This essay explores notions of "the body" and "subjectivity" in relation to performance. My focus will be on the performances of Anne Graham, Lyndal Jones and Barbara Campbell. I have experienced performances by each of the artists and interviewed them about their work and their attitudes towards subjectivity and theories of the body. I will look briefly at performance history and particular relationships to theories of the body and subjectivity to contextualise contemporary performance. I will then explore contemporary theories of the body and subjectivity and the relationships between performance practices, and also consider possible positions in performance theory and practice, and to examine theories about the body, subjectivity and sexual difference.
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THE BODY AND SUBJECTIVITY

Throughout the history of western thought the body has been regarded as a signifier of mortality, thus as a state which needs to be transcended. Christianity saw the body as "sinful and mortal" and the soul, separate from the body, as immortal. In Western philosophy, the body has been considered in opposition to the mind from the time of Aristotle. Descartes' theory of mind and body, as separate in structure and function, has been extremely influential. The oppositions which characterise traditional Western thought differentiate men and women, according valued characteristics to men and devalued characteristics to women. Feminists have sought to challenge these patriarchal and naturalised assumptions which have caused the oppression and inequality of women. The most apparent distinguishing features making male and female different are aspects of the body. So, the body, as the site of sexual difference has been a major field of investigation, although by no means has a conclusive alternative nor answer been accepted by all women.

Some early feminists theorised the specific functions of the female body, (menstruation, pregnancy and menopause), as limitations. (4) The female body was argued as the reason men and their experiences were excluded from representation. While these
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I am interested in an apparent shift in performance, from focusing on the physical presence or the subjectivity of the artist, to a more decentralised activity focusing on particular themes or issues. Much contemporary performance is at odds with theories which posit that the body and the self are the most important focus of performance. While the physical presence and the subjective presence of the artist are often used to activate an idea or an image in space and time, they are not necessarily the theme, content nor subject matter.

THE BODY AND SUBJECTIVITY

Throughout the history of western thought the body has been regarded as a signifier of mortality, thus as a state which needs to be transcended. Christianity saw the body as sinful and mortal and the soul, separate from the body, as immortal. In western philosophy, the body has been conceptualised in opposition to the mind from the time of Aristotle. Descartes' theory of mind and body, as separate in structure and function, has been extremely influential. The oppositions which characterise traditional western thought differentiate men and women, according valued characteristics to men and devalued characteristics to women. Feminists have sought to challenge these patriarchal and naturalised assumptions which have caused the oppression and inequality of women. The most apparent distinguishing features making male and female different are aspects of the body. So, the body, as the site of sexual difference has been a major field of investigation, although by no means has a conclusive alternative nor answer been accepted by all women.

Some early feminists theorised the specific functions of the female body, (menstruation, pregnancy and menopause), as limitations. (1) The female body was argued as the reason women and their experiences were excluded from representation. While these
theories are important, it is now seen that the attempt to affirm women's intellectual and academic capacity denies female difference and specificity. In these theories, patriarchal attitudes toward women's bodies as dysfunctional, frail or vulnerable are conceded. These theorist regarded gender as irrelevant in intellectual pursuits, sustaining the myth of rational and detached authorship. Gender is now recognised more, as integral to the production of knowledge.

"Essentialist" feminist theorists accord positive values to specifically female functions, proposing that women have unique knowledge and ways of living. (2) Women's links to nature and the body are affirmed. However, women have traditionally been regarded as more corporeal and natural than men, so this theory maintains the status quo of sexual difference; women as bodily, natural, emotional and irrational, men as cultural, thoughtful and rational. Yet in this conceptualisation, instead of accepting the denigrated status of these properties, they are accorded new value, as pure and truthful. These theorists challenged not the specificity of the female body's functionings, but the institutions and social organisations which make them oppressive. In this framework, the notion of the personal as political arose and emphasis was placed on personal experiences and histories. Some writers propose that women's language is based in the body, the inscription of difference. (3) To voice women's experiences of their bodies and sexuality is subversive because these things are not articulated in patriarchal culture. Many feminists now question the notion of biological difference as the basis for female subjectivity, arguing that essentialist or universal notions elide difference, locking individuals into socially dominant and oppressive categories.

Psychoanalytic feminists have reviewed the ideas of Freud and Lacan. (4) A psychoanalytic reading of the individual proposes that a person goes through a series of phases and identifications, relating to specific operations and areas of the human anatomy, in the process of becoming that individual. Through the study of Freud, psychoanalytic feminists recognise the need to develop theories of the subject rather than encompassing theories of society, aiming to develop positions which allow for many subjectivities. However the recognition of Freud's phallocentric interpretations of his female patients is fundamental for feminists, who insist on asserting the context of his theories. Lacan has been useful for feminists examining the acquisition of language as an internalisation of patriarchal order. For feminist psychoanalysts the body is a biological object which is socially marked and subjectivity is a social construction. While they endeavour to formulate a way of thinking other than in phallocentric terms, in
theory the mind/body dualism is maintained; psychology and biology are conceived in opposition. The body is regarded as biologically determined, while the mind is a product of ideology, society and culture. A fundamental criticism of feminist psychoanalysts is that they reinvigorate traditional notions of sexual difference. However they believe that by using the tools provided by patriarchy they can get closer to understanding the roots of women's oppression and thereby expose and challenge them.

Laura Mulvey's film theories and criticisms have been important in feminist studies across the board. Drawing on psychoanalytic theory, Mulvey considers cinema to satisfy a human desire to look, recognise and identify. Examining theories of scopophilia and voyeurism, she explains that the cinema audience subjects the screen "other" to its objectifying and controlling gaze. For Mulvey, traditional cinema (Hollywood) represents women in terms of sexuality and reduces them to a body. Representations of women are coded as sexual objects, and the male gaze projects erotic fantasy onto the female figure. Mulvey articulates the theoretical and political importance for women to represent themselves as social subjects, regarding the delineation of difference and specificity as the only possibility for liberation and change.

Poststructural and deconstructionist feminists seek to break down the dualisms of western thought and their implicit hierarchies, which privilege or undermine certain groups. Deconstruction is useful in understanding how and why women have been oppressed. Feminist deconstructionists see the body not as ahistorical, acultural, or biological but as a political, social and cultural object, "lived" and interwoven with systems of meaning. Fundamental differences between the sexes and differences between members of the same sex are asserted, affirming diversity and specificity. Making visible suppressed alternatives, these theories aim to reveal previously marginalised discourses. The idea that the experiences of all women can be condensed into a universal experience is repudiated. These theorists aim to question constructions of the female body and reformulate it as active, mobile and social. They reject the notion of a coherent, stable subject which can achieve objectivity and detachment. Language, and the way meaning and subjectivity are constructed within it, are explored in these theories.

The apparent irony is that while the terms mind and body are revealed as constructions, they are still used and their opposition is maintained. However, as Sue Best proposes, the maintenance of a traditional way of thinking may be necessary if women are to
voice their ideas and experiences. "It may seem a little odd for a feminist to insist upon the pertinence of binary oppositions, given that so many feminists have tried to theorise a way out of them or beyond them. I would argue this is the only model for sexual difference, to lose our grip on this is to risk falling into the abyss of indifference where the masculine yet again speaks for both sexes." (7) Naomi Schor also asserts the importance of examining the definitions and categories, instead of simply rejecting them. "Before tearing down the cultural ghetto where the feminine has been confined and demeaned, we need to map its boundaries and excavate its foundations in order to salvage the useable relics and refuse of patriarchy, for to do so is perhaps the only chance we have to construct a post-deconstructionist society which does not simply replicate our own.” (8)

**PERFORMANCE**

There are conflicting opinions about where and how performance art began. Some theorists date it back to the theatres of Alfred Jarry, Artaud, Brecht, Bauhaus, the Futurists and Dada. (9) Without denying the influence or the importance of this work, I will concentrate on performances which derived from developments towards the end of the 1950s. Different kinds of work evolved which come together under the umbrella term performance. Happenings, body art, political events and living sculpture, (among others), developed around the same time and are associated with the dematerialisation and democratisation of art. (10) I will focus on body art history as an example of how the body and the self can be the focus of performance and how theories about the body and subjectivity, as the focus of performance, could have evolved.

Performance theories often focus on abstract notions of "the body" and "the self". Usually, the artist needs to be present for a performance to happen. The physical presence of the artist has been discussed as the artist's body and has been abstracted, in theory, as "the body". Performance artists tend not to rely on acting or theatrical techniques or conventions and they usually appear to the audience as themselves rather than as a character. Because of this different kind of presence in performance, the audience frequently experiences the 'subjectivity' and the physical presence of the artist first-hand. (Subjectivity is the composite of the facets and complexities of a person; their socio-economic context, history, experience etc.) For this reason the physical and the subjective presence of the artist have been theorised as the focus of performance. In *Body and Self*, Anne Marsh asserts the importance of the body and subjectivity in performance.
Performance art has changed over the last twenty years but major themes persist as artists continue to analyse aspects of the body and the self". (11)

In the late 60's and early 70's "body art" was a popular new medium. Often, it was an existential exploration of identity, and primary subjectivity was fundamental. Much body art was based on a reversal of the hierarchies inherent in dualistic thought. Nature, the body, feeling and emotion were truer and purer than culture, the mind and rational thought. Body art often reinscribed traditional assumptions about the body; controlling, punishing or torturing it. Images of crucifixion, castration and traditional Christian attitudes towards the body recur. (12) Angst was often communicated through body art performances which utilised masochistic, primitive, ritualistic and shamanistic actions. Some body artists were influenced by Freud's ideas on the subconscious and the formation of the self. Many of his theories on repression, anxiety and the ramifications of these on the individual were manifest in body art performances. (13) Body artists also explored the 'out of control' body, focusing on its functions, processes and abjection.

When women became involved in performance, particularly in America in the 60's, some theorists argued that performance was a good medium for female artists to work in. (14) It did not have the same patriarchal traditions as established art mediums, so performance was seen as a possible space through which women could speak. Performances by female artists manifest the notion that women could at last represent themselves as speaking subjects. (15) Consequently, performances were often highly autobiographical. Artists frequently performed naked as they explored ideas of sexual liberation and the body as pure essential matter. To some theorists, performance by women could foreground sexual difference and repressive systems of representation and could thwart fetishistic viewing. Because of the proximity of the artist to the audience and because the artist was in control; the producer, author, subject, activator, director and designer; the artist could directly address the audience as a subject. Female performance artists could, it was thought, reclaim their body and assert their sexuality, thereby challenging patriarchal order.

Body art performed by women was problematised by theoretical discussions of "the gaze" and the call to abandon body representation, thereby avoiding objectification and sexual speculation. By performing naked, the attempt to present a female speaking subject could be subverted by the possible projection of the audiences' desire. Debate arose as to whether
performance disrupts the male gaze, as was previously argued, or whether it reinscribes the artists' body as an object and a source of visual pleasure.

Many theorists found any kind of literal representation of women problematic. Female artists investigated other ways of signifying women's bodies, without literally presenting one. This was particularly difficult for female performance artists who frequently relied on their physical presence to produce their performances. Naked performances became less frequent as the trend, in theory and practice, seemed to shift from a celebration of the individual and primary subjectivity to an investigation of the social construction of the individual. Reassessment of the artist as authorial voice gave rise to multi-layered performances, often using new technologies, video and sound, which split the audience's focus. Many artists subverted the sense of a stable subjectivity through cross dressing and masquerade. (16)

**CONTEMPORARY PERFORMANCE PRACTICE**

The physical and subjective presence of the artist often activates an idea or an image in space and time. These, however, are not inevitably the theme, content nor subject matter. Now performance artists seem less concerned with notions of primary subjectivity and are more interested in intersubjectivity and multiple viewpoints. Increasingly, artists recognise that the audience will bring subjective interpretations and meanings to the work. Acknowledging this, many artists are producing more open ended performances, insisting that the audience is responsible for their own readings.

Performance has developed beyond its early manifestations which often explored notions of the body and identity. The theories of deconstruction and the gaze have problematised the use of the binary oppositions, mind and body, when discussing performance. I questioned Lyndal Jones, Barbara Campbell and Anne Graham about theories of the body and subjectivity and their relevance to performance.

The questions I have considered in relation to particular performances are:

- Is the artist the performer?
- Is the artist acting a role or being themselves?
- What relationship does the artist have with the audience?

These questions are examined in relation to theories of the body and subjectivity.
LYNDAL JONES

Lyndal Jones (b. 1949) has been working with performance for many years, also using installation and more recently film. Her current series, From the Darwin Translations, explores sexual attraction, desire and the theories of Freud and Darwin. I will focus on Spitfire 123, a performance from this series. The word "spitfire" has three references; WWII spitfire pilots who were romantic heroes, the "fittest", a feisty young woman in the 1920's and a hissing cat. Spitfire 123 was performed at the Lonsdale St Power House, Melbourne, in April 1996. It is a complex piece involving installation, video, performance, theatre, music and text. The performance takes place in an old power station, like a warehouse; an industrial space with concrete floors and entry through a large roller door. The performance is in four parts, each taking place in a different area of the space.

Part 1 is an installation; videos of red poppies in a field, and vases of poppies on a shelf to the side. A woman with long red hair walks into the space and turns the videos on. The sound of birds can be heard and, with each monitor being turned on, the sound becomes louder. Another woman walks into the space, holding a cat. The woman with red hair is perceived as the "director". She signals the other woman, (the actor), to commence the performance and carry out certain actions. The actor becomes frustrated and strides away. The director goes to the video monitors again, turns the sound off each one.

The second part is a concert. On stage there is an electric guitarist, and a man dressed as a fighter pilot. The guitarist starts playing as a woman wearing a red evening dress, dances up on to the stage. She is flirtatious towards the men, a vixen, a "spitfire". She begins to sing phrases from popular tunes, mingled with erotic moans. The pilot signals, as if motioning a plane take off. Behind the stage is a screen showing footage of the sky shot through the cockpit of a small plane.

Part three takes place in the back room of the building. There are chairs positioned theatre style in different parts of the room and the audience takes their places. Couples appear, embrace, dance around, kiss; gently, tenderly, passionately or urgently. Individually, the actors walk to a microphone and begin to tell stories of love, passion, fantasy, sex. There are ten actors, of various ages; five male, five female; all dressed differently, different eras and subcultures. "Authorship" is blurred as the actors take phrases from others' stories and gradually the audience can no longer pinpoint whose fantasy, whose experience...
it really is. Language is fluid, slipping from German, Italian, Spanish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, French and English. The stories get closer together until most of the actors are talking at once in different languages, repeating phrases, in a kind of layered song.

The final part takes place in the laneway alongside the power station. An actor walks up the laneway and others follow. They mirror us or we mirror them, standing, waiting. A plane is heard above; loud and apparently close by. The actors stroll towards the gate, quickly walk out and then begin to run down the laneway. One stops, then others, until all of them are standing frozen in the laneway.

In this work Jones investigates the construction of the self and theories of how we are constituted, by exploring the work of Darwin and Freud. Both Darwin and Freud analysed what we are and who we are, through particular studies of individual humans and animals. Freud and Darwin have had an enormous influence on western thought, our perceptions of ourselves and our functioning in the world. Without reading or following their work closely we inherit some of their formulations as common sense.

Social Darwinism and Nazi interpretations of Darwin's theories made them unpopular. From the Darwin Translations attempts to reevaluate them, as Jones explores the human implications of Darwin's theories. "Natural selection" or "the survival of the fittest" is the "preservation of favourable individual differences and variations and the destruction of those which are injurious". "Sexual selection" involves a struggle between the individuals of one sex, generally the males, for the possession of the other sex. (17) Spitfire 123 examines desire, sexual attraction and relationships between humans, questioning whether behaviour is natural or learned. By contrasting the reading of Darwinian text with human actors, juxtapositions of human and animal, cultural and natural arise.

Lyndal Jones' exploration of Freudian texts stems from an interest in the construction of desire. Freud's "psychoanalysis" involved patients talking about their problems, memories, dreams and fears; confiding secrets. Tension is created in Spitfire 123 with the sense that the audience is overhearing a secret; something private or intimate; as the text in Spitfire 123 often reveals fragments of personal detail, fantasy and experience.

For Freud, desire is produced by a lack. Women, lacking a penis, bear children and have sex as substitution for their lack. This phallocentric concept is questioned and Jones reevaluates women's desire as a productive and positive force. A major impetus for the
work is representing women as subjects, able to manipulate ideas, materials and images. “The moment I really waited for when I saw it is when all the women are at the microphones talking and all the men had to stand back and listen. In the history of theatre of course, within theatrical conventions, it is usually the men who "drive" the scene. So they provide the energy source whereas here the women do that.”

Jones is more interested in questions and speculations than providing the audience with a coherent, autonomous message. This allows the audience members to bring to the work their own ideas and subjectivities, permitting them to be active, rather than passive consumers. Making the work, Jones is absolutely present but she feels that during the performance it is the audiences’ turn to make the work. In this piece Jones does not perform herself other than vocally, so questions of subjectivity become more complex. She employs sound, video, dancers, actors, musicians, singers and amateurs. The use of performance, film and installation with the same elements, corresponds with Jones’ intention to allow for multiple meanings and points of view. “Using other people....the notion of an immediate ego is reduced and to the extent where people might wonder where my voice is. What I love is that it is contradictory, that there are gaps. That there would be different senses of who that one person is and perhaps therefore who they might be.”

The first part of Spitfire 123 immediately confuses the audiences’ assumptions about the role of the performance artist. An actor takes the role of "director" within the performance and is perceived as the controller, the artist. Rather than expressing her own ego, Jones prefers to explore a number of viewpoints and subjectivities; a world of relationships. She uses a layering of many languages and many voices, reflecting the complexities of ethnic, cultural and sexual identities. Boundaries are fluid, characters sliding between identities, stories sliding between characters. Categories, generations, sexes, nationalities and identity shift in the performance, reflecting the instability inherent in culture and in people, and allowing many experiences and languages to coexist. Voices and positions are multiple and plural, posing questions, not offering fixed meanings. No single voice or position dominates or is presented as authority.

Lyndal Jones has a policy of refusing to use the term "the body", replacing it with a more encompassing word, "the person". She feels reference to "the body" objectifies the person and denies them feelings and thoughts. By constructing the body in opposition to the mind, the body is separated from the capacity for thought. Jones explains;
"I find the reference to the body absolutely contrary to the direction I want to go. I see it (performance) as a struggle to incorporate a physical presence in an art, in the idea of art. If you look at ourselves culturally and in a wider way, what it does is simply reinvigorate the old mind/body split...So what I do and what I insist on is talk about the person...Which is what makes performance, or live people being in it a very potent part of the work."

**ANNE GRAHAM**

Anne Graham (b.1949) has been working in performance since the early seventies, investigating issues of gender, the body and spaces. In her recent performances, she sets up calico tents, oil lamps and a makeshift kitchen and sometimes shows films on nearby walls or the tents. As these performances are ongoing, similar in form and structure, but dependent on the chosen site, I will describe two events which I have experienced.

Anne Graham’s **Compound Time**, was part of the National Sculpture Forum in April 1995. Strategically situated, the performance took place on the banks of lake Burley Griffin, between Parliament House and the War Memorial. A makeshift kitchen was set up serving vegetable soup and bread and students played drums beside the calico tents, lit with oil lamps. The audience moved around the tents but huddled in a large tent, set up for the opening of the Sculpture Forum, to keep warm. They ate the soup out of polystyrene cups, chatted to each other and without realising, interacted with the work. The atmosphere at the opening combined a formal occasion, a soup kitchen and the grunge/tribal feeling of the students playing drums. This reflected the site; positioned between two monumental and important buildings, the tents existed as a makeshift camp.

At **The Beggars Banquet**, April 1996, in Alfred Park, Sydney, (opposite the Performance Space), the same tents were set up, and a film was screened on the side of one of the tents. Anne Graham’s work was included as part of a group exhibition of performances curated by Victoria Spence. Graham did not cook and serve food this time as Gay Bilson provided an exotic fish soup, (causing an incredible queue of people to form) and Christopher Snee served homebrew. The audience was made up of a variety of people; the homeless people who live in the area, curious passers by on their way out on Saturday night and the art/performance audience who had come especially for the event.
Graham's performances reflect everyday life and satisfy human necessity; food, drink and shelter.

Anne Graham explores the geography, architecture and official and unofficial uses of specific sites, engaging academically with the politics and theories about cities, publics, populations and the way we live. The performances are aimed at liberating public spaces from their prescribed functions, setting up the preconditions for diverse personal interactions. Heterogenous groups of people emerge, through contact with the local community, and the interactions which take place are never predictable. With the tents, Graham constructs situations, reoccupying and reinscribing a place, thereby interrupting its meanings and design. "There are people who just enjoy it as a disruption of the space, a disruption of the norm. It offers them an opportunity for imagining in a way that they normally wouldn't." Elements of the performance are familiar and domestic encouraging the audience to share personal histories and memories of the particular space. Graham records the conversations she has, which will provide ongoing material for new work. However, she recognises that every audience member will have a different experience of the work, talking to each other, eating and watching the films.

Direct engagement with the audience is fundamental in Graham's performances, which she conceives as portraits of the particular place and people. Boundaries between artist and audience are blurred as the audience actively participates in the creation of the work and its meaning. "You can't just watch it because there is nowhere to watch it from. That is the difference between acting and performance. It is not about the proscenium arch; it's about being in it. So even if you're walking through, you're actually in it; you're responding to it in a way. It is not just about looking."

The hand-made calico tents evoke a sense of migration, history and war; a home for the exile, traveller, nomad or refugee; makeshift and mobile, open and accessible. The tents define an intimate, domestic scene in spaces which are often dangerous and hostile. The structures are confining, repetitive and aesthetically simple, reflecting the ordered rhythms of everyday life. Sue Best proposes that the work reproduces, mimics or reclaims feminised space; a displaced maternal space, a nourishing, nurturing matrix. (18) Contradictory spaces collide; public/private, outside/inside, dangerous/safe, extreme poverty/high culture.

Graham recognises that her history, politics, aesthetic, research and education all play a part in the formulation of the work.
"I acknowledge all the time that I really enjoy these shows because you can pack them all up into an amazingly small space. And I can move them around and I have always enjoyed that in my life...And I see that in these pieces because they are this intense loving space and its gone...So there are those subjective things and I love the temporality of the work. For me, there is a very political commitment to the lack of monumentality in the work."

Graham is not antagonistic toward debates about the body. Although she recognises a deep analysis of her work could produce bodily readings, she does not aim to investigate the body, much less her body, in these performances. "They are about the body in that people walk into a space and there is a phenomenological response to being there...And they are physical in that they are to do with conversation and the space between people. But if we're talking the body, the body, the Kristeva body, that is not in that work."

**BARBARA CAMPBELL**

In her performances, Barbara Campbell (b.1961) examines female heroes, notions of history, truth, interpretation and recollection. I will focus on Sylvia Pankhurst is Hungry, performed at the Performance Space in April, 1996. Amidst intellectual debate, this performance took place in conjunction with a two week conference and performance event exploring food and culture. The performance deals with the refusal of food by the suffragette Sylvia Pankhurst, a hunger striker at Holloway prison. (19) Jai McHenry, an actor, was directed by Campbell. Slides, costume and other objects were used in the performance and other people were requested to read some of the text, which is adapted from Pankhurst's diaries.

Barbara Campbell projected slides onto a placard held by Jai McHenry. The text, spoken by McHenry, tells stories of a young girl, associated with her mouth; with eating, speaking, refusing to wear lipstick. The menu for the inmates of Holloway Prison is read by one of the speakers at the conference; an unappetising and sparse list of food, rationed out to the ounce. The menu for hunger strikers at Holloway Prison is read by a different speaker. It is neither rationed nor unappetising. McHenry slides onto a desk on the stage, lies down and enacts and narrates the story of Sylvia Pankhurst's force feeding at Holloway Prison. The language used and the vulnerability of the actor's prostrate body alludes to rape. The dialogue is graphic, concerning men trying to find a gap between her teeth with a metal rod, so they could stick a tube
down her mouth. Pankhurst's teeth are clenched, her jaw jammed shut, but a hole is found and the tube shoved down, as she gags, tasting blood.

Campbell's performances focus on and interpret mythologised figures, examining the way history is used for certain political, social or moral purposes. The characters are mostly household names and people tend to be intrigued by them although most know little about their history and context of their lives. Campbell is interested in the relevance these characters hold for us now. Using different sources, she gathers a range of opinions, "facts" and histories of a particular myth. Exploring the implications and disjunctures in fact and opinion, Campbell questions the notions of truth and objectivity in history. The performances propose a number of different readings of the character at the same time, examining "the way that contemporary thought has been able to play with aspects of their lives...Truth is always elusive and interestingly so. It's when the truth is put at the service of other motivations that it becomes interesting."

The female figure has been used to represent or symbolise ideal states or nations or products and Campbell explores the contradictions between what they represent and what women are actually able to achieve. Representations of women tend to be projected within the available locus of female types. By imposing codifications on a character, it becomes confined to a stereotype, thus losing its uniqueness. Familiar categories of women are the martyr, the matriarch, the virgin, the whore and the witch. Campbell explores representations and their construction, looking at the way they are accepted as truth. Through the deconstruction of representations the status of active subject is affirmed in the individual.

Marina Warner argues that "...When a story is told, it is told according to the perceptions of its hearers or its readers: The teller unconsciously provides points of reference to make the material intelligible." (20) A real individual becomes the protagonist of a myth, and its meaning and relationship to the real individual depends upon how it is told. Heroes and mythologised figures are not people but products of ideology and culture. Their purpose is education and the communication of specific moral and social values, within a particular community.

For Campbell the relationship between performer and audience is an intellectual one. She provides the audience with elements which take some consideration to understand. "The way the images of all kinds; sound, images, text etc; require a certain amount of work on the part of the audience. They have to actively
work with the material. For me its an intellectual thing." Campbell tries to teach and implicate the audience, making them responsible for their own interpretations. Her aim is to demonstrate, illuminate and educate, using "experiential knowledge" as a medium. She sees performance as exchange, discourse and an active dialogue between the performer and the audience.

Campbell assumes the position of mediation in her performances, to allow discourse and dialogue to take place. "I set myself up as a mirror to reflect the subjectivity of the audience". By sending out and receiving messages which alter and distort; like myth, storytelling and history; she aims to offer critical self knowledge to the viewer. Campbell approaches performance as a way of activating an idea in space and time. "Certain images can only be generated through the medium of time, and obviously there has to be a physical presence for some of those images to be generated."

Barbara Campbell is the director, rather than the performer in Sylvia Parkhurst is Hungry. The artist's subjectivity becomes secondary, dispersed through the audience and a sense of an immediate ego is denied. Campbell acknowledges that her own passions, interests and personal fascinations exist in the work. Her subjective interpretations and identifications are also present in her choice of character. Her goal of active dialogue stems from the notion that we are all implicated in and collectively reform the subjectivities of the people we make contact with.

Interestingly, Sylvia Pankhurst is Hungry began as a radio drama, completely avoiding a literal sense of embodiment. When presenting the piece as a performance she felt inadequately experienced to "embody" the text in the way she felt was necessary. Although she has previously used actors, it is important for Campbell to activate the idea, and interpret the research herself. Her thoughts and lengthy research would be impossible to translate adequately enough for another person to manifest.

Campbell concedes that the body is projected as the primary focus of performance because it is always there. However she feels that debate about the body is over determined and assumes continued currency in the split between mind and body.

"Its sort of like a return to primitivism in a way. That the truth lies in this sort of prelatarian purity...there is too much emphasis on the body without fully teasing out what that actually means...The body is there as a support for the brain as much as anything else. I think that by buying into the
whole body argument, there is some sort of inherent assumption that the body is the source of all knowledge, its own body of knowledge

CONCLUSION

Because early manifestations of performance frequently explored issues of the body and identity, theorists proposed that the artist's physical and subjective presence are the focus of performance. However due to reconsiderations of the body, subjectivity and representations of women, this theory is now problematic. Contemporary performances are often complex and open-ended, leaving gaps for the audience and denying singular, definitive meanings. Increasingly, artists are employing alternative forms and means of performing to avoid traditionally oppressive and objectifying systems of representation. This endeavour to transform the way the body is perceived in performance is manifest in performances by Lyndal Jones, Anne Graham and Barbara Campbell. Employing various feminist deconstructionist strategies and negotiating theoretical discussions of the gaze, their performances deny fixed meanings and affirm a multiplicity of experiences.

Providing the audience with many voices and positions, Jones attempts to extend and expand representations of gender and sexuality beyond the usual stereotypes. Her absence in her performances subverts the theory that the artist's body is the focus of performance, and can be regarded as a strategy to avoid objectification. Barbara Campbell juxtaposes "facts" and personal recollections of a particular mythologised figure to illuminate the way representations are constructed as truth. Campbell's roles in the performances she directs and in her radio pieces are also at odds with the way the artist's body has traditionally been perceived in performance. Anne Graham participates with her audiences, constructing environments conducive to diverse social interactions. Because she is committed to individual communication with the audience her performances avoid the problems of objectification.

Definitions of performance have always been elusive. The attempt to explicate a single theme or focus from such a heterogeneous medium would ultimately neglect numerous practices. While performance has certainly evolved since the late fifties, many artists continue to work within the framework of previous performance practices. Advocating a multiplicity of voices, contexts and strategies in performance is crucial if it is to continue to exist as a diverse and challenging set of practices.
These ideas about torture, control and pain are repeated throughout Christian attitudes toward the body. Mike Parr saw performance as an act before representation. In his task performances, the body is described through its limitations. The body is revealed as an image of itself, disintegrated in space and time. Pain, at the threshold of the ego, is regarded as proof of existence and control over the body. Stelarc's performances; including swallowing a "stomach sculpture", and suspensions by hooks through skin; attempt to challenge the limits of the body, not as a deliberate violation but as a vehicle for exploration. Technological interest and desire to 'extend the body' rather than catharsis or ritual, motivate his performances. Jill Orr views her performances as a vehicle for "articulating those things which are denied"; (nature, gender, the body, matriarchy, martyrdom). These representations of women and the body have been used throughout Christian mythology, although here, they accorded positive values.

Psychoanalytic influence on performance can also be seen in the work of Parr, Stelarc, and Jill Orr. Parr explores the notion of a fragmented subject and the disruption of identity by testing ego through pain or restraint. An affirmation of instinct (also important in Freud's summations) and a denial of the rational can be seen in Parr's work which uses torture and abuse as catharsis and authentic experience. Stelarc; (see footnote (12)); sees the body as other, able to be manipulated and improved. This parallels psychoanalytic notions of the subject split and Lacan's mirror stage. Jill Orr explores identity, the formation of the ego and the body image. In recent performances, such as Raising the Spirits, she constructs multiple alter egos, to emphasise a holistic view of the human spirit. In "Jill Orr: Raising The Spirits", Art Monthly, April 1995, Penny Trotter suggests that while multifarious manifestations of the ego are represented, the self remains intact, making reference to Lacan's 'I as other'.

Many feminist theorists thought performance was a good medium for women including Moira Roth; (The Amazing Decade), Jeanie Forte; (Women's Performance Art: Feminism and Postmodernism) and Lucy Lippard; ("The Pains and Pleasures of Women's Body Art"; (From the Centre).

Carolee Schneemann sees naked performances as transgressive; a way for feminists to reclaim the body and a celebration of "creative female will". She thinks the immediacy of performance encroaches on and threatens the audience. Schneemann was probably the first women to work in this way and she saw the body as a primal archaic force. Other performance artists like Karen Finley and Annie Sprinkle feel that through confronting and graphic performances, they can reclaim their bodies and their sexualities. However, they have often been criticised for allowing their bodies to be reinscribed as sexual objects (not subjects) by fetishising audiences.

Multimedia performances, subverting coherent subject through cross dressing and masquerade were made by Lyndal Jones (Prediction Pieces) and Laurie Anderson. Also working in the same genre, Cindy Sherman's photographic works play with similar notions of the construction of the subject.

Darwin, Charles; The Origin of the Species

Sue Best, "Deconstructing Space", Transition, issue #42, pp27-41
Sylvia Pankhurst, (1882-1960), was an English middle class suffragette. Her parents (Richard and Emmeline Pankhurst) and sisters (Adela and Christabel) were also well known in the women's movement. Originally an artist and writer, her political activities first took the form of designing cards, posters, badges and banners for the movement. Later, she gave up art to pursue women's liberation full time. She was imprisoned for her political activities thirteen times and was often force fed while on hunger strike. While her sisters preferred to only associate with feminists of their class, Sylvia Pankhurst had socialist ideals and set up branches of the women's movement in poor and working class areas of London.
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However, I felt tentative about being watched by the audience. In establishing a performance persona, the performer constructs themselves as 'other' to the audience. The relationship between performer and audience becomes tense. The performer must decide on the kind of engagement s/he wants to have with the audience. One option is a confrontational engagement, in which the audience is spoken to, asked to do things, yelled at etc. Another is one in which the audience watches, listens but is not spoken to directly; the performer basically pretends the audience is not there and ignores any attempt by audience members to communicate with them. Or one in which the audience and the artist are not separated. They engage with each other on the same level; there is the potential for direct dialogue.

The earliest performance I did was part of a group performance event by ACMÉ, called Garage. I sat on a shelf, in a garage, dressed in overalls and knitted a long thin red thing. Another performer asked the group to take part in his performance, by improvised speaking... During this part of the performance I felt incredibly uncomfortable. The tension, I think, was due to feeling unskilled in speaking in public, and feeling as though I was acting, or taking on some other persona. This uncomfortable moment led me to consider many issues relating to the presence of the artist in a performance and the relationship between artist and audience.

The next performance I did was in Braidwood, on a trip with the sculpture department. I sat by the river with a 100 squares of paper which had instructions for an origami fold on them. I began to fold and as people walked by or sat down with me, I asked them to help me. There was no sense of being...
AFTERWORD: The relevance of this research to my own performance practice.

Originally, I used performance as a way of foregrounding the processes I was exploring in my sculptural practice. I work with simple techniques and commonplace materials, like knitting and origami in wool and paper. The making of the work is as significant to me as the product. I felt that because these processes were so important to me, I should find a way of communicating them more directly. So, my earlier performance were essentially a demonstration of these processes, in public.

However, I felt tentative about being watched by the audience. In establishing a performance persona, the performer constructs themselves as ‘other’ to the audience. The relationship between performer and audience becomes tense. The performer must decide on the kind of engagement s/he wants to have with the audience. One option is a confrontational engagement, in which the audience is spoken to, asked to do things, yelled at etc. Another is one in which the audience watches, listens but is not spoken to directly; the performer basically pretends the audience is not there and ignores any attempt by audience members to communicate with them. Or one in which the audience and the artist are not separated. They engage with each other on the same level; there is the potential for direct dialogue.

The earliest performance I did was part of a group performance event by ACME, called Garage. I sat on a shelf, in a garage, dressed in overalls and knitted a long thin red thing. Another performer asked the group to take part in his performance, by improvised speaking. During this part of the performance I felt incredibly uncomfortable. The tension, I think, was due to feeling unskilled in speaking in public, and feeling as though I was acting, or taking on some other persona. This uncomfortable moment led me to consider many issues relating to the presence of the artist in a performance and the relationship between artist and audience.

The next performance I did was in Braidwood, on a trip with the sculpture department. I sat by the river with a 100 squares of paper which had instructions for an origami fold on them. I began to fold and as people walked by or sat down with me I asked them to help me. There was no sense of being
Appendix

Chapter 1: The Evolution of Performance Appraisal

Originally, I used performance as a way of forecasting the
performance of my employees. I was skeptical of my company's practices, but
with the feedback I received, my confidence in my employees increased. I felt that performance
appraisals were essential to understanding my employees and their progress.
However, I found that routine appraisals were not enough to
understand the full picture of an employee's performance.

The performance must be assessed on the basis of engagement and
motivation. The performance appraisal system is expected to
encourage a performance-oriented approach and motivate employees
towards better performance. The performance appraisal is not just
a tool to judge the employee but also a platform for
enhancing the performance of the employee. The section below
the performance is expected to

The continuous performance I give are part of a broad
performance system in ACM. The challenge I face on a regular
basis is to ensure that employees are performing up to the
mark, and at the same time, I need to ensure that they
are motivated to perform. This innovation provides me the
ability to evaluate performance and give feedback
immediately, thereby reducing errors and

In conclusion, my performance appraisal system is

with me I also learn to help me. I have no place of failure


separate or alienated from an audience, because the distinctions between performer and audience were no longer really there. We all talked about the process and about other unrelated things. People stopped for a while and then left, the group of three or four people was constantly changing. When all the paper was folded I discussed with two people who were sitting with me what we should do with them. We floated them down the river. There was a strong sense of letting go of the product when the process was completed, but it was also very gentle. Rather than destroying the product, it would eventually disintegrate.

I was pleased with the artist/audience relationship in this work and continued it through to the next piece. This was Backyard, another ACME group performance. I set up a campfire and rugs and asked a few people to join me knitting. I had various bits of wool and knitting needles. I asked people to come before hand so there was a sense of group participation, and so that it seemed less like ‘my performance’ than something which was just occurring there at the time. Discussions about knitting, as well as a multitude of other subjects, took place. The people I had asked to come, moved around to watch the other performances, and new people, curious or tired and cold, came to join the group. At the appointed time we had decided to finish the performance, I stood up and left the group. People continued to sit and knit by the fire after I had left and I was pleased to see that an entirely new group of knitters had formed.

The next performance I was involved in was D-Block, an ACME group performance, at Performance Space, Sydney. Although we formulated our performances individually, this performance was more structured than previous group works, starting from the theme of work. Dressed in a suit, I folded tiny fans from post-it notes. The audience was seated. There is something I find very perturbing about being looked at by a large number of people. It makes me feel nervous, self-conscious, embarrassed, although it is also quite exciting and challenging. I felt as though I had taken on a character, which has more to do with being in front of an audience than what I was actually doing.

D-Block was also performed at Gorman House. I developed my part of the performance, knitting the tie I was wearing. We performed over five nights and with that intensity of performing, I considered how I felt about the performance and made minor changes every night. This performance was also interesting because the audience was not seated. Although we
able to achieve a balance between performance and influence. The need for clear communication and effective leadership is crucial. When we fail to engage the audience and fail to communicate the message, we risk losing the attention of the people. It is important to make sure that the people we work with are well-informed and motivated. When we work closely with people who are committed to the project, we ensure that the work is meaningful and relevant. As a result, we can maintain high levels of engagement and achieve our goals.

I was pleased with the performance of my team in the recent project. The team worked closely and effectively to ensure that everyone was engaged and motivated. I was happy to see the hard work and dedication of the team in achieving the goal. The people were willing to go above and beyond to ensure that the project was successful. It is important to recognize the hard work and dedication of the team. People who are willing to go the extra mile to achieve the goal are valuable assets to any team. I would like to thank the team for their hard work and dedication. Their efforts have contributed to the success of the project.

The core performance I was housed in was B-Density, an MCM with incredible performance. Although there were challenges in performance testing, the team worked hard to overcome them. We were able to achieve high performance and quality results. The people worked together to ensure that the project was successful. It is important to recognize the hard work and dedication of the team. People who are willing to go the extra mile to achieve the goal are valuable assets to any team. I would like to thank the team for their hard work and dedication. Their efforts have contributed to the success of the project.

I feel proud to have been a part of this team. I developed my skills in communication and leadership. I have gained valuable experience in working with people from different backgrounds. It is important to have diverse teams, which help in achieving better results. The team members were very supportive and worked well together. The performance was excellent. It is important to maintain high levels of engagement and achieve our goals. Although we face challenges in performance testing, the team worked hard to overcome them. We were able to achieve high performance and quality results. The people worked together to ensure that the project was successful. It is important to recognize the hard work and dedication of the team. People who are willing to go the extra mile to achieve the goal are valuable assets to any team. I would like to thank the team for their hard work and dedication. Their efforts have contributed to the success of the project.
assumed that they would walk around us, most nights they leaned against the walls. However, when audience members did walk around, I was challenged again to consider my relationship with them. When an audience member stood right beside me, watching me, I felt embarrassed and uncomfortable.

I have noticed that audiences tend to regard performers as objects rather than people, passing comments and discussing the performer as if they can not hear. In a situation where the audience and performers are not separated by any formal theatrical device, like seating or a stage, I find this a very strange phenomenon. I also found it difficult to respond to; I ignored the audience. However I find this problematic. My ideals in performance are the possibility that a direct or more immediate communication can be made through the fact of the artist making the work at the same time as the audience perceives it. So by not acknowledging the audience, any aim to communicate or establish a dialogue fails. I also find it dishonest. Because my work emerges from the realm of everyday life, because I think that is what life is about and what art is about, it is problematic for me to be acting, or alienating myself from the people I am trying to communicate with.

For this reason, I feel that the work of Anne Graham is most relevant to my own questions and practice. She directly engages with the audience, unaffected and not distanced. She does not even appear as “the artist”, but as a person. The performances are also very generous, offering food, listening to people and considering them as individuals rather than a mass.

The performances of Lyndal Jones and Barbara Campbell are less relevant to my own practice because of the way they are structured to distance the audience from the performer. Audience engagement is largely intellectual in their performances. Although Campbell and Jones both distinguish between theatre and performance, the audience still watches the performance, rather than being engaged by it. This is no different from what happens in theatre. Although there are other differences, particularly the usual lack of narrative in performance, much experimental theatre also takes this format. Rather than a criticism, this is a development I have noticed and is by no means less valid than other ways of performing. However, for me the potential to engage with the audience directly is a very important aspect of performance. The potential of discussing things that are happening with the work while it is happening is exciting.
However, when audience members 
interact with presenters. When an audience member speaks, it brings a different feel to the interaction.

I have noticed that audiences tend to regard presenters as
official, rather than people engaged in a discussion. In my experience, the audience and presenter are not expected to display emotion.

Instead of viewing the audience as a stage, I find it a way of
engaging the audience. I also found it difficult to reframe it
through a presentation. However, I find it empowering. My
interest in performance art is possibly just a glut of more
ideas inspired by the possibilities that a greater number of
interactions can be used for. Through the lack of the
improvised communication can be made through the use of its
practices to find new recognition of the audience's
emotions. Hence, my work on the idea of
communicating to establish a relationship with the audience.
I also find it

For this reason, I feel that the work of Anne Chapman is most
relevant to my own directions and practice. She
explores with the audience's unexpected and non-hedonistic. She
gives her own expression as "the artist", part of her vision. She
uses her own expression, but not as a. The
movement of people and communication is an important factor in a mass
production of the audience. I am trying to
communicate with the people I am trying to
communicate with.

The performance of Iman Jones and Barbara Campbell are
less action-oriented in my own practice because of the way they are
structured to achieve the audience's involvement in the
performance. Although Campbell and Jones perform in a different
fashion and performance they involve the audience with
unstructured audience interaction is exactly interesting in their
performance. Iman Jones and Barbara Campbell are

However, for me, the potential to engage with the audience

which is extremely exciting.
Performances by Anne Graham and the kind of performances I am interested in producing myself, have their precedents in the work of Allan Kaprow and "Happenings". They are things which happen in public spaces without the need for announcements, publicity or even calling it performance. It does not need to be called "Art" and can have a direct impact on the audience. Something happens in a public space, people see it, are perhaps curious, confused, dismissive, entertained. But they have at least a moment to consider something which does not fit into normal routine, normal behaviour, and perhaps they will go away, continuing to think about other possibilities for living, other ways of thinking.

The most recent performance I did was another ACME group event, which was part of Splinters performance of Faust. We all stood on plinths in the middle of a rectangular pond, at University House, ANU. The performances, again, were conceived individually. This performance was interesting for me in that I was not demonstrating any kind of process. I was dressed in white fake fur and held a black furry creature which I made, speaking to it softly and moving gently. I discovered that I could do performances which explored any number of things other than process. However, I would probably never have discovered this if my sculpture work had not somehow called for it.

Now I see my performances as a way of testing ideas, and a way of potentially getting honest and direct feedback. However I have a commitment to not judge certain strategies or structures of performance as better than others and to affirm the multifarious strategies used by performers. While the practice of Anne Graham is more relevant to my own ideals and intentions, I enjoy the work of Campbell and Jones in other ways.

But being looked makes me self-conscious. It makes me question who I am and makes me aware of every action, gesture, sound. I am uncomfortable with the notion of "true self" and prefer to understand myself in the context of the world, events and people. So my aim is to make performances which do not focus on myself but just happen, as other things I do, other interactions with people, just happen, continuously.

To avoid presenting myself to the audience as an object also avoids theoretical problems regarding representations of the female body and my personal aversion to the feeling of being looked at.
The most recent performance I did was another ACME group.
I was perceived as a member of a recreation group.

University House. ANU. The performance was meant to convey a sense of energy, creativity, and effectiveness.
I experienced this by creating a complex, well-integrated piece of work.
I have discovered that I can create a performance which expresses any number of ideas, including my own.

New ideas and techniques are a way of achieving success.

However, I have a commitment to not being a centre of attention.
I am interested in my own ideas, and to the extent that the audience is relevant to my own ideas, I will perform.

But beyond looking for self-acknowledgement, it takes the performance more of a sense of “there’s more to people” to make a mark on the scene.
I am innovative, and prefer to work in the context of the whole. I want to create a space that allows for the emergence of ideas and perspectives.
I want to create a space that allows for the emergence of ideas and perspectives.

I want to create a space that allows for the emergence of ideas and perspectives.

I want to create a space that allows for the emergence of ideas and perspectives.
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW WITH LYNDAL JONES
BY BRONWEN SANDLAND

Bronwen Sandland (B.S.): Increasingly there has been a shift away from your own physical presence in your performances. Why have you chosen to do this and do you think it will continue?

Lyndal Jones (L.J.): Oh yes! I got less interested in performing. However, I still work vocally alot, so you hear my voice in the film and I still have a very strong sense of myself performing in that way. I am much more interested in installation work and, of course, work that can be done without me being there. So, its fine to still work with other actors because you can just chuff them off, or a film, which has its own life once you have finished making it, or an installation.

B.S.: In Spitfire_123_, the role of the artist is even further subverted by Helen Hopkins acting the role of the director in part one. Why did you chose to make your role almost invisible?

L.J.: Well, I thought of doing it and then I couldn't be bothered. Its the same process of letting other people do the work. The person I chose actually is part Italian and that was my own background, so she is the closest in history to myself. Her mother was Italian whereas my grandmother was. So there was a sense of doing that even if it just fell apart immediately after that.

B.S.: I took some friends to see the performance, who didn't know you and didn't know your work and they thought she was Lyndal Jones. How do you feel about that?

L.J.: Fine. I don't mind at all. I don't have a big ego investment in being recognised on the street. What I love the most is making the work and so in the making I am fully there and once it is being viewed it is actually the audiences turn to make the work.

B.S.: How do you see your role as the artist in the performance?

L.J.: Its pretty well the same as the role for making any kind of creative project. I also have an installation version of the same work and a film version and the role has in some ways shifted. In the performance what interested me most was what happened between the first idea and the influences of the people who came in to work with me. And so I will shift the work to fit the space I end up with and the people who are actually there and it is that that is actually very exciting. The idea in itself is not all that interesting
Appendix B

INTERVIEW WITH IYANDA JONES
BY BROOKLYN SANDLAND

Katherine Sandland (K.S.): Interview dates please and place a special
manner from your own physical presence in your performances. Why
have you chosen to go pros and do you think it will continue?

I: I know Jones (I.J.): Oh yes! I go less interested in performing
however. I still work vocally, but so you hear my voice in the film
and I still have a very strong sense of my role in my performance.
And of course, work that can be done without me being present. So the film.

R.S. in Sheridan J.J. are the roles of the writer in every
supervision of Helen Hopkins, a critic of the role of the director in part
one. Why did you choose to make your role almost invisible?

I.J.: Well, it comes with the territory of being part of a film project.
The same process of telling stories to the audience and that the
broaden I choose correctly in my script is the content of the
viewer's reaction or response to my material. So there was a sense of
writing that was included in the performance. So what is your
friend know your work and your thought as I want.

Jones: How do you feel about that?

R.S.: Fine. I have a friend know your work and your thought as I want.

Jones: How do you feel about that?

I.J.: Fine. I want you to all. I have a big ego, in investment in
part because I am not a professional. I have the most of the
best, and so to the message. It's simple and once it is built
viewing is that, the audiences now to make the work.

R.S.: How do you see your role as the artist in the performance?

I.J.: The people will be the same...
but what is most interesting is what then happens. There is a huge amount of organisational work that is also a part of it and I hate that.

B.S.: What relationship did you have with the actors? Was it a collaborative relationship or an actor/director relationship?

L.J.: That is a complex question because it was an actor/director relationship but in that, it was not one in which they just did as they were told. I work with professional actors a lot and so what I do is something I think gets the best work from people. And most of the directors I respect most do this. It is to provide an environment whereby they can explore a range of responses and then I gradually hone it down. But I don't tell them the response at the start because then they would only give me what my imagination could provide. I think only a bad director does that.

B.S.: Do you think that by removing your physical presence from the performance, the focus is deflected from the artist's body, or the artist's subjectivity to the other issues motivating the performance?

L.J.: I think that is an interesting issue and I suppose the notion of an immediate ego is reduced and to the extent that people might wonder where my voice is. What I love is that it is contradictory, that there are gaps. That there would be different senses of who that one person is and perhaps therefore who they might be.

B.S.: I noticed that reviewers tended to see the work more in terms of experimental theatre than performance. How do you differentiate between experimental theatre and performance or do you think it is not necessary to differentiate between the two?

L.J.: Well, it's a complex issue. In a best of all possible worlds it doesn't matter. However, because people bring prejudices depending on the art form they are expecting to see, there are difficulties. The fact was that, given my druthers, I would have rathered theatre reviewers didn't review it, or that there were a number of reviewers. Some visual art reviews are starting to come out now. And the theatre people therefore saw the parts that were the most theatrical as most viable and that is understandable. Visual art writers will probably tend to see other parts as more viable. And they're the breaks. That's how it is. But I would have preferred, in fact we did ask, even more explicitly, some film and visual art reviewers if they could review it in magazines like the Age. But there were so many well known actors involved and a theatre publicist; (because that's what you normally use publicists
B.R.: When reactiveship, are you here with the service?

I'm.

J.S. That is a complex discussion because it was an acosting relation.

I./J: That is a complex discussion because it was an acosting relation

B.R.: Do you think that by removing your physical presence from the setting, punch of the utterance, should be the other issues involving the performance?

I.J: I think that is an interesting issue and I support the notion of

B.S. I'm going to introduce concepts to see the work move in
test of experimentation. When you are discussing

I.J: Well, it's a complex issue to be honest with myself. We have
gone about. However, because the people think, the goal. We've

B.S. And the people people inspection, that the people themselves

And your vision in the research, which is not anymore understandable.

And your vision in the research, which is not anymore understandable.
did the publicity and so it ended up with theatre reviews and I think that was a pity.

B.S.: So, do you differentiate between theatre and performance?

L.J.: Oh, yes, profoundly. There is a quality of presence that is not allowed in theatre, that is regarded as amateur or outside theatre concerns. There is an equality of objects and people in performance that theatre people tend not to see. So in fact the people who really had the easiest grasp on the performance were film people because they are used to both acting and the presence of objects. They are also used to different methods of cutting and interrelating; quite disparate concerns. And I am talking about experts. The general public or people who don't have a training in one of those disciplines, its actually quite fine for. They just liked bits and didn't like bits.

B.S.: There is a lot of discussion about the body in performance. How important do you think the body is in performance.

L.J.: I find the reference to the body absolutely contrary to the direction I want to go. I see it as a struggle to incorporate a physical presence in an art, in the idea of art. If you look at ourselves culturally and in a wider way, what it does is simply reinvigorates the old mind/body split. You're talking about "the body". So what I do and what I insist on is talk about the person. So I won't have any truck with "the body". Which is what makes performance, or live people being in it a very potent part of the work. It dissociates people's feelings. It is such an objectification and it is a disassociation. I find it really quite perturbing.

B.S.: How important do you think the artist's subjectivity or the actor's subjectivity is in performance?

L.J.: Well, that's an extension of the last question. Questions of subjectivity I think are all we have. Not in a world where there is an objective and a subjective, but only in a world that has many subjectivities. And you see, when you start to look at a world in that way, then you are not looking at questions of right or wrong to the same extent. You are looking at a world of relationships and that I am comfortable with.

B.S.: What qualities does performance have that cannot be achieved in installation?

L.J.: In installation work I'm not dealing with other performers. And the audience becomes the performer and that really intrigues
B:2. So do you differentiate between presence and performance?

I: 2. Of zero boundary there is a difference of presence and performance. I do not know in terms that is required asmntric or outside because... The presence or performance is a matter of opinion to people. So I think you might have... The presence is an attribute of people who have a training in one of those disciplines. The activity due to the... We have a training in one of those disciplines. It's activity due to the... Then I think that might have... The presence is an attribute of people who have a training in one of those disciplines. It's activity due to the... That might have...
me. With performers there is the extraordinary changeability of what they do. That has an aliveness and a vitality and there is a sense of risk for the audience then that is not there when it is just a video. They know it is dangerous. They know that someone could fall over and die or fart at any moment. So they are both interesting. The problems with performance; I usually only work with professional actors, or make a real offering to amateurs; (as I did with the people who were in the last scene, which meant training them for quite a long time); and so it is quite an expensive business. I also like working with people who are virtuosic in their area. You are just by passing a whole lot of problems. There are other problems. So it is very expensive which means it brings in a huge organisational problem. It means you have to start with a lot of people there. You cannot have people wandering in and out when they like. It has got to be situated over a very particular period of time. So you get in to crowd management, you get into publicity in a very different kind of way and so at that point you add thousands and thousands of dollars. And the organisational concerns that go with all of that.

B.S.: So why do you do both performance and installation?

L.J.: I started off doing performance and I became more and more enamoured of not having all that. When I first did performance, and it was also just me, so it wasn't so expensive then, and then clearly I wasn't enough. It was just too tedious after a little while. What actually happened was that I gave up teaching. I was teaching in a theatre school and in the theatre school, even before the constraints that have been imposed, you wouldn't get a regular time for research for your work, so you couldn't have a studio based practice. So I would have four weeks off a year, so that would be all I could do, is a performance. And I would be working five days a week with classes of twenty people. So that was one problem. The other thing was at that time I was working with slides which was viable. So to work with myself and some other people and slides; I could do that given the money and the time that I had.

So I gave up teaching and there were so many people working with slides by the late 80's. I thought if I ever saw another slide again it would be too soon. Particularly because most people were using them in a way that was just about seduction, and I had worked very hard to not do that. And so the natural thing was to go into video and so that is what I have done. I love moving images and so the work now, whether its video or people, its about the kinaesthetic. It is more and more about our moving sense rather than the optical which means that I can afford to be much more lush with the optical, if it is actually about movement. So that film
I'm afraid I don't have any specific meeting or past experience. However, I have some general observations about performance and management.

Performance and management are critical components of any successful organization. When I think of performance, I think of meeting goals, reaching targets, and ensuring that everyone is working towards the same objectives. When I think of management, I think of leadership, communication, and decision-making.

In my previous roles, I've had the opportunity to work with a variety of people and teams. I've learned that effective communication and clear expectations are key to success. Additionally, I've found that setting achievable goals and providing regular feedback is essential for continuous improvement.

One thing that I've noticed is the importance of setting realistic goals. Goals that are too ambitious can lead to frustration and burnout, while goals that are too easy can lead to complacency. It's important to find a balance.

In terms of management, I've found that strong leadership is crucial. Leaders need to be visionaries, but they also need to be practical and pragmatic. They need to be able to make tough decisions, but they also need to listen to their team and consider different perspectives.

Overall, I believe that effective performance and management are key to the success of any organization. By focusing on these areas, we can create a positive and productive work environment for everyone.
footage you saw from the inside of the plane of moving, (in part two, behind the singer), that forms a third of the film and that is absolutely about being subjective again, being inside it and being in continual movement.

B.S.: Is installation a new thing for you then?

L.J.: Well, I have done it since the early 80's but more and more frequently. I did a piece in '84 in Los Angeles that was an installation as well as a performance. Then in '86 I did and installation work that was a version of a performance. And then I increasingly would use the installation material as a conceptual and visual basis to sit the performances in, so they worked economically like that. And now it works the other way. I find the installation base and then I make the performance and then I make the film, because that comes out of a combination of the whole thing.

B.S.: How long is your film?

L.J.: It is a fifteen minute film which, if you are used to watching film; cinema, movies; that is the right length. I've stretched it. The AFC said that for what I was doing I should only have made a twelve minute film. They haven't seen the footage; I didn't show it to them.

B.S.: So that is to do with people expecting fast moving images?

L.J.: Yes. So, this is slower, although again it is about that sense of movement so it becomes faster. It is not slow and meditative. The Room with Finches work which is going to be shown in Canberra later has got a video on the back of it which is called Freud's couch and that is very slow and meditative; it drives people nuts! Its fun - and simpler.

So, I find video is much simpler to work with and more immediate. The thing about film is that the quality of the image is so much better. You win and you lose. The sound quality is not so good. But for showing at a big festival, to show a video to a whole bunch of people at once is crazy, you can't do it, its dumb. They are better for looking at on screens. But to show a big image you need that colour saturation.

B.S.: Do you think it is important that you attend your performances?

L.J.: Yes.

B.S.: Why?
H.S. What's a new thing for you then?

B.S.: Well, I've been in since the early 80's but more and more installation as well as performance. Then in '86 I did a show in Philadelphia. I did a piece in '84 in Los Angeles that was an installation as well as a performance. And then I installed work that was a version of a performance. And then I think that the current material as a consequence and necessity would use the installation material as a consequence and necessity and because that comes out of a combination of the work itself.

H.S.: How long is your film?

B.S.: It's a fifteen minute film which is you are used to watching fiction cinema movies that is the sign language. The structure of the AFC and what I was going to show only have made a fifteen minute film. That's because I think the shorter I think, the more intense it is.

H.S.: So what is to go with people experiencing last moving images?

B.S.: Yes. So that is to show, although again is to show that sense of movement as it becomes lesser if not slow and more immediate. The room with 'Image Work', which is going to be shown at MDST, I think is going to be a video on the pace of it which is called 'Image Work' and that is very slow and meditation is given people until he puts it simpler.

So I think video is much simpler to work with and more immediate. The finite point film is that the duration of the image is so much better. You can have you lose the sound duration is not so good for looking at a pigment 'in a picture' to draw a virtual to a whole pattern. That's what people are looking at an experience. But to show a pig image you need that color sensation.

H.S.: Do you think it's important that you extend your performance?

B.S.: Yes.
L.J.: It is a really weird thing because I had a huge fight with my production manager about it. He wanted me to stay at home. I go because I want to feel what is happening with people; what people do with it. And I just stand there fairly anonymously in the crowd and I have a sense of when people are intrigued or perturbed or annoyed. And also for people who do know me, sometimes they have to put their head in their hands and do an act of separation, or confusion. Because the stories that I tell, the starting points are my own life, but then I just fantasise, I go off into all this different stuff, but my friends, who know the beginning points think "Oh, Lyndal! Your sex life!". Its wonderful. So, its great like that. It mucks people who know me up, who could well be the easiest self-satisfied about seeing that stuff. But it is really to sense what it is about, what is happening.

B.S.: And does that change?

L.J.: It changes alot from night to night, so the meaning then shifts; how people respond changes. Some nights there is a fantastic buzz being part of an audience watching something because everyone is on edge, but other nights people are so pulled back and resentful and resistant and nothing is right and it is salutary.

B.S.: And in galleries you don't get to see people's reactions to the work.

L.J.: Yes, and you see how all this fits in with the sense of movement within yourself. Some people got nauseous watching the film.

B.S.: Yes, I did.

L.J.: Did you? And then other people were just hanging back. It depended on how far you were from it also. You would have had to have been close if that was happening. But you see I like being up the front and that's the other thing you'll see with this work. It is all very close so it is about intimacy. And I think that's what kinaesthetic is about. When you're so close to something it is no longer an optical experience. You have to put yourself there, in that space. You can't back off from it, you're implicated, you're next to it, you're engaged in it that way.

B.S.: I don't have any more questions for you, but if there is anything else you'd like to add...
I like to work late at night because I have a late night with my
production manager. I work late because I want to finish my work in the morning when people are fresh.

Sometimes I stand there for hours watching. The fishermen talk about how they have a sense of when people are in trouble or
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L.J.: I'm interested to know what happened for you during the performance. Things that you specifically remember about your own responses.

B.S.: Okay ... At first when Helen Hopkins came in I was confused because she was "directing". And I knew who you were, what you looked like. I'd also seen the installation at Artspace, so I had seen the videos of the poppies before and it was interesting to see people moving through them.

L.J.: Yes. There was a very different quality between the performance and the installation.

B.S.: Yes. And the sound in the installation was really chilling, especially in that space because it was so tranquil. In the performance it was not so surprising, perhaps because of all the people in the space, perhaps because I had heard it before.

L.J.: Well, they are very different pieces even though they use some of the same video footage and the sound that she put on the tape recorder was meant to be a very little sound. So you could see the tape recorder and it was clearly a little sound. And of course later on there were big sounds.

B.S.: Yes, that was interesting. The way all the technology was apparent. There was an openness about what was going on.

L.J.: To me that first bit was about showing the means of construction. Saying "this is what you're going to get."

B.S.: Part two was pretty overwhelming. The film and the sound. But I loved the way the singer was singing bits and pieces of everything and the interactions between the people on the stage. I think my favourite bit was probably part three. Probably something to do with voyeurism.

L.J.: Possibly. Absolutely. But the moment I really waited for when I saw it is when all the women are at the microphones talking and all the men had to stand and listen. In the history of theatre of course, within theatrical conventions it is usually the men who "drive" the scene. So they provide the energy source whereas here the women do that.

B.S.: Yes. And I liked the way all the people sort of flowed into each other. The people and the relationships all merged into each other. The stories all flowed so they were not one person's story but everybody's.
I'd like to express my interest in your performance. I think you specifically remember your own responses.

And I knew when Helen Hayden came in I was confused.

Yes, it was not so prominent. I think you're aware of the obstacles present in the installation we recently exhibited.

B: Yes. The sound in the installation was rather chilling.

W: Well, there were very different pieces each moved in response to some of the same video footage and the sound that built up in one section we meant to be a very little sound. So you could see the video footage and it wasn't exactly a little sound. And of course the large screen and it was almost a white screen.

It was as if the knowledge of your performance and the installation was absent. People in the space became because I heard it.

I think one idea was that sound.

And the sound in the installation was very different. The way in which the technology was approached. It was as if everything was going on.

I think your performance as a whole is very different. More suggestions, the film and the sound.

Possibly. Absolutely. Now the moment I really wanted for me to show is when the woman sat in the microphone listening. I think it had to stand in relation to the idea of giving the woman a sense. So they provide the context. And to make sure that the woman went out.

And I liked the way all the people sort of lowered into each other. The stage is different so we'd react with one person's story and another.

But in any way.
And the waiting in the laneway. I felt that the audience and the actors were mirroring each other. Some people in the audience were getting annoyed, but everyone was chatting and waiting; both the actors and the audience. We were all part of it. And then when the actors ran up the lane and one by one stopped. That was fantastic. Actually it was really horrible.

L.J.: It was fascinating to do. It is very hard for the actors not to act. And very hard for the audience not to expect that. Different kinds of performance modes are used throughout it so different people could be relaxed for different parts. The second part and the forth part you could only be part of in a sense because of the sound in the second part and, in the last one, you couldn't get a distance on the actors. They were right there with you. You couldn't get a distance in either of those. You were in it and there was no way of not being in it.

And then the first and the third, you could stand back and note, and have more room to negotiate it. And some people have real preferences. I have a real preference which is to go and stand right in the middle of it, which is why I make art like that. I like it to all happen around me. And there are other people who really need to stand back and have it over there. And people usually respond according to that preference. Although within that there are differences of course. That's a bit crude. But it is, none the less, one of the patternings I have noted.

B.S.: Yes, and I suppose it depends not just on a persons tendency toward one thing or another but on the whole surroundings to begin with and whether people feel comfortable in that situation.

L.J.: Exactly. But it changes of course because the audience could sit or stand anywhere so it depends on where you are and where you view it from.

B.S.: I liked the way the audience was directed from one place to another. In the first room it was quite intriguing being able to see that there was another room.

L.J.: It is an interesting thing to do; to make an exhibition out of performances. In retrospect I should have called it that rather than "A Performance In Four Parts". I think people would have dealt with it a bit differently.

B.S.: Yes. I think it does have alot to do with expectations.

L.J.: Yes all those things are dreadfully important. I was actually talked out of it but I should have insisted. Sometimes you have to
And the writing in the lower part. I felt that the audience and the
scene setting was good, but the audience was sitting and waiting
the actors and the audience. We were all there for it, and when
the actors ran on the stage and one by one stepped onto the stage.

Finance. Actually it was really horrible.

I.T. It was fascinating for me. It is very hard for the actor not to
act. And very hard for the audience not to experience it. Different
kinds of performance seems not very important to us different
people could be interested in different parts. The second part and
the second part you can only do part 1 in a sense because of the
situation in the second part and in the first part you can only do a
situation on the stage. They were like this. But you can’t really
contemplate a situation in order to just talk about it and where
were no way of not playing it in

And then the third and the fourth. You can’t stand back and take
steps. You and the other people have too many emotions. I really
have a fear that there is too much. And I realize that I like it the
most in the middle of it. Which is why I made the first thoughts. And
why I needed to act. And why I needed to act. And why I needed to
act. And why I needed to act. And why I needed to act. And why I
needed to act. And why I needed to act. And why I needed to act.

The influence of course. That’s a pit of course. But is it done the least.

One of the situations I have noticed

B.S. Yes and I suppose it depends on just on a隆重 land
speak well and we can’t do the Chaplin part and the people get comfortable in that situation.

I.T. Exactly. For all characters of course because the audience can’t
act or do anything so it depends on where you see the exact
place.

You view it from

B.S. I think if we are the audience we are not from one place to
another in the first room, but during interesting pieces or to see
women it’s a pit of difference

B.S. Yes I think if does have role to go with expectation.

I.T. Yes all those things are absolutely important. Sometimes you have to
filling out of it part I should have finished.
allow people who are part of it to make decisions on the things that are important to them, but in retrospect it would have made life alot easier for me.

BY BRONWEN SANDLAND

Bronwen Sandland (B.S.): Your performances tend to create situations rather than spectacle. In this context how do you think these events are performance?

Anne Graham (A.G.): Because they unfold I suppose. They require the presence of the artist to actually operate. They come to life. It is quite interesting to talk to people who have seen the installation in a non-operational situation. Somebody went through the railway station when I wasn't there; there was no food, no films, no sense of being welcomed into a space. And they described it as a very cool, minimal work, which it is not.

I don't mind the possibility of it being seen that way. It is actually ambiguous. It can be seen that way. And it is responding to all sorts of sculptural concerns that the minimalists were responding to.

But one of the main ones is that you actually walk into it and that I am actually there and that you actually engage with it. I find working with students too that at first they don't quite know what to do because people say "what is it?". It is in the middle of a public space and they want to walk into it. It is a non-threatening space to walk into. And in fact it becomes a kind of stage and they become the performer. The people who I work with, mostly students, start to engage with it in that sort of way and talk about it and respond to it. So it is a performance in that these things happen, these things occur. And when everyone moves out of it, these things die and it becomes a sculptural situation. I think the definitions, the boundaries between these things are not definite.

I have different audiences. There is always an art audience and they know they are in art; they know it is art. But the majority of people who see it are a non-art audience. There are people who just enjoy it as a disruption of the space, a disruption of the norm. It offers them an opportunity for imagining in a way that they normally wouldn't. And the interesting thing about offering that opportunity is that when it is happening to people they like to talk about it. So I spend a huge amount of time listening to people.

And the works are very evocative because they smell. There is the smell of food cooking, the kerosene lamps. And the light is very beautiful and very ambient, with kerosene lighting at night. It works on people's memories. The tents create a very immediate
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Anne Graham (A.G.): Because they understand, I suppose; they are used to seeing the presence of the spirit in everyday objects. They come to like it. It is quite interesting to talk to people who have seen the installation in a non-religious situation. Somehow their strength...In this room, no sense of being welcomed into a space...And their decision to sit down on some of the sculptures can mean that the minimalists were responding to it as a very calm, minimal work...which is not.

I can't mind the possibility of painting seen after way. It is satisfying. It can be seen that way. And it is responding to it empathically. If we can see that way...

...But one of the main ones is that your activity work into it and that I...

I find my activity here and part of your activity engages with it. I find very few people who can sit in that way. I don't know what can work with...in the middle of a work of this sort. So, to become people who can sit in that way. And in fact it responds to a kind of space and they do it to work with it. The people who work with me to become the performers, the performers, and people who are to work with it in the same way. And it is responding to it...

and respond to it. So it is a performance in that sense...and possibly...It's a kind of sculpture and it becomes a sculptural situation. I think it...

what is working...in the tension between these inside...not as

I have different audiences. There is a story in my/and and

And the activity here, the activity, became that. There is the

And the activity here, the activity, became that. There is the

And the activity here, the activity, became that. There is the
space that people can walk into. There is a sort of safety about it as well.

**B.S.:** Does the performance change each time you do it?

**A.G.:** Yes, totally! That's the other thing that can't be conveyed through photography. It is conveyed to a certain extent in the photographs but now I am recording the conversations that I have. This is a really new development but a necessary one because they are becoming the most important things that occur in the piece. They are becoming portraits of that place, the people. They are portraits of cities to a certain extent. The work in Melbourne was utterly different to the work in Canberra because of the kind of people who moved through that space. Also because of the kinds of connections they were making with the objects and absolutely because of the locations that were chosen.

Canberra is quite difficult to chose a location for me because it is so spread. The place had to be within a region around the gallery, so I actually chose a space that responded to the architecture of the city. The War Memorial on one side and Parliament House on the other and a flappy tent city in the middle. It was obviously making a comment both about the War Memorial and Parliament House. But it was also in a park that people cycled around, jogged around. And the population of Canberra tend to be public servants or retired (in that part). So the conversations I had there were very historical and very academic. Where as in Melbourne, one sight was with street kids and one was with junkies and one was on a gay beat, by mistake. So the work in those places was very much about the audience as well as the actual shape of it. The shapes that I have used for the last couple are actually pretty standard government sized tents that used to be issued to railway workers or builders. They used them in the army as well. So I get a huge amount of memories from people who have worked in those sorts of situations and, I have to say, it tends to be men in their fifties and sixties. And because it is Australia and there is a huge outdoors thing, I get alot of people who act like they are on holiday. And I have had wonderful responses in terms of people's histories really; their memories.

Also because this is a country where there are a huge amount of displaced people of many sorts, there is that sort of response too. It has that other layer which is about homelessness and about displacement. One of the earliest pieces I did; the Melbourne piece; was around the time of the Gulf War. I had been seeing those images of the Kurds, displaced. And then you see the Palestinians. So there is that as well. That piece in Melbourne moved around the
It was for that reason. It also meant that we didn't have much of an art audience because they couldn't follow us.

B.S.: Which one was the first in this series?

A.G.: The first one was the "Working In Public" which was at Walla Mulla Park.

They are all different too because they have different durations. Depending on how long you are in a place, the sorts of relationships that you have with the people are quite changed. At Walla Mulla Park, I went there every weekend for 8 weeks so I got to know the people very well and they were people who were pretty much living in the park. And they became very involved in the project; they became friends. So the possibility of that sort of relationship could not happen in Melbourne because it was moving around all the time. The relationships were shorter. But in Adelaide, being at the Adelaide Festival for four days; (and the Adelaide Festival is very intense); I got a festival audience. People coming and going to other things would come through regularly so it was a short but very intense kind of relationship. People knew when it was on so they would come in between other things.

Duration is very important. I prefer to be in a place long enough to establish relationships. I enjoy that. I actually enjoy quick hits as well. They are different.

B.S.: It seems important that the audience doesn't just watch the performance but becomes part of the situation and performers themselves.

A.G.: You can't just watch if because there is nowhere to watch it from. That is the difference between acting and performance. It is not about the proscenium arch; its about being in it. So even if you are walking through, you are actually in it; you are responding to it in a way. It is not just about looking. Although there are times when it is very sort of quiescent. And there is that possibility. I would not want to force people to be in it. If people just want to walk around it and think "bullshit", that's fine.

B.S.: How do you chose the films?

A.G.: You can't just watch if because there is nowhere to watch it from. That is the difference between acting and performance. It is not about the proscenium arch; its about being in it. So even if you are walking through, you are actually in it; you are responding to it in a way. It is not just about looking. Although there are times when it is very sort of quiescent. And there is that possibility. I would not want to force people to be in it. If people just want to walk around it and think "bullshit", that's fine.

B.S.: The presence of the artist is not foregrounded as the focus of the work. Do you think the presence of the artist is important?

A.G.: I do. For me it is important to be there because the conversations that are happening now are going to provide ongoing material for another piece. And they are very poetic. I think that the recording needs to happen and there is no one else that can actually do that. But in a way that is not the critical thing. I don't
have to be there. I can't be there talking to everyone all the time. There are lots of people there talking to each other, and eating and watching the films and having other sorts of experiences. So, for me, I have to be there, but I don't necessarily have to be there.

But for the work to actually live, things have to happen. I have got a routine. Inevitably you get a routine going and Tony, who I live with, usually does the cooking because I can't cook and engage with the people at the same time. If he is not there, I will have someone else there. Also to show the films. I spend alot of time just moving through it and people stand there, and I am very good at just going up to people and talking. I think working in the gaol was actually really good for that because I had to engage with one person after another all day, for five years. Teaching is good for that too. The other thing about working in the gaol was that you had to spend alot of time talking quite personally, and I don't have any problem with that. So there are these qualities you bring to it, that makes it what it is. (Its probably not a quality at all. You could describe me as extremely nosy!) But I actually really enjoy talking to people and I am really interested and intrigued by their responses to this thing.

The films are another really good way of generating responses and I always try to chose films that are appropriate to that situation. In Adelaide they were all train movies. Some of them were quite historical films looking at the development of trains. So I got all the railway guys in there because they were so intrigued. I try to use both contemporary and quite old films, so they are working with a range of viewers.

B.S.: How do you chose the films?

A.G.: It depends on what the place is. And if I am in a place long enough I will actually ask people what they would like to see, and then I'll show those films.

B.S.: Could you discuss collaboration in your work?

A.G.: Collaboration is very interesting. I was just in a conference in Adelaide with a very interesting man who was from RMIT. He was talking about the failure of collaboration. I have had some failed events. One quite spectacular, where we were quite a long way down the line with a piece of work and I just realised; "I cannot do this! This work is so far removed from its original intention". It was no longer what was interesting to me or what I wanted to do. It had become the other person's work. And I just moved out and said "That's yours, okay?". And that was because I was working with someone who was a friend but who wasn't
The time we spend together is a way of experiencing freedom. In that moment, we can be free to express our true selves, regardless of our circumstances. Each of us is a unique individual, with our own strengths and weaknesses. We are all part of a larger whole, and by working together, we can achieve great things.

Q. How do you choose the title?

A. O.C. If a project or project is 'and if I were a project', then I would choose a title that reflects the essence of the project. I try to use a title that is short and meaningful, so that it captures the essence of the project.

Q. Can you give an example of a project you have worked on?

A. O.C. One project that stands out to me is the development of a new software tool. It was a challenging project, but through teamwork and collaboration, we were able to create a tool that was both innovative and useful. The project was a great experience, and it taught me a lot about the importance of teamwork and collaboration.
collaborating. Or maybe I wasn't. That was the failure of collaboration - it didn't work.

But working with Tony and working with students, I have to be pretty controlled about how I want the work to be. And, after that, anything happens. I always acknowledge everyone who works on a piece. But I have had problems in the past. If you allow the work to stray so far from your intentions you can get into ethical problems, allsorts of problems. And you have got to be so scrupulous working with the human subject; which you are in performance.

I collaborate with Tony except that his input is really practical. An interesting collaboration was the Beggars Banquet at Performance Space. That was quite different, and worked much better. Victoria Spence curated these people; she selected people to work together. That was myself, Gai Bilson, and Christopher Snee. And she selected us for our very particular skill and we worked independently but in the same space. I created the space with the tents, Gai cooked, and Christopher did his beer tent. And other performances took place within that space we had created. It wasn't my work. It was actually Victoria's piece and I enjoyed that. I really enjoyed what happened out of it. What happened out of it was a huge queue. The queue was the event. I was quite intrigued by it. I thought "What am I doing? This is definitely not my work. I would never actually do that." And once I understood Victoria's role as the curator and relaxed into it, I really enjoyed that as a collaboration. It was quite unexpected. It was a collaboration in a way because I totally relinquished ownership and allowed what ever happened to happen and I enjoyed that. Because I wasn't working through the ethics of my own practice. The other thing that can be disastrous is sometimes when you are working with someone else they can just take the work and start doing things with it that can be very far removed from one's intentions. That happens with photography occasionally. I like to avoid that.

I worked with Derek Kreckler which I really enjoyed. And he just totally responded to what I wanted to happen. He was quite strong and different things happened because of that, but I enjoyed working with him alot. And I worked with Joan Grounds, whom I love, but I think we produced a very bad piece of work because I softened up too much. And we ended up with a work that was a bit sloppy. But it is interesting to do things that don't work because I thought about it alot afterwards. And I thought "How could I have allowed that to happen?" But you do tend to just go with it. I am very cautious of collaboration. I think you have got to be so careful about who you are working with and so respectful of the other people. Give them absolute credit for what it is that they do. But I
collaboration - it's give and take. But working withcocktail and working with students, I have to be pretty convincing when I want the work to be done. And after that, I always acknowledge the work that's been done on a problem, because that shows interest in the work and you show that you care about the work. But if you do anything to get people interested or to get people to go do something rather than to work, you don't care about the work. People give you unsolicited credit if you're not specific about the other people. Give them unsolicited credit for work if it isn't theirs.
really get pissed off when someone starts getting into my head and using it. It is not a pleasure. It should be able to work if people are absolutely clear about the intentions. And I think there has to be a great deal of conversation.

B.S.: There has been a lot of discussion about the body in performance. How important do you think the body is?

A.G.: Well, it's quite amusing really because in the early works, some of them were so much about the body. And I have a whole range of work that came out of those early performances which is still very much about the body. But in these works now, they are not really about the body.

Well they are about the body in that people walk into a space and there is a phenomenological response to being there. And they are very physical in that sense. And they are physical in that they are to do with conversation and the space between people. But if we are talking the body the body, the Kristeva body, that's not in that work. Although, I have to say that Sue Best talks about my work in a very female sense. These tents as apertures, as openings, as a very gendered space. And that take is definitely accurate. That is also there in the work. And yes they are about the body in that I am actually offering people food which they are ingesting. And I think as soon as you do that, you have a different sort of physical relationship with that person. Because they have taken this from you and it is becoming them. The other angle you can take is the whole thing about transubstantiation; offering.

Once you start unpeeling the work, yes, its about the body. But it is not about the body in the way that Cindy Sherman's work is about the body or the way much of my earlier work was so close to the body. This work [objects with hair] is about the body, very much.

B.S.: How important do you think the artist's subjectivity is in performance?

A.G.: The work wouldn't happen if I wasn't there. I acknowledge all the time that I really enjoy these shows because you can pack them all up into an amazingly small space. And I can move them around and I have always enjoyed that in my life. Being able to just pack something and move, relocate and begin again. And that I have enjoyed personally and I still do. I have this horrible tendency to just suddenly cut and move. And I see that in these pieces because they are this intense loving space and its gone. And I recognise that as part of my character.
B. What procedures/techniques do you think are most important to your success in your current role or position?

Well, I think it's a combination of several things. First of all, I think being well prepared and having a clear understanding of the tasks and responsibilities is key. Being able to communicate effectively with others is also important. In addition, I think it's important to have good organizational skills and to be able to manage time effectively. Lastly, I think being able to adapt to change and be flexible is crucial in my role.
So there are all those subjective things and I love the temporality of the work. For me, there is a very political commitment to the lack of monumentality in the work. So there is my history and my politics, my aesthetic, but I am also responding to a lot of reading in a way. So I am responding to that history and these readings. I have just been reading *Essays on The Blurring of Art and Life* by Alan Kaprow.

So the work is engaging quite academically with theories about the city, theories about publics, theories about population, theories about the way we live. The politics of all of those things. And it is also to do with power. It is interesting in terms of its art discourse because it is not fashionable. It is unquestionably not about ART, which seems to be the fashionable way to make art. It is working along the side of that. And I think Barbara Campbell and Lyndal Jones would probably fit into that category also.

B.S.: How do you see your role as the artist in your performances?

A.G.: When it is working with a big space and a lot of people, my role is to actually make it work on all levels. It actually does require an enormous amount of concentration to keep the right kind of level in those situations. Because in the railway station it can be violent and on the street it can be violent and if you are working with other people. I do take a fair amount of caution. So there is that role of making it work. You have got to be there, concentrating on it the whole time.

Prior to that my role, I think, is to really look and think and work with the space and correspond with that and make decisions about how it is going to be in that place. And that can be quite difficult. I just spent the day in Brisbane; found the perfect site, but then two weeks later, and two weeks less time, I can't use it. The artist is also the business end of the operation. I do work with a commercial gallery, but there is no way a commercial gallery would take on all the issues that occur, in terms of those sorts of public spaces. It is very organisational. But it only works when it comes to life. So it is not like doing a painting and then it is finished. Artists end up being their own secretaries; the business end of it. And then there is the absolute joy of it when it does come together.

B.S.: Have you ever had any big problems with the work in public spaces?

A.G.: There have been no big problems to do with the work at all. Because of being in a public space, things do occur. In the Adelaide Railway Station, there was actually a death in that place and there was also about six incidents of violence. But those things happen in
So the work for me that is very policy oriented, commitment to the lack of meaningfulness in the work. So there is my passion, and my policy objectives, my ambitious part I am to responding to those challenges I have lived personal Kessing on the injustice of Art and the lack of personal.

Art & Education: I am working on the site of Art and I think Herbert Campbells and I regard would want property fit into that category also.

How do you see your role as the artist in your performance?

A.C.: When I’m working with a new space and new set of people, my role is to study that and make decisions. I have to study that to get a sense of that. I need to understand the light and the space, the amount of light, the amount of people. I need to understand if it is possible to do it with light and if you are comfortable with light, with light and light. I take a first amount of caution so to work in that role of making it work. You have got to go there. Then there is the space and the work with light and light and light and light.

Prior to that my role I think is to study that and think about work with light and set that with that and make decisions. I don’t know if it is going to go in that place. And that can be quite difficult. I have seen three times and two weeks later that I can’t see the light is a major part of the operation. I go wrong with a communication barrier, but I am not on the space, but we can communicate. I take on the logistics that occur in terms of those sorts of things and how the work moves when it comes across it is work of communication. But it only works when it comes in this place. And then there is the absolute job of it when it goes together.

I.L.: I have never had real big problems with the work in public spaces.

A.C.: There have been no big problems to go with the work at all.
those places. And the railway authorities were a bit nervous about it being there but in fact relaxed into it and were great. At Walla Mulla Park we were dealing with a very fragile population of people and we did alot of things there that one would not normally expect artists to do. We would take people to the police station, take people to the hostel. But I have never had a negative response from members of the public.

You get the art audience...This is not work that is going to appeal to everybody. If you happen upon a critic who has very decided tastes in the other direction, you can get some pretty negative responses, but never from the public. It is quite interesting because it is over a long period of time now. I had one classic case of someone who came to see it and she reviewed the mural on the wall rather than the work. It must have been so far removed from what she thought art might be; she thought that I had done the mural on the wall.

B.S.: Do you think that by using a number of people in your performances, the focus is deflected from the artist's body or the artist's subjectivity to other issues motivating the performance?

A.G.: Yes. And that's fine. I don't always use alot of people. Mostly I have people helping, people around. And if someone who comes engages with one of those people; that's good. Or engages with someone else who is in the space; that's also good. Or watches the movie. It is very important for me to be there because of what I am doing. But for people coming into it, that is not an essential part of it at all. It doesn't matter. I like the work to operate on all those different levels and to have something in it that is going to allow for a series of engagements. I am happy with lots of people.

B.S.: It seems like there are always alot of people and it is difficult to tell who is the audience and who is the performer.

A.G.: I must say that I do enjoy that. You find some really wonderful conjunctions of people. Because of the way people dress these days, you don't know if you are talking to a gallery director or a garbage man. And I like that.

B.S.: What do you think are the most important aspects of performance?

A.G.: That it works so well in the space that people do engage with it. That it offers that opportunity for engagement on all those different levels. That all the elements in the piece of work are necessary for that thing to operate as an entity, and then that it goes. It is important for me that it actually goes because there is
You see, the issue... This is not about what is going to happen to you every day. It is about how you interpret the events you encounter and how you respond to them.

B.S. Do you think that by using a number of people at the back of the performance the focus is separated from the direct input of the audience and from their responses to the performance?

A.G. Yes. And that's fine. I don't always see what I want, quite honestly. And I'm someone who believes in people being creative and doing their own thing. Of course, with some limitations, but that's my approach.

I'm going to tell you a story that I've heard. You want to hear that story?

A.G. What do you think is the most important aspect of performance?

B.S. That it works so well in the space that people can enjoy it.

A.G. That it offers new opportunities to performance on all levels. To have different levels of performance in the piece of work and to have more variety of it and to have other opportunities for that kind of exposure in all aspects.
something about that quality of being there and then not being there that is quite magical.

It's anti-monumentality is important too. And the fact that I never know what is going to happen is important. I have no idea. I can't predict anything and I really enjoy that. That is very exciting for me as well; what might occur.

I will really look at a space for a long time and find out about the history of it before the event. There is also alot of immediate response occuring all the time. The work is not that predictable, although because it is quite big you have to be pretty structured about it.

I am on that very other end of performance in a way, in that the body has become invisible.

B.S.: What qualities does performance have that cannot be achieved in installation?

A.G.: It is that incredible engagement with other people. I do alot of installation too and I am doing more and more.

In installation the artist works with a space and something occurs and you don't have to be there and there is a certain amount of predicability about it. Whereas in these events there is no predicability about what might occur and what experiences people might have in the space because it is about interacting with other people and interacting with life. The flow that's going through the space itself. That is the enormous difference. We are out of the protected space of the gallery in the performances. As soon as you are, you're open to a whole host of other influences and possibilities and problems, which can be quite challenging. I think I do find it more challenging than working in a gallery space. I enjoy working in galleries very much. The sheer bliss of knowing! You make certain decisions and you are operating in the protected space, the confined space of the gallery. On the street you have got no idea what is going to happen. So that is the hugest difference. And the audience is totally different. In a gallery, you get art people. So it is a whole different set of involvements.

B.S.: Do you think you will continue doing both installation and performance?

A.G.: Yes.

B.S.: Do you have a preference?
I will really look at a space for a long time and find out more about it. I will really look at a space for a long time and find out more about it.

A.C.E. If I am thinking about people with other people, I go to an installation and I see going more and more, or installation where, where there works to a space and sometimes occurs where you can have to be there any place is a certain amount of people and interest in people. Where in these areas it is no possibility. Point might occur and might occur, and interest in the people and interest in the people.

As soon as you project space, space becomes more interesting and more interesting to people in a space. And if you project space with a space that is going to happen, so that is the budget difference. And the way it becomes naturally different in a Kelley. You see it in people. So if you project space, it is a whole different set of improvements.

B.8. Do you think you will continue going your installation and performance?

A.C. Yes.
A.G.: I think they are almost both essential and inevitable. I really like using different spaces and the connections with the spaces are to a certain extent architectural. In a way I am still working in terms of a flow of energy, a movement through the space; through the body of a building, through the body of a city. So I don't really distinguish so much. They are all necessary aspects of the work and I find I can work at home on the installations and allow my eccentricity and perversion to come out.

I enjoy the academic of exploring issues around all aspects of the work; the performance and installation work. I think most sculptors these days operate with space in a very different way than previously.

In fact the history of it is that it started off as a radio piece when I was working at the ABC. I did a lot of short performances for radio. It's hard to know what to call them but let's call them radio dramas although they don't really fit that category either. I did a lot of radio dramas: wrote them, researched them, produced them, mostly performed them myself and got them to air.

That piece I wrote but didn't actually want to voice myself, so I got another person who works at Radio National, Sherry Denise, who is a performer in her own right, to do the text. I thought at the time that someone else could give it more dramatic presence than I could. Voicing texts was something I wasn't particularly comfortable doing at that stage. So it started off as a radio piece which I've allowed someone else to perform.

Then I was invited to do a performance for the Queensland Art Gallery, for an exhibition called Out Of The Veld, celebrating the ten year anniversary of the Sex Discrimination Act. The exhibition drew works out of their collection by female artists. They wanted some performance and I was invited to do a piece for that. And because the exhibition context was the development of women's rights I thought Sylvia Pankhurst was the perfect figure because she came at the beginning of that whole suffragette movement. So I decided to adapt the performance from radio to a live context. Again, a very unusual thing for me to do. So the visual images were there really to support the text; they were there to make the text more solid, more object-like.

Because the central part of the text is very dramatic; it tells the story of Sylvia Pankhurst being force fed and a lot of that text comes from her own personal writing about it; they're mainly her words; already there was a sense that I had to embody her experience of what it was like to be 'force fed'. So that required a much higher level of dramatisation than I'd ever been involved in before and all
A.C.T. I think I've been more practical and interpretative. I really
like using different spaces and the connections with the spaces. I
work as an extrait architect. In a way I'm still working in
a certain extrait architectural. I move all around the city, a
mountain in the space, a group of people, the spaces. And
I think in a way I can work on the installations and show my
experiences and projects to come out
I enjoy the academic or exploratory. The spaces and the
work the performances and installations work. I think most
compares these two aspects with the space in a very different way.
Bronwen Sandland (B.S.): How did you come to collaborate with Jai McHenry in *Sylvia Pankhurst is Hungry*?

Barbara Campbell (B.C.): I'd actually be wary of calling it a collaboration. I see collaboration as working with someone to form a performance. That one (*Sylvia Pankhurst is Hungry*) has an unusual history within my practice because it is the only performance in which I've allowed someone else to perform.

In fact the history of it is that it started off as a radio piece when I was working at the ABC. I did alot of short performances for radio. It's hard to know what to call them but lets call them radio dramas although they don't really fit that category either. I did alot of radio dramas; wrote them, researched them, produced them, mostly performed them myself and got them to air.

That piece I wrote but didn't actually want to voice myself, so I got another person who works at Radio National, Sherry Demise, who is a performer in her own right, to do the text. I thought at the time that someone else could give it more dramatic presence than I could. Voicing texts was something I wasn't particularly comfortable doing at that stage. So it started off as a radio piece which is why it is so text heavy, text dependent.

Then I was invited to do a performance for the Queensland Art Gallery, for an exhibition called *Out Of The Void*, celebrating the ten year anniversary of the Sex Discrimination Act. The exhibition drew works out of their collection by female artists. They wanted some performance and I was invited to do a piece for that. And because the exhibition context was the development of women's rights I thought Sylvia Pankhurst was the perfect figure because she came at the beginning of that whole suffragette movement. So I decided to adapt the performance from radio to a live context. Again, a very unusual thing for me to do. So the visual images were there really to support the text; they were there to make the text more solid, more object like.

Because the central part of the text is very dramatic; it tells the story of Sylvia Pankhurst being force fed and alot of that text comes from her own personal writing about it; they're mainly her words; already there was a sense that I had to embody her experience of what it was like to be force fed. So that required a much higher level of dramatisation than I'd ever been involved in before and all
my fears about learning texts came back to me. Because I'm not trained to do that - my nightmares are about forgetting lines. But I knew that's what had to be done, so I did the performance there and in Tasmania as well. And in neither place I felt completely comfortable, both in how the texts and images worked together and in the fact that I was putting myself into this sort of role.

So when the Performance Space called for proposals for the Progressive Dinner, to do with food and eating, again I thought rather than celebrate the act of eating, I would bring out the political nature of the denial of food; the denial of food as a political act. And I suggested this piece, all the time thinking "Why am I doing this again? Why am I torturing it? Why don't I just bury the thing?". But instead I thought at least I might be able to solve one of those problems and hopefully both of them, by getting someone else to perform it. Someone who is actually trained to embody texts, as characters.

B.S.: Is Jai McHenry an actor?

B.C.: Yes, she's an actress, and she's also someone who has worked in experimental ways, with directors. She was until very recently part of Sidetrack Performance Group. And she had seen some of my work and liked it. So I thought there would be some rapport and we'd be able to work well together and we did.

So, it's not collaboration. I directed her to perform the text. She brought her own acting skills to the piece, to give it more presence than I could have. And of course that allowed me to step right outside the piece; again something I had never done before. And quite a few changes were made to the way the images and the sound, the text, worked together. It was staged in a slightly different way than it was in Brisbane and Hobart.

And it is the kind of piece that works well in a kind of seminar or conference sort of setting rather than a straight dramatic setting. Originally it was proposed to me by the performance space that it would be incorporated in an evening of performances and that wouldn't have worked at all. I didn't want it to be like a little cabaret act or something. The structure of it depends on a kind of shift between different modes of demonstration. One of them is demonstration in an illuminating or educating way; showing something. In this case we were showing the act of force feeding. And of course demonstration as a political act. So it needed to be supported by an atmosphere of demonstration in that first sense. So those two other women who gave there papers were demonstrating something and then that is what we did.
B.S.: Do you think that by working with other people, the focus is deflected from issues of the body or the artist’s subjectivity, to other issues motivating the performance?

B.C.: I think they are probably dispersed to a range of bodies. I don’t think they are deflected. I don’t think subjectivity is deflected. I think it is just divided. In that case I think it is divided.

B.S.: I am interested in the idea of using someone else’s body instead of your own. A lot of performance in the 70’s and 80’s was all to do with the physicality of the body, the naked body. I get the feeling that these days it’s moved on from that and it has become a bit more sophisticated. The body, or performance is more a tool to express other issues.

B.C.: Yes. I certainly think that’s always been a question that I have been conscious of with my work. The question of subjectivity. And I have consciously tried to deflect primary subjectivity away from me to one of implicating the audience in that subjectivity. So the position I prefer to take is one of mediation. So if you think of a technician who will assist or is involved in the primary act to help them. It’s like a channelling. It’s a hard thing to describe.

B.S.: So it’s there in your choice of characters and your interpretation of them, but not as YOU?

B.C.: Yes. Maybe another way to look at it is that I set myself up as a mirror to reflect the subjectivity of the audience. Not a great analogy actually. Probably more like a glass, a window, a sheet of transparent material. The audience is there on one side in their subjectivity looking through me, the glass, to something on the other side which is also looking back through the mirror. And in that process, the fact that the glass is there, changes the look of the subject.

B.S.: Like looking through water?

B.C.: Yes, its very complicated. Its a hard one to pull apart.

B.S.: In the past your presence has been the focus of the performance. Do you think you will continue to work alone or as a director?

B.C.: Well, I can certainly see some advantages in directing but I think for the most part I need to be the thing that interprets all the elements of the work. But I have to say some of that is pragmatics and economics. There is no way I could pay someone else to do the
kind of work I have prepared myself to do. But I also spend a lot of time researching and preparing for a performance. Over months, sometimes years, I build up a body of knowledge that I have to keep contained in my own person in order to realise the work and that is very difficult. That body of knowledge is hard to translate effectively to someone else, and hope that they can realise it in as full a way as I could.

B.S.: In your performances you tend to take on a persona or interpret a persona of a mythologised figure. Could you discuss what motivates your choice of character?

B.C.: Yes. I'd actually be a bit reluctant to say that I take it on. I've never actually found a term that completely satisfies me as to what I do...Focus? Interpret? But certainly what I do not do is characterise or embody them. The choices are to do with first of all the way these figures continue to live in the imagination of contemporary life. And the way they have been changed over time to suit successive publics. Obviously the longer the period between the now and the then, the more mutations have occurred. But it's still the fact that they do still in some way prick the imagination; that's what interests me.

So it has not got that much to do with the originals truth of their lives because that is something that will always be buried in the past. But the way they have been interpreted and the way that contemporary thought has been able to play with aspects of their lives. So they are well known figures on the whole. I am not an archaeologist in the sense that I am not discovering previously undisclosed lives, although that is obviously an interesting thing to do. But I look at people that everyone knows.

Everybody has heard of Mary Queen of Scots or Marie Antoinette. And there's also some aspect of their life that people know in some way. They usually don't know all the intricacies of those lives. Mary Queen of Scots is always thought of in a very sympathetic light. That she was the one who was hard done by in the pact, in the wash up with the English throne. That Elizabeth was the victor and Mary was the vanquished. So her life is shrouded in tragedy, and more than that a lot of people just don't know. But there are certainly images that are attached to her life that make the myth more powerful. The fact that she was incarcerated for the last nineteen years of her life. And when people think of the incarceration of a queen they immediately put her in a tower. In fact she did not live in tower. She lived in a draughty old castle in the north of England, but she was not actually kept in a tower. But it's a powerful image.
B.S.: Are you interested in working from the popular idea of your characters rather than the truth about them?

B.C.: Well, I think the truth is always elusive and interestingly so. Its when the truth is put at the service of other motivations that it becomes interesting. So, while in some ages she would be looked at in a sympathetic way, at other times and other places she would not. She would be seen as completely self serving and self obsessed. And I did try to take some of the sympathy out of her story and show its self obsessive nature with the film of the embroidering of my palm. That to me symbolised ultimate self obsession, self absorption really.

B.S.: I still felt sympathetic though. The isolated figure and the skirt coming apart were very poignant.

B.C.: The music probably had as much to do with that as well. That's why it is a good mass. It actually invokes all the right passions that as a Christian, as a catholic, you are supposed to feel. That is why it is one of the more popular masses.

B.S.: Is the character a way of distancing yourself from the audience?

B.C.: Yes.

B.S.: Why do you feel that you have to distance yourself from the audience?

B.C.: Because ultimately I don't think I am that interesting, so I don't want to show myself. I am not the most fascinating person in the world. I would not dream of writing an autobiography and expect people to enjoy it. I use myself as a way of offering some kind of critical self knowledge to the audience. "Why are you as a collective body interested in this subject; or how does it affect you?" "What in your own life can be projected onto this other life?" I am a kind of mediation. I think mediation is a very powerful position to have. That you allow a package of dialogue or discourse to take place. So yes, its not ME. It has hardly anything to do with me. Although of course my own passions and interests have to be there. I could not communicate anything if that was not the truth. There are always personal fascinations there.

In the tower performance, the way that skirt was sewn and formed was largely to do with my own kind of vocabulary of experience. So, I knew for instance that a skirt could be made from a continuous strip of ribbon. It was not hard to imagine. And that it could be held together with tacking and my physical knowledge of
tacking allowed that piece to develop in that way. If I had no experience of that very basic skill, it would not have come out the way it did.

B.S.: Did you embroider the words on the ribbon yourself?

B.C.: Yes. And more importantly the pulling out of the tacking during the performance was for me the very pleasurable part of the performance. That on one hand I was effectively destroying two days work in twenty minutes by pulling out all of that tacking and then having it all just fall apart. But on the other hand it is an incredibly satisfying thing to do. To actually physically do it; to pull it out and have it just fall away.

B.S.: How do you see the role of the artist's subjectivity or the self in the context of the characters you investigate?

B.C.: In the same way as I see the audiences subjectivity in relation to the characters. I think we are all implicated in each other's subjectivity; inter-subjectivity. I think we collectively reform each other's subjectivity.

B.S.: How do you see your performances in terms of acting or theatre? Do you think its important to differentiate between theatre and performance?

B.C.: OH YES! I DO!

They have very different conventions and its the scope of those different conventions that makes me prefer the conventions of performance to the conventions of theatre. I think they can convey equally important things but they do it in very different ways. And I am much more attune to the conventions of performance. So, some of those are about the relationship to an audience; an active rather than a passive. To visual detail, to a more critical working of the material, less reliance on the text to carry the meaning, and interpretation of the text. The text is not the primary object. And the sorts of traditions of theatre; I think its place in contemporary society has been eroded. I'd hesitate to say that it was dead completely but I'd have to say it is moribund. I don't think it is an agency for change. I don't think it has political force.

B.S.: So how do you see yourself as a performer as actively engaging the audience?

B.C.: That the way the images of all kinds; sound, images, text etc; requires a certain amount of work on the part of the audience.
They have to actively work with the material. For me it's an intellectual thing.

B.S.: It's not so much a physical involvement with the audience?

B.C.: No. Obviously there are a lot of performances that require much more physical involvement with the audience than I do.

B.S.: So it is active in terms of interpretation.

B.C.: Yes.

B.S.: How are you using the body in your performances?

B.C.: (laugh) The body is always something that's talked about in performance. There's a book over there called Body and Self.

B.S.: Yes. The concluding remark in that book is that aspects of the body and the self are the most important themes in performance.

B.C.: Well. We could talk forever about this. I think it assumes continued currency in the Cartesian split between mind and body, for one thing. I'd probably prefer to be in a book called Mind and Self. There are so many arguments wrapped up with what the body is... "Does the body encompass the mind?" "How is the body formed?" Anne Marsh is a Lacanian follower, so where she is coming from is much more to do with the psychoanalytical subject split.

For me, (this is a gross oversimplification of what happens) but the body is there as a support for the brain as much as anything else. I think that by buying into the whole body argument, there is some kind of inherent assumption that the body is the source of all knowledge, its own body of knowledge.

B.S.: So a kind of reversal of the hierarchy inherent in the Cartesian mind/body dualism.

B.C.: Yes, and there are so many things that it seems to assume. Its sort of like a return to primitivism in a way. That the truth lies in this sort of prelatarian purity. It is not something that I feel particularly akin to. I think it is over determined, the whole body debate. There is too much emphasis on the body without fully teasing out what that actually means. You will find, again, a lot of performance artists who you can quite easily see that that is their primary focus. Mike Parr is a classic example. Even Stelarc, and they disagree in a lot of ways, but they would probably hold together on that point.
B.S.: So performance is a way of activating an idea?

B.C.: Yes. Its looking at experiential knowledge as a medium. And certain images can only be generated through the medium of time, and obviously there has to be a physical presence, for some of those images to be generated. So, yes, the body. Its a major dilemma. I understand why the body is always projected as the primary focus of performance because its always there.

B.S.: But people don't talk about paint as the primary focus of painting.

B.C.: No ... Well, some people do!

Exchange. Discourse. I think it has to do with discourse. There has to be an active dialogue between performers and the audience. Active engagement - that's what I'm striving for.