

VIDEODANCE IN COURSE

Currently we can see different audiovisual works, which are given the name of videodance, or also mentioned as dance for the camera, in which this sense would tell us a dance to be filmed. If we speak in a traditional way, from the term "Dance for the camera", this is usually a type of production that exist in collaboration between choreographer and filmmaker, in which a series of movements and phrases have been created that then are move to a location to be filmed -in some cases properly from the camera than in others-, the exploitation in the editing process is rather minimal, intervening the temporality, repeating and cutting pictures, but trying to keep the choreographic piece , and the original dance phrasings. In general, the narrative maintains a continuity; it can be a story told or a topic to be discussed, giving importance to the "script" as a form of construction, that is, from a series of bodily movements that refer to a theme, represented in the dance (as can be the case with the "Theater" displaced to the image by the Cinema), which are then reproduced in the video, which through different planes and camera movements, dislodges the spectator's optics, giving it different points of view, forced in all cases and logically for one position: the cameraman's.

Many times, these pieces that are made in collaboration, although they respond to a dialogue between both disciplines, from both sides, can't be known how the work of the other performs; that is, the Audiovisual Artists do not "produce" in the Dance, and the Choreographers do not take part in the capture of movement or the post-production process. There are many cases, as there are others where there is a rapport in team work, which makes up all the production processes of the work, and that is possible to grasp when viewing the finished work. When we ask about the "director", that's the point of conflict (so to speak) at the moment of ponting the author ... Who's the author? The choreographer, the audiovisual director?, both? ... therefore, signing on "collective" may be a good way to avoid the "problem", if it is. As a good example, the magnificent works of the English collective DV8.

In a second case, we can see pieces that do not pose a thematic interest, or foreign discourse (so to speak), but take as speech the technical-aesthetic resources of the media used; that is, they focus mainly on exploring the dialogue between dance and technology, proposing a new universe that exists only in that space of creation, given by 3 temporal space moments: the body, the camera and the assembly. We could

understand these "moments" as a relationship between art and technology, since an audiovisual technological medium is used to propose works that move from the execution of dance, to be reappropriated from the medium, where the post-production process would come to have great importance, since it would be the place from where the work is built. We could talk about a way to make a "script" from the editor, from the technical-aesthetic executions that makes the machine, in turn, crossed by a concept, or clearly by the scientific relationship that brings them together; that is, by the time and space of the body versus the tools of the editing programs, and the frame of the camera and screen.

The original choreographic production here is subordinated to the montage; that is, the piece is articulated in the electronic process, in the timeline that cuts, fragments, pastes and manipulates the image, and the movement of the living body, to transform it into a new object. The original choreographic creation is part of a process that encompasses in the same way the previous moments of production (event, movement, camera, body / flesh) that are finally defined by the "electronic choreographer". In general, these productions are made by independent artists who self-manage their own projects, coherently with the medium they use - they are not productions that cover large production costs; since rather than their formal implications, the sense of research and experimentation are priorities.

On the other hand, there may be other productions in this line that may not have a theme, but a discourse, appropriating this production format as a critical space, dealing with problems or installing relationships that have to do with dance, but that not necessarily in their results propose a choreography or "dance". The readings of these works seem more complex, deal with problems and relate concepts that cross the field of dance proposing discontinuous and inter-textual narratives.

The limits of the painting and the media are used in favor of a discourse, rather than trying to make a work rich in aesthetic and formal terms. The actions or movements of the body, the position of the camera and the editing process, are subject to the content that you want to give the piece. These, like the previous ones, seem to be works closer to the field of Visual Arts, inclined to the productions of video art or video-performance, because there are no restrictions to intervene through photographs, texts or whatever is possible to enrich the meaning of work. These productions are made by artists who establish conceptual rather than formal proposals; they are usually low-cost, self-managed productions, although it is not excluded that there are others with more resources and collaborative or co-produced. The work *Global Groove*, of the recently

deceased Nam June Paik, or the video performances of Vito Acconci, can serve as an indication or reference, as productions made in the 70s.

This, in no case is a restrictive or static classification, it is a way of analyzing what has been built. Now, we must ask ourselves about the practice itself and what we want to do with video and dance together, with this new indissoluble product. If we want to maintain in a certain way a reproducibility of the dance in the video, in aesthetic and continuous terms of the formalities of the dance, now in the image, or do we want to explore the medium with the faculties that it delivers? Do we choose Videodance for a matter of novelty, or do we have something to say with the medium that makes it impossible for us to say without it? Why is the format called VIDEO-dance, and not FILM-dance? What is the relationship between the tool that is used with the format? Is there a political relationship between the video as a registration tool, inserted in everyday life, in terms of "democratizing" the artistic practice? Do we use the video to deny the proper condition of the dance, as an ephemeral and unrepeatable event? ...

Brisa MP, Santiago -Chile 2007

INTERFERENCES book, 2009. Chile

