon’ (Pearlman 2006: 52).
life of North London serial killer, Denis Nilson. The thematic content for this “physical theatre” work already represents a departure from the usual subject matter and aesthetic of stage dance. The physical body is used to communicate social issues and draws on the gestures and interactions of the real-life scenario, shifting between the stylized and the naturalistic, between “art” and life. Newson references behaviour and contexts both recognizable and evocative for a broader audience than the dance educated, and more easily translated to the screen. He also works with specifically constructed sets for stage, which replace the stage proscenium with alternate locations. By exploring the physical range of these real settings—nightclubs, back alleys, bathrooms, and bedrooms—Newson is re-locating the audience in space as the camera would in film. The Film Noir look (black and white, sharp contrast/shadows) provides a direct link for the viewer between known film conventions and dance (Reid 2001: 93).

David Hinton and John Costelloe also collaborated with Lloyd Newson on the screen adaptation of Strange Fish (1992) but the most recent DV8 film work, The Cost of Living (2004) was directed by Newson alone. In 1996 I attended the stage version of Enter Achilles (1996) which was later adapted to film by Clara van Gool. While the stage show used harnesses and aerial work in a relatively abstract setting of walls, the film uses an authentic English pub, interior rooms and exterior lanes and rooftops with most of the “flying” assisted by the support of extra cast members and the ledges and portals provided by the location. The setting is naturalistic and recognizable as a narrative location providing not only physical props and spatial configurations but also a socio-political context. Objects from this environment are utilized to comment upon the taboos surrounding intimacy and touch in this male public domain.

The contact duet, in which two men wrestle to reach a glass on the floor, demonstrates the pretext drinking can provide for intimate contact. Without the ‘game’ which focuses on the glass, on the drinking activity, the men would have no ‘excuse’ for this physical interaction—intimate touch between men seen as being subversive, homosexual. (Reid 2001: 94)

As DV8 have demonstrated, screendance is an effective format through which to address a range of sensitive personal, political and socio-cultural issues. The camera can take the viewer

---

28 DV8 could be regarded as the first company to use the phrase “physical theatre” to describe their particular approach to dance. Their artistic policy reads: ‘DV8 Physical Theatre’s work is about taking risks, aesthetically and physically, about breaking down the barriers between dance and theatre and, above all, communicating ideas and feelings clearly and unpretentiously. It is determined to be radical yet accessible, and to take its work to as wide an audience as possible.’ (http://dv8.co.uk/about-dv8/artistic-policy/)
Katrina McPherson (choreographer/director/producer) & Simon Fildes (editor/producer) are a Scottish partnership working under the production company name of Goat Media.29 For the past fifteen years they have created works for installation, performance, and small screen, specifically “video dance” and “arts documentaries.” Until recently they also held positions as lecturers and researchers in the media arts course at the University of Dundee. The ethos of social/community mindedness is reflected in their choice of collaborators and projects that are in many ways inclusive and which celebrate diversity and collaboration.

Working a lot with hand-held camera and moving within the action of the dance work, McPherson captures the kinesthesia of the dance. With a predilection toward detail of the body and an attention to movement through frame her footage is both visceral and painterly. Together with Fildes’ editing choices, their works resemble quilts in motion, detailed fragments pieced together in surprising and captivating patterns. Images and sound may be spliced up, repeated and re-ordered, often based on a mathematical equation (edit after so many frames, diminishing, etc.) so that the sequence is non-linear, a puzzle. The use of moving camera and close-up amplifies this deconstruction, an abstraction that could depersonalize the content. Yet the use of rich colour, the choices of angle and body detail, and an attention to the breath, murmur and body sounds of the dancers gives an intimacy that propels the viewer with the dancer, sharing the disorientation. The camera/viewer is simultaneously within the action and recalling it, the flashing of repeated images suggesting a history, a community, and a way of living in a body. This approach could be seen as an improvisational screendance practice,30 certainly in how the camera works with the dancer. In the performance documentary Force of nature (2011) about improviser Kirstie Simson, a second fixed camera reveals McPherson on hand-held camera moving within the performance action on stage in front of a live audience. By revealing the camera moving within the dance action, then cutting

---

29 (http://www.go-at.co.uk/) I have met McPherson and Fildes and participated in Screendance Labs facilitated by them on their visit to Australia for the Reeldance Festival in 2008, and at the Light Moves Festival of Screendance in Ireland in 2014.

30 I will discuss improvisational screendance practice further in Chapter 3.
to McPherson’s point of view, we (the viewers of this documentary) are introduced to the body of the camera, the dancer facilitating our gaze and our kinesthetic journey through the work.

*Moment* (1999) opens with flashes of movement across frame, the images over-exposed so that the edges are blurred, the forms undecipherable. Accompanying these opening traces are squeaks and brushes, sounds indicating friction, contact of contrary surfaces. Little by little we can discern a face, a hand, repeating flashes of a foot turning, an arm pulling, a torso turning and falling. As the shots become slightly wider and longer between cuts, the identities of these fragmented bodies are revealed as not one but two women with the same red tank top and bobbed haircut—the repetition extending to the dancers themselves. A musical pulse pushes the repetition of shots, a non-linear dance of falling, turning, shoulders colliding, hands assisting foot—the point of impact amplified as the frequency of cuts intensifies. This collaboration of close up camera and accelerated editing gives a heightened sense of kinesthesia, an attention to the trio that is the viewer’s dance in and around the space between the two dancers. A shift of pace and angle brings our attention to the location—slow motion circling shots revealing the ornate plasterwork of ceiling, walls drop into long static shots of the large chapel interior, the two dancers now in stillness leaning on one another first standing, then squatting. The disorientation of the preceding images amplifies the resonance of this stillness, the scale and gravity of the location arriving, and beautifully deepening with the simple action of one dancer’s fall away and apart from the other. The choreographic sensibility of the screendance now opens our field of vision to a longer duet of the dancers in unison and in real-time chronology. Intermittent overhead wide shots show the wooden floor and, with it, the forward journey of the dancers across the floor. The viewer has been elevated to the privileged viewpoint, out of danger of impact, able to discern the patterning in a broader landscape. As I view this I feel myself breathe out and my shoulders relax. I see the progress of the dancers across the floor as an echo of the processions that have traversed this temple or, even more abstractly, as a herd’s migration across a valley. Then the images begin to slow, the sound muffling and recalling the opening sequences but with a legato quality. The attention to touch draws us back into intimate range with a cheek to an arm, a hand tracing down the back, pelvises together, hand guiding head in a descending spinal roll. The echoes of the opening images are enriched, now slowed and coloured, into a choreographic denouement that suggests cycles and continuity—an exquisite metaphor for the lasting
impressions of physical contact, relationships and, in this particular case, of the work of a specific dance artist.31

The more recent screendance works of McPherson/Fildes relocate the body within the natural landscape, linking body and environment, dance and sustainability. *The time it takes* (2013), made in the couple’s homeland in the Outer Hebrides, Scotland, illustrates a development of their attention to the kinesthesia of the body (and a spontaneous, attentive body)32 to its dance with the environment, extending ideas about dance as a lived experience. These themes continue with their 2015 works, *Coire Ruadh* (2015) and *Uath Lochans* (2015) again featuring rich Scottish landscapes33 but experienced differently when “danced” by particular solo dancers. Their work echoes an improvisational sensibility in its engagement with body and the world around it—in ‘physical and visceral dissections of place.’34 Kent De Spain describes improvisation practice as ‘the world is improvising too; and that dance, your interaction with the world, forms you just as you form the world’ (De Spain 2003: 37). In their program notes for *The time it takes*, McPherson and Fildes also attend to being in the moment and in the world as they describe ‘the time it takes, to arrive, to live, to make a land.’ At the 2014 Light Moves Screendance Lab McPherson spoke about the connection between their life practice (she and partner Fildes), of reconfiguring their way of living within and in response to the Scottish Highlands, and the desire to relocate dance out of the studio and into the natural environment. In this context dancing and shooting must become fluid and emergent, allowing the landscape to become the movement score and to build the relationship between dancers and camera.

All these partnerships demonstrate the capacity for screendance to evolve, finding new contexts for the dancing body while embracing current technological developments. These works speak to me of the meetings of sites and sensibilities that address aesthetic shifts in design, camera work and editing without compromising the visceral impact of the physical body. These artists are working with sophisticated tools, their work is mostly “hi-fi,” (funded and well-resourced), and yet their subject matter is concerned with the personal or the

31 *Moment* is credited as ‘dedicated to the memory and inspiration of Michele Fox, dancer and film-maker 1966-1996’ and ‘funded through the generosity of Gerald Fox, Joscelyn Fox and Jeremy Gewirtz’ (*Moment* 1999).

32 The dancers have a delicacy and immediacy in their vocabulary and presence that suggests an attention to the lived experience, and their own considerable experience as improvisers.

33 These artists are partnering with conservation and heritage organizations, as well as arts partners, to use screendance as an artistic platform for raising environmental issues.

34 This phrase is included in the online description of *Uath Lochan* (2015) featuring dancer Marc Brew. (https://vimeo.com/ondemand/uathlochans/119744522.)
controversial—the impact of place on our bodies, or the impact the technological age is having on our relationships with the planet and each other. Some of these same artists are using screendance as a positive vehicle to represent physical difference and to challenge outmoded, discriminatory representations of the body. In the next section I contextualize my own research in the creation of screendance that celebrates the dance of different and difficult bodies.

2.3 Unbecoming Bodies

In coming so close to these different bodies’ surfaces I am inviting the viewer to look beyond the surface…I am aiming for a de-mystification of disability that shows the might of a crumbling structure, the credibility of collapse, the delicacy of distortion. (Reid 2012b: 90)

Sarah Whatley, in her essay *The Spectacle of Difference: Dance and Disability on Screen*, suggests that the viewing of disabled dancers on screen can both satisfy a curiosity to look at these different bodies but may also provide a visceral involvement, which invites the viewer to identify with the dancing human subject/s (Whatley 2010: 43). Screendances that present “diffabled” bodies are removing the distance, literally through the close-up, and metaphorically by replacing difference with individuality. Many screendance practitioners have and continue to represent the dancer as an able-bodied, virtuosic “beauty” with a stylization of movement vocabulary (fluid, shape-oriented), casting (young, athletic females) and production techniques (black and white, slow-motion). However, my study is interested in particular practitioners’ works that actively represent “different” bodies and, in doing so, present other possibilities for dance and ‘other ways of being-with-one-another-in-the-world’ (Albright 2003: 257).

35 “Diffabled” is a phrase I first heard coined by disability culture activist and community artist Petra Kuppers (when I attended a presentation she made at Dancehouse facilitated by Ausdance Victoria). She teaches in performance and disability studies at the University of Michigan and is the Artistic Director of the Olimpias Performance Research Series.

36 Tracie Mitchell’s *Sure* is a classic example of this particular screendance aesthetic, which uses slow motion and black and white to highlight and potentially reclaim concepts of “beauty” and “sensuality” for women and for dance (*Sure* 1998). In an interview I did with Mitchell at the time she states: ‘I think that women are amazing and are divine and I don’t feel like they’re celebrated enough in that place…and I think dance is sexy…not sexy like the way we’re selling our sports people, it’s organic…the sexual politics thing is difficult…I feel that for some reason dance is…the ownership of it is women’s business.’ Mitchell acknowledged that her visual style was influenced by the work of photographer Lillian Bassman and plays with shifts from black to white in background as Bassman did in her experimentation of burning negatives from dark into light and vice versa (*Interview with Tracie Mitchell* 2001).
In this section I will discuss a few of the screendance practitioners I have already mentioned (namely, McPherson/Fildes and DV8/Lloyd Newson) who have collaborated with “integrated” dance companies, or dancers with disabilities, on the making of works which I feel have contributed to diverse and inclusive views of the dancing body. I will also refer to some works by Australian artists including my own collaborations with diverse bodies and minds.

The 2001 Arts Council of England commissioned screendance, *Sense-8* (2001), was a collaboration between the already mentioned screendance artists McPherson and Fildes with Touchdown Dance. In this work, co-directed by the company’s artistic director Katy Dymoke, sighted dancers and visually impaired dancers interact with one another and the cameras. In this work it is again improvisation, specifically contact improvisation, which is both subject and vehicle. For these dancers, the navigation of bodies through touch is their way of meeting and moving through the world. The vision of the world is through sensation and McPherson echoes this by gradually revealing relationships with overlapping flashes of images of bodies with fragments of text. We see incomplete bodies, spliced together in impossible orders, seen through or past other bodies. It could be a comment on the dominance of vision over haptic and proprioceptive sensation that undermines touch in our culture and excludes the visually impaired. Intermittent shots of a surveillance-like view of the studio reveals the big picture—a number of duets happening at once followed by hand-held and tracking cameras—and we are reminded of the authority of vision, of being watched, in our culture. McPherson’s signature fragments of bodies in close-up and moving through frame serve to disorient the viewer in the same way that contact improvisation disorients the participant—where the shared point of contact between bodies is the axis of a mutual dance. The dance of contact improvisation can be exhilarating, kinetic, surprising, and that is reflected in this tumbling montage of experiences of touch, suspension, falling, turning... ‘reorienting the viewer’s senses away from the visual to the tactile sense’ (Whatley 2010: 50) and ‘opening up the

---

37 “Integrated” refers to the inclusion of both people with and without disabilities.

38 Rather than using the term “integrated” or “disabled,” Weave Movement Theatre originally described the company as made up of ‘diverse bodies and minds.’ Their more recent description is: ‘Weave Movement Theatre is an ambitious and diverse Melbourne based hybrid dance and theatre performance company comprising people with and without disabilities.’ (http://weavemovementtheatre.com.au/productions/2001-2010/.)

39 Touchdown Dance, based in Manchester, UK, deliver workshops and create performances using touch, contact improvisation and sensory feedback techniques specifically for the inclusion of visually impaired people. Steve Paxton & Anne Kilcoyne founded it in 1986 at Dartington College of the Arts, Devon. Katy Dymoke took over in 1994 when the company moved to the North West. Screendance artist Becky Edmunds (whom I will mention in the coming pages) has also worked with the company on a number of performances. (http://www.touchdowndance.co.uk/.)
possibility that we can look at the dancing body as a body in process, a body *becoming*’ (Albright 1997: 76).

DV8’s *The cost of living* (2004) features David Toole, a dancer with no legs.⁴⁰ In it the ‘viewer is encouraged to see David’s disability as just another bodily possibility’ (Whatley 2010: 46). In a duet with able-bodied and classically trained dancer Tanja Liedtke, Toole uses his differences as strengths, displaying the control and agility required of a male classical dancer but reoriented into the horizontal plane, lifting his own body weight as he circumnavigates the female’s legs. The duet is subverting the traditional notions of gender roles and body types prevalent in classical dance but at the same time there is something odd in the way that Liedtke regards Toole (smiling, perhaps patronizingly) and in the complete lack of regard from the other dancers in the studio (averting their gaze). The pas de deux supports ballet conventions as a fantasy sequence in the film narrative, but also reconfigures the shape of the subject of fantasy, desire, longing. It makes me feel uncomfortable, but then this is most likely Newson’s intention, to confront the viewer with of the ‘bringing together of two extremes…embodied by the classical ballet body and the disabled body’ (Whatley 2010: 47).

When one image meets the edges of the next one, both become unstable. (Kuppers 2004: 55)

There is a beautiful image at the close of the film, where Toole is given the illusion of having legs, riding the back of another dancer who is on all fours, moving along the shoreline. It is beautiful in the surprise and humor of the illusion combined with Toole’s elevated status as he uses the able-bodied as a vehicle—a vanishing of “normal” as man transforms into centaur.

South Australian Youth Dance Company, *Restless Dance Theatre*, describes itself as an integrated dance company working with young disabled and non-disabled people to create dance theatre and run workshop programs (*Restless Dance Theatre* 2016). With Closer Productions’ Bryan Mason and Sophie Hyde the company created a triptych of short dance films in collaboration with three independent Australian choreographers. Made specifically for the screen, *Necessary games* (2009) presents ‘three different takes on intimacy and connection and three explorations of the games we play.’⁴¹ Each film has a striking and quite

---

⁴⁰ Toole also features in the 1994 CanDoCo screendance *Outside in*, choreographed by Victoria Marks and directed by Margaret Williams. It is often cited in screendance texts as a landmark project for the representation of “other” bodies in screendance. Ann Cooper Albright states that it is ‘the combination of skillful cinematography and inventive choreography in this film (that) directs our gaze away from the extraordinary sight of Toole’s body to the interactive contexts of his dancing’ (Albright 1997: 80).

⁴¹ This citation is from the DVD cover notes of *Necessary games* (2009).
different stylistic look driven by a clever matching of location and emotional /physical narrative.

**Moths** (*Necessary Games* 2009) choreographed by Paul Zivkovich in collaboration with dancers Lorcan Hopper and Lachlan Tetlow-Stuart, plays out a co-dependent existence in a dark underworld. The blackness is dense and visceral playing against moments of rich colour—a green grassy upper world; multi-coloured butterflies animated onto a pale torso; the blues and reds of his jumper, the pink of his lips, the glow of a single tunnel lamp. Hopper, a dancer with Down Syndrome, moves between the dark world occupied by a sometimes motionless, sometimes scuttling other, and a lush lawn upon which he performs a sort of exorcism—tracing his navel, flinging his limbs, divining with his spectacles something from the ground in front of him. Rolling back into the underworld he engages in a leaping, rolling duel with his nemesis, riding the back of the other who circles on all fours in his own ritual of possession. *Moths* has a decidedly gothic and surrealist feel, that is amplified by sharp bursts of accelerated action, like physical spasms, that are just as quickly arrested in contrasting locations—laying on undergrowth, rolling to a bed of ice/snow, to bare-chested on dug earth (like a grave, a blue flower dropped in the background). At an earlier moment the other dancer, Tetlow-Stuart (with no visible disability), flies up and backwards in an impossible ascent from a bed of fluttering open books. The use of “odd” touch—sliding the palm of a hand under a foot, or placing the soles of another’s feet on the sides of one’s face—is both intimate and unnerving. The collaboration of design, choreography and post-production effects in *Moths* creates a sensual world, one with texture, temperature, scent, and weight. While it is clear that Hopper has a disability, it is not the content of the work, rather there is an attention to a struggle that is shared, intrinsically universal.

**Sixteen** (*Necessary Games* 2009), the middle work in the triptych, is choreographed by Kat Worth, a former Artistic Director of the company, and features Jianna Georgiou as the young woman discovering “boys” (she writes it in the air for the camera). The set is akin to a photographic studio, with Georgiou operating a flash and combing her hair with her fingers from her perch on a stool on the cyclorama. In three separate encounters she meets each boy, who have each been watching her from the edges of her “stage.” She performs a similar short ritual with each, meeting in gentle touch, finding a dance (sliding down his back, a playful shimmy or swaying cheek to cheek) and finally hand to heart, a gasp. Any young dancers could

---

42 The film is perhaps signaling “moth sickness,” a reference to mental or psychiatric illness in tribal societies. The Navajo (Native American) healer singers specialize in chants related to “moth sickness” (Roszak 1993: 78).
perform *Sixteen*, the blossoming of young love a universal theme; although the title alludes to innocence perhaps more common to a younger age suggesting that Georgiou is underdeveloped in “normal” terms. The sweetness of the encounters does diffuse the issues that I initially felt watching this work—issues relating to the media representation of young women as vulnerable and objects of desire. Instead, in each encounter she meets the boy as an equal, meeting and initiating touch, responding sensitively and intuitively to the varying character of each boy. The final gasp as she feels a hand to her heart is joyful, authentic and, face turned to the sky, a personal revelation or blossoming. There is a naivety and sweetness in *Sixteen* that celebrates youthful curiosity and discovery and could be seen to positively declare that innocence, a trait attributed to many intellectually disabled people, is a precious and desirable quality.

*Necessity* (*Necessary Games* 2009), Tuula Roppola for Kyra Kimpton and Dana Nance, places two young women inside a sepia-coloured room with peeling paintwork upon which Nance draws multiple smiling cartoon figures. In this work the hardships suffered as a result of difference are made explicit as the two girls share their “secrets.” ‘I’m afraid of moths...because they flutter’ one reveals, to which the other replies ‘Why does the flutter scare you?’ in what is most certainly a metaphor for a spasm, or speech impediment, some difference that, because of its difference, is feared. Nance’s story is clearly autobiographical as she talks about having no way to protect herself when she was younger because of her short arms. In their shared isolation in this place they find comfort in repetitions. Nance draws her figures in growing crowds on the walls and floor while Kimpton traces her own full-sized outline. The repetitions become frenzied. Kimpton is stuck in a loop in which the tracing has become slicing...hand between legs, to armpit, between lips, into ear, and back down again. Nance's drawings become more frenzied as Kimpton pushes herself between Nance and the wall to interrupt her compulsion. The intimacy in the work is heightened by the minimal use of music, rather the sounds of charcoal scraping, or feet squeaking on the floor, their quiet talk, and thunder and rain from a distance. Visually this delicacy is matched with attention to the detail of texture in the room’s paintwork and fixtures, and the subtle shifts of light moving across the floor. The two trace each other’s bodies, and list their favourite foods in whispers with their bed-socked feet up the wall, as if building strength and confidence through these shared intimacies.

In 2008 I was invited by Melbourne-based Director/Choreographer Katrina Rank to collaborate on *Yours truly*, a project within the City of Darebin Artist in Residence Program. Local people with disability, interested in dance, were invited to be involved in the
development of short dance films intended for an installation at the Art of Difference Festival at Northcote Town Hall in 2009. We worked with the five participants on short solo films, which were viewed through peepholes in small boxes, screened on small personal DVD players and heard through headphones. The viewer was both voyeur and scientist, hunched over containers each holding its own unique specimen. In this tunnel vision it was possible to leave the outside world, in this case a theatre foyer, and focus directly without distraction or self-consciousness at each dancer’s short disclosure. The use of headphones also made it possible to use sound kinetically, to explore texture and nuance through subtle developments in pitch, as well as capturing the content of some performers’ fast murmurings. One of these studies, I developed as a separate screendance for the ADF International Screendance Festival 2009. In *she sleeps* (2009) Jaye Hayes is a dancer navigating chronic illness (Chronic Fatigue Syndrome). Over the first two minutes I intercut brief flashes of her moving into an extended close-up shot of her “sleeping” on the studio floor. I very slowly wound the focus from sharp to soft/blurry as I filmed her that day, seeking to give the viewer the physical sensation of falling asleep/lethargy. The flashes of her dancing, also mostly eyes closed and close to or moving into the floor, are like a twitch, that shock or discomfort that one might feel at the edge of consciousness. To this visual slow fall I added an extremely slowed (thus lowered in pitch) sound chord that took an equal amount of time to climb. The flashes of movement increase in frequency as the chord ascends and we find Jaye in another place, still eyes closed but in a different plane, an altered relationship to gravity. I intended the last montage of falling, reaching, spiralling and suspending to be read as the physical struggle of this disease—that by translating the sensation (through the focal textures, rhythms, duration of images and sound) I could communicate her struggle with this misunderstood condition.

The viewer of an installation is invited into a potentially intimate relationship with the screendance. It is necessary to adjust one’s body in a particular way, to move into and around, even to activate imagery through physical presence. In *Yours truly*, the viewer had to hunch over the box and peer in, a devouring voyeuristic act. In this position and with headphones on, they were at once separated from the public foyer around them, and yet seen by others as voyeurs. Similarly, in *Take me to bed* (a multi-screen installation which I viewed at the Light Moves Screendance Festival in 2014, the viewer’s body and their attitudes to the disabled body are implicated and challenged. Across three screens are six “windows” alternating overhead wide shots of “different” bodies lying in their underwear on a bed, with close-up and proximal

---

*she sleeps* can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/84191890
*Take me to bed* won the Festival Prize for Best Overall Work. (http://lightmoves.ie/.)
shots of parts of these same bodies. These juxtapositions of overhead/distant and proximal/intimate allude to the issues of how disabled bodies are regarded. On the one hand they are regarded as “other,” confined in the frame and on the bed as a specimen, at a safe distance, removed from the public arena, perhaps, as many people with disabilities were, institutionalized. On the other hand the viewer is brought into intimate range of these unusual bodies, suggesting the possibility of carnal knowledge, sexually charging these bodies too often regarded as asexual. The viewer is not just close here but in bed with them, the camera/viewer lying beside and moving over their flesh in ways that implicate the viewer as physical participant.

In 2010 I worked with *Weave Movement Theatre*, a Melbourne based dance/movement performance company comprising people with and without disabilities, to create the screendance *A broken puzzle* (2010). On a personal level this was a benchmark project for me artistically. I felt I was able to draw together my roles as teacher, facilitator and dance filmmaker and develop a collaborative process that shares creative control of the content but then enables my choreographic vision to shape the form in the editing.

The close-up camera gives access beyond the personal space of the dancer, to the surface of the body, which can then suggest the interior space. ‘Close up you can read what is happening behind the eyes’ (Lockyer 2002: 160)—thoughts flick across the surface of the eyes; a wrinkle reveals a disposition, a scar...a history. It becomes important to create a familiarity, build a relationship between yourself and the dancer—they are not making shapes in the distance now, they are revealed and need to be “present” as humans. In order to capture the “real,” it is necessary to create the conditions to support an authentic performance. I create an imaginative landscape for the dancer, images to occupy and explore so that genuine tensions and ideas can move through the body and across the mind. I also, in a practical sense, have to find ways to use my whole body to support the camera and my movement through different levels, to use my peripheral vision, to predict a move so that I can continue the dance and keep the camera (or the bodies) from being damaged. Practical embodied solutions ‘of working with technology can be created from thinking like a dancer’ (Barbour 2011b: 2).

---

45 These performers—Caroline Bowditch, Janice Parker, Luke Pell and Robert Softely Gale—have a range of physical sizes and shapes.

46 *A broken puzzle* can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/80338955

47 I consider editing to be “choreography”—not the creation of rehearsed real-time sequences of “steps” but the montage of frames.
Conversely, considering the dancing body as camera sharpens our ways of seeing and moving with one another. Each dancer also became camera and explored moving the “frame” of what they could see in relation to the dancing body. This demystified the camera and enabled me to dance the camera within the action without interrupting the improvisational flow and without the performers becoming self-conscious. They could be aware of the camera and relate to it as a duet partner, and they could consider the three-dimensionality of their bodies and allow expression through surfaces other than the face. This is an example of my use of screendance as a methodology, as well as a form, an improvisational process I will elaborate on in chapter 3.

To make a film about this company was to instantly raise issues relating to representations of the body—concepts of beauty, voyeurism, and difference/discrimination. The camera allowed me to satisfy my natural curiosity, to really look at someone without judgment, to notice and spend time with a body and to see both their uniqueness and our commonalities. We are all dealing with difficulties, issues—some less visible than others and some more supported by infrastructure. I wanted to capture each company member’s specific body rhythms and qualities, to examine differences in shape, range, and speed and, in doing so, demystify difference. The screen space and post-production techniques can provide these very different bodies with an expanded range of movement potential, and a visibility as expressive individuals.

The decision to create a soundscape from their fragmented and altered spoken text built the thematic underpinning of *A broken puzzle* and gave me a framework to then cut the image to. It gave me opportunities to introduce aspects of each individual, to give clues, to encourage a viewer to (metaphorically) put the pieces together. The puzzle being the complexities of our lives, the many events, emotions and circumstances that make up the whole, and the idea of having to pull things apart to understand and appreciate them.

My screendance featuring Melinda Smith, *a beautiful day* (2012d), was edited from footage taken at mentored practice sessions with myself and other dance artists as part of Melinda’s

---

48 *A broken puzzle* received the ADF International Screendance Festival, Durham, NC, USA, Certificate of Recognition—2011 “For a work that is invested with dignity and humanity, and demonstrating the potential for screendance to make a difference” (*ADF international screendance festival* 2011).

49 *a beautiful day* can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/168281422
*Cultivate* grant.50 These workshops took place over the course of several months and across locations in two different states (I was based in Adelaide during 2011 and 2012) so the footage captures the development that happened over time, in relation both to Melinda’s physical capacities and to the relationship between camera and dancer. The creative process mirrored the developing friendship between Melinda and myself, the trust and kinesthetic understanding that was enabling a mutual exploration of the body in that moment. Exploring exterior environments—the beach, parks, and lane ways—as well as working out of the wheelchair on the rich red wood of the Dancehouse studio floor provided other frames and stimuli for Melinda’s moving. The beach sand provided support that enabled her to stand upright for an extended period of time and also provided a visual metaphor for growth.51 Similarly, the dancing of the camera with, around and in intimate proximity to Melinda demonstrates the experiential nature of dance and its capacity to open the body, and the individual therein, to the world. Here, screendance brings the viewer into range with the individual body, close enough to feel the temperature of the sun on her face, to experience new planes and different relationships to gravity, the joy of disorientation and the pleasure of sensation. I believe I was aiming to give the viewer an empathetic experience—to ‘deconstruct the notion of disability as transgressive by recognizing the humanity of the dancer, and to experience the relationship as transformative, where physical diversity need no longer be disabling’ (McGrath 2012: 156).

The presence of the camera, either in the context of studio practice or a screendance “shoot,” offers an active witnessing, a support for the dancer both in the moment of performance and in reflection as feedback. The use of camera in our studio practice, extending from these beginnings in 2011 to this doctoral research project, transforms our ways of seeing our own and each other’s bodies as well as gradually re-patterning our physical habits. The screendance technology could be seen as an ideokinetic tool, a means to transform anatomical and kinesiological information using the video images to re-imagine movement in the body52 (Thompson 1985: 6).

50 Melinda received the professional development *Cultivate* grant from Arts Access Australia. I was the mentor and primary tutor for the project, which enabled Melinda to develop her dance practice through a series of workshops with dance improvisation practitioners including Anne O’Keeffe and Joey Lehrer.

51 I am not inferring that Melinda desires to or should measure up to an “ableist” standard but that the growth is in relation to her personal range of embodied experience.

52 Whereas ideokinesis, as described by Thompson with reference to Lulu Sweigard (1974), works with imagined movement within the body (a visual or kinesthetic image imagined while the body is at rest), in this instance I am extrapolating so that the reviewed video imagery enables the imagined movement and the consequent possibilities for change.
I've lost that fear, shyness, awkwardness with the camera/video...I’ve learnt small steps to relax, be myself, play, be experimental and use it to feedback to myself, and communicate my world to my peers/supporters. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015: 8 February 2014)

There is potential for screendance to suggest more than embodied ways of viewing the body but also to illuminate the physical approach to studio practice, and transform the shape and potential of that embodiment. This potential is being continually realized in my practice with Melinda Smith, as I will outline in a later section of chapter 3.

2.4 Screendance and live performance

A number of artworks across a range of genres and contexts draw both on the craft of screendance (incorporating edited video and projection with live bodies) and activate the audience’s body in unexpected ways. While there are many artists who have incorporated video projection within performance or installation works my focus here is on works that specifically “flesh the interface,” in which live bodies (performer and audience) and video imagery interact in a new, shared space.

**Hellen Sky** and **John McCormick** are Melbourne artists working across the fields of dance and media. Together they founded *Company in space*[^53] (or CIS) in 1992, a new media performance company that consistently pioneered applications of new technology to movement. Over more than a decade (until 2004) CIS collaborated with a range of dance and media artists to produce provocative works that brought screen and dance together in multiple sites and formats. Their telematic performances were simultaneously live and virtual utilizing video and interactive technologies (ISDN, Web TV and VRML) to merge dancing bodies and audiences across global sites. Their performances worked poetically and technically with the craft of screendance, i.e. using live camera and video editing production techniques to merge flesh and pixels into a new hybrid site. Sky and McCormick worked with a high degree of improvisational sensitivity necessitated by their real-time interactive systems. Many artists working with dance technology over the past two decades (Merce Cunningham, Bill T. Jones, William Forsythe) have recognized the importance of an open or improvisational approach when exploring the potential for exchange between human

[^54]: This refers to formats used for web-based applications: ISDN=Integrated Service Digital Network; VRML=Virtual Reality Modeling (or Markup) Language.
performers and digital platforms. One such pioneering dance technology artist, Sarah Rubidge, writes that those forms of digital media which allow for real-time interactivity, ‘provide a framework for choreography which opens up new modes of practice, and new ways of thinking in and through dance’ (Rubidge 2002: 2–3). The questioning of known or traditional choreographic practice that arises when working with interactive technologies ‘not only extend(s) the possibilities available to the dance artist, both in terms of form and content, but also open(s) up the possibility of using choreography to interrogate complex philosophical issues (Rubidge 2002: 3).

With *Navigators: mapping the dream* (1995) Sky claims that CIS were ‘probably some of the first people to start using cameras that would observe the performers from different locations within the theatre space, in their use of telematic or interactive spaces where the body has been responsible for orchestrating or being connected to more than one site’ (Sky in *Hellen Sky & John McCormick interviewed by Shirley McKechnie* 2003).

...We were working with observing the dancing body by two points of view, by two camera points of view that followed the movement around. Then we were able to combine them into a single frame. So those two camera performers were cooperating their filming of the work to recompose what they were filming to make two people look like they were in the same space when, in fact, they were in two separate camera point of views... then John was able to change and alter the quality and effect of that by some of his real time animation and sort of onboard computer effects... so it was very possible for us to look at that work and divide the space completely. So put those dancers in very different locations, because still the same system observing the body through the camera would be appropriate to make it still have the same projected screen... juxtaposition to the live performer. (Sky in *Hellen Sky & John McCormick interviewed by Shirley McKechnie* 2003)

*Escape velocity* (1996) was a duet that worked with videoconference technology to move ‘into this idea of using it as a dual sight/site performance’ (McCormick in *Hellen Sky & John McCormick interviewed by Shirley McKechnie* 2003) with the dancers (Sky and Louise Taube)

---

55 There has been much debate about what Philip Auslander calls the ‘life and death struggle’ between live performance and technology, with the digital regarded as the ‘dominating aesthetic force’ (Auslander 2008: 41–42). In fact, CIS were involved in an online exchange with another digital performance artist, Nick Rothwell, that demonstrated the ‘tension behind the “technology versus content” issue (Dixon 2007: 5–6). When working with new technologies there is often both an enthusiasm to focus on playing with the tools and a resistance to changing former artistic practices. Perhaps it was the combination of McCormick’s technical prowess and Sky’s artistic insistency that enabled CIS to create a technology/artistic content balance and pose new philosophical questions.

56 Sky refers to the camera operators as “performers” both because they were visibly inside the stage action, but also because their framing of the dancers, their movement in relationship to the dance, was as vital as the action they filmed. It was danced material in the editing of the telematic mix (Sky in *Hellen Sky & John McCormick interviewed by Shirley McKechnie* 2003).

57 *Escape Velocity* won a Green Room Award for outstanding creativity in performance in 1998.
often performing simultaneously in different countries. In each live performance space a single dancer and camera operator/belayer\(^{58}\) interacted in real-time with a projected dance partner. Audiences and dancers in both sites could see each other projected remotely. With this and subsequent works including *Trial by video* (1997), CIS were using real time intervention into a live performance work in order to bring in ‘this idea of distance and communication…and still read the richness of the performance and the bodies and map it into the sound and visual elements of the performance’ (McCormick in *Hellen Sky & John McCormick interviewed by Shirley McKechnie* 2003).

In 2008 I worked on *The darker edge of night…it’s about time* (2008a), conceived and performed by Hellen Sky. This developing work involves collaboration from a number of artists working across the fields of theatre, dance, sound, image and new media technologies.\(^{59}\) Sky orchestrated these technical and performative threads into an event that is a virtual reality/danced lecture realized live. Using a cavernous space, once an abattoir/meat market and now reconfigured as a performance space, Sky created a new site in which real and virtual elements met.

A solo performer navigates her way through slippery time fields. Her past, our present and the future are fluid ‘states’ where boundaries blur between the virtual/game world and the world of story/imagination and memory to reveal poetic perspectives about our experiences of time and timelessness as influenced by technology. (*Hellen Sky—The darker edge of night* 2008, para. 3)

Although the audience was seated in a traditional relationship (a frontal seating bank) within the performance space the multi-dimensional texts and tools at play served to reconfigure the audience’s relationship with the performer, the location and, potentially, their own body. The use of a mirrored dome as projection surface bounced a star-filled galaxy in three-dimensions around the entire space including the audience in this other world. Multiple projections were also mixed live over an abstract mountain of boxes, tables, and odd bits of theatrical scenery. Sky moved into these other worlds physically and poetically mixing ‘spoken word, movement, sound, moving image, virtual and physical spatial design, and the responsive sensor technology systems to influence the choreography of her body and the audiovisual

---

\(^{58}\) The work incorporated the use of harnesses and rope/pulley systems, often with the camera operators also controlling the abseil rope to enable the dancers to walk up and down the walls of the performance space.

\(^{59}\) Collaborating artists included: Tim Bateson; Paul Bourke (WASP); Margaret Cameron; Susie Fraser; David Franzke, Rebecca Hilton; Garth Paine (VIPRe); Michael Pearce; Dianne Reid; Tetsutoshi Tabata; and Leigh Warren.
environments through which she moves’ (Hellen Sky—*The darker edge of night* 2008, para. 4). Sky wore sensors, which translated data from her brain waves, muscle flexion, breath and voice into real time evolving sound worlds. Live camera feeds\(^{60}\) transformed her body within virtual and real architectural spaces. In my experience the immersive nature of this world served to weave the viewer into a blend of virtual and live worlds, shifting their attention across the senses and potentially into sensation.

The screen is not a surface but the reach of my extended touch. My body is a bridge spanning time. (Sky 2012: 222)

**Simon Ellis** is a New Zealand artist working in the UK and Australia. His artistic work spans live performance and dance, screen, web-based work, DVD-video and ROM, installation, and writing. I am familiar with much of his body of work, having video documented some projects,\(^{61}\) and, while Artistic Director at Dancehouse, assisting in the first public presentation of *Inert* (2006). Ellis is part of the Centre for Screendance (*Centre for screendance—about* 2016), a group of international screendance peers who founded initiatives including the International Journal of Screendance.\(^{62}\) Ellis invited myself and another screendance artist, Lucy Cash, to join him in responding to the Pia Ednie-Brown essay *Falling into the surface* (1999) for the second volume of *IJS* in 2012.

Ellis’ works are pertinent to my current research merging the live encounter with screendance. *Inert* is a unique and intimate screendance/performance experience. Involving two dancers and two audience members it runs for only fifteen minutes and must be managed with a particular front of house attention.\(^{63}\) Audience members are given headphones and

---

\(^{60}\) I contributed to this work with the creation of video scenes (camera and editing), the operation of live camera to augment and mix her live image within the projected environments around her, and the editing of video documentation of the performances.

\(^{61}\) (*Conversations with the dead* 2008) and (*Inert* 2006).

\(^{62}\) The network originally included Claudia Kappenberg (University of Brighton), Doug Rosenberg (University of Wisconsin-Madison), and Katrina McPherson (formerly Dundee University). The network’s goal was to create a research forum for critical debate and publication on screendance. The network also aimed to foster dialogue with adjacent fields of practice and enquiry and invited scholars such as Professor Ian Christie, (Birkbeck, University of London UK), Professor Noel Carroll (Temple University, USA) and Catherine Wood, Curator (Tate Modern UK) to contribute at different stages of the project. In December 2011 and after two years of debates and activities the Network – Claudia Kappenberg, Sarah Whatley, Doug Rosenberg Harmony Bench, Ann Cooper-Albright, Marisa Zanotti and Simon Ellis – held its final meeting, and these seven now contribute to the work of the Centre for Screendance, alongside other artists, scholars and students (*International journal of screendance* 2015).

\(^{63}\) Audience members must disclose their physical height when booking their “appointment” and arrive fifteen minutes before their allocated booking at which time they receive a yellow or red ticket designating to which performer they are assigned. Their height is used to calibrate the weighted mechanism of the tilting benches each audience member is placed on, and which each performer guides from vertical to horizontal during the performance.
placed on a tilting structure, like an operating bench, that moves from vertical to horizontal during the work to reveal a video screen hung overhead facing downward. The two performers, Ellis and Shannon Bott, interact directly with the viewer—firstly live and then as a screen character. In the live encounter each dancer holds the gaze of the audience member who is also physically held by the structure and attached headphones. It is a direct and intimate encounter in which the audience must place their trust in the dancer who sometimes disappears from view while still being heard moving in the peripheries. After a while the dancer approaches their audience partner and slowly tilts their platform from vertical to horizontal. This altering of the viewer’s relationship to gravity, in addition to the intensity of the dance and text delivered directly from dancer to viewer (both live and via screen) results in a profound bodily experience—an intimate physical and emotional relationship is created and a history implied between performer and audience. In the horizontal position, after having met the dancer live but at a slight distance, the viewer encounters the screen image, a several minute artwork, which is both screendance and video journal.

I will describe one of the videos to illustrate the integration of live performance and screen context in *Inert*(2006/2009).

Yellow Video (Ellis): It begins and ends with black and white shapes, like imprints, ink blots coming into view and disappearing on different parts of the screen (perhaps a negative of the body moving)…He begins to speak ‘The first time I saw you, you looked a little awkward’ and this is where small frames of his body begin to appear, overlap, creating a patchwork of frames, little windows sometimes blurred, other times focused on a hand, an open throat, intimate details…so the audience is a voyeur, as if looking through a crack in a door, a keyhole, viewing someone who thinks they are alone. The voice-over quality is real, close, intimate and the content is direct, questioning, remembering…the electronic blips, like static, are pulse like but metallic/electronic. It makes me think of my breathing or hearing water dripping, something close/intimate/incessant. He talks about getting close, implies touch. The view becomes singular, a slightly wider view of the dancing body…then to white…then to Simon sitting looking directly into the camera, smiling with voice-over…he is describing what he sees, he might be remembering, fragments of images and sounds, relationships…the words overlay and become more complicated, multiple voices…

You, you, I’m saying this to you (*Inert* 2006/2009)
The image changes to an extreme slow motion landing, his feet beginning off the floor and ending in a crouch with his hands on his thighs...he suggests an intimacy, that becomes exhilarating, hungry, faster, details, a sneeze...the quality of the image is a slow blur that is quite liquid and visceral, like a painting melting. The voice-over falls back to one voice then ends. There is a return to the black and white images and a final voice-over...

I see you lying, full body, I think this is not real. (Inert 2006/2009)

In the live performance the black and white imagery (about 30 seconds at each end of the video) was the time in which the viewer was shifted from vertical to horizontal and back again. After this video and that last statement, the audience member finds themselves facing the real dancer, who has now turned away. The performers remain there in stillness until the audience member, released from their viewing position (by front of house staff), leaves the room.

There is an intensity of connection between viewer and dancer in this work, one on one, which resonates with my earliest performances of Dance Interrogations. The audience is, in a way, trapped, confined, held in an intimate relationship with the dancer/performer. The video components of this work also imbue the screen image with three-dimensionality, a visceral quality, an attention to touch and intimate parts of the body.

Bott (red): 'I could touch you right now...I like being alone with you' (Inert 2006)

Two other artists whose work foregrounds audience intimacy in mixed digital-analogue environments are UK performance/filmmakers Leslie Hill and Helen Paris. They formed the company Curious in 1996. Like Ellis' work, these artists position the audience in specific physical ways to focus attention on particular sites and artifacts and intensify the relationships between performer and audience, body and screen. In The moment I saw you I knew I could love you (2009) the audience is seated in life rafts flanked by projection screens, making them aware of their own bodies as their movements, their turning to see the screens, make the boats rock. Paris also uses a hand-sized projector to project onto a strip of travel sickness pills on an audience member’s hand...images of a woman at sea.

---

64 I first performed site-specific solos under the title Dance Interrogations in 2012 at the Adelaide Fringe Festival in an underground tunnel and at the Edinburgh Fringe Festival in a small blacked out hotel room.
65 (http://www.placelessness/com/.)
As a live performer invested in the potential for connectivity in performance I often use a fusion of analogue and digital technology in live work to engender different nuances of proximity and intimacy between performer and audience. I am fascinated by how this mélange of visceral and virtual can work to open up levels of embodiment and closeness, to tease identities and blur performer-spectator relationships. (Paris 2012: 195)

Their installations interact directly with the physical body of the audience and deliberately play with the senses. *On the scent* (2004) explored the relationship between smell and memory, bringing audience into ‘rooms of a house where visitors are received’ (Paris 2006: 184) (a living room; a kitchen; a sick room/bedroom) where they encountered a single performer’s narrative and an accompanying “smell-scape” (rose and violet cream chocolates and vases of lilies; home cooking and burning; Dettol and Pepto Bismol) (Paris 2006: 185). *On the scent* drew on the intimacies of personal interaction in a domestic setting and the capacity for smell to ‘transport us back to a moment in our past more vividly than any of the other senses’ (Paris 2006: 187).

Another of Paris’ collaborators, Gretchen Schiller is a Canadian choreographer and co-author with Sarah Rubidge of *Choreographic Dwellings: practicing place* (2014). I interviewed Gretchen while we were both attending the Global Dance Summit in 2014 where she presented a paper *Moving Mnemes*, focusing on her installation *Falling into Place* (2012). Her artistic and academic works incorporate live performance, screendance and installation and have also included Susan Kozel (whose work and writings I draw on in my phenomenological research) as performer. Schiller describes the work as a ‘choreographic dwelling—a participatory installation whose aim is to awaken the public’s sensibility to their subjective identification with place through the stories of others woven into the actions of a choreographed scenographic narrative…a library’ (2014c). *Falling into Place* was developed as part of the Body Library research project beginning in 2011. This research questioned ‘the ways in which our physical gestures and repertoires collect, index and reference our bodies’ inhabitation of lived place’ (Schiller 2014b: 143).

Led by a librarian’s voice embedded in the furniture—an armoire, a coffee table, an armchair—each audience member moves into a library-like set embedded with images and textures. They flip through a book of video images, text and drawings of the hand gestures of an 80-year-old woman at a coffee table. They hear a story of a woman washing clothes in a basin. Sitting in the armchair, the audience member’s hands become a projection surface for the drawings of others’ hand gestures.

---

...When I started working on (Falling into Place) I wanted to film people walking in their daily...because it's the procedural, the habitual...I'm going to the bakery every day, I'm going to etc. and I thought I can't film them, why would I film them? That's ridiculous, what am I going to get from that? And so I started following them. I would just follow people and it was fantastic...and then imitating them. So what I did was my body was the camera, not the camera. How do they walk...I would take on their rhythm, or how they were moving their shoulders. And it would make me understand the space completely differently. (Interview with Gretchen Schiller 2014a)

In an interview with Schiller we spoke about how place is carried through movement, of the “knowledge” acquired through everyday movement, about what traces linger and what slips through the gaps. By bringing the imagery of gesture onto the viewer’s skin in Falling into Place each visitor was given a ‘heightened experience of their own physical awareness of place that often lies ignored.’ We agreed that designing ways to come close gently and generously to the live bodies of the audience to encourage an embodied viewing experience is ‘crucial knowledge,’ knowledge that is central to this Dance Interrogations research project. (Interview with Gretchen Schiller 2014a)

At the 2014 Light Moves Screendance Symposium, a number of artists acknowledged their use of movement on screen as a means to engage with communities and to explore geopolitical themes. Becky Edmunds, whose multi-screen installation Distant Wars (2013) featured in the Festival’s Installation program, speaks of her move fifteen years ago from live performance to video practice so she could just engage with documenting things rather than “inventing.” Her installation work utilizes a combination of found propaganda footage and choreographed dance sequences housed on small screens (iPod Nanos), which the viewer can move around on a table reminiscent of military map tables. Edmunds spoke of her distance from war in contradiction to the ever-present preparedness for war.

After the 7/7 bombings in London there was the “Go in, stay in, tune in” slogan and now the terror threat is always at the highest level...war has been present but distant: via drone technology, where weapons are operated from other side of world, recruiting video gamers; in time (parents’ experiences); and in the imagination (mediated through screens and slogans). (Artists panel discussion 2014)

Edmunds’ installation moves the body into that of the strategist, in some way giving the participant some control in the scenario while simultaneously caricaturizing it. As I participated in the installation I was moved up out of the chair and into motion over and around the table as I arranged the “pieces.” Although the subjects (archival footage, video
dancer) and the implied subjects (soldiers, political leaders, war victims) were not physically present in the room, I was physically shifted in plane and position to stand looking down at the table as I surveyed the “bigger picture.” I was alerted to the possibility of being inside rather than remote from war.

These installation works I have mentioned are setting up the possibility of coming close—through strategies of “staging” the screen and accessing kinesthetic content these artists are inviting viewers into the dance of their own body. There is a sense that these artists are “listening” to the bodies of their imagined audience, that is, they are considering the physical context and how that might affect the viewer’s body. In the next chapter I will discuss how my “live screen/dance” is my strategy for closeness. I will move inside the methodology of screendance and access the kinesthetic content in all our bodies (my performer body, their audience body, your reader’s body), an embodied approach to the creation and reception of screendance and live performance.
I accumulate an artwork with my audience—
each individual simultaneously witnessing and creating
within our performative interaction.

The performance combines dance, physical theatre, voice, soundscape
and video projection
in unusual architectural locations that act as metaphors for the body
attending to the detail of the interior
its volume, openings, texture, acoustic, history, function.

My role as improvisational performer is simultaneously that of subject and witness
uncovering the artifacts of my history
as I share a particular experience with an audience.

I interrogate my physicality and in doing so uncover traces
of emotion, vocabulary, incident, idea that have moved through my architecture.

I implicate my audience in the narrative as our bodies share these moments
in a particular site.

It is a three-dimensional sharing of interior spaces both physical and metaphoric
...a fleshting of the interface.
(Reid 2013–2015: 27 December 2012)

The multiple sites of my hybrid practice underpin this research. My charting of these sites is
a phenomenological enquiry—a dance interrogation acknowledging that ‘potentially dense or
difficult concepts can be demystified and given a sort of intuitive fluidity once they are read
through the body’ (Kozel 2007: xv). The research is experiential and ongoing. A
phenomenological framework enables me to make sense of the complexity of interconnections
and distances at play as I practice dancing my body/bodies with other bodies. I feel a particular
connection to Susan Kozel’s phenomenological writings about her practice because they/she
seem/s to sit in my “world”—she is a dancer, she improvises with software and from the inside
of interactive installations, and she believes phenomenology is a process that can grow with
your devising process of a performance. It can help you to create artistic content. Kozel is an international peer, a potential collaborator working on the same side (the inside), working with similar tools (the body and technologies) and understanding that the only way to understand is to do (phenomenology). She is advocating for the body, spending time there and returning, dwelling and challenging, revisiting, rewriting, redesigning, finding one’s own voice and style—playing between practice and theory. I don’t feel so alone knowing she’s there…and that it’s personal. She draws me \textit{Closer} and reveals how she ‘needed a methodology that could allow (her) passion for philosophical concepts to converge with the innate ideas and even critiques that were embedded in (her) body and which surfaced through (her) performance experiments’ (\textit{Phenomenology—practice-based research in the arts} 2015).

Take your attention into this very moment
Witness…
Take a break (a moment, a month, a year)
Describe what you experienced
Take a break
Re-examine your notes with an eye for what seems significant…pull some of these out…identify where there may be deeper conceptual relevance
Begin to write or compose your document. Select your voice, style and audience.
(Your decision how and whether to use the first-person in your document is political and strategic as well as stylistic)
Share your text with a colleague
Rewrite and redesign your phenomenological process
Revisit, repeat, reiterate your process (having a respect for living through or dwelling within an experience or set of experiences)
Remember, a phenomenological document can range from the scholarly to the more poetic…can be visual, physical, written, spoken…there is a play between abstract and concrete.
(Kozel 2007: 53–55)

This chapter is a reflection of and between my creative practices—dance improvisation (as studio research and a performance practice), screendance (as projections in performance, as research documents and as screendance artworks), and writing (as poetic text, performed script, or reflective document). It is an analysis of the interconnections between the physical, technological and theoretical methodologies at play, and the arrival at a renewed knowledge that is hybrid, embodied and multilingual. This interrogation of my knowing and being within arts practice and discourse has generated multiple artifacts—performances, screendances,

\footnote{67 This is a summary of a Kozel score I shared in the email \textit{exchange in the global studio} 1 with peer/PhD researcher Amaara Raheem. We had a weekly, shared studio practice during 2015 but while she spent several weeks in the UK we transferred the practice to an online/written one.}
verbal and written texts, aural histories—woven across sites, skins and surfaces with multiple philosophical threads.

With specific reference to the final performance work, *Dance Interrogations (a diptych)*, presented in September/October 2015, I will use particular points of convergence in practice (practice description and poetic reflection) and theory (dance, film, feminist, disability, phenomenology) as sub-headings in my discussion. These sub-headings reflect the connection of fields and modes of working as they specifically impact on my phenomenological practice as screendance artist and live performer. As I mentioned in the introduction I have included video links and poetic reflections on my research throughout to imbue your reading experience with multiple spatial, temporal and textural planes in a manner reminiscent of the performance work and its theoretical underpinnings.

**Ethics and data collection**

As this project involved human subjects and interpersonal encounters in shared spaces I sought ethics clearance from the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Committee. Participants were invited to contribute to the research in one or more of three ways—as dance improvisers and/or camera operators participating in shared studio practice or duet/group performances; as interviewees speaking about their involvement in and experience of dance improvisation or screendance; or as audience/viewers interacting with the researcher and other audience/viewers at the performances held over the course of the research period. I invited individuals from the dance/arts community who are experienced in the practices of improvisation or screendance to be involved in the shared studio practice and interviews. These were mostly people whose work has a complementary aesthetic or research interest, or with whom I had an established practice. I also specifically invited Melinda Smith, a dancer with a disability with whom I had been developing a regular dance practice, to be involved in my studio and performance research. She became my main dance partner as our interests and friendship drew us into a regular (at least) weekly practice over the three years. We developed extensive and regular written reflections and discussions via online communications (email, text and Facebook messages) which I compiled into the document *Online communications between Reid & Smith 2013–2015*. Because of Melinda’s particular speech and written communication needs this became a valuable way to allow adequate time for reflection and feedback. It became

---

68 Ethics clearance was granted from 4 June 2013 to 4 June 2017.
a way to ensure her voice was heard, my expectations and creative ideas were explained or
developed, and the research could be a truly collaborative exchange.69

Audiences were invited from the wider community via public advertisement distributed
through a range of arts and community networks. I envisaged that video documentation of
studio practice, interviews and performances may be used in a final performance installation
toward the end of the research period subject to consent from participants. Three variations
on a plain language statement were issued with consent forms for the various practitioner
participants, or as a front of house notice for audience participants (Appendices 1–3). I
developed written questionnaires and online surveys which a small number of people
responded to (Appendix 4). In addition to these forms of data collection I kept a journal of
written, drawn and photographed responses to my ongoing practice experiments and my
related reading and research (Reid 2013–2015). As a reflective and emergent creative research
practice, my focus has been on qualitative rather than quantitative findings, responding to the
shifting and particular relationships between myself and my participants.

69 I will elaborate on my reasons for inviting Melinda and any associated ethical concerns later in this chapter.
3.1 Improcinemania
—improvising screendance

Dance is both the location and the tool of interrogation

My dance is "improcinematic." As I dance I am simultaneously practicing screendance and improvisation. I am bringing perceptive technologies (the camera and its microscopic and telescopic capacities) into my imaginative vocabulary as I notice and occupy each frame, and make connections from frame to frame. I am the camera and the subject; I am the moment and the montage. I have "cinesthesia"—I am "making sense" of what I see with all my senses. I am the dance and its spectator, touching and being touched, seeing and feeling, the images in my body are playing out through my fingers. In 'crisscrossings of the senses' (Elaine Scarry in Sobchack 2004: 69) my dance responds to the recollection of a touch, the weight of a sound, the idea of a taste, the gravity of a location. The interactivity of my senses, the simultaneous existence of my doing and my viewing of my doing, spins me into a state of heightened activation, a cinesthetic mania. Vivian Sobchack’s discussion of “cinesthesia” in relation to...
the viewing of film can equally be applied to an analysis of my dance improvisation. For her, ‘the film experience is meaningful not to the side of our bodies but because of our bodies’—that our vision and hearing are informed and given meaning by our other modes of sensory access to the world (Sobchack 2004: 60). In my dancing (which expresses itself as movement and words/sounds), body and language ‘radically in-form each other in a fundamentally non-hierarchical and reversible relationship that…manifests itself as a vacillating, ambivalent, often ambiguously undifferentiated, and thus ‘unnameable’ or ‘undecidable’ experience’ (Sobchack 2004: 73).

I decide to name it “improcinemia” and let it play out between my senses, across the fields of dance and cinema, interchanging and interacting between subject and viewer. Now I am looking for the sensual in this script, inviting you, reader, to rub up against this language, to taste this document and hear the resonance of my dancing body.

For me writing is choreography
a dance of words
images trip, connect, float, fall
the rhythm of an idea
the balance of a metaphor
the right composition has a melody, a pulse, a texture
poetry is kinetic
it sweats us out
and defines each sinew of us
saving it saves me
(Hipsync—Mind 2016, Column 2)

I am playing with words, poetic and scholarly, and how they are spatialized in the frame of this written document. I’m looking for reconfigurations of language to undo its form, dismantle its choreography and maroon it in my peculiarities…less sense and more sensation…and I’m playing with performing writing as something not separate from my practice but as a dance practice in itself. Writing is ‘auratic insofar as it is enabled not just by

Centering® developed by Bonnie Bainbridge Cohen, the organs are regarded as providing us with a sense of personal self and organic authenticity (http://www.bodymindcentering.com/course/organ-system.) In 2015 Melinda and I attended two short courses in BMC with Melbourne practitioner Alice Cummins to deepen our improvisational practice and to connect with other dancers/bodies.
a material body but by a *lived body* that, however regulated, cannot avoid inscribing its singular intentionality in acts and marks of expressive improvisation’ (Sobchack 2004: 130).

*I want to yearn
to swim in sensation that is caught in a duration
imagining a dissolution of space.*

(Reid 2013–2015, 17 June 2015)

Improvisation facilitates the phenomenology of the body, the ‘dance’ is not predetermined, but supports Merleau-Ponty’s claim that the body is a set of possibilities to be continually realized, ‘a grouping of lived-through meanings which moves towards its equilibrium’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962: 153). Improvisation privileges the interval—the incipiency appears, animating across frames, I animate the space around my/their bodies, crafting the future/present, the transitions between frames, our combined potential experientialities.

The more I worked with screendance, the more I began to improvise.73 The “unknowns” of improvising can reveal rich stories, surprising moments, breath-taking accidents that are not achievable in choreography, too often flattened and depersonalized through the repetitions of rehearsal and “take.”74 An improvisational approach to screendance—the movement within frame, the movement of the camera in response to dancer and location—enables other possibilities for seeing, imagining and being in the dancing body.

The more I improvised the more I wanted to re-enter the live frame, to bring the flesh back into the interface, to rub up against bodies and let the sparks of sensation and proximity illuminate a “live screen/dance.” I have journeyed across the multiple sites of screendance—the body (dancing with or without camera), the physical location where shooting takes place, the camera tape or memory, the edit suite, then the DVD/file, then the screen it is finally viewed on. This hybrid journey has led me back to the live body. I am interrogating my own

---

73 I began choreographing and directing dance for the screen in 1993, moved into the role of camera operator and editor with my Masters research (1998-2001), and established Hipsync as an independent screendance practitioner from 2002. Although I had used improvisation as a studio tool for developing choreography throughout my dance history, I only began to practice improvisation in performance from 2003 with the solo work *Scenes from another life* (2003). From 2005 I began performing regularly as part of the improvisation collective *The little con*.

74 ‘The consequences of...traditional film-making processes...Movement development, narrative and dynamic become subsumed by the demands of camera placement, the pressure of time when shooting footage and the anticipated requirements of editing. Thus the performance of movement by the dancer potentially becomes dislocated and disconnected from the dancer’s embodied experience’ (Barbour 2011b: 3).
embodied knowledge as hybrid site within a live screendance body. I connect with the Merleau-Ponty notion that ‘the body is the fabric into which all objects are woven, and it is, at least in relation to the perceived world, the general instrument of my comprehension’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962: 235). I literally weave objects from my world into the projections that interact with my skin, and become the intersection of my past experiences and our shared experiences. I consider ways that we might share the lived experience of the present.

3.2 Coming closer:

The dance of ‘viewing-with’

—Screendance as methodology

Cameras...facilitate a kind of seeing that is a manifestation of our desire to draw phenomena closer to us. (Rosenberg 2012: 29)

Screendance is a methodology, a hybrid practice, which enables an augmented and enriched view on and experience of the body. I regard it as both a creative and a social practice—emergent and responsive, reconfiguring representations of the dancing body and also reconnecting audiences with their own possibilities for movement, change, and sustainability. Screendance practice can inform approaches to dance practice, diversify the demographic of “dancer” and develop screendances that enable the body to be ‘not merely objectively beheld but also subjectively lived’ (Sobchack 2004: 187).

As a screendance practitioner, I am attending to shifting temporalities and spatialities in the way my body moves, with or without camera, in locations physical (geographic environment or architecture), virtual (edit suite or projected image), imaginative, and interactive. The camera has augmented and expanded my senses. The screen has become the skin, and ‘the skin becomes not a container but a multidimensioned topological surface that folds in, through, and across spacetimes of experience...what emerges is not a self...what emerges is relation’ (Manning 2013: 12). Spending time engaging with screen technologies shifts the way I understand my body and my relationships to others.
The shift required to enable the camera to negotiate shifting angles and proximities to another moving body has been taken up most successfully (in my experience) when dancers take the camera into their own hands. Dancers have an ability to anticipate movement, to use peripheral vision and somatic awareness to stay with the dance action at the same time as negotiating walls, floor, and other bodies or objects in the location. This is improvisational play, the capacity to attend to the moment, to develop the material (the relationship between camera and subject) whilst opening out to the physical context, the three-dimensionality of the encounter and its changing parameters. Katrina McPherson, whose cinematography I discussed in chapter 2, comes close when filming the dancers with whom she is working. Not surprisingly, most of the dancers she works with are also accomplished improvisers and are similarly engaged in the shared dance of seeing and being seen. The screendance camera-dancer becomes finely attuned to the space around and between herself and the subject, but also to the detail of her own surfaces and bodily interior, releasing, folding, glancing, supporting the camera in its own shifting relationship with her body’s surfaces.

For screendance artist and scholar, Ellen Bromberg, what she loves about the camera, and what facilitated her ‘falling in love with video in the eighties, was how it changed the way (she) saw dance’ (Interview with Ellen Bromberg 2014b).

It always stems from deeply perceptual, personally perceptual places. How does my ability to see the world change? The camera became an extension of my own ability to reframe. And you know the metaphors are always there…how do you frame an idea? How do you frame the world? What’s your frame of reference? What’s your point of view? And all these metaphors are really clear with the camera…they’re clear with the body…sharing weight, responsibility, touch, partnering…there’s so many metaphors here in all of this work. So that became, in a way, a fascinating theme to look at the camera and see how it could reframe the body and my understanding of language. How do we read what we’re looking at? (Interview with Ellen Bromberg 2014b)

As I film the dance from within, moving alongside and in relationship to the dancer, I feel I enter my own dance of “viewing-with.” I am attending to the shifting spatial tensions between us. I am anticipating a movement’s possible trajectory, I am tuning in to the rhythms, considering meeting points and counterpoints. The camera is supported, not by a tripod, but by my own breath and muscular control or release to enable the continuity of our shared dance. I have appropriated a physical theatre duet exercise once shared with me in a workshop

---

75 I use the female pronoun rather than “him/her” as a feminist statement, a counter to the historical bias toward the male in English syntax and semantics. I am also acknowledging my subjective experience as female and dancer.
with Wendy Houston\textsuperscript{76} that I use in my own Improvisation and camera workshop\textsuperscript{77} to nurture this duet rapport. Without cameras, two participants move together from one end of the studio to another. The intention is to attend to the shifting spatial relationship between them, while peripherally negotiating the pathway through greater space, shared with other bodies similarly at work. Firstly, their connection is visual and from a distance. The two participants must maintain eye contact as one rolls—moving through laying, sitting, kneeling—and their partner travels on foot—moving with, around, over their partner. New strategies for surviving emerge in order not to break this point of contact—slowing, rewinding, reconfiguring. The roles are swapped with each repeated traverse of the studio, facilitating a sliding of status and an experience of the possibilities inside this negotiation. To bring the duets into more intimate spatial range, the next traverse is aural, one whispers in the other’s ear, leading them through different planes and levels, through an intimate sonic beckoning. In the third and final stage of the exercise, the connection is tactile. One gently rests their hand on the other’s head, which leads them in and out of the floor across the space. Incrementally, the partners are moving into closeness—I deliberately use the cinematic metaphor as a screendance practice—from distance to close-up, from the landscape to the detail. Bodies become both camera and subject, considering the reciprocity of the relationship between viewer and subject. I find this exercise “tunes” both dancers and camera operators in to their other senses—not just the visual, which generally demands distance, but to the tactile and aural, which bring us into other more intimate, surprising relationships.

Lisa Nelson’s “tuning score” is an improvisational strategy for enlivening the senses and for “surviving a dance moment.”\textsuperscript{78} Dancers working with her close their eyes before entering the space. By taking vision out of the equation, the use of the other senses (and the imagination) become imperative in order to dance together as duets, trios or groups. Nelson also acknowledges that these studio and performance practices developed as a result of her working with cameras and video editing—that working with camera taught her about working with her senses and that this then became integrated ‘into (her) daily life, teaching, and dancing with others’ (Nelson 2003: 4).

\textsuperscript{76} Wendy Houston was an original member of DV8 Physical Theatre. I participated in a number of workshops with her in Adelaide and Melbourne in the nineties when she was touring her solo work.

\textsuperscript{77} Improvisation and camera workshop can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561019. This video is edited from my footage of teaching an improvisation and camera workshop as part of my PhD field trip to Salt Lake City, Utah in 2014.

\textsuperscript{78} I am referencing an anecdote applied to the practice of contact improvisation, a duet and group practice, developed by Steve Paxton who was a long-time collaborator with Lisa Nelson. To “survive a dance moment” in Contact Improvisation is to negotiate the shifting weight and momentum of falling in and out of contact with one another and the floor.
We are constantly recomposing our body and our attention in response to the environment, to things known and unknown…this inner dance is a most basic improvisation—reading and responding to the scripts of the environment. (Nelson 2003: 1)

Another “tuning” aspect of screendance practice is the way the craft of video editing can enliven one’s temporal sensibility, drawing attention to rhythm, to the dynamic texture of playing with changes in speed, jump-cutting, repeating, reversing. Quite different emotive impacts can be achieved by moving an edit point a frame this way or that, by elongating a moment through a slowing of speed or shocking the viewer with a jump in time or speed. These post-production tools can become physical material themselves, scores for dancing which may re-pattern the body and present other possibilities for being in and with dancing bodies. The attention to rhythm and speed in video editing has translated into my other practices, recognizing that ‘to let something new emerge requires questioning standard registers of temporality’ (Kozel 2007: 76). In a live context, studio or performance, I consider the possibility that my physical body can reconfigure its relationship to time—an improvisational score that, through its difficulty (even impossibility) in physical terms (moving backwards, slowing to unmanageable speeds, dropping ‘frames’ of time) my body is capable of shifts and directions I may not have found otherwise.

The camera has brought me into a closer negotiation of the body, a finer navigation of its contours and negative spaces. I use the metaphor of the camera as a score for practice, and the actual instrument of the camera as a prosthetic for seeing and a tool for documentation and reflection. With the camera I am writing a visual journal and enacting a way of looking. ‘It’s a seed that puts vision on the line and in the field of play’ (Nelson 2003: 11). By placing the camera in my/our hands, I am drawing attention to the ways we compose space and how spatial configurations shift our perceptions and interactions. The dancing of the camera enables permission into the intimate space of the other dancers, ‘seeing the kinesthetic dimensions of a visual experience’ (Albright 2010: 22). When I am holding the camera I am not afraid of coming too close, my dance is about serving my vision, my moving inside the action is justified by the imagined presence of other future witnesses. Of course I must approach the dancer, the subject, my partner, as an equal. The permission I speak of is still a negotiation that listens and approaches gently and generously. In this age of over-documentation, it is as if the act of “recording” someone’s image (still or moving) reconfigures personal space and its accompanying courtesies.
The placement of the camera in the dancer’s hands also demands a peripheral attention, a physical control and ease, a seeing with the rest of one’s body to safely facilitate the camera’s journey. I am the fleshy tripod. My improvisational practice, my dancing, is now informed by my way of seeing and working with camera. I am increasingly mining the micro as a deepening of my attention and my movement material—attuning to the potential of working inside a nano-second or across a cellular distance. I consider light falling into the body through the lens of the eye as breath moving into the bloodstream. I play with the zoom and focus of my vision as I simultaneously move and witness. I am editing imaginatively, a montage of images, dynamics, narratives that move through the timeline79 of my body.

As I improvise I am constructing a reality that I am inseparable from in time and space.80 In an instant I make choices that are editing in real time, cinematic device flushed through the chemical sparks of my neurons and the pump of oxygen through my bloodstream. The practice is simultaneously making and undoing a moment, drawing on and acknowledging a range of knowledge and virtuosities without hierarchy. As contemporary dance practitioners the common ethos is one of community and social exchange. We share personal space, touch each other, carry in with us our histories, dreams, emotions and desires inside an organic framework which is remaking itself each moment. Improvising is a socio-political act, ‘an investigation of the moment…a holistic technicity’ (Bucksbarg & Carter 2012: 9). When I improvise, my dance magnifies ordinary moments and celebrates the present moment. In this way its historical and social background is that of the viewer, rather than of the dance itself. It brings together fragments of many people, places and ideas into a dense and diverse summary. Improvisation is a life practice.

What I’m working with when I’m improvising is not separate from how I’m looking at living and how I’m looking at my relationships…it has to do with our place on the planet here and what we’re doing…I think a lot of people are looking for something else now because things are getting so bad…people are going ‘wait a minute! What do we need for life to have more meaning?’ (Kirstie Simson in Force of nature 2011)

This screendance reconfiguration of my studio and teaching practice has directed me to reconfigure my performance practice into a “live screen/dance.” To interrogate the spaces between us, to disrupt and reconfigure the views of and with/in the body, it became necessary

79 The “timeline” in video editing software is the “stave” upon which footage is arranged/cut to create the edit.
80 As mentioned earlier, Maya Deren described her film-dance ‘as a dance so related to camera and cutting that it cannot be ‘performed as a unit anywhere except in this particular film’ from the 1945 article, Choreography for the camera. (Deren 2005: 222)
for me to move the audience into the frame and into physical range. I have shifted the performance event into physical sites that are intimate yet non-theatrical, screen locations rather than performance spaces. I seek to alter the audience’s gravity, to bring us closer to one another and to sensation, acknowledging that ‘taking people out of the theatre and including them in the same space as the performers blurs boundaries and transforms experience, expanding notions of time and space’ (Monk 2009: 40). In order to bring the audience into my screen/dance, I sought spaces that suggest bodies and movement—a train carriage and a convent passageway—vehicles for the body, frames for movement. I draw the audience into the cinematic site and together we enact a life. There is a freedom in the fiction that encourages the play of interaction and imagination. In my building of my attention to the textures, sounds, implications of each location I can build our contract in this shared experience.

### 3.3 My body is a vintage carriage

—*Body, place & poetics of space*

*A rattling journey…*

*Her body is a vintage carriage—holding moments and might-have-beens the mess and magnificence of a life—derelict yet divine.*

*The world runs through her…traces and faces, meetings and partings… at once exhilarating and decimating.*

(Reid 2013–2015, 21 February 2014)

To bring the audience closer to the dance of my/our bodies, it seemed vital to move them out of the theatre or studio and into a “lived” environment. I sought to amplify the notion of embodiment by presenting my performances in site-specific locations suggesting the shape and/or movement of bodies—to ‘entwin(e) the interior spaces of the body with the external place of performance’ (Brown 2010: 59), I moved our bodies into the train carriage.
The red train, a vintage AE railway carriage (now an independent gallery stationary in the environmental park CERES, Brunswick East) was built over 100 years ago and travelled around country Victoria for 74 years. Given the name “red rattler” as these vehicles aged and became more decrepit, this site seemed an ironically apt metaphor for my own body as a vintage vessel carrying the emotions, vocabulary, incidents, and ideas that have moved through my architecture.

These vehicles are shared public sites, memories of which we all share in some form or another. We are trapped in it for the duration of the journey, as we are all trapped in this body for the duration of our lives. In that imprisonment we find escape through dreaming…(or used to)\(^{81}\) using the repetitive motion of landscape past window, a rolling interface that lulled us into the quiet consideration of our memories and thoughts…we improvised from within an extended state of being in the now.

As soon as we become motionless, we are elsewhere; we are dreaming in a world that is immense. (Bachelard 1994: 184)

In his philosophical literary work, *The Poetics of Space*, Bachelard cites the house as a portal to the metaphor of imagination, a large cradle, the topography of our intimate being. My train carriage, though not a house is a container, a shelter for daydreaming, ‘something closed (that) retains our memories’ (Bachelard 1994: 6). It is, in a comparable way to a body, a container that moves us through space, albeit with the added irony of being marooned in this location (life) at CERES.

“We are derailed, marooned in our fragile shells,”

*I yell out the train window.*

An excellent exercise for the function of inhabiting the dream house consists in taking a train trip. Such a voyage unreels a film of houses that are dreamed, accepted and refused, without our ever having been tempted to stop, as we are when motoring. We are sunk deep in daydreaming with all verification healthily forbidden. (Bachelard 1994: 62)

\(^{81}\) The current proliferation of mobile phones and rise of social networking has brought about a new "escape" in public. We bow over our tiny screens and armor ourselves against physical interaction like turtles retreating inside their shells. With our attention elsewhere, we render our physical bodies inert, almost lifeless. Susan Leigh Foster, in her study of "empathy," states, 'these new technologies, integrated into our physicality, are challenging and transforming our capacity for empathy. The new cyborgian bodies do not connect with one another…Instead, they catch furtive, flickering glimpses of one another's corporeal status as it transits, blurred into the prosthetic devices that intensify even as they obscure physicality.' (Foster 2011: 168–169)
In the era of the CERES carriage, in my childhood and that of my parents, the train was a public, community space. With the rise of the car as a mobile private space came the demise of public transport, and the rise of the mobile device as a virtual private space. Cyberspace changes our notions of place and travel. We need to ‘traverse place in order to attain the vistas that shape ideas’ (Hill & Paris 2006: 102). Spending time in, and moving through, this “place” shaped my creative research. I let my performances in the train reveal the site, as we entered into a relationship. The red train and I created a lived history together, formed by the other bodies who entered each performance, bodies who steered and channeled my navigation of that interior, and my own imaginative interior, as we all—bodies, train and all—toched one another. With each performance I discovered another way of traversing the structure, its hard edges that bruised and scraped me, and its de-furnished negative spaces interrupted by flesh and other personal histories. It was a contact improvisation with numerous and shifting hard and soft partners. Through touch I was seeing…it was a writing of a history through the body. It was a negotiation of place from which personal and cultural content could arise.

My body continually takes me into place. It is at once agent and vehicle, articulator and witness of being-in-place. (Casey 1993: 48)

I fell in love with that train, not for itself so much as for what it reflected back of me, and the audience as they watched/rode with me. It became a love affair…a memory of an imagined intimacy that built its own soliloquy, a written account that holds the traces of the event but transforms as it moves into another site. It was a comment from one audience member, that I “danced the site like a partner,” that prompted the writing of A Love Poem for the Red Rattler, itself a memento of that relationship, another artifact of the research. The carriage had become my dance partner in a contact improvisation of discovery and reconciliation, a falling in sync and in love, finding new expression in a dance of words. It rewrote history so that I couldn’t tell if it was a real memory or if I had made it up? I decided it didn’t matter. As I invent it becomes mine, as I draw on autobiography I create a fiction.

---

82 I presented the first development of the red train solo in 2013 so my return to it in 2015 made our shared history all the more real—we really had spent time in each other’s daydreams and I was able to duet with the body/architecture of the train with more ease and certainty, and in closer, more challenging proximities to my audience. Similarly, for those returning audience, there was a real shared history between us—amplifying the metaphors of journey and relationship, intimacy and potential, body and mortality.

83 This poem became set as memorized script within the red train solo in 2015. It was included as a hand written letter in the travel documents wallet given to the examiners of this thesis.
We began as a clumsy collision
our bodies bumping and bruising with each dance of the carriage
a rattling rhumba… ti ti ka ti, ti ti ka ti, 1 2 & 3, now where are we?

We try to make each other fit, etch ourselves upon the other
We spend time in each other’s daydreams, lulled by age
and the lure of longings past
Slipping into sleep, your edges soften
and I can climb in and explore your secrets
crawl into your corners
balance on your broken edges
scramble across your scarred surfaces

(Love poem for the red rattler 2014b)

It is a tango, a contact improvisation, a partnership where the catalogue of ourselves contained in our physical bodies—our past images, actions, sensations, dreams, ideas—intersect and we must negotiate the dance of it. Just as my body, the container of my experiences, provides a palette of material for me to dance out, the train carriage holds traces of the past—real (initials scrawled into the woodwork) and imagined (of those riding this train within country Victoria fifty years ago).84 I allude to that temporal past with the artifacts of an era gone by—the old suitcases, my vintage costumes—dressing the set of this film which can transport us back to the past, before this audience member’s laptop bag or that one’s “hoodie” pull us back into the present. The collision of conceits is a deliberate signaling of my intention—to interrogate, question, accuse, invade; and to dance, move, play, and connect. As I play out my relationship with the train, anthropomorphizing it into a lover, I am suggesting other intimacies, yours (the audience) and mine. I am moving us into a private space in public. We are watching each other blush.

When the environment or the conditions of a particular place acts as a partner…it becomes not only the ‘setting’ for action but a performative opportunity. (Schiller & Rubidge 2014: 23)

84 This carriage, number 24AE, is a former Victorian Railways country express first class sitting car that entered service on September 2nd 1909. For 74 years it travelled all over the State in trains hauled by Steam, Diesel and Electric locos. Together with their second class "BE" and combined first/second class "ABE" sisters, these "AE" carriages were used on express trains from Melbourne to Adelaide and all corners of Victoria such as Bairnsdale, Albury, Cobram, Swan Hill, Mildura, Horsham and Warrnambool. The "AE", "BE" and "ABE" carriages were the mainstay of passenger train travel in country Victoria for many decades. Initially they were considered luxurious, but as the decades rolled on they became increasingly decrepit and (along with many other types of carriage) earned the nickname of “red rattlers." 24AE was retired on October 7 1983 and sold to a buyer from Rushworth. It's not known how it made its way to Ceres. (Synergy Gallery 2013)
I am working with the “affordances” furnished by this location, both functional (enabling me to climb a wall, or fall through a window) and affective (memories, residues of sensation). These affordances equip my performative potential to engage the audience’s “cinesthetic subject.” We are both having and making sense of this cinematic location. We are viewing through the receding pyramid of camera space where the foreground is narrow, close up bodies or objects frame or obscure our view, and the background is wide, offering whole body views and more information about the location and context. The dimensional “pull” is sagittal, forward and back, from near to far—a metaphor for movement, progress, and travel. The frames within the train, the windows, mirrors, dividing wall, offer particular points of view, fragmenting and refracting the action differently for each viewer. Each audience member’s experience is unique and subjective. They are the camera and the subject (of another’s frame), a role that becomes more explicit as I draw individuals into my action and move them into the spotlight.

The context of the performance environment—I immediately felt I wasn’t merely a passenger on old Victorian carriage, I was part of the performance—we all were! The observer being observed etc. I felt, at times, that I may be just as vulnerable as the performer who embraced us physically (through touch/spatial locations), emotionally (the performer opened up what felt like an honest vessel relating personal histories/human experiences), socially (a familiarity with the audience members was felt in spatial location, spoken word, improvised moments), personally (I felt a welcoming warmth and unspoken acknowledgement from the performer). I was engaged beyond underlined naming dimensions…creatively, intellectually, psychically, spiritually.

I noticed different levels of curiosity and boldness in terms of willingness to explore the space of the train carriage and the space between them and the performer. I noticed how one person’s curiosity gave license to others. (Audience responses to “Dance Interrogations in the red train” 2013)

In my imagination, the train carriage became an anatomical interior and I was moving through it like the microscopic traveller injected into the bloodstream in Fantastic Voyage. I think of the windows and mirrors as eyes, the open spaces as bodily cavities, the timber paneling as skeletal structures, and my/our bodies as the blood moving through its passageways. Then its interior becomes mine, I move inside myself and perform an autopsy—an excavation to get to the heart of the matter, to develop the narrative which I both dance in words and utter as movement.

85 “Affordances” is cited in Schiller & Rubidge (p.23) as a term from James J Gibson’s 1979 text The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception.

86 Fantastic Voyage was a science fiction film released in 1966 by 20th Century Fox Studios. Directed by Richard Fleischer, the film is about a submarine crew shrunken to microscopic size that venture into the body of an injured scientist to repair the damage to his brain.
unpack the legends laying in the ligaments
release the fables fixed in the fascia
expose the manifestos making up each muscle
unravel the riddles riding the nervous system
decant the sentiments swimming in the bloodstream
separate the enquiries erupting in the grey matter

To re-imagine space in this way allows me to reconfigure physical space cinematically, that is to say I am letting a multiplicity of spatial configurations or tensions activate and complicate my physical decisions as I dance. I am letting myself fall across dimensions and keep changing my reference point. It is an improvisational strategy, an aspect of my screendance methodology, to generate original and sensual material. By putting myself in the gaps, my letting the “moment” become the editor, it becomes possible to move into new places and relationships.

3.4 I’m shaking you awake
—Activating the physical,
affecting the emotional

I’m shaking you awake and launching into you until I’m impaled, expelled, laid bare, undone…

This time together is peeling me like wallpaper groaning off a wall You skin me, and the hot red mess of my life spills out staining the floor a murder on the dis-orient express

(Love poem for the red rattler 2014b)

87 I wrote this text to form part of my biographic statement for The Little Con website (2005-2010) (http://thelittlecon.net.au.)
Framed together in the carriage as site, our attention can shift to the carriage of our bodies, to ‘an understanding of the kinaesthetic as topological’ (Schiller & Rubidge 2014: 21). My familiarity and intimacy with the site and the personal material invested there (now identified and captured in the Love Poem script and the Red Rattler screendance) was pushing me to go deeper, to move the audience (physically and emotionally). Could I shift the audience’s experience of what I/we are doing in this location from viewing to inhabiting, and then, by effecting the sense of one’s own bodily stance, tensility, and dynamism, equally affect their/our emotions? (Foster 2011: 128)

I used cinematic strategies to activate our bodies—bringing the motion of the train to life via visual and aural suggestion. Train window loop section projected images of passing and disappearing landscape, were fitted into a side and rear window frame, accompanied by the sounds of trains rattling and whistling as the audience entered, and again later in the piece.

The world of the work being in the train car – it was a bit like the TARDIS – made bigger by the performance on the inside – and I quickly fell into that world – one that had me believe that we were on a train that was moving!! The perception of being on a moving train hit me first and I stayed there as long as I could before my brain covered up that phenomena with knowledge that I was watching video and even then I tried to bury that knowledge and get back on the phenomena of a moving train. (Marchant 2015, 26 November)

I began in a remote frame, sitting by an open (curtained) window rocking to sleep as if with the motion of the train. The suggested motion of the train, of us all, rolls me around the carriage and gradually into meetings and herdings of the audience bodies. I was insinuating myself into the space, populating the vessel, moving into the spaces between people, between floor and wall, into the imagination. My experience as a dancer (and as a roving/street performer) enables me to negotiate “closeness” with the other bodies and architectural edges of the site. It is a play between touching and not touching—a titillation of potential collision with intimate encounter. I am re-siting the screen viewer into the physical body of the live audience and exploring strategies for expanding the ways we watch and engage with/in the moving body. In this train, we are travellers, ‘inviting and cultivating the unknown, the absence of routine, with the question what do I want?’ (Kaplan 1997: 217)

---

88 I will discuss and link to this later under the subheading Red Rattler.
89 train window loop section can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561214
90 I have had extensive experience of dancing, and improvising, in public shared spaces with audience. It has sharpened my “reading” of other bodies—of their mood, their possible trajectory, and their availability to interaction. In a similar way to working with hand-held camera, or with another in contact improvisation, survival and success (safety and creativity) is in opening attention to the perceptual field, attending to the moment, and possessing physical control and balance. Yoga practice also sustains these possibilities.
Why are you leaving? Where are you going?

*(Love poem for the red rattler* 2014b)*

Rachel Kaplan writes of the ‘highly improvisational nature’ of spending several months travelling around the world alone. She was comparing her journey to her practice of working with the improvisational score called “wandering and arriving” (Kaplan 1997: 215). Interestingly, the development of my improvisational practice coincides with several extended periods of travelling and working in other countries.91 The physical act of travelling can have a particular emotional resonance because, similar to the attentiveness cultivated through improvisation, things become open to us in a different way. Removed from the familiarity and routine of “home” (and, in the case of this research, from the theatre), new encounters with people and place become possible and, with it, the possibility of connectivity and new knowledge. Adding to this metaphor of travel I could add the material of my real travels (within the video footage, as verbal anecdote, or as an imaginative resource) and the double metaphor of my dance history as a “journey” opening me to the new knowledge possible from this research project.

In the train I played at being co-traveller and performing dancer. I slipped in and out of a “dance” vocabulary, moving between everyday gestures and abstracted sequences, from the conversational to the poetic in either language, spoken or moved. I was playing at the subtext of this dance interrogation; its probing of my body—a dancer’s aging body under the scrutiny of an audience, a woman’s aging body in a society reserving desire for the youthful. However, my maintenance of my physical skill, my ability to dance, enables me to challenge these preconceptions while still acknowledging the shifts in my bodily range and appearance. I draw on “real” movement—walking, sitting, rolling, climbing, falling, spinning, laying—and let them transform into unexpected directions and pronunciations. Like Yvonne Rainer, I present ‘aging (as) the ultimate goal and hurdle’ (Rainer 2014: 6). I am embracing the notion that our bodies are our enduring reality, and in spite of that I continue to dance. I continue to let my body be my means of experiencing the world.

In fact, the evolution of the aging body in dance fulfills the earliest aspirations of my 1960s peers and colleagues who tore down the palace gates of high culture to admit a rabble of alternative visions and options. Silence, noise, walking, running, detritus—all undermined

---

91 I undertook an Asialink residency in India in 2006/2007; I was a collaborator on a Swedish/Japanese/Australian project in Lapland in 2009; and I toured the beginnings of this research (my solo performance and duet work with Melinda Smith) to the Edinburgh Festival before return visits to Sweden and India in 2012.
prevailing standards of monumentality, beauty, grace, professionalism, and the heroic.
(Rainer 2014: 6)

I reference my real dance history and my academic context—I am in a Bausch dancer’s dress, I am exhausted with Lepecki.\(^\text{92}\) We share real and remembered physical experiences and become a community as we jump and weave as a group, close our eyes and feel our blood pumping, or recall running through the sprinkler. I touch and am touched as “she” lets me lay my head on her shoulder. “She” is moved and moving as I blow on the back of her neck. We get to know one another. My disclosures are personal and direct, improvised so spontaneous, particular to that day, those people, and often acknowledging “real” connections between us—referencing real events or names, establishing a trust, encouraging relaxation, and an opening of the body to this moment. Then, from that moment, perhaps you, the audience, will let me lead you somewhere more difficult.

\begin{quote}
The bruises of interrogation are still visible
I have pushed and pulled my edges
trying to wring myself out while drawing others in
A collision of hundred-year-old wood and metal with fifty-year-old flesh…
our stories writing and writhing across each other
scratched epitaphs of love and warnings of dangers long gone
My 76 passengers each brought other baggage for me to deal with…
except for a handful I knew them all
some very well, some for many years, some not seen for many years
causing me to look at the reflection of myself and time passed
in their eyes…look at my body now, look at the passage of time
consider the journey of my dancing body, the continuity, the adjustments
the wear/where on and below the surface
Skinning myself like a snake, shedding movement vocabularies, screwing up schedules
tossing up taboos, throwing myself from the train and climbing back on

I’m balancing on a thin edge, teetering between laughing and crying
in an ecstatic effervescence as textures and landscapes pulse through me, light me up, transport me.
(Reid 2013–2015, October 2013)
\end{quote}

After each performance I would write about the encounters that stayed with me. The strongest images involved touch, sensation.

I playfully held the young man’s head and praised his intellect in the train, and our fingers played out a Sistine chapel ceiling before I rested my head on his shoulder in the convent. a rattling rhumba with Chris that doesn’t quite connect… I can smell his men’s cologne. I squeeze the older woman into a corner as I am looking for forgotten codes and lost loves. I carry Jaye from floor to wall—using my body to ease her landing.

(Reid 2013–2015, September 2015)

This 2015 encounter with Jaye (above) has its own lived history from our 2013 encounter.

she is crawling towards me, she is taking a journey, it’s not sentimental, it’s an investigation in motion, she’s travelling through time. the landscape changes, the foundations sink, it makes me think about all the times I’ve wondered if it’s time to stop, but the rhythm continues under our feet, the dance takes us & makes us more than ourselves. She is holding me up, she is sitting me down, she is carrying me across the threshold, she is inviting me to play. (Hayes 2013, 30 October)

3.5 My life is running through me like a film

—The skin is the screen, vision as sensation

a stream of postcards and blurred impressions merging into a melancholic rhythm

(Love poem for the red rattler, 2014b)

In my incorporation of video projections onto my body, I am fleshing the interface, literally and figuratively revealing the narratives housed within the lived body. I am moving the audience into the sensations of embodiment as I ignite my skin and react to its touch.
I become the screen, my body the site of the screendance via my “skins”
the micro landscapes of costume layers that are populated
by video projected imagery
and animated as they are revealed or discarded
I want to be able to peel myself, to metaphorically get under the surface
to reveal other identities, past selves, dreams, traumas
I am speared by micro images of myself
crawling and climbing over my torso.
I am zooming in on myself—
amplifying a moment edited into a new multi-layered exchange
my screen self interacting with the frame of my live body
It is both ridiculous and reflective
this metaphor for technology’s “breaking” of the body…
we are reduced and reproduced, defying gravity and yet still falling
(Reid 2014a: 123)

The first projections that connect with my body in the train are images of myself in miniature
in the first section of *train master projections*. These images of my whole body crawling,
climbing, rolling, and cartwheeling up and down my torso make my physical body a
mountainous landscape, the wide shot for my virtual self. These video images were created a
decade ago for the solo work *Scenes from another life* (2003) so the metaphor of attachment,
of bodily inscription, is doubly inferred—my “present” self is inscribed with my dance “past.”
It is an infestation, a playful allusion to the annoyances of aging, to shifts in contemporary
dance aesthetics, and to the persistent constraints of stereotypical images of the “female
dancer.” My accompanying banter is improvised, playing at a pretense of the separation of
then and now, body and mind. I have tightly choreographed the editing of “mini me” with the
soundtrack, to enable the illusion of swatting myself until I finally catch my past and splatter
it into the moment, into my life-sized image hitting the end wall of the train.

…because in dance, as in film, comedy is dependent on two critical skills—timing and the
capacity to give the illusion that one is totally immersed in the present moment and oblivious
to the disaster around the corner.” (Ross 2007: 119)

---

93 *train master projections* can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561212
94 Created for the Bodyworks season at Dancehouse in 2003, this was a twenty-minute solo work where I began experimentating with on-body projections and improvisation in live performance. Francis Treacey, a Deakin colleague with whom I co-taught the tertiary unit *Dance Video: choreography and the camera* shot the footage.
To bring “liveness” into the screen encounter I explored devices for stretching the flat, rectangular video image to fit the three dimensions of the frame of the body. By shifting the shot size on my frame I could play with the cinematic illusion, employ a pull and push of focal range with this suggestion of shifting spatial dimension. From the wide shot of the “mini me” topography, I shifted to the mid shot where subject fits into the edges of the frame, and eventually to the close up where the world is contained within the outline of my real body. With these suggested changes of lenses (wide-angle, normal, telephoto) I am referencing the perceptual shifts occurring within the physical mechanics of the eye. The wide-angle has the effect of greatly emphasizing our sense of depth perception and often, as well, distorting linear perception. The telephoto lens magnifies objects in the distance, while the normal lens most closely mimics the way the human eye perceives reality (Monaco 1981: 60). With their shifting depths of field, these projections were not only a way to inscribe myself, literally, with the places, events, desires that make up my subjectivity, but also a way to draw the viewer into close-up with my lived experience.

The hand-held projector95 that I drew from a small suitcase miniaturized the size of the projected frame and mobilized the apparatus. At this point in the performance, midway through my Love Poem script, I have literally opened the case of my life and my body reflects on itself. I can move the image with me through the site and across the sites of my/our bodies (the audience and, later, fellow performer Melinda Smith).96 I play a sequence down through my body, swallowing a lifetime; a forensic opening as I discard another costume, shed another skin, down to a flesh covering. I carve a descent with the light of the hand-held projector, as a surgical instrument cutting through to my interior, then a torch leading us through the wilderness, a searchlight seeking us. These projections, as virtual tattoos, ‘become signifiers of a hidden or inferred signified which is the subject’s interiority, these incisions function to proliferate, intensify, and extend the body’s erotogenic sensitivity’ (Grosz 1994: 139). I am interrogating ideas about corporeality and the traces held in the physical body. These train interior97 suggest the real traces of past events that stay in the body—scar tissue, muscle memory—and the emotional residue relating to issues of corporeality and mortality.

95 The Pico projector has a rechargeable battery and runs images from files on an attached USB stick making it portable and “danceable.”
96 I will introduce my working methods in practice and performance with Melinda Smith further on in this chapter beginning with the sub-section Wanting Distance.
97 train interiors can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561213
A haunting of my face with my younger self
matching image of face speaking onto live face, a temporal slippage, an illusion
The view from a train window rushes through my throat the
panic of moving into the unknown
A heart as a childish drawing, scrawled, scribbled over...“my heart’s a mess”
Something foreign emerges in my pelvis, an unformed creature
a tumor, a foetus, a decaying creature
A section of the floor of the train
its knots and peeling red paint, its own scar from a hundred years of travel...
I project it on itself like fitting a jigsaw puzzle piece
‘Give me your hand’ I say and place the word “hope” there
it lingers in our shared touch
before dissolving as though below the surface of the water
(Reid 2013–2015, November 2015)

Originally, the final image was a photo of a mehndi, a henna tattoo, on my hand, from my first
visit to India. I changed this to be something we all might want to hold—the word “hope.” It
is small in script, fits nicely into the palm of a hand. I have faded it out with a shimmering
dissolve so that it appears to melt into or evaporate from that audience member’s hand.

Hope hangs in the air
Not a word that lands
No resting place
It pops like a bubble
It eludes like a butterfly
(Reid 2013–2015, 7 August 2014)

We are all focusing in on the sensation of two hands touching, together holding an elusive
idea, this “fading hope.” We are feeling the skin in the palm of our hands and losing sense of
our boundaries. It facilitates a dissolve back into my verbal script; to draw focus to my moving
body and the way my poetic language activates my dancing, soaks in and out of my skin.

The skin is no longer the boundary between the world and myself, but rather the sensing
organ that brings the world into my awareness. In this intersubjective space in which one can
be penetrated by sensations both external and internal, the heretofore unquestioned separation
of individual and the world (or me and you) becomes more fluid...the possibility of
reconceptualizing the physical borders of bodies through attention to sensation. (Albright 2003: 262)

In his chapter on Interdisciplinary Phenomenology, Don Ihde discusses the “embodiment relation” where one’s experience of phenomena is mediated and potentially transformed when probed via an instrument.

I experience the blackboard through the chalk…feel the smoothness or roughness of the board at the end of the chalk. (Ihde 1986: 139)

He compares this example to Merleau-Ponty’s blind man who experiences the “world” at the end of his cane (Merleau-Ponty 1962: 152)—he ‘discovered that touch is also a distant sense’ (Ihde 1986: 140). I have an embodied relation to my hand-held projector, which probes my body with digital phenomena, revealing, for the audience, other possibilities of myself…past or imagined. Tiers of embodied relations are inferred here—the instruments that sit in this circular field, cameras that film my body, my holding of the camera to access other phenomena which I then experience through computer keys in the edit suite, to the phenomena I experience through physical touch or dialogue with an audience body in this intersubjective “world” of the performance—a polymorphic observation, a realm of the possible opened by imaginative variations.

The train master projections running the imagery linked to the soundtrack, sent video images into a specific part of the performance space and I arrived into it as it appeared (as I did earlier with the “mini me” projection). These images were shot projected onto my naked torso at an earlier time, so again the temporal haunting occurs but also matched frame, to the frame of my body rather than the square of a screen. Originally shot in 2013 they were contained to my torso, leaving my head out of the picture. In 2015 I reframed and reshot these to include my head and onto a flesh body stocking, to enable more successfully a disappearance of my live body into cinematic landscape. This sequence of images that I call the “textures” is edited from footage I have gathered in locations where I have travelled, mostly connected with dance projects. Opening with text rolling like credits into the distance (My life is running through me like a film...) it is swallowed into my torso like the earlier (and later) railway tracks disappearing into the distance. The text is light, perhaps not legible, but is recognizable as

---

98 train master projections can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561212
99 By placing the camera recording the images on my torso at an angle to the projector throw it is possible to only see the projected image caught on my body (i.e. any spill of the image beyond is off camera).
words and is meant as a cross-fade, from an attention to my spoken word as I back away from the audience into the end of the carriage, to focus on my body as a three-dimensional surface, as screen. The text gives way to a close up of sand falling from top to bottom, filling my torso (I might drown). Swaying soft wheat-like grasses turn into yellow flowers, to red foliage, to apples...shifting grains of sand become surf, propelling us into motion. The passing landscape moving through my frame from left to right, is some of the same footage that is running throughout the performance in the frame of a side window of the train. We, the viewer and I, are travelling from left to right (as we would read), through India, Sweden, and South Australia. The audience may not know exactly where these landscapes are, but they shift between foreignness and familiarity (and there are clues around us in guidebooks piled with the suitcases in the middle of the carriage). The direction of travel shifts from side to side to forward and back—we are moving forward through cornfields, then in reverse with the railway tracks disappearing as they were at this end of the train at the start of the performance. I am applying the motion through frame and its shifting directions and speeds as a strategy for amplifying the sensation that we are in motion, through landscapes and within our bodies. Can you feel the dryness of my skin in the Indian desert, the sharp and sweet smell of the apples that we gathered and lay upon in they disappear100 and the salt air blowing the yellow flowers in Goolwa2101 Earlier those first images to emerge out of my body included one of these yellow flowers in the palm of my hand, which grew and shrank in frame as I opened and closed my hand as though from the force of the image itself. The recurring images, which also include the animation of a heart (which will later be one drawn by Mel but projected by me onto her exposed chest), are clues, little fragments that feel familiar and, so, significant. Clues leading us somewhere, like the tracks this train travels on; like fascia creating space for nerves, blood vessels, and fluids to pass—reminders of the body as a network. We are reminded that

100 they disappear can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/121309994
This screendance work was created in collaboration with a group of artists at Summerwork 2014. The group of five women I worked with were a mix of dancers and writers, aged between 22 and 60 years, so movement and text were foremost modes of creating and interacting with each other and the environment. As I was the guest artist, the week focused on the making of a screendance work. Over the week I shared my creative processes of working with notions of vision and touch, incorporating improvisational scores involving tactile partner work, dancing vision/witnessing with and without camera (as previously outlined in relation to the screen/dance workshop) and in direct relationship and response to the rural environment we were in. The residency also incorporated authentic writing workshops led by local writer, Miriam Hall, so we drew from the text we wrote to feed into our danced scores in location, and to add to the soundscape. The screendance that resulted was a summary of a shared week in that world—three-dimensional points of view, the textures and sensations of the environment, and where our bodies “fit” within it and in relation to one another—foot lifting root; pine cones as guts spilling; the arch of a neck as a branch of a tree; a disappearance, a death, as a season passing.
101 This image was gathered during the shooting in Goolwa, South Australia for the community dance and film project Under my feet (Frahn, Lee & Reid 2012).
'networks are not just ways for us to maintain connection; networks are ways for us to maintain distance, or difference' (Kozel 2007: 30).

I amplify the attention to sensation with my live voice, as though these images are causing physical pain or pleasure, or transporting me to another dimension to

\emph{an almost death, a pleasurable preview of another place.}

(\textit{Love poem for the red rattler} 2014b)

I’m static but moving, responding in small quivers, tensions, shivers, with vocal gasps and singing, shifting between exhilaration and anguish. The tracks fade and I walk into myself, my back exposed, in a fleshy pink dress. In these final images of myself layered upon myself, I am scratching and swiping at my torso as though exorcising past selves, now life-sized, until opening my hands like a multi-armed goddess to let myself fall backwards into the distance, the future, death.

She choreographs her final position; a fortunate death, a dramatic death, an untimely death, but love (a body of) unravels the moment until she is glowing with visceral transcendence. Time flows backwards across her skin, as Saraswati opens within her. She is endless. (Hayes 2013, 30 October)

I’m letting my skin effervesce with my lived experience to a final letting go…a phenomenal fall that lands back in the present, in my partially disrobed body, then turns, opens the rear door of the carriage to walk into the bright sunlight, into the distance.

While visiting with Ellen Bromberg during my field trip, she and I discussed the way we film with an attention to how not just our bodily movement but our other senses might “read” for the viewer. In the following passage she is referring to video projections (‘using video as light’) she made for the live dance work \textit{States Rendered} (2015) by Doug Varone.

Some of the things that I’m making now they are so abstracted you can’t tell what they are but it’s human movement. And I feel that at some core level we recognize that—our bodies know it. So, there’s something resonant that we experience, totally maybe unconscious or preconscious, but there’s something resonant about it that feels really gratifying to me. It’s almost like it keeps the thread of my own process clear in my own mind that it really does all still stem from the body even though I’m no longer dancing, that’s where my sensibility is.

(\textit{Interview with Ellen Bromberg} 2014b)
These final train sequences summarize the lived experience of this research. They are intersections of how my seeing/filming feels, how my imagination is activated through my senses (and vice versa) and how my live screen/dance is realized through the audience’s witnessing: I am the body-in-deformation.

To move is to exfoliate. (Manning 2009: 27)

Many potential bodies in a single body, a collective many-bodied state of transition, and a personal political knowledge.

---

3.6 Red rattler

—Consolidating performance practice via the screendance artifact

I mean it’s just so beautiful to see an older woman in this piece…in general…but in this piece in particular because I feel it’s so much about a journey and, not to be clichéd but there’s so much more life in your face than a younger face and so I love reading that, I love reading your life experience in your face, even when you’re doing nothing but gazing…there’s a very strong communication going on…so it’s very powerful and I feel like you’ve maintained a kind of continuity, a structural continuity of the performance piece which I feel is right for the screendance. (Interview with Ellen Bromberg, 2014)

The screendance, Red rattler (2014) is a poetic summary, a writing of the essence of my performance experiences in the red train. I created it just after my confirmation of candidature performance in early 2014 while I was “bumped into” the location again. It was a marking of a moment, a sort of closure on a beginning in both the physical practice and the writing of my research project. I wanted a memento of this period of research, this performance experiment, not sure if I would return to this site as the research continued.

I did have video footage documenting the 2013 performances by two different people (one a dancer with camera skills, one a cinematographer with dance skills). I had also asked another

---

102 Red rattler can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/106141347
103 “Bumped in” refers to having the theatrical set-up in place.
cinematographer colleague to shoot a performance for camera with no audience. But I felt all this footage to be somewhat distancing—to translate back to a screen only context it needed to renegotiate the relationship between myself, and the camera as viewer. It needed my point of view and the frame I imagined being viewed. It needed the rhythm of the train and my heartbeat, and to feel these movements there needed to be more places of stillness. Even though in performance the audience moved to find me as I moved to another part of the train carriage, they would then arrive in places of stillness in varying proximities to me. I was the one moving into and out of their fields of vision.

So, to that end, I needed to let the camera point of view shift and rest, and clean up the clutter of the frame privileging the focus on the space between us, viewer and I. In the performance footage the power points and other modern additions seemed to stand out, disrupting the authenticity of the location (which in performance are mostly hidden by other bodies or at least peripheral to the focal point of the action and not necessarily noticeable). The visibility of other audience members in shot made the camera/viewer seem to be a voyeur, external to the action rather than a participant in it. So I spent time alone with the camera in that space—fixing the camera on a tripod framing particular angles in the location, in varying proximities to me, and “played” (performed) within and on the edges of that field of vision. Each “set-up” held its own temporal and textural feel, this moment could be happening at a different time to the last, implying a shared journey over time and alluding to the bodily journey of a lifetime. I magnified an intimacy between us—allowed the camera to see my vulnerabilities—by watching me sleeping, following the trace of my finger on my throat, falling through frame, crawling into corners, struggling out a window, looking directly and “unmasked” at camera. These positions I put myself in, and the charging of the space between the camera/viewer and myself, were surprising unexpected places physically and emotionally (I am balancing on an edge, I am skewered in its framework, I am too close to you). These extremes, behavior inappropriate for the public space, were strategies, in performance and now on screen, to engage directly with the sensations and emotions of the viewer’s body.

I set up shots to drop into the “imagined,” into dream-like abstractions, to amplify corporeality by transcending it (seemingly levitating above the train seat, the soul departing the body, or sinking into the light of the window as the film fades to an end). To this mix of locked-off camera shots, I added moving camera shots taken from my point of view, from a GoPro camera attached to my head. From here you can see/feel the room spin, read the writing on the wall, float up and see the discarded skin of my/your body. I used reflections of myself off-screen in
the glass interior panels to bring the three-dimensionality of the location into the screen frame. The fog of my breath prepares a canvas to draw a heart and this brings my three-dimensionality into the location, its heat, touch, memories, and longings. We all remember this physical act, drawing on the misted window, and the dreaming state of travel that this lives in. I did use one shot in the Red rattler edit from a previous live performance to show the image of my (past) face onto my (present) face, from my hand-held projector. For other moving images of other locations, I incorporated fragments of the footage I had projected in performance onto my body. I had done this in performance to suggest my “interior/imagination” and to play with the metaphors of skin and screen, past and present. In Red rattler, these fragments added the same textural layers and spatial/temporal shifts—my torso emerges as a field of flowers as I press my cheek against the window, the heart I draw on the misted window animates into a drawing and words that layer and drown the frame into a scrawled mess.

Just as the Love poem for the red rattler is a written declaration of an intimacy, Red rattler (the screendance) is a shared intimacy written on the pixels of the screen and riding on the soundscape. The writing became a blueprint for the edit, reminding my eyes viewing a screen, my fingers on the keyboard, of the sensations of this dancing life, improvising itself from this moment to the next.

---

104 I drew on sections of the live score, a number of discrete compositions by Stuart Day (Adelaide based composer and high school friend, so another historical link), which I had woven together with train sound effects to create the tonal and temporal structure for the performance. I kept a sense of the journey of mood that I had had in the performance—the clumsiness of arrival (the rattle of the train), finding your seat and settling in to the location (a lulling, rhythmic guitar melody), the playfulness of getting to know each other (the single repeated piano notes that begin to layer and chase one another), and then to a more intimate place, of dream, longing, loss (the sustained choral voices and otherworldly bell tinkling).
3.7 Wanting Distance

—Moving across multiple sites, the ‘diptych’ format

It unrolls, a giant scroll that my body reads, articulates, making kine-sense of it
It draws the bodies of the audience close to me and then tosses them into the long distance
It has past and present simultaneously, in duet, courting a promise of the future
It has windows (video) and doors (entrances and exits)
It changes tack, moves through a building, from corridors to small corners to vast open spaces
(Reid 2013–2015, May 2014)

After the train performances in 2013 I considered ways to work with distance—how to look further than my own body, to widen the perspective to include other performers and sites, to consider the social and cultural context. How could my various roles as editor, improviser, and choreographer interact to generate new constellations of practice? How could I now move from one voice to many, to a sharing of weight and responsibility? How could my art practice contribute to new ways of knowing ourselves in relation to and including others?

In dance making I have the opportunity to dream myself anew. (Barbour 2011a: 69)

In response to this I developed the performance work *Unbecoming* in 2014. This duet with Melinda Smith, a dancer living cerebral palsy, extended the role of dancer to other bodies and objects, and these new interactions extended upon the content and context of my screendance imagery. It provided an opportunity to mine the metaphors and practice of undoing, in addition to shifting the temporal and gravitational “knowns” of my physical practice. In the next sections of this chapter I will expand on that duet practice (including my/our shared practice with other dancers), both in the studio and in performance, and the philosophical and socio-cultural issues and discoveries arising from the practice. I will draw on the written
reflections that Melinda and I have shared during our intensive and extensive practice, in addition to responses from audience gathered from online surveys, interviews, open discussions and personal communications. However, my focus in this document is to articulate the integration and development of my screen and dance practices, as maker and ‘made,’ into an original and phenomenological practice of “live screen/dance.”

With *Dance Interrogations (a diptych)* I brought together both stages of my performance research into a two-part performance event. I built upon the cinematic in the live experience by physically shifting the action across space, into quite different locations in different suburbs of inner city Melbourne, and over time, separating the two episodes with an extended interval. This broader commitment on the part of the audience, of four hours rather than the usual 1–2, and of transporting themselves between locations, was a strategy for bringing the audience closer (in considering my creative vision, but also with each other as an group) while at the same time giving them space to dream, to consider what had been (in the train) as they move toward what might be (in the convent).\(^{105}\) We are fellow travellers, spending time together, moving into the unknown.

Travel suspends us together in time and space, somehow absolved from decision making as we allow ourselves to be moved. (Paris 2014: 91)

---

### 3.8 Sharing practice

— *Understanding my own body in relation to others*

I get it more, the more I practice improvisation - what comes up, comes up. It's not about doing the same moves; it's about shifting to another direction. Seeing where the dance takes me, takes us, takes you (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 10 May 2013)

\(^{105}\) I will discuss my choice of the site at the Abbotsford Convent in the forthcoming section subtitled *The Mural Hall.*
Dance is the vehicle for my experiencing, reflecting on and imagining my life, and also a way to come closer to others. To dance is to ‘face oneself as one faces others and the world—imaginatively’ (Fraleigh 2004: 2). The relationships you develop in the dance studio are deep because they are deeply connected to breath and touch, to our most intimate states. I wish I could bring the whole world, everyone, into the dance studio, into their own breathing and sensation, so they might get on with living (generously) with each other.

My solo improvisational practice is nurtured by my dancing with others, and so I have cultivated shared practice with several individuals over the course of this research project. This practice varies slightly depending on the particular individuals present, their interests in terms of aesthetic, context, tools, but in all instances our practice involves a fluidity of moving between dancing for or with one another. It is my “improcinemania” that often urges our practice into extended dances of “viewing with,” of witnessing from within the dance. I share the proposition, or “score,” that as we dance, we always maintain an attention to the relationship between ourselves and the other dancers in the space—we are improvising with frames—that even in the act of watching another we are “present” in the dance and potentially also being witnessed. This keeps the viewer’s body alive, whether moving or in stillness, acknowledging the micro dance in the act of watching, and that we might “watch” with our whole body. When facilitating group practice I have developed screendance narratives that move through physical and imaginative scores, using shifts in focus and ways of viewing/interacting that explicitly call attention to the metaphor of film and my camera and editing methodologies. The following text is an example of a blueprint for one of my 90-

---

106 I want to acknowledge the generosity and artistry of a number of individuals who have practiced regularly with me and positively supported my dancing over the past three years. In addition to Melinda Smith, who has been my most constant dance partner, those people include Paul Roberts, Ann-maree Ellis, Shaun McLeod, Dani Cresp, Gülsen Özer, Inga Muribo, Luke Hickmott, Madison Phillips and Amaara Raheem.

107 A “score” is a term used in improvisation for any instruction to suggest possibilities relating to how one might be attentive, while dancing. Olivia Millard describes them this way: ‘Scores support me to allow myself to not know what comes next: they are a prop, a ruse, pretence, which, while giving me the illusion of ‘knowing’ in my dancing, allow me to not know. Thus while scores are usually in the form of a verbal or visual statement their role is to ‘act’ rather than to define’ (Millard 2012: 29).

108 Improvising with frames can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561021 It is edited footage of a shared practice with Inga Muribo and Madison Phillips where our score included moving the static camera to a new position in the room and then working within that frame (or as close as could be imagined from within the frame).

109 I facilitated group improvisation sessions in 2014 with a small group of invited dancers (including some mentioned previously), led workshops at ‘The Little Con-ference’ (Melbourne) and ‘Precipice’ (Canberra), both of which are events for improvisation practitioners to share practice and performance, and taught as part of the Ririe-Woodbury Summer School during my field trip to Salt Lake City, Utah (as seen in the video Improvisation and Camera Workshop).
minute workshops. Linked closely with a musical playlist, I would use these landmarks to develop a verbal narrative leading participants through an “improcinematic” journey.

**Walking and meeting**…show another person a detail of your body (a scar, a feature, a part that connects to a memory/event) ask them simply “Look at this” then move on…

**Down into CRT**…attention to topography, macro to micro …images of body as landscape/geology

Body in the room…walls, roof, other bodies, longitudes and latitudes that intersect your body
Your personal space…hills, valleys, fly over, movement of air, shadows, humidity, bodies of water…zoom in to rock pools/body surface …zoom into body interior, geological shifts, seismic waves

**Rocking and shifting**…sloshing to swiping, brushing, coating, reforming …breathing into new forms, seasons

**moving outward and upward**…let focus enter, eye as portal receiving light and info (texture, line, shape) breath in, through and out of the body.

Play with focus leading the body. Where does it land? Moving between close-up and distance. What is the frame? The edges, through other bodies, blurring or sharpening, shifting the frame, tracking, panning, cutting between frames, shifting the rhythm from frame to frame

**Moving into specific locations in the room**

---

110 I put together a sequence of musical tracks that move through dynamic terrain to support the dancing without imposing upon it, e.g. longer tracks (20-40 minutes) by artists including The Necks, Jo Quail, Jason Sweeney, Amphibian, Boards of Canada, Ludovico Einaudi, Brian Eno, and All India Radio.

111 CRT, or “constructive rest,” is the position of laying on the back, knees bent to 90 degrees and feet parallel flat on the floor, and arms laying on the floor just out from the sides of the body (below shoulder height) with palms up. It is often used in the beginning of contemporary dance class and somatic practice as a means to drop one’s attention into the body, to work with an image. ‘The image is commonly introduced when the body is at rest (Dempster 1985: 14). ‘These images, embodying concepts of skeletal balance and efficient muscle action, can with the support of the kinaesthetic mechanisms, effect new physical understanding and real bodily change’ (1985: 13).
—place yourself in the frame...for imagined witnesses.

What is the angle, perspective? What is the detail in the frame? What’s off screen? Move in and out of focus. Zoom in/amplify. Notice textures, light, colour, scents, temperatures, line/architecture, possibilities/perches, objects/bodies.

Find a few different frames...settle on one of those explored to share with the group

Showings/sharings—The group moving as herd
to perform/see these frames...
call 'here' to enter your frame...others choose their viewpoint...
call 'gone' to move back into the herd.

Partners to build relationship and material for filming

Houston exercise 112...rolling with eye contact, whispering, contact, moving between the three

Touch (location and quality) into moving

Trio for 2 dancers and 1 camera

Use movement from previous exercises eyes open, passing the camera between you...dancer sometimes coming to rest so camera can move across landscape

...let camera become prosthetic for seeing, finding and leaving the dancer

In most of my regular shared practice sessions with others, however, the use of “scores” are not necessarily pre-determined or articulated. Although we may become aware of working with a particular pattern or idea ourselves, or pick up on and develop something from or with our dance partner (see Practice with Paul)113 mostly scores emerge and evolve to support the dance rather than directing it. Working in fluid and intimate ways with other bodies in practice has honed my capacities to engage with audience bodies in performance (physically, conversationally, imaginatively) and to further develop my screendance methodology into the site design (placement and interaction with architecture and video projection). In my 2013 performance season in the train site I incorporated two durational performance events involving several other improv practitioners. Each event, titled The little con express114 ran for

---

112 I described my version of Wendy Houston’s physical theatre exercise earlier in this chapter.
113 Practice with Paul can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561020
It is edited from a practice session with Paul Roberts in which we took turns in setting up a camera frame.
114 The little con express can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561022.
five hours on the two Saturday afternoons of the season. The other performers and I, costumed to fit the era of the carriage, moved between dancing and witnessing as audience and passers-by entered the train or viewed through a window. There was an ambiguity in terms of who was a performer or an audience, or, in fact, if this was a performance or simply a community space at play. I was following a similar desire to that of Anna Halprin, ‘to demythologize the acts of spectating and performing and to elicit a new sympathy of one for the other…to reconstitute the audience role into that of witness’ (Ross 2007: 221). These “open” group performances in the site also helped me to quickly deepen my familiarity with the train site as a location during that season, and added to the real personal history I shared with the train as I came into the 2015 season. It was also the first time that Melinda Smith had experienced performing/improvising outside of a studio or theatre setting, and one which I think deepened her understanding of my vision for the diptych work and her consequent capacity to imagine my train journey in each performance that then developed with her in the convent.

Dance improv/practice is more than a body/mind movement experience - it opens the creative path to build my confidence in all areas of myself - after a session like yesterday, my imagination gets a buzz and takes me on a roll to find me another way to do things. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 7 February 2013)

It has been the sharing of practice with Melinda (D&M practice) that has most challenged (opened and diversified) my way of looking and being in the world as a dancer, a woman, an able-bodied person, and which saw the development of solo to duet performance with the second part of the Dance Interrogations diptych.

The Little Con refers to the name of an improvisation collective, which performed monthly at Cecil Street Studio from 2005 – 2010. I was an original member alongside Shaun McLeod, Joey Lehrer, Ann-maree Ellis, Paul Romano and Grace Walpole. I have revived the title for a few events I have facilitated in the past few years including The Little Con-ference, a research performance event at Deakin University in 2014 & 2015. This footage is a collection of still images taken during The little con express performances.

With a children’s playground and a café located next to the train site, there was often much passing inquisitive traffic that served to continually enliven my sense of “performing” this site in the hours I spent rehearsing or testing production aspects there.

Melinda writes: ‘this was to be my first performance on a vintage train carriage, and with a new bunch of people, dancers with a lot more skills and experiences under their hat. I was ready for the challenge, but I was also apprehensive about doing something quite foreign to me, in dance language. I remember the first rehearsal on the vintage train, I had farted my nervousness and one of the dancers turned it into the next shift of direction, giving the dance such a moment of ‘life’ in a conversation on a vintage train… My nervousness lifted. On the vintage train carriage my hands, fingers pinned to the floor, memories flooded back, to when I was a young child with my mum travelling to Flinders Street to attend endless appointments at the Children’s Hospital. I remembered the men in business suits, women in tight fitted skirts and chains of smoke travelling through the carriage, because smokers had no boundaries. I was a child with a wild imagination; I had plenty of time to study people and their strange behaviours. While the world thought my brain was destroyed, and beyond any comprehension, I lived the life of a secret dreamer inside my head. It was an amazing revelation to find myself inside a vintage train carriage many years later, exploring dance moves to communicate with the dancers and the public’ (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 29 November 2015).

D&M practice can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561297
I think the combination of us dancing together, and this is about our combined resources (imagery, musicality and the merging of our spatial and dynamic ranges... walls, floor, each other's surfaces, chair) is what is unique and engaging. Not me pulling you onto your feet and waving your arm for you but the real concept of duet which is listening and going with. The principles of contact improv really apply here, even when we're not in physical contact—

"CI looks at the interactions within the perceptual body, the body-mind organism. Through the direct experience and perception of dance, we can access new pathways to ourselves and our environment." (Kaltenbrunner 1998: 11)

—This is what your/our dance practice is...a re-training of the body and mind connections and possibilities...this is the same for me, what I've been working with in improvisation to open the neural connections and revealing the rich personal 'material' by paying attention to the moment. And I love the way it is so applicable across bodies/experience...that it celebrates the unique and the personal, which has all the facets of grace and awkwardness. (Reid in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 1 April 2015)

Melinda describes herself as a ‘dancer living with cerebral palsy.’ Cerebral palsy is a condition of unique diversity; it effects each individual differently and to varying degrees. In Melinda’s case it means she cannot speak, eat or walk unassisted. What that means is that she is working with different temporal, spatial and dynamic structures. It also means that the majority of her day-to-day interactions with others are about explaining her difference and/or asking for assistance. For Melinda, technology enables her to participate within “able-bodied” contexts. She is surrounded by technological devices that have enabled her to work, travel and communicate—enabling her to connect with the community and with her creative and intellectual potentials. Technology has, to an extent, “normalized” her body and what that body wants now is to dance, to feel sensation and engage with the imagination. She wants to get out of the chair and struggle in the now, celebrating slowness, effort, and accident. Almost in direct opposition to the ease and efficiency of the technology that frames her life, she seeks to maroon herself in the present moment and, in that abandonment, forge new connections within her body. Dance improvisation now provides her with a means to investigate her un-augmented body, to mine the material of spasticity and slowness and rummage around in her imagination.

---

118 This is one young woman’s description of herself on her Facebook page: ‘I have Athetoid Quadriplegic Cerebral Palsy. The brain has to control every single movement that you do, like lifting your arm. For this the brain has to decide when and how to make those movements. Let’s imagine you have a post office in your mind sending directions to every part of your body about how to move (including your mouth for speech). Basically, my post office is having a party all the time, so they send mucked up directions to every part of my body. This means that I don’t move like most people’ (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 29 September 2015). Melinda has a combination of Athetoid (or Dyskinetic) and Spastic Cerebral Palsy.
Through dance – I can explore who the heck I am, and what is physicality like in a body that demands so much more to touch and be touched... the deeper I go, the more connections I make between myself and the people around me... and how I want to survive in this world, to experience the potential of the/my dancing body... this can only be achieved in the body I already exist in. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 25 March 2013)

Both screendance and improvisation could be seen as vehicles for “inclusivity” in dance—attending to individuality, spontaneity and diversity. Working with the particular range and experiences of each individual, improvisation essentially legitimizes all movement as dance, and all types of body as dancer. Improvisation is the ideal practice for differently-abled bodies as its material is about an individual’s unique experience of living. In this way the practice of improvisation and screendance are ideally matched—the close up camera and the spontaneous movement are revealing, idiosyncrasies and peculiarities are magnified. This magnification is an undoing of generalization in favour of specificity to the moment, the detail. It opens the body and the viewer to other creative possibilities.

Watching disabled bodies dancing forces us to see with a double vision, and helps us to recognize that while a dance performance is grounded in the physical capacities of a dancer, it is not limited by them. (Albright 2001: 58)

When we began practicing together we spent a lot of time outside of the studio chatting online, reflecting on our experiences, sharing information about our histories, our bodies, our aesthetic, imagination, musicality. This part of our practice, online written communication, enables extended discussion not always possible during practice sessions.\footnote{During our studio times we are focused on the physical aspects of our practice—arriving, dressing, warming up, dancing, packing up, calling cabs, etc. Melinda also finds it difficult to shift quickly from moving into reflecting/talking. She finds that she needs time and distance, to physically relax and then allow the dance experience to coalesce into language.} Over the past three years we have practiced (at least) weekly and in three-hour sessions. Each practice begins with chatting, dressing/preparing\footnote{We both wear kneepads to protect ourselves against the unexpected (spasm, over-balancing chair). We place water bottles at the edges of the space—Melinda’s with a straw to give her independent access during practice. Other tools—Melinda’s Vantage Lite, our notebook/journals, one or two wheelchairs, cameras—are placed at the edges for potential inclusion by either of us in the improvisation without having to stop the flow of the dance.} into warming-up separately in the space into extended improvisations moving between duets and solos. We work with 60–90 minute playlists of music, a range of tracks which we both contribute to and rearrange from practice to practice. Dancing with another over a long period of time and moving in that intimate range develops a trust that enables new learning. Taking time to listen and feel the smaller shifts has enabled us to expand our shared vocabulary, and work in different relationships to gravity and to each other. Melinda’s control and strength has significantly increased allowing...
her to move through space more quickly and expansively, to move from floor to moments of standing. We have both reconfigured some of our ideokinetic pathways. When we work in physical contact, I tend to slow my movement down, excavating stillness/moving in an amplified way, enabling me to work with our shared weight more acutely, to discover new connections, points of balance, pathways. Our contact improvisation has deepened and we are able to negotiate gravity and each other’s weight with more control but also with more abandon. When we dance at a distance I can use speed or height to add to the overall composition, using counterpoint and contrast to activate the spatial tension between us.

I get so involved in our dance journeys now, there was a moment in our journey yesterday I had the image of space travel when my feet were supporting my legs and watching you move in sync felt incredibly easy for my body to go with it and be in it. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 12 May 2014)

I had some wonderful reflections after yesterday's practice...you may think it was, about me showing/trying my strengths...I saw some pretty awesome things in you too, I don't see you as an able bodied dancer, mover who could do almost anything beautifully...but I see you in a reflective light, a body of reflections and strengths that oozes out and reinforces messages, communicates to me, that inspires me, to just BE and DO and practice...laying relaxed on my front and absorbing your reflective body in the timber mirror - wow, that seemed such a powerful moment of realisation where stillness communicates in extraordinary ways...I see your movements and feel inspired to embrace mine...I feel your movements and see that I am safe to explore mine. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 8 February 2015)

Our dance practice moves through imaginative or tactile scores, which are not predetermined but which emerge spontaneously for each of us. Our connections are felt rather than articulated, and our differences become meeting points. We work with objects, space and gravity in unusual or unexpected ways, between watching and dancing and, later, translating into writing and drawing. To her mobility and speech devices I add the technology of screendance (cameras, editing software, video projection) and our duet becomes populated with a chorus of other surfaces and senses, other identities and landscapes. As we move from chair to floor, speaking or typing, watching or being seen, we are editing a “live screen/dance”—shifting the geography, distorting time, destabilizing roles and narratives.

The camera becomes a prosthetic for seeing and...transforms the ordinary into the extraordinary. Through this vision-prosthetic, a new kind of intimacy is created between the camera operator and the performer. (Rosenberg 2012: 69)

---

121 In the past year these moments have extended from seconds to minutes standing unsupported by myself or a chair or wall.
Improvising with my own prosthetic, the camera, I have created screendances that seek not to solve people’s architectures but to engage curiously with their particular virtuosities and, so, with the richness of diversity. When I first worked with Melinda in 2010 I recall watching the effort of Melinda moving out of her chair and onto the wooden dance floor as a profound and cinematic experience. Time slowed and space contracted for me as a viewer. The intensity of her focus and physical effort had, for me, the parallel visceral effect as a sustained zoom of a camera to an extreme close up. I was drawn in by her attention. I was slowed in body and breath as I attended to the minute detail of this effort, where I felt the distance between chair and floor as if it was a slow motion fall from a cliff. Today, in response to my current research and our mutual interest in visual imagery and the cinematic, our dance practice often draws on screendance methodology as a shared way of dancing/viewing within one another’s personal space. We have built a shared access to one another’s bodies with the inclusion of cameras, sometimes a fixed frame is set up that we move in and out of, sometimes as an extension to either of our bodies (hand-held, a manoeuvre of or strapped to the dancing body). Cameras inside practice offer feedback as well as improvisational scores. In our viewing of footage, we are able to reflect upon it as a meeting point, a visualization of our shared dynamic, where our differences are the vital and exhilarating catalyst.

From the moment you started to film my dance performances, I saw my body differently than in any other photography or filming I had previously done…I saw the beauty in my spasticity and awkwardness in my shifts with my dance partner. I can remember feeling proud of my vulnerability and putting my body out there for the public to see, but mostly for my own satisfaction. I could now accept and work with what I have and who I am. (Interview with Melinda Smith, 18 April 2014)

Melinda’s occasional spasms become surprising and interesting material, a dynamic relief from the sustained effort required to negotiate the CP neural pathways. Rather than ignore or try to cover up a spasm, we play with it, repeating and amplifying it, celebrating its contribution to the dynamic texture of our dancing. Similarly, Bruce Curtis, an improviser with spinal cord injury, writes of his experiences of dancing with his body’s particularities:

122 Melinda’s dance career began in 2006 when she performed with a small theatre group called Amuse Ability. She then helped to establish a small dance troupe, Wheel Women who partnered with Fusion Theatre to develop Perfectly Imperfect in 2010, where we first worked together. This was the first time Melinda had experienced dancing out of her wheelchair and the beginning of a dance mentorship with me that has developed into an ongoing duet improvisation practice and saw Mel join Weave Movement Theatre. We first performed at the Sambhav Festival in Delhi, India in November 2011, then at Atalante in Gothenburg, Sweden and Darpana in Ahmedabad, India in August/September 2012.
The point was not to clamp down and control my body but to listen to it, accepting whatever movement was inherent. If a spasm did occur, we would just keep dancing and let it happen, allowing the spasm to become part of the dance. (Curtis 1988: 16)

This ongoing and emergent research is an exploration of the evolution of this dancing partnership with Melinda as a shared lived experience. It also reflects the shifts in my physicality and movement vocabulary as a result of this relationship and, of course, as a result of my own aging. I am undoing my self-image from the dancer I was, the one that adhered to the classic model of a dance body and syllabus, to know what I’m “unbecoming.”

---

3.9 Unbecoming

—Undoing body representations

We are unbecoming
unhinged, undone, unencumbered
We are marooned in the moment
a collision of hard edges and soft tissue
of difficult bodies and sensational possibilities

Melinda and I presented the first development of Unbecoming (see Unbecoming promo) in 2014 in the dance studio where we practice at Deakin University. We wanted to bring the audience into our space-time, to offer other angles and investments with watching our different (aging and disabled) dancing bodies. We were looking to ‘perform the mobilization of the trapped body’ (Kuppers 2004: 68). With this dance work we were ‘celebrating risk-taking for performers and audience, the risk of being seen in an awkward moment, of not conforming to

---

123 Program notes for Unbecoming (2014).
124 Unbecoming promo can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/110457868
125 We also borrowed a dozen wheelchairs from disability support organizations and alternated them with as many chairs as the audience seating in our dance studio space.
expectation, of aging, of falling over, of revealing our thoughts and using our imaginations, of moving in different relationships to time and space.\textsuperscript{126}

Throughout my reading, particularly in phenomenological and feminist texts, “becoming” continues to rise to the surface (Sheets-Johnstone 1966; Beauvoir 1974; Deleuze & Guattari 1980; Fraleigh 2004). Braidotti discusses Deleuze’s “becoming-woman” as problematic, although seen to overcome gender polarization on the one hand, ‘it clashes with women’s sense of their own historical struggles’ (Braidotti 1994: 120). With the title “unbecoming” I wanted to infer these undercurrents of thinking, playing with issues of gender and power across the fields of dance and disability. To be “unbecoming” suggests subversion. It most frequently calls up the phrase “behavior unbecoming to a lady”—itself an acknowledgement of the hierarchy of beauty and conformity that dominates much of the imagery representing women. The traditional definition of dancer (synonymous too with beauty, and femininity) in Western theatrical dance is both narrow and exclusionary, a point taken up in feminist readings of dance history from a number of dance scholars (Daly 1992; Albright 1997; Banes 1998). In \textit{Mining the Dancefield: Feminist Theory and Contemporary Dance} Albright acknowledges the cultural stereotypes that marginalize women and dancers, and people with disabilities, as being tied to the material conditions of their bodies (Albright 1997: 6–7). The stereotype of dancers as “feminine” and as the site of visual pleasure (Mulvey 1975) continues to live in contemporary consciousness. This “dancer” is young, fit, flexible, able-bodied, ambulating on two long legs, strong, controlled, visually (suggesting sexually) available. This dancer, this woman, is as stated in de Beauvoir’s The Second Sex, ‘an historical idea and not a natural fact’ (Beauvoir 1974: 38). She is a corporeal style, an act, in need of undoing. The term “unbecoming” could be reclaimed and considered, like the body, as Butler’s incessant ‘materializing of possibilities’ (Butler 1988: 521).

\begin{quote}
We are the same/different
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
A many-armed goddess
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
holding the high-tech weapons of movement and communication
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
We are feminist figurations
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
Alternative subjectivities
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{126} These words were included in the program notes for the 2014 performances.
Not the binary of abled/disabled
but blurred boundaries
political fictions
a multiplicity of mechanisms and muscularities
twitches and switches
voices animal and animatronic
various inflections of female
our “woman” our “dancer” — a site of overlapping variables

We are nomadic subjects
travelling together across the planet, literally and across imaginative landscapes
We are subverting conventions, resisting definition, challenging classification.127
(Reid 2013–2015, 17 January 2015)

Braidotti’s “nomadic methodology” is a means to imagine fluidity, a means to move across boundaries and toward other qualities of interconnectedness. It provides a means by which we might “unbecome” our dancer, our woman, and our ability—and become a retelling, a reconfiguring. The creation and re-creations (as each improvised performance is a remaking, a revisiting of a landscape from different angles) of Unbecoming are, as Braidotti suggests, nomadic, ‘a political project in which a new subjectivity is created that blurs boundaries and consists in erasing and recomposing the former boundaries between self and others’ (Roets & Braidotti 2012: 168). In Unbecoming we worked nomadically in literal and metaphoric ways. We were shifting and interconnecting our bodies, in contact with one another, moving within projections of our bodies or using projection to animate the skin and suggest an interior. We were dismantling or repurposing the wheelchairs, wearing them like armor or being dragged beneath them. We were writing words on the speech-generating device called Vantage Lite (we have named “Penny”) to throw disembodied voices into the space.

Then we played with Bluetooth speaker amplifying Penny’s voice
…on/behind Xena so she speaks…in my kneepad so my leg speaks

disembodied voices

127 This is a poetic reflection I wrote after one of our performances and in response to reading Braidotti.
wheelchairs that speak
empty suits/skins talking
a voice from beyond the grave
the voice in my head
talking bodies not heads
if the walls could talk

(Reid 2013–2015, 28 February 2015)

By blurring the borders of our bodies we can escape ableist and sexist “fixing” to be, as Elizabeth Grosz suggests, ‘indeterminate and indeterminable.’

the body…is an open-ended, pliable set of significations, capable of being re-written, reconstituted, in quite other terms than those which mark it, and consequently capable of re-inscribing the forms of sexed identity and psychical subjectivity at work today. (Grosz 1994: 60–61)

Grosz’s proposition of a ‘rewriting (of) the female body as a positivity rather than a lack…a reorganizing and reframing the terms by which the body has been socially represented’ (Grosz 1994: 61) offers a feminist challenge for the ‘politics of mourning and melancholia’ that have dominated disability theory, ‘the dominant understanding of impairment as loss, deficit, lack, tragedy’ (Roets & Braidotti 2012: 161).

…the experience of disability, our own or that of others, becomes the scene where we can frame how we experience embodied existence and thus disability becomes a place where culture can be examined anew, again and again.” (Titchkosky & Michalko 2012: 141)

We work to re-inscribe ourselves by re-working the tools and the content of the cultures of dance and disability. It leans toward a post humanist feminist approach with its focus on the material effects of changes to human embodiment—a rethinking the human with its nonhuman others, the machines of disability culture in this environment. This artistic practice is my project toward what Braidotti calls ‘horizons of hope’ (Dolphins & van der Tuin 2012: 36). I projected “hope” in the train, a metaphor for this nomadic practice yearning forward to this dance of “faith” in the convent. These “live screen/dances” are permeated with a fleshed thinking, drawing on the creative powers of the imagination, dreaming up possible futures and being activated in the present by those visions and yearnings. Melinda works for the most part out of a wheelchair on the floor, she moves into contemporary dance culture, giving into gravity, celebrating the counterpoints of strength and struggle, the graceful and the
grotesque. I incorporate her technologies—the wheelchairs and the speech-generating device and also the physical dynamics of interruption, spasm, slurring, falling, struggling that are potentially the extended embodiment of these cultural artifacts. I become not less abled but experientially augmented and expanded. When supporting Melinda or a wheelchair I must exercise extreme balance and strength because of her unpredictability or his (the wheelchair's) in-animation, while at the same time giving up control over the outcome, the direction of our combined effort, which is also dancing with the forces of gravity.

I feel that my shifts are giving me more feedback now or maybe I'm listening more and just letting what happens happen...using Robbie as the centre of our relationship creates an interesting dynamic, sometimes as a support mechanism and sometimes as a third physical body. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 28 March 2013)

Within this duet we are working with new time frames and spatial/gravitational parameters in a way that reminds me of being in the editing suite. In post-production editing time and space can be shifted and tweaked to enable a multitude of possibilities. Working there I become tuned into subtleties that can have considerable impact, strategies for imagining other ways of dancing the body and the viewer. In a live context, for example supporting Melinda’s descent to the floor, I feel this tuning in translates to my subtle shifts of weight and counterbalance, attending to the point of contact as a frame-by-frame negotiation. Physical virtuosities are stretched in different ways and my attention is to an overall composition where I am sometimes the frame, or the negative space within the frame. I am facilitating the shift of the other. I am the crane, the dolly, the tools of cinema and a human mobility aid. I am never pretending not to be “me” but through my own dismantling I am becoming magnified, monolithic, preconceptual.

---

128 We have given Melinda’s wheelchairs names—Robbie and Xena—and they have increasingly become identities rather than objects for us.
129 Refer to D&M practice video between 1:25–3:03
3.10 DSW

—Duration
/Spasm
/Wheelchair

In the same way that making the screendance Red rattler served to consolidate my ideas about form and content for the train performance, DSW (2015) clarified the direction for the duet component. DSW\(^{130}\) was edited from an improvisation specifically set up for camera, after a performance of Unbecoming in early 2015 while we still had the extra wheelchairs and lighting set up to play with in the dance studio. It shifted the liveness of the encounter—between live dance and video projection, bodies and wheelchairs—into a screen site. The title DSW is an acronym Melinda and I coined for a Skype emoticon we used in our online conversations when we first began working together. It was a stick figure dancing that Melinda re-visualized in her painting of DSW, Dancing Stick Woman.\(^{131}\) It could also stand for:

\begin{itemize}
\item Dance Spasm Warrior
\item Don’t Stop Working
\item Dynamic Strong Women
\item Different Same Wonderful
\item Doing Something Wrong
\item Dizzy Sickening Waning
\item Determined Simple Wants
\item Drifting Subtle Whimsy
\item Dangerous Stunt Wheelchair
\item Distant Sleeping World
\item Difficult Singing Whispers
\item Definitely Standing Wobbly
\item Deft Succinct Writing
\item Does Some Wishing
\end{itemize}

\(^{130}\) DSW can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/121306214

\(^{131}\) Melinda’s drawing is the header image on my blog entry at http://www.hipsync.com.au/diannereid/dsw/
In the opening footage, of our live bodies moving within the frame of our projected bodies, I have chopped and dis-ordered the progression of time, removing frames and jumping forward and backward in the temporal sequencing. I have infused the montage with speed changes to amplify the irregular rhythms and tensions of spasms—this is how it feels in my physical body sometimes when I dance with Melinda. It is a stuttering montage in my muscles—a micromanipulation of tension and time. *DSW* could be seen as a screendance of the “gap”, of Merleau-Ponty’s “écart.” I seek to make this sensation, or this skip of the senses, visible. It is the invisible charge of space between her movements. It is a losing of self in the flinging as our identities jump back and forth between bodies. From left to right of frame, from white suit to black, standing to sitting, we become interchangeable, equal. The binary of black and white, abled or disabled, is confused and subverted. *DSW* is an editing of the flutter in time—a present that is unstable, a jittering of restraint and desire.

Just as the notion of the “invisible” challenges the supremacy and literality of vision (Kozel 2007: 40), this dance challenges the supremacy of the vertical and the linearity of time. I am editing in the glitch. I am fleshing the screendance with my embodiment of this difference. This is a montage of my experience of this world, this duet of her to me to her, often flattened into the horizontal plane, hung on the sharp edges of disability equipment, threatened by the unpredictability of spasm and fall. Jason Sweeney’s track *Action* has the right undercurrent of hypnotic whirrs and percussive twangs to reflect the spinning wheelchair wheels or the rebound of a spasm. I intercut the black-and-white wall sequences with our crawling colour footage, our bodies on dangerous angles and dismembered by the edges of frame. As with *Red rattler*, I have drawn in fragments of the footage that was projected live in the 2014 performances—the *Gopro* cam on Melinda’s feet as her wheelchair propels cross the floor; the radial blurred images of us in close contact; the images of rib cages and skulls. There are flashes of Film Noir, of horror film—the threatening mountainous shadow of chairs like the remains of a disabled holocaust, and skeletons projected upon our prone forms as reminders of our mortality. I am deliberately imposing this “other” spatial/temporal physicality on the

---

This “radial blurred” (type of effect) duet footage, originally at the end of the piece in 2014 did not get included in the shorter diptych performance. I found the new juxtapositions of wall followed by hand-held projection better served to provide the slippage, the blurred boundaries I was looking for.
viewer—to feel the struggle against the closed frames that our culture puts around these bodies (the stair-cased buildings, the “support” (repairing) devices, the race against the clock). I look directly at the camera, at you, as my slowed and blurred image falls from the frame. This is permission to look at an excavation of another kind of space-time, to engage with other textural repertoires, and perhaps to upset the authority of ableist architectures.

The reconfiguring of Unbecoming into a screendance site served to amplify the temporal and spatial particularities of Melinda’s lived experience. The 2014 studio performance, with the audience seated and static (albeit in wheelchairs), served to push our duet practice into an extended (50 minutes) performance context, and experiment with the content and placement of projections within that.

There is a particular magic to taking an audience on a real journey through time and space, there is a commitment that you make to them and they to you to allow them to be moved through space, to go with you. When you make work that physically moves an audience you travel before them, your own body taking in the sensations that will occur in theirs. (Paris 2014: 87)

Now, my screendance methodology was telling me to relocate our live duet into an architecture that could move the audience into range, skew the angle, alter gravity—challenge the supremacy of verticality and the linearity of time. To build upon my gesture of intimacy in the train and push our relationship to the next level, I needed to take the audience’s hand and lead them somewhere foreign.
3.11 The Mural Hall

—Cultural constructs

in the convent

To locate a work is often to imagine the texts that haunt its scenes. (Waugh 2013: 24)

Architectures can shelter and nurture community, but they can also impose themselves upon the shape of the human body and our socio-cultural codes. The more I have worked with Melinda, and within the disability sector in general,³³ the exclusive and confining nature of the physical and cultural structures we live with has become more apparent to me. The majority of these architectures are built around finite ideas of a body (upright, ambulating, verbal) and on a specific measure of living, in able-bodied dimensions. Not only have these architectural structures limited access for people with disability, the institutions housing them (the church, schools, courts etc.) have also excluded and devalued people not conforming to the dominant culture (historically dictated by and for the white, Anglo-Saxon, able-bodied male). The imposing historical site of the Abbotsford convent not only presented a rich cinematic backdrop for the Unbecoming duet but, as a home for ‘fallen women and girls needing refuge from the temptation of the world,’³⁴ it could allude to these issues of oppression of “others”—in our case, “other” in gender (female) and ability. That passageway in the convent, the “Mural Hall,” is a metaphor for the inequalities of “conforming.”

The Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd at Abbotsford Convent (1863–1975) was one of the largest Catholic complexes in Australia with over 1000 women

³³ In 2011-12 I was a community support worker with CARA (an accommodation and respite service for people with disabilities) At this time I also undertook study for the Certificate 3 in Disability. (https://www.cara.org.au.)

³⁴ Nuns took vows of poverty, chastity, obedience and zeal for souls: ‘I bind myself to labor for the conversion of fallen women and girls needing refuge from the temptation of the world’ (Wikipedia—Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd—2016, Australia).
and children living there at its peak. Income to buy what could not be grown or made on-site was generated through lace-making and commercial laundry services. In an Australian Parliament Report (2004) Sister Anne Manning writes: ‘we acknowledge that for numbers of women, memories of their time with Good Shepherd are painful. We are deeply sorry for acts of verbal or physical cruelty that occurred’ (Wikipedia—Congregation of our Lady of the Good Shepherd 2016, para. 3). Melinda and I both included text relating to personal experiences of cruelty in response to this knowledge of the history of the site, to evoke the resonance of past events, the lived experience of the location. These anecdotes were not directly related to religious oppression (neither of us are Catholic) but our personal experiences of physical abuse or control.

Each day, I had to stand for 2 hours in a standing box…
It was a wooden upright closed in box on castor wheels.
There was a flat tray in front for my schoolbooks.
There was a lock on the door for security…
my legs, feet would ache terribly after 30 minutes of standing.
I could barely concentrate on anything other than, trying to relieve the pain by lifting my feet by pushing down on my hands
when the teacher was turning the other way.
I wore bulky hand splints to keep my wrists straight.
But this would make my hands spasm more frequently
and my fingertips would dig into the fibreglass.
The long full-length callipers with lots of straps held my legs firmly in place,
but I walked like a robot.
I hated them when I went to the toilet
because the tops of the callipers came up to the top of my thighs
and I would always end up weeing on my pants
because they weren’t pulled down far enough.\footnote{\url{135} I asked Melinda for an anecdote to include. This is from her experiences at primary school (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 31 August 2015).}

\textit{Darker Places}

There’s a noise in the hallway and he leaves the room for a minute,
she pulls her hands free, pulls the tape off, runs out of the room,
into the front room,
into the corner,
she has picked up the stick he brought with him,
she’s pressing herself into the corner, trying to press herself wafer thin to slide behind the cupboard, trying to melt into the wall, into the darkness, her mind is running fast away but her body is frozen, there’s a flashlight on her, she was next to the door… she was right next to the door…

The notion of “healing” often comes up in discussions relating to dance and disability. Melinda and I wrestle with the dominance of the “therapeutic” argument in relation to our shared dance practice. While there are obvious benefits for physical and emotional wellbeing resulting from regular dance practice, to focus on this rather than on our collaborative artistry can come across as condescending. The verbal and the able-bodied are often bending down, patting Melinda on the head and talking in loud and simple language—and I am the invisible Florence Nightingale, doing my service for the sick and infirmed.

needing healing
solving architectures
the aspiration upward
toward God, and toward being able-bodied
specifically, for Mel to ascend to standing, walking
more human, less animal

She writes about her “baby wobble stand-up”

Her developmental shifts to her feet, to balance, is an aspiration
it is joyful to reach the top, to arrive after effort,
but it is adding to her vocabulary and expanding her access to other points of view,
other relationships with the world
not a denial of her particular physicality, her experience
(Reid 2013–2015, October 2015)

I move back and forth in time, remembering long corridors in hospitals and schools – maybe I’m shifting with bones, skeletons of the ghosts the days when I was labelled a disability, a problematic question; such a shame, what is she going to do, be…I’m not who they thought I was. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 13 October 2015)

To come to the convent after the train carriage is to feel the cultural contrast. You, the audience, followed me walking into the light and now I play with the literal transformation

136 This text was written for Scenes from Another Life (2003) referring to my rape in 1983.
as I am found perched like a statue on the pedestal with virgin woman, chaste woman, youthful and able-bodied dancer, Victorian representations of beauty. And below me/you is Melinda on all fours, fallen or up-ended from her chair, crawling, barefoot and bestial. The suggestion of these binaries of good/bad, savior/sinner, abled/disabled are echoed in the black and white of the tiles and our costumes—referencing historical dress similar to the pantaloons and cape I wore in the train, and the habits of the nuns who would have quietly hastened through this hallway on their way to the Mother Superior’s office. The cold hardness of the marble floor almost demands a speedy slipping through, making haste to be chaste. It is an architecture that contains the traces of oppression, of controlling the movement of bodies. The emptiness of the interior and the distressed crucifixion scene at one end are denials of the earthly, like that Victorian denial of the body’s interior…eyes cast upward and away from flesh. The passage is lined with windows like the train carriage, but here the journey is that of the soul not the body, toward a future after-life rather than a present lived. Even the wood-grain pattern of European timber has been painted onto the Australian wood framing the doors and windows—a cultural assertion and a denial of difference.

Both the train and the Mural Hall are low-fi architectures, connecting to a past era where the body was the instrument of toil and communication. These spaces hold the hand-written and the worked by hand—longer journeys and lives in service. In contrast to the warm cradling of the train, however, the Mural Hall is a cooler aspiration, a linear path toward an end point (the mural of crucifixion implying the journey via death to heaven). The temporal shift from day (train) to night (convent) built the contrasting “feel” of the two locations—in darkness the audience approach is slower, more cautious.

I feel that the distance between the first part and second part of the diptych allowed me to reset - to perceive it fresh. Unlike the tight and constrained space of the train car the second part of DI took place in a long hallway – rich with history. I entered with the others at one end to find the performers there as well and we (the observers/audience) were spatially led by the performers from one end to the other. If the first section in the train car was guiding the observers temporally – the second section guided us spatially (however ‘here’ (space) and ‘there’ (time) work together – but upon reflection, I think time was more evident in the first and space was more prominent or guiding in the second). (Marchant 2015, 26 November)

Entering from the end furthest from the Mural end, the audience are in camera space again, the cone of vision widening into the distance. The length of the corridor in an invitation for

---

137 We kept the black cape short to enable ease of floor and contact work, a modification that “fitted” crawling yet looked slightly ridiculous/incomplete when standing or inverted…like an adult in a child’s superhero cape. This became another dismantling strategy, a use of physical humour to defuse tension.
the body to move forward, moving through an interior as a body moves through life. The height of the ceiling, the tall windows, all emphasize the open “space above” while also reminding us that we, humans, are small and earthbound. My climbing on these bigger windows has miniaturized me, like the earlier image of myself climbing over my body. Melinda’s slower progress on the floor, places the audience in the position above, the overhead crane shot and the view from heaven upon things earthly, carnal. With Melinda close to the entrance door, I wanted the audience to almost fall over her, direct their gaze down, and slow their movement down. I wanted to put a little tension in their bodies and draw attention to their breathing, as they hesitate and hear Melinda’s quite laboured breathing.

By using floor lamps or lights coming in through windows we called attention to light and shade, to that Film Noir mood (in *DSW*), using shadows to make our bodies (performers, wheelchairs, audience) monstrous and larger than life. As we gradually shifted from one end to the other of the passage, the lights were faded in and out creating stepping stones toward the other end and emphasizing the chiaroscuro, allowing bodies to move in and out of light (again a physical configuration alluding to a metaphorical one). Our arrival into the Mural and into quartet with the projections of ourselves drew the audience mostly all the way down the passageway so that we could again throw their field of vision into the wide shot as Melinda and I run and wheel quickly back to the entrance, to fall in the distance.

*Psalm for fallen women.*

*They are writing themselves*

*descending from the pedestal*

*and dragging their lifeless limbs across the cold marble.*

*They are holding themselves up*

*pressing themselves thin into the corner*

*and carrying the weight of it on their backs.*

*They are flying, a woman’s gesture,*

*a passage, an escape,*

*transcending, disappearing, exorcized.*
They are folk-dancing in the forest;

witchy women in the woods; calling out across chasms;

tied to traditions; weary in wedlock; insinuated into institutions; avoiding the cracks;
crawling out of chokeholds; jumping off ledges; bracing themselves for impact.

They are the universe in the whorl of a fingerprint.

They are hanging on

They are letting themselves fall

They are tearing themselves open

They are looking under their skin

They are watching time spin into nothing\textsuperscript{138}

They are moving into the distance…

(Reid 2013–2015, 5 November 2015)

\textit{Dance Interrogations (a diptych)} hinges on thresholds of transformation. It is an interplay of practices and positions. The methodology of screendance and the practice of improvisation entwined with the physical bodies of dancer and viewer, and with the physical and symbolic parameters of the architectural sites. The attention to the present, to the body and its physical, imaginative and emotional residues, activates the “live screen/dance” as both new and known, a “form” and formless. I am playing out the potential of the relationships between us, interacting from and with multiple angles and proximities, to activate our bodies. This project carries theoretical threads and social assertions but can’t pin them down. The flux of frames (place) and sentiments (phrase—movement or word), collisions (difference) and co-operations (relationships between bodies and images) activate potentials of seeing, moving, knowing. I risk revealing the subjective as my improvisation calls forth my dreams, desires, political convictions, and the socio-cultural imprints residing in and moving across my body. My research is the search for knowledge of the collective, the shifting unknown of relation. By giving weight to the transient and significance to the incidental each artistic encounter, each performance, is a reminder of community, a yearning for touch.

\textsuperscript{138} I had key-framed the final image of a clock face (another Melinda drawing) to disappear as a dot in the centre of the screen. In rehearsal I found if I spun while holding the projector during that section it appeared that the velocity of the spin was the cause of the image’s disappearance.
3.12 Woman must write herself

— *Writing and speaking*

Woman must write herself.
Woman must put herself into the text—as into the world and into history—by her own movement. (Cixous 1975: 245)\(^{139}\)

To speak about writing is to bring many threads of this research together. As I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, I am playing with words, poetic and scholarly...looking for reconfigurations of language to undo its form, dismantle its choreography and maroon it in my peculiarities...playing with performing writing as something not separate from my practice but as a dance practice in itself. In this research I am writing with the body to dance my lived experience, to move bodies through frames and from frame to frame, to respond to another's lived/dance experience or to document and reflect upon my other acts of writing. I am taking up the 'notion of language as malleable, as playful, and as dynamic as the body (which is) not only a surface of inscription but an instrument of writing' (Lepecki 2006: 57).

Writing is a physical act...a phenomenon that 'implicates an embodied and enworlded subject' (Sobchack 2004: 110) and involves 'a reciprocity between our bodies and our various writing technologies that co-constitute different experiences of spatiality' (Ibid: 112). Choreography and cinematography both literally mean “writing in movement” and in film and in dance we are watching moving images, bodily writings of experience.

Dancer and writer Alys Longley\(^{140}\) develops what she calls “movement-initiated writing” as a way to disrupt the disembodied language of academia in her scholarly texts—to ‘unsettle the notion that methods of documentation are about taming and containing creative practices in tidy, conventional forms’ (Longley 2013: 77). We have both drawn a connection between matters of “voice” for dancer and for woman as a feminist discussion and have both been inspired by the writings of Helene Cixous.

\(^{139}\) Sections of this text were spoken by the animatronic voices of the wheelchairs in the Mural Hall.

\(^{140}\) Alys also inspired my choice of font for this document, choosing 'Bell MT as a font appropriate for a PhD document about creative practice' (Longley 2011: 2)
Cixous’s writing has been central to the development of ‘écriture feminine’ which highlights the corporeality of writing, the fluidity of written processes, and the female voice in language. (Longley 2011: 13)

Matters of written language and of voice are foremost issues to myself as woman and dancer, in a cultural context as well as an academic one. These issues are also foremost for Melinda as woman and dancer but also as one whose capacity to write and speak is marked so differently because of her bodily configuration. She can write by hand, slowly and not always legibly, with her left hand, but she must move herself into a hunched curl around and onto the paper, into Bachelard’s shell-like form (Bachelard 1994: 124). Electronic devices equalize the world of written communication more for her with specialist aids such as keyboard guides to direct her fingers more accurately, and speech-generating devices using pictorial language keys and predictive options to speed the process. The computer generated voices of these electronic devices, however, are always a wrong fit...mostly American accents and with timing /expression that bleeds the life out of any content.141 The input of rhythm and accent into these voices becomes a strategy of punctuation and spatial formatting. Melinda’s natural voice is, like her handwriting, slower and often hard to understand for those unfamiliar with her “accent.” Because writing and speaking takes so much more time for Melinda, she is often cut off before she can make a comment or reply to a question. So, the use of Penny’s “voice” (a standard voice I recognize in Google maps) is a shortcut enabling communication with those operating in different bodily configurations. She is a translator, with her own identity. Just like the wheelchairs, Robbie and Xena,142 Penny has become another dance partner, a participant in our dance practice. In practice I might work with Penny, partly teaching myself the Minspeak language,143 and partly as an aural and physical possibility for play.

I accidently put Penny into presentation mode and she recited Mel’s complete AGOSCI paper that she gave again at CPEC this morning144 so I push Penny along in front of me as I drag myself along on my stomach—

---

141 Melinda informs me that Penny’s voice is ‘Real Speak Australian Karen Voice.’
142 “Robbie” is the name we have given Melinda’s first manual wheelchair. “Xena” is the name of her newer sportier model.
143 ‘I recall when I was learning Minspeak (2008) it was like my (mostly pointer) fingers were moving with my brain and I could see it colouring my world. I often would say to communication partners that it is like dancing across the keyboard with my fingers... Minspeak takes me away from the regularity of letter by letter typing that only lets you ever so slowly express the self - Minspeak lets me fly with language to create whole words to get to the idea more fluently. In a strange way I think I have adapted the same concept into my body expression and movement and put the two together when it comes to using voice and movement’ (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013–2015, 27 November 2015).
144 AGOSCI stands for Australian Group on Severe Communication Impairment and CPEC is the Cerebral Palsy Education Centre.
one foot pedaling me forward

I meet Mel and Robbie on his side—we revolve on our sides together
now I am pulling Penny, her strap hooked around my ankle

I stand and walk, suriashi, toward the mirror—dragging Penny like a ball and chain
I turn and move at right angles to the mirror, a whispering wall,
Nuns filing into mass

I’m wading through water
she (Penny) is the rip in the ocean dragging me off course until I’m turning on the spot
—caught in a Charybdis, a whirlpool—
and the strap winds around my ankles until I am hog-tied and fall to the ground

I draw Penny into the air and raise my legs—
I am hung, her words demolishing me
I swallow her in, under my legs
—she has vanished and I am her mouthpiece, miming her words
a robotic, not quite in sync mouthing—I am animatronic
until my voice emerges, and I use verbatim technique\textsuperscript{147}…a delay
I can hear the next word as I speak this one…it feels nice in my brain, its own sort of lag
speaking in the recent past while listening in the present

(Reid 2013–2015, 8 August 2015)

I was beginning to hear the “call of things,” the ‘thing power’ that political theorist Jane
Bennett describes as ‘the positive or creative aspects of things that can draw us near to them
and provoke our deep attachments.’ In a new materialist turn I was considering what could
be glimpsed in our interpersonal relationships by exploring what Bennett refers to as the
‘vital and interpenetrating relationships between people and things’ (Powers of the hoard:
artistry and agency in the world of vibrant matter 2011).

\textsuperscript{145} These are the PowerPoint slide prompts (by Penny’s voice) punctuating the text of Melinda’s conference paper.
\textsuperscript{146} “Suriashi” is a type of footwork in martial arts, or a form of slow walking from Japanese dance/theatre.
\textsuperscript{147} In “verbatim technique” performers are speaking the words they are hearing through headphones. It is
used in recent “documentary theatre” where interviews with real people are the material and the
accent/timing of that person, to create both an authenticity and theatricality. I attended workshops with
Roslyn Oades (Urban Theatre Projects) in the technique in Adelaide in 2011 hosted by Vitalstatistix Theatre.
(http://vitalstatistix.com.au.)
The decision to animate Robbie and Xena with voices then became political, practical and theatrical. It was possible to include our words, stories and some other writings that have informed this research, such as Cixous. Through them we could both speak, in equal measure and tone, without disrupting the flow of our dance. We could layer our bodily inscriptions with sub-text while bringing these “objects” of disability to life, into focus as equal players. It was a playful illusion, these unemotional voices periodically issuing forth from one or other wheelchair, adding an inference to sermons and scripture—perhaps to the miracle of the religious statue coming to life.

Each wheelchair had its own audio track timed with text and silences to align with the 37-minute musical soundtrack. These were played from our iPhones to Bluetooth speakers hidden on the wheelchairs—Robbie as the male “Alex” voice and Xena with Penny’s voice.148 We looked for another female voice to differentiate between the two wheelchair characters but none were as clear as the Alex voice, so we opted for a reference to the “man of god” who may have delivered sermons in this place. It was another bodily approach to technology, to sync the three audio tracks by pressing play on the two phones at the same time as a sound cue at the start of the soundtrack/video file.149 The musical soundtrack was a collection of pieces we have worked with in practice, some of which were included in the 2014 version of Unbecoming. All of the artists except one are people we have met or worked with giving the musical works more resonance and connection for us as we dance to them. The choices also call up some pagan inferences, moody cello, whispers and eerie screams, a wailing Sami woman’s voice in another language.

As I did with the train, I had synced the sound with the master video projections, this time onto the end mural wall. I also added the church bells at the start to “call” the audience into the space, also aiming to shift their gait and slow their entrance, suggesting a shift into a “sacred space.”

The dance of words and sounds of the soundtracks and texts in both sections of Dance Interrogations offered frameworks upon which to “write” relationship. This scripting was a mechanism for tuning in to the sonic vibrations of the movement of matter across bodies and

148 “Alex” is a voice option in “text to speech” Apple computer System Preferences. Refer to Appendix 5 for Boom voice script parts for “Robbie (Alex)” and “Xena (Penny).”
149 This was not a foolproof approach. Sometimes we missed the cue, or the connection to the speaker dropped out of range, putting the text in different relationships to the overall sound/action or prompting me to surreptitiously manually adjust or reconnect the devices. It was another “lived” and improvised aspect of the work, interacting with and shifting our dance each performance.
objects and to draw energy from (as performers) and feel the exchange (as audience and performers) between our bodies and our technologies and built structures.

### 3.13 My skeleton is showing

—*Getting under the skin and to the heart of the matter*

I think I also heard someone comment on the careful timing of it. From my own experience with film in live performance, I immediately agreed and remembered how tricky timing is for the projections to sync with the music and the live bodies. So people were impressed, as I was with the quality of the production. I also don’t think this genre or type of performance – live screendance – is well known…

In the convent I was able to expand the shot again, this time by increasing the size of the projection to include multiple life-sized bodies (*mural wall projections*), real and projected. In 2014 I had experimented with this idea of filming our life-sized bodies, including Robbie the wheelchair, and then interacting live with these projections. I was blurring the boundaries, confusing our identities, suggesting that ‘we implicitly live in a process of constant transformation’ (Sobchack 2004: 9). We could move in and out of each other’s body, in and out of Robbie who is costumed in white with a head and hands, both another “body” that could be inhabited and a projection screen. It is worth noting here that Melinda and I have a lot of things in common and have established a close friendship in tandem with our dance partnership. We are the same age, have similar family backgrounds and relationships with our family, same creative interests, compatible sense of humour, and matching aesthetic tastes. With so much in common, the glaring difference is in the shape and “ability” of our physical

---

150 *Mural wall projections* can be viewed at [https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561912](https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561912)

151 I enlisted the assistance of my mother (who has made a great many costumes for me over the past 50 years) to create a costume-cum-projection screen to fit the wheelchair’s dimensions. She expressed discomfort at having the wheelchair in her home. She felt taunted by it, by its representation of the threat of immobility that accompanies aging. It seemed as if to sit in the chair would be to sit in the lap of the disabled.

152 We now message ahead a photo of what we are wearing before we go out somewhere because we kept turning up wearing the same thing.
bodies. This, of course, has made me acutely aware of the possibility that I could have been the one who had stopped breathing during birth and now have cerebral palsy. It is another of those things that might haunt us, along with past regrets and present fears about the future. We live in an age of terrorist threat; our bodies held taut and alone as we watch acts of war mediated through telecommunications.155 We are mostly distanced from real events and each other, and yet ‘there’ could be ‘here’ and ‘you’ could be ‘me.’

We are ‘interfaced’ rather than face-to-face
and we must search for our three-dimensionality
inside the pixels and portals

The body has become a storage device
with webcams for eyes
a 2 finger flipper that scrolls and clicks
riding around in bigger vehicles with smaller phones

We are in ecological denial
putting protective layers between ourselves
and the world we are dismantling
it’s hard hard rubbish
(Reid 2013–2015, 8 January 2013)

In the large mural wall projection and in some of the hand-held on-body projections I have deliberately pointed to our interchangeability, to things we share as humans, to universal connections. Whereas the 2014 wall was a simple white brick wall, the convent wall offering the distressed faded mural of a crucifixion scene, adding colours and textures, light and shade that made our interaction within it all the more haunting, a painting come to life. The slight slippage of the projection match over the painted image provided a blurring of focus, a proprioceptive illusion—causing, for the viewer, an interaction between the visual and vestibular systems causing the visually induced illusion of self-motion (Boucher 2014: 66).

Who needs stereoscopic technology? (Audience response in Reid 2013–2015, 1 October 2015)

155 This idea was also underlying Edmunds’ Distant Wars, discussed in chapter 2.
These are the points of convergence in my live and screen practices, which inform and form new iterations in both contexts. The research is a translation of embodied sensation into technological equipment and back again. My 2015 screendance *Faldinghurst*\(^{154}\) phenomenological document that uses this practice to reveal a particular idea—a re-visioning of vision. I wanted to remind the viewer of the screendance how “seeing” feels. Through a cinematic play with focus, depth of field, I believed it possible to effect the viewer’s physicality—encouraging adjustments in your optic mechanism and the muscles around the eyes through visual shifts across space and plane, from foreground to background, left to right, down to up, pulling the viewer in and out of the frame. I was looking to upset the viewer’s balance, to shift their relationship to gravity and expand possibilities for “seeing”—to consider ‘the physicality of perception—the way we feel ourselves in the present’ (Dove 2006: 64).

The *Faldinghurst* experiment proceeded in this way. Firstly, I asked dancer Gülsen Özer if I could make a film with her at her farm residence in the hills on the outskirts of Melbourne. I asked her partly because I wanted to continue the connection that I had set up in the 2014 practice sessions at St Johns hall,\(^{155}\) and partly because I wanted to have a new screendance to submit to the Light Moves Festival\(^{156}\) by the end of May. But mostly I asked her because (besides needing a body other than mine) she has a capacity to fill a stillness, to inhabit her body attentively before the moment of impulse. She also has access to this geographic location—a landscape promising spatial depth, texture, autumnal colours, rural artifacts, and the traces of a culture lost or remote. She and I both understand that dancing the location is a way to understand it, decode it, inscribe it, and that ‘movement is a translation of space’ (Deleuze 1986: 8).

\(^{154}\) *Faldinghurst* can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/127775637

\(^{155}\) Over several weeks I invited several dancers to attend shared improvised practice sessions, the “frame” of which I facilitated using scores attending to ways of looking and watching, as perceiving bodies and/or cinematographers within the dance. I needed other bodies to experiment with and get feedback from, and to enable me to deepen my research in the role of cinematographer. The dancers I invited all possess what I consider to be a strong ‘presence’, i.e. an ability to fill the moment in their bodies and, in a Deborah Hay-esquian way, “invite being seen”—Hay’s performance practice circa 1986 (Hay 2000). They also have an awareness of cinematic/photographic frame and a familiarity with working with/holding cameras.

\(^{156}\) I attended and presented at the inaugural *Light Moves Festival of Screendance* in 2014. My screendance *Red rattler* was screened as part of the installation program and I presented the “performed paper” (read, danced, screened), *Improcinemania*, at the Light Moves Festival symposium (*Symposium: Rooting/Rerouting screendance 2014*). *Faldinghurst* was accepted for the 2015 program screening on 22 November.
I also wanted to see how my research, this improvisational practice, might be effecting my screendance practice—a development I was also tracing, sharing during my 2014 field trip.\footnote{My field trip included attendance at the \textit{World Dance Alliance Global Summit}, Angers, France; guest artist at Ririe-Woodbury Dance Company’s Summer School, Salt Lake City, Utah; and guest artist at Douglas Rosenberg’s \textit{Summerwork}, near Madison, Wisconsin.} The score I gave Gülsen was about occupying the frame, attending to the relation between us, as dancer and camera, a shared passing of time and noticing of sensations…temperature, moisture, terrain, frames, textures, traces. The score I worked with was to find frames that satisfy my aesthetic\footnote{See \url{http://www.hipsync.com.au/diannereid/screendance-works/} for still images from my works as an example of my “framing” aesthetic. Also follow links to my YouTube and Vimeo screendance playlists. (http://www.hipsync.com.au)} and then play with the edges of these points of view—geometrically (composition within frame, negative/positive space, planes/lines of movement) and viscerally (moving in and out of focus within shot to expand and contract the focal length in the viewer’s eye and to physically effect the musculature around the eyes).

I hoped that by shifting the ratios between what is focal and what is fringe, I could suggest a phenomenal field of possibilities…a “transcendental strategy” to lead to “noematic gestalts” …loosening our hold on the “sedimented” and freeing our participation in this “world.”

Phenomenological observations do violence to the passivity of ordinary viewing. (Ihde 1986: 107)

The projections in \textit{Dance Interrogations} were designed to find the meeting points between the hi-fi of screen technology and the low-fi of the body. As an independent practitioner I have often had to find hand-made solutions to realize an idea. Finding creative and low-budget ways to make artwork has enabled me to continue to develop my practice when not supported by arts funding or University infrastructure. Moreover, my hand-made approach is now enabling me to embody the technology, to bring the attention back to the human as creator of it. Using images drawn by hand by both Melinda and myself,\footnote{Melinda drew the images of a hand, a ladybird, a heart and a clock face that I “animated” into the hand-held projections in the Mural Hall. I drew the \textit{heart’s a mess} image I used in the train (also included with the sub-heading of the previous section of text 3.12). A colleague asked me how I did that animation, if I had used a computer graphics program. I replied that I had drawn a bit, shot the frame, drawn a bit, etc. he exclaimed ‘Low-fi! Great!’} I am humanizing the imagery, even making it more childlike as a reminder of the curves and imperfections of the body—because “handwriting is more connected to the movement of the heart” (Goldberg 1986: 7). My “live screen/dance” is a tactic to subvert the authority of technology over flesh and to raise the profile of physical contact.
Another thing that stood out for me was that the high quality of the production matched the significance of the subject matter. Both deeply thought through. Often I find contemporary dance performance lack substance in their content and yet have high production value so this aspect was refreshing for me, as an avid movement-based theatregoer. The screendance elements were slick and seamlessly entwined with the live bodies - again so refreshing because when film is incorporated into low-budget works, it is often disappointingly jarring as there is a visible lack of skills and attention to detail. The movement qualities of the performers contrasted but this difference, I felt, was key to the work. I loved watching both performers move in utterly different ways and yet produce the same effect - an engaging performance. (Maguire-Rosier, 29 November 2015)

I used echoes of imagery from location to location to draw the connections between the two episodes, to call attention to the synchronicities of subject matter despite the contrasting moods. The life-sized image of my face projected onto my own in the train later merges with an image of Melinda’s face projected (convent handheld) onto the false head of Robbie. This then decomposes into a skull as it once again falls upon my live face as I walk away from the audience toward the end of the hall (an echo, albeit reversed, of my exit from the end of the train carriage). The “joyful” green floral dress I wore in and leaving the train, re-emerges on my ghost body seated in the projection of Robbie in the convent. This is intercut with Melinda’s ghost body in a pink floral dress as we both raise and lower our arms as though flying, transcending into angelic form. One could be the other, past and future as present, the body as a portal rather than a prison.

Stepping out of the way

It’s a lateral manoeuvre
With a falling downhill sort of momentum to it
One step demands another
Building a wall works that way
A structure strong in its off-centeredness
The spaces in between being the places of power
Like martial arts as well

Move away from your opponent; let the force of their own attack pull them off balance
Interrupting myself
And also letting myself fall
Tumble teeter crumble reassemble

160 convent handheld can be viewed at https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/176561432
I am dragging myself, my legs clutching the wheel,
I’m pulling myself from beneath the fallen building
I am inside the horror of 9/11
I am under the earthquake rubble
I am sucked into the tsunami
I am careering out of control into the world trade centre
I am beheaded on the news
Flesh is torn from my bones and my skeleton is showing

(Reid 2013–2015, October 2014)

161 This text was part of the audio “spoken” in duet/canon by the wheelchairs in the convent. It is text I wrote in response to reading *Writing Down the Bones* by Natalie Goldberg. Goldberg suggests gathering a list of topics for practice, to help activate writing quickly and cut through resistance.... ’You are not trying to control your writing. You are stepping out of the way’ (Goldberg 1986: 17).
4 Conclusion

My research has examined what travels between people...the in-between, the affect...and our meeting points, the points of arrival in and between our bodies. Each Dance Interrogation employed a phenomenological methodology—that is, the subjective is the content and mode of transmission—the process, the lived experience of “something happening” between us. I have taken philosophical tenets as performative methods for social engagement in an embodied context. Each performance required other bodies with and through which to ignite my embodied experience as I attempted to spark others’ embodied memories in the sensation of the present. To that encounter I added visceral traces of past and future by means of the intervention of video projection, a virtual viewpoint to augment the affect, layering the present physical sensations with the impressions, imaginings, memories of other possible embodiments. Each performance sought to ‘operate through resonance rather than through truth’ (Phenomenology—Practice Based Research in the Arts 2015)—the knowledge arising from this research being not about finding truth but about celebrating the transitory.

This research practice has been an enactment of its theoretical underpinnings. Each stage in this creative development was a phenomenological reduction, whereby I opened and multiplied the possibilities of the practice—discovering deeper layers and correlations between the phenomena of each performance field, themselves informed by the preceding practice experiments. My fusion of screendance and improvisational methodologies enabled my “improcinemania,” a playful interaction between the tools of the fields of screendance and live performance and the sites of skin and screen, body and place, performer and viewer. My “live screen/dances” implicated our bodies as creative and receptive sites, a reminder of the imaginative and communicative potential of bodily engagement and the potential detriment of a soporific attachment to technology. The “tuning” aspects of screendance practice can bring us closer, to each other and to our own senses, and provide augmented and enriched views on the body. The relocation of the audience across locations and an extended time period reiterated the impact of place on the body, the poetics of space, and the richness of lived experience, of suspending time in memory and “dreaming.” My use of touch and movement of the audience within and between the specific locations and one another had an emotional affect, a reminder of the way that notions of safety and survival, emotional responses and memories resonate and are held in our physical bodies. By blurring the boundaries of skin and screen, of flesh and technology, I used an interplay of digital and analogue to effect the
viewer’s physical body and draw attention to how we view with/in our bodies. By sourcing
the subjective, dancing (my own) mature or (Melinda’s) disabled female bodies, I personalized
the exchange between performer and audience, highlighted the space between us, and pointed
to the inequities of gender representations and cultural stereotypes of women and disability,
specifically in cinema and dance. By interrogating my practice from different perspectives and
in relation to different bodies I have discovered deeper layers in my art-making, in my way of
looking and being in the world as a dancer, a woman, an able-bodied person, a writer and a
researcher. The feedback from each screendance artifact, each studio and performative
encounter with dance partner or audience has danced/dances the shimmer and ripples through
into the next encounter. It is lived research that resonates and reinvigorates the idea of the
dance of viewing-with.

My audience is each worlding with me/others as their noema
understanding themselves as both within and perceiving this world (of the performance)
from each witness’ ground zero
a dancing field within the experience
we are correlated

Flashes of form, foam, light, weight

Rise toward me
Glimmers of select succinct-icities
And gargantuan vagueries
The unpacking of perception
Unravelling my fascia into a flimsy net
A future-past-presentness
Worlding and waning

The sharp intensity of holding my focus on a point of light to its point of disappearance

My performances are acts of reactivation of yours and mine
Always and never becoming in the almost now
Like bodies out of phase
Slipping across and into one another
My *Dance Interrogations* have reconfigured elements of live performance and screendance into a new form, “live screen/dance.” That new form is emergent and shifting with my body and the bodies of my audience/viewers as we engage with one another’s lived experiences. Through my fusion of the roles of performer, cinematographer and editor, in the creation of digital imagery and improvised dance, I am offering opportunities for intimate access to our bodies and to our relationships with one another. My art making is a particular act of survival\(^{162}\) and a strategy for knowing, paying attention to (the world’s) reverberations. It is a “writing” of relationship, a yearning for touch, an inclusion of the sensate body in our viewing and our being-with. This research rethinks and reworks understandings of the body, how it is represented and our relationships with and within it. It offers a truly hybrid model of creative practice across the fields of dance, performance, video art and literature, which can inform and stimulate further research in the arts, humanities and social sciences.

*Dance Interrogations* is my new, ever-worlding knowledge inseparable from my body, rattling me into an/other becoming.

---

\(^{162}\) I wish to acknowledge my artistic colleague Ami Skånberg Dahlstedt at this point. She used a line from one of my pieces of poetic text as the title of her recent work *A Particular Act of Survival*, acknowledging my/our resilience as dancers and filmmakers who continue to speak and make as independent and mature artists. Ami’s program notes: ‘With focus on the female dancer’s vulnerability through history, Ami Skånberg Dahlstedt has created a piece that glances backwards, inwards, forwards, and outwards. She uses movement, music and text to activate the silent archives she carries within herself, and which she shares with her dancing colleagues in Gothenburg and globally, after thirty-two years as a practitioner of various dance techniques.’ My original text: ‘To be a mature dance artist is a particular act of survival. It requires both a hardening of political resolve and a softening into the complex flux of physicality. There is a richness of expression, personal and technical, that lives within the mature dancer’s body—textural detail and virtuosic nuance that emerges from the experiential. There are emotions and truths housed in this physicality that dancing can access, offering possibilities beyond the misogynist glossary of pubescent nymph or lusty seductress. Even in our globally “enlightened” times, dancers remain hung between tutu and G-string by the mass perceptions that objectify women, deny the intelligence of the body and continue to worship at the altar of the young and air-brushed’ (http://hipsnc.blogspot.com.au/2012/05/dance-as-act-of-survival.html).
Appendix 1—Plain Language Statement 1

TO: Shared Practice Participant

Dear

I am inviting you, as a dance colleague, to participate in the shared dance practice sessions that form part of my ongoing practice and research for my doctoral project “Dance Interrogations.” The aim of this research process is to explore ways to bridge the gap between screendance and the embodied experience of watching live performance. This project has approval from the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Committee.

“Dance Interrogations” is a solo dance performance combining improvised (created in the moment of performance) movement and spoken word, with video projection. It is performed in unusual architectural locations rather than in theatre venues, for example, underground tunnels, small hotel rooms, or railway carriages. With limited or no seating available in these venues, audience members are encouraged to move around the performer and each other as they view the performance. The performer responds to and interacts with the individual audience members, sharing ideas and memories about the body, dance and how we see and relate to one another.

An important part of my process is to rehearse regularly with other experienced dancers/performers in order to develop my skills as an improviser, witnessed by others. To aid my research into improvisation and screendance, I will video record some of our shared studio practice and discussions. Images or comments recorded in these sessions may be used as part of the final performance installation and accompanying documents, or included in publications or presentations resulting from this research.

Each session will run for 2-3 hours in a Deakin University studio or another site as required and decided through discussion and mutual consent. The format for each session will also be mutually determined as we go, allowing time for adequate warm-up and cool-down, and encouraging discussion and feedback. While there is no payment for your participation I hope that the access to space and interactions with peers offered by these sessions can contribute to your own practice development, and in turn contribute to the activity and visibility of the improvisation community more generally.

You have the right to withdraw from further participation at any stage, and/or withhold the use of any footage in which you appear or comments made by you in our sessions. You will be informed of any publication of comments or screening of footage before it occurs and will have the right to withdraw its use at any time. All footage and information gathered will be stored in secure files held by me for 6 years after the completion of this research project.
Appendix 2—Plain Language Statement 2

TO: Interviewee

Dear

I am inviting you to participate in an interview as part of my research for my doctoral project “Dance Interrogations.” The aim of this research process is to explore ways to bridge the gap between screendance and the embodied experience of watching live performance. This project has approval from the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Committee.

“Dance Interrogations” is a solo dance performance combining improvised (created in the moment of performance) movement and spoken word, with video projection. It is performed in unusual architectural locations rather than in theatre venues, for example, underground tunnels, small hotel rooms, or railway carriages. With limited or no seating available in these venues, audience members are encouraged to move around the performer and each other as they view the performance. The performer responds to and interacts with the individual audience members, sharing ideas and memories about the body, dance and how we see and relate to one another.

I would like to interview you about your experience with dance performance or screendance. I will video or audio record our interview/discussions. Images or comments recorded in these sessions may be used as part of the final performance installation and accompanying documents, or included in publications or presentations resulting from this research.

Please be aware that there is no payment available for your participation. However, please note that your contribution is greatly appreciated and will contribute to the new knowledge this research seeks to generate.

You have the right to withdraw from further participation at any stage, and/or withhold the use of any footage in which you appear or comments made by you in our sessions. You will be informed of any publication of comments or screening of footage before it occurs and will have the right to withdraw its use at any time. All footage and information gathered will be stored in secure files held by me for 6 years after the completion of this research project.
This performance is part of the doctoral research of Dianne Reid. The aim of this research process is to explore ways to bridge the gap between screendance and the embodied experience of watching live performance. This project has approval from the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Committee.

By entering this performance of “Dance Interrogations” you are agreeing to participate in the creation and documentation of this artwork. As this is an improvised performance (created in the moment of performance) in a non-theatrical setting, you may come into contact with other bodies or become engaged in the action. While all due care will be taken in regard to your safety, by participating in this performance you acknowledge that you do so at your own risk.

Your image may be recorded and may be used as part of the final performance installation and accompanying documents, or included in publications or presentations resulting from this research. You have the right to view footage in which you may appear and can do so by contacting the researcher.

Contact details
Dianne Reid
E: dianner@deakin.edu.au
or dr@hipsync.com.au
M: 0404 379 851

My principal supervisor is Prof Kim Vincs
E: kim.vincs@deakin.edu.au
T: (03) 925 17663

Complaints
If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:

The Manager, Research Integrity, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125, Telephone: 9251 7129, research-ethics@deakin.edu.au

Please quote project number 2013–086
Appendix 4—Audience Responses

The negotiation of ‘where to be?’ ‘How to situate yourself to witness the work?’ and other questions such as ‘who am I looking with?’ all come up and add to the ‘thickness’ of the experience as I am led temporally by Dianne – in a unique world that we are all sharing/experiencing together. (Marchant 2015)

I gathered audience responses after each performance development. In 2013 a written survey with return envelope was distributed by my front of house helpers for Dance Interrogations (in the red train). I had a dozen anonymous responses from a total audience number of between 70 and 80. After Unbecoming in 2014 I set up an online survey and received four responses. In 2015 I invited email responses from a selection of specific audience members including dancers or dance-educated, non-dance literate, and people with disability or working in disability sector. All my respondents were given the same five questions, designed to ascertain the ‘affect’ of the work, a direction toward a phenomenological reflection. The questions directed their responses toward the personal, the physical and the experiential—what stood out most strongly for you; what images or memories did you notice coming up; what did you notice about your body, and about others’ bodies—and sought to implicate their presence as significant in each unique performance event. Below I have collated a selection of responses for each question, which illustrate the range and overall ‘feel’ of the audience feedback.

1. What stood out most strongly for you?

What stood out strongly for me was by far the relationship between the two performers in part of the performance at the Convent. There was visceral trust between the two. And a warmth. It was such a pleasure to experience their relationship unfold and for the two to not take things that seriously. There was a palpable feeling of belonging and ease that came through for me. The performers made me feel good to be there with them altogether. (Maguire-Rosier 2015)

It was interesting, as I didn’t know what was going to happen - kept the audience on their toes and interesting in seeing what was next. I am not an overly artistic person and did find it confronting and out of my comfort zone, which can be a good thing! (Beauchamp 2015)

The connection between personal history and the body. The memories you can have of past times and events from reconnecting with the body. Also the use of the train as the performance space. I loved! It felt very special. (Anonymous 2013)

2. What images or memories did you notice coming up?


For me, I noticed images of my childhood - slamming my middle finger in the rusty wooden heavy window on the Zigzag railway old train when I was about 8. That was a sad memory, which resonated with the melancholic mood of the train work. I found images and memories actually surfacing all the time. (Maguire-Rosier 2015)

Touch, connection. Memories of train journeys. Recognition/memories of awkward situations with strangers on public transport or elsewhere. Being so close physically, but not knowing each other. It didn't feel awkward when you came close. Feeling of being alone. Loneliness. Images of female body. Images of trying really hard to make something work or get somewhere and then understanding that one is working against the current. (Anonymous 2013)

I saw the show twice and had different reactions. The first time I was more tuned in to the humour. The second time I felt more connected to a kind of wistful sadness. (Anonymous 2014)

I thought of the beauty of the solo and the lusciousness of time passing. I thought about the power of the duet and of difference. I sometimes felt sad. I think when Melinda is trying to get into the chair, or is reaching for things or seems in any way the least bit in pain, it is difficult to sit with that. I mean I want to help, I squint a little, like watching a child in a tricky spot or any other character reach for things, you want them to succeed and you want them to be happy. I guess that is in part like that for me because of my attachments to attraction and aversion. Attempting to avert potential suffering and seeking pleasure. I thought about how to care and be respectful. The moment when the AV of Dianne steps forward and leans/reaches to Melinda on the chair, reminded me of my heart (I think it is my heart) when I want to hug/help/reach out/ call out/cry for, another. I guess it is related to a feeling of empathy. I often want to reach forward and also there was something in the way Dianne performed the movement with her head bowed or facing down that made the gesture so beautiful. (Anonymous 2014)

Children, mental health, intimacy, warmth. (Anonymous 2013)

3. What did you notice about your body?

I felt like a performer too. Brought into the world and momentarily suspending my everyday existence. It was like an escape, but to the present moment! I felt extremely included in both parts of the work - my presence was acknowledged time and time again. I think my body was very open during the performance because I just noticed sensations passing through me. (Maguire-Rosier 2015)

I was in a typical audience mode, expecting to receive passively. I was excited to try something new (participating). I strongly noticed when I was holding back, when I was thinking about how others perceived me, the camera, etc. I was in a constant “what-should-I-do-now” state. Interesting. (Anonymous 2013)
I liked being in the wheelchair in the audience. It helped me to think about the dancing that involved the wheelchair. I noticed how my body was. What was good and easy and what hurts and is less able than before. I found myself thinking about ageing and motherhood and female body. I also thought the way that wheelchair was used, regarded, dancing with, was always very considered and surprising. (Anonymous 2014)

4. What did you notice about others?

I noticed other people visibly take pleasure in the work. They were regarding the performance, the artistry and the themes with such open hearts. I think it was deeply moving for everyone who attended - I think I noticed a couple of people cry. Dance always tends to produce (or encourage?) some sort of empathetic connection with its audiences. Integrated dance seems to highlight this. The other thing I noticed was that all audiences admired the work for what it was and I don't think they were well meaning or were just saying that. I overheard an audience member at the end of the train comment "That was excellent - there should be more shows like that!" For pretty well everyone who came, I got the impression they were more than satisfied. (Maguire-Rosier 2015)

Other people shared looks with each other and me and became less like strangers. There were people who 'lead' the audience into different parts of the train. (Anonymous 2013)

5. Any other comments.

I left one world and entered back into my everyday existence and then I came back and re-entered the world of the performance but this time it was at the Convent. I felt that was significant to my experience of the second part of the work. In some ways it is like warming up again to perform in the evening after performing earlier in a matinee. The matinee is still fresh in my experience but the temporal distance from it makes me feel like I am starting from scratch – with a tired body. The second part had the advantage of being both temporal and spatially separated from the first part. I feel that the distance between the first part and second part of the diptych allowed me to reset - to perceive it fresh. (Marchant 2015)

The final thing that was emotionally powerful for me as a spectator was to watch a young boy with visible disability being held by his father, surrounded by his mother and siblings and collectively experiencing the work. This was beautiful to watch and I must admit, I was distracted by their presence and noted their presence shifted the dynamic of the performance that night - I was privileged enough to experience the show multiple times so from many vantage points. (Maguire-Rosier 2015)

I have also referred in this document to the extensive written reflections and feedback of Melinda Smith, some drawn from an interview with her, some drawn from our ongoing online
communications. Verbal feedback from other audience members has mostly used the words “confronting” and/or “moving” in relation to the performance content and context. There has also been comment made about other audience members’ presence as contributing to or detracting from the performance experience. In all instances there has been an attention to how it “felt” to witness with/in this site-specific screen/dance context.

What do I think about Dianne’s research and what impact does it have on me?
When I first heard about Dianne’s PHD in screen dance we were in Delhi, India, waiting for our flight back to Melbourne. Dianne was obviously excited about her granted scholarship, while I was trying to comprehend what it meant to her. I remember congratulating her with a wine at the airport. Both of us were weary travellers at that point, and did not ask questions. A few months later I found myself on the floor at the Deakin dance studio. I had accepted an invitation by Dianne to join her collaboration practice in her PHD research journey. I was excited by her offer, and I was enthused by her as a dance artist and film artist and knew that by working together, I also had the potential to learn deeper into my dancing body.

Having a weekly practice at the studio became my week highlight – it was important to me to have that time where I could, be myself, throw myself out of my structured routine for a few hours and just roll around a dance floor. But as time went on, it became more than that, it became a journey with my body and getting to know my body potential. Dianne never pushed me, nor did she pressure me to do anything I was not comfortable about. There were no agendas or expectations, and there were no specific scores in mind. We were comfortable with the idea of space sharing, unfolding moments and offering support mechanisms to build on any for coming development projects…. This has allowed me the opportunity to work at my pace, taking my own risks and choices, but also with some guidance and support from Dianne’s mentorship and dance experience.

During the first year of our shared practice, there were challenges and mishaps. Dianne took a somersault flip back from my wheelchair, landing on her big toe and badly bruising, fracturing it. At the time, I had no idea how serious this was and continued dancing, until I saw her pain. This made me realise the huge risk in this incredible passion of ours. I would need to learn ways of managing risks by making sure we took care of our bodies in the process—the bodies also including the wheelchairs. At that stage the wheelchairs were lumps of metal with sharp edges, but as time has gone on, we have been able to build closer relationships with the wheelchairs and respect them in the same way we respect one another in dance. It does not mean we have become super careful or over sensitive when we use the wheelchairs in our practice - we still use the risk to experiment, explore with the moment and if we fall and become bruised in the process then we must move forward with that. But with the hours of practice and trial and errors, you do learn where the sharp bits are and there are ways to soften them with your technique of movement. Dianne’s use of my wheelchairs continues to be important to me. I get to communicate with my wheelchairs in a totally different way than in my 50 years of life; I am much more at ease and even have names for them. They are part of my body and I am part of theirs. (Smith in Reid & Smith 2013-2015, 10 November 2015)
Appendix 5—Boom Text

Robbie

Woman must write herself...

Woman must put herself into the text— as into the world and into history—
by her own movement. (Cixous)

Xena

Text: my body—
shot through with streams of song...
the equivoice that affects you,
fills your breast with an urge to come to language and
launches your force:
the rhythm that laughs you. (Cixous)

It is time for her to dislocate this “within,”
to explode it,
turn it around and seize it;
to make it hers,
containing it,
taking it into her own mouth,
biting that tongue with her very own teeth

to invent for herself a language
to get inside of. (Cixous)

Sometimes words come to my head when I move—
feeling words,
action words,

words about places,
names,
people words, animal words, words about love—

words about uncertainty,
words, words, words,
meet,
need time to articulate
words on my brain move with me,

I am words made up of letters. (Melinda Smith)
flying is a woman's gesture...
we've lived in flight,
stealing away,
finding, when desired,
narrow passageways, hidden crossovers. (Cixous)

Each day, I had to stand for 2 hours in a standing box... It was a wooden upright closed in box on castor wheels. There was a flat tray in front for my school books. There was a lock on the door for security... my legs, feet would ache terribly after 30 minutes of standing. I could barely concentrate on anything other than, trying to relieve the pain by lifting my feet by pushing down on my hands when the teacher was turning the other way. I wore bulky hand splints to keep my wrists straight. But this would make my hands spasm more frequently and my fingertips would dig into the fibreglass. The long full length callipers with lots of straps held my legs firmly in place, but I walked like a robot. I hated them when I went to the toilet because the tops of the callipers came up to the top of my thighs and I would always end up weeing on my pants because they weren't pulled down far enough. (Smith)

there's a noise in the hallway and he leaves the room for a minute, she pulls her hands free, pulls the tape off, runs out of the room,

into the front room,
into the corner,
she has picked up the stick he brought with him, she's pressing herself into the corner,

trying to press herself wafer thin to slide behind the cupboard, trying to melt into the wall, into the darkness,
hers mind is running fast away but her body is frozen,

there's a flashlight on her,
she was next to the door... she was right next to the door (Dianne Reid)

Stepping out of the way

It's a lateral manoeuvre

With a falling downhill sort of momentum to it, One step demands another.

Building a wall works that way,
A structure strong in its off-centredness. The spaces in between being the places of power.
Like martial arts as well,
Move away from your opponent,
let the force of their own attack pull them off balance, Interrupting myself,
And also letting myself fall,
Tumble
I'm pulling myself from beneath the fallen building

I am inside the horror of 9/11

I am under the earthquake rubble

I am sucked into the tsunami

I'm pulling myself from beneath the fallen building I am inside the horror of 9/11
I am under the earthquake rubble
I am sucked into the tsunami

I am careering out of control into the world trade centre

I am careering out of control into the world trade centre

I am beheaded on the news

I am beheaded on the news

Flesh is torn from my bones and my skeleton is showing

Flesh is torn from my bones and my skeleton is showing

We are unbecoming

We are unbecoming

How we feel dismantles us. (Dianne Reid)
## Appendix 6 — PhD video links

[https://vimeo.com/album/4067828](https://vimeo.com/album/4067828)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>a beautiful day</td>
<td><a href="https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/168281422">https://vimeo.com/album/4067828/video/168281422</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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