Approaches to Collaboration: Choreographers and Visual Artists
September 8, 2007
3:30 p.m.
The Philoctetes Center

Levy:	**Francis Levy**
Nersessian:	**Edward Nersessian**
Carroll:	**Noel Carroll**
Copeland:	**Roger Copeland**
Fleischer:	**Mary Fleischer**
Garafola:	**Lynn Garafola**
Rainer:	**Yvonne Rainer**

Levy: I'm very proud to introduce Roger Copeland. Roger is Professor of Dance and Theater at Oberlin College, and he's the author of *Merce Cunningham: The Modernizing of Modern Dance*. Roger Copeland's film, *The Unrecovered*, which was shown here last September, will be showing at the Anthology Film Archives on Wednesday, September 12th at 8:30. It's really a fictional film based upon the events of 9/11. Is that correct?

Copeland: Yes, that is correct. It's certainly fictional.

Levy: I'm very pleased, again, to present Roger, who will introduce the other panelists and moderate this afternoon's panel. Thank you very much.

Copeland: Thank you, Francis, as always, and let me be the first to welcome everybody to this afternoon's, shall we say, collaboration, something that I suppose every good panel should aspire to be. Let me tell you a little bit about the genesis of this event. It was inspired, at least in my mind, by two exhibitions that have been on in Manhattan this summer. The first is an exhibition at the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts called "Invention: Merce Cunningham and Collaborators." And as you guess from the title, it deals in part with Cunningham's ongoing collaborations with visual artists as various as Rauschenberg, Johns, Warhol, Bruce Nauman, the list goes on and on.

There's a second, current exhibition, this one at the Museum of Modern Art, and this might at first blush not seem quite as relevant to our topic this afternoon. What I'm referring to is the magisterial retrospective of Richard Serra's work at MOMA, which I think is on just through this weekend. Now, there's no overt emphasis in the MOMA exhibition on collaboration between Serra and other artists, but one of the most salient aspects of his sculpture is the way it affects the body of the perceiver, the way it incorporates your own bodily experience in time as you move in and around it. Very early on in his career, Serra was quick to acknowledge the influence exerted on him by a major choreographer named Yvonne Rainer, who we are lucky enough to have on the panel this afternoon. So I mention this just because my hope is that in addition to talking about overt collaborations between choreographers and visual artists, we'll also be able to talk about exchanges of influence, as in the influence that Yvonne exerted on Serra, and perhaps the influence that people like Sol LeWitt exerted on you. We shall see.

Now something that I should make clear right at the outset is that there is nothing particularly unusual about collaboration, per se. Choreographers routinely collaborate with composers, costume designers, lighting designers. What's the big deal, you might be wondering? But this afternoon, we're going to focus on those less typical occasions when the collaborators designing the costumes and the décor for dance are the great living visual artists, people who would normally be quite content to work within the confines of their own mediums, the Picassos, the Rauschenbergs.

The late, great American dance critic Edwin Denby once wrote, and I quote, "The reason easel painters are better designers for ballet than anyone else"—something which may or may not be true, but anyway, he says they're better designers than anybody else—"because they are the only craftsmen professionally concerned with what keeps pictures alive for years on end. When they know their trade, they make pictures that hold people's interest for hundreds of years. So making one that will be interesting to look at for 20 minutes is comparatively easy for them." End of quote.

Now, on the other hand, there are plenty of horror stories about the naiveté of easel artists who design for the first time for the theater or for dance, as in, "Oh, you didn't tell me they were going to move in my costumes. Why didn't you warn me about how much they perspire?" So this is a collaborative relationship that cuts both ways. And given the dicey hit and miss nature of the results, you may be wondering why it is that so many of us continue to be fascinated by these collaborations among major artists working in different media. Just as a hypothesis, let me throw this out: the possibility that our fascination with these interactions may have something to do with the fact that, rightly or wrongly, we still tend to envision the contemporary artist as a lonely, rugged individualist. Now, even after the death of Modernism, we think of him or her as somebody too committed to, too protective of the idiosyncrasies of his or her vision to ever successfully collaborate with anybody else. Winston Churchill once described the horse as a camel created by a committee, and all too often collaboration runs the risk of creating a kind of art by committee, not a terribly appealing prospect.

On the other hand—let's face it, we wouldn't be here this afternoon if the other hand didn't exist—there have been many instances over the past 150 years when major choreographers have successfully collaborated with major artists working in other mediums. The panel that we have assembled, the people sitting around this table this afternoon, is really, really well equipped to discuss those major periods of collaborative activity.

The person who's best qualified to talk about the first great collaborative endeavor we're going to focus on is Mary Fleischer, who is the head of the Division of Fine and Performing Arts at Marymount Manhattan College. She's also the author of a recent book that plunges right to the heart of this topic, a book entitled *Embodied Texts: Symbolist Playwright-Dancer Collaborations.*

I think it can probably be argued that a lot of the very same ideas and strategies deriving from the Symbolist movement animated what is arguably the greatest collaborative venture the western world has ever known, and I refer to Diaghilev's Ballets Russes, an enterprise that existed in Paris from 1909 to 1929. And we're very privileged to have on the panel this afternoon Lynn

Garafola, who teaches at Barnard. She's the author of many books, but I'm going to cite just one, her monumental study of the Ballets Russes, called *Diaghilev's Ballets Russes*, the sort of book that you really don't want to drop on your foot. It's really, really heavy, in all senses of the word.

Now, if we continue to proceed chronologically, the next great collaborative endeavor we encounter is the work of Bruce Cunningham, John Cage, Robert Rauschenberg, Jasper Johns, et al., beginning in the 1950s. Now, as Frank mentioned, I published a book about that extended to the Cunningham family, so I'll probably have something to say about his collaborative ventures, but undoubtedly Noel Carroll, who is the Andrew W. Mellon Term Professor in the Humanities at Temple University—I've got a question for you. If you're a Term Professor, do you believe in term limits? Or your employer believes in term limits?

Carroll: I don't—

Copeland: But they do. Okay. Just wondering. Anyway, Noel will undoubtedly have something to say about this topic, probably about every topic we address this afternoon, because I think it's fair to say Noel has written about more different topics than almost anybody else alive. I mean I can't really begin to do justice to the range of his work, but suffice it to say that it includes books with titles like *The Philosophy of Horror*, *Interpreting the Moving Image*, *A Philosophy of Mass Ar*t, a forthcoming book this fall titled *The Philosophy of Motion Pictures*, and his most recent book is *Comedy Incarnate: A Study of Buster Keaton's Films*. So, a true polymath. Noel has also written about the work of the person that I'm going to next introduce, the only bonafide choreographer on the panel, Yvonne Rainer, one of the founding members of the Judson Dance Theater. One of many, many works she choreographed at that time was the now classic, *Trio A*. It always seems that somebody somewhere in the world is reviving or reconstructing *Trio A*, or certainly studying it if not actually seeing it performed live. Yvonne is also a very accomplished filmmaker. If I'm counting correctly she's written and directed at least seven features.

Rainer: Seven.

Copeland: Seven feature films. She's also a terrific prose writer, and she just published an incredibly readable memoir entitled *Feelings are Facts*. And in the last couple of years, and this is good news for us in this room, she has returned quite actively to her former life as a choreographer.

Okay, the task at hand. Let's see if we can trace some kind of chronological timeline from the Symbolist collaborations through the Ballets Russes, Cunningham, and Judson. A pretty tall order for a single panel in a single afternoon, so we may not make it to the end, but we'll give it the old college try.

I want to turn first to Mary and ask if she can talk a little bit about the Symbolist movement and some of the ruling passions for the Symbolists that I think inherently promoted collaboration, their fascination with Baudelaire's "Correspondences," with Wagner's *Gesamtkunstwerk*, the "total work of art."

Fleischer: Absolutely. I think Wagner is a terrific place to start, because we are probably going to intone the phrase "total work of art" a number of times today. So we might as well just start with that. Wagner was polymorphic in so many ways. He had so many influences, from Darwin to Buddhism to Marxism. He certainly was high Romantic. I think what's interesting for the Symbolists is that he was certainly their spiritual father. While they venerated him, they also reinvented him for their own uses, as they reinvented Poe and lots of other influences.
I think, though, the idea of a spiritual father for the Symbolists is an important thing to think about in terms of why do we do art, and why the Symbolists engaged in art. It's a real organic, total sense that we need a revolution in the human spirit. It's not about just another art movement. It's really about changing human nature, of relying on nature to evolve further, hence the interest in Buddhism, in Darwin, in all these natural, progressive processes that hopefully will come to a better Utopian place.

Copeland: Unity, right? A return to something whole.

Fleischer: Absolutely. Thus, Wagner's not talking about the artwork of the present. He's harping on the artwork of the future, where we're going to go. He also sees progression in individual art forms, and I think when you talk about collaboration you can talk about collaboration among people, but you're also talking about component arts getting together. They can get together by fusing. They can get together individually. They can trade off. There are lots of different ways to talk about individual art inputs into a completed work. Certainly Wagner had very strong ideas about this. His idea was that individual arts weaved a certain level of progression or perfection. Thus, music reaches its epitome in Beethoven; drama reaches its epitome in Shakespeare. They can't go any further. What should they do? They should get together, and they should get together in opera, so that way the art form progresses further.

The Symbolists certainly were very influenced by this, but it was a different kind of movement. Let's jump—now we'll jump back and forth, because Wagner is such a huge topic, you could go on and on. Turn of the century, last century, France, Paris, we have the beginnings of the Symbolist movement, basically a literary movement to start. They looked to Wagner, and they have to look to Wagner because Wagner isn't being done in Paris very much. When his work is being done, it's being done in excerpts. No one's going to Bayreuth and seeing the full flowering of Wagner's work. There's a very influential publication in Paris at the time called the *Wagnerian Review*. That's basically how a lot of painters and poets are getting their ideas about Wagner. There's an interesting article by Baudelaire, and he wrote about Wagner a lot, but the one that caught my attention is the one where he's talking about the *Overture to Lohengrin*, and he's trying to describe it. He compares his description with those written by Berlioz and one written by Liszt. The thing that impresses him is that the three men, on very different occasions listening to this work, are coming up with similar images, similar ways of talking about the music. So he says, "Aha!" In the middle of an article, talking about Wagner, he kind of makes a left turn and he says, "You know, there's similarities there that are very interesting." He starts talking about his idea about "Correspondences." So the theory of correspondences, which is slightly different than this idea of a total work of art, because in a total work of art the idea is to take drama, music, lighting, spectacle, and compress it to create this unified product.
In correspondences, one art form gets you to the other. So the music of poetry, the poetry of music. You can swap out. The idea is that correspondences are patterns, they're analogs in life

that get us to these hidden states, these universal orders, the underside of reality, that for the Symbolists, and certainly the Romantics and many other art movements, are what's important in life. That's the spiritual quality. That's the path, not only to my own salvation, but also to the sense of what makes us a community, and I think that's one thing that often is not talked about too much with Wagner is that his idea of the folk, his idea of this total work of art, is to create a total community. The sense of the way Wagner's theater is designed to incredibly concentrate the audience's attention on the stage spectacle with continuous progressive attention into the work. From his point of view, he wants us to reach that place of collective unconscious, to create a community in the theater that looks forward to a Utopian society.

Going back to the Symbolists, they too wanted a different kind of regenerative, ritual society, and the way you did that was through the ritual practice of art. As I said, Wagner first influenced writers, and writers started writing in advocacy of Symbolist painters: Villard, Minard, Toulouse Lautrec. That's where we start getting a nice reciprocity between artists and writers in the Symbolist period. When writers started doing readings of their works—and, again, there's this lovely progression in terms of theater—the artists followed. So you have some early Symbolist work in the small theaters around Paris—the Theatre d'Art, for instance. Basically amateur theatricals, where the emphasis is not so much on the actor. The actor is more of a medium than an interpreter. The emphasis is on the spoken word, and it's on trying to access this otherworldly experience, and it's done through the senses. So the use of music, the use of suggestive lighting, and the use of an environment that is not in any way realistic, but that is suggestive. This is early paintings and environments created by Bonnard, Villard, because these were the writers' friends. These were the people they were hanging out with. These were the people they were dialoging with. So you had some wonderful, very natural kinds of collaborations, if you will, around 1887 through the '90s in Paris that would influence many movements to come. Maybe I should leave it there.

Copeland: Well I had a question. You want to talk specifically about some of the collaborations that involve the body, for example, Mallarmé's incredible interest in dance—I mean the way in which the body provides a kind of fulfillment to certain Symbolists that they can't find in words alone.

Fleischer: Sure. The problem with words, of course, is that they're words. They fix a reality. For the Symbolists, the body was a great way of evading those words. The life of the body on stage did several things. The moving body on stage was a great fascination, and became the spatial equivalent of music. It was a way of suggesting other worlds. It had, obviously, a kinetic interest. It also did something to character, because it destabilized character in a way that was very useful for the Symbolists. It wasn't about psychology so much. It was about different psychic and emotional states that did not necessarily need to be connected to a dramatic storyline in the old conventional sense of the realistic theater. It could be associative, as opposed to plot driven. So it opened up, it liberated the stage to different kinds of experiences, rather than a realistic storytelling kind of experience.

For instance, let's talk about one example. At Paul Fort's Theatre d'Art, there's a famous piece called *The Woman with the Severed Hands*, which is based on a legend. It's a highly visual piece. There are several actors in this piece, but they're not necessarily playing characters. They're

intoning parts of the story in a very melodic, melodious kind of way. It's so free-roaming and associative that they actually need a narrator, in blue flowing robes, standing on the apron, to be able to narrate occasionally where we are in the quote-unquote story. So it's a very different kind of theater experience that is asking its audience to imagine, to fill in the gaps, to create a suggestion of a kind of reality.

Audience: Sorry, I didn't hear the title of that?

Fleischer: *The Woman with the Severed Hands*.

Audience: By?

Fleischer: Pierre Quillard. And there are experiments that I've certainly written about where Symbolist artists bring even scent into the theater. So the idea that the sensory experience would bring you to a different reality that would be suggested—

Copeland: You know, this is a perfect segue, I think, into the early work of the Ballets Russes, because, Lynne, is it not true that there are just a lot of Symbolist ideas hanging in the air?

Garafola: Absolutely.

Copeland: This desire—you know, Wagner didn't really pull it off. Who can really out-Wagner Wagner?

Garafola: I don't think they wanted to out-Wagner Wagner. They were very indebted to Wagner. They were all impassioned Mallarmanes, if you will. Moreover, they had read their Baudelaire. Now we really move from Paris to St. Petersburg. And one does get involved with mythologies, but they're no longer the Teutonic mythologies or the Nordic mythologies that one finds in the Ring, but rather moving into a kind of Slavonic, or one might say a larger Slavic community. By and large, despite Mallarmé, and certainly despite the enormous interest that the Symbolists in Paris took in the dancer Loie Fuller, whose work and experiments with light seemed in many ways to symbolize exactly what you were saying—of a world you could not pin down. It was full of emotional and visual suggestiveness. By and large the Symbolists were not terribly interested in dance, per se. However, the St. Petersburg group, beginning with Sergei Diaghilev and the various people who worked with him beginning in the 1890s, were extremely interested in ballet, as well as being interested in music and the visual arts. So that one can say that what the Russians really added—threw into the hopper—was ballet, and it was through ballet that they would, in fact, make this incredible impression about the idea of collaboration. Because there was such a strong tradition and such a strong conventionalized background in Russian ballet, you had scene painters but no real artists designing the numerous set designs, for instance. In things like *Sleeping Beauty* there might have been seven, eight, nine décors. There might have been hundreds of costumes. The colors may have had nothing to do on one side of the stage with the other side or the person next door. So there was no unity, no harmony between anything to do with the actual subject of the work, the music of the work, and there was a great deal of connection between what you might call the musical rhythm and the musical tonalities and the step text of the ballet. But this did not lead, necessarily, to terrific music being produced. In the

very early 1900s, Diaghilev and this group of people, who had already been through a number of collaborative experiences—founding and working on a journal together, an exhibition society, a concert society—began to launch themselves into production outside this incredibly conventionalized and bureaucratized environment of the Imperial theaters. In other words, one sees here something that you also kind of mentioned in relation to Symbolists, the idea of doing this as a kind of private, personal collaborative Utopia, a process that then gradually professionalizes and becomes bigger.

Throughout the history of the Ballets Russes there were, of course, many changes, and periodically Diaghilev would get rid of all his collaborators and have a whole new group. But again and again, people would write about these extraordinary moments of collaboration, when suddenly they felt they were drawing from artists from all different media, and it was perhaps the most thrilling experience of their lives. The correspondence between, let's say, Stravinsky and Alexander Benoit, and then some of the memoirs, by Benoit as well as the choreographer Michael Fokine, still, almost 100 years later, seem to have that sense of excitement, of exchange, like this was a high moment in their lives. One reads this again and again, and I think that notion of collaboration is a kind of Utopian process. It's something that goes along with this idea of the *Gesamtkunstwerk* and correspondences, because it's awfully hard to have a unified work of art, especially with this notion of it being a kind of symbol and metaphor for a new kind of community, if people don't talk to one another. Or if something is not going back and forth and the creative juices are simply not flowing.

Copeland: Of course, it wasn't just the collaborators themselves. I mean the entire intelligentsia of Paris was ignited by this and writing about this as if the scales had fallen from their eyes.

Garafola: And this was something absolutely new to them. These were Russians. Russians were considered a little bit barbaric. They came from this other place.

Copeland: Yes, it's the primitivist impulse.

Garafola: Not only the primitivist, but also the otherness. I mean a lot of these dancers were not primitivist at all. They were extremely conventional young ladies and young men. But they were viewed by the French as belonging to some other kind of reality. Moreover, when they did bring certain works that showed, one might say, the European inheritance of the Ballets Russes, works like *Giselle*, which, of course, began life in Paris itself, they didn't really like that. They wanted really exotic stuff like *Scheherazade*, *Firebird*, stuff to really quicken the blood. That was part of this Orientalism, this exoticism. I mean, where the Orient left off and Russia began was a kind of murky line. Another really wonderful moment when you read the memoirs is the collaboration for *Parade* in 1917. It was Picasso's first theatrical collaboration. It involved Erik Satie. Leonid Massine did the choreography and Jean Cocteau did the *libretto* and hoped to be doing a little bit more, but he wanted also to be a narrator. He wanted to have text in it, and everyone else decided the text was too much. Maybe it was Cocteau who was too much. I was just rereading some of Massine's memoirs, and the excitement of working especially with Picasso and going back and forth, as though ideas were feeding other ideas. It wasn't a question of saying, "I'm going to do that and I'm going to do that," but that something happened in the course of that collaboration and something turned out. Now, collaborations don't necessarily mean that you're going to have

a terrific work and it's going to be *Gesamtkunstwerk* or anything, but they're going to have a better time. At least the memoirs say so. Something else that is very interesting about *Parade* is that all the collaborators were very conscious of doing something that in fact acknowledged the break, the rupture of cubism, and musically the rupture with impressionism.

Copeland: Which is also going to rupture with symbolism in a lot of ways, too.

Garafola: And also the rupture with symbolism. Moreover, there wasn't necessarily the notion of this kind of organic whole.

Copeland: Right.

Garafola: It's true that the pieces met, and they all seemed to support one another, but I really think that here is where you see the first moment, the first step toward what Merce Cunningham would do, using collaboration, but using a very different process and having a very different idea of what the product might be.

Copeland: Right, right. And that would be the perfect point to segue into Cunningham, but before we do that, just to complicate the picture of the Ballets Russes a little more, can you talk about Balanchine's work? People sometimes forget that Balanchine worked for Diaghilev, and that his last ballet for Diaghilev, *Apollo*, in 1928, in a certain way is about collaboration, and yet when it comes to working with visual artists, Balanchine was not terribly interested in that kind of collaboration.

Garafola: Well Balanchine actually joined the Ballets Russes in 1924, fresh from Russia, and Diaghilev died in 1929, and this was a very key moment for him. Probably Diaghilev's greatest impact on him was musically. For Balanchine, at least the mature Balanchine, the key collaboration was between music and movement. Diaghilev, with his vast knowledge, both intellectual as well as musical and logical, certainly refined Balanchine's taste and very much introduced him to the contemporary western music at that point. However, Balanchine does say that when he first got to Paris, one of the first things he had to do for Diaghilev was a new version of *Le Chant du Rossignol—The Song of the Nightingale*. It had designs that had been commissioned a few years earlier from Matisse, and Balanchine said, "Matisse? Who's this?" Certainly Matisse was known by many people in Russia and the early Soviet Union, but clearly not by Balanchine. This seems to suggest that Balanchine was really not that interested in the visual. He did have some interesting collaborations with Tchelitchev, who was, like Balanchine, an émigré Russian artist who did a very, very wild *Orpheus* at the Metropolitan Opera in New York in the mid 1930s. It seems to me that later on his great collaborations in the visual sense were with light, almost as though he was trying to liberate his dancers into some kind of luminous Utopia. The stripping of the stage of other things, the reduction of costume to its simplest elements—one thinks of leotard ballets or ballets in which the women may have just worn very simple tunics, that in the 1940s and early '50s were very close to one of the forms of practice that you see in the photographs of the period. I think that is really about light. This was a form of luminous theater. Later, in the last part of his career, when he began adding stuff back, it was, to my mind, really bad. He needed a good artistic advisor, like Diaghilev.

Copeland: It seems to me for the most part Balanchine just wants to leave the space open. He wants the space to be devoured by the dancers. He doesn't want anything in the way.

Garafola: But he did want light.

Copeland: That's true. That's true.

Garafola: I think the light was extremely important, and he worked with Gene Rosenthal and very important lighting designers. I don't think we should just dismiss it like he just wanted them in space.

Copeland: I see what you're saying.

Garafola: He wanted them in this luminous space.

Copeland: Right, fair enough. You know, there are lots of instances of great choreographers like Martha Graham working over an extended period of time with a great sculpture like Noguchi. Anybody can chime in with an alternative scenario of dance history here, but it seems to me that if we're looking for another period, the next period where you have a lot of great visual artists working on a regular basis with a great choreographer, if not a bunch of choreographers, then that would have to be the Cunningham-Cage era, beginning in 1953 or so. Noel, would you be willing to talk a little bit about similarities and differences between the Cunningham-Cage, Johns-Rauschenberg approach to collaboration and the Diaghilev approach? Because it seems to me one of the things that happens is an absolutely radical, and to some minds quite heretical, redefining of what collaboration means.

Carroll: Well I think bringing up *Parade* is interesting. I hadn't really thought of that connection. I have the feeling that if Cunningham saw *Parade* he'd say, "Never again," because of the way in which the fine art does tend to dominate the dance. It restricts and constrains the kinds of steps that are allowed.

In terms of your question, with Cunningham you enter a kind of period of disillusion. There's no longer the attempt to symbolize the arts, no longer an attempt to make that *Gesamtkunstwerk*. But Cage and Cunningham I would want to say pursued disillusion for different reasons. Everybody talks about it as the Cage-Cunningham couplet. I think of them not as two sides of the same coin, but two coins in the same pocket. They are interested in the same strategies. They are interested in dissolving that kind of Wagnerian masterpiece, but for different reasons, and those reasons actually point to the fact that in the 20th century there are at least two avant-gardes, not just one. There's not just one narrative. There's the Modernist avant-garde, the Purists on the one side, and another avant-garde that's not noticed quite as often, the Integrationist avant-garde, the Impurists. Both of these approaches have very strong parallels in the fine art of the time. The Modernist, the Purist, is the defender of the autonomy of an art form. That's why I said that I think Cunningham must have saw Parade and said, "Never again." The dance has to be fore-grounded. The dance has to be appreciated for its own sense. The dance has to acknowledge its nature as dance, and that's why even though Cunningham relaxes the balletic idiom, you still detect the dancerly in it, as opposed to some other people who we'll talk about.

The Modernist avant-garde descended through cubism and is theorized by people like Greenberg and Freed. But the other avant-garde, the Integrationist, isn't interested in separating art from the other arts. In fact, it's not just an art world endeavor. It sort of has Duchamp as its founding father, and it's involved in, as Rauschenberg said, exploring the distance between life and art. In fact trying to dissolve that difference as much as possible. Now, I think in terms of Cunningham-Cage, Cunningham belongs to the Modernist, or the high Modernist, or the Purist side. Cage belongs to the Integrationist—he's interested in dissolving the difference between art and life, overthrowing those great synthetic Wagnerian artworks, and deconstructing the difference between art and life, deconstructing the difference between music and sound. Cunningham is interested, I think, in staking out the purity of the dance medium. Interestingly, they can agree on a strategy that serves both of them, which is, of course, the conjunction of artworks, music and dance, on an Aleatoric basis.

Often times the first time the dancers hear the music in a Cunningham concert is on the evening of the first performance. So any correspondences that you would find are completely random and accidental. That's how I think Cunningham stakes out the independence of dance. It's not the case that the music, as in so many other kinds of dance forms, is driving the movement. It's not that the movement is illustrating the music. You have two co-existing art forms, independent, and that allows Cunningham to assert the purity of dance.

Cage, on the other hand, likes these methods, because, in a way, he thinks life is more like that. Life is full of all kinds of random coincidences, so that the same technique that enables Merce Cunningham to be a Purist enables Cage to be an Integrationist. As I suggested before, this really parallels large-scale movements in 20th century art, where you can also talk about the Modernists and the high Modernists on the one side, and the Integrationists, from Duchamp through Warhol, Johns and Rauschenberg, on the other side.

Cage is straightforwardly Utopian. But it is about reclaiming experience, reclaiming the world, reclaiming the every day, reclaiming the ordinary. Maybe Cunningham is Utopian too, but in a slightly different way in that he wants the republic of art to be very well ordered, the streets to be straight, the dancers to stay on their side and the musicians to stay on theirs.

Copeland: But the collaborative model itself is a Utopian metaphor as they describe it, one in which there will no longer be any sort of hierarchical relationship of movement, music and décor—three equal, co-existing entities in space and time.

Carroll: Right. My only point is that they're different hierarchies.

Copeland: Of course.

Carroll: They're aimed at different hierarchies, one between the every day and the artistic—between music and noise, as Cage would say—and the other is a hierarchy of the arts.

Copeland: I think you're onto something. I mean I'm convinced that if Cage had not been part of Cunningham's life and work that Cunningham would have been very content just to choreograph

those pieces without any radically redefined relationship to sound and image. That was largely Cage's doing. But we'll never really know for sure.

I'm hoping now that Yvonne can talk about the difference between some of her early attitudes toward collaboration, broadly construed, in the Judson years. Some of the manifestos that appear in your book *Work 1961-73* seem to me to take a very different attitude than we find either in the Cunningham or Cage model, or the Diaghilev model, and a lot of your rhetoric, if not your practice, was very anti-collaborative.

I think of your *No Manifesto*—no to spectacle, no to virtuosity, no to magic and make-believe, no to moving or being moved, no to just about everything. Here's another quote. "I would like to say that I'm a music hater. The only meaningful role for music in relation to dance is to be totally absent or mock itself. I love dancing. I'm jealous of encroachment upon it by any other element. I want my dancing to be the superstar and refuse to share the limelight with any form of collaboration or coexistence. Music does not accompany paintings in a gallery," blah, blah, blah. So, do you want to talk a little bit about that, as you look back on it?

Rainer: Well, I too wanted to start with *Parade*.

Copeland: Great.

Rainer: Because I was struck by the interaction between the various artists involved in different media. They talked to each other. It was very important to have a discussion. You didn't just have a company and commission a work and that was that. There's something very mechanistic about the Cunningham collaboration with Cage—although, of course, they lived together. He and Cage must have had some great discussions. But when I think of some of those collaborations with various artists that were not very successful, it was as though they said, "Well, okay, let's try this one." With the music, too—"Let's try this one." They come smack together. So, yes, it set up a different model of what you call dissolutionist and I call somewhat mechanical. I'll get back to that.

Collaboration, when I entered the game, was very much about the Judson people working in each other's pieces. There were different artists, and there were painters and musicians, and they were also performers, and sometimes they provided music, sometimes not. It was a very social scene, perhaps comparable to late 19th century, the Diaghilev scene in Paris and before they got to Paris. My own relation to music was, of course, presented in a very satirical essay I wrote about being a music hater. I used music in a very mocking way. I used pedestrian movement with very grandiose music, so all of the drama was in what you heard, and all you saw were people walking or running around the space. And if I used décor at all, I kind of stole the ideas of others—I didn't go out and say to Sol LeWitt or Dan Flavin, "Do you want to work with me?" I had a wooden grid descend on the proscenium, but it descended for two minutes and went away. I never wanted décor to hang around. If it came, it went. Or, like in 1969, *Rose Fractions*—at the very end these red florescent tubes descended and made this Hades-like, underworld red glow on the stage, and that was for a very specific section and then it was over. Even in the present dance, the most recent dance, I have collaborated with Joel Reynolds, a scenic designer, but his work

appears in the second half of the piece. It does hang around for that second half, but it's not there for the whole dance.

I think of the work of John Jasperse, the décor and the props, many of his own making, and there's one extraordinary dance where this whole elaborate thing was pulled apart by the dancers and destroyed. I'm very sympathetic to that view. Certain works that become of interest in their own right offer the possibility of dominating the space, to the detriment of the dancing, especially if, as in my present concerns, that work has entered a canonical pinnacle of legend. It has to be undermined in some way, and pulled apart and brought down to human scale. So I guess this idea of high art and low art has always been operating in my work. Low art, of course, includes the pedestrian, the every day, which, of course, is directly related to Cage's ideas.

Carroll: It's interesting, though, that when you move into collaboration and the grand union, that in fact an awful lot of it tends to be not dance, but riffing.

Rainer: Well that's a very special case. That was not really about collaboration, but a kind of a communal warfare or something. It was a totally improvisatory situation, but fraught with danger. I mean you never knew what was going to happen. There was no discussion at all beforehand about what we were going to do, which sometimes resulted in amazing things. But the risk involved in that was too much for me. I didn't last very long in it. Yes, that was another form of collaboration.

Copeland: I'm going to open things up to the audience in just a moment, but before we do that, I wanted to ask you to talk a little bit about your motives in gravitating away from the dance world and toward filmmaking, where you have this absolute control, if you want it, in the editing room?

Carroll: It's also de-collaborative art.

Copeland: It's also de-collaborative art, right. That's the irony.

Rainer: Yeah, but it's sort of willy-nilly. You don't get it done unless you collaborate. Unless, as many avant-garde, experimental filmmakers, you are in total control from the conception to production to editing. But to make a narrative film with actors, if you're a technophobe like I am, you're very dependent on all kinds of people. So this was a kind of enforced collaboration. I never enjoyed it very much, and the part of it I enjoyed most was the writing beforehand, and the editing, where I got back my control over the material and I was temporarily not in fear of the laboratories and those other technicians. That's also a kind of collaboration. You give up your work to the laboratory, and it's taken over.

Audience: As you were talking about Wagner it struck me that his *Gesamtkunstwerk* was totally his own. He was his own collaborator. He didn't depend on anybody else. That's no doubt the way he liked it. So I don't think anybody could have out-Wagnered him, so to speak.

Copeland: That's a good point. I think one distinction that we didn't make is the distinction between some kind of inter-media or multimedia work that is the result of a bunch of

collaborators working in different mediums, or somebody like Laurie Anderson or Allan Kaprow—people whose work tends to have a multimedia component, but they are the sole Wagnerian controller. Now the product may be exactly the same. I mean the audience may not know the difference.

Carroll: It's interesting, though, the way we chose to tell the narrative. We really chose cases where either the arts looked like they were on an equal footing, or on an equal footing in different ways, either because they were very symbiotically connected, or, in Cage and Cunningham, because they were disconnected. But, actually, the norm of collaboration in dance probably is that the dance takes the lead. The sets and the costuming just serve the dance, and if there's any question of equality, it will be in those cases where people are interested in performative interpretations of the music. Then the music and the dance will stay equals, or almost equals, because actually dance can do certain things that the music can't.

Copeland: Right. Yes, and if you're a member of the dance audience, you're probably going to say that's how it should be. Everything else should be there to serve the dance.

Carroll: But in a way the narrative is the narrative of breaks from what the norm is, so that in something like *Night Journey,* Noguchi's set actually sub-serves Graham's grand design.

Garafola: I would just like to add something that I'm working on an exhibition about Jerome Robbins. Robbins, of course, went through numerous years in that collaborative form called Broadway, the musical, where, of course, tempers rise and everything. He then left Broadway and returned to the New York City Ballet in the late 1960s. Then he began—and this is what I just discovered this week—he began designing sets and costumes, which I had no idea until I was looking through these restricted papers, and there were his costume designs for various things, as though he too was trying to aspire to this total control—

Copeland: But never actually realized in performance, right?

Garafola: Yes, there were the costumes.

Copeland: Accredited to somebody else?

Garafola: Not credited to someone else—no credit at all.

Audience: My experience was that I used to dance here. I'm now living in Kansas City, and what dancers do there is choreograph shows. I mean in terms of hierarchy, you are the lowest. And in terms of control, you have a director that takes your stuff and changes it. You talk about *Parade* and it being a wonderful experience for them. My experience with collaboration in terms of performing shows, musicals—it's horrible as a dance person to put my stuff out there and have it changed, and not respected. And that's what dance is in the Midwest.

Garafola: Well I would say in the commercial theater, you're absolutely right. Dance in the commercial theater is absolutely the bottom. Where is Agnes De Mille and all the stuff she did on Broadway? Forgotten, re-choreographed, made contemporary. Not Rogers and

Hammerstein—they're all protected by copyright. I think exactly what you said explains why so many choreographers who work on Broadway for any length of time eventually try to move into being choreographer/directors. In that sense, Robbins's career, followed by Fosse and many others—De Mille, Stroman, among the more recent ones—they want to be directors. Gene Kelly.

Audience: Someone said something about co-equality, and I was thinking about spectatorship and relational arts and these trends of being social with dance and sculpture and mixing the medias. How does anyone feel about spectatorship these days, and how is the audience part of pieces? Does that make sense?

Copeland: Yes. Well this is about the postmodern notion of the perceiver as a co-creator, not just as an interpreter. I assume that's where you're going with this, right?

Audience: Yes. The creator. I guess I'm most familiar with Happenings—when the stage became more nonlinear.

Carroll: Well audience is always a co-creator in some sense, even in a very modest mystery story. You're going to have to fill in lots of material. However, I think there is a degree of difference—the degree to which you put pressure on the audience to do more and more work. Cunningham famously says it's up to the audience to interpret, by which I think he means something like thematically interpret—whatever the significance of the work is, that's up to the audience.

Copeland: Or maybe just to make certain perceptual choices. He is giving you a certain freedom about connecting what you hear and what you see—literally where to direct your visual attention. So in that sense, even the act of perceiving a Cunningham dance is more, quote unquote, participatory for an audience member. There's less imposed upon him or her.

Carroll: Right. I mean I think in truth the audience always has to participate, always has to add something, even in the things that we call passive.

Copeland: Yes.

Carroll: There's always some level of activity. The question is how much, how taxing? I tend to think of the Modernists as having come along and imposed the Protestant work ethic on us—that there's really strenuous demands on the level of work the audience has to do.

Fleischer: Well, even Mallarmé found it problematical that if a dance had a libretto or a story that the audience member was already creating a text in his head as he watched the dance, and it was competing with the written text. So you already had a disjuncture. The audience is very much always a collaborator to some degree.

Garafola: But I do think that Cunningham theorized it in some very interesting ways. The fact of saying there is no center on the stage and that the audience is free to look here or there or whatever, and create, so to speak, his or her own center. Of course, I always love Martha

Graham's statement, "The center is where I am." The Cunningham theory would be that the center is where the eye is gazing.

Copeland: Yes. And it's no coincidence that Cunningham was a former Graham dancer. That I think is one of many Graham legacies that he was rebelling against.

Audience: I'm curious about the historical context of collaboration, because through that period you have the enlightenment, where the model was towards a holistic view, bringing together something that would create a unification—that one world kind of stuff. Then we come to the existentialists, the two World Wars, the breakdown of narrative, and, in relationship to the non-collaboration and in relationship to Cage, the interest in eastern ideas, randomness, all of that. In other words, the breaking down of narrative. You had it in writing, where the novel was breaking down narrative. You have a whole transition period. Is there historical resonance here as well in terms of looking at Judson or looking at any of this from today's perspective?

Carroll: Well it's very difficult to tell a narrative, because I think if we consider the present moment, a lot of the leading choreographers have returned to a kind of search for something—not perfect organic unity, but a kind of unity. A couple of weeks ago Mark Morris presented the Mozart dancers as part of the Mozart series, and if you want to talk about complicated interrelationships between the two arts, it's almost as if he brings out and annotates almost every line of the music, up to and including the harmonic movement of the music. So I think the tendency to look at history in terms of a line rather than a line with lots of spirals and regressions in it is probably—that's probably the advisable way to look at it.

Rainer: You mentioned Cage's ideas as Utopian. He thought of this disjunction and inclusion of disparate elements as a social project.

Carroll: Well he was an anarchist.

Rainer: Yes.

Copeland: Yes. Wholeness for Cage was associated with fascism, with an attempt to exclude anything that wasn't part of whatever the Aryan or folkloristic notion of the whole was.

Carroll: He's a leveler in every way.

Copeland: Yes.

Rainer: But, about my own work, I never made any idealist claims for it, even though I think my ideas are kind of in a straight line from certain disruptive, Modernist moments, from 1900 through Duchamp, Dada, Cage. I guess I'm more interested in history than in social aspirations.

Carroll: Is that true of your films, too?

Rainer: Yes, in a way, sure.

Carroll: That's a surprise.

Rainer: In terms of their strategies, yes.

Audience: I actually had a question that was directly relevant to what's just been said, but before I say that I do want to make a comment. When we talked about the Diaghilev era collaborations, you mentioned the word Utopian. It came up a couple of times. You can't forget that there was an impresario there. And there wasn't in the Cage-Cunningham collaboration. So they're very different models. But one of the wonderful things that came out of the Diaghilev era collaborations, and the things that survived the best, are the scores. It's interesting, and maybe a dual question for Lynne and Yvonne—if you look at *Rite of Spring*, what do you think the influence on the score is of the visual collaborations, and of the choreographer? What can you find of Nijinsky in there? And, Yvonne, when you were working with the score, as we know you've just done, how did you find yourself collaborating with it?

Rainer: I wouldn't say I collaborated with the score so much as with the soundtrack of the BBC production called *Riot at the Rite*, which is a rather corny dramatization of the making of *The Rite of Spring*, culminating in the Finnish National Ballet doing a version of Millicent Hodson's *Reconstruction* for the Joffrey Ballet in 1987, and cutting from the stage to the disruptive, churlish audience and their remarks. I was working with that soundtrack as a score, which was fiendishly difficult for my dancers, one of whom is sitting back there, Sally Silvers. And it would not have been possible to work with the soundtrack, where sometimes the audience's sounds obliterate the orchestration, without perusing the actual score and doping out the counts. Because the whole dance is pretty much done on the music, much in opposition to my early essay.

Carroll: I don't know if this is relevant to the question, but certainly there are parallels, say in *Les Noces*, and the strategy of designing the score of *Les Noces*. In choosing the movement and the costumes, they all have a kind of ethnographic dimension, looking at Russian folk songs, looking at Russian festivals. So in that way they seem to be evolving with a pretty common idea of the kind of sources and directions that they want in the score and the artwork and in the choreography.

Garafola: Genesis is very much a problem. Sometimes there really is collaboration at the genesis. I mean going back to *The Rite of Spring*, I think there was a real collaboration with Roerich as a focal person feeding both Stravinsky and then later Nijinsky ideas about prehistoric Russia, this Slavonic past, these myths—some of them true, some of them not, it didn't matter—that really captured their imagination. I know Millicent Hodson would disagree with me completely, but I don't find so much of Nijinsky in the score. I sense a deep, deep brilliant stylization and distillation of what Roerich had suggested to him, as well as hearing things from Stravinsky's older music, like Petrushka. But I don't really feel Nijinsky's presence, because in any event, Nijinsky wasn't involved with that—Stravinsky was writing on his own. I also think in a curious way the original *Rite of Spring* was where certain elements, despite collaboration, didn't work. For instance, the set and the costumes, which were very ethnographic, was very conservative, whereas the score was so radical for that period, and the movement was so radical.

Rainer: I think it's a pertinent question—where do we find Nijinsky? Where do we find that movement? I mean are you thinking of Millicent Hodson? What do you base your impressions on?

Garafola: No, I'm saying I don't feel the movement in the score, in the music when I just listen to the music.

Rainer: You don't feel—

Garafola: Nijinsky. When I just listen to the music.

Rainer: But what's your idea of Nijinsky?

Garafola: My idea of Nijinsky is basically what I have read about Nijinsky. Because while of course I've seen Millicent and many other takes on this score, I think what Millicent did was a very valiant attempt at doing something, but not necessarily the original. I think the original can only exist in the imagination.

Rainer: Right.

Audience: Yvonne, did you say which was the high part of art, or the low part? When you said the low and high—

Rainer: I guess I was thinking of everyday movement in relation to—

Audience: Trained dancing?

Rainer: Well, maybe virtuosic dancing, or Stravinsky's *Rite of Spring*. Yes. That's high art. Sure.

Audience: Ginger Rogers always claimed that she added a lot of the dance to Fred Astaire's choreography. He supposedly, according to Arlene Croce, worked it out with Hermes Pan, and then Ginger would step in, because she was busy making all these other movies that didn't involve her dancing. She told me herself that she had a lot to do with making it up, and that she would write that in her memoir, which she never did. I always had this really romantic idea that because tap dancing is music—at least tap dancers think of themselves as creating music with their feet, playing their feet—that there was this great relationship between Duke Ellington and Count Basie and all the tap dancers, and they were all one big happy family, until I read in Telly Atkin's book, and also just learned from experience, that the tap dancers would hand the musicians their charts, and it was all very set, and they were often very unhappy with drummers dropping bombs and things like that. There is one tap dance called "For Dancers Only," where the music is written after the dancing, and that's very interesting to me, because mostly the dancing went to the music.

When Twyla Tharp said, "Mozart doesn't need my help," in *The Bix Pieces*, was she getting that sort of from John Cage and Merce Cunningham going into very different places? I always just wondered if she was influenced by that, that she made up her dances and what worked for

Mozart worked for Bix Beiderbecke. Does anyone know *The Bix Pieces*? It seems as though the dances were created without the music.

Carroll: I can say one thing about Ginger Rogers. I'm sure that she's right, because the way a Hollywood film is made is very often times they don't have the script, or the script is arriving page by page, and the director is changing it and then the actors are changing it. I'm sure that that must have happened on the set with Ginger Rogers, if only because there might have been steps that she felt uncomfortable with. She might have had suggestions. But that's the way Hollywood filmmaking in the studio system was made. There's a director who's got to organize it all, but it also has to be made to happen on the ground.

Audience: Yes, she was just too feisty to not make up a lot of stuff.

Copeland: Well, and as far as *The Bix Pieces* goes, one of the things that Tharp was interested in doing—David Gordon has also done this on occasion—was to show how the very same movement changes when it's accompanied by different music. So I mean it's partly an attempt to suggest that there is not an absolutely rigid fixed connection between the two, that in fact you can be listening to something different, watching the same movement, or having somebody wearing different costumes as they perform the same movement. Gordon's also experimented with that idea.

Fleischer: I think the idea of doing a piece of choreography to certain kinds of music, or doing it to counts and then later having it retrofitted to a different piece of music, is something that happens more frequently.

Copeland: I think that's true, and usually not for aesthetic reasons. Usually for reasons that have to do with the availability of music, or programming—

Garafola: Well, imagine *The Moor's Pavan*, by Jose Limon, which was originally choreographed not to the music it's choreographed to. The fit seems so tight, it's kind of hard to think that it actually was done to something else.

Audience: With the rise of experimental theater and the way that it changed, I think in the middle of the century, and also with the way that the actor became the dancer, with a lot of Robert Wilson's work and Lucinda Childs, and the way that a dancer was an actor, those two terms were kind of lost. As we've been talking about this period of the collaboration of the arts with dance, what's interesting is that theater is very often the left-out little brother, in that you have music and you have the visual arts and you have dance. Then you have this other art, which is sort of like a collaborative form of all of them. So is the theater an intrinsically collaborative art? Would you only be able to have its pure form if you had, say, naked actors just talking without any clothing on in the dark? Would that be its purest form? If you look at, say, Anne Bogart as the director who's sort of both the divorce lawyer and the marrying priest of text and movement, is acting itself a collaborative art, or is text simply the preface for it without it actually being able to exist?

Rainer: There's a lot of questions in there. Well partly it's a matter of nomenclature. I mean if you have people moving around and there's no language, then you call it dance. When does dance become theater? Dance *is* theater. It's performed in theaters. Would we be splitting hairs to make a distinction? Anne Bogart—I've not seen enough of her work. But I've seen some very interesting things, like the solo performances she directs.

Fleischer: I think this also gets to the point that any text is only a blueprint for a stage production, right? How you define that or collaborate to create that stage production can take so many different avenues. When you were talking I was thinking about Adolf Appia, who certainly put up a lot of Wagner's work, and of course one of his ideas is that the moving actor creates space, makes us look at space, and vitalizes the stage. There are so many experiments. I mean you can talk about certainly plays that happen to have dances in them. In a piece by Gertrude Stein, you see a text, but clearly there are no stage directions, there are no characters, so that it has to become staged. Actually, Anne Bogart's done some wonderful work with Gertrude Stein. I think it's a way, going back to the Symbolists, of how we *theatricalize* a space, how we *theatricalize* a text. How do we poeticize that? There are so many different approaches to movement for actors these days, whole anthologies of them, but they're all trying to get at this thing of how do we *physicalize*, what stories does the body have to tell in space?

Copeland: Yes. The other side of the collaborative coin is that there are a lot of writers—Edward Albee's a good example—who put contractual constrictions in the text that say, "No incidental music. You may not add music to this."

Carroll: There are a lot of movements of theater purism. There are different purisms. The different purisms are determined by who the theater has anxiety about. You may decide that our competitors are words, so now let's have theater without words, which will make you very relaxed about dance, or bodily movement. I'm thinking of something like Wilson's earlier work, like *The Life and Times of Joseph Stalin*. That, I think, expresses an anxiety with literature. Then Jersey Grotowski would have a whole different form of purism, because of a whole different set of anxieties.

Garafola: Even one of Beckett's last plays, *Quad*, is for four dancers. No text at all.

Audience: You're probably aware that philosophers and psychologists for millennia have been posing the same kind of questions regarding what constitutes a legitimate collaboration. The question there was more what are the modalities. There's a whole bunch of things that can be cross modal in this sense, like rest, movement, brilliance, intensity. The most super modal things, where you can go across any modality and get the same feeling, are shifts in force and movement and how they sculpture time. I was thinking about that because that's exactly what dance does, and it's the only medium that actually does that. So it makes sense to me that we would be talking about dance and its collaborations, and not any other way around.

Carroll: I think actually though it's not a perennial question. It's really a very 18th century question. The idea of having to sort of separate the arts, correlate them to different modalities, the building up of kind of systems of the arts, like Kant's and Hegel's. I think Aristotle was cool with theater being the combination of song and dance. He thought that those were parts of

theater. This is a conjecture, but I would say the obsession with having to divide the arts apart and decide levels and relationships of hierarchy and hybrid relations is a very 18th century consideration, and it happens in text earlier than this, but the most important text that it begins to happen in is Lessing's *Laocoon*.

Copeland: Yes. And Greenberg and Freed are very much the 20th century children of Lessing and *Laocoon.*

Audience: When you take it from the perspective of different types of activities, such as dance, music, theater, et cetera, I agree with you. When you take it in terms of features of experience, I don't agree with you, because that's what's universal. In fact, it's a very hot topic right now with all of the neurosciences, because it's a mystery.

Carroll: I agree with that. But I think when you focus on the arts it's really an 18th century problem that we should grow out of.

Rainer: That we should put behind us.

Carroll: Yes.

Audience: I teach a class on interpretive collaboration, and we focus on the Judson and on fluxus, and I'm thinking about what Dick Higgins said, because the term he came up with is *inter-media*, which is the area between any two forms. What I've been thinking about is that kind of distinction that we always make and how it might be productive to use this kind of terminology to think about work that doesn't entirely classify itself in one spot or another. One thing that's an issue that we can't get away from, and this came up a lot at the Nothing Festival this year at DTW, was the intersection of these kind of terms with the way that art is funded, and the way you have to identify your work as belonging to a particular category in order to ask for grants.

But more on the level of what you mentioned when you started this is the way that Richard Serra's work goes across these categories. It's not just that it invokes dance, but it actually fulfills these choreographic possibilities. But interestingly, when he spoke about his work, he spoke about it in terms of *Las Meninas*, and the way that painting puts the viewer at the center. He spoke about the person coming into contact with his enormous works in particular as being central to the experience.

Copeland: Have we reached the witching hour? Are there any more questions?

Levy: I just want to say one thing. What really excited me when you first said Yvonne Rainer was going to come was that when I first saw her work, there was this meditation on the whole concept of human character in a distinctly formalist type of setting. How does that fit into the whole concept of collaboration? That was striking to me. I would go to see very Modernist dance works and here she came in, and two radically different components were put together.

Copeland: Yes, right.

Rainer: What work was that?

Levy: I don't remember the exact work.

Rainer: What year?

Levy: This was a long time—this was 40 years ago.

Copeland: Could have been *Story of a Woman Who*.

Cohen: It was our first date.

Rainer: Well you must know when your first date was.
Levy: It was actually in the '70s. But it could have been one of the films that I'm thinking about.

Rainer: Okay.

Copeland: Well, Yvonne, you've written a lot about how formalism, broadly construed, and humanism are not incompatible with one another.

Rainer: A lot of those issues took place over a long time, where I was moving from performer to persona. I didn't instantly make that leap, as some people might, to go from being a dancer to being an actor, let's say. Going back to very early discussions at Judson about who we were, what constituted the presentation of this self in front of an audience, it became a more and more complicated set of issues, and especially moving into film at a certain time when all of this was being debated by feminist film theorists. So I don't know. It's too much to get into. But yes, the formalism and abstraction of dance is always teetering into something else because of the human body, which we attach stories to no matter what it does.

Fleischer: I think in the process of collaboration, if we think about just regular collaboration—getting a dance concept together and deciding on a lighting design and everything—going from the abstract and having to articulate your point of view seems like a huge compromise. The fact that you have to say something right now because someone has to order something, or somebody has to make a decision. That's a very pedestrian sense of collaboration, but even in its higher forms, when artists are working with one another, it's always a balancing act. I think when you read letters of collaborators, sometimes there's incredible excitement, almost a self-manifesto of "This is what I think and this is how it's going to be and it's going to be wonderful." There's also the reticence of "I'm not sure I'm ready to make a statement about this yet, but I have to somehow." So I think that tension of never being ready because we always need more time in the arts, of having to come to grips with articulating it for someone who's not necessarily going to be on your wavelength, is quite a challenge to the whole collaborative process. It's the creative process in miniature, because the tape in your head is always saying things about your work as well. I think collaboration sort of mirrors and magnifies that to a large degree.

Copeland: Should I make an effort to wrap things up? I was just thinking about a very provocative definition of inter-media art by Namjin Kim. I think he says, "Male human body has nine holes. Female has ten. When all holes are filled, you have satisfaction. Purpose of inter-media art is to fill all holes as fast and efficiently as you can." Okay, so, toward that end, thank you, panelists, for your collaboration.