



# Applied Choreography with Lucy Cash

*(automated transcript from otter.ai)*

## **SPEAKERS**

Gill Clarke, Lucy Cash, Audience

*(Introduction: Renée Bellamy speaking in 2021 over spare guitar chords)*

Welcome to Independent Dance. This talk is part of our digital library, which houses an extensive collection of material to read, watch and listen to, drawn from ID's programme over the past decades. This talk is part of the Crossing Borders series, which ran between 2008 and 2019 and featured dance artists in conversation with people from other fields, including philosophers, scientists, geographers, and architects. The entire library is free to access at [independentdance.co.uk/library](http://independentdance.co.uk/library).

*This is a field recording of variable quality with a live audience at Siobhan Davies Studios.*

*(2009 audio file begins)*

### **Gill Clarke 00:45**

Nik Haffner last week made a nice segue into Lucy Cash's talk this week by showing a short excerpt of her films. I kind of hesitate to introduce her as filmmaker, as will become revealed later. Her talk is called applied choreography. And I promised Lucy I would give a tiny little bit of kind of background to why that might be. We've been talking over, gosh, quite a long period of time, every now and then about the really interesting work that we both feel has been coming out in different ways from artists whose background and education is dance, but the work maybe doesn't come out through a dance form. And do we call that work dance? Or do we call it something else? And then what do we call ourselves? And I really enjoyed in these talks last year, there was an artist called Claire Twomey, whose education and background was as a craftsperson in ceramicist, and had begun to call herself an artist who works with clay. So I enjoyed the thought of taking that into movement and thinking well and artist who works with movement, or is it dance, or is it choreography. And then notice that she was working in this exhibition, Jerwood Space that was called applied crafts. And I enjoyed the idea that I'd always sort of understood applied arts were craft. And then the idea that applied crafts, were actually people with a craft skill and expertise with certain materials who might now be thinking of their

work more as an art practice. So that's kind of the background to conversations we had about, well, maybe we could be applied choreographers that give kind of an idea back then

### **Lucy Cash**

we did also decide that possibly you could be an applied citizen, because of a whole kind of branch different applications that you could label yourself with if you chose to. So it's quite nice to kind of think about this word in a different way.

### **Gill Clarke**

I promised also to ask you a question, which felt really useful to me, it felt that thing of our identity sometimes comes from what our education was our formation, what were the skills that we got hold off first, somehow. So I wanted you just briefly to give us a sense of, Well, what was the education that led you to this crossing borders kind of place that you're in.

### **Lucy Cash 03:48**

So haha, always is a complication at the root of things. So I have to go back slightly into the small story, which is that when I was doing lots of dance training as a teenager, devoted to my dance training, I got hit by a car on a crossing on the way home from a very long morning of dance. And because I was so tired from dancing, actually, I was hit by the car and thrown back onto the pavement, and I dislocated my knee and I fractured my skull, but apart from that, I didn't break my spine. So it was really good news. But the problem was that everyone told me Well, you can't go and study dance. You can't do that now because you're basically too much of a risk. So nowadays for us, I would ignore all of that, but being an impressionable teenager, I thought Blimey, they're probably right. And anyway, it's hard enough so I ended up going to university and I studied performance and film at Bristol and never felt quite like I fitted in and I had a fantastic education in the I got exposed to a whole range of ideas. Lots of theory, I studied bits of sociology, psychology, feminism. So I had a really, I got a chance to, to think about a lot of things and to do a lot of writing. And that feels really valuable. But what it meant that was that I basically worked as a performer, I didn't see myself as someone who was a maker at all. And so I left university still as a performer. And then it kind of took a while to kind of leave behind all of that criticism, identify other people's work at university, and start to sort of consider and be brave enough that I might begin to make work myself. And that's extraordinarily different and probably sounds quite odd for anybody who goes to a conservatoire or an art school, where you're so encouraged to think about your practice, but I wasn't encouraged to think about practice at all. That just isn't how University at that point worked. And that's my, that's my complicated beginning. And I often am really, really happy to improvise. But for some reason, I was thinking, actually, I wanted to write down some thoughts that I have in relation to these ideas that I just talked about. So I actually have written down some ideas. But before that, I just wanted to say thanks to Joe, because the idea of crossing borders is really important to me, and also apologists to Nick, because I was out of London last week, and otherwise, I would have been here. So thank you. So I'm going to kind of refer a little bit to this, but I'm really, really happy to be derailed any point. And these are only pieces of papers, and I don't need to get through them. So I just want to say that it's more important if we find something interesting to land on the way and don't worry, I'm not just going to talk I will show some things as well.

So okay, first are 10 things gonna give you an image of:

"our body is in the world like the heart is in the animal" - Merleau Ponty.

"the reshoring notions of so called insight for how I came to be who I am stories are a poor substitute for people's capacity to transform their worlds." - Adam Phillips.

"the purpose of art is to challenge perception." - An artist I met last year

"when we're silent and when we stand still, we are not resting. We're searching inside ourselves for the turn." That's a poet, Dan Beachy-Quick

"A visible parlance of bodies, objects, houses, roads, trees, fields." - Robert Bresson.

"My movie is born first in my head, dies on paper is resuscitated by the living persons and real objects I use, which are killed on film, but placed in a certain order and projected onto a screen come to life again, like flowers in water." That's Bresson again.

"To movement then everything will be restored and into movement. Everything will be resolved" - Henri Bergson

"I thought if you opened people up, you would find landscapes inside them. Inside myself, I found the landscape of beaches." - What I remember from seeing Agnes Varda's film *The Night Before Last*

"to omit what no one else has thought of leaving out." That's Brian Eno, quoting Peter Schmidt. And finally,

"the job of the clown is to raise doubt in the audience," which is something I heard Jerome Bel say.

Two. This talk is in parts by the way, that was part one, this is part two. When I first started thinking about what it means to move between disciplines, it seems that the words translation and displacement were useful ways of conceptualising this. Displacement we're familiar with, we displace a movement from one part of our body to another, or we take something out of its usual environment and place it elsewhere. As a description it's spatial. The problem is it suggests that there is an original place to be displaced from. Similarly, although translation actually means to be capable of being expressed in another language. Again, we often think of a translation as having a starting point in one place, which shifts to another. Lately after a discussion with Gill a few months back, I've been thinking about the word applied, and how this might be a more useful way to describe some of the processes that I feel I'm using in the work I do. So I looked up applied because I thought I should check out the definitions. And amazingly, there's quite a few different ways that you can use the word Apply. Apply means to make use of as relevant or suitable so you can apply a theory to a problem. You can put to use you can apply pressure to a door You can bring into action. So you can apply brakes in order to come to a stop. You can use as a label, or designation, as in don't apply that to me. You can assign for a specific purpose, she applied a portion of her salary each week to savings. You can devote or employ diligently you can apply yourself to something. And you can also placed in contact with so you can apply paint to a wall or a bandage to a wound. And you can make a request, you can apply for something. So I like the subtlety of new answers offered by this word. And it can be used in connection with bringing attention to something and placing things in proximity to one another, as well as the fact that you could be relevant or pertinent. And the fact that it doesn't carry the same sense of originating in one place and ending up in another. Part Three. Some thoughts

about not being an expert. There's something about this. Sorry, I should say this. Being an expert. Again, a definition is defined as having extensive skill or knowledge within a particular field. When it's validated publicly, it easily gets tied to an individual, rather than something which could be shared like expert attention. There's something about his position of moving between disciplines. That means you can never consider yourself to be an expert. This is tricky within contemporary thinking, because increasingly, the world is divided up into specialisations. That call for a person to define themselves as an expert of something in order to be heard or taken seriously, and for their opinion, to be valued, to be of worth. And yet by the very nature of moving between two disciplines, you work against the idea that you can be an expert because you work against the idea of a single specialisation. Within the performing arts being an expert is often characterised as being a great performer. Being a great performer is the mix of having a subtle, sophisticated use of technique at the surface of a strong presence or charisma. There's a whole industry built on that. One thing that I've also observed by crossing over between different art forms is that experts from different fields often find it very hard to communicate with one another. Because each form of human knowledge or expertise quickly begins to generate its own shorthand or jargon, which means that those in the know can communicate more succinctly and briefly and pass your ideas more swiftly. Unfortunately, those outside of the field can be baffled or left in a state of half translation. This has never felt very helpful to me, because it often disguises the fact that ideas are being that are being discussed, may in fact have things in common, but it just being considered from two different viewpoints viewpoints. The other thing about this area of non specialisation is that we can very quickly believe that if we're not expert, then we won't do a good enough job, we won't be full or rich enough in what we do. For me as an artist, I've been thinking of ways in which to disentangle an idea of specialism within a certain form. So the idea of becoming an expert and certain qualities that feel like they're relevant and necessary, and he might be useful in the world. This is certainly relevant to an application of both movement training and an understanding of choreography in other disciplines. Some of those qualities, which is a lifelong aim, and aiming to become expert in our listening, giving attention to and being able to hold two contradictory ideas in my body at the same time. I'm definitely interested in pursuing ideas through an experiential set of conditions that understood phenomenologically rather than through a lens of a representational intellect, or particular schooling. I'm not sure what word to use for this, but maybe for now kind of embodied intelligence. This is in part come about from my work with goat Island, who are a performance company that were until recently, I'm gonna make salad, they're dead. They're all still alive, but the company making work for about the last 20 years in Chicago. But this year, the company has gone on and is no longer making work together and different members in the company are making now making work by themselves and in different configurations. As a company was always very clear with Ireland that there were a group of performers with no particular specialism or rather, the company was both the sum of a more than the sum of the parts of a group of people with different specialisms that decided to try and share languages within the form of performance. If you go to go Islands website, it says on the front page, we have discovered a performance by making it hidden within the statement is a very subtle ecology of performance making, which begins from a clearly announced starting point. Director Lyn Hixon would give a company a question from which the piece would begin and then over the next two years or so making performance within the company would respond to that question. Do For

many different areas of life and thought, not to get sidetracked but as you can imagine what and how you ask what you asking the question is obviously of great importance. This approach to make your performance work as one which does not set out with identified objectives of meaning, but involves instead and negotiation of intentions, and knowledges through collaborative practice. Adrian Heathfield, who's a writer who has written about Goat Island's work quite a lot, and who I find very helpful in his writing. describes what he sees in the process is this and I'm kind of going to Adrian because I am an associate - was an associate member of Goat Island and was a non performing member. So I'm kind of in that funny position of being half inside and half outside. And Karen, please feel free to say anything you'd like. So here's Adrian: "sources enter the evolving aesthetic and are then interrogated within it until their place in relation is solidified. Here, their use of sources is akin to the use of found objects in visual arts practice, in the sense that rather than being directly sought out, sources seem to come towards the artists, there is a deliberate giving over of the aesthetic to these objects, whose continued presence is negotiated through a communal process. This is perhaps best described as a process of hearing and response in relation to the members of the group and the sources that arise through them. They do not set out to deliver the meaning of their work, but rather they undertake a process of the discovery of meaning in their work and implicate their spectators within this process." It's "aching like birds," which I'm going to show a short clip from, was the first work that I made with Goat Island, and it was founded by an award from southeast dance, and began to open up a relationship between the live work that the company were doing and the filmic one, the film took material from it's an earthquake in my heart, which was being performed and toured in 2001. To this live piece, " It's an earthquake in my heart" was a complex interweaving of ideas that included the construction of memory, the aftermath of historical destruction, the place of nature, and the way one might learn to love the world. The question was generated much material for the peace was, in fact how to live clear in the work or ideas of imitation, the pattern of a dance, a fragment of material from Pina Bausch's Cafe Muller, but also the idea of becoming other imitation imitating machines and also imitating people learning to behave like people, which is material that came from a documentary by the filmmaker Harun Farocki , who made a documentary called How to live in the GDR. I had been to rehearsals and seen the piece several times. And when we got the funding, I carried on the thought process by watching the VHS VHS documentation of the piece. And at this point, I was still in the UK and go island over there in Chicago. I'd often watch it and fast forward or fast rewind trying to see the simple patterns between the complex ones. And I wrote to learn about images, which seemed like they could be transplanted into film from performance. And also kind of other Daydream images which I had been thinking about in relation to the work since the work since the live work invites and includes so much from the outside world if that important shoot the film on location to follow some of the ideas back into daily life, but in a way that at the same time, fictionalised these real spaces, so that they somehow also stood in for the real world. Like the world imitating the world and I'm gonna show

**Renée Bellamy (speaking in 2021) 18:45**  
*a video is played during this time*

**Gill Clarke 18:50**

is this a good side tracking breathing moment? Built there's so much information on there be if there's anything anybody wanted to follow up or ask about all ready?

### **Audience**

Did you say you felt like you fitted it?

### **Lucy Cash 19:12**

We did. It didn't fit in? Good. You breathe out. Your thinking thought if it didn't, you're wrong. I didn't fit in. Yeah, no, I definitely didn't. And I think it's really interesting that I'm probably going to spend my whole life thinking I should have gone to art school, or I should have I should have actually ignored everybody and gone to dance school and taking the consequences. But it's interesting when you feel like I guess, maybe if it's interesting, it's just this point of when you fully set off on the wrong foot literally, that's what comes into my mind. And that means that you are consenting and negotiate negotiation with what it is that you think is useful and not useful. And you're really aware of all the things that you've been given and the you know, the education that you do have and how valuable that is. But then in go shooting yourself in relation to that is something which is a process, which takes quite a long time, I think.

### **Gill Clarke**

I was thinking in relation to what you were saying about collaboration about how it's hard because we don't speak the same language. And I was thinking in relation to the work with Goat Island, for example, or that the nature of your work is collaborative, and was wondering if, if actually in working collaboratively, one is then working at the level of really what one's receiving and at the level of the particular and that the problems arise when we try to generalise and that's when we get into jargon, or it feels that feels, to me even seeing that those clips that you're not having trouble communicating, when it comes to actually get into work. Yeah.

### **Lucy Cash 21:00**

I think that's really true. And I think I have worked in a lot of very different kinds of collaborations. And I think that, for me, what had begun to do recently is think about the processes involved in those collaborations. And that's where something that this idea of applied becomes interesting to me. Because somehow, I'm just reaching a point where it feels necessary to be able to write about them, because I encounter quite a lot of resistance to the idea of collaboration. And it brings you smack up against lots of things like authorship, and ownership of ideas, and intellectual kind of copyright and all those kinds of things. And they feel like they're very much part of the certain cultural structure that we find ourselves in very often. And so it seems to me important to begin actually teasing out what these different processes in within collaboration are. And for me, I'm really clear that there are some collaborations I've done where I am not there at the starting point. And that already is a seed been sown, someone has an idea and they're inviting me into basically respond to that and listen to that and empathise with those ideas. And then to develop something which may be finally Yes, does contribute to part of the meaning of the final work, but is a very different role to a collaboration where, basically, you're setting off from sort of a point zero, and basically, you're there at the beginning,

inviting someone to work with you. And you know, that the work is about what you will make with the other person or people in the form that you're deciding to work in.

**Gill Clarke** 22:46

And in relation to this example. Was it's somewhere between response?

**Lucy Cash** 22:54

Yeah, I mean, this was the first time that we'd worked together and I had known the company quite well, I first met Goat Island doing a workshop here in the UK. And so the pieces I mentioned, it's an earthquake in my heart already existed. I'd seen some rehearsals I've been to performances, that basically that was a complete work in itself. And so this was, in a sense, responding filmic Klee to ideas within the piece. And then the process of how we might go about translating that was a partially shared process. But then to be honest, you know, one from the rest of the company was there for the Edit, say, but everyone knew what the material was. But it's there. So that process, I would say, is definitely an in between one and also different parts of, say, the before the shoot the shoot and after the shoot, different levels of collaboration and involvement were happening.

**Gill Clarke**

And it seems to me really clear example of the choreography applied to filmmaking, because that that wasn't a documentation of the work, was it? No,

**Lucy Cash**

the original piece is probably about two hours long and takes place. If you haven't seen Goat Island's work, it's usually had a very interesting performance configuration with audience on two sides. And the actual performance space would often be a kind of some kind of particular shape that related architecturally to this space, and I should remember what the specific space configuration was for isn't earthquake in my heart, but it's eluding me right now. But it's a kind of off slant. (Audience interjects) Chevron. (Lucy) there we go. That's the word. Thank you, Chevron. And so Yeah, the material that you're seeing here is a tiny, tiny fraction of material, which was extracted and then reworked and reworked in terms of its relationship to one movement to another. And certain motifs or choreographic motifs, which were in the live piece, again, extracted and put throughout to kind of make a different kind of shape for the film. I mean, the whole film is only about 11 minutes long. So you can see that that's a very small percentage of the original material. I might take liberty and say that I kind of wanted to say one more thing, and then I'll kind of come back to that I've got it in my mind. And it may be kind of relevant to the next bit I'm going to talk about, but I've got it right here. So pardon me, if I don't seem to be answering. The only thing I wanted to say, in terms of collaboration with Ireland, is that for the next piece of work, which I'm not going to show, which was a live piece of work, and then it also exists as a two screen installation, a version of I was there from the beginning of that process and went to a lot of rehearsals and in fact brought ideas in and some of those ideas appeared, when in particular in the performance before they then appeared in the film. So no one, I don't know, I think it's a very particular experience I've had working with go island. And I think that really developed through the pieces that we made. And again, yeah, was quite

different in terms of a collaboration at this point to kind of subsequent collaboration. But it's true that the processes of filmmaking, especially post production, always, at some level mean that the number of people is going to diminish, because, you know, in terms of an editing process, it's something where it doesn't really work with more than one or two people in a room. And it's how you find ways of sharing those decisions, or whether you've storyboarded something so clearly beforehand, and then you stick to that storyboard. And so then the editing is a kind of enactment of that script, if you like of the storyboard. Yeah, that's it kind of

**Gill Clarke 28:00**

thought about that. I mean, it seems obvious. I don't want to derail us, but it just seemed worth kind of reiterating the way it seems to me this is, this is an art work. It's not a documentary, it's something live in a way. And that felt worth just reinforcing

**Lucy Cash 28:19**

it. Yeah. But what's interesting now is that, of course, it is a kind of document. And that's, that's also a kind of his, you know, in history, it becomes a kind of document of, of this kind of piece of work. So yeah, it's

**Gill Clarke**

because it's an object names. Yeah.

I don't want to derail too much, but I'm really loving the, this term to introduce the plot, and I'm really lingering over it. And in particular, that last, the last definition to ask, it occurred to me that what's asked for is a report mainly on logically shaky grounds. Because we then apply them to each other. I think this is what I think this is what you're trying to say. So I'd say that that that shifting the language away from issues of translation, how does how do I take something and express it in film? Or how do I take or transformation even How do I turn something into a film, but rather, this kind of conversation that's happening, which seems to me might be something like, you take a dance piece and apply it to film and you're asking for five from films, you're learning something about film, by applying the fence applying a kind of performance work to the film, you're learning about film, which is a different thing, I think from trying to translate the dance into film so that the dancers on yours For me, it's a two way kind of relationship as well and applying films to a company to a performance to events, these is a reply from, from from, from the dance. So it's it's a question being asked with the work by application. Another set?

**Lucy Cash 30:24**

Yeah, I think that's, that's really true in a kind of more roundabout way, so thank you kind of drawing that in. So a little bit about the process, the process of working on the ideas for the film. So at the time, I worked quite intuitively, and I felt a bit like I was cheating. But recently doing some research, I came across some writing about intuition that feels very relevant to this idea of applied illness. And as a writer called Guy Claxton, who has spent some time thinking about what's at work when people talk about intuition. And he's kind of put us into different categories of following expertise, implicit learning, judgement, sensitivity, creativity, and my favourite rumination. And each of these things could be at work at any moment that intuition is activated, and often these elements are activated in different combinations. So, you know, expertise could

be the unreflective execution of intricate skilled performance. implicit learning. The acquisition of such expertise by non conscious or non conceptual means, judgement, making accurate decisions and categorizations. Without at the time being able to justify them. sensitivity or heightened attentiveness, both conscious and non conscious to details of a situation and creativity, the use of incubation and reverie to enhance problem solving. And rumination which is the process of an I love this expression, chewing the card of experience in order to extract its meanings and implications. When you start to explore what the processes of intuition might be, it's clear that they have a relationship to the sense of application particularly in the sense of making use of what's relevant, bringing a heightened awareness to bring together elements from different places and this kind of conversation back and forth that there was talking about. Henri Bergson described intuition as we call intuition here, the sympathy by which one is transported into the interior of an object in order to coincide with what there is unique and consequently inexpressible within it. Okay, we're already at part four. Some thoughts about collaboration. Because a lot of my work has been collaborative, and still is often having to explain and sometimes defend collaboration. There is sometimes a suspicion that this word is hiding something. And the whole question of authorship, as I was mentioning earlier, can be problematic for existing cultural models. Really, I think we need some different words to describe different kinds of collaborative processes. For instance, I have sometimes been involved in a kind of collaboration where I will be asked to develop and make a contribution to a piece of work eg film for a performance or installation. And yet, I will not be invited into this process and sorry, and yet, I will only be invited into this process after the initial conceptualization has taken place. So what I was saying earlier, I'm not there is that original moment of the thought being developed. So whatever I make will add to, in effect the meaning of the whole, but I haven't been present to plant the seed. When this happens, I will often need to find a way through the material that I'm working with. And this often, for me really draws on the idea of replied in a very concrete way. And again, I'm only becoming clear about how to articulate this relatively recently, I was reading a book called cutting rhythms by an editor who originally had a background in movement, and then now solely works in film editing. And it was a very peculiar experience reading this book, because it was like someone had kind of cut my head open and taken lots of sort of bumbling, burbling ideas that were in my head and actually clarified them on paper. And Pellman read the book because she spent a lot of time talking to the editors, and they would all use this word intuition very often with how they cut and manipulated the filmic image. So she formulates her ideas about film editing process around the notion of rhythmic intuition. And her suggestion is that as a movement practitioner, you have a heightened awareness of rhythm of course, both in interpretation of set movement, but also in all the work that one might do with Being aware of kind of different rhythms, both internal rhythm of breath, heartbeat, organs, etc. Pellman argues that although film editors aren't normally changed in movement, they can nevertheless develop a heightened sensitivity towards movement, but through hours of practice, of watching film, and also becoming aware of the kind of rhythms in daily life, basically, and the experience of just kind of living in the world. So, for instance, things like the rhythmical and secrets you might go through unlocking and locking a door is definitely the rhythm thing that which is always kind of, we don't even notice, but it has a certain rhythm. And if you took that rhythm away from the concrete action of unlocking and locking the door, you could probably recognise what that action was somehow. Again, you know, also by watching people having a

conversation, but not actually listening to the dialogue, you become aware of this kind of push and pull of interaction, the rhythm of that interaction, rather than the content that they're speaking. And, of course, you know, editors are also human beings. So they're having to learn to live in the world and deal with gravity and all of that in terms of how that relates to rhythm. But what really interested me was that Perlman talks about mirror neurons, which are neurons that discharge both when you make an intentional movement. But also when you merely observe another person or thing or animal doing that movement. So as you can imagine, this mirroring function unlocks many ideas around kinesthetic empathy, and Perlman quotes. A scientist could vs REMAC drum, Ramashandra, thank you. With knowledge of these neurons, you have basis for understanding a host of very enigmatic aspects of the human mind, mind reading, empathy, imitation, learning, and even the evolution of language. Anytime you watch someone else doing something, or even starting to do something, the corresponding mirror neurons might fire in your brain, thereby allowing you to read and understand another's intentions, and thus to develop a sophisticated theory of other minds. So film editors may very often be involved in a kind of unconscious corporeal response to their own bodily rhythms at the same time as mirroring neurologically what they see in here and something that they might be editing. It goes without saying that as an audience, you're also responding or mirroring neurologically to the material you see. And when I was writing this, I suddenly had a memory of Graeme Miller sitting and talking in the space about a year ago and saying that when you see a person fall on stage, in some sense in the audience as an audience member you fall to. So one of the complexities of film editing is the fact that each shot both has its own inherent rhythms, whatever the action within the shot contains, as well as the rhythm which is created when it's placed next to another shot. And this it's a bit it's a bit like automated, I suppose I do this in your head when you're thinking about this. When the inherent rhythm of a shot is complicated by its placement next to another shot, with its own inherent rhythm, a third rhythm is created, which is not the same, or even just the sum of the first two that begins to have a rhythm all of its own. And I think the filmmaker Andrei Tarkovsky describes this really beautifully. He said, cinema is able to record time in outward and visible signs, recognisable to the feelings, rhythm and cinema is conveyed by the life of the object visibly recorded in the frame. Just as from the quivering of a reed, you can tell what sort of current what pressure there is in a river. In the same way we know the movement of time from the flow of the life process reproduced in the shot. And that for me, takes a little work back way to that quote, of Bergson, right at the beginning about how it feels like when you're making a film, you have an idea, and then it gets killed, and then somehow it comes to life again. And obviously, so through the movement of time, within film, we experienced a sense of time and energy. And for me, editing is the closest that I get to dancing when I'm not dancing. And this is because I'm very conscious of the ways when I'm editing in which I feel the rhythm of the shots. And I feel them in a kind of sort of as a kinesthetic response. More relevant relevantly in relation to the sense of applied Ness, I'm aware that I draw a knowledge and experience of making and choreographing movement in real space in relation to the editing of shots. Some examples. Finally, this would be counterpoint, working with more than one rhythm. So the intrinsic rhythm of a shot is at one pace of speed. And then I might deliberately set this against the counterpoint a bit Different edited rhythm to create the sense that the meaning of the thing you're watching is shared between its constituents. And another form of counterpoint would be to deliberately place attention in one part of the frame,

and then sort of surprise an audience with a shift of attention to another part of the frame. Repetition, so that in seeing something again, or apparently seeing something, again, you experience it differently. The rhythmical relationship between the visual rhythms of the shot and the auditory rhythms, and the use of elements that are missing or rather missing from what might be expected so that an audience might need to imagine to be supplying element to something that watching. All of these become crucial when I'm working collaboratively. Because in a sense, I see my role as both responsive and initiating, I might need to respond to ideas already in place before I joined the project, and at some level, feel that I can inhabit them and empathise with them. And then another level initiate areas of meaning which work is part of the ecology of the whole piece. So I'm going to show my shut up and show another couple of clips. The first clip is from a piece I made for a theatre show for a company called Volcano, we're based in Wales. And extraordinarily, they've made a show about the writings of W.G. Sebald, who is an incredible writer. Sort of almost impossible to describe, actually his work kind of do you know, his work, he kind of kind of goes across history, and it's Fact or Fiction. Yeah, it's very unclear, actually. And so they took on, they were so inspired by his recently took on the idea of making a show in response to his work. And then I worked with one of the company members, Catherine Bennett, who is also a dancer to make a film and this film that you're gonna see a clip of sits at the beginning of the show, and the company, in fact, are making Foley Sound effects to the piece that you see. So there's this kind of physical engagement with the film in some way. And then the second clip after that is from a piece that, I guess it's solely mine, I didn't collaborate with anyone on it. And it's called Requiem for the redhead. And it was a commission to make a short film in response to Darwin's ideas of evolution. And I'm showing you these two clips, because in some way, those very practical things I just mentioned that counterpoint and repetition are kind of at play in these two pieces.

**Renée Bellamy (speaking in 2021) 42:41**

*A video is played during this time.*

**Lucy Cash 42:47**

Does that begin to answer some of what you were thinking of in terms of the process of translation? Or just something more specific? seem to pick up on that, I guess. I mean, filmmaking is a complex process that and has different stages to it. So is there something in particular about filmmaking? I mean, in terms of how you might think about composing material for a camera, or what what is your interest in terms of choreographically in terms of the relationship? Well, I'm curious to hear your ideas. I mean, for me, this is hinging around this idea of rhythm actually. And the way that kind of just as I was talking about just now that there are kind of these inherent rhythms within a shot, and then you create this other rhythm when you kind of edit them together. And I feel that because I've always been interested in ever since I was small, I'm, if I go and watch your film, in cinema, I'm, I react, and when there's people, there's kind of always flinching and, you know, kind of really bodily reacting to things. And I'd always was curious about why that effect was kind of generated in my body. And then it wasn't until I started to work with them and think about that notice and observe it when I was constructing things in a more subtle way. That it seemed interesting to try and locate it. And I do I think it's this. I think rhythm is is really the key between the relationship between the two. But

what what was your thought As we say things you remember system? Did you say tension? Yeah, yeah. Say like, what are the things gonna be mentally? Yeah, I mean, you know, just to take pick up a very kind of clear example of that. For instance, you might think about, if you have a moving camera, you might think and somebody is moving in that direction. If the cameras moving in the opposite direction, you instantly create this tension, because you have to think, to moving things moving in opposite opposition, which again, completely for choreography, we know, you know, we know about that. We know what that feeling is, you know, and I think I mean, the thing about filmmaking is, it's about the moving image. So there is the should be this kind of inherent ways of kind of finding a conversation that can happen between the two. I think, it's in a way, it's surprising that it doesn't work more often

**Gill Clarke** 46:32

No, I was thinking more about how in the last section, you'd been, very adequately describing yourself as an expert. In the sense of, actually, it's very logical that the sensibility that you take for movement and timing is it's what you take to the filmmaking medium, but it feels like it's inherent in that process, in a way.

**Lucy Cash** 47:03

Yeah, it is like that. For me. I mean, I just being political with a small p, I feel it's important to question the idea of specialisation and expertise in a way because I feel like and again, I feel like there should be another word for it somehow. Because I think, for me, my my sort of genuine feeling of working between disciplines is that it is like trying to be bilingual. So you feel like you take longer to kind of have a grasp of these different languages, that is a way in which translation feels really, really relevant. And I sort of feel like, I would feel quite differently about what I do. If I had stuck in one discipline and only done that one thing, and done it for 10 years or so, no, it's a different kind of negotiation that you have to do. But it's, and sometimes it's awkward to contain that. But for me that awkwardness is actually interesting. And means that you're constantly having to be open to reevaluate, actually. And that's the idea that I resist in the idea of experts is that I'm not saying that he was just in his but often I feel like expert is slightly untouchable, that sort of someone's an expert, you know, you have to take their knowledge on trust somehow, which is fine on one level. But I think what feels valuable and useful in the world is to be able to question that knowledge and see how, when it's placed in a different context, it might mean something different. And context them for me becomes really, really important.

**Gill Clarke** 48:45

I mean, you talked about, at some point further back about what sometimes to you problematic, as I understood it, sort of dance film. And it feels to me what I am sent some seeing is that you're able to be outside the material at one level, whereas sometimes I think I feel with dance film, that it's, it's trying to be too true to the material, in a way was trying to get consent, with honesty what the material was, rather than be able to step back and see what's there, in through the lens of another medium. That's both.

**Lucy Cash** 49:30

I think that's really, really helpful to say, because it's reminded me and again, it's funny how much of our processes are quickly become sort of inherent, and we forget about bits of them. But that reminds me of the fact that I think you it's this the tension for me is that you have to come really, really, really close to the material to understand it. But then that's not the point where you need to make a film. You have to then yes, exactly. have this other point where you use sort of distract or abstract yourself from it slightly, in order to not try and replicate what you see in 3d space in 3d space. And then the sense, be true in another way and find the way to be true, which isn't just to replicate.

**Gill Clarke 50:25**

And I was thinking when you gave that list, I don't remember them or counterpoint repetition. I was sort of feeling a bit jealous in a way, because it feels Oh, yeah, these are the tools we have in our choreographic toolbox. But somehow, in their in the moment with all these live bodies, and one can't kind of separate oneself from this material, and then apply the tools in a way and one gets caught up in what this stuff is and where it seems to be going and what it's doing and, and how great it is, at some level to be able to sort of take that away and say, Well, this is the material and now I can choreograph with it. Yeah.

**Lucy Cash 51:07**

Yeah. And that's something else that. So for me, I work in different ways in terms of filmmaking, sometimes something will be storyboarded. And then other times material will be gathered, and it's exactly that that the piece emerges from an editing process. And in that latter way, yes, absolutely, you can refine those moments. I would say that when I'm working collaboratively, I wouldn't tend to use that process of material gathering, I'd be more likely to use that for something that was mine, partly because of the kind of conversation that you might need to be having with the other collaborators. Although sometimes, I have also done that. I was just wanting to talk about one other thing. Jumping forward to the last bit that I wanted to talk about, which is when does something become known. And this again, kind of stays on the idea of collaboration but talks about another specific collaboration. And in 2007, Litó Walkey who was also a member of Goat Island, and I engaged in a very interesting but also practical collaborative experiment, we both had pieces of work that we were trying to make, Litó was revisiting a piece which she had made when she was still at the School for New Dance 10 years ago, and which had been impactful both for her and the audiences that saw it. At the time, she didn't really understand how the work had become what it had become. And something about that intrigued and disturbed her now that she was making her own work, and she wanted to go back to it. And yet in the going back to it, she also had a quandary because she was asking yourself, why do I want to go back to this? I had a bursary from artsadmin, which is an organisation that I'm now an associate artists with and the admin bursary is an amount of money to research and explore, and you don't have to make a piece of work necessary at the end of it. But as part of that, and the ideas gathering that I was doing, during that time, I knew that I wanted to make a piece and that I wanted to ask Leto to perform in it. And I'd been researching humour and repetition and also about a book reading a book about people who claim to see with parts of their body other than their eyes, which sounds extraordinary. But in the early 20th century, there were a lot of experiments into this was called per optic vision. And the

experiments that were done, were very theatrical, and that people had doh placed on their eyes and then bandages put around their eyes and and there will be a formal jury of people watching people try and read like this with their different parts. Currently, the skin here is really good, and he's very sensitive. And so we kind of were speaking to each other and said, right, well, not sure how we're gonna get started. But why don't we do a kind of strange, hopefully mutually beneficial kind of exchange. So, Litó sent me some notes from the time when she was working on the piece from 10 years ago. And they included circumference the boundary line or an area the idea of physiognomy is studying the features of face to reveal characteristics. syncopation, rhythmic placement of a turn on a weak beat, and banal, the ordinary, and something about this little list that she sent me felt really resonant. The other thing that we were both talking about, and that was important for us was the relationship between abstraction and emotionality. And here we were thinking not of emotionality, not As a deliberate construction of a particular emotion, or the expression of an emotion for an audience, but how a work might resonate on an emotional as well as intellectual level for an audience. And the best example for me as a shorthand for work that always does this is Jonathan Burrows work. And then I leave his work feeling kind of elated at the end of his performance. So there's definitely a sense of emotionality in his work for me. So he came to London and we spent the week in a rehearsal space me sharing this strange material from this book, analysing humour and the rhythm of humour. And the fact that humour comes from a tension between how people are expected to behave in everyday life and how they often end up behaving. And also humour is very much related to what it is to be human. So when we laugh at things in animals, it's often because they're doing something that's a bit human. And we watched some Super-8 material that was she had of Carlos who was the performer in this piece, which she originally made, and also an old video documentation of a piece. And she, during that week, tried to begin the process of taking this material into her own body. So she was watching Super Eight, watching the video documentation of the original performance and take it into her body. And I was kind of watching her do this and feeding back. And we were talking about the ideas that I was bringing with this kind of research I've done. And I called Litó to kind of ask her whether she was remembered anything that I might forget. And she said that the research material acted as a very much as a kind of catalyst for her, enabled her to embody the material that Carlos had embodied in her own way, because it gave her a new way of kind of thinking about this material, something about the idea of this humour and rhythm. And this idea of looking at obstruction, made a kind of platform through which she could kind of feel like she could embody this material, which she had made on Carlos and given to him and watched him perform many times. So she also reminded me that we tried to the other idea that I was interested in was the idea of an eclipse, a planetary Eclipse. And we tried to physicalize what an eclipse might be in the body as a way of generating movement material for my film. Of course, this didn't work at all. And we came to the conclusion that if there was going to be an eclipse in the film, that it had to be an event that might somehow be physical, but that it couldn't be repeated, and it would somehow have to halt the film or provide a break in the film. So I think I'm going to show the film that resulted from this. I'm just gonna skip forward. So this is again, just a clip. And it's from the middle of the film, with Litó in

***Renée Bellamy (speaking in 2021) 58:07***

*a video is played during this time.*

**Lucy Cash** 58:15

One thought that was just in my head was thinking about another way of describing this movement that's inherent in a shot. And when I've worked with people in filmmaking workshop situations, often they want to do something where someone walks through a shot here, and then they walk through another shot sometime later. And nine times out of 10, the pace of the person walking through the shot is wrong, and you can't cut them together because the person's walking. It's not usually it's not a big difference, but it's just sort of slightly infinitesimally slow or faster than any other shot. And that's often a very concrete way of kind of seeing this kind of other is the literal movement of the walking but also the walking sets this other kind of rhythm or pace. It's like a metronome for the kind of filmic edit. And it's, it's really interesting, because, for me, there's a point where the more you think about it and look at it, the more complicated it becomes, until you kind of put it to one side again, and then kind of relax and think, Okay, well, there's all these different rhythms going on. I'm just going to, you know, see how to feel my way through it, which is where the intuition comes back in and trying things. Another story from, there's a very famous editor called Walter Murch, and he edits standing up. And what he does is he plays a film clip, and he just hits the sort of baseball stop when he feels like it's right and he does it three times and he hits the same frame on all three times and he knows that's the right place to edit. So again, it's using this kind of physical response in his body to know where the cut should come

**Gill Clarke** 1:00:01

and standing up is just to be more,

**Lucy Cash** 1:00:03

more open. Yeah, yeah.

**Gill Clarke** 1:00:08

I was struck by the layer of or the choice of music or text. That seems like another layer that's kind of like got a different phrasing or a different timing often. And is that another part of the intuitive or is that where does that come in the mix?

**Lucy Cash** 1:00:30

I think that would, again, that I'm interested in playing between sort of the rhythm that that sets up and then the kind of rhythm of the kind of visual editing that you're getting. So yeah, it's another sort of

**Gill Clarke** 1:00:43

like a counterpoint layer.

**Lucy Cash** 1:00:47

And that was Erik Satie, Vexations - part of Fixations and Vexations is a piece of music, which is designed to be played repeatedly over 18 or 20 hours. It's kind of a short phrase of music.

**Audience** 1:01:06

I had a question It's a rhythm, photograph, walking. What is your intuition? You've worked on the process, they're collaborating pieces, to build up those sort of rhythms and PowerPoints to try to do the opposite? Or do you sort of uses as your guide changed in the very beginning?

**Lucy Cash** 1:01:41

It's a really good question. And thank you, because you've allowed me to talk about something else, which is this that if I was in a collaboration and the material already existed, so decision about whether to go with that rhythm or to work against, it would be a discussion about where you would like where we would like the audience to sit in relation to the material. So if there was a sense of wanting the audience to be close and drawn into a particular moment, then probably go with it. But if wanting to sit back and kind of have a slightly more removed sense of it, maybe to use a sense of counterpoint. And that would change the course, which

**Audience** 1:02:26

is that I was just thinking about the very beginning, identity operation, keeping your, your identity objects, with coming into these sort of already pre made situations where you pull your identity changing wherever you go.

**Lucy Cash** 1:02:52

I think it's about - I'll go back to this idea of a conversation because for me, I am less concerned with my identity and more concerned with what my role is. And as long as my role is really clear within the collaboration, and I know how much to give or not give, then my identity becomes really clear then. And it may be that. And this is where it feels like we need other words to describe these things. But it may be that someone wants a very light collaboration, you know, and actually, they want someone to concentrate on a very, maybe almost an A level of interpretation that enables something in the piece to become clearer or highlight it. And then another level, somebody else might be seeing a lot of the meaning content in this part of the collaboration stemming from that. So in that way, then that is much more chance to sort of get in there and really kind of think about how the ideas are working.

**Gill Clarke** 1:04:14

Little bit going back to this notion that sort of reply. Yeah. Other questions? Yeah.

**Audience** 1:04:28

Really interesting. Coming back to that phrase, which was something that like, the causal justification doesn't produce a new idea, or a new, it was something it made me think about how when I look, there seems to be it's almost like you're recognising something that we've set in motion. This thing about recognition and Learn, from what I hear you do think, an awful lot to analyse as you write about it. And then I'm interested to see how those thoughts actually become subsumed, not not as escaped thoughts within the work. And I wonder how much you like to deliberately use isn't quite the right word, you know, whether it comes into you, you've had some very poetic phrases on carbon and in your writing, and then sometimes they appear

like, Hey, I don't know, not sure whether that's to be clearer to yourself, or whether there is a very direct connection for you with the coach before. And whether it is like up in other words subsumed within it. So I've been interested, when you said something else about being true, or those people there was with these theories and how true to yourself, and I'm interested in that moment. You know, it's true that we get a sense of our country.

**Lucy Cash** 1:06:20

Yeah, it's, I mean, for me, I don't often do the kind of writing that I've done here. And I'm much more of a person who kinds of improvisers often. And I decided recently that I wanted to start writing about these processes to kind of try and understand them better, because I did feel like and I have felt like I'm a very intuitive person. And I, you know, I just became fascinated when I started to read about what might make up intuition and how you could kind of think about that differently. And I would say this, that, the thing that always comes back to me in whatever work I'm making is, there's always a point where the piece of work tells you what it needs. And I don't know how other else to say that. But there's always that point. And at that point, it's a big relief, because finally you can stop worrying. And it's just about getting on and making peace. But until you reach that point. And what I guess my one of my process is to gather material and to end is this is this where I need to be looking, is that where I need to be looking? Oh, is it over here? Let's listen. Yeah, a little bit of that. Still not quite. Ah, okay. That's, yeah, yeah. No, no. And if anyone has written about what that aha moment is, then I'd love to read it. But yeah, it's and that's. So I think, and I really trust in that, because I've experienced that again, and again. And so that's what I would say about that. And then in relation to language, and words are very important to me. And I'm very interested in how language set against something doesn't necessarily need to explain it. But again, might be a kind of different counterpoint. And how you could have a line of text, which might be talking about something very small in relation to an image, which is very big or vice versa. And what does that do in your mind? How do you contain those two things? Because I am interested in this idea of being able to contain more than one thing at any moment. Because that's something that interests me. Yeah. Yeah.

**Audience** 1:08:40

Even earlier, when you were, when there was an image option you did the first groups, and it's so much easier to kind of absorb them. And when the image went out.

**Lucy Cash** 1:08:52

that's an image, I don't really won't work this autobiographical at all, that that image I love, and it's an image of me and my gran, who's also called Lucy, and I don't know who took the image. I don't know where it was. But when I look at that image, I think I see so much of what I'm drawn to in the work I make. And it's just bizarre, just to remind you all because I'm sure you remember it, but it's like who framed this image. It's great look, I mean, there's all that landscape. And then these two heads right on the bottom of the frame isn't a comic about it. For me, there's something about I don't even know where that place is, because I have no memory of going there. And there's something about this relationship between these two people who are very different age and yet we're on the same level. And then the oddness of this object of the pram

handle going above my grands, which is kind of ludicrous. So I think there's something in this image about comedy and also the sublime, which I feel really I'm drawn to, it's very dear to me

**Audience** 1:10:10

personally, struggling this which was really feeling that you're speaking about clearly, especially. And I just feel like I'm sensing something in your work. And I wonder if you have thoughts about something that you're inquiring specifically around, which is, which is something about feels very strong. The kind of games and even when work that you've shared is more dynamic is moving. And I can see like a vivid, describing come to me and my sense of stillness, somehow, even within, I just wanted to have thoughts on that.

**Lucy Cash** 1:11:15

Think one thing about the I just to say is that one of the things that coming from performance that I found problematic about filmmaking was this sense of the gaze actually, and of wanting to have to get over the problem with kind of disembodied pneus of a camera lens. And so I guess, that would make a lot of sense that that idea of the gaze is present, because it's something that I wrestle with. And also this. And again, I'm not sure how to describe it, but this this space that is between a performer say, and the camera lens, and if in some way, I can make that space, less of cool, objective one, and somehow more of an empathetic one, which is, I don't think I've necessarily achieved but that's something that's in my mind when I'm thinking about things. And the idea of stillness is an interesting one that I hadn't thought of, but it makes me think about the idea of what is it that anchor is a piece? How do you anchor something even momentarily? When everything might be moving around you? How do you locate for moments that you can absorb something before you shift into a new place? And this ability to be open and shift is really important, but also visibility to land as important? So I guess, yeah, that's my off the cuff response.

**Gill Clarke** 1:12:50

That nice quote you had right near the beginning, about silence or stillness?

**Lucy Cash** 1:13:00

Yeah, I just missed this patient. Yeah, this that was a line from Dan Beachy-Quick, and he actually wrote it in response to Goat Island - the films of Goat Island that I've made,

**Gill Clarke** 1:13:13

when we're silent, and when we stand still, we're not resting, we're searching inside ourselves for the turn. So there is something suspended in those about that isn't during those moments...I sense

**Lucy Cash** 1:13:32

I think and that's definitely, probably still can be more and unconscious than a conscious level. But it's interesting to have it pointed out

**Audience** 1:13:44

what I wanted to say as to what you're talking about, it's also connected to what Gill said earlier. And whether it's documentation of performance or documents, and also, your questions about choreography, and film and how they translate into each other. And I think when we went out I was had formance documentations. They don't seem like the performance of good film. It's never it's only good to show a presenter. What's going to happen here really mean it doesn't give any sense really, because it's a live performance or for other reasons as well. But when I look at try to think about why do I lose these films of our islands seem more like spirit. Even though they're not of our last two, they don't have all these other things. Would they feel more than to me? It might be connected with the I am not quite sure to say what we're talking about, but it might be connected that way. And the sense of Lucy is presenting an initial response. It is kind of a question sounds relatively common. But it feels to me like you're presenting your experience. And when a single audience member is sitting in performance, they are in the eye, and answering about the actual ego. But they are watching what they choose to watch. So they're not seeing the whole thing anyway. Right? There, it goes to something. And then thoughts occur while they walk. And so when we see a loose cash flow on anything, let's just go. We're seeing where your eye goes. And what? Yeah, so we're getting something more like.

**Lucy Cash** 1:16:05

Yeah, yeah, I think it's really truth if the work with garland, because I've spent, as you know, so much time watching, all of you live in front of me, not just in performance, but in rehearsals. And that's, you know, quite a few hours of watching, I was just trying to think how many hundreds of hours of watching. But there's a sense in which you, you're not only using your eyes, then it's about a point of watching where you're not just using your eyes, it's something to do with it's also involves a listening. But again, it's the sense of absorbing the material, through, you know, through your senses somehow, which sounds a bit woolly I know. But it's something it's something about that is what's necessary for me in order to transform this act of looking so that it doesn't become this kind of hard gaze or something, you know, it has this other quality to it.

**Audience** 1:17:08

Is it not also the fact that because the camera image in the 2d environment has a frame, so whatever you do with it, shooting the whole thing, you will always oppose, regardless, because you cannot choose to do is just your natural tendency to You're right.

**Lucy Cash** 1:17:32

No, of course. And I think what Karen saying there about kind of reminding us that, you know, when we, when we're looking at an audience member, we're still actually taking a viewpoint on something because we're not, you know, especially if there's a piece with more than one performer I'm choosing kind of to look at, and maybe I'm there kind of there in my peripheral vision, but I'm really looking at this person of hammock net right now. And I've kind of got you there sort of, it's, it's still a choice making decision, and you're following your desire path, if you'd like I'm looking through this performance. And that's your journey that you're making through it. And always I've been, ever before I picked up a camera, as a performer and as a watcher of performance. I was really aware of that.

**Gill Clarke** 1:18:14

But I feel what you've made us even more aware of tonight, but what I feel is inherent in your work is something about how the editing and the rhythm I it's also very clear in those choices. So it's not only that you move from one thing to another, but really in the timing of how you choose to focus on one thing, and then in juxtaposition with something else.

**Lucy Cash** 1:18:47

Yeah, and for me that says, Again, I've only started to think about it recently. So that's been as intuitive as the way that everyone has a different way of moving, you know, your your patterns of moving for me are what you'd like with Nikki are the kind of rhythmical person you are. If you were if if everybody in the room went out to take up editing and had what have you, maybe you'll do but you're kind of had the skills to edit and we were sitting down editing the same piece of material, then because of our own particularities of movement, we will produce as many different versions as there are people in the room. And that's, that's precisely because of that. I mean, there's inherent kind of waste of attraction that you're drawn to doing or not doing. And I think, what can be hard. I mean, it's the same with taking on a technique of movement, but it's like getting beyond the technique. So when you first start to edit, I taught myself so that was really helpful because it meant that I didn't have a lot of things telling me oh, you can't do that. And you have to do this. I've kind of picked up a lot of knowledge by working as a kind of apprentice for a while and watching somebody else. To edit, but essentially, I wasn't learning either from a manual or from somebody teaching me. I actually learnt by needing to edit material. So it was the hard way. But the good way to learn that, I think.

**Gill Clarke** 1:20:17

Couple more questions that we should finish. Go.

**Audience** 1:20:22

Well, I was just curious, I was looking at existing piece of work. And I'm just wondering whether, when you're, do you have to adapt to the existing work? And is that what you mean? Like? The creative process is very different when you take them from what they've been through. I'm just kind of curious about how you much do you have to adapt to that work setup. And I just, I feel like I'm seeing the filters underneath the reel, you're telling me what you see. And just kind of is that where the creativity located? How you kind of direct the viewers to go?

**Lucy Cash** 1:21:16

I mean, that's, the thing is that that's that view of how to see the material in a film is, in part collaborative. So there are discussions about the ways of seeing things on film, does that make sense? And then ultimately, there's a lot of trust. And I feel that responsibility as the eye that gets to be outside. So it's, it might go something like this, that we know we're going to make a film version. This was say this was, say, the experience of its economic birth, which as I said, it was the first thing we made. So was me much more responding, rather than bringing ideas. But I said things that were very present to me about the case, and what, what if we did this, or this or this or made some suggestions, there was some discussion from that discussion. And there was a sense of trust, and okay, go away and kind of, you know, draw those things together, see

how that could work. I did kind of storyboard something brought that back, again, an immense level of trust there. And then when we worked on the shooting, although it's very hard for performance in front of a camera to have an input into the process of being filmed. That was, of course, still an open possibility. But I think it's right to say that there was a point, and I'm looking at your camera, because you can tell me whether you think differently, but where it isn't helpful. And you might just want to say, you know, we've talked about this, and I'm just gonna go and do that material in front of that setup there, because that's where I need to get my headspace now. Yeah.

**Gill Clarke** 1:23:16

Nik, last

**Audience** 1:23:19

Good, because I have a question that is a little related to what you mentioned quite early on. And I think I got it right, when you said that, at least at a certain point, in your development of education, you're feeling there is a need to kind of become an expert in one thing, but maybe you feel that because you were first morning performers, that maybe this didn't go only one direction. But what I wanted to ask you, if you could imagine, because listening and seeing things tonight, maybe we could also think of you know that I see an expert in front of me, for example, in timing and communication. This might be applied in film, or in choreography, or, you know, God knows what else probably there many fields were just to have the skills like communication and, and the sense for rhythm or timing would be very needed. You know, if you feel now where you are, and actually, it's maybe good that you are the non or the expert that you are. And for example, could you imagine writing a piece of music? Would that be something where you could think, yeah, timing and communication? Would that be something really wrong? Why not take those things those expertise and take them or be brought into the next

**Lucy Cash** 1:24:39

Yeah, and to answer quickly because that's a great that's lots of brilliant things in there. I actually said that. It's funny because I didn't say this but I when I was younger, I always did want to be only within one field like I had this image if only I'd been a cello player and I spent all my life playing the cello. Wouldn't that be great or You know, if only I'd been, you know, this or that or just stuck to that one thing, but that was never going to be who I was for a variety of reasons. And so I am interested in this idea of expert in relation to things and I said, you know, kind of listen to an expert listener or an expert respond, and those that is really important to me. And I think, you know, an expert in relation to qualities that could be transferred to different situations was a really, you know, interesting idea to me. And I did just not to completely take his chequebook want to say that, no, I'm just thinking very quickly about this idea of process because I collaborated with Nik and another dancer called Chris inquiry with a call Christina Ciupke. And our process when we made subtitles, which showed a bit of was that we, we kind of spent a month together, didn't we, in the process, the piece, again, already existed. And our process initially was to watch other films that felt like they had the kind of timing and a kind of I think we might have used the kind of world or not the world, but kind of,

**Nik Haffner** 1:26:10

for example, I remember we watched the film last day.

**Lucy Cash** 1:26:13

Yeah, I was gonna say that. Yeah.

**Nik Haffner** 1:26:14

Which to me. It's a fantastic education and timing. Silence. So there is not much.

**Lucy Cash** 1:26:25

Yeah, um, last days is, as Nik says, it's really it's an incredible film for its timing, and it, it works with quite long shots. And I remember very clearly, we decided that the beginning of subtitles would, we'd really there's a series of edited kind of still images and then you get this shot, which turns into a moving shot and is really quite slow and long. We actually, there's something there's a ridiculously small amount of cuts in that film, considering it's about 40 minutes long. And it was interesting that we played with this idea of resisting the moment to cut to see what that would do to the timing.

**Gill Clarke** 1:27:06

We should draw to a close that was very richly filmed. Thank you very much.

*(Outro: Renée Bellamy speaking in 2021)*

This has been a talk from Independent Dance's Digital Library. Find more from the archives at [independentdance.co.uk/library](http://independentdance.co.uk/library)