

# Do Look Now: re-imagining and re-purposing audiovisual creative practice

## Abstract

The appropriation and elaborate re-working of mediated images and sound stand in a fluid relationship with established notions such as creativity, originality and artistic freedom. The evocative, recontextualised montage works of the eminent video artists Christian Marclay (*The Clock*) and Tracey Moffatt (*Other; Love*) may be viewed critically in the light of several theorists' work, such as Walter Benjamin's ideas on the crisis of reproduction and reactivation. The ironic pastiche, *Do Look Now*, a recent video installation work, is presented here as a similar dialogical intervention, representing a subversive deconstruction and critique of filmic codes and conventions, as well as being a new work crafted out of old film clips. (The films quoted in the work are listed here in an Appendix). These practical provocations are framed within a renewed, 'queering' investigation of creative works. Such an exploration is, arguably, both illuminating and liberating for particular practitioners and researchers engaged with the unpredictable intersections of creative meaning-making in a heavily legalised, mediated and digitised world. (153 words)

**Key Words:** pastiche, video montage, audio-visual copyright, queering creative practice, Christian Marclay, Tracey Moffatt.

---

**Helen Yeates**

Queensland University of Technology

## Introduction: a pastiche of knowingness

In his cultural study of the 'poetics and politics' of pastiche, the renowned film theorist Richard Dyer claims that '[p]astiche intends that it is understood as pastiche by those who read, see or hear it...' From this 'savvy' viewer perspective, the term pastiche applies to creative works containing 'montage or collage', as well as 'knowing imitations of previous works', and, therefore, pastiche itself is playful, an 'aspect of irony' (Dyer 2007, 3). Reflecting on his recent video montage installation *The Clock*, Christian Marclay, affirms such knowingness as central to viewer participation and pleasure: 'People understand what it is, and it can only exist if it is appropriation. That's what makes it so special: you're able to recognise where it came from' (Marclay in Westwood 2012, 6).

Taking the cue from Dyer's in-depth historical exploration of the rich evocative spaces between parody and imitation, and his assertion that the word 'pastiche' itself 'is in practice extremely elastic' (9), I would argue that the particular nuanced works being considered here (by such video montage artists as Marclay, Moffatt and myself), fall within this 'evocative' space, the uncertain borderlines of which can be seen to be exciting and expansive, rather than frustrating and limiting. Dyer further cites Deffoux, who 'situates pastiche between straightforward imitation and parody: "pastiche seems more nuanced than parody and more pointed than imitation"' (53).

Creative praxis can encompass the practice of pastiche in all its forms, and the knowingness and ideas behind the works. From Greek meaning 'practice, action, doing', praxis relates to the creative possibilities afforded by reflective action. Dewey argued that 'action influences theory and theory influences practice' and that the fundamental creative interchange of ideas and production could be termed praxis (Dewey, in Bach, 2010). The radical transnational filmmaker Trinh's own theoretical analysis of praxis is inspirational for creative practitioners; for her, theory and practice are equally important and virtually interchangeable. She describes theory as risky and life-changing, but also warns against using theory as a kind of academic window-dressing that simply valourises conservative modes of thinking:

..[T]heory becomes a mere accessory to practice when it speaks from a safe place, while practice merely illustrates theory when the relationship between the two remains one of domination-submission and of totalization. I see theory as a constant questioning of the framing of consciousness – a practice capable of informing another practice, such as film production, in a reciprocal challenge. Hence

theory always has a possibility, even the probability, of leading the other practice to ‘dangerous’ places, and vice versa. I can’t separate the two...[Making the film] transforms the way I see the world around me...[H]istory is full of people who die for theory..

(Trinh, T. Minh-Ha 1992, 123)

Passionate filmmakers and pastiche creators alike do take heightened risks with their creative works, some more seriously than others, depending on the socio-political context and the controversial nature of the ideas at stake. In this vein, Christian Marclay has discussed the radical yet ‘pleasurable violence’ of his transformative collages (Marclay in Zalewski, *The New Yorker*, May 2012). Pastiche in art, whether it be termed mashup, montage, collage, assemblage, appropriation, bricolage, combination, burlesque or homage raises not only challenging issues around the nature of praxis, creativity and originality, but also flags a darker side concerning serious legal issues of copyright and fair use. Dyer argues that it is often a matter of degree:

All art involves learning from others, taking, adapting, borrowing, imitating, and since this is standard practice, there is not necessarily any felt need constantly to acknowledge it. The issue.. is...*whether they have so transformed the element(s) appropriated as to produce a new work*’ (2007, 26) (my italics).

Given that the roots of appropriation art lie mainly in movements such as Dada, Surrealism, and Pop Art (Sherman 2002, 405), Dyer notes that, by now, post-modernity and its associated emergent forms of irony and pastiche, may well have quelled, once and for all, public concerns relating, on the one hand, to innovation and originality, and, on the other hand, the currency and acceptability of artistic appropriation. However, the issue is no longer simply confined to an aesthetic discussion about whether or not a particular piece is a ‘new work’; rather this debate has become transformed into problematic discussions about ‘the question of ownership, shored up by the lucrative legalisation of the copyright’ (Dyer 2007, 27).

Regarding audio-visual copyright and the core issues of creative freedom and fair use, Claude argues that ‘the ability of the digital artist to borrow, appropriate, and re-use other works in new ways’ (2002, 250), highlights the relevance of Walter Benjamin’s views in ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’ (*Illuminations*, 1992). Benjamin’s ideas bring into stark relief the dramatic shift from what he calls the ‘auratic’ art works of the nineteenth century, to ‘non-auratic’ works such as photography and the

moving image. Hence, for Benjamin ‘[t]he end product of making a film...is not its final print, but its exhibition in cinemas around the world’. By extension, Claude argues, ‘[t]here are no originals on the Net – everything you view on your terminal is always already a representation of a prototype’, and therefore, ‘[e]ach copy is fully malleable, open to appropriation, re-purposing, and what Benjamin called “reactivation”’ (250). Also drawing on Benjamin’s groundbreaking conceptual work, McLean points to such examples as the factory-style reproduction of works by Andy Warhol and Damien Hirst, a re-processing which makes their individual distinguishing signatures ‘a source of inversion and play’. In the past, the signature of an artist has been traditionally a sacrosanct ‘mark of authenticity and creativity’ (McLean 2002, 32).

Beyond such ‘pleasurable’ postmodern inversion, and descending into legislative pain, Sherman notes that ‘the academic energy dissipated in chronicling the various changes in copyright law has been formidable’. In particular, he discusses the radical challenge to legislators of appropriation art itself; that is, ‘the process by which artists borrow images from other sources and assimilate them into their own work’, mostly taking the ‘form of open and direct copying, montage, collage and simulation’ (2002, 405). As he also rather mournfully points out, citing Anderson: ‘despite the rhetorical force of much that has been said and done in the name of “appropriation”...’, it has produced few changes in the way that the law deals with artistic property’ (Anderson 1989, cited in Sherman 2002, 407), and such conditions still prevail today. Adding to this debate, Dyer cautions against an ‘open season’ on creativity, arguing that certain kinds of pastiche, for instance, ‘may be a wearying confusion or a stimulating array, a mess or a carnival’ (2007, 21). Therefore, it is necessary to discuss briefly several further key points and counterpoints in these interconnected creative and legislative fields, in order to contextualise more clearly the upcoming analysis of the works of Marclay, Moffatt and myself. My aim here is to transcend some of the possible ‘wearying’ complexities and legislative conceptual entanglements regarding appropriation art, and ultimately to celebrate Dyer’s stimulating pastiche ‘carnival’ in terms of a fresh interpretative paradigm for creative praxis and practice-led within and beyond the academy.

### Copying rites or rightful copying

A UK specialist in copyright law, Johnson Okpaluba shows that, in general, while many jurisdictions differ within Western economies,

...[t]he judiciary needs to understand the processes of creative authorship and the culturally transformative nature in which

copyright-protected works are used, otherwise it will continue to privilege right-holders over transformative users, who are themselves creative authors in their own right (2002, 217).

He points out that, in order 'to understand appropriation as transcending reuse or plagiarism', it is important to be aware that '[t]he referent in postmodern art is no longer nature but the closed system of fabricated signs that make up our environment'. Furthermore, Okpaluba urges that we need to foster 'optimal cultural conditions for dialogic practice. By objectifying and reifying cultural forms...(and) fencing off fields of cultural meaning with "no trespassing" signs', then it is inevitable that 'intellectual property laws may enable certain forms of political practice, but more harmfully constrain others' (2002, 217).

Offering a similar, but more recent global view, Eva Hemmungs Wirtén draws on Foucault's ideas in her incisive metacritique of the hegemonic practices around intellectual property and the associated narrow focus on authorship. She opines that

The Eurocentric conception of authorship – rewarding individuality and originality through legal regimes of ownership...is counterproductive in recognizing the collective nature of creativity or the many informal ways that allow us to regulate cultural practices (2011, 254).

For her, 'authorship has become, if not the root of all evil, then at least a serious mental obstacle' to a more inspired 'free' notion of creativity, which is, in itself, 'a key concept in fighting back against copyright hardliners'. However, regrettably (for a transformative appropriation artist), she points out that nation-states and large multinational companies hold sway over the enactment and interpretation of intellectual property laws that still narrowly define creativity, freedom and originality (255).

Moving away from a purely academic lawyers' perspective, art critic Julia Bradshaw (2009) has reviewed 'Mediated' at the California Museum of Photography, an exhibition of installations by seven artists (including indigenous Australian artist, Tracey Moffatt). Bradshaw takes a positive view of the 'borrowed and reborn' value of these risk-taking appropriation works from films, television series and video games:

These artists borrowed, re-mixed, and retold scenes from our collective knowledge of moving images, nudging up against

definitions of fair use and challenging the cultural context of the original source. Like most appropriation artists, these artists benefited from our familiarity with much of the source material and thus, the approachability of the artworks' (43).

By contrast, Sarah Smith points out that some commentators view such inversions and repurposing as 'promiscuous practices of regurgitation...often characterized as parasitical and purely derivative, expressive of a late capitalist cynicism...and indicating the impossibility of innovation'. According to her, these negative views overshadow counter-discussions of the 'parodic reframings' integral to the creative capacity of appropriation art works to 'critique the forms and images they invoke'. Citing Hutcheon, she suggests that, rather than viewing the dialogical re-situation of cinematic works 'as a simple gesture of imitation for its own sake or for nostalgic purposes', the value lies in subjecting the works to this "complicitous critique" (2008, 209). Given the parodic leanings of postmodern pastiche, pleasurable, complicit knowingness is central to an understanding of the works of such eminent artists as Christian Marclay and Tracey Moffatt, as well as of my own creative praxis, a modest video montage installation entitled *Do Look Now*.

### Beyond timebound definitions: Christian Marclay

Marclay is a brilliant video installation artist, deemed to be an art world phenomenon. As one online biography states, he is a 'New York based visual artist and composer whose innovative work explores the juxtaposition between sound recording, photography, video and film'<sup>1</sup>. His most renowned work, *The Clock* (2010), is a 24-hour montage of reassembled film clips, which won him the Golden Lion for best artist at the Venice Biennale in 2011. Marclay has explored 'notions of synchronicity among music, film and video' in many of his works leading up to this triumph:

"The Clock" runs for 24 hours and features a montage of clips from such diverse films as "High Noon," starring Gary Cooper; "Titanic," with Leonardo DiCaprio; and the Arnold Schwarzenegger action movie "Eraser." Times shown on screen in "The Clock" are synchronized with real time. (Culture Monster: Christian Marclay's

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.egs.edu/faculty/christian-marclay/biography/>

'The Clock' wins Gold Lion at Venice Biennale, *Los Angeles Times* June 6, 2011)

In the light of debates around what can be deemed to be new work and the very nature of creativity in the bewildering world of reproduction, *The Clock* is a celebrated work, most interestingly for its being praised by critics and viewers alike for its stunning originality. For instance, Casey Ruble notes the worldwide 'feverish reception' of *The Clock* in her review, calling it a 'mesmerizing compilation of thousands of movie clips that include timepieces or references to time...'. In her view, *The Clock* 'traverses a spectrum of human experience', and she applauds Marclay's inversion of traditionally escapist filmic techniques relating to the distortion of temporality as well as spatiality:

Marclay does the opposite, adhering to the staccato passing of each minute to disrupt – or reconfigure – the storyline. Curiously this exposes the artifice of cinema while making its fiction seem more real.

She rounds off her commentary thus: '*The Clock* brilliantly illuminates the fleeting yet concrete nature of time..' (Ruble 2011, 118). Other writers also stress the profound humanity of the piece as well as the forceful materiality of his technical expertise (Romney 2011; Zalewski 2012).

Through his piecing together of thousands of clips over several years, not only has Marclay playfully foregrounded the nature of the medium itself, but also he has raised questions on the mysterious nature of creative meaning-making. For instance, in an interview with the renowned film critic, Jonathan Romney, Marclay states that '[t]he material comes first...Then I project into it ideas and themes... I've been thinking about over the years' (in Romney 2011, 30). Romney further muses that '*...The Clock* is poised between scholarly focus and fetishistic obsession. What is remarkable...is the way that, from extreme fragmentation and multiplicity, Marclay has created a smooth continuity – or at least the illusion of one'. Given the 'hyper-fragmentation' of some of Marclay's early experimental work, this smoothness is especially striking. With refreshing frankness, Marclay himself comments that:

I've grown tired of the jump cut - the fast edit – that we see in everything. The false continuity that I was trying to create...is, to me, more connected to the way time flows. There can be a seamless flow and momentum of a gesture from one film to the next, but it

jumps from colour to black and white, and you know it's not true, but you still believe in it. It deconstructs cinema – you see all the tricks and you understand the vocabulary' (Marclay, cited in Romney, 31)

In a revealing article on Marclay in *The New Yorker*, Daniel Zalewski analyses further the technical aspects of Marclay's creative process in making his 'unorthodox anthology of cinema' (2012, 4). Zalewski argues that '(Marclay) wanted to make an expertly edited film that exposed the fakery of editing'. As Marclay himself explains in this interview, "'By putting the clips back into real time, it's contradicting what film is...You become aware of how film is constructed – of these devices and tropes they constantly use'" (5-6). He also wonders if he could "'fashion from familiar clips a genuinely unfamiliar film, one with its own logic, rhythm, and aesthetics'" (3). As mentioned earlier in relation to bold creative risk-taking, along with such speculation, Marclay draws on his conviction that 'the best collages combined the "memory aspect" – recognition of the source material – with the pleasurable violence of transformation' (3 – 4).

Regarding one particular aspect of this confronting process, Zalewski makes the significant observation that '[o]ne issue that didn't give Marclay pause was *copyright*, because nobody had objected before to his appropriation art' (for example, with *Telephones* 1995 - one of the 'first video mashups'; *Video Quartet* 2002; *Cross Fire* 2007):

He (Marclay) had a theory: "If you make something good and interesting and not ridiculing someone or being offensive, the creators of the original material will like it" (5)

Even though no actual creator of the 'original material' appears to have been offended enough to take him to court, Marclay has placed various restrictions on the material; one is that he will not allow any entry fee to be charged for the exhibition. As he said in another recent interview, 'I don't want people to exploit the work..I don't want it to be used for other things' (in Westwood, 2012, 5-6). Marclay also openly admits that he has no copyright clearances for the multiple film clips that he used in the piece: 'The copyright issue worries some people. I don't think it's an issue at all', pointing out that, in his view, 'Fair-use provisions in US copyright law allow for some creative reinvention of existing material'. However, Westwood rather wryly comments that '[e]ven in the wild west of cultural appropriation, it would be hypocritical...to charge others a fee to view something so abundantly borrowed' (2012, 6). Nevertheless, despite the tensions and problems that others may perceive as needing to be addressed in relation to his

extraordinary pastiche creation, Marclay's masterwork has been lauded worldwide by critics and audiences alike.

### Tracing paradoxical pastiches: the subversive montages of Tracey Moffatt

In May 2012, Tracey Moffatt, another internationally acclaimed video montage creator, Indigenous Australian photographer, filmmaker and video artist, displayed a retrospective of her films and video montage works at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. The seven pastiches screened were compilations directed by her and edited by Gary Hillberg, all of which involved material that has been 'abundantly borrowed'. For instance, *Love* (2003, 21 min.) is described on the MOMA exhibition website as 'This commentary on violence against women climaxes in a rage that only grand Hollywood depictions of love can convey'. Another montage, *Revolution* (2008, 14 min.) 'confronts the class system', while the last in the series, *Other* (2010, 7min) 'deconstructs the treatment of the native in Hollywood, from Mutiny on the Bounty (1962) to The New World (2005)'.<sup>2</sup>

In a rare recorded interview with Moffatt in 2000, Bruce James from ABC radio asked what inspired her to venture into video montage work. She described her core reason as being an urge to collaborate creatively with a particular person:

It was really about linking up with a wonderful artist Gary Hillberg. He's a film editor but he obsessively sits at home alone and puts these montages together - for no reason, just for him. He's such a film buff and I realised it would be exciting to collaborate with Gary Hillberg, because as an artist you're often working on your own, and you get so lonely and depressed. To do something as lively as these video montages is such a release in a way. (*Summer Series, first broadcast 31/07/2000*)<sup>3</sup>

However, it would seem as though the collaborative arc has become, for her, a rather jaded inspirational trajectory, given that a recent reviewer of an exhibition of her video montages in the Bronx Museum of the Arts (2011) has written a piece not entirely glowing with praise. In a comparison with the work of Christian Marclay and others, The *New York Times* critic, Ken

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.moma.org/visit/calendar/films/1270>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.abc.net.au/rn/legacy/programs/atoday/stories/s229128.htm> (accessed 15 June 2012)

Johnson, deems Moffatt's appropriation art as inferior. He judges that Marclay's work is actually the 'high-water mark for this genre', which he terms 'the thematically pointed montage of samples from popular films', enabled by 'the advent of easy digital editing'. Although Johnson has strong reservations about the quality and effectiveness of some of Tracey Moffatt's montages (eg *Artist* 2000, and *Doomed* 2007), he is, on the other hand, less dismissive of, and even considerably impressed by *Mother* (2009) and *Other* (2010). The latter montage he sees as having 'a ferocious erotic energy enhanced by urgently percussive music'. Johnson argues that, overall, Moffatt's video montages

...are not as innovative formally or conceptually as those of Mr Marclay..., and her production values are comparatively primitive. But at their best they have a stirring, paradoxical effect. They are emotionally gripping, like Hollywood movie trailers, and they activate critical thought about how films manipulate the masses by means of primarily seductive fantasies (2011, C27).

Thus he sees her critical meaning-making interlaced with and inseparable from the creative works, which at times, as with Marclay's work, tend to foreground the medium itself. In the light of such comments, it is interesting to learn that, apparently, 'she has finished with making montages and plans to produce other kinds of video art' (C27).

### Do Look Now: sex, montage and videotape

As a beginner in the field rather than an established video artist, my recent montage installation *Do Look Now* was part of a group exhibition entitled *One Night Stand*, featured in the Queensland Festival of Photography 4 program. This was held at an alternative exhibition space on 21 April, 2012 (entry was free). The initial creative impulse was drawn from my continued fascination with particular sex scenes that have, in my view, creatively and substantively pushed the boundaries of filmic codes and conventions. Therefore this video montage encapsulated my personal love affair with cinema over many years of viewing. One aim of this historically-based project was to re-present an ironic, autobiographical interplay of love, sex, humour, nostalgic yearning and cultural memory. Hence, the postmodern pastiche effect of 'the presence of the past' is central to the montage (Jencks, 1986, cited in Dyer 2007, 133).

Covering a timespan of dedicated viewing and reviewing from 1967 to 2012, the installation piece comprised an intercutting and re-presentation of particular sex/love scenes from 24 films, with 55 very short clips utilised

over 16 minutes of montage. The excerpts are not presented as sequential and complete in themselves; such a format might have been of some interest, but it would have defeated the core creative purpose of this erotic reimagining. In my considered view, each film represented, in its time, a particular challenge that resonated with audiences on the occasion of first viewing – and beyond.

The creative process has involved researching and trawling through the films, and then working collaboratively with two editors over several months, in order to create a provocative, unified piece with its own internal delights, ideas and metanarrative threads. The video montage therefore has its own particular organic form and sensuous rhythms, reflecting the shifting moods of sex and love in cinema, as seen through the eyes of an academic researcher and cinephile. A related projection piece was also devised to be shown on a second screen close by, acknowledging the films and giving details, both visually and textually, of each film in a distinct chronological sequence.

This meditation on sexual pleasure follows in the postmodern pastiche tradition of similar evocative video montages of ‘found film’ by Christian Marclay and Tracey Moffatt. *Do Look Now* confronts several ‘taboo’ themes such as the nature of female sexuality, queer sexual politics and the challenge of renewed, shifting meanings of sensual depictions when set adrift from their original moorings and re-edited into a different work entirely. Hence *Do Look Now* can be viewed as a kind of ‘queer’ pastiche, breaking filmic conventions and pushing the boundaries of a normative creative praxis.

### Queer Lens for a Straight Shoot

This queer interpretative lens has many facets, including those that illuminate unforeseen textual fragments, taking the creative works to unexpected levels of viewer experience and understanding. The other two artists being considered here may also be viewed through the queer lens, each in different ways. With regard to a queer reading of Tracey Moffatt’s video montages *Lip* (1999, 11 mins) and *Love* (2003, 21 mins), Sarah Smith applauds the ‘subversive repetition in the pastiche films of Tracey Moffatt’ (2008, 209). Furthermore, Smith argues that the particular ‘parodic reframings’ in each of these films

..demonstrate a productive intersection between parodic repetition, described by Judith Butler as a key strategy for queering (disrupting) normative categories of identity, and composite

pastiche which...is particularly well placed to produce a critical transformation of the texts it cites... (Smith 2008, 209).

Citing Butler’s theories throughout her article, Smith points out that queer political artists such as Moffatt ‘s work with pre-existing discursive practices, and therefore “The task is not whether to repeat, but how to repeat”, in order to produce what she [Butler] calls a “radical proliferation” of the stereotype’. Such critical, pointed hyperbole and repetition used by Moffatt both displace and reveal the ‘schism between the stereotype and the logic it purports to represent’ (214 – 215). Hence, for instance, in *Love*, Moffatt clumps together and regurgitates many stereotyped examples of the Hollywood amorous embrace to heighten her point about the false romantic illusions being perpetuated. Significantly, as the images become increasingly more disturbing, she reveals ‘the connection between love and violence in popular narratives’ (214). These pastiches work as queer parodic critiques in order to mock the contrivances of dominant cinematic practices, as well as to make hard-hitting points about the often brutal treatment of women in society, and Hollywood’s historical collusion in normalising such abuse.

As mentioned above, my own montage work *Do Look Now* fits, to an extent, within a similar queer framework of unstable interpretation and pleasurable re-negotiation around fluid sexual identities and desire. *The Clock* may also be read as a queer construct, given that Marclay embraces ambivalent, ‘non-normative logics’, in particular relation to both the manipulation and celebration of ‘space and time’. With the pastiche gallery-oriented productions of Moffatt, Marclay and myself, shards of mediated works from one era and culture reach across time and space, to be pasted together and juxtaposed against each other, in disruptive, striking ways that their original creators would not have thought possible. Such tensions between creativity, re-appropriation and originality have strong implications for practice-led researchers within and beyond the academy who wish to push the boundaries of both theory and practice across many fields, not simply within the audio-visual context.

### Que(e)rying praxis and practice-led endeavour: a new inflection?

Given such pleasurable ‘queering’ of the artists under consideration here, the ‘querying/queering’ of creative practice itself could arguably be a way forward in this context. This proposition articulates a process of enabling creative practitioners to be freed from the totalising conventions that tend to define, restrict and ‘measure’ creativity. It is noteworthy to consider, however, that a stable, consensual understanding of the term ‘queer’ cannot be taken-for-granted. For instance, Judith Halberstam proposes one useful

definition, saying that ‘queer refers to non-normative logics and organisations of community, sexual identity, embodiment, and activity in space and time’ (2005, 6). On the other hand, Carlin and DiGrazia argue that queer ‘is in itself an unstable term, one whose effectiveness depends upon it remaining unstable’ (2004, 198). This inherent paradox is one of the main reasons that this rich, multilayered concept poses an appealing flexible framework for further study of transformative creativity-in-flux.

### Creating queer pastiche and advocacy

As Okpaluba points out, many art historians suggest that the ‘whole history of art...is a history of sampling’. He cites Leonard Steinberg (1978) who claimed that “‘there is as much unpredictable originality in quoting, imitating, transposing, and echoing, as there is in inventing’” (2002, footnote xiii 218). I have argued here that there is much creativity and originality in the video montage works under consideration; whether these works would pass ‘fair use’ laws is another matter entirely, and, while touched on earlier in this paper, a detailed consideration of such issues lies beyond its scope.

Putting aside legislative wrangling, and taking into account Dyer’s sobering concerns regarding the dangers of creating capricious, inconsequential ‘mess’ (2007, 21), I contend that pastiche itself could be termed a fundamentally liberating, inherently ‘queer’ practice. For instance, in summing up his considered approach to the nuanced complexities of the best aspects of the creative praxis of pastiche (including, of course, within film, his area of expertise), Dyer states that:

..(Pastiche) imitates formal means that are themselves ways of evoking, moulding and eliciting feeling, and thus in the process is able to mobilise feelings even while signalling that it is doing so. Thereby it can, at its best, allow us to feel our connection to the affective frameworks, the structures of feelings, past and present, that we inherit and pass on. That is to say, it can enable us to know ourselves affectively as historical beings (2007, 180).

In a similar vein, Haraway states prophetically that ‘queering specific normalised categories is not for the easy frisson of transgression, but for the hope for livable worlds’ (1994, 60). Hence, arguably, the queering of practice-led work and research would provide a significant reframing of established discourses and practices, a ‘pleasurable violence of transformation’ in Marclay’s terms (in Zalewski 2012, 4). Moreover, this multilayered ‘queering’ process would open up a fascinating scope for practising artists across all fields, granting a fresh social advocacy lens

through which to view and articulate our practices, beyond narrowly defined legalistic restrictions.

### References

- Bach, J. 2010. *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*, Sage Publications
- Bradshaw, J. 2009. Borrowed and Reborn. *Afterimage*. Vol 37. No 1.
- Carlin, D. and J. DiGrazia, eds 2004. *Queer cultures*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall
- Claude, G. 2002. After Digitopia: the internet, copyright and information control. In McLean, D. and K.Schubert (Eds) *Dear Images: Art, copyright and culture*. London : Ridinghouse ; Institute of Contemporary Arts. 241 – 252.
- Dyer, R. 2007. *Pastiche* London and New York: Routledge.
- Halberstam, J. 2005. *In a queer time and place*. New York: New York University Press.
- Haraway, D. 1994. A Game of Cat’s Cradle: science studies, feminist theory, cultural studies. *Configurations* 2 (1) 59 – 72.
- McLean, D. 2002. Introduction. In McLean, D. and K.Schubert (Eds) *Dear Images: Art, copyright and culture*. London : Ridinghouse ; Institute of Contemporary Arts. 10 – 42.
- Okpaluba, J. 2002. Appropriation art: Fair use or foul? In McLean, D. and K.Schubert (Eds) *Dear Images: Art, copyright and culture*. London : Ridinghouse; Institute of Contemporary Arts. 197 – 224
- Romney, J. 2011. What time is it where? *Sight and Sound* 21. 5. May. 30 – 31.
- Ruble, C. 2011. Christian Marclay. Paula Cooper Gallery. Exhibition Reviews. *Art in America*, April, 118.
- Sherman, B. 2002. Appropriating the postmodern: copyright and the challenge of the new. In McLean, D. and K.Schubert (Eds) *Dear Images:*

*Art, copyright and culture.* London : Ridinghouse ; Institute of Contemporary Arts. 404 – 419.

Smith, S. 2008. *Lip and Love*: subversive repetition in the pastiche films of Tracey Moffatt. *Screen*. 49.2 Summer. 209 – 215.

Trinh, T. Minh-Ha 1992. *Framer Framed* New York and London: Routledge

Westwood, M. 2012. Time Lord *Weekend Australian* March 17-18, 5-6

Wirtén, E.H. 2011 *Visualizing Copyright, Seeing Hegemony: Towards a Meta-Critique of Intellectual Property*. In McLeod, K. and R. Kuenzli (Eds). *Cutting Across Media: Appropriation Art, Interventionist Collage, and Copyright Law*. DukeUniversity Press 252 – 263.

Zalewski, D. 2012. *The Hours*. How Christian Marclay created the ultimate digital mosaic. *The New Yorker*. March 12, 1 – 12.

## Appendix

### Films referenced in *Do Look Now*, 2012

1967 <i>The Graduate</i>	dir: Mike Nichols
1970 <i>The Conformist</i>	dir: Bernardo Bertolucci
1970 <i>Five Easy Pieces</i>	dir: Bob Rafelson
1971 <i>Klute</i>	dir: Alan Pakula
1973 <i>Don't Look Now</i>	dir: Nicholas Roeg
1974 <i>Stone</i>	dir: Sandy Harbutt
1981 <i>Body Heat</i>	dir: Lawrence Kasdan
1983 <i>The Big Chill</i>	dir: Lawrence Kasdan
1986 <i>The Big Easy</i>	dir: Jim McBride

1986 <i>Betty Blue</i> Beineix	dir: Jean-Jaques
1988 <i>Bull Durham</i>	dir: Ron Shelton
1990 <i>Wild at Heart</i>	dir: David Lynch
1991 <i>Thelma and Louise</i>	dir: Ridley Scott
1991 <i>My Own Private Idaho</i>	dir: Gus Van Sant
1993 <i>The Piano</i>	dir: Jane Campion
1996 <i>Female Perversions</i>	dir: Susan Streitfeld
1997 <i>The Ice Storm</i>	dir: Ang Lee
2001 <i>Y Tu Mama Tambien</i>	dir: Alfonso Cuaron
2002 <i>Secretary</i>	dir: Stephen Shainberg
2003 <i>Japanese Story</i>	dir: Sue Brooks
2004 <i>In the Cut</i>	dir: Jane Campion
2005 <i>Brokeback Mountain</i>	dir: Ang Lee
2007 <i>Lust, Caution</i>	dir: Ang Lee
2011 <i>Shame</i>	dir: Steve McQueen

---

Helen Yeates is an Adjunct Professor in Film, Screen and Animation in the Creative Industries Faculty, Queensland University of Technology. She has presented papers at many national and international conferences and has published widely in such areas as creative practice methodologies, representations of masculinities in popular culture, and feminist media studies. She has also produced a number of short films such as the award-winning '82 *with a Bullet* and the Indigenous doco-drama *Shattered Dreams*. She directed and produced the video montage *Do Look Now*, which has screened both as an installation for the 2012 Queensland Festival of Photography and in the *Forbidden Pleasures* section of the 2012 Brisbane International Film Festival.