

A Calendar of Happenings:

Allan Kaprow, Counter-Chronologies and Cataloguing

Performance, c. 1970

Catherine Spencer

Between 1968 and 1969, commissioned by the Junior Council of The Museum of Modern Art New York (MoMA), the performance artist Allan Kaprow worked to design a ‘non calendar calendar’ for 1970 as the press release, delighting in the paradox, put it.¹ Measuring nearly forty centimetres high and just under thirty centimetres wide, Kaprow’s *Days Off: A Calendar of Happenings* is an unwieldy, uncompromising affair, designed ‘for wall hanging’ and fashioned using rough and ready newsprint to keep the retail cost down.² For Kaprow, this was vital if his aspiration ‘to reach numbers of young people with a cheap throw-away item’ was to be fulfilled.³ The content that Kaprow was so keen to communicate consists of scores and photographs from ten of his Happenings executed between 1967 and 1969, arranged in the format of a calendar, albeit a distinctly dysfunctional one which skips some dates and repeats others. The curator and critic Lawrence Alloway celebrated it as ‘an object of tough grace, with a profusion of grainy, factual and enigmatic photographs.’⁴ Somewhat ironically (or perhaps appositely) for a ‘non calendar calendar’, *Days Off*’s production

schedule was delayed by disagreements about promotion and packaging between Kaprow and the Junior Council, with the artist convinced that his project was ‘irreversibly being turned into just one more cute art world gag’.⁵ Yet despite, and even arguably because of, the project’s relative collaborative and commercial failure, *Days Off* powerfully demonstrates the tensions surrounding the documentation of actions and events as the 1960s progressed into the 1970s.

Days Off was first commissioned by the MoMA Junior Council in 1968, under their remit to produce educational and promotional materials connected to the Museum’s activities, including lectures, Christmas cards and an annual calendar.⁶ The Junior Council sought ‘to extend the Museum beyond its own walls and to make modern art available to as wide an audience as possible’.⁷ They approached *Days Off* in this spirit, collaborating with an artist not represented in MoMA’s holdings, and who operated predominately outside museums and galleries.⁸ Never one to pull any punches, in 1967 Kaprow claimed that museums ‘reek of a holy death which offends my sense of reality’.⁹ *Days Off* fell into the category of ‘special projects’, and Kaprow’s calendar differed markedly from those normally produced by the Junior Council.¹⁰ Their standard appointment calendar for 1969, despite a psychedelic cover, is a staid affair featuring highlights from MoMA’s collection. The most adventurous it gets is Claes Oldenburg’s 1962 *Dual*

Hamburgers, and a 1964 lithograph by Allen Jones. By contrast, Kaprow adapted the calendar template as a means of frustrating attempts to order, fix engagements and divide time up into clearly demarcated zones of work and play, resisting the regulation of leisure time according to the demands of production.¹¹ While the Junior Council's 1969 appointment diary is an eminently functional object, perfect for the city-dwelling cultural consumer, *Days Off* presents a very different kind of social calendar.

The now-yellowing pages of *Days Off* reveal Kaprow reflecting on his most recent experimentations in a form that he had been honing since his first performance in 1959, thinking seriously about photographic documentation and its capacity to circulate through mass media channels, and addressing the pressure to catalogue performance as its recently accrued histories became ever-more evident.¹² Kaprow undertook his first retrospective exhibition in 1967 at the Pasadena Art Museum, while exhibitions such as *Happening & Fluxus* curated by Harald Szeemann at the Kölnischer Kunstverein in Cologne between 1970 and 1971 attempted to catalogue and display transient art works on a grand scale, embroiling artists like Kaprow in a wider momentum to historicize performance.¹³ The calendar project provided space for some opportune artistic stocktaking, and for Kaprow to test the self-imposed limitations he had set for the Happening. Kaprow revelled in the

contradictory temporalities opened up between performance and its record, while keeping a canny eye on his artistic legacy.¹⁴

Although Kaprow referred to the ‘uniqueness’ of *Days Off*, his calendar relates to a constellation of contemporaneous critical and curatorial initiatives, which span Happenings, Fluxus activities, performance art and Conceptualism.¹⁵ These include the gallerist Seth Siegelaub’s use of the calendar format to display Conceptual art works in *One Month, March 1–31, 1969* (1969); the *Fluxcalendar* created by the Fluxus impresario George Maciunas during the early 1970s using Mieko (née Chieko) Shiomi’s *Spatial Poem No. 3* (1966); and Alloway’s *Artists and Photographs* publication of 1970. *Days Off*, this essay proposes, is an overlooked but significant endeavour within Kaprow’s practice, forming a bridge between his Happenings of the 1960s and ‘Activities’ in the 1970s, and intersecting with a network of national and transnational avant-garde activity.¹⁶

The first two sections of this essay address the multivalent temporalities and networked distribution of artistic labour in which *Days Off* participates. The third and final part argues that Kaprow’s challenge to linear histories was part of an attempt to re-conceive the Happening as a pedagogical, social tool that could reach a mass audience. By situating *Days Off* in relation to the rich array of recent scholarship on performance documentation and re-performance, the essay finds that, rather

than the chrononormative organization implied by the calendar layout, *Days Off* remains open to repetitions, returns and reinventions. Kaprow's 'Calendar of Happenings' offers a counter-chronological understanding of performance art's histories, which challenges diachronic progression and what Peter Osborne identifies as 'the homogenization of labour time' according to 'the time of the clock' under capitalism.¹⁷ Instead, *Days Off* prioritizes the anachronic, out-of-joint interruptions that might be achieved through taking 'days off'.

Catalogues as Calendars: The Temporalities of Performance

Documentation

Days Off: A Calendar of Happenings did in one sense function as an actual exhibition catalogue, in that the page-layouts Kaprow designed for the project were displayed in New York at the John Gibson Commissions Gallery on 27 East 67th Street during October 1969.¹⁸ Yet *Days Off* more broadly catalogues ten Happenings from the previous three years of Kaprow's practice. The sheets of the calendar contain photographs from individual works, rendered in practical black ink on the thin, newsprint-quality paper. Kaprow allocated each piece a varying number of pages, placing the score on the first leaf for every section. The oldest Happening Kaprow selected was *Fluids*, presented in Los Angeles and Pasadena as part of his 1967 retrospective; he also included *Moving*, commissioned by the

Chicago Museum of Contemporary Art in November that year.¹⁹

Six of the Happenings were performed in association with universities and colleges: *Runner* (Washington University, St Louis, February 1968); *Transfer* (Wesleyan University, February 1968); *Record II* (University of Texas, April 1968); *Population* (Colby Junior College, New Hampshire, May 1968); *Travelog* (Fairleigh Dickinson University, July 1968); and *Course* (University of Iowa, May 1969).²⁰ The remaining two, *Pose* and *Shape*, took place in March and April 1969 respectively as part of *Project Other Ways*, a pedagogic enterprise that Kaprow embarked on in 1968 with the progressive educator Herbert Kohl and the Berkeley Unified School District.²¹ Throughout the calendar, Kaprow marshals his images in ways that seem to sketch the evolution of each Happening clearly enough. The first day for *Runner*, for example, shows people eagerly unpacking bundles of tarpaper, one of Kaprow's favourite materials, from the back of a van, preparing to unroll it 'along the shoulder of a road' during the three-day Happening as the score dictates (*plate 1*). The subsequent four pages follow the participants as they repeatedly unspool their tarpaper burdens over the next two days. Photographs from the three dates of Kaprow's *Fluids*, which required participants to create rectangular ice-structures in different parts of Pasadena and Los Angeles, are spaced over six pages. The score that prefaces the photographs describes how

once built, the ice sculptures were left ‘to melt’. The images on the last page for this Happening show the transparent, ragged edge of an ice-wall disintegrating in the California sun.

Ostensibly, *Days Off* catalogues Kaprow’s Happenings chronologically, tracing the arc of their execution, as in *Runner* and *Fluids*, matching them up with their dates so that ‘the pages correspond to the actual days on which the Happenings occurred in diff. [sic] places around the country.’²² Yet *Moving*, one of the first Happenings to take place in 1967, appears last in the calendar, while *Pose* of 1969 gets sandwiched between *Transfer* and *Record II*, both performed in 1968. Linking each Happening with the date and month of its execution, counter-intuitively, actually re-shuffles and disrupts their chronology. This deliberate confusion is compounded by the fact that the calendar cover, a photomontage by Peter Moore of Kaprow leaning nonchalantly against a ball of screwed-up paper, was originally produced for the promotional poster advertising Kaprow’s 1968 Happening *Round Trip*, which does not feature in the calendar (*plate 2*). As Kaprow acknowledged during the design stage, some dates were represented but others intentionally omitted:

The repetition of days such as January 2, January 2, January 3, January 3, etc. not only makes it possible to broadly fill out the fifty two weeks of the year without cramping the pictures; it is entirely

consistent with the flexible time used in the Happenings themselves. Thus, some days feel, and are, longer than others. (And perhaps some days disappear entirely...²³)

The photographs from *Pose*, which occurred on 22 March, take up seven pages, while those from all five dates relating to *Moving* from 28 November to 2 December, are compressed into six. Altogether twenty-four dates are spread across sixty-four pages: the year demarcated by *Days Off* is thus drastically truncated yet strangely expanded. The dates, stamped big and bold on each sheet, become gently loosened from a specific temporality, particularly because they are never anchored to named days of the week (although retailed for 1970, the press release pragmatically noted that the calendar was ‘useable in any year’).²⁴ The dates in the calendar function simultaneously as markers of past events but also as holding spaces for future plans, while the elisions that punctuate their arrangement register the fallibility of memory.

For Kaprow, the calendar structure was by no means chained to chronological ordering. ‘Calendars’, he mused, ‘have always been for humans somewhat arbitrary arrangements of time: solar calendars, lunar calendars, calendars of “coming events” and calendars of past ones called “history.”’²⁵ The arbitrary, syncopated understanding of time unfolded by *Days*

Off corresponds with the ‘flexible time’ within the Happenings. In her landmark study of the relationship between art practice and time in the United States during the 1960s, Pamela M. Lee argues that the interplay between the two was marked by ‘chronophobia’, fostered by technological developments. This manifested itself in artistic resistance to endings and historical progression, together with explorations across multiple media of both ‘presentness’ and being out of time.²⁶ Although she does not dwell on the Happenings, Lee suggests that, like Kinetic art, they ‘represented a historical moment that could not quite keep its bearings straight – could not quite determine its trajectory – because the moment itself was rushing by so fast’.²⁷ Kaprow’s calendar implies that the Happenings weren’t so much ‘chronophobic’ as ‘chronophilic’ – although these terms are perhaps best understood as two sides of the same time-fixated coin – intensely attuned to the pressures of the archived past and anticipated future on the present moment.

At first glance, *Days Off* might seem like a distinct anomaly within Kaprow’s practice, and 1960s performance art more generally. Kaprow’s biographer Jeff Kelley notes that his ‘professed attitude toward the photographic documentation of his work was one of indifference’, concluding: ‘he was not opposed to the documentation of an event as long as the act of documenting it didn’t interfere with the work itself.’²⁸ Yet the careful inventory of performance photographs and scripts in

Days Off contradicts Kaprow's apparent indifference and insistence on the 'perishable' nature of the Happenings, which in his 1961 essay 'Happenings in the New York Scene' he famously maintained 'cannot be reproduced'.²⁹ By the late 1960s his attitude had undergone a sea change: indeed, several Happenings in *Days Off*, notably *Record II*, *Shape* and *Pose*, incorporated the acts of taking and disseminating photographs into the scores themselves. In a recent, timely intervention, Mechtild Widrich argues that performance photographs and documents have the capacity to act as 'performative monuments', and identifies 'a readiness to equate performance and photography which we hardly associate with the 1960s'.³⁰ Widrich highlights the need for art historians to re-assess established narratives that associate Happenings and performance art more generally with ephemerality, and to find new ways of handling their archival traces.³¹ *Days Off* explicitly demands this of its viewers and users.

The question of how to display and communicate his work had been preoccupying Kaprow. In 1966 he wrote to the French critic Pierre Restany: 'I don't think making an illustrated scenario or "history" of my evolution would do any good. It would merely be a collection of exhibition pieces. [...] Yet *some* [*sic*] sort of documentation should be undertaken before all the evidence vanishes into oblivion. I don't have any answers. It's a dilemma.'³² This dilemma was perhaps sharpened by the critical

reviews that Kaprow's Pasadena museum show received the following year. Kaprow framed the exhibition in his catalogue introduction as a 'compromise'.³³ The retrospective focused on early collages, sculptures and assemblages, although it did contain three of Kaprow's participatory environments: *Yard* (1961), *Words* (1962) and *Push and Pull: A Furniture Comedy for Hans Hofmann* (1963). Yet even these, *Artforum's* reviewer Jane Livingston cuttingly concluded, seemed 'as old hat as a novel by Ayn Rand'.³⁴ In 1970 Kaprow's work, along with that of many other performance artists, was included in Harald Szeemann's large-scale *Happening & Fluxus* exhibition in Cologne, which included a substantial array of documentation collected by Hanns Sohm.³⁵ For the show Kaprow again re-created *Yard*, a sea of rubber tyres that originally flooded the courtyard space of the Martha Jackson Gallery in New York.³⁶ Kaprow also designed a new work entitled *Sawdust* (1970), which debuted during a series of performances scheduled for the exhibition's opening. The legacy of *Happening & Fluxus*, which was largely a critical failure, has been overshadowed by the controversy surrounding performances by the Viennese Actionists and Wolf Vostell. Yet the exhibition is significant because of the prominence it gave to a voluminous array of performance documentation (*plate 3*), and its attempt to complicate ostensible divisions between the layered

sedimentation of archival material and live acts – issues which Kaprow had been grappling with since his Pasadena show.

The catalogue for *Happening & Fluxus* attempts to impose order on this material by dividing the documents up into a chronology and bibliography for 1950 to 1970. In the double-page spreads for the chronology, works are listed in date order down the left-hand side (*plate 4*), and selected documentation reproduced on the facing right-hand page. Each work is tagged with information about author, place and form, while the documentation is classified with a quasi-scientific air, according to the categories of script, review, photograph, poster, program and film, invoking the lists, posters and calendars that Maciunas designed to advertise Fluxus events. The reviewer Lazlo Glozer likened the layout of these items in the exhibition's vitrines to 'the contents of an opened prehistoric burial site, where not even the skeleton remained in one piece'.³⁷ Conversely, Glozer evocatively described the catalogue as functioning like 'a timetable providing the departure times for the action trains', indicating polyphonic nature of the photographs, scores and ephemera stuffed into the catalogue.³⁸

Throughout the *Happening & Fluxus* catalogue, photographs, scripts, flyers and advertisements pull against the rigid marshalling of dates, and the very premise of transparent 'documentation'. The chronology for 1966, for example, logs the fourth iteration of Charlotte Moorman's annual New York

Avant Garde Festival in Central Park, which included a tyre-rolling event for children entitled *Towers* by Kaprow.³⁹ The opposite page contains material relating to the *Festival*, which takes the form of event photographs, including an image of children playing during Kaprow's Happening. More unusually however, the photographs have been used to make a flyer instructing people to 'vote "yes" on Proposition no. 1: authorising bonds for recreation facilities'.⁴⁰ The politics of this protest poster are temporally and geographically specific, yet its imperative demand to 'vote "yes"' for a public services bill achieves a disruptive charge within the catalogue, as if exhorting the continued relevance of play, participation, and community engagement well beyond the moment of its making.⁴¹ The uneasy relationship between the catalogue's relentless chronology and the performance ephemera it contains underscores the capacity of this documentation, and its unpredictable afterlives, to disrupt teleological histories.

Kaprow's poster for a suite of works he designed in 1969, entitled *Six Ordinary Happenings*, was also reproduced in the *Happening & Fluxus* catalogue and provides an even more overt example (plate 5). These six Happenings (*Pose, Shape, Giveaway, Charity, Purpose* and *Fine*) were executed by schoolchildren and teachers from public schools in Berkeley as part of Kaprow and Kohl's wider educational initiative *Project Other Ways*. The poster features the concise scores for each

piece, together with an image from the performances. For all the poster's status in the catalogue as the partial record of a prior event, Kaprow's scores render the status of these Happenings deeply unstable through their use of the present continuous tense: 'carrying chairs through the city' for *Pose*; 'making a mountain of sand' for *Purpose*; 'spray painting' the silhouettes of shoes and bodies on the sidewalk for *Shape*. Kaprow's directions also carry an imperative edge comparable to the directive 'vote "yes"' emblazoned on Moorman's *Avant Garde Festival* flyer.

Kaprow took pains to distinguish Happenings from Fluxus events. He declared that the Happenings were 'urgent' and 'full of a kind of unsettledness, they invaded the space around, they tended to spill out of the edges' while 'the event was discreet, usually very coolly limited within its field.'⁴² Yet the percolated precision of Kaprow's later scripts, such as those developed for *Six Ordinary Happenings*, can be compared with what Julia Robinson calls the 'indeterminate score' of Fluxus activities. This 'indeterminate score' was 'a card with a few lines of text [that] could propose an action, a thought, or perhaps an object. The score could be realized in any way the performer wished. Rather than dictating a "true" version, the score was only ever a cue.'⁴³ The scores on Kaprow's poster retain a similar potential to function as prompts for audiences to create their own performances. Even the *Happening & Fluxus* catalogue, with its

bibliography acting as a roadmap for further research, can be approached as a manual for action, or at the very least a ‘cue’ for imaginative projection and investigation.⁴⁴

In notes relating to his 1968 work *Runner*, the February performance which opens *Days Off*, Kaprow described the Happening as ‘fleeting, relatively private and undocumentable, it deliberately dies on its every performance.’⁴⁵ His language, particularly in its stress on mortality, is reminiscent of Peggy Phelan’s influential and controversial formulation that ‘performance’s only life is in the present. Performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations of [sic] representations: once it does so, it becomes something other than performance. [...] Performance’s being [...] becomes itself through disappearance.’⁴⁶ Yet Kaprow qualified the first part of his statement by asserting that the Happening’s ‘very deliberate death, is its conscious bid for regeneration.’⁴⁷ Although his wording is ambiguous, in the mid-late 1960s Kaprow’s Happenings became increasingly open to photographic or textual transmission and relay, pre-programmed with the possibility that they might re-emerge in other forms and versions.⁴⁸ *Days Off*, like the poster for *Six Ordinary Happenings*, has a self-sufficient quality, providing enough information for the repeated execution of the Happenings it contains.

In particular, the images of *Pose* and *Shape* from *Six Ordinary Happenings* included in *Days Off*, generated as part of the performances themselves rather than by external observers, have a theatrical air that blends the demonstrative with the poetic. *Shape* directed participants to spray-paint each other's silhouettes onto the pavement, before taking pictures and sending them to the press for publication.⁴⁹ It produced particularly dramatic images of participants swaddling themselves in protective plastic sheeting as they painted around each other's bodies. The silhouettes are reminiscent of crime-scene outlines, and also in some instances – such as where the outline of a single hand is haloed by a circle of paint – evocative of political graffiti (*plate 6*). *Pose*, meanwhile, required that participants strike a pose in the middle of Berkeley's streets and have a Polaroid picture taken, before pasting it down at the site of the photograph, taking another picture as evidence, 'going on', and leaving the first pictures in situ. Across the pages devoted to *Pose* in *Days Off*, photographs proliferate of self-aware stagings, and of miniature *mise-en-abymes* created by photographs of photographs. A series of three images, arranged sequentially on a single calendar page from top to bottom, first show a chair positioned between train-tracks, then a participant sitting in the chair and precariously resting her hands and feet either side, before finally revealing the second photograph neatly taped to one of the rails (*plate 7*). While this

configuration seems almost didactically chronological, another page features a photograph in which the photographer's shadow falls across a Polaroid taped to the ground, as they take another picture to record this action. Yet the taped Polaroid is not the same image as the one placed immediately above it of a man sitting on a chair (*plate 8*). The composition triggers what a review of *Days Off* in *Artforum* identified as the calendar's disorienting effects of 'spatial vertigo' and 'temporal vertigo'.⁵⁰

Rather than disappearance, these photographs manifest what Philip Auslander calls the 'performativity of performance documentation'. As Auslander notes, the 'shaky distinction between the categories of documentary and theatrical images' often collapses in photographs of performance art from the 1960s and 1970s.⁵¹ The strongly performative nature of the photographs from *Pose* and *Shape*, in which participants were acutely aware of their self-presentation, results in a fluidity that mimics, and even reproduces, the simultaneity and immediacy of the Happenings themselves, particularly when paired with Kaprow's increasingly 'cue'-like scores.⁵² Kaprow's 'non-calendar calendar', by drawing out the slippery temporality of his Happenings, covertly anticipates and enables reinventions in the future, and can be understood as a participatory strategy that extends, rather than substitutes, the performances.

While looking forwards, the temporal instabilities of both Kaprow's 'non-calendar calendar' and the ruptured chronologies

of the *Happening & Fluxus* catalogue also glance backwards. They resonate with the theorization of queer temporalities developed by writers such as Elizabeth Freeman and Judith Halberstam, which continue the resistance to fixed identity promoted by Phelan, but complicate her stance on transience. Although developed with specific relation to embodiment and queer subjectivity, Freeman's notion of 'temporal drag', and her invocation of 'all the associations that the word "drag" has with retrogression, delay, and the pull of the past on the present' are illuminating here.⁵³ Temporal drag provides 'a way of thinking about identity and social change relationally across time' and constitutes 'a *productive [sic]* obstacle to progress, a usefully distorting pull backward, and a necessary pressure on the present tense'.⁵⁴ The counter-chronological movement of *Days Off*, with its complication of causality and sequence, sees Kaprow embracing the drag and drift of documentation to rethink the time and space of embodied performance. As the following section elaborates, Kaprow was by no means the only practitioner during this period navigating these issues.

Poses, Exchanges and Citations: Performance Networks

For the *Artforum* critic Jean-Louis Bourgeois, Kaprow's calendar was so engaging that 'the published work makes his John Gibson show redundant.'⁵⁵ Alloway, meanwhile, reflected that scores and photographs like those in *Days Off* could

‘convey more to a reader than some participants could be expected to derive from a performance’, concluding that ‘documentary reproduction can be the only route of access for some art.’⁵⁶ Kaprow’s own awareness of this infuses a series of playful photographs taken at the John Gibson Gallery by Harry Shunk, who recorded many performances in Europe and the US. Shunk captures Kaprow in front of his framed calendar designs for *Pose*, camera in hand (*plate 9*). In a moment of mirror-play Kaprow seems to re-perform the gestures involved in *Pose*, mimicking the shadow of the photographer in the image pinpointed by his own camera lens. While self-reflexively commenting on the particular structure of *Pose*, by inserting a camera between work and eye Kaprow signals that replication rather than originality might act as a guiding principle for his work more generally. Kaprow and Shunk collude in the construction of this knowingly wry comment on the mediation of experience to infer photography not only offered a way of finding out about events and Happenings, but also constituted the means through which even those attendees ‘present’ might choose to filter their engagement.⁵⁷

As Alloway implied, the use of photography in these Happenings potentially opened them to a wider audience, while revealing the multiple participants involved in their creation. Kaprow’s exploration of his recent back catalogue through *Days Off*, and the active archiving of his work that the commission

entailed, positioned his Happenings within a network of wider activity. Shannon Jackson has usefully re-focussed critical attention away from individual performances, and onto the wider ‘support’ structures – technical, physical and emotional – through which they evolve.⁵⁸ Returning to Phelan’s formulation of performance as an art which becomes itself through disappearance, Jackson persuasively reflects: ‘it seems to me that Phelan’s provocative statement did not suggest that we disavow the labour required to create an experience of unravelled becoming.’⁵⁹ Instead, Jackson urges us ‘to acknowledge the material relations that support the dematerialised act’ and attend to performance’s ‘systems, contingencies and coordinations’.⁶⁰ Jackson provides a way of respecting Kaprow’s statements about the transience of his work, while accounting for the roles played by documentation, artistic exchange, embodied labour, and the formation of social groupings in their realization.

Kaprow used his calendar catalogue to re-think sites of display, documentation and the archive, in a way that shared tactics with a number of other contemporary practitioners also seeking to expand the times and places of event-based works beyond the moment of performance. There are particularly strong links between Kaprow’s use of the calendar format and its popularity in Conceptual art circles, from the *Date Paintings* that On Kawara executed from 1965 onwards, to Hanne

Darboven's extensive investigation of calendar arrangements. The most immediate correlation is with Seth Siegelau's use of the calendar layout as an organizing structure in his project *One Month, March 1–31, 1969* (plate 10). For this exploit, Siegelau sent a typewritten letter to selected artists, assigning them a date and asking them to send him details of a work to be executed on the prescribed day.⁶¹ Their responses were then reproduced in the catalogue-calendar. Some invitees refused to participate, while others withheld work as their contribution, so that blank pages disrupt Siegelau's chronology just as Kaprow played fast and loose with dates in *Days Off*.

Unsurprisingly, many artists explored temporality in their submissions. Christine Kozlov, the only female artist involved, proposed a work for 19 March 1969 that consisted of a continuous recording over twenty-four hours, on a looped tape of one hour's duration.⁶² Thus while twenty-four hours of sound would be recorded, there would only be one hour of sound on the tape. This again resonates with the malleable understanding of time infusing *Days Off*, challenging clear distinctions between productive and wasted time, labour and leisure. For Siegelau, experiments like *One Month, March 1–31, 1969* demonstrated that 'the catalogue can now act as primary information for the exhibition, as opposed to secondary information *about* art in magazines, catalogues, etc., and in some cases the "exhibition" can be the "catalogue."⁶³ In

making *Days Off* Kaprow similarly approached the work of art as able to inhabit, and be activated by, multiple photographic and written forms, to exist across a number of sites, and to be transmitted as information.⁶⁴

A comparable approach informs the *Fluxcalendar* Maciunas designed using a work by Mieko Shiomi (*plate 11*). *The Fluxcalendar* started life as Shiomi's *Spatial Poem No. 3* of 1966, one of nine *Spatial Poems* the artist developed between 1965 and 1975.⁶⁵ Shiomi first met Maciunas when she visited the United States in 1964. After her return to Japan in 1965, they continued to correspond via mail and collaborate on publications of her works.⁶⁶ In New York, Shiomi joined a transnational group of artists creating performance actions and events, presenting works like *Direction Event* at the Washington Square Gallery during the 1964 *Perpetual Fluxfest*. Underlining the closeness of the Happening and Fluxus communities, a photograph by Peter Moore captures Kaprow bending over one of the maps that formed part of this work, writing a place name on a card (*plate 12*). These cards were then attached to strings which Shiomi looped around her fingers as the participants walked away towards their chosen location, using the maps and compasses provided. Shiomi's *Spatial Poems*, by contrast, did not occur in one site, but were enacted by practitioners across North America, Europe and Japan. For *Spatial Poem no. 3* Shiomi sent instructions to prospective participants through the

postal system, asking them to ‘to make something fall’.⁶⁷ Fifty-eight artists performed *Spatial Poem no.3* during the summer of 1966, reporting back to Shiommi about their falling events through the mail (some sent more than one reply). Shiommi then collated these accounts ‘chronologically’.⁶⁸

In 1976, Shiommi published a book of all nine *Spatial Poems* that reproduced the falling events for *Spatial Poem no.3* on a map of the world, emphasising the geographic spread of the artists involved.⁶⁹ By contrast, in using the reports of ‘falling events’ to construct the *Fluxcalendar* during the late 1960s and early 1970s, Maciunas focused on the temporal rather than geographic aspect of the work. Shiommi herself stressed that ‘the main point is people’s simultaneous performance.’⁷⁰ In the *Fluxcalendar*, Maciunas gave each event its own individual calendar page, and recorded the time as well as date of the reported actions, where provided by participants. ... On 3 July at 2.30pm, John Cage’s correspondence cascaded into a fireplace; flick to 6 August, and Carolee Schneemann dropped an ‘atrocious poster’ against the war in Vietnam in front of a policeman during a protest march (*plate 13*). As in *Days Off*, the *Fluxcalendar* produces a distorted sensation of time’s passing, as some dates are repeated to document multiple falling events, while others are missing. For Jessica Santone, Shiommi’s ‘simultaneous event’ is actually ‘full of holes, ruptures, and fragments’.⁷¹ Equally, its fractured vision of impossible

simultaneity can be understood as an attempt to counteract ideas of historical progression.

Maciunas made two versions of the *Fluxcalendar*. In one, the pages are fixed to a strip of leather for wall hanging via two sets of rivets, with 'pages to read' affixed to the bottom and 'pages that have been read' at the top. Through this arrangement, Maciunas explained, 'the pages will tend to fall down (which was the original intention) about 1/3rd of the way, so you must pick up the fallen pages and hang them on the upper rivets.'⁷² The result activates the user in the creation of their own 'falling events' as they read the calendar. For the other version, the reports are still printed on calendar pages, but on loose leaves contained within a box, vulnerable to rearrangement by idle or mischievous hands. In both iterations, potential reordering constantly threatens the chronological progression of events. Some versions also contain several events that came in after the allotted timespan for the performances, including a late entry for 5 September 1966 from Kaprow (*plate 14*). Kaprow's micro-performances for *Spatial Poem no.3* and *Direction Event* reveal the artist engaging with, as well as designing, what the philosopher Umberto Eco refers to as an 'open work', shaped by multiple contributions rather than a single author.⁷³ Through *Spatial Poem no.3*, Kaprow joined a temporally and topographically networked performance involving people across the globe, the socio-political and poetic

embrace of which was given coherence by, but not irreducibly fixed through, the format of the calendar catalogue.

One of the immediate afterlives of *Days Off* further underlines Kaprow's participation in a network of artistic exchange. In 1970, the calendar pages relating to *Pose* appeared in *Artists and Photographs*, a hybrid exhibition-publication curated by Alloway and produced by Multiples, Inc., New York. Gathered together in a boxed multiple, the individual contributions by Kaprow, Robert Smithson, Bruce Nauman and Ed Ruscha, among others, can be taken out and handled (*plate 15*). The result is a portable display that assumes different permutations each time a user opens the box, merging conceptual strategy with interactive play.⁷⁴ Alloway's catalogue introduction to this enterprise echoes Siegelau by referring to 'the present exhibition/catalogue', asserting that photography, with its predisposition to reproduction and transmission through mass media circuits, enables this fusion: 'both the exhibited "object" and the catalogue "entry" are permutations made possible by the repeatability of the photographic process.'⁷⁵ The seven calendar pages for *Pose* are printed on un-collated sheets of card (much smaller and more robust than the pages in *Days Off*), housed inside a utilitarian manila envelope. Their re-appearance in *Artists and Photographs* realises the networked potentiality encoded into the calendar, together with the capacity for people to experience a productive encounter with the

performance through its documentation in multiple different times and places.

This is moreover a quality of the specific act performed within this Happening – that of posing. The photographs from *Pose* included in *Days Off* and *Artists and Photographs* capture participants deliberately re-staging the same tableau: sitting on chairs in the street; perched more adventurously on the top of a train car; and on a pier, caught in the act of fishing. One image sees Kaprow precariously seated on a concrete plinth, like a scruffy piece of impermanent public sculpture (*plate 16*). The significance of these posing actions, and their particular contribution to the temporal instability of *Days Off*, can be understood via the performance theorist Rebecca Schneider's influential writing on re-enactment. In Schneider's formulation:

A pose is a posture, a stance, stuck in reiterative gesture often signifying precedent. In this way, a pose can be said to be reenactive, citational. Even if the precise original of a pose is unclear, or nonexistent, there is still a citational quality to posing due to the fact that a pose is arrested, even if momentarily, in what is otherwise experienced as a flow in time.⁷⁶

The frozen quality of the pose does not mark completion: rather, its ‘citational quality’ facilitates re-appropriation. Importantly, to pose is to look backwards as well as forwards, so that the entire premise of a Happening like *Pose* is based on repetitions of shared attitudinal signifiers, which undercut any notion of originality or end-point, and operate according to a polyphonic and counter-chronological rather than linear and progressive structure.

The pages of Kaprow’s calendar re-appear in *Artists and Photographs* on individual pieces of paper which can be arranged into any order. Similarly, the actions presented during *Pose* have the capacity to multiply and change not only through photographic reproduction, but through being picked up by other hands, other bodies. They belong, to use the words of performance theorist Diana Taylor, as much to the repertoire ‘of embodied practice/knowledge’ as the archive and its ‘supposedly enduring materials’.⁷⁷ This recalls the notion of ‘temporal drag’ introduced in the first section of this article. Freeman builds on Taylor’s comparison of the archive and the repertoire to argue: ‘repertoire is a corporeal mnemonic, whose work is to reincarnate the lost, nondominant past in the present and to pass it on with a difference.’⁷⁸ Rather than promoting either the archive or the repertoire, *Pose* and *Days Off* fuse them together, presenting the relationship between performance,

embodiment and document as continual relay between past, present and future.

In the frontispiece to *Days Off*, Kaprow stated that: ‘each day is a page, or more, that can be taken off and thrown away. The Happenings were throw-aways. Once only. Nothing left – except maybe thoughts.’⁷⁹ He underlined this by placing three sections of torn photographs from unidentified Happenings around the text (*plate 17*). This chimes with Kaprow’s decision to use the portrait from *Round Trip* – a Happening that required participants to go on a walk and gather up any rubbish they encountered into a ball – as his calendar cover. Kaprow underlined this ethos elsewhere: *Record II*, for example, asked participants to cover rocks in tinfoil, take photographs and then ‘scatter’ them. On the last calendar page for *Record II* Kaprow reproduced multiple images from the Happening, layered ‘pell-mell’ on top of each other.⁸⁰ The photographs of *Record II* are gathered together in *Days Off* only to be potentially ‘scattered’ once again through the gradual discarding of the calendar leaves. Yet Kaprow qualified the initial part of his introductory statement, going on to describe the contents of the calendar as ‘leftover thoughts in the form of gossip. And gossip is also play. For anybody. As the calendar is discarded like the Happenings, the gossip may remain in action.’ Although emphasising the Happening’s intrinsically disposable nature, this opening offers a glimmer of performative potentiality, envisaging each removal

of an individual sheet as a ‘throw-away’ event. At nearly forty centimetres in length, the calendar feels surprisingly bulky to handle: it takes determination and effort to lift each sheet, and presumably even more to tear and crumple one of the large pages. Like the miniature performances occasioned by Siegelaub’s *One Month* and Maciunas’ *Fluxcalendar*, the interactive aspect of *Days Off* chimes with Kaprow’s notion of ‘gossip’ to infer his work’s continuation through a network of embodied poses, iterative gestures and material citations. The complex temporality of *Days Off*, which results from Kaprow’s reflection on his own work and engagement with that of others, is intrinsically linked to Kaprow’s social aims for his practice at this point, as the last part of this essay will explore.

Mass Communication and ‘Social Art’

Kaprow was keenly interested, to use Widrich’s evocative phrasing, in the ‘temporally extended’ and ‘delayed audiences’ that his calendar might reach through its disruption of linear time and spatial dispersal.⁸¹ Although no one emerges particularly well from the ‘record breaking acrimony’ that blossomed between Kaprow and the MoMA Junior Council during the production of *Days Off*, the impassioned volley of letters exchanged afford a revealing insight into Kaprow’s communicative ambitions.⁸² One of the major ructions related to the poster for *Days Off*, designed as a promotional aid for the

calendar. Kaprow believed that the poster needed to be mass-produced on a grand scale, in a run of at least 4,000, but the Junior Council balked and only printed 1,000.⁸³ For Kaprow, this could ‘neither reach the wide audience planned for, nor do the sales job it was intended to do’.⁸⁴ He maintained: ‘1,000 copies of a poster whose program is social in nature, which purports to advertise a social art like mine, is an elitist frippery, and I could never have agreed to such an idea.’⁸⁵ Kaprow’s intriguing definition of his work as ‘social art’ indicates that he understood poster and calendar as standard bearers for an integrated practice based on accessibility, interchange, and mass consumption.

Kaprow conceived of his calendar as a ‘fundamentally mass media item’, designed for widespread circulation.⁸⁶ The newsprint used to make the calendar was functional and cheap, and reinforced its ‘throwaway, tabloid format’.⁸⁷ Kaprow’s investment in the calendar format’s mass media, ‘tabloid’ potential reflects his enthusiasm for the writings of Marshall McLuhan.⁸⁸ In a 1968 interview the performance theorist, writer and teacher Richard Schechner asked Kaprow if McLuhan had influenced his work. Kaprow responded:

There’s a very strong relation between his ideas and mine. If you simply think about TV – that 17 million people [...] are watching the same thing at the same

time – that can create a terrific sense of community
[...]. But [...] the TV community is passive and I
am interested in a variety of modes including
contemplation, observation, and participation.⁸⁹

Kaprow's comments relate to his own attempts to use live television broadcast in his work at this time, but his interest in multiple interactive modes and participation comparably informs *Days Off*.

In correspondence with the Junior Council, Kaprow repeatedly highlighted that he wanted to reach 'the youth markets'.⁹⁰ He maintained: 'our agreed-upon idea in all our planning was to get away from the elitist market of the Museum and its devotees and members, and tap, instead, the much larger, undifferentiated youth market that I am interested in. The nature of my work naturally argues for this.'⁹¹ *Days Off* manifests the interest in marketing – and to a certain extent, the flair for self-promotion – that Kaprow shared with Maciunas and Siegelau. The impact of Maciunas' Fluxus publications can be traced in Kaprow's engagement with typography in *Days Off*, which employs a variety of different fonts and constantly experiments with the layout of text and image. Kaprow's eye had been caught by Maciunas's visual compositions, and he praised the latter's eye-catching 'use of type' and skills as a designer.⁹² Although Kaprow kept production costs minimal, he ensured

that the calendar was ‘lavishly illustrated’.⁹³ Kaprow’s concern with marketing can be compared to another 1970 calendar by Joe Goode, featuring Los Angeles artists including Ed Ruscha and Larry Bell photographed with their cars, which plays on the use of calendars to promote goods and products.⁹⁴ Indeed, the poster that Kaprow designed to advertise his calendar contained a coupon on the back that could be used to purchase a copy through the mail, and used sales rhetoric – ‘24 Days Off Next Year! Get them Now!’ – to ensnare potential customers (*plate 18*).⁹⁵ Like Goode’s all-male calendar of artists, there is a strong element of machismo to the image Kaprow chose for his poster, which shows the artist wielding a phallic chainsaw indicating where to cut along the dotted line of the giant coupon, while a female figure fills it out. While this correlates with the gender imbalances of Kaprow’s Happenings during the 1960s, Kaprow also burlesques the aggressive, excessive posturing of much marketing and advertising in this period.

We might detect an element of subversion in Kaprow’s attempt to use MoMA’s status to bypass its established audiences. Siegelau dryly observed that ‘The Museum of Modern Art is the most public relations-loaded situation that there is. [...] If you’re going to effect change and you want a certain amount of exposure from doing it, that’s the place.’⁹⁶ The Junior Council presented Kaprow with an opportunity to use MoMA’s branding and distribution systems to further the

experimental work it did not then show within its walls. *Days Off*, *One Month*, *Artists and Photographs* and the *Fluxcalendar* arguably aim to achieve what Siegelau described as ‘a more ephemeral, spontaneous and less sacred art space’.⁹⁷ Yet these ventures re-inscribe the individual author-function, despite being collaborative productions.⁹⁸ Kaprow did register the collective endeavour that went into *Days Off* by clearly crediting the photographs used.⁹⁹ His venture is more open than Siegelau’s arbitrary designation of days to artists, but there is still an edge of coercion and sublimation of group industry in the final result sold under his name.¹⁰⁰

Equally, within the context of art world protests against institutions including MoMA towards the end of the 1960s, highlighting structural inequalities and perceived links to the war in Vietnam, Kaprow’s collaboration with the Junior Council sits somewhere between disruption and complicity.¹⁰¹

Practically speaking, the social reach of Kaprow’s calendar was limited. *Days Off* had a print-run of 30,000, the same as MoMA’s standard 1969 appointment calendar: whereas the latter sold out, Kaprow’s creation proved harder to shift.

Although the Junior Council initially claimed that the ‘calendars are selling well’, ultimately they acknowledged that ‘despite mailings to over 2,200 potential outlets [...] we have unfortunately been able to sell only a very few.’¹⁰² It may have retailed at \$1.95, as opposed to the higher \$2.95 price of the

traditional calendar, but sales of *Days Off: A Calendar of Happenings* paled in comparison.¹⁰³ Kaprow remained convinced that the Junior Council had failed to understand the scale of the media campaign necessary to promote such an unusual item, while this commercial failure inadvertently revealed the weak points within institutional systems.¹⁰⁴

Kaprow's desire to reach beyond MoMA's established audiences converged with his movement away from the New York art world during the late 1960s, as the number of Happenings in *Days Off* commissioned by universities, and his increasing interest in alternative education, indicates.¹⁰⁵ This culminated in the *Project Other Ways* initiative in Berkeley during 1969, which had the radical aim of bringing 'the arts into a central role in the public schools' curricula'.¹⁰⁶ Happenings like *Pose* and *Shape* within the *Six Ordinary Happenings* cycle were designed as pedagogic initiatives for the students and teachers who joined *Project Other Ways*. Kaprow remembered these Happenings as some of his 'most interesting performances [...] using the entire environment'.¹⁰⁷ In *Project Other Ways*, which Kaprow and Kohl ran from a disused storefront in Berkeley, the Happening was one tool among many – including poetry, storytelling, sculpture, sport and photography – that provided alternatives for learning outside formal schooling. *Days Off* can comparably be approached as a pedagogical device, both in that Kaprow tried to inform a large audience

about his Happenings through it, but also because it presented the Happening as a way of learning through social interaction – as a ‘social art’.¹⁰⁸

Six Ordinary Happenings, and the wider *Project Other Ways* programme, took place at a time of heightened social tension in Berkeley, in an atmosphere that Kaprow described as ‘off kilter’ with ‘energies poisoned’.¹⁰⁹ In the spring of 1969 a campaign by local activists to save an area of parkland known as the ‘People’s Park’ from development, buoyed by anti-Vietnam sentiments and the momentum of Civil Rights protests, was met with heavy-handed violence, which escalated during May. One student was killed and Ronald Regan, then governor of California, called in the National Guard (*plate 19*).¹¹⁰ While the ‘People’s Park’ protests were based on bodily presence, *Shape* and *Pose* by contrast operated via bodily absence – the participants in *Pose* ‘move on’ once they pasted down their picture; those in *Shape* left bodily outlines. However, by distributing temporary physical markers and corporeal traces recorded by photographs, both Happenings approached the streets as shared social zones that people had the right to occupy as they wished. Within the wider context of debate and protest about civil liberties in Berkeley during May 1969, the playful attitude to shared space that characterized *Pose* and *Shape* from earlier that March and April assume retrospective resonance when gathered into the calendar format for 1970. The

photographs of participants lying on the street in *Shape*, simultaneously vulnerable and eerily shrouded in their plastic wrappings, but infused nonetheless with a powerful claim to public space, become especially charged (*plate 20*). The calendar thus draws out the oppositional qualities of these works through its embrace of archival drag.

Kaprow recalled that *Six Ordinary Happenings* and the activities of *Project Other Ways*:

rarely addressed the conflict directly, yet they reflected its paranoias and powerful energies, as well as the surge of utopian fervor that fueled it. [...] No-one could ignore the tension and the smell of tear gas, and our experiments sometimes approached the edges of social boundaries.¹¹¹

Arguably the incorporation of photographs from *Shape* and *Pose*, devised as part of an alternative educational project that ‘approached the edges of social boundaries’, in *Days Off* sees them co-opted into a commodity item. Yet their presence might operate in a similar way to Schneemann’s insertion of anti-Vietnam protest into Shiomi’s *Spatial Poem no. 3*, or the adaption of images from Moorman’s *Avant-Garde Festival* into a campaign flyer, creating little irruptive sparks that belatedly register, and then re-perform, public discontent and protest,

anticipating the merging of art, mass media communication and social practice.¹¹²

Rather than protest or activism, however, Kaprow's 'social art' finds its strongest expression in the titular exhortation of his calendar for people to take 'days off', and indulge in play outside the structures of work or organized leisure. During the calendar's development, Kaprow and the Junior Council explored the idea of linking the calendar dates with 'possible holidays'.¹¹³ The proposed holidays cover a range of religions, rites and observances, from Washington's Birthday through to Passover, Labor Day, Veteran's Day and Thanksgiving.¹¹⁴ While this was not followed up, the prevailing sense bestowed by Kaprow's introductory salvo – 'these were days off. People played' – is that each Happening transforms its given dates into an impromptu festival. The holiday offers a useful model for thinking about Kaprow's calendar: holidays provide a temporal demarcation during which ritual activities can be undertaken, retaining the same core makeup but embellished each time they are enacted.

In his 'Theses on the Philosophy of History', Walter Benjamin reflected: 'The initial day of a calendar serves as a historical time-lapse camera. And, basically, it is the same day that keeps recurring in the guise of holidays, which are days of remembrance. Thus calendars do not measure time as clocks do; they are monuments of a historical consciousness.'¹¹⁵ Similarly,

the elliptical, playful temporalities in *Days Off* incite what we might think of as active memorialisation. Its pages offer holiday structures that look backwards and forwards, while holding out the possibility Benjamin raises of revolutionary memory. As John Roberts observes, for Benjamin, ‘the temporality of the everyday is seen, therefore, as internally complex and conflictual, rather than as teleologically settled and continuous with the past.’¹¹⁶ This returns us to the key issue of counter-chronology and the anachronic drive of Kaprow’s calendar. The documentation in *Days Off* refers neither to a stable past nor a secure future, but instead elaborates a continually changing present. Rather than the controlled time of the clock, and its links with the regimentation of the labouring body under the directives of capitalism, Kaprow’s calendar project can be understood in relation to Benjamin’s desire to seek ‘a fissure in this temporal structure through which to break it open onto a new form of historical experience’.¹¹⁷ This is by no means to suggest that the roles of delegation and outsourcing of activity in projects like *Days Off*, *One Month* and the *Fluxcalendar* are not problematic.¹¹⁸ Yet the ‘days off’ invoked by Kaprow’s title, when ‘people played’, offer a re-conceptualisation of time that substitutes managed leisure with collaborative, creative learning, and a sense of the radical potential contained in his ‘social art’. *Days Off* presents the Happenings, and the acts of performance demanded by their execution, as the means through which this

alternative social time and space can be achieved.¹¹⁹ Rather than treating the Happenings as ‘throwaways’, the calendar charts the on-going multiplicity of performance time and space.

Notes

I would like to thank Lucy Bradnock and Christopher Griffin for convening ‘Exhibition Catalogues as Experimental Spaces’ at the AAH Annual Conference 2014, and Eva Ehninger and Bernd Herzogenrath for organizing the 2012 conference ‘The Legacy of Thoreau: Transcendentalism in American Art After 1945’, where material in this article was first presented; the Getty Library Research Grant scheme and the Terra Foundation for American Art for supporting the archival research; Lois Brown for her kind assistance; and the Estate of Allan Kaprow.

¹ Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), press release no. 118, July–December 1969, The Museum of Modern Art, New York.

² MoMA, press release no. 118, July–December 1969.

³ Allan Kaprow, letter to Wilder Green, Office of the Director, The Museum of Modern Art, 1 December 1969, Allan Kaprow Papers, 980063, box 17, folder 5, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles (hereafter AKP).

⁴ Lawrence Alloway, ‘Allan Kaprow, Two Views’, first published as ‘Art in Escalation’, *Arts Magazine*, XLI:3, December 1966–January 1967, 40–43, and ‘Allan Kaprow, Days Off: A Calendar of Happenings’, *The Nation*, 20 October 1969, 419–421, reprinted in Lawrence Alloway, *Topics in American Art Since 1945*, New York, 1975, 195–200, 200.

⁵ Kaprow, letter to Green, 1 December 1969. It is difficult to pinpoint when the calendar went on sale. In one letter Kaprow worries: ‘it is nearly November now and we are far beyond the time when calendars for 1970 can

be effectively distributed and sold.’ Allan Kaprow, letter to Wilder Green, 24 October 1969, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

⁶ Letters confirming the commission date to September and October 1968. However, discussions seem to have begun earlier as Kaprow was already working on page designs by this point, indicating that later Happenings were incorporated as they were performed. James C. Crimmins, Chairman, MoMA Junior Council, letter to Allan Kaprow, 17 September 1968; and James C. Crimmins, template letter ‘To whom it may concern’, 24 October 1968, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

⁷ MoMA Junior Council, Annual Report, 1968–69, Junior Council Records, folder 1, The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. The Junior Council was established in 1949. One member reflected: ‘we really functioned as the education department’. Barbara Jakobson, cited in Harriet S. Bee and Michelle Elligott, *Art in Our Time: A Chronicle of the Museum of Modern Art*, New York, 2004, 95.

⁸ Kaprow submitted a proposal to William C. Seitz’s 1961 exhibition *The Art of Assemblage* at MoMA, but was rejected: in correspondence Kaprow mentions conversations where ‘we questioned the appropriateness of having this type of art in museums.’ Allan Kaprow, letter to William C. Seitz, 25 January 1961, William Chapin Seitz Papers, box 10, folder 31, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC (hereafter WCS). Philip Ursprung argues that the episode ‘shows that at this early stage in the history of Happenings [Kaprow] had no intention whatsoever to launch an attack on the institution of the art museum.’ Philip Ursprung, *Allan Kaprow, Robert Rauschenberg, and the Limits to Art*, trans. Fiona Elliott, Berkeley and London, 2013, 73.

⁹ Allan Kaprow, statement in *Allan Kaprow*, exhibition catalogue, Pasadena, 1967, unpaginated.

¹⁰ Junior Council, Annual Report, 1968–69, JC, 1. MoMA Archives, NY.

¹¹ Helen Molesworth has traced how artistic practice in the US during the 1960s and 1970s engaged with changing conceptions of labour and time, as post-industrialisation occasioned a shift from an industrial to a service-based economy. Molesworth reads Kaprow's 1967 Happening *Fluids* as 'a highly staged version of "useless" labour.' Helen Molesworth, *Work Ethic*, exhibition catalogue, Baltimore, 2003, 44.

¹² For an in-depth study of Kaprow's development, see Judith F. Rodenbeck, *Radical Prototypes: Allan Kaprow and the Invention of Happenings*, Cambridge, MA and London, 2011.

¹³ Although Kaprow is widely viewed as one of the key practitioners in post-1945 US art, the curators of his large-scale travelling retrospective between 2006 and 2008 described Kaprow as 'the best known unknown artist among the major post-war practitioners in the United States.' Eva Meyer-Hermann, Andrew Perchuk and Stephanie Rosenthal, 'Introduction', in Meyer-Hermann, Perchuk and Rosenthal eds., *Allan Kaprow – Art as Life*, London, 2008, 2–3, 2. This verdict reflects that while Kaprow is heralded as the innovator of the Happening, his practice has yet to be fully integrated into histories of post-1945 art. There has recently been important work rectifying this: together with Rodenbeck's significant intervention, see the chapters on Kaprow in Ursprung, *Allan Kaprow, Robert Smithson, and the Limits to Art*, 2013; Alex Potts, *Experiments in Modern Realism: World Making, Politics and the Everyday in Postwar European and American Art*, New Haven and London, 2013, 323–361; and James Nisbet, *Ecologies, Environments, and Energy Systems in Art of the 1960s and 1970s*, Cambridge, MA and London, 2014, 13–66.

¹⁴ Kaprow was cognizant of the calendar's self-promotional potential, asking it be mailed to critics including Thomas B. Hess, David Bourdon, Richard Schechner and Grace Glueck. Allan Kaprow, letter to Elizabeth Shaw, Director of Information, MoMA, 19 October 1969, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

¹⁵ Kaprow, letter to Green, 1 December 1969.

¹⁶ For Kaprow's transition to 'Activities' from 'Happenings' (a term he increasingly stopped using as the 1970s progressed), see Glenn Phillips, 'Time Pieces', in Meyer-Hermann, Perchuk and Rosenthal eds., *Allan Kaprow – Art as Life*, 34–41; and the Activity Booklets reproduced in Giorgio Maffei ed., *Allan Kaprow: A Bibliography*, Milan, 2011.

¹⁷ Peter Osborne, *The Politics of Time: Modernity and Avant-Garde*, London, 1995, 34.

¹⁸ The invitation card for the exhibition promises 'the original photocollage documentations of ten selected happenings', and features an image from *Fluids. Days Off* exhibition card, 4–31 October 1969, John Gibson Commissions, New York, 1969, box 10, folder 1, WCS.

¹⁹ While the choice of *Fluids* is significant for its connection with the Pasadena retrospective, *Moving* was one of Kaprow's first Happenings to be filmed (after *Household* in 1964) and produced as an Activity Booklet featuring photographs by Peter Moore.

²⁰ Kaprow taught at universities throughout his career from his first job at Rutgers University in 1953, and created multiple Happenings for educational institutions. *Days Off* appears at a pivotal moment in his professional life, as he moved permanently from the East to the West Coast (having already spent time there for *Project Other Ways*) where he joined the newly-founded California Institute of the Arts (Cal Arts) in 1970, before transferring to the University of California, San Diego in 1974.

²¹ *Project Other Ways* ran for a year between 1968 and 1969 as a cooperative venture with the Berkeley Unified School District, facilitated through the University of California system and supported by \$68,000 from the Carnegie Corporation. Florence Anderson, Carnegie Corporation of New York, letter to Neil V. Sullivan, Superintendent, Berkeley Unified School District, 20 September 1968, box 57A, folder 1, AKP.

²² Allan Kaprow, handwritten notes for *Days Off*, c.1969, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

²³ Allan Kaprow, letter to Ann Gross, MoMA Junior Council, 18 September 1968, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

²⁴ MoMA, press release no. 118, July–December 1969.

²⁵ Kaprow, notes for *Days Off*, c.1969.

²⁶ See Pamela M. Lee, *Chronophobia: On Time in the Art of the 1960s*, Cambridge, MA and London, 2006 [2004], particularly ‘Presentness is Grace’, 36–81.

²⁷ Lee, *Chronophobia*, 103–4.

²⁸ Jeff Kelley, *Childsplay: The Art of Allan Kaprow*, Berkeley, 2004, 130.

²⁹ Allan Kaprow, ‘“Happenings” in the New York Scene’, first published in *Art News*, 60:3, 1961, 36–9 and 58–62, reprinted in Jeff Kelley ed., *Allan Kaprow: Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2003 [1993], 15–26, 20.

³⁰ Mechtild Widrich, *Performative Monuments: The Rematerialisation of Public Art*, Manchester, 2014, 31.

³¹ Heike Roms and Rebecca Edwards argue that emphasising the ‘ephemerality’ of performance risks ‘losing sight of the fact that performance does not only generate emotional and intellectual responses but often also quite tangible outcomes: networks, platforms, festivals, spaces, training programmes, funding schemes, publications and ... archives.’ Heike Roms and Rebecca Edwards, ‘Towards a Prehistory of Live Art in the UK’, *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 22:1, March 2012, 17–31, 28.

³² Allan Kaprow, letter to Pierre Restany, 22 June 1966. Pierre Restany Papers, PREST THE PER 002 (118), folder 7, Archives de la Critique d’Art, Rennes.

³³ Kaprow, in *Allan Kaprow*, unpaginated. Kaprow’s experiments with photography in the catalogue for his Pasadena show, and his book *Assemblage, Environments & Happenings*, constitute important precedents for *Days Off*. See Martha Buskirk, ‘Kaprow’s Vector’, in *Creative Enterprise: Contemporary Art Between Museum and Marketplace*, New

York, 2012, 115–145, particularly 123–130. See also Allan Kaprow, *Assemblage, Environments & Happenings*, New York, 1966.

³⁴ Jane Livingston, ‘Allan Kaprow: Pasadena Art Museum’, *Artforum*, 6:3, November 1967, 65–66, 66.

³⁵ Hanns Sohm was a Swiss dentist who developed an extensive archive of materials relating to Fluxus and Happenings through correspondence with artists. For *Happening & Fluxus* he distributed ‘information sheets’ to gather data for the catalogue chronology, relaying to Maciunas (who boycotted the exhibition) how: ‘for the catalogue I collected only dates, names, events etc. from [*sic*] which I am in the possession of the original documents, so [...] no uncontrolled thing has been put in.’ Hanns Sohm, letter to George Maciunas, 20 May 1971, The Gilbert and Lila Silverman Fluxus Collection Archives, I.1135, The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York.

³⁶ *Yard* has become one of Kaprow’s most re-created works. For the intersection of photography, re-creation and institutionalisation in *Yard*’s ongoing history, see Buskirk, ‘Kaprow’s Vector’, 115–145.

³⁷ Lazlo Glozer, review of *Happening & Fluxus*, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 12 November 1970, reprinted in Tobia Bezzola and Roman Kurzmeyer eds., *Harald Szeemann: with by through because towards despite: catalogue of all exhibitions 1957–2005*, Zürich, 2007, 284–303, 285.

³⁸ Glozer, review of *Happening & Fluxus*, 303.

³⁹ In the first detailed study of Moorman’s career, Joan Rothfuss notes that ‘as a public, multimedia, outdoor art event attended by thousands, Moorman’s Central Park festival was virtually unprecedented.’ Joan Rothfuss, *Topless Cellist: The Improbable Life of Charlotte Moorman*, Cambridge, MA and London, 2014, 170. *Towers* was one of several Happenings Kaprow designed during the mid-1960s for young children, indicating his growing interest in alternative arts education.

⁴⁰ For a reproduction see Harold Szeemann and Hanns Sohm, *Happening & Fluxus*, exh. cat. Kölnischer Kunstverein, Cologne, 1970, unpaginated.

⁴¹ This protest literature can be contextualized within the wider politicization of art in the US during the 1960s. See Francis Frascina, *Art, Politics and Dissent: Aspects of the Art Left in Sixties America*, Manchester, 1999; and Julia Bryan-Wilson, *Art Workers: Radical Practice in the Vietnam War Era*, Berkeley, 2011 [2009].

⁴² Allan Kaprow, interview with Lawrence Alloway, 1969, Lawrence Alloway Papers, 2003.M.46, box 26, folder 14, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles (hereafter LAP).

⁴³ Julia Robinson, 'Maciunas as Producer: Performative Design in the Art of the 1960s', *Grey Room*, 33, Fall 2008, 56–83, 66.

⁴⁴ Other books that use the bibliographic format include Lucy Lippard, *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966–1972*, Berkeley, 1997 [1973]; and Carl Loeffler and Darlene Tong eds., *Performance Anthology: Source Book for a Decade of California Performance Art*, San Francisco, 1980.

⁴⁵ Allan Kaprow, notes for *Runner*, February 1968, box 14, folder 2, AKP.

⁴⁶ Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*, London and New York, 1993, 146. Phelan's position has been equally influential and controversial, taken up by critics like Jane Blocker, while generatively contested by scholars including Amelia Jones, Philip Auslander and Adrian Heathfield.

⁴⁷ Kaprow, notes for *Runner*, February 1968.

⁴⁸ Nuanced reflections on re-performing Kaprow's work include André Lepecki, 'Redoing 18 Happenings in 6 Parts', in Barry Rosen and Michaela Unterdörfer eds., *18 Happenings in 6 Parts*, trans. Fiona Elliott, Göttingen, 2007, 45–50; and Michael Ned Holte, 'Happening Again: Reinventing Allan Kaprow', in Peggy Phelan ed., *Live Art in LA: Performance in Southern California, 1970–1983*, New York and London, 2012, 39–60. For an overview of the wider discourse on re-performance see the essays collected

in Amelia Jones and Adrian Heathfield eds., *Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History*, Bristol, 2012.

⁴⁹ Photographs from *Shape* were published to accompany Noel Lieberman, 'Hard Lessons the Easy Way', *Oakland Tribune*, 4 June 1969, 17, box 16, folder 3, AKP.

⁵⁰ Jean-Louis Bourgeois, 'Allan Kaprow, John Gibson Gallery', *Artforum*, 8:4, December 1969, 71–2, 71.

⁵¹ Philip Auslander, 'The Performativity of Performance Documentation', *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 28:3, September 2006, 1–10, 4. Auslander draws on Amelia Jones' argument that 'while the experience of viewing a photograph and reading a text is clearly different from that of ... watching an artist perform, neither has a privileged relationship to the historical "truth" of the performance'. Amelia Jones, "'Presence" in Absentia: Experiencing Performance as Documentation', *Art Journal*, 56:4, Winter 1997, 11–18, 11.

⁵² 'Performative' in the foundational sense outlined by J. L. Austin when he identified a performative utterance as one that does not simply describe an action, but constitutes the act itself. See J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, edited by J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa, Oxford and New York, 1976 [1962]. Austin first delivered the lectures collected in this volume in 1955 at Harvard University for the William James Lectures.

⁵³ Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, Durham, NC and London, 2010, 62. See also Judith Halberstam, *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives*, New York, 2005.

⁵⁴ Freeman, *Time Binds*, 64.

⁵⁵ Bourgeois, 'Allan Kaprow', 71.

⁵⁶ Alloway, 'Allan Kaprow, Two Views', 200.

⁵⁷ See Philip Auslander, *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*, London, 1999.

- ⁵⁸ Shannon Jackson, *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics*, London and New York, 2011, 11–42. .
- ⁵⁹ Jackson, *Social Works*, 38.
- ⁶⁰ Jackson, *Social Works*, 39 and 21.
- ⁶¹ Seth Siegelaub, letter to prospective artists, *One Month, March 1–31 (1969)*, exhibition catalogue, New York, 1969, unpaginated.
- ⁶² Christine Kozlov, ‘March 19’, in Siegelaub, *One Month*, unpaginated.
- ⁶³ Charles Harrison, ‘On Exhibitions and the World at Large: A Conversation with Seth Siegelaub’, first published in *Studio International*, December 1969, reprinted in Gregory Battcock ed., *Idea Art*, New York, 1973, 165–173, 168.
- ⁶⁴ Other examples include Lippard’s Numbers Shows: see Cornelia Butler et al., *From Conceptualism to Feminism: Lucy Lippard’s Numbers Shows 1969–74*, Manchester, 2012.
- ⁶⁵ Shiomi’s score informs recipients: ‘you could participate as many times as you want until August 31, 1966.’ Maciunas dates his *Fluxcalendar* to 1968, which may have been when Shiomi finished collating the reports, although he was finessing the design in 1972. Mieko Shiomi, score for ‘Spatial Poem no. 3’, in *Spatial Poem no. 1 – no. 9 (1965–1975): Invitation Letters*, Tokyo, 1976.
- ⁶⁶ Midori Yoshimoto, *Into Performance: Japanese Women Artists in New York*, New Brunswick, NJ, 2005, 149–158.
- ⁶⁷ Shiomi, score for ‘Spatial Poem no. 3’.
- ⁶⁸ Shiomi, score for ‘Spatial Poem no. 3’.
- ⁶⁹ See Mieko Shiomi, *Spatial Poem*, Tokyo, 1976.
- ⁷⁰ Mieko Shiomi, letter to George Maciunas, undated, Xerox copy from archive of Jean Brown, Silverman Fluxus Archives, I.1122, MoMA Archives, NY.
- ⁷¹ Jessica Santone, ‘Archiving Fluxus Performances in Mieko Shiomi’s Spatial Poems’, in Christopher Townsend, Alex Trott and Rhys Davis ed.,

Across the Great Divide: Modernism's Intermedialities, From Futurism to Fluxus, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2014, 120–136, 128.

⁷² George Maciunas, letter to Mieko Shiomi, 16 March 1972, Silverman Fluxus Archives, V.A.1.35, MoMA Archives, NY.

⁷³ See Umberto Eco, 'The Poetics of the Open Work' (1962), in Claire Bishop ed., *Participation*, Cambridge, MA and London, 2006, 20–40.

⁷⁴ Alloway's archives contain substantial Happening and Fluxus materials for an unrealized exhibition: it is tempting to speculate that Fluxkits form a key model for *Artists and Photographs*. Box 12, folders 1–21, LAP.

⁷⁵ Lawrence Alloway, *Artists and Photographs* (1970), exhibition catalogue, New York, reprinted in Alloway, *Topics in American Art Since 1945*, 201–206, 201 and 202.

⁷⁶ Rebecca Schneider, *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment*, London and New York, 2011, 90.

⁷⁷ Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*, Durham, NC, 2003, 19.

⁷⁸ Freeman, *Time Binds*, 71.

⁷⁹ These words by Kaprow are re-used in the voice-over for the film that was later made of *Moving*. *Moving*, 1969 [1967], Super 8 (transferred to DVD), 16 minutes, Bruce Breland, Sunset Haven Cinema, F45, AKP.

⁸⁰ Bourgeois, 'Allan Kaprow', 71.

⁸¹ Widrich, *Performative Monuments*, 8.

⁸² Gordon Hyatt, letter to Allan Kaprow, undated, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

⁸³ Kaprow, letter to Green, 1 December 1969.

⁸⁴ Allan Kaprow, letter to Wilder Green, 7 November 1969, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

⁸⁵ Kaprow, letter to Green, 1 December 1969.

⁸⁶ Allan Kaprow, letter to Wilder Green, 23 February 1970, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

⁸⁷ Kaprow, notes for *Days Off*, c.1969.

⁸⁸ See especially Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, London and New York, 2001 [1964].

⁸⁹ Allan Kaprow and Richard Schechner, 'Extensions in Time and Space: An Interview with Allan Kaprow', *The Drama Review: TDR*, 12:3, Spring 1968, 153–159, 155.

⁹⁰ Kaprow, letter to Green, 1 December 1969.

⁹¹ Allan Kaprow, letter to James C. Crimmins, 29 September 1969, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

⁹² Kaprow, interview with Alloway.

⁹³ Kaprow, notes for *Days Off*, c.1969.

⁹⁴ For a reproduction of Goode's calendar see Rebecca Peabody et al., *Pacific Standard Time: Los Angeles Art, 1945–1980*, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles, 2011, 312–3.

⁹⁵ Kaprow requested that posters for *Days Off* be 'sent in quantity to schools' to advertise it. Kaprow, letter to Crimmins, 29 September 1969.

⁹⁶ Patricia Norvell, interview with Seth Siegel, 17 April 1969, in Alexander Alberro and Patricia Norvell eds., *Recording Conceptual Art*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2001, 31–55, 47.

⁹⁷ Maria Eichhorn, 'Interview with Seth Siegel', 4 April 1996, in Gerti Fietzek ed., *Maria Eichhorn: The Artist's Contract*, Cologne, 2009, 39–57, 45.

⁹⁸ Bourgeois observes this tension, stating that the calendar 'shows an artist ... moving toward being a director.' Bourgeois, 'Allan Kaprow', 72.

Photographs apparently considered for *Days Off* featured Kaprow's art world acquaintances like George Segal, Dan Flavin, and Claes Oldenburg; these did not make the final cut, perhaps because of their 'exclusive' impression. Box 17, folder 6, AKP.

⁹⁹ The readiness with which people contributed photographs testify to good working relationships between Kaprow and many participants. Box 17, folders 5–6, AKP.

¹⁰⁰ Susan Sontag noted the Happenings' coercive qualities early on, while Rodenbeck has proposed that many Happenings 'were far more ambivalent, negative, and even creepy than they have been painted in contemporaneous accounts'. Susan Sontag, 'Happenings: An Art of Radical Juxtaposition' (1962), in *Against Interpretation*, New York, 1966, 263–274; Rodenbeck, *Radical Prototypes*, ix.

¹⁰¹ Bryan-Wilson traces how 'MoMA became the primary target for anti-war actions' during 1970, protested by the Guerrilla Art Action Group and the Art Workers' Coalition. Bryan-Wilson, *Art Workers*, 21.

¹⁰² Wilder Green, letter to Allan Kaprow, 20 November 1969; and Wilder Green, letter to Allan Kaprow, 8 July 1970, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

¹⁰³ A royalties statement for July–December 1969 lists 2,882 copies sold. The Museum of Modern Art, 'Royalty Statement', 11 March 1970, box 17, folder 5, AKP. For the standard 1969 appointment calendar, 'A total of 32,295 copies was printed and all were sold ... Estimated amount of money in gross sales for this publication is \$61,000.' Junior Council, Annual Report, 1968–69, JC, 1. MoMA Archives, NY.

¹⁰⁴ In a missive dripping with sarcasm, Kaprow thanked Green for 'a great promotional effort'. Allan Kaprow, letter to Wilder Green, 16 March 1970, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

¹⁰⁵ During the 1960s Kaprow worked on a number of grant applications and proposals for experimental educational initiatives inside and outside the university setting, culminating in *Project Other Ways*. Allan Kaprow, proposal for 'Continuous Experimentation in the Humanities', 1964–5, box 47, folder 1, AKP; proposals for Institutes and Centres in 'Experimental Research in the Arts', c. 1966, box 47, folder 11 and box 57A, folder 1, AKP.

¹⁰⁶ Allan Kaprow, 'Success and Failure When Art Changes', in Suzanne Lacy, *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, Seattle, 1995, 152–158, 152.

¹⁰⁷ Allan Kaprow, interview with Moira Roth for the Archives of American Art, Pasadena, 1980, 65–66, box 53, folder 16, AKP.

¹⁰⁸ At Cal Arts Kaprow continued to develop Happenings as class exercises with students. See scores by students including *Directions for Positions* (1971), *Walking* (1971) and *Rare Black Parrot Tulips* (1972), box 57, folder 9, AKP.

¹⁰⁹ Kaprow, interview with Roth, 66.

¹¹⁰ Wilson's photographs of the protests for the *Oakland Tribune* predate the publication of images in the same newspaper from *Shape* (see footnote 53), resulting in a delayed temporal overlap.

¹¹¹ Kaprow, 'Success and Failure When Art Changes', 152.

¹¹² Suzanne Lacy, who studied with Kaprow at Cal Arts, has stressed the importance of his work for the development of socially engaged participatory practice since the 1970s. Suzanne Lacy, 'Tracing Allan Kaprow', in *Leaving Art: Writings on Performance, Politics, and Publics, 1974–2007*, Durham, NC, 2010, 319–325. A 2014 exhibition *Allan Kaprow: Other Ways* at the Fundació Antoni Tàpies in Barcelona, curated by Soledad Gutiérrez, took *Project Other Ways* as a starting point for exploring pedagogy and politics in his work. See also Grant Kester, *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context*, Durham, NC and London, 2011; and Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*, London, 2012.

¹¹³ Anon., 'Possible Holidays for Kaprow Calendar', c.1968–9, box 17, folder 5, AKP.

¹¹⁴ Anon., 'Possible Holidays', c.1968–9.

¹¹⁵ Walter Benjamin, 'Theses on the Philosophy of History' (1940), in Hannah Arendt ed., *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zorn, London, 1999, 245–255, 253.

¹¹⁶ John Roberts, *Philosophizing the Everyday: Revolutionary Praxis and the Fate of Cultural Theory*, London, 2006, 61.

¹¹⁷ Osborne, *Politics of Time*, 143.

¹¹⁸ For the relevance of these issues in contemporary performance see Jen Harvie, *Fair Play: Art, Performance, and Neoliberalism*, London, 2013.

¹¹⁹ In a coda to *Days Off*, Kaprow wrote a score called *Calendar*, which involved transposing sections of turf between dry and green grass. *Calendar* plays with interrupting growth and decline, challenging the progression of the seasons through transplanting and grafting grass at different stages of its life cycle. Allan Kaprow, score for *Calendar*, October 1971, AKP, box 19, folder 10.