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Abstract

‘Attempting to capture this transience, this constant appearing and disappearing, through the medium of the still photograph might seem the epitome of oxymoronic endeavour’.


An Oxymoronic Endeavour is the resulting artwork of a collaboration between photographer, Celia Walmsley, and New Zealand dancer/choreographer (dance maker), Jessie McCall. It combines two oxymoronic (apparently contradictory) art forms where one artist is also the subject of the resulting images. McCall and Walmsley co-author the development of the artwork and Walmsley is the author of the exegesis.

Through this production collaboration Walmsley and McCall explored the oxymoronic relationship and use of photography and movement. The resulting artwork is not a recording of a performance that will be repeated. The choreography and performance occurred only for the purpose of creating the images and exist only in the resulting ‘performative’ (Baker. S. & Moran. F. 2016) photographic work and its associated writing. The work breaks with the traditional style of dance photography, and with the conventional role of ‘still’ photography in relation to dance, as the ‘revelatory authority’ (the power of the camera to show what has been) of other artists’ work. (Reason. M. 2004).

Use of and the critique of, collaboration and co-authorship are essential elements in the artwork’s process, form and outcomes. This reflects Daniel Palmer’s (2017) proposal on the move away, since the 1960s, from the ‘art-world trope’ of sole adventurer photographer towards collaborative work. Issues of agency, power, and the link between authorship and authority, also influenced the work.

Through the essential component of collaboration An Oxymoronic Endeavour developed into ‘performative’ photography between photographer and choreographer/dance artist. The work contributes to the sparsely populated field of collaborative ‘performative’ photography which also represents a paradigm shift in the way that photography and dance are created, presented and consumed.
Introduction

An Oxymoronic Endeavour is a collaborative artwork between a photographer (myself) and New Zealand dancer / choreographer (dance maker) Jessie McCall. The artwork is co-developed by McCall and I and the exegesis is authored by me.

My personal aim, through the Master of Fine Arts (MFA), was to develop a new personal ‘aesthetic’ (set of principals underlying the work of a particular artist) and/or methodology in relation to my photographic work with dancers and choreographers. In particular I sought to break with, as Matthew Reason describes it, the conventional role of photography in relation to dance as the documentary ‘revelatory authority’ of other artists’ work (Reason, M. 2004). By way of a circuitous route of exploration, I have achieved both aims in the form of collaboration with McCall and the production of artwork in the field of collaborative ‘performative’ photography - performance that is designed to exist only as photographs. (Baker, S. & Moran. F. 2016).

This collaboration, in which one of the collaborators, McCall, is both the subject and co-developer, proved to be key to all aspects of the project including the provocations, ideas, methodology and final outcomes of the work.

In Chapter 1 I describe the key pieces in the final artwork including the ‘Creating’, ‘Performing’ and ‘Liminal Space’ pieces. (Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 & 28). I note key components and influencing factors including the breath, transition movements, the frame and boundaries and early photographic influences.

Chapter 2 explores the key elements that influenced the development of the work including the use of photography to express the ideas of movement. I outline the provocations, choice of contemporary dance, ideas, media, methodology and some of the developmental works from which the artwork developed. I link key elements of the final artworks with the provocations and how the collaboration was integral to the development and final decisions in the resulting artwork.

In Chapter 3 I explore the key elements of our collaboration. I then investigate how our work reflects Daniel Palmer’s (2017) proposal on the move, since the 1960s, away from the ‘art-world trope’ of sole adventurer photographer, towards collaborative work and shared authorship.

Chapter 4 examines the key issues that arose in developmental works, which influenced my decision to work in collaboration, our methodology and aspects of the final work. These include the principles of ‘agency’ (power or control) of the subject over their own representation, the rebalancing of the ‘photographer’s prerogative’ (privilege) and inherent ‘power’ over the subject (Durden, M. & Richardson, C. 2000), and the links between authorship and authority.

In Chapter 5 I explore the form of ‘performative’ photography (Baker, S. & Moran, F. 2016), which, I discovered, is the new aesthetic that I sought. I cite other practitioners of ‘performative’ photography and conclude that our artwork contributes to this sparsely populated field. I also examine the symbiotic relationship that photography and dance has had since photography’s invention and suggest that the development of collaborative ‘performative’ photography provides a platform on which each can work together as equals.

In Chapter 6 I review where our artwork fits with other practitioners in the art worlds of photography and dance, particularly in New Zealand. I cite examples of practitioners working in ‘representational’ and ‘revelatory’ modes and seek those working collaboratively, in ‘performative’ photography, or both. I also review the extent to which Palmer’s proposal, on the increase in collaboration since the 1960s, is evident in the art worlds of photography and dance and how this relates to our artwork.

Ultimately, I conclude that our artwork successfully combines the oxymoronic interests of two artists concerned with stillness and movement. I note that the work breaks with the traditions of dance photography and with the conventional relationship of photography as the ‘revelatory’ recorder of dance. (Reason, M. 2004). I conclude that, most importantly, collaboration is key to the essence and outcomes of our artwork and that our collaboration reflects Palmer’s (2017) proposal on the increase in collaboration since the 1960s. I also suggest that our work contributes to the genre of collaborative ‘performative’ photography (Baker, S. & Moran, F. 2016), which remains a relatively sparsely populated realm in relation to the arts of photography and dance.
Figure 2. Walmsley, C. (in collaboration)
Finally, I conclude that ‘performative’ photography represents a new paradigm in the way that photography and dance are created, presented and consumed.
Chapter 1 Our Oxymoronic Endeavour

This research arises from my years of experience as a photographer, particularly of dance, and my aim to develop a new personal ‘aesthetic’ (set of principals underlying the work of a particular artist) and/or methodology in relation to my photographic work with dancers and choreographers. It also arises from McCall’s experience as a performer and choreographer. It combines the oxymoronic (apparently contradictory) endeavour of combining ‘still’ photography and movement. The title of the work is inspired by senior New Zealand choreographer, Michael Parmenter’s statement.

‘Attempting to capture this transience, this constant appearing and disappearing, through the medium of the still photograph might seem the epitome of oxymoronic endeavour’.


Our final artwork is based on a movement ‘phrase’ (series of movements linked together to make a distinctive pattern). McCall created this in rehearsal clothes (figs. 1, 2 & 3) and then performed for the camera in make up and costume (figs 6, 7 & 28). These two modes represent McCall’s provocation of the binary positions of creator and performer. The difference in each state is subtle but noticeable when viewing the full set of images. The process of putting on make up and costume subtly changed both the dancer’s and the photographer’s focus. The performance images (fig. 6, 7 & 28) have a sharper, tighter, more intense and less playful quality about them compared to the images of the creation.

In Creating the Phrase (figs. 1, 2 & 3) McCall worked out the choreography which she repeated fourteen times. Five images were taken during each of the repetitions and these were combined in-camera to create a 6th composite/multi-shot image. The multi-shot images condense and collapse time and space in an oft-random way. Reflecting the collaborative nature of the project, the moment at which the shutter was pressed for each of the images was selected by McCall, myself, or by the camera when it could not focus.

Of these images, McCall notes that contemporary dance explores the folds of the body. She recalls that, as she has short Achilles tendons, she was encouraged during her training to explore ways of folding from the hips and waist and that this folding is evident in the multi-shot images. The multi-shots have a strong sense of ‘seeing the unseen’ and emphasise the ephemerality of dance. Even though McCall knew the phrase intimately, she did not immediately recognise the connection between a particular phrase she performed and its corresponding multi-shot image.
Creating the Phrase displays an inherent oxymoron connected with something that is soft, strong, malleable and moveable converted into, and contained within, something set, hard, framed and still. This series also reflects Reason’s (2004) proposal that still photographs cannot reproduce movement and must therefore seek to create something new, not revealing but constructing a new and still moving dance, seen through the eye of the camera and experienced in the mind of the viewer. (Reason, M. 2004).

The Liminal Space image (fig. 4) originates in McCall’s interest in the transitional space between creation, rehearsal and performance. In this artwork she is in transition; waiting, preparing and looking out. Reflecting the position of the dancer on the side of the stage waiting to go on – unseen but seeing the audience. In the context of dance making, the choreographer usually witnesses their creation, and the audience reaction to it, in the resulting performance. However, with ‘performative’ photography (refer Chapter 5) the choreography is made for the resulting images and is not intended to be seen by an audience in its original form. In this image, McCall, as the choreographer/collaborator, asserts herself in the room and ‘witnesses’ her work and its audience. Gierstberg (1990) suggests we present differently to others because of the gaze the viewer casts in our direction. (Dujardin, P., Visschedijk, R., Loakimidis, V., & Gierstberg, F. (Eds). 2015). In this case the gaze is reversed as McCall watches us, the audience, examining her dance. The choice of transparency (Ultra Premium Pictorico) as the print medium for The Liminal Space reflects this primarily hidden and fleeting time and space, and gives viewers the opportunity to see the dancer and creator as an individual, to share in that moment and get close to what is often unseen in the theatre space. By walking around the image, viewers can witness what she sees. The Liminal Space is placed by the doorway, which represents a place of transition. Most importantly, in this representation, the choreographer/collaborator has ‘agency’ (input/control) over her representation (refer Chapter 4). Sima Satama (2017) proposes that the two distinct realms of rehearsing ‘off-stage’ and the bodily transformation to ‘on-stage’, provide rich and specific environments to observe ‘embodied agency’. Satama also notes the high level of awareness dancers have of their own ‘embodied agency’. (Satama, S. 2017). In The Liminal Space (fig. 4) McCall is challenging us and performing for herself. In Performing the Phrase (fig. 6) she is challenging herself and performing for us, the audience, be that the camera or the viewer.

In Performing the Phrase, (fig. 6) the grid represents the movement phrase created in the rehearsal (figs. 1, 2 & 3) as a performance for the camera. The movement phrases are read horizontally with the top line revealing five images of the first
repetition of the phrase, the second line revealing five images of the second repetition of the phrase and so on.

The results produce an unconventional representation of movement, which is conceived more by implication in the mind of the viewer through patterns, blur, sequencing and composite multi-shot imagery. Patterns in the choreography appear and yet no two images or phrases are the same, even though the same movement phrase is repeated fourteen times. McCall points out that the scale affects the reading. She found the smaller scale of the individual images intriguing as it focuses on the choreography rather than individual movements. She also observed that the ephemerality of dance and the trace of the movements are revealed in the grid. She sees it as one unit, which a dance phrase is.

McCall notes that in contemporary dance the transition of movements is an important element compared to classical ballet which honours the exquisite moments of extension. Rather than capturing an instance of perfect stillness, the transitions are purposely revealed, evident and honoured rather than deleted or avoided as in much conventional dance photography. This focus gives the impression of the choreography and movement.

The use and sound of the breath is also a key element in contemporary dance and *Performing the Phrase* (fig. 6) in particular reveals a sense of the breath in the light and shade of the background. McCall also notes that the fade in the background of our images has the impression of film rushes. This references still photography’s contribution to Thomas Edison’s development of moving pictures. (Burbridge, B. 2015).

The sequences and multi-shot images rupture and reconstruct, giving the impression and feeling of the choreography in the mind of the viewer. These still images create an impression of movement, in a different way to video, through the definition of muscles, expression of effort in the face, and blur of limbs which the human brain interprets as movement. Through this methodology we demonstrate Reason’s (2004) theory that, to counter the paradox of stillness and movement, still photography is “better able to present motion through undermining its own essential characteristics of revelatory authenticity”. (Reason, M. 2004). Through this work we revealed that there is the possibility of transposition or complicity between the two different art forms of photography and dance. (Parmenter, M. in McDermott, J. 2015).
Performing the Phrase references the work of early photographer Eadweard Muybridge, whose motion studies (fig. 5), laid out in grids, formed the foundation for understanding and recording movement. (Solnit, R. 2003). Creating the Phrase (figs. 1, 2 & 3) references the work of Etienne-Jules Marey, who pioneered experiments with imposing successive movements within a single frame. (Burbridge, B. 2015). This image also references work by Thomas Eakins and Harold Edgerton (Edgerton, H. E., Jussim, E. & Kayafas, G. 1987) as well as New Zealand photographic/videographic artist Daniel Crooks (Leonard, R. 2016) who have all utilised technical treatments to still, understand or manipulate time and movement.

Both Creating the Phrase and Performing the Phrase reference the form and function of photographic film. The grid layout of Performing the Phrase also references dance notation systems (such as Labanotation), which analyse and record body movements in two-dimensional sequential layouts. The multi-shot images also reference the flip dance books of the 1930s as popularised in the 1937 Astaire & Roger’s film Shall We Dance. The flipbook comprised a series of individual dance images which when flipped created the impression of a moving dance. (Croce, A. 1972). While our work is a portrait of a dancer and movement, the use of the landscape format reflects the frame of the stage and the space for the dancer to move in.

There exists an oxymoron in the containment of movement within a space or stage versus the free flow of movement. In traditional semiotic analyses of the photographic image, the border/frame determines that all that is within the frame has meaning. A dialogical interpretation, on the other hand, privileges the temporal, where the borders of the image do not enclose and limit the space but operate as pointers to the process. (Durden, M. & Richardson, C. 2000). Reflecting this latter idea of the dialogical and temporal, the fact that the limbs have, in some images, moved outside or been cut by the frame has been countered by the placement of all the images in the grid, creating one unit and giving democracy to each.
While McCall and I were both initially uncomfortable with using images where feet and hands had moved out of the frame, we purposely chose to honour all images and moments rather than deleting those that were not ‘perfect’ in the conventional way. The convention, in dance imagery, of including the full body with clear focus on the feet, has prevailed for decades across a wide range of dance genre.

In the majority of his dance films, dancer Fred Astaire famously maintained artistic control, not only of the choreography, but also of the camera angles of the dance. He insisted the camera capture the full body of the dancer, including a clear view of the feet and the full range of the movement with no cut-aways, reflecting the tradition of theatre from which he came. (Croce, A. 1972).

Figure 7. Walmsley, C. (in collaboration with McCall, J). Photograph. (2017) An Oxymoronic Endeavour - Performing the Phrase, single image detail

Both Creating the Phrase and Performing the Phrase (figs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 & 28) offer insight into the creative process of both dance making and photography. Parmenter notes that in dance, ‘process’ is understood more as a verb than a noun, as in ‘work of art’. Dance, he says, is never finished but is created anew at each rehearsal or performance. ‘Process is understood as the durational, moment-by-moment experience of research, discovery, accident and invention that often leads towards, but is not primarily focused upon, a finished product’. (Parmenter, M. in McDermott.
J. p6). George Brecht's 1959 Fluxus artists 'Towards Events' performativity concept was one of the first public performance events to suggest direction rather than goal, process rather than finished object, as its form. (Frielings, R in Frielings, R., Groys, B., Atkins, R., & Manovich, L. 2008). Reflecting this idea of durational 'process', the artworks are presented around the room with no obvious beginning or end and can be read clockwise, anticlockwise or across the space. Equally so, the images cross boundaries of the space in the room as well as the borders of the frame. They work their way over columns and round the corner, not inhibited by space but using the space to make their dance. Similarly, the process of creating this artwork is not contained by this room or time but will likely continue beyond the life of this thesis project.
Figure 8. Walmsley, C. Photograph (1998) Viktor by Pina Bausch, Tanztheater Wuppertal, London
Chapter 2 Taking or Making: Early Developments

Matthew Reason evokes the oxymoronic relationship that our artwork embodies as: “the characteristic of dance is movement; the specificity of still photography is stillness”. (Reason, M. 2003).

Initially, this research explored a new personal methodology in expressing movement through photography that would be as distant as possible from the convention of the precise image of movement caught in flight. I aimed to move in a radical way from ‘taking’ to, what Parmenter (2015) describes as, ‘making’ (the image of dance). I also intended to move from what Reason (2004) describes as ‘revelatory’ photography (the power of the camera to show us what has been) to ‘representational’ photography (communicating movement beyond what it reveals photographically to what it evokes in the mind of the viewer). (Reason, M. 2004). Similarly to Reason, Carl Hamer (2016) describes photography’s traditional relationship to performance. Hamer suggests a ‘performative’ approach, in relation to ‘staged’ photography and dance, in which the photographer is repositioned as co-creator in a dialogical partnership. This latter is the path that I took with McCall in An Oxymoronic Endeavour. (Hamer, C. 2016).

In my early developmental works I explored how movement and emotion of movement could be implied in the mind of the viewer. A photograph I took of Pina Bausch’s Tanztheater Wuppertal performance of Victor in 1999 (Fig. 8) influenced my research significantly. This image conveyed the essence and intensity of this moment in Bausch’s work, while breaking the conventions of dance photography. These conventions are complex and founded in the technique and concords of the dance form concerned, many of which, with the exception of classical ballet, are implicit. (Cleave, P. 2015). Demands for authenticity and ‘revelatory’ authority dominate the world of dance photography and are what I aimed to depart from. I agree with Reason’s argument that attempts to freeze time, and reproduce a perfect instance of dance made possible by advances in technology, can result in losing the sense of movement. Also, I agree that it is the ‘representational’ rather than ‘revelatory’ attributes of photography that capture the spirit and movement of dance. (Reason, M. 2004).
Early developmental works explored different ways of expressing movement through sequence, stacking, blur and other techniques. Artist Laurence Demaison’s sequence ‘Sauté d’humeur’ (fig. 9) was significant in my search for a new aesthetic. In this work Demaison fabricated the illusion of movement by moving the box around her rather than jumping herself. (Shaw, R. 2014). A breakthrough came with perfecting the use of the multi-shot technology which allowed me to take multiple images and combine them ‘in-camera’. The result is a set of individual images plus a composite image. The composite image condenses and collapses time, space and movement in a specifically designed or random way.

The Still Moving exploration led to investigation of portraiture in a series of Moving Portraits (figs. 10, 11, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 32, & 33). I was particularly interested in how the portrait, as an object separate from the time and space of its creation, is often seen as a representation or statement of truth about the subject based only on a fleeting instant. ‘Looking at a portrait one is confronted with ‘the other’ as a fellow human being’. (Gierstberg, F. (Ed) 2015). My research involved the potential for multiple images or movement to better represent the essence of a subject and to give the subject more opportunity to select the form of their representation. As described by Cornelia Kemp and Suzanne Witzgall (2002) and R. A. Sobieszek (1999), many artists and scientists have searched for ways of finding and expressing the essence or soul of the human subject in the photographic image other than through the single thousandth of a second image. Artists, such as Andre Bazin and Duane Michals have explored strategies such as composite images, manipulation, temporal and alienating strategies to interpret the essence of their subject. (Kemp, C & Witzgall, S. (Eds.) (2002) and (Sobieszek, R. A. (1999). This exploration also led to increased interest in the ‘agency’ of the subject and the power of the observed over the observer, which is covered in Chapter 4.

As part of the Moving Portraits series I created laser cut images of photographic portraits on clear Perspex (fig. 10). The result was an ephemeral portrait which,
When held up to light, became a negative that was reminiscent of photographic film. When the image was held away from light it became positive, providing two different perspectives in one image. I photographed the Perspex laser portraits in various locations that had meaning to me. (fig. 11). This approach explored ideas around the ephemerality of the individual and relationships between an individual and a place that has influenced them for a finite time or vice versa. These images display a uniquely ephemeral aesthetic and authenticity that would be difficult to replicate if combined in Photoshop. So far I have found no other examples of the technique I used involving photographing transparent raster images to explore the ephemerality of the individual and portraiture in the environment. My Still Moving explorations led to considerable research into the ‘still/moving’ field of study, which Evind Rossaak (2011) and Karen Beckman & Jean Ma (2008) describe as theories around still and moving effects in photography and cinema. This field is based on the axiom that “the still image was the hidden or repressed basis behind the illusion of motion” and that cinematic movement is an illusion, an “ideological effect of cinematic apparatus”. (Baudry, J. L.1974 in Rossaak, E. 2011; Beckman, K. & Ma, J. 2008). As my research progressed, the study of ‘still/moving’, which primarily involves the use of stillness in the moving image, became less relevant to my subsequent projects.

My fundamental interest in dance, movement, agency and collaboration (refer to Chapters 1, 3 & 4), took me back to working with choreographers and dancers. My choice to work with contemporary (made in the present day) dance choreographers was influenced by the freedom of
expression and form allowed and encouraged in this style of dance as compared to, for example, classical ballet, which is more restrictive in its codes. (Buday, C. S. 2006). I also chose to work with still photography/image capture rather than video/moving image capture due to photography’s ability to ‘see the unseen’ and to create something new through the compression and temporal possibilities of combining still photographic images.

To promote the shared inputs and outcomes of collaborations, I invited McCall (and Delarbarca (figs 13, 14 & 20) and Hemopo (figs 12 & 16 in previous works) to base the actual photographic session around their own ideas. My only request was that we did not create a ‘revelatory’ record of an already choreographed piece.

McCall’s provocations, reflecting her personal interests, were initiators for my interest in the photographic translation of movement and emotions. Her interests included ‘seeing the unseen’ (the camera’s ability to see what the eye cannot see or comprehend in the actual performance) and representations of the ‘binary’ positions of being creator and performer.

McCall also noted that the process of creating choreography can be mundane and less gendered than performance. She was concerned with how the transition, of being prepared with make up and costume, in order to perform in the work, manifested in the resulting images. In another representation of a binary position, she was interested in exploring the waiting time that inevitably occurs around creation and performance of dance, such as time in which dancers wait to be called to rehearsal or stage. Linked with these provocations McCall was keen to explore the transitional or liminal space in between creation and performance and with ideas of reversing the gaze either between choreographer and performer or performer and audience.

My provocations included working in collaboration with a dance artist, who is also the subject, as part of my search for a new personal aesthetic or methodology. My interest in promoting the ‘agency’ (power or control) of the subject and challenging the photographer’s prerogative and perceived power over the subject were key drivers, as was the combination of the interests of both artists. My enquiry was fuelled by ‘seeing the unseen’ and exploring the ephemerality of dance in ways that do not reflect the conventional relationship of photography and dance (Reason, M. 2004), and why many dance artists appear keen to be photographed despite it being a still medium.
Chapter 3 From I to We: Collaboration and Expanded Authorship

With each successive developmental work it became apparent that collaboration was key to creating the work I sought. The protocols around these works went from dialogical (figs 12, 13, 14, 16 & 20) to collaborative (figs 1 to 4, 15, 23 & 28) over the course of the year. The developmental works started out as an exploration of movement and progressed to become performances about ideas in their own right.

The process of collaboration was iterative. In each of the projects with Hemopo, Delarbarca and particularly McCall, we created, reviewed and reworked each step of the project as we went along. At the end of each series of movements we reviewed the images in the camera together, which the dancers found unique and intriguing. Dancers, as opposed to choreographers it appears, rarely have input into the selection of images and often do not see their own image until it is published. As we progressed, we reviewed and made changes through discussion. As a result of the developmental works with Hemopo and Delarbarca, the key components of collaboration were established including that the collaborator was recognised as co-creator in the production of the artwork and had equal access to the resulting images and associated writing.

Because An Oxymoronic Endeavour with McCall was about both photography and dance it needed the input of both photographer and choreographer. Each artist had different interests and ideas to input into the project but had the same interest in producing the outcome i.e. an artwork. To achieve this type of creative artwork each artist was in creator mode. Each was interested in, and had mutual trust and respect for the other’s discipline and each had responsibility and ownership of the outcome. The provocations, embodied knowledge and decisions were richer for encompassing the views of artists in two distinctly different disciplines. That one of the collaborators was also the subject also affected the results in that the subject had input from being in front of the camera as well as providing ideas. This was a very different situation to where one party is serving the other as in a photographer documenting dance or a dancer providing a subject for a photographer.

Relevant to the subject of collaboration is that Daniel Palmer (2017) proposed that, since the 1960s, there has been a move in photography away from the conventions of art-history and art-market discourse, which frame photography as ‘an art of individuals who produce discreet works’, towards an increase in collaborative work and expanded authorship. (Palmer, M. 2017). Collaborations between choreographers and dancers, composers, designers and dramaturges have existed.
for centuries (Parmenter, M. 2015). However, collaborations between photographers and choreographers appear to be rare.

In 1964 Marshall McLuhan declared “nobody can commit photography alone” (McLuhan, M. 1964 in Diack. H. 2011). Palmer, by emphasising that photography is a social rather than a solitary act, supports this declaration. While stated in the context of photography’s effect of speeding up temporal sequence, McLuhan’s declaration fits with my objectives for this research. My research aimed to establish the extent of the photographer/choreographer collaborations, both internationally and in New Zealand, and how our artwork relates to this landscape.

In a similar vein to Palmer (2017), collaborators Jenny Gillam and Eugene Hansen (2016) state that a broader perspective on collaboration has resulted from renewed interest in the strategies of 1960s post object art and artists. (Gillam, J. & Hansen, E. in Bacharach, Booth, and Fjærerstad 2016). Bacharach, Booth and Fjærerstad also propose that collaboration in the arts is now more of a necessity of artistic survival than a choice to make a specific artistic statement. (Bacharach, S., Fjærerstad, S. B. & Booth, J.N. (Ed) (2016). As a starting point, Palmer points to the archetypal figure of the 'lone photographer' as a persistent myth and the idea of the intrepid, typically male, ‘photographer-as-lone-adventurer who bears witness to the
world’ as an outdated reflection of ‘art-market’ and commercial drivers. Susan Sontag (1977: 119) recognised photography as “an acute manifestation of the individual ‘I’”. Gillam and Hansen (2016) also propose that the belief in the myth of the ‘artist alone’ is outdated and, while artists’ collaboration remains largely unrecognised, artists do not operate in a void. (Gillam, J. & Hansen, E. 2016).


Another personal motivation to collaborate with the subject is my unease with the concept of the photographer controlling the subject. Palmer describes this as “one-eye one-finger bearing witness to and thereby controlling the subject” (Palmer, D. 2017). My aim was to adopt a more synergistic, collaborative and creative approach where the subject has ‘agency’ in his or her own representation. I chose to work in collaboration with choreographers and dancers as these artists are trained to create as well as perform, including in front of a camera. Prior knowledge of each other was a definite advantage and motivator in the choice of collaborator. Palmer
also promotes broader forms of authorial involvement as more relevant today. (Palmer, D. 2017). Similarly, Gillam and Hansen suggest that collaboration, including unacknowledged collaboration, is both increasing and no longer an unrecognised experimental practice. (Gillam. J. and Hansen. E. 2016).

Evidence of increased collaboration from the 1960s onwards exists between choreographers and other artists including filmmakers, photographers, musicians and others. Notable examples include works involving the Judson Dance Theatre (Banes, S. 1982), John Cage & Merce Cunningham, Yvonne Rainer (Archias, E. 2016), Yves Klein, Pina Bausch and Trisha Brown among many others. Collaborations with photographers appear to be less prevalent than other disciplines, with the primary relationship of photography to dance remaining that of documenter.

Relevant to our collaboration are the principles of contemporary photographic collaborators Adam Broomberg and Oliver Chanarin. Their strategy has evolved in opposition to what they call ‘the shooter’ approach in which a sole photographer decides on all the elements of the image. (Broomberg and Chanarin quoted in Lehan 2006 in Palmer, D. 2017). Broomberg and Chanarin’s projects are often more ‘performed’ rather than ‘taken’ and the person who finally clicks the shutter is irrelevant. The clicking of the shutter is the result of a conversation and discussion leading to conceptually informed decision making rather than lone intuition. (Lass & Smyth 2010: 47). Many of Broomberg and Chanarin’s projects reflect ideas of performance, collaboration and expanded authorship, which are relevant to our work. Photographers Wendy Ewald and Sharon Lockhart’s collaborations with children, in which each photographer aimed to create environments for the children to express their own voice, are also relevant to our artwork. As noted earlier, McCall and I chose various methods to decide who and when the shutter was clicked, including taking it in turns, using the rhythm of the breath or the count of the dance phrase. On occasions, the camera overrode our decisions when it did not achieve focus at the required instant and therefore became the third author in the photo session.

Berensmeyer, Buellens and Demoor (2012) point out that different periods, disciplines and cultural fields have different concepts of authorship. Similar to Palmer’s description of the archetypal lone photographer, they describe reliance on the solitary genius, which appeared in the Romantic period, as the ‘strong’ model of authorship. They describe the opposite to this as a ‘weak’ model of authorship being more prevalent where multiple authors may be involved but remain unrecognised. Like Palmer (2017), they propose that the digital era appears to favour a collaborative model due to the predominance of content shared on line.
Consequently, they propose a more holistic approach to authorship. An opponent to this idea is Jaron Lanier (2010) who sees the loss of the individual author as loss of individual agency, responsibility and control. (Lanier 2010 in Berensmeyer, Buellens and Demoor, 2012). While Lanier makes a point, my concern is the appropriate acknowledgement of the authors in the work. Palmer’s, (2017) and Berensmeyer, Buellens and Demoor’s (2012) proposals are particularly relevant to work with contemporary dancers as these artists draw ideas from multiple contemporary sources. (Berensmeyer, I., Buellens, G., & Demoor, M. 2012). Berensmeyer, Buellens and Demoor’s (2012) proposal on authorship in the digital era is relevant to our work as it developed into ‘performative’ photography (refer Chapter 5), which represents a shift in the way dance work may be created and consumed, particularly on line.

Dance in this context, with the exception of a solo choreographer performer, like photography “cannot be committed alone”. (McLuhan, M. 1964). Dance is an art that is either ‘made on’ the dancers by the choreographer or more commonly now, particularly in contemporary dance, made with the choreographic input of the dancers. Even the solo choreographer performer has to collaborate with the composer, lighting, set and costume designers. There is a prevalence of collaboration in contemporary dance although this, as in photography, does not always translate into expanded authorship and recognition of all creators in the team as author.

As Walter Benjamin states, authority is also linked with authorship (Benjamin, W. 2008). This principal further fuelled my quest to establish co-authorship of the production of the artwork and consequently the artwork of An Oxymoronic Endeavour is jointly owned by McCall and I, with each having access to both the artwork and the writing, with joint discussion for any future use. The titling of the images took careful consideration to acknowledge the collaborators, particularly as one of the collaborators was also the subject.

Collaboration is often seen as a process of each person contributing equally (Gillam, J. & Hansen, E. 2016). However, ensuring that ideas, decision-making and authorship of the artwork were shared rather than equal, according to each person’s interest and availability, was vital to our collaboration. Ethics approval (low risk) was sought. Given that the intellectual property, input and risks are similar this put us both in a low risk situation with regard to potential future use and developments. Trust is a vital component in collaboration and McCall and I know each other well and have worked together before on different projects. We have built mutual trust.
over time which enriches the collaboration and provides a degree of safety for each of us.

Collaboration, as I have found, does not necessarily equate to expanded authorship. Photographer Manual Vason’s *Double exposures* (2015) is a book of collaborative projects with other artists, including dance photographer Hugo Glendinning. However, Vason is credited as sole author, which appears to be in opposition to the objectives of collaboration on which the book is set. (Vason, M. 2015). Similarly, photographer Lois Greenfield refers to collaboration in much of her work with dancers, however the sole author is invariably Greenfield. (Greenfield. L. Retrieved 30 July 2017 from [http://www.loisgreenfield.com](http://www.loisgreenfield.com)). On the other hand Finnish artists Sasha Huber and Petri Saarikko’s performance-based work made for the film *Remedies* (2016) acknowledges and names all the participants as co-authors. Saarikko states that his work often challenges artists’ authorship and seeks to expose power relations to make room for individual narratives. (Saarikko, P. 2015).

The process of collaboration and expanded authorship is as important to our work as the outcome. It is likely to continue beyond the life of these current works, again reflecting Parmenter’s (2015) views on the fundamental nature of the ‘process’ in the context of dance and photography.
Figure 17. Walmsley, C. Photograph. (2014). *Daniel Cooper in Poipoia* by Kelly Nash, Wellesley Studios, Auckland, New Zealand.
Chapter 4  Agency, Power, and Authority

Some of the key drivers that led me to work in collaboration with my subject included my desire to re-balance the ‘photographer’s prerogative/privilege’ with the ‘agency’ of the subject and the link between authority and authorship.

A key personal motivation to work in collaboration is my discomfort with the concept of the photographer’s power to control the subject. Several developmental works highlighted concerns around the ‘agency’ (capacity to act) of the subject and my desire to create a working environment where inputs, control and decision-making were distributed and where both the photographer and subject had ‘agency’ and authorship.

In this context ‘agency’ is used to describe the capacity of a person to act in any given environment. In specific relation to dance professionals, ‘embodied agency’ can be described as people acting in ways that are coherent with their personality, a sense of self-assertion and qualities of everyday activity through which ‘we become who we are’ (Satama, S. 2017).

A series of developmental works entitled Still Moving were responsible for focusing my attention on the ‘agency’ of the subject. Viewer responses showed that the subject in Still Moving 6, (fig. 19, a self-portrait), and in the image of dancer Daniel Cooper, in Poipoia by choreographer Kelly Nash (fig. 17), exhibited agency. Conversely, the subjects in Still Moving 9 (Fig. 18) and Still Moving 5, 8, 10, 11 and 15 (figs. 29 to 33. Refer Appendix 2), did not. On examination it would be more accurate to say that, in these latter images, the subject was acting with an aim to satisfy my wishes rather than achieve a mutual exchange. In Still Moving 9 I saw a potentially loaded narrative with the inclusion of the kitchen knife. However, I resisted giving too many indicators to the subject in order to allow her to create her own narrative. I was also conscious not to ask her to act too far outside her personality. The resulting image can be read as loaded. However, I question whether the subject has ‘agency’ because the exchange was uneven. The motivation behind the image was mine, the subject was ‘acting a part’ to produce an image for me, and the character or situation was removed from whom, I believe, she really is. ‘Agency’, I conclude, is less visible in situations of uneven exchange.
This situation reflects anthropologist Marcel Mauss’ early (1920) concept of ‘social contract based on exchange’ as a fundamental concept of social theory. Mauss proposed that understanding the symbolic power of the exchange relationship and the recognition of the agency of individuals is fundamental to understanding ways societies operate (Durden, M. & Richardson, C. 2000). Gierstberg (1990) offers an alternative view on the question of agency by suggesting that we are not our natural selves when we pose for the camera and that a portrait is always a construction in which we try to live up to the image of ourselves that we wish to project. (Dujardin, P., Visschedijk, R., Loakimidis, V. & Gierstberg, F. (Eds). 2015).

The basis of the relationship between photographer and subject is implicit in the codes of the photographic genre. (Durden, M & Richardson, C. 2000). My developmental works highlighted that the outcomes of posing for the camera depended on the relationship between photographer and subject. In Mauss’ terms it represented the moment of exchange. The pose for the camera represents the value or form of the transaction. The fact that agency was unclear raised questions around the social exchange that was taking place.
Photographer Raymond Depardon’s work *Contacts #3*, made at the San Clemente Asylum in Italy, was particularly relevant at this point. This work comprises unedited photographic film contact sheets videoed in sequence. Like *Creating the Phrase* and *Performing the Phrase*, this work includes all the frames, irrespective of their merit, which represents an uncommon approach to selection and display and also represents temporality. As in the photograph of Daniel Cooper (fig. 17), in which I selected one of a series to enlarge, Depardon selected specific images by pausing the video. *Contacts #3* is an example of the sequential conception which came back into force in the 1960s. (Guido, L. & Lugon, O. 2012). *Contacts #3* also highlights issues of ‘agency’ of the subject and the role of the photographer as Depardon describes himself as a voyeur moving along corridors of the asylum, as a victim or aggressor.

As a result of my findings on ‘agency’ and authorship, the developmental works with dancers Delarbarca (figs. 13, 14 & 20) and Hemopo (figs. 12 & 16) produced very different results. My aim in these works was to create a dialogical situation where the subject was more an equal collaborator and that the relationship allowed them true ‘agency’ in their own representation. To do this I invited the dancers to select the location and base the actual photographic session around their own ideas. Delarbarca selected to respond to an urban industrial design and Hemopo responded to vertical and curved architecture. In both situations the choreographer/dancer was free to design their own representation. In many instances they selected the moment of capture by pausing their body placement, which indicated to me the instant they had selected. Delarbarca, Hemopo and McCall display agency for a number of reasons. Firstly, they are trained performers and creators who are comfortable in front of the camera. Secondly, they are collaborators and co-authors as well as subject.

Central to the artwork was that mutual decisions were made at each step of the project. The *Performing the Phrase* images of McCall present the subject in flesh-coloured dance clothes and revealing dance moves, which could be read as not ‘correct technique’. Therefore joint selection of images and their mode of presentation was essential. This focus on consent appears to be relatively rare outside of collaborative projects. Reflecting my aims, Cecilia Järdenmar (2015) promotes the idea that it is possible to change the relationship between photographer and subject, commonly constructed as a power relationship, to one of empathic accord. (Järdenmar, C. 2015).
Allan Sekula draws a symbolic parallel between the camera and the gun. The use of terminology such as ‘point’, ‘take’, ‘capture’ and ‘shoot’ represents the symbolic ‘power of the image machine over its prey’. (Sekula, A. in Palmer 2017). This parallel of the photographer’s ‘prerogative’ or ‘privilege’ equating to power over the subject has influenced my working style and interest in working in collaboration with the subject. Similarly, Steve Edwards (1990) suggests that the photographic studio represents abstract principles around power and control. Edwards proposes that the studio is the place where the photographer has ultimate control over the representation of the subject, which can be seen as a monological (one way) situation. In situations outside the studio, the photographer has less authority and control and therefore the subject is likely to be more responsive to self-representation, creating a more dialogical (two way) situation. (Durden, M. & Richardson, C. 2000).

A project with similar motivations and outcomes to some of my developmental work is photographer Rineke Dijkstra’s *The BuzzClub* (1996) with teenagers in a nightclub. Dijkstra creates an interesting balance between the potential control of the photographer, operating in a makeshift studio space in a nightclub, and the teenagers taking control of their own self-representation. As a result of being allowed time, their self-consciousness is replaced by self-absorption. As a result they reveal a certain authenticity of the self as the product of a dialogical process”. (Durden, M. & Richardson, C. 2000). The subjects speak for themselves as the result of a negotiation in a collaborative space. *The BuzzClub* is an example of one of Dijkstra’s projects that take place in a transitional space, as ours did in *The Liminal Space*. (fig. 4).

My goal was to reduce or remove the power struggle. Money has a key impact on power relationships and ownership. When the photographer pays a model to pose for the camera the photographer holds the position of power. Similarly, when the subject pays the photographer to take their portrait the power balance is reversed. (Durden, M. & Richardson, C. 2000). Therefore it was vital that no money changed hands in any of my projects. In my collaborative projects the balance of power was sensitive and both parties needed to be alert to any changes that might affect or break down the effectiveness of the collaboration.
Figure 19. Walmsley, C. Photograph. (2016). *Still Moving Portrait 6 - self portrait*
Chapter 5 Performative Photography: Performance for the Camera - An Oxymoronic Moment

A key oxymoronic moment in the development of our work occurred with the discovery that all the principals developed had led me to work in a form of performance for camera and that form had a name. Up to this point I had searched for a new personal aesthetic but did not know what it was and how it was referred to in the photographic literature. Simon Baker and Fiontan Moran describe the form that Hemopo, Delarbarca, McCall and I used as ‘performative’ photography, a combination of performer and photographer in which the performance exists only for the resulting image. (Baker, S. & Moran. F. 2016). Lori Pauli describes a similar concept, involving still subjects rather than performance, as ‘staged’ photography. (Pauli, L. 2006). These descriptions link with Parmenter’s theories on ‘taking’ versus ‘creating’ and Reason’s theories on ‘revelatory’ versus ‘representational’ forms of photography.

The implications of working in this mode are not just about the methods of creation and display of the artwork. In terms of photography and dance, they also challenge the traditional paradigm with regard to how the work is created and consumed. ‘Performative’ photography is a new paradigm for combining dance and photography in that the choreography and resulting dance is not created for live performance, as in the traditional paradigm, but for exhibition, print or on-line consumption. This changes the way in which the work needs to be created, the way it is consumed as well as the potential audience.

The birth of ‘performance art’ or ‘performative’ photography can be traced to the seminal images of Yves Klein, Harry Shunk and Janos Kenders’ Into the Void (1960) (fig. 21) and Aaron Siskind’s Pleasures and Terrors of Levitation 1956-65. Both of these works were performances made for camera and marked the departure from photographs of performances to ‘performative’ photography (Baker, S. & Moran. F. 2016). Interestingly, Into the Void has come to be recognised as a classic of this type of photography and was remade by Yasumasa Morimura in 2010 as A Requiem: Theater of Creativity/Self-Portrait as Yves Klein.

As in our artwork, ‘performative’ photography exists as single images or large series. A notable example of both single and series images is Trisha Brown’s (1973) Woman Down the Ladder created with photographer Babette Mangolte. (Teicha, H. 2003). The series work of Japanese photographer Eikoh Hosoe is also significant to our ‘performative’ photography and collaboration. Hosoe’s works in the publication
Dance Experience (1960 & 1961) and the photobook Kamaitachi (1969) (Baker, S. & Moran, F. 2016), (fig 22) were made in collaboration with Tatsumi Hijikata, (the founder of the Butoh dance movement). The latter brings the performing artist and photographer together in one work in which both are credited as author.

There are few, if any, examples of ‘performative’ photography in New Zealand. The closest I have found is choreographer Carol Brown’s 1000 LOVERS (2013). Brown, C. Retrieved 26th July 2017 from http://www.carolbrowndances.com. This choreographic work was also translated into a large-scale photographic work that co-existed alongside the performance.

Due to the marriage of performance and photography, ‘performative’ photography by its very nature is often collaborative. ‘Performative’ photography has developed since the 1960s, which also links it with Palmer’s (2017) proposal on the increase in collaboration since the 1960s. My research shows that the genre of ‘performative’ photography between photographers and dancers is not as populated as one might assume given the prevalence of both photography and dance performance over the last century. However, notable examples of dance designed for the movie camera exist. The parallel practice of choreography designed for the movie camera, with movements prescribed by the camera’s frame, also developed in the 1960s. (Porter, J. 2009). Meyer Deren’s 1945 film A Study in Choreography for Camera led the way

‘Performative’ photography raises interesting questions about where the meaning of the resulting artwork resides i.e. in its original performance or in the resulting ‘performative’ images, in the idea or in its subsequent display in another context. (Doherty, C. 2004). In our work, much of the meaning for us is in the original collaborative performance experience. Encouragingly, McCall believes that the ideas we started out with inevitably seep through to the final work even if not consciously. However, for the viewer the meaning can only exist in the resulting images, which particularly without access to the accompanying writing, will be imbued by the viewer’s own experience and interpretation.

The relationship between photography and performance is complicated and balances on a sliding scale from pure documentary to a full collaboration in which photography is recognised for its contribution to the creation. This depends on the aims intention, authorship, experience, vision and integrity of the parties. (Baker, S. & Moran, F. 2016). While I have found that the majority of photographic images

Fig. 22. Eikoh Hosoe with Tatsumi Hijikata. Photograph. (1969). *Kamaitachi*
involving dancers still appear to fulfill the role of the ‘revelatory’ authority (Reason, M. 2004), there is evidence to support a change and expansion in the relationship of photography to dance. These include ‘representational’ artwork and ‘performative’ photography made solely for the resulting images. (Reason, M. 2004, and Jobey. L. 2016). My own early work has moved from ‘revelatory’ to collaborative ‘performative’ photography with Hemopo, Delarbarca and McCall.

Photography and dance have had a long, co-dependent relationship. No sooner had photographic equipment advanced sufficiently to capture movement, even in its most basic form, then photographers turned to dancers to record or create photographic works around complex movement. Similarly, senior New Zealand choreographer MaryJane O’Reilly has stated, “Photography is vital to capturing the ephemerality of dance”. (O’Reilly, M.J to Celia Walmsley, C 2015). As Reason describes, the methods for expressing the essence of dance in photography are changing. Whereas early photographers focused on freezing movement, as photographic equipment advanced and high-speed shutters have frozen time, it could be argued that the representation of movement has completely disappeared. We now look to new ways to express movement such as multi-shot, flash, blur, collage and abstraction. (Reason, M. 2004). Nevertheless, the relationship between photography and dance has, for over a century and a half, remained much the same. With photography being the faithful recorder of dance and dance being the enticing subject of photography, each has maintained its independence and authorship.

Now, with the development of ‘performative’ photography, I propose, that photographers and choreographers / dancers have arrived at the position where they can be collaborators and artistic equals in the creation of new work with joint outcomes and authorship.

An Oxymoronic Endeavour - out take
Chapter 6  To Flirt with Terpsichore*

*Terpsichore – ‘delight in dancing’. Terpsichore was one of the nine muses and Goddess of dance and chorus who lends her name to the word ‘terpsichorean’ meaning ‘of or relating to dance’.

My final question in this research was how Palmer’s (2017) proposal is evidenced in the work of photographers working with dance today. A plethora of ‘How to photograph dance’ guides and sumptuous art-style books of exquisite dance exist such as Lois Greenfield’s *Moving Still*. (Greenfield, L. 2015). However, little writing appears to exist on collaborations between photographer and choreographer/dancer. Some of the most esteemed photographers working with dance today include Lois Greenfield (USA), Hugo Glendinning, Bill Cooper and Chris Nash (UK), Greg Barrett and James Houston (Australia), Maarten vanden Abeele (Germany) and John McDermott, Stephen A’Court and Jose Cano (New Zealand).

These photographers’ work range from the pure ‘revelatory’ to ‘representational’. Many refer to their work as art or collaborations in varying ways. However, few show evidence of collaborative ‘performative’ art and/or expanded authorship.

Nash, Glendinning and Cooper have all worked in ‘representational’ dance photography (Dalva et al, 1993) while others, such as J. Abbott Miller, Patsy Tarr, Sandra Lee and Thomas Hunt, work with straight documentary. (Lee, S. & Hunt, T. 1998). Greenfield and Barrett have made much ‘revelatory’ fine art images, many of which make little sense without the camera (Barrett, G. 1999). Greenfield describes her work as isolated instants that are not plucked from a continuum, which is contrary to McCall’s and my intention. (Retrieved 8th September, 2017 from [http://www.loisgreenfield.com](http://www.loisgreenfield.com)). Greenfield also describes some of her work as collaborations. However, the dancers are usually named as subjects, if at all, rather than co-authors. (Ewing, W. & Greenfield, L. 2015). While a similar aesthetic to Greenfield, New Zealand photographer Amber Griffin’s award winning work with dancers is classed by the New Zealand Institute of Professional Photography (NZIPP) as commercial rather than art due to its use in advertising. American photographer Steve Clarke, on the other hand, explores the collaborative and creative process in the development of choreography for performance rather than capturing perfect technique. (Clarke, S. 2004)

Of these international photographers, Glendinning has also over the course of his career moved from ‘representational’ to ‘collaborative’ work, including with many performance companies. Interestingly, numerous images of Glendinning’s collaborations display the copyright of the artist/collaborator rather than Glendinning,

McDermott, A’Court and Cano describe their work with dancers in various forms of informal rather than formal collaborations. McDermott provides a valuable perspective on collaboration likening it to mutual trust, which is an essential foundation to any project with dancers. Trust, he says, is essential with dancers for their emotional and physical well-being in the hands of other people – they have to allow trust and to be trusted. Therefore, McDermott, equates trust with collaboration. (McDermott, J. 2017. Refer Appendix 6). A’Court similarly describes the need for trust as the basis of his work with dancers. He considers much of his work requires collaboration even when the project is not specifically named as collaboration. The degree of collaboration depends on the experience and ideas that the dancer brings to the photo session. The more prepared the dancer is with ideas the better the outcome even in a commercial situation. (A’Court, S. 2017. Refer Appendix 4).
A’Court also notes that sometimes projects named as collaborations turn out not as true collaborations when dancers find it hard to break with the tradition of seeing the photographer as the documenter of their work rather than a collaborative artist. A’Court notes too that, when dealing with dance companies, irrespective of the skill and renown of the photographer or the artistic merits of the image, the acceptance of each image is subject to ‘sign off’ by the dance company’s artistic director. (Cleave, P. 2015).

New Zealand photographer Jose Cano’s work with dancers underwater could be described as a form of ‘performative’ photography. Cano considers that he works in collaboration on several levels depending on whether he is a witness to the work of the dancer or in a more directorial role. In the latter, where specific outcomes
are required, Cano considers himself to be the author. However, the dancers are credited. (Cano, J. 2017. Refer Appendix 7).

New Zealand photographer Victoria Ginn (2005) was perhaps ahead of her time in creating ‘performative’ photography (fig. 25). Ginn describes her work as a ‘collaborative essay’ authored by her (camera/film/visual discipline) with dancers/

performance artists who agreed to share their creative originality with her. Due to the inclusion of nudity and to protect the privacy of the other artists, Ginn did not include their names. (Ginn, V. 2017. Refer Appendix 5).

McDermott, A’Court, Ginn and Cano all consider and deal with authorship in different ways. Each acknowledged that they had not really considered the question of expanded authorship when working with dance collaborators. However, each stated that their awareness had increased subsequent to our conversations. On this point Cano states “you have raise[d] a very interesting point that surely is going to change the way I credit the dancers I work with!!”. (Refer Appendices 4, 5, 6 & 7).

Reflecting Palmer’s (2017) proposal, there is growing evidence of unconscious or inherent collaboration between photographers and dancers. However, evidence of conscious collaboration with expanded authorship remains scarce both internationally and in New Zealand. There is, however, growing evidence of conscious collaboration between choreographers, filmmakers and multimedia artists in New Zealand. Examples include choreographer Loughlan Prior’s (Royal New Zealand Ballet) collaboration with cinematographer Ryan Fielding for the dance film Mystery House (2013) in which the choreography was devised for the camera and

Looking ahead, senior New Zealand choreographer Carol Brown’s recent collaborations *SINGULARITY* (2016) and *We Are Here and We Are Everywhere At Once* (2017) give an indication of where collaborative work between choreographers, photographers, film makers and digital artists may head in the future. These works blend data, dance, music and creative technologies in an immersive performance, coupling dancer and data shapes. (Retrieved 30 July, 2017 from www.carolbrowndances.com).

Evidence of expanded authorship is variable in collaborations between photographers and dancers both internationally and in New Zealand. However, the collaborations in which Brown is involved clearly name all the creative collaborators.


Figure 27. A’Court, S. Photograph. (2012). *Still Dancing, Emma Delarbarca.*

An Oxymoronic Endeavour - Performing the Phrase (multi-shot)
Conclusion

My original objective through this thesis was to create artwork with choreographers and dancers. In particular, I aimed to develop a new personal aesthetic in the perceived opposing behaviours of expressing movement in still photographic images.

What I aimed to do, and what McCall and I achieved, is known as ‘performative’ photography, a combination of performer and photographer in which the performance is made for the resulting images rather than for live performance to an audience. This discovery of ‘performative’ photography and what it entails, was, as it turned out, my oxymoronic moment.

Our oxymoronic endeavor is not just about the methods of creation and display of the artwork. It is also about challenging the traditional paradigm with regard to how the work is created and consumed. ‘Performative’ photography is a new paradigm for combining dance and photography in that the choreography and resulting dance is not created for live performance, as in the traditional paradigm, but for exhibition, print or on-line consumption.

Along the journey towards ‘performative’ photography I achieved my aim to break with the traditions of dance photography, which is to freeze time in one perfect image and to be the ‘revelatory authority’ of other artists’ work. Through the process of research and creation of artwork with McCall I achieved the oxymoronic endeavor of creating a ‘representational’ (Reason. M. 2004) expression of movement in still photography. This involved both camera techniques and display methods including multi-shot, blur, allowing the image to break the frame, grid, sequence, and transparency. These methods, I believe, express movement more in the mind of the viewer than a still image of dance is able to achieve.

Before I knew about ‘performative’ photography I recognised that collaboration was an essential part of the work with McCall. Without the nature of collaboration we achieved the work could not have attained its form, depth of ideas or outcomes. In order to achieve collaboration, joint authorship of the production of the artwork was needed because it was not only about the photography but also about the dance making. The collaboration required an iterative process in which McCall and I created, reviewed and reworked each step of the project over and over again in order to achieve the outcomes we both sought.
As a result of this research I also found evidence of increased collaboration between photographers and choreographers/dancers both in New Zealand and overseas. This supports Palmer’s (2016) proposal on the increase in collaboration in photography in general. Much of this collaboration appears to be inherent in the nature of the work between photographers and choreographers and is manifested in the form of trust rather than conscious or named collaboration. (McDermott. J. 2017. Refer Appendix 7). My research has shown that collaboration does not necessarily translate to expanded authorship and that expanded authorship is relatively rare between photographers and choreographers/dancers. My conversations with New Zealand photographers working with dance have therefore posed questions for others to consider.

‘Performative’ photography embracing photography and dance is relatively rare, particularly in New Zealand therefor our artwork contributes to the development of this field of art-making.

I conclude that our artwork is a ‘pas de deux’ for photographer and dancer. Just as a ‘pas de deux’ between two dancers allows one dancer to move in ways that they could not without the other, so the camera allows the dance to be expressed in ways that it could not without the camera and vice versa. Most exciting is that, looking ahead, ‘performative’ photography is still, as Parmenter describes, ‘in process’ and so for me provides an evolving aesthetic for developing other forms and projects in the future.
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Appendix 1. Biography Jessie Rose McCall

Jessie is a freelance dancer and choreographer with a BPSA in Contemporary Dance from Unitec. Jessie has choreographed the full-length works *The Way We Fall* (2014), *Tassel Me This* with Shani Dickins (2015) - winner of Best of Fringe and Best Dance at Dunedin Fringe Festival 2015, *Cover Lover* (2015), and *HEALR* (2016) with Rose Philpott. She has enjoyed performing work by Katie Burton, Kelly Nash, Michael Parmenter, Shona McCullagh, Sarah Knox, Malia Johnston & Sarah Foster-Sproull, among others. She tutors contemporary dance at The Auckland Performing Arts Center and Unitec Institute of Technology. Jessie is a fan of glitter, documentaries and 80s music, and is the founder of All You Can Eat Productions. She is currently pursuing a Masters in Psychotherapy at Auckland University of Technology.
Appendix 2. Developmental Works - *Moving Portraits*

Figure 29. Walmsley, C. Photograph. (2016). *Still Moving 10*

Figure 30. Walmsley, C. Photograph. (2016). *Still Moving 5*
Appendix 3  What is Contemporary Dance?

Contemporary dance is a style of dance influenced by early modern, postmodern and contemporary choreographers. Csaba Steven Buday (2006) summarises contemporary dance succinctly as ‘a form of dance made in the present day, often reflecting, responding to or commenting on current issues’.

Contemporary dance is influenced by early modern choreographers including (but not limited to) Ruth St Denis, Martha Graham, Doris Humphrey, Jose Limon, Merce Cunningham and post modern movements and choreographers including Judson Dance Theatre, Yvonne Rainer, Trisha Brown, Twyla Thorpe, Shiobhan Davis, William Forsythe, and Pina Bausch. Influential contemporary choreographers are too many to list but include Jiri Killian, Birgit Culberg, Mats Ek, Javier de Frutos, Shobana Jeyasingh, Akram Khan, Hofesh Shechter and Ohad Naharin. Key influencers in New Zealand include Douglas Wright, Michael Parmenter, Shona McCullough, MaryJane O’Reilly, Louise Poutiki Bryant, Carol Brown, Lemi Ponefacio, Daniel Belton, Neil Irimea, Moss Paterson, Kelly Nash, Malia Johnson and Sarah Foster-Sproull among many others.

Appendix 4
Interview with New Zealand dance photographer, Stephen A’Court, 21 August 2017, Wellington

I don’t have any training in dance so I completely rely on artistic directors and dancers who know about technique and who know about the conventions and tell me whether I’m doing the right thing or not otherwise I’d be making terrible mistakes.

Palmer’s proposal on move towards collaboration since 1960. Looking to see if there is evidence here in NZ and with photographers working in dancers.

What is your general mode of working with regard to authorship i.e. are you usually the sole author of the images?

If there were commercial opportunities for the images that I create my stand is that I refer to them beforehand, explain what it is and share any proceeds. They are bringing their own ideas, something of themselves, to that session that I’m allowed to capture. I do see the images belonging to me but in practice when it comes to exploiting the images I believe that is something that should be shared not a complete blank slate to do whatever you want.

In what situations would you be co or joint author?

Has there been a change in authorship for you personally in recent years?

Still Dancing was a collaboration with NZSD – was it also a collaboration with each of the dancers?

Yes, to a greater and lesser extent. Not everybody came along to the session with as much of an idea as others. Some people had thought about it a lot beforehand such as costuming and location and had created stuff to put in the background. Other individuals came along with no idea whatsoever so we’d make up some stuff. Was there was a correlation between the most successful images and those people who came prepared? Totally.

The choice of when to press the shutter was entirely mine. The dancer(s) talked in general terms about what they wanted (e.g. what part of the body to focus on).

Did the dancers contribute to the ideas in the project?

Yes (e.g. using flour)

Was the identity of the dancers important or were they primarily models for the NZSD 40th birthday?

The dancers were incidental to that 40th year, by accident of time they were the ones who were graduating from the school that year.

Would you consider that they were solo works by the photographer (authored by the photographer) or made in collaboration with the dance artists? Who do you consider was the author of each image? Do you consider that you are the author of those images?
No, I’m very conscious that what I’m photographing is somebody else’s intellectual property so I make a distinction between the photographs and the work that I’m photographing. I do a lot of photographs of original artwork so I’m very clear in my mind that the images that I create of the artwork are mine but the objects I’m creating are somebody else’s. I’m very careful about keeping them private and respecting other people’s ownership of them. When I’m working with dancers … I don’t recall a time where I’ve ever created a dance work /photograph that I consider entirely my own.

If you’re working with a student for their portfolio and it’s a young student looking for something for their portfolio, do you consider that to be a collaboration?
To a lesser extent because they’re bringing less to the table …. but if they’re older, yeah, if they’re older I get them to bring along their dance friends to turn it into a bit of a group thing where they all keep an eye on each other. I quite like those little group sessions. I’d work with 3 or 4 dancers which is ideal and they all have a little go. They all come along with some pictures and they have some ideas in their head and they all have a go and everyone stands around me and the other dancers and they’ll say “That’s not working” and then someone else will have a go and I’ll find my light is in the wrong place so I ask them “Can you do it around the other way because of the light” or I’ll change the lighting. Or “I like what you’re doing but it’s not working for the camera”.

The dancers were named as subjects were they also named as authors?
No, they weren’t. It’s not a question that was ever properly addressed or answered.

Do you do personal projects outside commercial work? Are these generally solo or do you do any in collaboration with other people?
I do a lot of private sessions with dancers for their portfolios. I’m doing it to extend myself. I love shooting stuff with dancers where the result doesn’t matter quite so much.

Have you noticed any change in the photography world towards increase in collaborations or do you think that the majority of photographers work on their own?
I can’t say that I have but then I don’t spend a lot of time sitting back and looking at it. For myself absolutely. For almost all of my work there are 3 legs to my pictures – me, the artistic director who is giving an overall thing and the dancer themselves all bringing something or other. It’s always been that way – I can’t say whether it’s more or less, certainly not less. I’m totally inspired by that idea (collaboration creating a work), I’d love to be able suggest some projects to the companies I work with.
Appendix 5
Letters from photographer Victoria Ginn on her photographic work *Figure in the New Zealand Landscape*

21 August 2017
Dear Celia,

I have skimmed over your request/s and it will require more than ‘a few minutes’ of my brain-time to answer the questions.

You mention *Figure in the NZ Landscape* – a ‘collaborative essay’ authored by me (camera/film/visual discipline) involving both Nature (landscape-weather- time of day) and dancers/performance artists who agreed to share their various creative originality with me, for the purposes of my marrying their aesthetic with empathetic landscapes. Sometimes the reverse occurred – whereby a dancer/performer conformed to the mood of a landscape.

I never invaded a dancer’s particular genius/moment of dance expression. Despite some critics saying my images are ‘posed’. Always they (still image) is a flash of a second – a moment of artistic-marriage determined by my eye during a performance/dance.

In *Figure in the NZ Landscape* I included nudes . To protect the privacy of models and dancers I did not include personal names in my book – but you will have noted Red Mole, Limbs, NZ Ballet and other names. Maybe I ought to have given more attention to personal identities of those who participated, but then it might be argued that as the dancers were in a transformed state of otherness at the moment of an image being created, personal identities were insignificant. But, again, I might have caused some offense by my lack of name inclusion. (To be honest I couldn’t recall everyone’s names).

‘The Spirited Earth’ took another tack; I was working with conservative forms of traditional expression pertaining to cultures foreign to me. But again, and for the above reasons, I say I am ‘author’ of the images.

If it were simply a matter of placing a dancer/performer in a white background and documenting their movements/performances, it could be argued that they (dancers/performers) are author of the resultant images, as the photographer in this instance is merely recording what the dancer owns/expresses. I do not identify with this stance in any of my work, as it required a degree of creative genius on my part to marry landscape and dancer/performer in a way that deepened/revealed the message/relationship of both.
With my documentary portraiture the same applies – but we could get quite tangled here.

Paul Jenden and I shared a lovely artistic relationship, for a time. I remain grateful to having known him, and Lois.

Almost all of my work is collaborative on one level or another.
I was horrified by the movement in the 1970’s street photography that saw the wanna-be’s using wide angle lenses to shoot innocent pedestrians, then calling themselves photographic artists.
Documentary photography, and photography in general, is an art form that requires sensitivity and empathy, but is prone to attracting predators, and fraudsters.
No-one has looked at my work with seriousness. I am outside the institutional.

Does this assist?

Am happy to speak more but not all at once.

Victoria

20th August 2017

Kia Ora Victoria

This is Celia Walmsley. I’m an admirer of your work and particularly your work with dancers in Figure in the NZ Landscape and the Spirited Earth. I’m a photographer completing Master Fine Arts (Photography) at Massey University in Wellington. My personal photographic work is mainly with dancers and choreographers and my Master’s work and exegesis is around Daniel Palmer’s proposal in Photography & Collaboration (2017) on the move towards collaborative photographic work since the 1960.

If you can spare a few minutes I would love to ask you a few questions about your work Figure in the NZ Landscape and the Spirited Earth as I can only find a little writing on these works. If it’s easier to talk by phone then I would be happy to call you or meet in person.

I’m particularly interested in any collaborative aspects of the work with the dancers - if any. I recognise some of the dancers including the lovely and sorely missed Paul Jenden and Lois Solino and I think there are other faces in there that I recognise. (I worked as CEO and Programme Director at St James Theatre and Opera House in Wellington from 1999 - 2011, which is where I knew Paul and Lois, and then as Director of Tempo Dance Festival from 2012 - 2015). I’m now focused on photography both commercial and artistic.

May I ask you about the relationship of the photographer and models/dancers - particularly in the Figure
in the NZ Landscape work. For example:

Would you consider that these were solo works by the photographer (authored by the photographer) or made in collaboration with the dance artists? What was your relationship with the dancers – e.g. were they hired models who fulfilled a brief, friends who were helping out, professional artistic collaborators or what was the relationship? Did the dancers contribute to the ideas in the project and if so in what way? Was the identity of the dancers important or were they solely there as models (I can't find any reference to their names or identity). Would you consider the dancers to have been co-authors in any way? If you can point me to any writing about your work outside your website that would be great.

Finally would you be happy for me to quote any examples you give in my Masters exegesis with full credit of course?

Many thanks and I look forward to hearing from you.
Nga mihi nui

Celia
Appendix 6

Notes from conversation with New Zealand dance photographer, John McDermott, 13 September 2017

1. In *Process* - were there aspects of collaboration between you, as photographer and the choreographer and/or dancers? And if so what?

Dancers are more grounded, they work more for each other, they have to trust each other, they grow up very quickly, very inclusive, aware of other people, important for their own mental and physical safety. I have less tolerance for actors over time. Can be very individual. Even see it socially at a party – with actors and dancers there – from 2 different planets.

In Process – question of collaboration – never consciously categorised it as collaboration but assumed it. If you are around them (dancers and choreographers) for a long time they have to trust you and visa versa.

With *Truth By illusion* (book) Douglas Wright – very intense – he has no time for anything that distracts him from what he is doing. To distract him would be the end. Realised how intense the choreographic process is. I was a relative nobody, an unknown at that stage. I was very intense about what I was doing. I think he realised that I was serious and that was enough for him. I represented what he was doing quite honestly. Having those things in common was very important.

Never thought in depth about collaboration but that’s why it worked. Dancers and choreographers are on the bones of their bums – doing it because they love it. It was the same for me – common plight.

Not an academic treaties on collaboration.

There’s a point at which you are ignored, not in a negative sense but to do what you are going to do – part of the group.

Trust is essential with dancers for emotional and physical well being in the hands of other people – have to allow trust and to be trusted.

*Truth By Illusion* vs *Process* (books). *Process* was one company – there from day 1. For *Truth* I was there on and off for short periods of time with the company. I spent more time with the dancers. Moments were fleeting and it’s harder to get what you want. Theatre moves more slowly, more predictably, more time to get what you want. Dancers are easier to work with. They are more an open book once you have their trust. Actors are different.

Question 2. Would you consider any of your other works (or books) to be collaborations between you, as photographer and the choreographer and/or dancers? and if so which and how?

Works with dancers taught me about composition. Especially Douglas Wright. I did a photo essay in the Listener on East Coast Forestry – spent time with shepherds and station owners. I started to look at the way they worked and how they moved as choreography. You could call it street photography – is choreography and dance – station = stage /street. Aspects of collaboration were there with the people – they have to trust you. Collaboration = trust. To get collaboration you have to have trust.

You don’t have time to think consciously – have to have good habits. Best when you don’t have the mind involved. It’s the mind gets you into trouble.
Question 3. Collaboration vs. authorship. Cited Vason and Glendinning as an example of a collaboration between two photographers however one is named as sole author. Tricky without seeing the work. If I got together with dancers to do something photographically I would be explicit about that collaboration. If working with another photographer, even if instigated by me, I would call it co-authorship because both are creating the work/content.

Working with a dance company is different – I do credit the company and whom I’m working with but authorship still comes from you and how you are working with the dancers. Certainly it’s something to be aware of. Interesting about the commercial value of the sole author. Look at fine art photography, photography of celebrity’s works for both – explicit collaboration. This would work for a gallery e.g. Mapplethorpe worked for both parties. Question of authorship. Lois Greenfield photographs forms rather than people.

3. Finally would you be happy for me to quote any examples you give in my Masters exegesis with full credit of course?
Yes.

7th September 2017
Sent by website form to John McDermott

Kia Ora John

May I ask you some questions about the collaborative aspects of your work with dancers and choreographers for my Master Fine Arts (Photography), which I am in the final throws of completing at Massey University in Wellington focusing on dance photography. (I was Director of Tempo Dance Festival based at Wellesley before Carrie Rae Cunningham).

Your book Process has been a key trigger in my research, in which I am quoting and acknowledging the eloquent and well informed words by Michael about your work and the relationship of dance and photography.

My Master’s photographic work is a collaboration with dancer/choreographer Jessie McCall (whom I’m sure you know) and my exegesis is around Daniel Palmer’s proposal in Photography & Collaboration (2017) that there has been a move towards collaborative photographic work since the 1960s. I am tracing evidence of Palmer’s proposal around photographic collaboration specifically in the world of dance photography.

If you can spare a few minutes I would love to ask you a few questions about the collaborative aspects of your work. I’m particularly interested in the collaborative aspects of your work with the dancers - if any.

Michael describes your works with NZDC in Process as ‘revelatory’ or capturing the revelatory moment.
(Reason 2004) and in Process I understand your role to be capturing and expressing in images the process of duration choreographic development. Would I be correct?

My questions are:
1. In Process - were there aspects of collaboration between you, as photographer and the choreographer and/or dancers? And if so what?
2. Would you consider any of your other works (or books) to be collaborations between you, as photographer and the choreographer and/or dancers? and if so which and how?
3. Finally would you be happy for me to quote any examples you give in my Masters exegesis with full credit of course?

Many thanks for your time and consideration and I look forward to hearing from you.
Nga mihi nui

Celia

Celia Walmsley
Appendix 7
Letter from New Zealand dance photographer, Jose Cano, 11 September 2017

Hi Celia!

I hope is what you needed! Let me know if you want anything else!

My questions are:

1. Do you consider your work with dancers to be collaborative and if so how? Can you give any examples please?

Yes, in general, specially working with dancers, I consider a collaboration. But it has several levels of collaboration. On the more collaborative side is when I am more of a witness of the work of the dancer, for example, on my work for the book on NZ dance. The dancer has total freedom to express herself, being the boundaries just the physical limits of the studio or background. And example is the images with Anita Hutchinson, Jesse McCall, and others.

On the other side of a more directed work that, even if it's still highly collaborative in the process, is more directed by me as it has to be part of a longer conceptual and visual scheme. For example is my actual work ‘Humans’ on mental health, where dancers have to act in a very precise way a selected human feeling. The goal is to transmit this same feeling on the person who enters the installation (is a mix of video, images and voice recordings, all underwater) that is a work in which I consider myself the author in general of the full piece, but every dancer is recognised and credited, does it make sense?

2. Do you consider yourself to be the author or are you and the dancer joint authors? (Is answered before, I think…)

For example is the dancer usually named as subject or subject and author? Normally as subject and actor in my new work Aqua Ingravitas and Humans. Or is the dancer unnamed as in model rather than collaborator?

I've seen the names of some dancers on facebook but not on the images on your website. I'm interested in the relationship between photographer and subject. My website makes more difficult to add captions, and is more of a general showcase. Nowadays Facebook and Instagram are the main media I use for promotion. One problem is that Fb is very restrictive on nudity, and some of my images do include nudity as an intrinsic part of the project. So I don't really show this work much. Also, as is waiting to be shown in a gallery there is a certain “image embargo” until the week before the exhibition, so that may explain the lack of information.

Anyway, you have raise a very interesting point that surely is going to change the way I credit the dancers I work with!!

3. Finally would you be happy for me to quote any examples you give in my Masters exegesis with full credit of course? Of course you can dear. Let me know if you need any image.

I hope it has been helpful!

All the best!

Jose

Jose G.Cano Underwater Fine Art Photography
www.josegcano.com
Appendix 8
Celia Walmsley previous photographic work with dance companies

While working at Sadler’s Well Theatre, London I photographed many of the world’s great dance companies and artists including The Royal Ballet, Tanz Theatre Wuppertal (Pina Bausch), Northern Ballet Theatre, The Bolshoi Ballet and Opera and Nederlands Dans Theater. In New Zealand I have photographed, amongst many others, the Royal NZ Ballet, Sydney Dance Company, Imperial Russian Ice Stars, Slava Pollunin, NZ Dance Company, Footnote Dance Company, Okareka Dance Company, Atamira Dance Company, NZ School of Dance, UNITEC Dance, ID, many independent dance artists and as Director of Tempo Dance Festival (2012 – 2014) almost every performance plus Tempo Festival branding and marketing imagery.
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